

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 7. No. 14.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"But were they guilty?" I asked. 'I do not know,' he replied. . . .

"But what about justice in such a case? You mean to say that there is no way in which the general public is to be made aware of such a charge, and its opinion consulted?"

"Well, you see, that is not the way the law is here. The Government does not arrest or charge, or at least it says it does not, until it has sifted all the evidence and is convinced of guilt. . . ."

"But what about the Russian papers?"

"The Russian papers, my friend, publish what they are advised to publish—what is in the interests of the ruling powers. This is a Communist Dictatorship."

"And so people can be taken up like that—just disappear—and nothing more is heard?"

"They were shot, so I heard, but exactly when or where, I don't know. I thought it best not to enquire too closely."

— *Dreiser Looks at Russia* by THEODORE DREISER.

But of course, it couldn't happen here.

. . . .

The first impact of Socialism is generally on railways, because transportation is civilisation, and it has invariably resulted in steady deterioration of the service rendered by them. Socialism is monopoly, which is barbarism, and is generally accompanied by "rationalisation," with the object of rendering the minimum service which the public will tolerate. The passenger is a nuisance to be discouraged as much as possible. The Socialist technician regards the railway as primarily something through which to exercise political power. Policy become identified with administration, since the "sanction" provided upon policy by a competitive service no longer exists. A considerable share of the responsibility for the decay of the Parliamentary system is due to the usurpation of National Policy by an administrative body, the Cabinet, and the consequent lack of an alternative. In other words, the unsatisfactory nature of so-called Democracy is due to the fact that it is increasingly Socialistic, and the more Socialistic it becomes, the worse is the result. It is to the eternal credit of the Roman Catholic Church that it has steadily set its face against Socialism from its earliest beginnings, in contrast to the Protestant Churches which have dabbled with it without betraying discernible evidence of trained intelligence, adequate to distinguish between the results of financial monopoly and private administration.

What is commonly called Socialism, by which is meant the progressive emasculation of individual initiative in favour of a monopoly of which the real controllers are hidden, is passively accepted by numbers of public-spirited, but technically incompetent people who intuitively dislike it, because it has been skilfully surrounded with an atmosphere of pseudo-science and "efficiency."

In regard to its "science," apart from its studious financial orthodoxy five minutes' examination of almost any orthodox socialist text-book will convince anyone that it is a theory in search of a fact, and that the procedure advocated is the exact opposite of that insisted upon by reputable scientists.

Always the objective is to stifle reaction and adverse criticism. So far from insisting on demonstration by small scale experiment, failure to run a collar and tie shop appears to be conclusive evidence of ability to provide blue-prints for a new universe.

As to efficiency, the meaning of which is the ratio of the input of what you have, to the output of what you desire, socialism's proudest boast is that it abolishes "unemployment." That is to say, it takes the most precious possessions of the individual, his time and his initiative, and gives him guns instead of butter—plague, pestilence and famine, battle, murder and sudden death.

Efficiency! Yes, the Devil is very efficient.

. . . .

"Sakes, George, where did you get that awful tie? I thought I'd sent it to 'Bundles for Britain,' months ago."

— *Saturday Evening Post*, Philadelphia, U.S.A.

. . . .

A correspondent of *The Times* in the Far East says (1) It is a curious fact that war, whether in the west or in the east, seldom achieves those aims which its begetters intend it to achieve, and (2) No country that was not as decentralised as China could have withstood the shocks which she has had to endure—two things well worth saying. The correspondent ought to come nearer.

. . . .

Sir John Wardlaw-Milne is of the opinion that we have not yet reached 75 per cent. of our potential efficiency in industry. Several M.P.s thought he had over estimated.

. . . .

Other M.P.s spoke with wonder and admiration in the recent debate on the Maximum National Effort of the way in which public opinion had always been 'ahead' of the Government when any new (and disagreeable) Orders and Bills had been brought in.

(No Clarence, in this country opinion is *not* subject to pressure—merely to the press).

Socialist Revolution by Stealth

"Is Britain fighting this war to defeat Nazi-ism and Fascism or to establish Socialism?" asks the *Dundee Courier and Advertiser* of December 4 in a leading article entitled *The Threat to Unity*.

"This may seem an absurd question, but as readers of yesterday's Commons debate on the new national service proposals, and of the report of the Labour Party meeting which followed it will find, it is not so absurd as it looks.

"It is clear that a considerable section of the Labour party are intent upon breaking up the party truce and upon seizing the occasion, if they can manage it, to do big business for the Socialist cause."

Pointing out that it would be a mistake to take this movement too seriously the *Dundee Courier* adds:—

"But thirty of the members at yesterday's meeting declared themselves in favour of an amendment demanding, as a corollary of national service, the conscription of wealth and the nationalisation of transport, coal mining, and all the business now concerned with the production of munitions. . .

"The prospects of wealth at the end of this war, which is now consuming it at so portentous a rate, are so very indifferent that a fight in its defence may well prove to be a fight for a shadow.

"That aspect of the question raised is hardly worth considering. What is worth considering is the effect upon our war prospects of the kind of politics the truce-breakers are pushing to the front—assuming for a moment their success. There is hardly room for a doubt that the effect would be disastrous, and that Hitler would win the war.

"Consider for a moment the consequences at the present time of a conscription of property. With a basic income tax at 10s. in the pound and a sur-tax rising to 19s., the whole economic fabric by which the nation lives is maintaining itself precariously. What must happen if in addition the Government attempts to levy a conscription on wealth?

"The answer is obvious. It is just a grand wreckers' plan to bring the whole hypothec down in chaos—to produce untold confusion at the crisis of the most momentous struggle this country has ever been engaged in. Hitler would delight in the news of it.

"Are the proposals for the nationalisation of industry any better?

"One of the Socialist speakers in yesterday's debate, Mr. Alfred Edwards, said that 'everything in this country is speeded up except the Civil Service, which is so constructed that it cannot be speeded up. We have created a Frankenstein which will destroy us if we do not do something about it.'

"We have no wish to dot Mr. Edwards' 'i's' and stroke his 't's.' His generalisation may be unjustly sweeping. Beyond doubt, however, it has its element of truth. In the bureaucracies 'red tape' is the enthroned enemy of swift action—often of all action.

"And nationalisation of industries means their management by a vastly enlarged and, therefore more incompetent Civil Service. Frankenstein's monster is to manage the mines, the railways, the great industries, and the land.

"In all these departments of the national life the monster has already intruded his hand, and many well-informed

authorities tell us that most if not all of the disorganisation and delay of which we hear so much is due just to that intrusion.

"It is a great plan for stopping the war—in just the way that Hitler would like to see it stopped."

Continuing, the article emphasises that this attempt to impose Socialism in war time is directly against the principles for which we are supposed to be fighting, as the British Democracy had rejected Socialism on every occasion on which it had the opportunity to do so:

"And now when the Democracy cannot be consulted the most professedly democratic of all our politicians propose behind Democracy's back to effect the unwanted revolution. The whole idea is a shabby treachery to Democratic principles.

"Long before this war is over it will be evident to all that the chief of our difficulties will be to keep this country as a going concern, capable of repairing the immense damage war and our industrial organisation for war have done to its economic structure.

"And almost if not quite the greatest lesson we should learn now is to abstain from unnecessary damage to that structure.

"Already thousands of small businesses have been ruined by damage which was not necessary, and the neglect of others, traceable directly to the centralising fetish, is gravely impeding war production. One reason, said Mr. Henderson Stewart, yesterday, 'why we do not yet come in sight of maximum production was that we had failed to make effective use of the smaller industrial establishments scattered in thousands throughout the country.'

"That is a true saying, and in our case, both actual and looming ahead, infinitely more to the point than the disloyal clamour for more and ever more centralisation of industry under the guidance and control of giant bureaucracies—the revolution by stealth which certain people are intent upon engineering behind the back of British Democracy."

AT THE "CEASE FIRE"--

By B. M. PALMER

"In respect of any undertaking centralisation is the way to do it but is neither the correct method of deciding what to do nor the question of who is to do it," is the closing paragraph of chapter II, *Economic Democracy*.

We need to understand the purpose of both planning and centralisation. Like most products of the human mind, they are only evil when wrongly used, and no civilised community could function for a week without them.

Confused as were the issues of the years before 1939, and ignorant as the vast majority of us were concerning the causes which made the conflict inevitable, it is beyond doubt that the people were united in their determination to use the sanction of war when the Germans invaded Poland. They did not know why things had come to such a pass, but they knew that fighting was the only way out. To win the war became the people's policy. In so far as this was the policy of the whole nation it could not be said to be the decision of those at the apex of international finance, although no doubt they also wanted a war in order to turn it to their

own ends. Thus from the very beginning two policies have been confused—the determination of the British to have victory, and the secret intrigues of the agents of certain interests whose aim is the consolidation of the power they have gained.

Left to themselves, the people of no nation would willingly undergo the progressive discomfort and loss of freedom which has been our lot during the last two and a half years. But having decided what to do, and concurring on who was to do it (Mr. Churchill was willingly accepted by the majority), the next step involved the handing over of the whole undertaking to those who would be capable of centralising—to the *optimum* degree, and no further—the nation's war effort, until it was more than a match for that of German National Socialism.

"Now it may be emphasised that a centralised or pyramid form of control may be, and is, in certain conditions, the ideal organisation for the attainment of one specific and material end. The only effective force by which any objective can be attained is in the last analysis the human will, and if an organisation of this character can keep the will of all its component members focussed on the objective to be attained, the collective power available is clearly greater than can be provided by any other form of association." (—*Economic Democracy*.)

Thus the whole British Empire is forced by war to submit to a pyramid form of control of which Mr. Churchill is the chief executant. The powers of this control are absolute, but *these powers are granted only until the war is won.*

Thus Mr. Churchill has a second function—he is answerable to the whole people for the use of the powers which they have granted him for the duration.

Our danger lies in the attempt which has been proceeding for several generations and has succeeded in Germany, Russia and Italy to centralise *policy* as well as technique. It is asserted that the State has an authority from which there is no appeal; that it has a concrete existence and can decide on what is to be done and who is to do it. Thus *The Times* leader of November 17 last wrote of the state as the active dispenser of education, health, and the social services, as though these things were no concern of the individual at all. Of course "the state" as such cannot exist without the people composing it—but those individuals with a will-to-power in this country may very well make use of our present centralised war organisation in an attempt to retain the making of policy in their own hands when the war is over.

Thus the Labour Party, who are quite unscrupulous when it comes to the formation of policy, decided at their conference at Bournemouth in May, 1940, that the war must be used as an opportunity for nationalising the railways, mines and other large undertakings, and for implementing the main points of the Socialist programme, despite the fact that they had no mandate from the electors to do so. The present government was not elected as a socialist government, but Socialists hope that if these things are done now they cannot be undone by later elections.

When the objective of the war is won the present war organisation of the Empire will have served its purpose. It cannot be dismantled immediately but it must be clearly recognised that the next agenda must be chosen by the people, not by the war cabinet or the socialists. This can

only be done by means of a general election which should take place as soon as possible after the close of hostilities. It seems likely that an attempt will be made to postpone this election in order that the centralised control may be adapted to peace conditions and made so permanent that the people will be unable to throw it off. If this attempt succeeded they would never again be in a position to decide on policy, and the "state" would be supreme. The real rulers of the world would probably be 200 anonymous individuals in control of an international air force.

Soon after the war began Mr. Herbert Morrison, according to *The Times*, said "What I conceive us aiming at is a co-operative international system, guaranteed by an international police air force."

And Mr. Atlee said at the conference of the Socialist party M.P.s in November, 1939:—

"There must . . . be an international force possessed of such overwhelming strength that no would-be aggressor would dare to challenge it."

These plans involve British disarmament. The point is not whether Messrs. Morrison and Atlee still desire these things, but whether the British people desire to surrender their last sanction, an ability to resort to arms in their own defence.

Mr. Greenwood and Lord Reith are busy drawing up plans for the building of a new Britain. These plans must be drawn, and Britain must be rebuilt, but the people should first be consulted as to the sort of New Britain they desire. I have heard it said that they don't know, and some one must decide; and why not leave it to those who know best. Such an attitude is completely servile. There are, of course, certain technical points that the people cannot decide, but they have never been asked the elementary basic questions, which anyone intelligent enough to use a vote could deal with.

Two of these questions may be indicated here:—

- (1) Do you wish the British Navy to surrender itself to an International Federation?
- (2) Do you wish to be in a position to own such property as may be necessary for you to live your life in your own way?

When the answers to these and similar questions had been given, it would then be necessary for someone to assume the responsibility of forming an organisation to deal with the policy laid down by the people. This would involve a certain amount of centralisation and planning, but the plan would be drawn in conformity with the appropriate strategy, and the organisation would be dissolved as soon as it had served its purpose.

"The advantage accruing from the use of it [centralisation] for the attainment of one concrete objective, such as, let us say, the coherent design of a National Railway or electric supply system (just so long as these objects are protected from use as instruments of personal and economic power) is quite incontrovertible; but every particle of available evidence goes to show that it is totally unsuitable as a system of administration for the purposes of governing the conditions under which whole peoples live their lives; that it is in opposition to every real interest of the individual when so used, and for this reason it is vital to devise methods by which technical co-ordination can be combined with individual freedom." —*Economic Democracy*.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*

One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 7. No. 14.

Saturday, December 13, 1941.

ENTER JAPAN

Japan enters the war with a deposit of bombs on some of those South Sea Islands which have supplemented romance with military bases, and as full war encircles the globe strategists, professional and amateur, seize pen and pepperpot in an effort to work out the probabilities of action. These we cannot judge, although it must be observed that to extend a fight is to come no nearer to winning it, even though the extension was not of our seeking, and the scarcely veiled satisfaction of the national press that the United States is now well 'in' is hardly justified by the decrease in material help we must expect to experience. But at least the alignment is clearer.

Social Crediters can, however, add to the experts' armoury one or two points which are normally ignored.

In Australia and New Zealand, on the south of the new ocean of operation, and in Canada, to the west of it, are strong forces of realists competent to do a sound job in social engineering, and to protest firmly against the botching of the war effort into the pattern of over-centralisation and financial tight-lacing laid down by those who are planning to use this war, whoever wins it, to seize control of the whole world.

The force which the Albertans and others know how to generate by using the release rather than the restriction of human initiative and energy is an important factor in the situation. So also is their determination to win the war as quickly and easily as possible.

In British Columbia, the province of Canada nearest Japan, the recent general election has returned a majority, though not a clear one, of Liberals. A correspondent describes it:—

"The socialist Liberal party will have to unite with the socialist Conservative party to oppose the socialist C.C.F. party, and the three will see to it that all intelligent efforts for progress will be thwarted."

Once the people have decided on a policy of war it is their job to collaborate willingly, to scrutinise the results produced by their experts and to ensure that they are the correct ones—and that those in power, whose power has been given them for a special purpose, are not taking advantage of their position to rivet on the nation after hostilities, any system of remote control, which is the antithesis of the democracy for which we are fighting.

Great Britain and the Commonwealth are fighting all the axis powers, Russia is not at war with Japan, nor is the United States at war with Germany. Behind the lines, alien 'systems' threaten from all sides as propaganda waxes and wanes. With disingenuous simplicity the press in turn implies that as the Russian army is making a brave military

stand, therefore communism is 'the thing'; that the German war-machine is efficient, so we should delegate power of deciding policy; that citizens of the United States have refrigerators and cars, so we should go in for 'federation.'

In this welter, Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders and British, indeed all of us, will be well advised to hold hard to our traditional way of democracy. This is not the 'democracy' that resides in the canonisation of parliamentary routine (so horrifyingly described by Mr. Vernon Bartlett on the wireless) nor the 'democracy' of huge federated unions where it is the bureaucracy that rules, but the democracy of policy:

"There is no possible definition of a policy which is all-embracing in its acceptance other than the word 'Freedom.' *People only unite in wanting what they want.*"

E. E.

PARLIAMENT

NOVEMBER 27.

Written Answers (12 columns)

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. Mander asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will bear in mind, in connection with the work of the bureau created by the St. James's Palace Conference, the advisability of close co-operation with the International Labour Organisation and the Economic and Financial Sections of the League of Nations in preparing post-war plans?

Mr. Law: Yes, Sir. The possibility of such co-operation will certainly be borne in mind.

DECEMBER 2.

Oral Answers (31 columns)

FOOD SUPPLIES WHOLESALERS' OPERATIONS

Mr. McKinlay asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food whether he is aware of the practice of many wholesalers in trafficking in storekeepers warrants or orders, whereby food in wharves or stores is normally transferred, always at an increased price, from one wholesaler to another, although none of them handles the food, with the ultimate result that the consumer is obliged to pay the maximum possible price for the article; and will he take steps to stop those operations by prohibiting wholesalers from selling to other wholesalers at a profit?

Major Lloyd George: The practice referred to exists only to a limited extent, seeing that all the important articles of food are subject to maximum price control. The policy of my Department is to restrict the flow of food to the most economic channels from the point of production to the consumer, but it would not be practicable to prohibit all sales from one wholesaler to another.

Mr. McKinlay: Is my right hon. and gallant Friend aware that 100 cases of casserole of rabbit changed hands between wholesalers several times, and that the price jumped from £231 to £275, although the stuff had never been moved?

Major Lloyd George: I have had no information about that, but with regard to the vast majority of food in this country to-day the price is controlled, and going through many hands would not alter the fact that no more than the maximum price could be charged.

(continued on page 7)

Social Credit Technique and Christian Doctrine

By BEATRICE C. BEST

For some time past I have been thinking of Social Credit in relation to Christianity from an unfamiliar point of view. The result may appear to be merely a rationalisation; but I do not think this is true of it. I have a strong sense of its significance and importance, and I believe that what I have seen is of more than merely subjective interest.

What I have been considering relates to the correspondence which exists between Social Credit *technique* and Christian *doctrine*. I emphasise technique and doctrine, since the correspondence between Social Credit and Christian philosophy, or view of life, has been, and is being emphasised, and its importance realised.

The point, however, of the correspondence between Social Credit technique and Christian doctrine I have never seen raised, or the singular fact of its existence recognised. That it is a singular *fact* cannot, I think, be denied; although whether one considers it of vital importance, or merely a curious coincidence, is another matter.

This correspondence exists in the fact that what I should call the scheme of economic salvation in the one case, and of spiritual salvation in the other, both depend on the same means for the realisation of their respective ends; which ends, however, might be said to be one, namely the realisation of the Kingdom.

The scheme in both cases involves the idea of, or depends on, the existence of a Trinity.

The Christian Trinity consists of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The Father represents the wealth, or potential wealth, of our (spiritual) inheritance, the Son represents redemption, or forgiveness (of sin), the Holy Ghost represents the gift (of the spirit); these last two being the means whereby man may obtain his inheritance.

The Social Credit Trinity consists of the National Credit, the Price Discount, and the National Dividend. The National Credit represents the wealth, or potential wealth of our (material) inheritance, the Price Discount represents redemption (of debt, or cost), the National Dividend represents the gift; and these last two are again the (corresponding) means whereby man may obtain his material inheritance.

In both cases, then, inheritance is involved, and in both cases Redemption and the receiving of a gift are the essential conditions for obtaining that inheritance.

(A short digression is necessary here. I know Major Douglas opposes the idea of original sin, and if by 'original' we are intended to believe that man is by origin sinful, then, I agree, the idea is manifestly absurd, since in that case only by departing from his origin, and so ceasing to be man, can man cease to be sinful. But if by 'original' is meant a 'fall' or deflection at some time or other from a state of original uprightness, or righteousness ('original' in this case referring to this point of departure in time), then the idea appears to me to be reasonable and inevitable. "God hath made man upright, but he hath sought out many inventions" might express this point of departure. Anyway, whatever the nature of this 'fall' or 'deflection,' whether sin or corruptibility, or some 'flaw' or weakness in man's nature, there

must be *something* to account for the filthy mess man has got himself into. Nor can I see that he can be held blameless for this state of affairs, as I cannot understand how anyone can consider the scandalous course of history, or of present events, without feeling a sense of shame, and hence of guilt, and hence a need of forgiveness or redemption.)

There is also a correspondence in *sequence* between the doctrine of the Trinity and Social Credit technique. Redemption, accomplished by Christ's death, precedes the gift of the Spirit. If I am not mistaken, in the technical proposals associated with Social Credit, the Price Discount takes precedence before the National Dividend. At any rate, the Price Discount must accompany the Dividend, in order that the Dividend may not defeat its end by causing inflation of prices. I can see the corresponding necessity of forgiveness preceding the gift of the Spirit in the Christian scheme, since an influx of the Spirit which preceded the recognition of the need for forgiveness, and the humility belonging to such a recognition, might easily cause an 'inflation' of pride in man's spirit fatal to his spiritual salvation.

A further correspondence between Christianity and Social Credit (not strictly relating to technique and doctrine, but, I should say, arising therefrom) is manifest in the fact of immediacy pertaining to both, expressed in the—"Behold *now* is the accepted time . . ." of Christianity, and in the possibility of an *immediate* and actual realisation of the beneficial results from Social Credit effected by the application of Social Credit technique.

It follows from this fact of immediacy that Christianity and Social Credit belong to the order of eternity, (the circle), in contradistinction to that of infinity, (the straight line). In the case of Social Credit, this may be seen in the significant distinction between Social Credit and orthodox finance in the matter of foreign trade; the one facilitating exchange, reciprocity, mutuality, and a satisfaction in such relationships, the other involving the necessity for infinite extension and expansion, and a fatal exclusion of true reciprocity. In Christianity, this ideal of reciprocity is realised in the doctrine of the Incarnation, in the light of which true relationship between God and Man becomes possible, avoiding, as it does, the extremes of pantheism and transcendentalism, both of which preclude the possibility of such a relationship.*

There is also, by way of further correspondence, the *absolute* nature of Social Credit means, and Christian doctrine, which is involved in, or arises from the immediacy of both. This claim meets with a common resistance from money and social reformers on the one side, and from religious reformers on the other. This resistance finds expression in the "let's get together and sink our differences, and find what we have in common" attitude, a specifically eclectic attitude, and destructive of the living organic nature of both Social Credit and Christianity. It may be seen operating in, for example, the Economic Reform Club in the one case and the Theosophical Society in the other.

This claim—of immediacy and absolutism—is particularly objectionable to the "planners," and to all who advance theories or schemes of "gradualism": also to the philosophers of the ever-receding goal, or the "to-travel-is-better-

*Cp—"I think the Doctrine of the Incarnation, repeated in many forms—(e.g., 'By their *fruits* ye shall know them)—is the central doctrine of Christianity—not the only doctrine."

(C. H. D.)

than-to-arrive" school of thought—the carrot in front of the donkey's nose attitude to life, one of everlasting approximation, precluding all hope of consummation on both the spiritual and material planes.

So ingrained is this attitude that once, in trying to convince a person of the truth of Social Credit, I was met with the objection (!)—“But that would be millenium!” It is an attitude which has permeated the Christian Church, anyway the Protestant branch of it, (due, I believe, to consciously subversive influences), and made of Christianity an ideal to aim at, but impossible to achieve; and so we have a bishop telling us that although it may not be immediately and literally possible to indulge in the realisation of the Christian ideals, we should in spirit and motive strive after them (!).

Again one finds a correspondence between the nature of the reaction to the idea of a ‘National Dividend,’ on the one hand, and the Christian doctrine of ‘salvation by grace’ on the other. The idea that the Kingdom must be inherited, that salvation is a gift to be accepted, and not a state to be acquired by our moral efforts is, to many, an offence. And the same thing is met with in Social Credit. I have myself seen the venom with which the technical need for a dividend was denied by two noted monetary reformers. I believe in all cases the reaction is due to man's pride. It is essentially vulgar. The pride is the pride of the self-made man congratulating himself that he owes his success to no one but himself. In both cases the idea of something for nothing is derided; one must gain (spiritual) salvation by good works; economic salvation (one's living) by work.

There are other striking correspondences between Christianity and Social Credit; but it is the correspondence between the means used to attain the end in view (which may be termed the coming of the Kingdom) that I find so deeply interesting.

I find myself on dangerous ground here, and in danger of being misunderstood in view of the stress laid, in *The Social Crediter*, on ends and not means, its warning against confusion of ends and means, and against losing sight of the end through exclusive consideration of the means. It is reasonable to suppose that Major Douglas regards the stress on ‘results,’ or ends, as being merely one way of saying that the end is contained in the means—to say that a ‘good’ end can ‘justify’ a ‘bad’ means is to say that men gather figs of thistles, or grapes of thorns. Nevertheless, I do not see how the arguments about means and ends can *minimise* the importance of the means used, nor the importance of understanding them.*

I am all the more convinced of this when I see how Christianity has been emasculated by the rise of Liberal Christianity, and the ignoring, not to say contempt, of Theology and doctrine which accompanied it.

I am, furthermore, convinced of the perverse nature of the influence controlling this development since I read, in a book called *The Jewish Question*, of the attitude of the Jews towards this secularising process. It is there stated: “One parallel between the Protocols and the real hopes of the Jews is written in the common Jewish prophesy that Christianity is doomed to perish. It will perish by becoming to all intents and purposes Judaism. And it will become

Judaism, first, by *ousting all the doctrines pertaining to the person of Christ...*” Again: “No Jew,” says the *American Israelite*, “will conceal his gratification when he finds Christians virtually admitting that liberal Christianity is practically an acceptance of the doctrine of liberal Judaism...” “Liberal Christianity and liberal Judaism meet, but only by the surrender of all that is distinctly Christian in doctrine.” Isaac M. Wise predicted (1899) that within a quarter of a century there would be practically nothing left in Protestant Christianity of a belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ, or the *distinctive dogmas* of Christianity. Dr. Charles F. Aked delivered a sermon in which he cast aside all the ‘supernatural’ elements in the life of Christ, from His birth to the significance of His death, and this was hailed by the Jewish press as “the fulfilment of the prophecy that within fifty years the religion of all the American people, outside the *Catholic Church*, would be Judaism in principle if not in name.”

These quotations seem to me to make it clear that it is through the attack on *doctrine*, and the efforts to discredit or eliminate it that the “liberalising” of Protestant Christianity has been brought about.

In further support of my argument concerning the importance of the doctrinal basis of Christianity, and the technical basis of Social Credit, an importance rendered all the more vital because of the correspondence between them, there is the statement of Major Douglas reported by a correspondent recently: “of the visible agencies showing a disposition to assist us at certain points, or at least an inclination to see done some of the things we should like to see done, the Roman Catholic Church stands out (or certain elements within it)”.

Why should this be so? Because, I contend, the Roman Catholic Church, and it alone through all its vicissitudes, and in spite of all its crimes,* *has held fast to doctrine*. Not only has it held fast to doctrine within the priesthood, it has taught it to the multitude, so that at least its members have had a knowledge, if not a complete understanding of it. In view of this, it is significant to note that “Antagonism to the Catholic Church runs throughout Jewish literature.” —(*The Jewish Question*).

It may be argued that this antagonism exists because the Roman Catholic Church presents a rival power to Judaism; but, even so, the fact remains that it is through their attack on doctrine that the Jews have attempted to destroy, and have largely succeeded in devitalising Protestant Christianity; and, further, that this attack, *and its object*, have failed in the case of Roman Catholicism.

It has been said that “without this foundation (of doctrine) the ethical teaching of Christianity could not have survived.” It would have been nearer the mark to say that without this foundation Christian teaching could have been infinitely corrupted. And in fact it has been: take away the hard core (of doctrine) from Christianity, and what you have left is mush, which could be moulded to any shape, even the shape, for example, of Judaism.

It may be argued that in the story of the Last Judgment, the acid test was not theological, or doctrinal: it was, “I was an-hungered and ye gave me to eat...” Nevertheless, by restricting Christianity to this particular ethical content, the ethics themselves have become so perverted that it would be no exaggeration to say that there are people who feel that to abolish poverty and destitution,

*Cp.—“It is the business of the expert to reply to a demand for grapes by planting vines. But you *must* keep the mind of the non-expert concentrated on the grape, so that he may assess the expert.” (C. H. D.)

**Corruptio optimi pessima?*

might deprive them of the opportunity to act as Christians!

The 'sales-talk' of the powers that be is so adroit, and so well calculated to deceive, that all their schemes—Federal Union, Planning, etc., are advertised as specially designed to obtain for the people anything they want, as, for example, freedom. Without knowledge, if only a superficial knowledge, of the means necessary to obtain the desired end, the possibilities of double-crossing appear to me to be infinite: all the more so since the people have been misled into believing that they desire certain ends—for instance, work, employment—in reality inimical to them as 'ends,' but useful to these powers.

In any case, it seems to me far easier to pervert and contort the definition of Social Credit as "the belief inherent in Society that in association people can get what they want," than it would be to pervert for any secret purpose anything so concrete as a free income, and buying things below cost.

In the end though, I suppose, it comes to this, that when we are dealing with Truth means and ends form an organic whole, and cannot be divorced without injury to the whole.

But this divorce is aimed at. If you cannot destroy doctrine, exploit the love of controversy, and keep the Christian arguing about nice theological points, Higher Criticism or what not, and render him innocuous; or, in the name of Christian ethics, keep him busy, if you can, working for "the poor"—and the abolition of poverty will come, in the end, to appear to him as a positive calamity!

I cannot help wondering, therefore, whether the same divorce is aimed at by the enemies of "Social Credit." At all events, if they could keep the technique and the *policy* of Social Credit apart, they might prevent the attainment of either. The union of the two would increase understanding and make deception difficult.

Individual experience on such points is inconclusive. It is, nevertheless, illustrative. I arrived at an understanding of Social Credit (such as I have) through a knowledge of its technique, which aroused my interest and curiosity. It was by meditating on the means that the implications of the true end and nature of Social Credit became clear to me, as also, later, the correspondence between the means or technique of Social Credit and Christian doctrine. Without a knowledge of this technique, the fact of such a correspondence would have been hidden from me. That would have been a great loss, for realising it has confirmed my faith in Christianity, since I cannot believe the fact of such a correspondence to be purely fortuitous. Also, before my knowledge of Social Credit a hiatus existed for me in Christian thought. One is taught to pray, "Thy Kingdom come"; yet the Kingdom, in spite of so-called progress, seemed as far away as ever. One had to fall back, nevertheless, on a vague faith in gradual progress, despite appearances, or console oneself with Keats's idea of this world as a "valley of soul-making." However, both these make-shift solutions were seen to be unnecessary in the light of Social Credit, since a knowledge of this showed how completely the hiatus could be closed: that, in fact, it did not exist. But it was by a knowledge of Social Credit technique *and all the implications involved therein* that I reached this understanding.

It will be clear, I hope, that no confusion of categories is involved in the correspondence the fact of which I have tried to establish. Christianity and Social Credit, each within its own category, or on its own plane, is a manifestation or embodiment of the Truth. Upon examination,

the means necessary for the realisation of the Truth in the two cases are found to be the same, or corresponding. There is no question, in my mind, of Social Credit being a religion, or having a religious value apart from the 'religious' value attaching to all truth. I would say that as Christianity is not a religion, but the Truth *about* religion revealed and made manifest in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ; so Social Credit is not an economic scheme, or a political or social theory, but the Truth *about* these things discovered and revealed by it. Each, therefore, within its own province, supersedes all previous partial revelations. It is a case with both of, "when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away."

Furthermore, it can be seen also that precisely because of this 'wholeness' each resolves the dichotomy existing in man: Christianity, by healing the breach between soul and body, makes them one in Person: Social Credit, by reconciling the seemingly rival claims made on man by matter and spirit, renders the pursuit of both, hitherto so difficult and conflicting, harmoniously possible.

Yet Christianity and Social Credit are necessary to each other, for Christian values can save man from pursuing purely materialistic ends which, with the aid of Social Credit, and without the aid of these values to inspire him, he so easily might do. On the other hand, Social Credit alone makes it possible for man to pursue and realise these values in his life on this earth. Indeed it might be said that it is the destiny of Social Credit to, "prepare in the desert a highway for our God, to make His paths plain."

PARLIAMENT

Continued from page 4

Maximum National Effort (80 columns)

Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne: ... We are all very grateful for the help we are receiving from overseas... but the point which I desire particularly to impress upon the House is that we must get the people of this country to realise that it is we who have to win the war and that we cannot depend on anybody else, though in saying that I do not wish to deprecate the assistance we are receiving from the Empire and the United States of America. I am tremendously hopeful of what we shall get in time from America, and very grateful to the American people, especially for their supplies of raw materials, without which we could do very little. But there is an idea in the minds of some people, not that we can afford to slack, because that would be putting it too strongly, but that in the end it will be American production that will get us through. If the war goes on for another three or four years it may be so, but I suggest that we shall get no large supplies from America in the next year and, if Japan should unfortunately go to war, possibly not for a longer period.

I do not wish to make any statement of my own knowledge about American production or on information from any British sources at all. I want to give the House the ideas of the Americans themselves. Perhaps I might be allowed to read a very short extract from the *New York World Telegram*:

"The figures in terms of appropriations allocations and transfers, are large. In terms of deliveries they shrink like a pair of wool socks in the laundry...."

So far as the British are concerned, ours still is a popgun arsenal....

We have not set ourselves an impossible task. It is only that we have dawdled at it, cluttering it up with compromises, with red tape, with delays amounting to weeks."

Again, I give an extract from another American newspaper, *Life*:

"At the most, it appeared, only 72,000,000 dollars' worth of war materials had reached Britain under the Lease-Lend Act since March...."

One of the U.S.A. Senators said:

"But as the sad and sobering import of the President's figures sank in, it became apparent that the torrent of arms which he envisaged in his Lease-Lend message was as yet no river, no stream, but still a wretched, inadequate trickle...."

Hon. Members: What date?

Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne: The date is 29th September, 1941. I considered very carefully before reading even those very short extracts to the House. It may be said that they may do injury to the good feeling between this country and the United States of America but I do not believe it...

DECEMBER 3.

National Maximum Effort (64 columns)

Mr. Stewart:... We all know that hon. Members opposite regard Socialism as the ideal of political effort. But the great majority of this House, reflecting, I am sure, an equal majority outside, do not share that view. Their ideal, and my ideal, is exactly the opposite. I believe, with the same passionate conviction as they, that the life-spring of national prosperity and national progress lies not in State action, but in individual effort, individual enterprise, and individual initiative.

Mr. G. Macdonald: During the war?

Mr. Stewart: I am coming to that. That is my belief—that the life blood of national well-being is individual effort. In such an emergency as now exists, State control and direction are of course inevitable for the duration of the emergency; and the nation is ready to face that. I have always said that. I said it long before the war. In March, 1939, in the teeth of the Whips' opposition, I joined with the present Prime Minister and 32 other rebels on this side of the House in tabling a Motion to the following effect:

"In view of the grave dangers by which Great Britain and the Empire are now threatened... this House is of opinion that... a National Government should be formed on the widest possible basis, and that such a Government should be entrusted with full powers over the nation's industry, wealth and manpower, to enable this country to put forward its maximum military effort in the shortest time."

I stand by that declaration to-day. But it is entirely different from what the hon. Member for Stoke is asking for—universal and permanent State ownership and control. The country, as I have said, is prepared to accept a large measure of State control of activities during the war; but just as the trade unions, as the hon. Member said, have agreed to abandon certain rights for the moment, on the clear understanding that these rights shall be restored when the war is over, so the nation as a whole, which has offered far greater sacrifices, expects that its traditional liberties and its freedom from the shackles of Whitehall will be returned to it in fullest measure when peace arrives. And that is a bond as solemn as—nay, infinitely more solemn, because it has not been made the subject of any precise guarantees—any made with the T.U.C. Still more it is in fact to restore and safeguard for ever those vital liberties that this war is being fought. What a mockery it would

be if, after all the sacrifice and bloodshed, we were to succeed in defeating one form of tyranny merely to discover that we had set up another in our own country in its place...

Mr. A. Edwards (Middlesborough, East): ... Some of the best minds and most efficient men in the country are to be found in the Civil Service. They carry a very grave responsibility. But with the machine under which they have to work, they simply cannot do what is required. Everything in this country has speeded up except the Civil Service, which is so constructed that it cannot speed up. There is a limit to the speed of any machine; there is a very low limit to the speed of that machine... You can get the best brains you like from all industries, but as long as they have to go at the speed of the permanent officials, production will not be speeded up. That machine destroys and frustrates every effort.

Wherever I have found delays I have discovered that they have been frequently due to the throttling hands of the Treasury. The officials, with the best will in the world, cannot get the machine speeded up. Someone else will have to do the work. I would like to take the House on a personally conducted tour of two or three Departments. I will tell the Parliamentary Secretary now that there is serious competition within his own Department, and not competition merely between his Department and another. It is a most serious matter indeed. Ministers know the conditions which exist better than anyone, because they are always having to fight with their Departments.

Mr. Simmonds (Birmingham, Duddeston): Can the hon. Member tell the House why, if what he says is true, so many of his hon. Friends are anxious to extend State control?

Mr. Edwards: I cannot, but I have no doubt that the hon. Member has, since the war, modified many of his own views. I would tell the House frankly that Socialism does not even remotely mean the inefficiency I have seen...

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., 20 Dromara Street, 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 17.

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.