

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 8. No. 24.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The part played by the United States in post-1918 diplomacy could hardly be better expressed than in the following extract from a book by Mr. Hugh Wilson, U.S. Minister to Switzerland, a professional diplomat.

It should be remembered that President Wilson with his *entourage* of Jews, forced the League of Nations on a reluctant Peace Conference and thus sowed the seeds of another war. The United States then repudiated Wilson, refused representation on the League, but insisted on an observer who meddled constantly.

When Mussolini attacked Ethiopia, the U. S. press shrieked for sanctions by the League, particularly on the part of once-great Britain, who had been continuously abused for not disarming still more completely and thus had deprived the United States of the money to be saved. The British representatives on the League however, refused to act without information as to the proposed action, if any, of the United States, which was not a member of the League.

"... Fred Mayer, Counsellor of the Legation and I turned our thoughts to devising some method which would alleviate British anxiety in respect to our eventual attitude, and at the same time, not commit the United States to any positive act in support of the sanctions policy... There would be no ground, in the event of sanctions, for the European States to call on us to participate, establish a blockade ourselves, or to adopt other than a purely negative attitude."

— *Diplomat between Wars* by HUGH WILSON, p.285

In other words, push everyone else into the soup, and then collar the joint.

Communism is the most rudimentary social system of which we have any knowledgs, and is, incidentally, the exact opposite of State Socialism, with which most people confuse it.

With a few exceptions, such as the cuckoo, all the higher animals have evolved from communism to rudimentary conceptions of private property.

Modern political communism can be traced without difficulty to the nomadic tribes of the middle East, who, immemorially lazy, moved their flocks from place to place to avoid labour of systematic cultivation.

Socialism, on the contrary, is pure, abstract, intellectualism run mad, and politically adopted for interested purposes.

Russia is not, and never has been, a communist State— it is an example of State Socialism.

The centralisation which is an inevitable feature of State Socialism contains the certainty of war, and it is not too much to say that the Socialist State is primarily a War State.

"No foreign observers have been allowed to witness the most important battles of the Soviet-German War; even British and American Military Observers accredited to Moscow, have been refused permission to see more than occasional and inconclusive glimpses of what was going on. At present, we cannot even be sure whether the battles in Russia were so extensive and so ferocious as both belligerents have claimed that they were... the German-Russian War has been the most obscure and mysterious large scale campaign which has ever been fought..." — From *Why Germany must invade England* by DEMAREE BESS in *The Saturday Evening Post*.

This week's *Grande Première*: "MCARTHUR THE MAGNIFICENT." As advertised.

"So I stuck to my desk, and never went to sea,
And now I am the ruler of the Queens Navee."

The *Encyclopedja Britannica* is owned by Messrs. Sears, Roebuck and Company and is edited in Chicago. It is about as British as Adolf Hitler, Mr. Bernard Baruch or the 1940-41 policy of the "B."B.C. and its "friendly Alien" staff.

"Encyclopedia" is a word much beloved of Freemasons and World Planners. The French Revolution was intimately associated with the Encyclopedists and their peculiar methods of presenting "knowledge" in watertight compartments, analogous to the grades of a secret society.

Unfortunately, as so often seems to be true, there is a reality behind the crude materialism of Encyclopedism. It is a fact that the human individual can only assimilate wisdom to the extent that he becomes wise. Any ascent in the scale of real consciousness appears to be something like lifting yourself up by your own bootstraps.

The comparatively simple idea, for instance, that freedom involves functional discipline of a high order seems to be too much for the majority. Nothing in the present political chaos is more nauseating than the idea so sedulously propagated that a war such as that now in progress, which itself is the outcome of world intrigue to ensure world slavery, is a desirable thing because it "teaches the masses to obey rules." It does nothing of the sort. It teaches the masses

the technique of complying with the law while eluding the reality.

The 1914-1918 phase of this war produced a generation of "lead-swingers" who were mental and moral invalids, where they were not physically incapacitated. They were an easy mark for the Fabian Society and the Planners. Those people who say that the war is terrible, but that the peace will be awful, may easily be right, unless better work is being done by such bodies as the Army Educational Corps than would seem to be humanly possible.

• • •

A summons against the Strand Palace Hotel (owned by Messrs. Lyons) alleging waste of electricity was dismissed; the Magistrate, Sir Bertrand Watson, awarded 15 guineas costs to the Company.

Yeth.

• • •

Representatives of farm organisations and governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta were present at a conference on farmers' debts held in Saskatoon during June. Mr. Bracken, premier of Manitoba, was appointed chairman of the conference, and Mr. Lucien Maynard, of Alberta, vice-chairman.

After two days of deliberation the conference passed a resolution that a tribunal or tribunals should be created with authority to cut the principal and interest of farm debts, stay all proceedings after an adjustment had been made and to extend protection to any debtor who may require assistance. The programme also provided that these remedies should be made available for all farm debts whenever they had been incurred.

• • •

The Daily Telegraph says that the appointment of an American generalissimo to command the Allied land forces in operations on the continent, if "made after full consideration of the qualifications and abilities of all possible leaders, would be welcomed both officially and unofficially in this country, where the only desire is to see the best man at the head of the Allied forces, whatever his nationality may be."

The journal does not, however, state whether experience and proved ability in dealing with Germans and German methods of warfare, the nature of European peoples, their conditions, habits, relationship and economy, and practical familiarity with the physical nature of the ground, shall be counted as qualifications for purposes of the selection.

By C. H. Douglas
THE BIG IDEA
 2/6

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

CORRESPONDENCE.

"All Aid to the Enemy"

Sir,

Having regard to the successive unexplained surrenders, destructive legislation, and recent disclosures in regard to munitions, the above slogan must appear to many to represent our Government's war strategy.

Under the circumstances a short statement of the position will not be amiss.

It is common knowledge amongst high-grade freemasons and can be proved without difficulty that this fantastic war and war "racket" has been promoted under the auspices of universal freemasonry and is being stage-managed and directed from behind the scenes in every country, including Germany, by a Jewish sect (Zionists) organised as a nation through the instrumentality of "German" Jewry and the international money monopolists.

The objective is Jewish world dominion and empire achieved under cover of the U.S.A.

The situation may be compared to an important horse race which is being run on a private course owned by a syndicate of wealthy "German" Jews and in which all the runners, unknown to the racing public, belong to this syndicate and are trained from their own stable.

With the exception of the Judge all the course officials as well as the trainer and jockeys, are employees of the syndicate and the Stewards their personal friends.

There are no bookmakers, the owners' privately managed totalisator providing the only means of betting and determining or registering the odds.

A high charge (personal freedom and initiative) is made for admission to all the enclosures but this is offset by the provision of innumerable free side-shows and attractions (increased wages, sinecure employment, opportunities for graft, etc.).

The big race, promoted by the Stewards, is for the "All-World Stakes" subscribed by the racing public.

The principal entries in a very big field are Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, Japan, China and U.S.A.

Great Britain, the best bred horse is, in spite of being deliberately badly trained, top weight and the favourite.

The race is in progress and the horses bunched together are coming round the bend. Germany, a non-stayer, ridden all out, is leading, she and Great Britain having made all the running.

— France, purposely left at the starting post, is out of it.

Great Britain, badly "pulled" by her jockey (the Government), like all the others riding to instructions, is being bumped on to the rails by Italy and Japan and obstructed by Russia and China.

Perfectly fresh and lying a few lengths behind ready to move to the front as soon as the straight is reached, is the cross-breed, bottom-weight, rank outsider U.S.A., the designed winner who carries the owners' money.

The crowd (civil-populations) is getting restless and beginning to "barrack."

The question then that arises is what will be their reaction in the face of a situation fast becoming obvious, when

at the finish of the race, with U.S.A. the winner, they realise they have been swindled and the police guarding the course (regimentation and bureaucracy) are unable to keep them in check.

They may tear down the railings (law and order), stampede the horses (services discipline), destroy the totalisator (banking system), wreck the grandstand (organised society), hack up the course (State economy) and lynch the owners, trainer, jockeys and course officials (pogroms and revolutionary bloodshed).

It is to be hoped therefore that on a complaint from the Judge (Truth), the Stewards (masonic hierarchy) will be compelled to declare the race "No Contest," compound the stakes, entrance fees and betting money (taxation, bank loans, war savings) for later distribution, warn off for life the crook owners, trainer, jockeys and course officials (Jew-controlled political and economic systems) and arrange that in future the course is maintained and supervised by independent officials (Monarchies) above suspicion and genuinely representative of the sporting public and their interests.

In conclusion it must be pointed out that inasmuch as one of the primary objectives of war promoters is the mutual extermination of the combatants, this part of their programme as far as British lives are concerned has been largely frustrated by surrenders which in the end may be of no account.

Yours etc.,
GUY ANDREWS.

Crowborough, Sussex; July 1942.

Submarines' Oil Consumption

Dear Sir,

Allied ships are being sunk by U-boats which use an invention enabling them to operate 15,000 miles from their base without re-fuelling. The invention increases the submarine's range for the same expenditure of fuel and accumulators which take up so much space and weight, and eliminates the necessity for the main electric motors. Apparently this invention cannot be used because the inventor has been sent to a concentration camp in Canada. By reducing the amount of oil required in submarines their efficiency and period of service at sea would enable us to better safe-guard supplies, reduce the overseas transport of oil, and shorten the length of the war.

Why is the public kept in ignorance of this invention? And what are the real reasons why it has not been utilised by the authorities? The explanations that "it would not be in the public interest" or that "it would give information to the enemy" cannot be justified in this matter. The public is entitled to know the full facts and the justification for not using an invention which, in enemy hands, is doing the Allied cause incalculable harm.

Your faithfully,
J. CREAGH SCOTT.

Moretonhampstead, Devon; August 12, 1942.

EXPLOITATION

By B. M. PALMER

The following letter has been written by a woman in an Essex village, and has been sent to people of influence in her district. It is given publicity here in the hope that

others will help in dealing with this threat to village life, which is being developed through the very organisation which, ostensibly, set out to make country people happier and more secure—the Women's Institute:—

"In our Village there is a very small trader who came home to look after an aged Mother and opened a home-made jam and sweet shop. She was for many years a member of the Women's Institute, she has customers registered with her who want her home-made jam, but she is forbidden to make it, and must either buy from the Women's Institute or from a wholesaler, which is not what her customers want.

"Before the War the Women's Institute movement set out to encourage preservation in the home and I attended various classes to improve my knowledge.

"When a poultry disease wiped out my husband's living, we had to turn to other means of livelihood and we grew more fruit to preserve, for which I found a London Market.

"In 1940, when there was a plum gut, I worked all day, encouraging various Women's Preservation Centres and after the day's work went home and bottled hundreds of bottles of stone fruit with sugar that I had been allowed for preserving, and which I could much more easily have used for jam. I may add that this was fruit which Women's Institutes refused to tackle.

"Last year, also after a day's work, I fetched and preserved a hundred pounds of tomatoes which the Women's Institutes could not handle.

"The bulk of my bottled fruit went to London to people working through the Blitz who would otherwise have had none.

"I am now told that this year only Women's Institutes may have sugar, although we have the fruit and the jars and it is part of our living to preserve this fruit.

"The Food Officer is again taking up the matter, but she feels that she can hold out very little hope.

"These are only isolated instances, but Mrs. X.—[the Food Officer] could give you the names of others similarly treated in her Rural Area.

"In my opinion the Women's Preservation Scheme is being exploited at the expense of small people who preserved before the War and I feel that the above facts should be brought to your notice."

Yours faithfully,

A MEMBER OF THE WOMEN'S INSTITUTE.

In a further letter the same writer asks:—"Why are the shops here full of tinned American tomatoes, when people like — have lost their son in a convoy and these tomatoes could have been grown and preserved here? I cannot get enough petrol to do my work, and yet tomatoes grow here and are taken to London and tomatoes from — (25 miles away) are brought here. Another village near by is seething because the Women's Institute jam centre bought the entire black currant crop of the village and boasts it has made 800 lbs of jam, while the villagers might have been allowed to buy a few currants in the country town 5 miles away, if lucky—there are plenty of prunes says the M.O.F. (brought by convoy)."

Correspondence, which will be treated in the strictest confidence, is invited concerning similar cases to the above, with a view to action.

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. 8. No. 24. Saturday, August 22, 1942.

THE 'COMMUNITY'

The 'Community' has received a 'shock' and has been 'the victim' of aggressive youth, blundering disrespectfully into territory sacred to the Jewish Board of Deputies.

This is the contention of the *Jewish Chronicle* concerning the Trades Advisory Council whose doings were studied in *The Social Crediter* for August 8. The Board has issued a statement of which the essential paragraph is:—

"The Officers of the Board of Deputies and the Defence Committee have been in communication with the Executive Committee of the T.A.C. in connection with the publicity of the annual meeting of the T.A.C. at Leeds on July 22 last. They have been informed by the Executive Committee of the T.A.C. that the communication to the Press of the speech on general policy, made on behalf of the Executive Committee, was without the knowledge or authority of the speaker and of the Executive Committee of the T.A.C. This clearly reveals a serious internal weakness in the Council's organisation."

Accordingly a scheme has been adopted to secure that no publicity of any kind shall be undertaken without the full detailed knowledge and consent of the Press Officer of the Board.

In a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle*, Mr. Alec Nathan, Chairman, Trades Advisory Council, says that Mr. Goodenday's speech, intended only for a private meeting, was given to the Press without the knowledge of Mr. Goodenday or himself in breach of the rules of the T.A.C. For that fault the Chairman of the Editorial and Publicity Section has accepted responsibility, and has tendered his resignation.

In any case, he has done his bit, and the *Jewish Chronicle* reprimands Mr. Nathan for "taking cover behind a departmental officer. . . . To suppose that the situation can be met simply by tossing the resignation of a subordinate to an outraged and alarmed community [N.B. little c] and then going on as though nothing had occurred, is the height of puerile folly. The plain truth is that the Community [capital C] has lost all confidence in the Council's leadership. . . ." etc., etc.

Later: "the sacrifice to be made will not fall upon the Community—" [capital C].

That may be. The history of the Jews does not provide many instances in which the Community has evaded responsibility for its dual maladjustment, internal and external, and it is interesting to read in the *Jewish Chronicle* that Mr. Nathan's offence (whatever it is) is "incompatible with the

efficient functioning of any democratic State, institution or movement, and cannot be tolerated in a Community [capital C] in which the democratic system is *still only a very frail and tender plant.*" (The emphasis is ours).

Does this mean that Jewry contemplates a reorientation of its philosophy?

It certainly does not.

T. J.

More State Taxes Annexed in Australia

Fresh from his success in 'levelling-up' income-tax, Mr. Curtin, the Commonwealth Prime Minister of Australia, announced another inroad by the Commonwealth on the States' field of taxation, in particular the entertainment tax.

Mr. Curtin, when asked by the States to leave the entertainments tax alone, intimated that if they agreed the Commonwealth would levy a uniform tax yielding £A3 million a year, compared with the £A750,000 now raised by five States, Queensland at present not imposing an entertainments tax. The Commonwealth would annually refund to the States the amounts they had received from tax in this financial year.

Except for Mr. Cosgrove, the Premier of Tasmania, who accepted the proposal for the duration of the war only, the Premiers objected. Mr. Dunstan, Premier of Victoria, protested that it was only a matter of time before the Commonwealth would ask the States to leave one by one all their fields of taxation, and eventually the States would have to go to the Commonwealth as beggars.

After an inconclusive discussion Mr. Curtin said that the Treasurer would submit the proposal to each State separately. If the States did not agree the Commonwealth would superimpose on State taxes a uniform Federal tax.

Propaganda in Russia

A writer in the *Daily Express* comments with evident approval on the internal propaganda in Soviet Russia, a large part of which is directed towards combatting and easing the problems of loneliness and separation. "In spite of its seeming simplicity," he says, "it is most efficiently conducted.

"The man responsible is Alexandrov, who is head of propaganda of the Central Committee of the Communist party.

"He gives a line and from that thousands of lecturers go out through the countryside speaking at public and private meetings, and articles appear simultaneously in the Press." As described this process seems similar, though on a larger scale, to practices in this country, while the Russian folk have fewer alternatives to, and defences from, such a tyrannical imposition of ideas.

In example the writer cites a remarkably ingenuous 'semi-fiction' tale which was recently treated in this way.

Respectful admiration for a machine of such power must be expected from the *Daily Express*, but it is high time that journal realised how incompatible the principle of intensive propaganda (be it never so efficient) on a defenceless population is with the independence of mind and body for which, and with the remains of which, we are fighting.

Or people may confuse the contents of the *Daily Express* with 'semi-fiction'.

Jeremy Bentham

"France may have philosophers . . . but it is England only that can have patriots, for a patriot is a philosopher in action."

— Helvetius's *Commonplace Book* 1774-75.

Revolutionaries (so-called) are individuals in reaction; and reactionaries are never consistent: Jeremy Bentham's contemporaries, the Paris promoters of that Music-hall trio Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, studied his writings (he knew Mirabeau and corresponded with Rousseau), and seeing in them something they thought useful to their reactionary purposes, they made him an honorary citizen of the first Republic, along with Tom Paine and Priestley (not J. B.).

"The mainspring of Bentham's life and work," says H. Sidgewick in his essay *Bentham and Benthamism*, "as his French friends saw, was an equal regard for all mankind; whether the precise object of this regard was conceived as men's 'rights' or their 'interests' was a question which they would not feel of primary concern. He himself was always conscious of the gulf that separated him from his fellow citizens by adoption. 'Were they,' he writes in 1796, 'to see an analysis I have by me of their favourite Declaration of Rights there is perhaps not a being who would be less welcome to them than I could ever hope to be.'"

In the intervening hundred and fifty years the ideological descendants of those same reactionaries seem to have scented something in Bentham not just so useful to their purposes, which had escaped Rousseau and the rest. Possibly it has dawned on them that the two words "interests" and "rights" are neither interchangeable nor even compatible. It is possible, too, that their instinct warns them that Bentham's famous formula, "the maximum balance of pleasure over pain," is too easily read a measuring-stick to be safely placed in the hands of a society destined for the straight-waistcoat joys of Equality and Social Justice as epitomised in the War Ration Book.

Certain it is that Bentham's memory, unlike that of Lenin, is in no immediate danger of civic honours, or commemorative tablets in the New Order that is rapidly assembling itself about us. And it is significant, but not the least surprising, that in the curriculum of the pink-complexioned W.E.A. (Workers' Educational Association) Utilitarianism should receive a conspicuously black mark.

Along with Darwinism as interpreted by the Manchester School of Economists, it is bracketted with child-labour and the sixteen-hour day in a sort of propagandist-pie and given the comprehensive title of *laissez-faire*—than which, as anyone who studies the contemporary Press knows, there is nothing more noxious. The present-day Socialists, even if their understanding of Bentham is no greater than that of their eighteenth century prototypes, at least *mis*-understand him differently.

Incidentally, it is interesting to learn from the recent, suggestive article on Karl Marx in these pages, that he apparently made the same mistake with Darwin that Rousseau made where Bentham was concerned. It would suggest that there is a fundamental difference between the Continental and the English mind—or is it just the difference between the "reformer" and the searcher for truth?

The fact was, of course, that Bentham and Darwin

were not sentimentalists, which reactionaries always are. A sentimentalist might for most purposes be defined as one who is afraid to examine the workings of his own mind, and is thereby deprived of his only real standard of judgment. Bentham, on the other hand, was a realist. To quote Mr. Sidgewick whose appreciation of him in his *Miscellaneous Essays* is well worth reading: ". . . from different points of view one might truly describe Bentham as one of the *most*, or *least* idealistic of practical philosophers. . . his ideal is . . . as much as possible *de-idealised*, positivised, some might say philistinised; his good is purged of all mystical elements, and reduced to . . . the quantitative notion of 'maximum balance of pleasure over pain.' His conception of human nature and its motives is not only unideal, but even anti-ideal. . . . While he is confident in his power of constructing a happy society as the most ardent believer in the perfectability of man, he is convinced of the unqualified selfishness of the vast majority of human beings as the bitterest cynic."

Bentham's outlook derives very considerably from the French philosopher Helvetius, whose book *De L'Esprit* (condemned by Church and State and publicly burned) contained a vast amount of common sense. Helvetius considered that "our moralists do not perceive that it is futile to try to alter the tendency of man to seek their private happiness—futile as well as dangerous." He judged that most of our troubles are caused by the ignorance of legislators who always tried "to set private interest in opposition to public." And states it as his considered opinion that "the hidden source of a people's vices is always in a people's legislation," and as a retired and wealthy Civil Servant of eighteenth century France he ought to have known what he was talking about. It is quite possible that his comment, quoted above, as to England being a land of "philosophers in action" may have a profound significance for the immediate future. Had he pre-eminently in his mind, one wonders, men of the calibre of Edmund Burke and Bishop Berkeley, and perhaps Washington and Benjamin Franklin, who were at that time still "Englishmen"?

In Helvetius's definition of a patriot, Jeremy Bentham certainly was one—a philosopher in continuous action throughout a long and incredibly busy life. One feels inclined to claim Bentham as the only real social scientist in the modern and exact sense of that term, until Douglas. He plainly saw, as every intelligent, and every moderately philosophical mind must see, that if there is a thing to be done, "centralisation is the way to do it"—in other words, to be effective, the force used must be a matter of mass and weight. And that the harnessing and focussing of that mass and weight is what we loosely call "government." That is the obvious half-truth known politically as collectivism, and is about the point at which the average human reason stops working. Hence the popularity of collectivism, since it represents the outer rim of easy and comfortable social speculation and experiment.

Bentham, like Douglas, combines with a particularly clear view of this popular aspect of the matter, an unbiased and quite un sentimental view of human nature, which accepts the fact that the only genuine, safe, and permanent basis for human association is bound to include the satisfaction of individual wants, however "immoral" such a fact may appear to soaring sentimentalists like the Archbishop of Canterbury. As Mr. Sidgewick says, "Bentham's origin-

ality and importance lay not in his adoption of utility as a standard of right political thinking and action, but in his real exclusion of any other standard. . . .” And it is just that rigorous exclusiveness and consistency that entitles both Bentham’s and Douglas’s writings to be regarded as scientific.

But Bentham and Douglas alike have seen that “Government” (collectivism) is only half the truth, and that the all-too-obvious limitations of the benefits of government to date have arisen, not from a deficiency of the powers centred in the government, so much as from an excess; from an absence of consideration given to the other half of the social truth—that, as Douglas says, centralisation “is not the way either to decide what is to be done, or who is to do it.” In other words, there must be the counterweight of individual personal (public) opinion. If Lord Acton is correct in his statement that “all power corrupts, but absolute power corrupts absolutely” (presumably he means physical, material power), then the first thing to be done, since government without power is a contradiction in terms, is to see that it *never* under any but *immediate and temporary* circumstances degenerates into absolute power. And the only means for ensuring that is what we call democracy, individualism—the Sovereign Will of the People.

Mr. Sidgwick sums up Bentham on the point in this way: “If once we regard the administration of the law as a machinery indispensable for the identifying of the interests” (self-preferences) “of individuals with the conduct by which they will most promote the general happiness. . . . it is plain that our arrangements are incomplete unless they include means of similarly regulating the self-preferences of those who are to work and repair the machine”—*i.e.*, the public servants; making allowances for a sufficient crop of “the fruits of office” (on the lower plane “graft,” on the higher, aristocratic plane “privilege”), and yet keeping this “corruption” which is what it undoubtedly is from the moralist’s (Lord Acton’s) point of view, within the bounds of what the governed find it possible to stomach.

Government, Bentham argues very justly, cannot be limited or crippled by public interference. It must be conceded powers adequate to its job. “The only plan that remains,” as Mr. Sidgwick puts it, “and the only one that can possibly secure the requisite junction of interests, is to provide that government, while supreme over individuals, shall be under the continual, vigilant control of the citizens collectively.” Bentham considered that the public should have, and exercise the right of dis-location, as he calls it, over peccant officials. What we might call the rule of ‘the Bird.’

Bentham, with the dispassionate eye of the scientist, saw and acknowledged the very definite limitations of human enlightenment and he asked of his contemporaries an equally unsentimental and humble outlook on the problem as his own. What he did not see were the many specific means by which men’s none-too-clear minds were being confused and played upon for the conscious purpose of keeping them in the dark, though there are signs that towards the end of his life some inkling did dawn upon him.

The depression following on the Napoleonic wars brought much to light. But frustration of his most cherished schemes had by that time gone some way towards embittering Bentham’s outlook, and he was unable to achieve the necessary mental discrimination. In 1817 he published his Plan of Parliamentary Reform—“The hand-book of modern

English Radicalism,” Mr. Sidgwick calls it; in it he condemns what he had originally called England’s “matchless Constitution,” as an “elaborately organised and anxiously cherished and guarded mechanism of sinister interests and artifice.” See his contemporary, William Cobbett, on the Jews and the Bank of England.

It is the fate of Truth to be first denied, then ignored, and finally appropriated and misapplied—with a possible fourth stage, of execration, which Utilitarianism now enjoys, when the sufferers from that deliberate misapplication are shewn the ostensible cause of their woes.

There are more than hints abroad to-day that Social Credit is well into the third stage, of mis-appropriation and mis-application. And those who hold the Truth an important matter will certainly need to be on the alert lest post-war England find herself tipped into a centrally planned Work-State, with Sir Stafford Cripps close at hand to explain that this is Economic Democracy, and that Social Credit means faith in the People’s Representative, *i.e.*, the Government, irrespective of results.

Our hope is that the acute French-man was inspired when he sensed the “active philosophy” across the Straits of Dover, that was still capable of a true, organic patriotism, courageous enough even during a world-war to champion and assert the interests of the individual as the only counterpoise to universal slavery.

N. F. W.

Points from Parliament

AUGUST 6.

Adjournment (Summer): Jews (Fighting Services)

Mr. Hannah (Bilston) opened the debate by asking the Government to consider the possibility of bringing some Jewish Army into actual being. ‘Eloquent’ and ‘humorous’ were epithets used of his speech by later speakers, though it is not immediately evident which is applicable to his statement that, “I welcome this Jewish Army, and I have, with enthusiasm, joined the English Committee [of the American Committee for a Jewish Army], because I believe from the very bottom of my heart that the future of the world is largely bound up with loyal Anglo-American co-operation.” Sir James Grigg (Secretary of State for War), in his final summing-up commented fairly enough:

“I have noticed in the Debate to-day a certain confusion because a number of hon. Members mean different things when they are talking about a Jewish Army. There have in fact been before the House to-day, not always clearly defined, three different projects. The first is that of a world-wide Jewish Army not confined to recruitment in Palestine, but recruited from Jews all over the world. Then there is another project, which is for a self-contained Jewish force of all arms within the British Army, and then there is the much narrower project of a Palestine Regiment recruited from Jews in Palestine. It has not always been quite clear which of those three projects hon. Members favoured. . . .”

Points of interest elicited in the course of the debate were that the *New York Times*, which is opposed to the formation of a Jewish Army (Captain De Chair), “has long been owned and run by Jews who are anti-Zionists*” (Colonel Cazalet); that the number of Jews in Palestine was 80,000 at the end of the last war and is now 450,000,

and that it has been calculated that after this war there will be seven million dispossessed Jews in Eastern Europe alone (Sir Denis Gunston); that after the last war Commander Locker Lampson and his friends went to Poland to try to raise an Army of 200,000, which it was hoped to make up to 500,000 in America, for the purpose of defending the Suez Canal and Palestine—"Why was an army agreed to by the Government and why was that privilege withdrawn? . . . I would like to know who stopped it. We ought to know, for all the facts were published in America both as to the size of the army and the name of the officer who was to take command"; and, not least, Mr. Hannah's reminiscence of his last stay in America, "At that time a certain amount of stir had been caused by some sort of Jewish Convention—I cannot give actual chapter and verse at this moment—voting that America was their promised land, and Washington their Zion." The only Jew who took part in the debate (Mr. Lipson) was opposed to the formation of a Jewish army.

The substance of Wing-Commander James's speech which included good points raised by Captain De Chair and Mr. Lipson appears below:—

. . . Had this issue been argued logically—and I notice that both the hon. Member for Bilston and the hon. Member for Chippenham really spoke pretty far from the point—it would have been quite evident that this is really an attack on the foreign policy of His Majesty's Government. It is an attempt to force the hand of the Government and to secure a reversal of the policy of the White Paper adopted and decided by the overwhelming Vote of this House so shortly before the war. In short, the whole movement for a Jewish Army is really an attempt to stake an exclusive claim for Palestine. . . for the post-war period. It is made quite plain to anybody who takes the trouble to read the current Jewish Press that they are trading upon the appalling sufferings of the Jews in Europe to press this very specific demand. It is most important to distinguish clearly between the old-established British Jews, those who have been here for generations and who form a most valuable element in our national life, and the Zionist Jews, who for the most part are those Jewish elements which came to this country in the 1880's and later from the pogroms in Poland, then under the Russian Government. This difference between the old-established British Jews and the Zionist Jews is clearly shown by the extreme virulence of the attacks upon the former in the Jewish Press in connection with demands for what amounts to a freehold of Palestine after this war. The Jewish demand, in my submission, raises the fundamental issue facing world Jewry, an issue which has to be faced, and probably can only be solved, in the immediate post-war period—the decision between nationalism and assimilation. On that, the Jews alone have to make up their minds. They cannot go on trying to have it both ways, to have the benefit of citizenship of countries and an over-riding external nationalism.

If they go for nationalism, the Jews must face the fact that Palestine cannot possibly offer a solution. Even if you gave it to the Jews, it could not solve their problems. The numbers involved make that obvious. A Jewish speaker, Professor Brodetsky, has said recently that there were in

Europe 9,500,000 Jews, largely oppressed and almost entirely dispossessed, who after the war would need homes. Another Jewish speaker—I have the quotation here—recently gave the number as 8,000,000. It is obvious that this problem cannot be solved by Palestine. These people, for the most part, are dispossessed, and horribly oppressed. It is certain that in the post-war settlement of Europe the anti-Semitic feeling which is prevalent in most of South-East Europe—to which, for example, Mr. Harold Butler referred in his recent book *The Lost Peace*—will preclude, or will make extremely difficult, the resettlement of the dispossessed Jews. I do not think they can be re-absorbed. I believe the logical outcome of the Zionist attitude must be the creation under the Peace Treaties of a specifically Jewish State in South-Eastern Europe which Jews can have as their homeland, seeing that Palestine cannot possibly take them. The Jewish claim on Palestine is only a sentimental one—sentimental, of course, is a powerful factor, but, neither historically nor ethnologically, have the Jews in reality as much claim to the soil of Palestine as the Arabs have.

We, as a democratic people, fighting for freedom, have no right whatever to seek to impose a Jewish minority, aiming openly at majority, brought in from the outside, on a native, indigenous Arab majority. We have no right whatever to do so. It is rather significant to notice the extremely ruthless, realistic attitude to the Jewish problem as usual adopted by the U.S.S.R. In Russia while Jews are, I understand, given complete equality in other respects, any separatist or Zionist tendencies are ruthlessly repressed, and to that the Jewish Press in this country makes constant and bitter reference. Russia at least is apparently going to solve the problem of Jewish nationalism in its own way. Both the opening speaker, the hon. Member for Bilston (Mr. Hannah), and the hon. and gallant Member for Chippenham (Colonel Cazalet) referred to the interest taken in this problem by the United States of America. In nearly all the discussions in the Jewish Press on this matter something very much like a veiled threat is made and it is constantly asserted that in the United States interest in this matter is so vital and means so much, that our relations with the United States largely depends upon our handling of the matter of Zionist aspirations in Palestine to-day. As the extreme Zionists demand its handling, of course.

Mr. Hannah: I would like to repudiate that.

Wing-Commander James: I apologise. I do not want to misrepresent the hon. Member but the hon. and gallant Member for Chippenham certainly so represented it, as did the hon. and gallant Member for Handsworth (Commander Locker-Lampson). I do not know whether this is true or not. I have not been to America for a long time. If it were the case, provided that it meant that the United States of America are prepared to share with us the burden and responsibility, and I must say also the ingratitude and the odium to which we are exposed, and have been exposed for years past in endeavouring to be fair and generous to the Jews, then I should welcome that interest. We have had all too little thanks for the immense amount which the British Government have done for the Jews. Lastly, I would like to ask how many British and American Jews who support in writing and by subscription a demand for a Jewish Palestine themselves want to go and settle in Palestine. It would be far more convincing if that were the case. . . .

—The policy of His Majesty's Government to the Jews

*On August 11, Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the *New York Times* was reported to be in this country on a mission for the American Red Cross. He said at a conference that "he had always had the feeling that collective security was the only possible way in which anything could be done." —*Ed.*

over a period of years has been generous in the extreme. I instance the treatment of refugees, the grants of large sums of money. Jewish affairs have occupied an enormous amount of our time in Parliament, and anybody can check this for themselves. I look at the index of the last pre-war published volume of the *Official Report* and observe that the affairs of Palestine occupied six columns of our time and the affairs of India three and a half. That is the measure of the interest and sympathy this House has taken in Jewish affairs in normal peace-time.

Sir J. Grigg: . . . The Government have recently had under review the adequacy of the existing arrangements for affording all sections of the community in Palestine the opportunity they desire to defend their country against a possible attack by the Axis forces. They have come to the conclusion that the following further measures to strengthen the defences of the country should now be adopted. Firstly, a Palestine Regiment of the British Army will be created at once, consisting of separate Jewish and Arab infantry battalions for general service in the Middle East. Normally, the Regiment will be employed in Palestine or adjacent countries for the defence of Palestine. The existing Palestinian companies of the Buffs will be incorporated into the regiment, and it is hoped to obtain at least 10,000 additional recruits for it. . . .

Secondly, the Palestine Volunteer Force, recruitment for which is open to all sections of the community, will be expanded to a maximum of 2,000 as arms, equipment and training facilities can be made available. Thirdly, the establishment of the Jewish Rural Special Police will be completed by the enrolment of 1,500 additional recruits, requisite training staff and co-ordination officers, arms and equipment to be provided by the Commander-in-Chief, Middle East, as soon as circumstances permit. . . .

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy(edition exhausted)
- Social Credit 3/6
- The Monopoly of Credit3/6
- Credit Power and Democracy(edition exhausted)
- Warning Democracy(edition exhausted)
- The Use of Money6d.
- "This 'American' Business"3d.
- Social Credit Principles1½d.

ALSO

- The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold4/6
- Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy
by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson6d.
- Democratic Victory or the Slave State?
by L. D. Byrne4d.
- How Alberta is Fighting Finance2d.
- The Rulers of Russia by Rev. Denis Fahey.....6d.

Leaflets

- The Attack on Local Government
by John Mitchell9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
- Taxation is Robbery50 for 1/9; 100 for 3/-
(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

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.
- BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 73 Manor Rd., Blackpool.
- BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
- BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
- CARDIFF S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 8, Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
- DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.
- LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.
- LONDON D.S.C. 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 September 3.
- NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.
- SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

Affiliation to the Social Credit Secretariat, which was accorded to Groups of Social Crediters, has been replaced by a new relationship and all previously existing affiliations were terminated as from January 1, 1942. This new relationship is expressed in the following Form which Associations* desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members of Association

.....

.....

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat†.

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy to every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Signature.....

A brief statement is also requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,
Director of Organisation
and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.