

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 7. No. 12.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It is a major feature of Judaeo-Masonic politics to force political voting power into the hands of the inexperienced. Hence all the tender consideration for youth and the "worker"—i.e. the wage-earner tied to his job. Majorities of inexperienced voters can be deluded by broadcasting, the Press, and Hollywood glamour, to vote for anything.

Youth and Age are no more virtues than red or black hair. It is generally correct to say, as it has been said for thousands of years, "Age for the Council, and Youth for the Field," which the Satanic habit of inversion would deny. But there are a good many old men of twenty-five years, and some young ones of sixty.

One hundred and ten years ago, William Cobbett wrote in his *Rural Rides* of "poverty amidst plenty" and related how he saw "shiploads of respectable farmers fleeing from the fangs of taxation" to America and Canada. He prophesied that the Jews would first cause the landlords to empty the pockets of the farmers and would then have their own turned inside out.

The socialism of such men as Lord Snowden and Sydney Webb, with its organised drive for ever higher taxation, has been the mainstay of Jewish Finance-Capitalism. Without it, the Debt System would have been broken seventy-five years ago, and poverty abolished.

There is no more dangerous fallacy than that which is consciously propagated by Bankers and Financiers—that a hard-working world is an efficient world. The present war is an integral part of a world whose ideals and religion are voiced by the "B".B.C.

Since Cobbett's day, productivity has increased fifty-fold. Had that production been induced by realistic needs, and sanely distributed, the "Labour" Party would have had to explain what its title meant.

You are enjoined by the anonymous organisers of the "British Democratic Movement" to Rally Now for the establishment of True Democracy in Britain for All Time.

This appears to consist in advancing the political fortunes of Emmanuel Shinwell, Sir George Schuster, Sydney Silverman (n), Colonel Wedgwood (who would like *Truth* suppressed), Lloyd George (friend of the Isaacs family and solicitor to the Zionist Party) and Mr. Richard Stokes, whose passion is to "nationalise" land, and the Bank of "England" ("Nationalisation? We welcome it").

On the police principle of localising your nuisances, there might be something in it. Look at their photographs.

In the case of limited companies, it is usually considered that the prefix "British" to its title indicates that it is a local centre of a foreign undertaking, employing a percentage of British labour and money, and controlled from abroad.

"If Wilson had been either simply an idealist or a caucus politician, he might have succeeded. His attempt to run the two in double harness was the cause of his undoing. The specious philanthropy which he exhaled upon Europe stopped quite sharply at the shores of his own country. . . .

"He did not wish to come to speedy terms with the European Allies; he did not wish to meet their leading men around a table; he saw himself for a prolonged period at the summit of the world, chastening the Allies, chastising the Germans, and generally giving laws to mankind. . . . In the Peace Conference—to European eyes—President Wilson sought to play a part out of all proportion to any stake which his country had contributed, or intended to contribute to European affairs."

— RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL in *The Aftermath*.

President Wilson was controlled by Strauss, Brandeis, and Jacob Schiff.

"Washington, October 14. Strikes are rapidly becoming America's No. 1 problem. Interruptions to the defence programme continue. Hundreds of millions of dollars of defence work contracts are held up. . . .

"Why is the President so timid about labour difficulties? He makes a speech or a plea now and then. . . . But they know nothing will come of it. And nothing does. . . .

"Sydney Hillman, who boasts that he alone makes the labour policies of the Administration. . . ."

— DAVID LAWRENCE in *The New York Sun*.

Sydney Hillman is a Ukrainian Jew, for many years secretary of the Garment Workers' Federation. He was in the closest collaboration with Strauss, Brandeis, and Jacob Schiff.

He is now a member of the Production Board. The omnipotent industrial committee of Priority in Washington.

"He [Sydney Hillman] recommended that the Government pay higher for certain building contracts in order to favour employers with American Federation of Labour employees."

— *The New York Sun*.

S.P.A.B. (the U.S. equivalent of Lord Reith) has ruled that no new public or private building shall be started unless it is essential to the health and safety of the country.

Federal Union in action, no doubt.

Commander Stephen King-Hall, M.P. (Economics for

Tiny Tots from the "B".B.C. you know) tells us that Total Peace means Public Control (now then, Clarence, keep quiet) of public necessities and Social Security, some form of League of Nations, and "a managed Gold Standard operated by a body similar to the Bank of International Settlements."

Waal, waal, waal, we always knew he was the feller who knew what the war was for.

"It is clear that the fundamental motivating force for the present conflict between the Axis Powers and the British, American, and Soviet nations, is the inordinate desire of the United States for world hegemony."

— Japanese House of Representatives, *The Times's* Report, November 19.

If a mere Englishman may venture to comment, isn't it odd that the three political parties pledged to introduce Home Rule in Scotland after the war, the Liberal, Labour and Communist parties, should be those most set on Foreign (international) Rule for Britain?

We trust that no one is under the impression that the new order banning new shops and licensing old ones is any solution to the problems of small traders. It will provide a fine opportunity for large stores with copious financial backing, by buying up the business of the small men no longer able to stand the strain of war-time conditions, to approach the complete monopoly of distribution with legal sanctions against competition.

Mr. John Hargrave, we learn from the *Jewish Chronicle*, has "condemned" Major Douglas. The paragraph conveying this information appears under the heading 'Jewish Defence.'

"The *Gleichschaltung* of the Commonwealth Bank is clearly under way." So now what, Mr. Chifley? (No prize is offered to the reader who first explains why *The Economist* chooses so uncouth a word as most suitable to advance its modest opinion. But he might tell Mr. Chifley!).

Trades Unionism in the U.S.A.

The more rash propagandists for Union either with America or Europe are in the habit of holding up the United States of America as their prize exhibit, largely on the grounds that the component states don't go to war with each other.

Now it is quite evident that war, appalling as it is, is not the greatest of all evils, or we should not, to-day, be waging war against something that we consider more frightful still. "A greater evil," it has been said, "would be the unchecked operation in a helpless world of those causes of which war is an effect."*

In the United States the friction between the geographical *blocs* of the states has been greatly reduced by a process which has homogenised their different cultures and left the Southern states, the centre of a civilisation that rivalled that of the Notherners, in a condition of permanent depression. But since the 'causes of which war is an effect' have not been

eliminated, 'geographical' war seems to have given place to a friction between lateral *blocs* of the population, a class warfare which, if it has not yet come down to bombs (other than stink bombs) and aeroplanes, is none the more acceptable because it is a more lingering form of the same horror, and a progenitor of revolution rather than intra-national war.

An interesting assessment of some of the forces at work in the United States was made by Mr. W. J. Brown, General Secretary of the Civil Service Clerical Association, in a recent article in the *Daily Telegraph*. Mr. Brown, himself a trades union leader in this country, seems to have been gravely perturbed by the effect and methods of United States trades unionism:—

"... But in fact it is difficult to pick up a newspaper without reading of a stoppage in one industry or plant or another, and often stoppages are in industries and plants essential to national defence. Nor are these strikes and lock-outs always disputes about wages or conditions of employment. Two elements other than the usual ones play a large part in them.

"The first is the desire of the American Federation of Labour and the Congress of Industrial Organisations alike to extend trade union organisation as such.

"The second element is strife between the A.F. of L. unions and the C.I.O. unions, fought out in the field of industry itself.

"Two phrases epitomise the issues here: 'The closed shop' and the 'Check-off.' When a union has organised a substantial proportion of the staff of a given plant it demands not only recognition by the employer but that the employer should impose the 'closed shop.' This means that the employer must compel the remaining workers to join, under pain of dismissal, the union making the demand.

"The 'closed shop' is in some cases supplemented by the 'check-off'—which means that the employer is obliged to see that having become members of a union, the staff keep fully paid up in their contributions to the union. This means, in effect, that if a man leaves his union, for whatever reason, he will be fired by the employer, who thus becomes, in fact, a subscription-collecting and membership enforcing agency for the union.

"A.F. of L. unions and C.I.O. unions try to enforce the 'closed shop' and the 'check-off' not only against the employer but against each other. The upshot is an alarming number of what are called 'union jurisdictional disputes' carried to the point of stopping the plant. In particular cases where the plants are essential to national defence, stoppages lead to the taking over of the plants by the Army or the Navy, in which case the rights of employers and competing unions alike go by the board.

"A free and wholehearted acceptance of trade unionism by American employers would probably make the 'closed shop' and 'check-off' out of date issues. The 'closed shop' is a thing which I should not like to see in Britain, for it seems to me to lead straight to the 'Labour Front' on the German model.

"Another element, personally distressing to me, in the industrial and trade union situation is plain unadulterated racketeering, in which the interests of employers and workmen alike are subordinated to the interests of the racket."

*C. H. DOUGLAS: *The Control and Distribution of Credit*.

MENTAL SUGGESTION

Although it is, perhaps, one of the healthiest and most hopeful signs in the world to-day that the majority among the white races do not to any large extent study Occultism—study, that is, to practice it, yet the trend of events suggests that there may be great danger to the Western World in continued ignorance on the matter.

With no pretence to be exhaustive, the familiar term “mental suggestion” defines what Occultism is—deliberate mental suggestion.

It is a fact as old as society. And there would be no special need for a warning on the subject were it not that in recent years there are growing signs that the English-speaking nations are becoming more and more habituated to the exercise of Occultism in the form known as Propaganda—a term that has achieved such respectability and official status that it threatens to become indistinguishable in the public mind from those good words—news and information. Lately there have been several open and acknowledged efforts at mass-suggestion which easily come to mind; and we are taught to think no harm of them.

The direction of all this must surely be unmistakable to any decent intelligence? Or is it really not a matter beyond dispute and opinion, that to manipulate another individual's mind, consciously to interfere with his God-given thinking apparatus for one's own purposes, constitutes an absolute bar to any ordered way of life whatsoever? But if that matter is ceasing to appear to Englishmen in this light, then surely another line of civilisation's defences must be in process of abandonment.

The Western reaction to Occultism, or what might be termed the typical British attitude, has been either entirely to ignore its existence, or to laugh at it. Perhaps the Protestant Churches' chief, if not their only, claim to our support is their childlike defencelessness in respect of it. To the pure all things are pure; and particularly to the Englishman of pre-Hollywood and pre-radio days the very idea of mental interference, which lies at the root of all Propaganda and Occultism, was naturally repellent. One of those things “not done.”

Now that was an entirely commendable attitude as long as it was effective; but it is becoming clear that, for whatever reason, it is no longer so. The “thing” is being more and more “done,” and to continue to insist on one's simple ignorance of it, loses all childlike virtue and becomes mere childish and dangerous pretence. If un-English arts are being practised in England in spite of him, it is incumbent on the Englishman to bestir himself before it is too late, and discover how and why.

Propaganda may be described as the thin end of the wedge, of which the thick end, as Douglas has so often said, is Black Magic—the age-old practice of taboo, employed in primitive societies by witch-doctors for preserving a mystery that has no existence in reality.

It is the exact opposite of the Englishman's taboo—that simple idea of “cricket” that we have all been so sedulously taught to deride, which has reference to actions that decency forbids, and is applied to *oneself*. Whereas Black Magic deals with the thoughts of *others* respecting oneself, or with something from which one wishes to divert investigation. It is not a self-imposed restriction, but an inhibition injected into another's mind.

Black Magic is an exploitation, for one's own purposes, of the innate timidity of human ignorance. It takes many different forms; least dangerous where most crude, as in the gangster and terrorist underworld where, if you give a pal away you're for it. Substantially the same threat, of course, lies in the initiation oaths common to all Secret Societies. Nor is there any fundamental difference to be observed in the subtle intellectual intimidation induced by the high-financial patter of the City. Implicit and explicit in all of them is the threat of the dire consequence following on any attempt to “give the show away”—just flat opposition to light and truth. At the one extreme it's a bullet in the neck; at the other it's inflation; and between the two every threatening variation calculated to keep the human tongue silent and the human mind shut in a dark and secret conspiracy against itself.

Social Crediters, by the grace of their comparative enlightenment in regard to monetary matters, have warred more successfully than any other single body of people against this mental force as it is met in what we know as High Finance. But nevertheless there have been signs all down the history of the Social Credit Movement that many were not fully alive to all the psychological implications of their Monetary enlightenment. It needs to be recognised that where the force of Occultism is employed to keep certain practices hidden, once the facts about them begin to leak out, as happened long ago in the case of Finance, the same force can be, and is, used to ensure that if possible the wrong deductions are made from the facts.

One has only to consider the Labour Movement to recognise that to see through the Financial Ramp, and to see it *only* as such, has been the undoing of Labour all over the world, in its efforts for freedom. It is, in fact, the over-emphasis on the personal-greed aspect of the matter, due to a false scent deliberately laid down, and assisting towards the lowering of the general estimate of human nature, that has been the means of blinding Labour to the real goings-on. That was exactly what High Finance wanted; for it helped them to lead the “working-man” and the sentimental among the Fabians along the utterly sterile path to Socialisation, in a forlorn attempt to curb the wicked speculator and the blood-sucking capitalist.

And in our case too (let us admit it) there is equal danger, if we fail to face squarely the fact of an authentic Plot for world-control behind and beyond all the mere plutocratic wallowings of the Stock Markets—a Plan for ultimate world-control; and penultimately—as an essential and unavoidable step towards that end, the over-laying and marring and obliterating by every means fair or foul, of British culture, i.e. the Christian Democratic idea. Because, until and unless we bring ourselves wholly to this realisation, our subconscious minds must remain, at least partially, at the mercy of the false reasonings and deductions and apprehension which it is the aim of the projectors of this Plan to plant here.

So when we are tempted (using the word quite literally), to say to ourselves, “World Plot, but it's too childish!” we need to make sure that the source of that impulse is original and pure—our very own reaction, and not subtly suggested from outside. It won't do to yield too easily to what may be one of the most insidious of soporifics, sophistication—the illusion that we know too much to be taken in. Perhaps we need to remind ourselves that the statement beginning “Except ye become as little children . . .” has an immensely wide application.

N. F. W.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Offices: (Editorial) 4, ACREFIELD ROAD, WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL,
 Telephone: Gateacre 1561; (Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 7. No. 12.

Saturday, November 29, 1941.

JOAD ON SUCCESS

On Sunday, November 16, Professor Joad of the 'B'.B.C. Brains Trust, gave it as his view that Success (the word itself was left undefined) depends to a very large extent upon the development and exercise of a man's individual peculiarities, as distinct from any other qualities of a more general nature that he might possess.

Later, to the usual background of merriment (which reached a high pitch when somebody made a witticism about honouring your father and mother) the Trust agreed unanimously that children were "better" at nursery schools than in the home. Professor Joad contributed the argument that the "accident" of child-bearing does not automatically produce an expert in child-rearing.

So, within the half-hour, listeners were able to hear Joad the man explaining what is good for the individual (i.e. for Joad)—and Joad the planner moralising on what is good for the masses (i.e. the non-Joads).

A fundamental difference between the "expert" educator and the mother is that the one is academically interested in the highest common factor of many children while the other is jealous to preserve the prime factors of her own. The institutionalist sets out to "rub off the corners," whereas the mother knows by instinct (and a jolly good instinct too) that her child's corners are the characteristics most deserving of preservation—that, in fact, (to return to Professor Joad) "corners" are the raw material of success in life.

It would be underestimating Professor Joad's intelligence to suggest that he is not aware that a policy which leads to the success of a community *as individuals* is diametrically opposed to that which aims at success in "experiments in governance." To know on which side of the fence the Professor stands one has only to mark the varying degrees of horse-power he puts behind his frequent outbursts of laughter.

In fairness to Joad, it should be kept in mind that he is only one cell in this peculiarly synchronised Brain. We are not surprised to note that Professor Huxley is about to sail for America.

W. W.

Sir Ernest Benn tells the readers of *Truth* (not the *Marines*) that he is "not in the habit of expressing views on matters outside his own personal knowledge and experience." In the next column, Sir Ernest reveals that he shares the incapacity of many people to distinguish between an

asset and a liability, and regards 'rubbishy things called Aski marks' as assets. The lapse is relatively unimportant in view of Sir Ernest's well-known habit of himself publishing assets, not claims on other people's assets. The relation between Sir Ernest's idea that the Jews are 'the prime lubricators of world trade' and any little difficulties he may have encountered in creating and distributing the assets prominently associated with his name he might soon discover if he really did put his excellent maxim into execution.

From the *Jewish Chronicle*, under the heading *Anti-Semitism has come to Stay*:—

"What are the reasons for this comparatively new anti-Jewish movement in South Africa? Apart from the general reasons that apply to every country where anti-Semitism is generated, the explanation so far as South Africa is concerned is that the Jew is being made the scapegoat for what the reactionary Afrikaner believes to be the Englishman's sins against his people. . . . The South African Jew is standing by Britain. . . ." Yes, *which* Britain? (Lord Moyne, in the House of Lords, indicated that H.M. Government had received no communication from the Union Government on the subject of General Smuts's broadcast demanding the reaffirmation of the Balfour Declaration.)

The Chancellor of the Exchequer has been telling the House of Commons that "the money out of which the banks lend to the Government is, broadly speaking, derived from deposits made by customers in the ordinary course of their business, and there is no question of banks creating credit for the purpose of lending money to the Government." *The Economist's* motherly comment that here the little fellow "strayed quite unnecessarily on to dangerous ground" must not be taken to mean that that anxious journal is yet convinced that there is anything improper in holding the community to ransom for the "debt."

Congratulations to Osbert, who has had the bright idea that, since we are to do away with "Esquire and All That" (see *The Times*) "we should all be called by the same name, as plain a one as possible. If this should render difficult the filling up of forms, a number could be attached to each—or rather the same—name." (There is no truth in the rumour that P.E.P. has already conducted an investigation into the most suitable name for Mr. Sitwell's purpose, or that it is *Goy*.)

Mr. Henry Morgenthau, United States Secretary of the Treasury, stated recently that Britain and the United States were discussing a reciprocal tax agreement. The plan, it is said, would exempt British-owned factories in the United States from taxes and confer the same benefits on American-owned factories in Canada and Britain.

At the same time holders of the 15 United States securities which were temporarily called up and used as securities for dollars were asked to give the Government a chance of buying the securities outright.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Mr. James Golder and Mr. A. R. Turpin have accepted office as Directors of the Secretariat.

THE RULE OF LAW

By "ANAGAMMADION"

I have been shown a letter from a supporter of the Secretariat who expresses the opinion that the relation of Statutory Law to Common Law is "analogous to the relation between Financial Credit and Real Credit."

The writer thinks that it is a potent weapon in the hands of the people's enemies to be able to exploit their ignorance of the meaning of the term 'Common Law,' and states that the Amalgamated Union of Asphalt Workers has recently advised its members to claim compensation for injury, whenever it is possible to do so, under Common Law instead of under one of the Acts specifically dealing with such matters. One result has been the award to a claimant of damages of £2,500 where the maximum which might have been claimed under the Workman's Compensation Act was £600. Another point of interest is the opinion which is expressed that our legislators, not our judges, have been to blame for allowing the Common Law to be undermined and the high notions of justice which it embodied to be neglected to the detriment of individuals in the community. This is all to the good. It exposes the falsity of the current idea that Parliament is ceaselessly hatching out a brood of 'progressive' legalistic chickens, each a great improvement on its predecessors, distributing bounty on all hands, whereas a realistic estimate of the view which legislators entertain of themselves and their place in this world goes better with the idea that social advancement is directly proportionate to the size of the police force—the more police that are required to deter people from transgression the more satisfactory everything is.

I have heard people solemnly defend this view, on some high-sounding sentimental ground such as that 'it only shows the widening moral perspective; that as man grows "better" he naturally becomes aware of an increasing number of things which it is wrong to do,' and *therefore* requires, I suppose, artificial stimulants to give him the courage to live at all, since his powers of obedience to his own moral notions do not keep pace with his 'widening perspective'! However, it's not my view. I think that by the time one half the adult population is in the police force and the other half, plus nearly all the children, are in prison, the community in which such a state of things occurs has far outgrown its usefulness, and some radical steps are necessary to restore it to sanity and successful organisation.

It is, from this point of view, salutary to learn that there was a time, and there were once rules of Law, which accorded a higher, not a lower, value than at present to some part or other of a man's person, and that, if he were deprived of it, through the fault of anyone else a greater, not a less, injury was admitted by common consent to have been suffered.

Of all the damned lies lying about for contradiction, I think the 'progress' lie about the damnedest, and anything which serves to contradict it has my full approval.

But then the letter goes on to suggest that "we can bring the public to its senses by telling it the facts about Common Law," and that "this is a more profitable proceeding than merely making negative attacks on our opponents." Presumably it is considered by the writer of the letter that that is what *The Social Crediter* is doing, even if it is not all that it is doing. I should have thought that Major

Douglas's observations, not very long ago, on the error of conceiving such a thing as 'positive' electricity as something which could exist independently of 'negative' electricity—observations which were pointed, if I remember rightly, by saying that some people might regard the R.A.F., along these lines, as a purely 'negative' instrument—would have dissipated misunderstandings of this kind. But I rather fear it is the view that you can overcome the law by appealing to it which is here the truly 'negative' proposal. You can't. The Law is anything and everything that the legislators like to make it. And the really useful laws left lying about to the disadvantage of 'interests' are only left lying about because they are good 'cover' for legislators who can change them at very short notice if they become too densely populated and places of public sanctuary. *The Economist* expresses this truth with almost Hebraic subtlety in the statement that "Parliament is more than ever wary in protection of individual rights, especially those of Members." The bone of contention in modern society, as in society throughout its recognisable existence, is the *political* bone—that is to say it is the question *who* shall determine policy. It does not matter how much you scratch at the skin of politics, or how deep you cut into the flesh, unless you cut down to the bone you effect nothing at all.

That lively and well-seasoned paper *Truth*, for example, publishes this very week a claim by an official of the National Association of Local Government Officers to be allowed to plan the future 'functions, structure, finance and machinery of local government, and comments very pertinently that taxpayers and ratepayers pay their officials to be officials, not to be new world makers. But, says the newspaper, "The electorate returns a Lower House of over six hundred representatives" etc., etc., "to devise national policies and direct national trends." Nothing of the sort! With so many great 'constitutional' issues in the air (and blowing about to not much purpose) I had the curiosity to look the other day at Dicey's *Law of the Constitution* (which I notice now is more modestly labelled "An Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution.") Why, asks Dicey, have certain principles, which are not laws, are not to be found on the statute-book, are not maxims of common law, and will not be enforced by any judicial body, the force of law? He says a reply more often suggested than formulated in so many words is that obedience to the conventions of the constitution is ultimately enforced by the fear of impeachment. This suggestion Dicey discards. If it were accepted, he says, such principles would be laws, "and their sole peculiarity would lie in their being laws the breach of which could be punished only by one extraordinary tribunal, namely the High Court of Parliament." He slowly works round to "the fundamental dogma of modern constitutionalism; the legal sovereignty of Parliament is subordinate to the political sovereignty of the nation." "... the sanction which constrains the boldest political adventurer to obey the fundamental principles of the constitution and the conventions in which these principles are expressed, is the fact that the breach of these principles and of these conventions will almost immediately bring the offender into conflict with the Courts and the law of the land." Unfortunately, Dicey wrote before the full force of "administrative lawlessness" (Hewart) had grown to the well-known proportions of the present time. If Dicey had been asked what safeguards there were against the abuse of such practices, he might have answered by pointing to the insecurity which besets the

footsteps of all who rely upon an Act of Indemnity. "There are times of tumult or invasion when for the sake of legality itself the rules of law must be broken. . . . A statute of this kind is . . . the last and supreme exercise of Parliamentary sovereignty. It legalises illegality. . . ." It was Dicey's view that between suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* Act and Indemnity there exists a special connection. "It is however almost certain that when the suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* Act makes it possible for the government to keep persons in prison for a length of time without bringing them to trial, a smaller or greater number of unlawful acts will be committed, if not by the members of the Ministry themselves, at any rate by their agents." Such persons "can derive no defence whatever from the mere fact that, at the time when the unlawful arrest took place, the *Habeas Corpus* Act was . . . not in force."

But if the legal sovereignty of Parliament is subordinate in all cases and at all times to *the political sovereignty of the nation*, it is that which we must conserve. Between political realism and legal illusion there is the same gulf as between Real and Financial credit. Law and custom can both give correct expression to individual policy. They don't. The powers of the law are useless unless they are invoked. All power is ineffectual unless it is used.

RETROGRESSION

By B. M. PALMER

The Times's leading article of November 17 on the Colonial Empire deserves close attention. It is based on the recent speeches of Lord Hailey, one of whose remarks is quoted.

"We must not," he says, "give our native population cause to complain that when they asked for bread we offered them a vote."

An automobile is of no use to a man who cannot drive. There have been periods in the life of every colony when votes would have been useless to the vast majority of its members. But it is plain from the tenor of the article that it is not the *ignorance* of the colonists which render their votes comparatively useless. It is simply that we are to believe that a vote is of no avail to the natives, or to anyone else for that matter, in securing to its holder food, clothing and shelter.

The very turn of the sentence casts contumely on the franchise. It is plain that the votes of the people are no longer considered the ultimate sanction, for "if freedom and civilisation are to survive, political self-government everywhere can and must be made compatible with some form of common financial and economic policy."

This is only another way of saying that self-government can have no sanction in financial and economic matters. We do not need to conform to conditions which we are able to master. But those who inspire *The Times's* leading articles believe that economic policy lies outside the scope of self-government. They do not say so, unless by the implied statement that we must conform to "inexorable economic law." The fact that this belief is in harmony with their own will-to-power must not be overlooked.

Until it is realised that the vote is the proper political means by which the individual can secure to himself his rightful share of food, clothing and shelter, we shall be doomed to upheavals, strikes, revolts, and world wars. It

is natural that men and women should have control of sanctions; any attempt to take these away will be followed by the natural results.

After the appearance of this leading article it can surely no longer be seriously denied that *The Times* is our leading Socialist daily, in face of its main statement that we must abandon our doctrine of Imperial trusteeship as inadequate, together with the system of thought that would reduce the activities of the State to a minimum. For "this change in Colonial policy corresponds closely to a change at home in the conception of the State, not as the aloof guarantor of the rights and liberties of the subject but as the active dispenser of education, health, and the whole range of what are called the social services."

Millions of British people throughout the Empire must ask themselves what they are fighting for if this is a true picture of our future. Are we to reverse the whole conception of democracy which has made the Empire unique in history—the tremendous ideal that the state exists only to further the liberty of the individual—that we should let the other fellow go his own way because we prefer to go ours? The British people do not wish for more government interference, more and more compulsion, more and more forms to fill up. No wonder anti-Nazi propaganda is obliged to confine itself to German atrocities; they are the only distinguishing marks of German National Socialism from the brand advocated by *The Times*. Our masters intend at present to be kind and gentle to us, but they do not intend to give us any more freedom than we should get under the New Order. But let us beware—absolute power corrupts absolutely. Once we consent to a state tyranny we may expect it to stop at nothing. Consent to an open tyranny is perhaps not in the character of the British people, but still more serious attempts may be made to rivet an economic tyranny upon us in order that the State may be supreme, instead of being no more than a convenient means of distributing dividends. But if this is done it can lead only to more and more disturbances, both civil and military, simply because men and women are compelled by their very nature, never to rest until they have found the highest good. And that good will not be found along the retrogressive path to which *The Times* so persistently directs us.

ALICE IN ORDER-LAND

From "*The Dundee Courier and Advertiser*," November 15, 1941:—

(CONTRIBUTED: WITH APOLOGIES TO LEWIS CARROL)

"Silence," shouted the Madcap. "We must have orders and economy—economy of paper, coal, light, food, clothing, and things."

"What's orders? What's economy?" asked Alice.

"Economy," said the Madcap, "is getting an office, appointing officials, clerks, and issuing orders. Orders is orders in Orderland. Everybody gets orders—orders how to live, how to eat, how to clothe, how to spend, how to travel."

"Give me an example," said Alice.

"Eggs," said the Madcap. Take eggs. There's registration, collection by motor car, petrol, coupons, clerks, graders, distributors, and then eggs—"

"Vanish," said Small Voice. "Rotten."

"Who said that?" shouted the Madcap.

"I did," said Small Voice.

"Do you mean rotten eggs or rotten system or rotten Vanish?" asked the Madcap.

"All three," said Small Voice.

"Hush," said Alice. "It isn't good form to criticise an official idea."

"Who said forms? We must have forms," shouted the Madcap. "Forms! We can't economise without forms. Forms and coupons and orders—fill 'em up—rush 'em out."

"Is that what you call a campaign?" said Small Voice.

"Indeed it is," said the Madcap. "If you don't obey orders then comes the real pain."

"Ha, ha," said Small Voice. "Good joke."

"It's no joke," said the Madcap. "Those who disobey are threatened. Those who have thought out the most forms and most orders will be rewarded with free trips to Snoopoo."

"Where's Snoopoo?" inquired Small Voice.

"Everywhere and anywhere. That's a great secret," said the Madcap.

"I know," said Alice. "It's not a nice place. That's where people spy on each other."

"Is it anywhere near Gestoopoo?" asked Small Voice.

At this there was loud disturbance.

"Order, order," shouted the Madcap.

"That seems to be our motto," said Small Voice.

Miserable Sinners?

An Albertan doctor to an audience of 400:—

"You look well fed and comfortable sitting here in front of me, but you are suffering from the disease prevalent throughout Canada . . . malnutrition. You don't get enough calcium, iron, Vitamin B-1, so you are frequently fatigued and have undiagnosed aches and pains."

PARLIAMENT

Privilege: Small Traders

NOVEMBER 13.

PRIVILEGE (0.5 columns)

Sir Herbert Williams (Croydon, South): Mr. Speaker, I desire now to raise formally the question of Privilege which I brought to your attention on Tuesday last. During the Recess I received a letter purporting to be signed by Major E. Hammond Foot, Wilton Corner, Beaconsfield, Bucks, and dated October 25, and among other things it contained this paragraph:

"Then came the blight of vested interest, and high finance and International Socialism of a Bolshevik type, which infected the House, the Whips and the Speaker's Chair . . ."

In another paragraph this appears:

"I apologise for circulating this letter, but if Members of Parliament are tied by Party Whips and the Speaker's Chair to keep silent, then the elector has the right to criticise openly before them."

I submit that these statements constitute a gross breach of the Privileges of this House.

Mr. Speaker: In these matters it is not for me to decide whether a breach of Privilege has been committed, but whether the hon. Member has made out a *prima facie* case, and in this case I think he has.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill): I beg to move, as it is my duty,

"That the matter of the complaint be referred to the Committee of Privileges."

Question put, and agreed to.

PRIVILEGES

Ordered,

"That the Committee of Privileges do consist of Ten Members."

Committee accordingly nominated of Mr. Attlee, the Attorney-General, Mr. Clynes, Col. Sir George Courthope, Mr. Denman, Colonel Gretton, Sir Percy Harris, Mr. Lambert, Sir Hugh O'Neil and Earl Winterton.

Ordered,

"That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records."

Ordered,

"That Five be the quorum."—[*Major Dugdale*.]

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS (74 columns)

Mr. Austin Hopkinson (Mossley): . . . The hon. Member for Llanelly (Mr. J. Griffiths) seemed to think that industry could be perfectly well run and run on a most efficient basis by setting up workers committees with managerial responsibility. I can only tell them that I have a great deal of experience of that, an experience which is perhaps unique. In the case of the works with which I am concerned, the whole works and the profits of the business have been the property of the men and the net result has been that the place is, I think I may say, a happy place. Everbody does what he thinks good in his own eyes and is persuaded rather than forced to fulfil the requirements of war time. But as regards this arrangement proving a spur to effort, it does nothing of the sort. The production per man is satisfactory. Nobody is driven and nobody is exerting himself to an extent which might injure his health but everything goes on quite comfortably. The one thing that is obvious, however, is that the men do not want to run the management because they realise, as I have pointed out to them, that one of the first things a management has to do nearly every week is to decide who is to be sacked and who is to be retained. A works council was suggested some years ago but when that problem was put to the men they decided that they would like me to deal with it and not them. Thus it will be seen that these things are not quite as simple as the hon. Member for Llanelly seems to imagine. After all, our Allies, the Russians, tried out these things in their army and their navy and in their workshops, and they came to the conclusion that such a system was not the best way of maintaining the efficiency and the prosperity of the people. . . .

Captain Profumo (Kettering): . . . The Germans have not only entirely failed to understand the British Empire, but they have also demonstrated exactly what they themselves as individuals and as a Government fear most of all.

There are some who say we must not debase ourselves by bombing anything but military objectives. To those I would answer that in my opinion any square inch of land which is occupied by anything, animal or mineral, which is contributing in any way to the German war effort is a legitimate military objective. Let us, therefore, abandon our present bombing policy. One more last word on the subject. If the Government would give this their consideration, bearing in mind at the same time that discontent, bad faith, cowardliness and bad conscience create excellent bombing targets, I think a new policy such as this could very well be inaugurated over the heel of the Axis Power, Fascist Italy. . . .

NOVEMBER 18.

Oral Answers to Questions (34 columns)

SMALL TRADERS

Sir H. Williams asked the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the Location of Retail Businesses Order, 1941, he is prepared to take steps during the duration of that Order to prevent multiple shop organisations from buying up the businesses of independent retailers?

Sir A. Duncan: As at present advised, I do not propose to extend the scope of the Order on the lines which my hon. Friend suggests.

Mr. Shinwell: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is throughout the country considerable discontent, particularly on the part of small retailers who have been thrown out of business as a result of the war, when they see the chain stores and multiple shop organisations flourishing? Is it not possible in some way to protect the interests of the smaller people and curb the activities of these octopuses in business?

Mr. Kirkwood: Is it not the policy of our party, the Socialist party, to eliminate the small man?

Mr. Shinwell: Is my right hon. Friend aware that it is no part of the policy of any party in the House to eliminate the small business man in order to give advantage to the multiple shop organisations?

Sir A. Duncan: This is obviously a very controversial question, but with regard to the specific point put to me, I would remind hon. Members that the Retail Trades Committee, which made a report on this subject, advised that it would be very unhappy if anything was done to limit the possibilities of sale for the independent traders.

Mr. Kirkwood: Is it not the policy of the Government not to play into the hands of the multiple shop owners but to further the interests of winning the war?

Mr. De la Bère: This matter cannot be lightly dismissed; indeed, it cannot be dismissed at all.

Written Answers (25 columns)

FEDERAL UNION

Sir W. Smithers asked the Prime Minister whether in view of the fact that the declared policy of the organisation known as Federal Union, is to surrender sovereign powers to a Federal government, he will take the necessary steps to stop the activities of Federal Union as being inimical to our war effort?

The Prime Minister: I am advised that the activities of this body have not so far called for such action as the hon. Member suggests.

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

Information about Social Credit activities in different regions may be had by writing to the following addresses:

- BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.
 BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
 BLACKBURN S.C. Association: 168 Shear Brow, Blackburn.
 BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
 DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.
 LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.
 LONDON Liaison Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
 Lunch hour re-unions on the first and third Thursdays of the month at 12-30 p.m., at The Plane Tree Restaurant, Great Russell Street, W. C. 1. Next Meeting December 3.
 MIDLAND D.S.C. Group: see Birmingham.
 NEWCASTLE and Gateshead S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.
 PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: 115 Essex Road, Milton, or 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor.
 SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Use of Money	6d.
"This 'American' Business"	3d. each 12 for 2/-

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold	4/6
Lower Rates (pamphlet)	3d.
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson	6d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report	6d.
Is Britain Betrayed? by John Mitchell	2d. each 12 for 1/6
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	2d. each 12 for 1/6

(All the above postage extra).

Leaflets

Bomb the German People	100 for 1/9
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell	9d. doz. 50 for 2/6
(The above are post free).	
Taxation is Robbery	100 for 3/- 50 for 1/9

(Postage extra).

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