

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9 No. 13.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket (I)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

"The aristocracy of the *goyim* as a political force is dead—we need not take it into account; but as landed proprietors they can still be harmful to us from the fact that they are self-sufficing in the resources upon which they live. It is essential for us at whatever cost to deprive them of their land. This object will be best attained by increasing the burdens on landed property—in loading land with debts."

(The foregoing quotation is alleged by the People to whom it is attributed, to be a "forgery," so we will say that it is one of Grimm's Fairy Tales.)

I suppose that there never was a time when so much nonsense was talked by so many people on so many subjects, as the present. Sober judgement was once the object of respectful attention; but nowadays none is so poor as to do it reverence. The very foundations of considered opinion appear to be undermined; words, in our new "wonderland," mean what we want them to mean, and are used, not so much to conceal our thought as to advertise our determination to dispense with it.

High up on the list of matters on which almost everyone feels competent to give a firm, not to say strident, opinion, noticeably at a time like the present, which one would have imagined to be inopportune, is the subject of "the land." No experience is necessary; in fact, it is a serious handicap; it cramps your style. From the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is primarily a schoolmaster, through Mr. R. R. Stokes, M.P. who is a machinery manufacturer, to the shadowy backers of the Commonwealth League, all agree in their line of criticism—more laws "ought" to be passed about the land, and it "ought" to "belong" to the "people."

Practically all of this agitation can be traced back to international politics. Before giving to this aspect of the subject the attention it requires, however, it may be desirable to emphasise that no-one with any knowledge of the situation would waste time in the defence of the system of large estates prevalent in Great Britain, say, a hundred years ago, not because that system had not many virtues, as the devastation due to its break-up shows; but simply because land-holding, by individual proprietors, has been penalised to a degree which has turned the individual holder of considerable acreage into a mere land salesman. Slowly at first, but now very swiftly, the "county" families, who were interwoven with the system, and in the main lived and died in its not unexacting service, have disappeared. They were an organic growth, and are not susceptible of mass production by Act of Parliament. But it is quite certain that to substitute for this organism a Government Department primarily concerned

to collect taxes for international bondholders, is not progress but reaction.

There are many concrete facts the consideration of which is essential to an appreciation of the threat, not to that system (whose assets are being bought up with paper money at scrap prices), but to the individual Briton, which its disappearance involves. If the delusive word "ownership" can be forgotten for a moment, it will be easy to realise that it was a highly articulated system of administration, developed by trial and error over a long period.

To the agitator (though not to his hidden paymaster) "land" is homogeneous; an acre is an acre whether it is on the slag heaps of Widnes or the High-farming land of the Lothians. Agitation is moulded to justify "office-management" in place of personal responsibility.

One of the first considerations of the old system was to maintain, in the real, not the financial sense, the capital value of the land, and to do this required extraordinarily detailed knowledge of local conditions and custom. The desperate condition of much English arable, which has been "farmed-out" by tenant farmers not properly supervised, and having little anxiety as to their ability to get another of the hundreds of farms on offer, is the direct result of the sabotage of this administrative system.

Now, we are hypnotised by the propaganda of the international chemical combines into the belief that soil analysis, chemical fertilisers, and oil-driven farm machinery are far superior, and "scientific" than the intimate farming of the older order. Not only is there not a particle of genuine evidence for this, but there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Never has there been so much "professorial" farming; and never have agricultural products been so unsatisfactory in quality. Bread which has to be re-inforced with drugs; fruit which looks attractive and is both tasteless and lacking in all its old essential virtues (the Phoebe strawberry, the staple export of the Hampshire strawberry beds, looks large and delicious, and tastes like wet cotton wool); fabrics which are showy but neither warm nor durable; chemical beer, wine doctored and prohibitive in price. Progress!

But it is easy, more particularly in war-time, to look upon "the land" as though it were almost entirely an agricultural and production problem, which is the usual misdirection of emphasis fostered by international finance. It is *primarily*, but not *principally* an agricultural problem. It is, I think, a problem which can easily be misapprehended, unless it is considered in intimate relation with the character of the population, as well as its numerical magnitude. For instance, the last pursuit in which the land agitator wishes to engage, is farming, nor do farmers do much agitating.

There are many very curious circumstances surrounding

the question of population statistics, and population habits, in Great Britain. William Cobbett was aware of them. They have become still more curious in the last hundred years, as anyone who will take the trouble to consider the figures available in Whitaker's Almanack can see for himself.

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

A Nation Within A Nation

By N. F. W.

The duration of medieval Jewry in England was historically speaking very brief, and the expulsion which terminated it peremptory and complete. It is extraordinarily instructive to examine what the Jews had achieved in little more than two centuries, and particularly what it was that produced their dismissal. The short answer to that first question, apart from all other considerations, is that they achieved a remarkable anticipation in miniature of our present financial set-up. Operating on exactly the same self-destructive, mental principle, it was as hampering in every way to real statesmanship, and as little enjoyed by the individual citizen as to its practical results as in our own day.

What exactly had the Jews done to the land of their adoption to merit such abrupt ejection back to the Continent of Europe in 1290? Technically, the Jew had done nothing to England—except act according to his nature. It might be argued that no one can do otherwise. That may be so; but if a man's "nature" is a thing never to be questioned for one moment, or to be trimmed or modified by time or circumstance, *i.e.*, experience, trouble of some sort must inevitably be his share, and the more "real" his environment the quicker the retribution.

The history of the medieval Jews' two hundred years sojourn in England is the financial history of the country for that period—neither more nor less; and I suspect the same holds good of the Jew anywhere and everywhere. Mr. Roth* says that the "English" Jew took to usury because he was debarred by law from holding property or following a trade, but I long ago ceased to believe in that well-worn argument. It holds no water. In the present instance its weakness is shown up by Mr. Roth himself; for when finally at the end of Henry II's reign the Gentile population was prohibited by law from pledging land to the Jews, who thereby lost their job, they, the Jews, took to trading in wool and corn—buying up "futures" on the harvest. At a later date, this practice appears to have been a speciality of the Quakers, *vide.*, William Cobbett. The Jew has an unerring eye for bottle-necks—or for the point at which they can be created!

If I say that the Jews take to usury under the same compulsion that a duck takes to water, I hope Mr. Roth won't think me personal or prejudiced. I am, I believe, getting past any such feeling where his race is concerned. But all evidence on this matter is on my side—even his own remarkably lucid and unbiassed history. As far as nine tenths of the enactments against Jews are concerned, they amount in practice to nothing. For the truth of the matter is that the Jews are by nature legalists. They appreciate "law" for its own sake; laws against anything and everything, even (or most of all) against themselves. Because, I suppose

(to paraphrase a famous indictment of them) being themselves "lawyers, and the father of it," they instinctively know that the law has not yet been framed round which they cannot get—if they want to. Their whole history proves that. And if there is anything they don't want to do, *i.e.*, abandon usury, manipulating financial values, why, laws against their taking up honest pursuits are manifestly and palpably useful.

In a surprisingly short time after their first appearance at the Conquest, individual Jews rose to prominence in their particular field. Isaac fit Rabbi, although his race was technically debarred from holding property, received the manor of Ham in the reign of Henry II, for services rendered. And prominent along with him was Jurnet of Norwich. After 1166 came Aaron of Lincoln, who at his death "was reputed to be the wealthiest person in England in liquid assets" (blessed word!), as well as one of the first financiers in Europe.

As time went on these Financial Houses extended their associations to cover the whole country, and very soon an interlocking system, on the lines of our own Financial Institutions developed to embrace London, Norwich, York and Bristol. The Jewish community created and accepted the function of financial sponge, soaking up all available liquid assets. With increasing frequency the Crown, in its straits for cash (the King's shortness must certainly have been in part due to the Jewish accumulations), contracted the wholly bad habit of periodically squeezing the Jews. Gradually this proceeding became systematised, particularly as the Crown now made a practice of confiscating the estates of deceased Jews, and Gentile officials were appointed to what came to be called the Jewish Exchequer, a branch of the Great Exchequer, upon whom it developed to regulate the whole Jewish community, and operate all special taxation.

Further and inevitable developments followed. On page 15 Mr. Roth says, "The favour and protection enjoyed by the Jews under the first Plantagenet kings was not due. . . simply to their importance as tax-payers. . . they were at the same time what may be termed Treasury Agents, advancing large sums to the Crown to defray day-to-day expenditure or unexpected calls, and being paid by drafts on the sheriffs, secured on the "ferme of the shire," or county revenue. . . For convenience as well as security certain capitalists found it convenient to pool their resources and to work together. Hence after the middle of the reign" (Henry II) "we find a few prominent *consortia* of Jews dealing with the Treasury, the heavy advances being reflected by orders for repayment in due course out of county revenue."

That, surely, has the authentic "City" ring, and along with it was growing up all those unhealthy results and abuses that seem to be inseparable from money manipulation. When they first came over the Jews were regarded tolerantly by the Anglo-Saxon. "Religious" feeling was not acute as on the continent. The crusading fervour had not yet reached England, and when it did, was never so bigoted. But as time went on the Jew became fully identified in the public mind with usury and alienation of property, and Gentile tolerance began to wear thin. Jews were being mal-treated all over the country. A considerable number of them were "burnt out" of York Castle. "Ritual murder" charges, false or authentic, were levelled against them. Raids were made on the Jewish "Archi" (chests)—card-indexes really, of indebtedness both public and private, kept by the big

*CECIL ROTH: *History of the Jews in England.*

"Houses," which were prized by the Government as the only Public Records in existence.

When civil disturbances broke out, three forces—Government, Jews, and the mob—all made a bee-line for the local Archa, which was either borne off to safety like the Ark of the Covenant, or went up in flames, according to who got there first. The really bad feature in all this, however, was that it was identifying the Government, and by implication, the Crown, more and more in the public mind with Jewry. The impression created was inevitable and not unjustified. Even if most of the taxation was squeezed from the Jews, the cash derived in the first case from the people and they knew it. It was a vicious circle. The more the Jews were attacked, the more the authorities had to act in their defence, and the closer the identification between the two became.

But that was not the end of the trouble. Land tenure was becoming confused, and land alienated to such an extent as to threaten the whole feudal basis of the State. The alienation was not directly to the Jews, of course, for they were theoretically debarred from dealing in land. The baronage who borrowed from the Jews on their only security, land, when their loans became due, were forced to sell for cash. Those who bought were those who had "access to credit," and who tended naturally to be the bigger, and "sounder" of the land-owners. The cash that was to satisfy the original Jewish lender was in fact advanced by himself, or one of his interlocking confreres, to repay himself.

Modern finance is no stranger, of course, to such "mazy dances" as that. But the net result of all this was that the balance of power between the state and a nicely adjusted baronage, (all with relatively equal holdings, and hearty scrappers among themselves) upon which the Plantaganet kings relied, was seriously upset by the growth of a number of predominant estates and titles, which by their weight constituted a menace to government, a parallel to the trusts of our own day. In addition, the Crown, as ultimate landlord, found itself less and less secure of its rent, *i.e.*, the armed fealty of the barons, and thus at a disadvantage both actually and relatively.

There has been no drawing on the reviewer's imagination in this picture, the stages and phenomena of which present such a startling parallel to what we are familiar with to-day. There has not been one point made that could not have been given in Mr. Roth's own words, although, to him the picture presented is just the familiar one of a much abused race striving against adverse circumstances. The value to the modern student is the simplified texture of the whole thing in an isolated medieval community, and its smallness of scale, which permits us to see it as a whole. It was that, too, combined with an admirable native realism, and an absence of confusing propaganda, which without doubt enabled the government of the day to face its problem and act with a decision that in 1290 freed the country of its whole Jewish population in the space of four months.

One can't help regretting that we to-day are deprived of the invaluable asset of experience which a comparatively unbiassed official history of these events, and many others, would have given us. The conclusion is, however, that if the history had been unbiassed it wouldn't have been official.

Aberdeen

Social Credit has never lacked supporters at Aberdeen. It is an open secret that the defeat of the Duchess of Atholl in the parliamentary bye-election which she fought shortly before the war was due to their well-directed efforts in association with the electors' strong objection to a nominee who did not represent their policy. The formation of an Aberdeen Douglas Social Credit Association (Hon. Secretary: Wm. J. Sim), with headquarters at 18, Adelphi, in affiliation with the Social Credit Secretariat, is a development probably more closely related to the present political situation in Scotland than to any need for formalities.

Scotland has not taken so kindly to bureaucratic encroachment under cover of the war as have England and Wales. England has a large number of political prisoners, many of whom, it is often said, do not know why they are in prison. It is whispered that a higher proportion of Scottish political prisoners know why they are in prison.

Professor Lindley Fraser's article in *World Review* was followed by an article in *The Banker* by Lord Rosebery (grandson of Baron Meyer de Rothschild), inviting Scotland to become a 'marshalling-yard' (to use an expression now familiar) for goods *en route* from the U.S.A. to Europe. Newspapers as widely separated as Eastbourne and Edinburgh have suddenly become interested in the financing of the Guernsey Market; and *The Scotsman* has broken a long abstinence by printing an address delivered in Edinburgh on Social Credit. Following upon Lord Rosebery's patriotic effort the Duke of Montrose (*q.v.* any good Scots History) has called for devolution. (N.B. there is no need to contradict the rumour that the Duke shares the imprisonment of the Scots nationalist Douglas Young, because no one would dream of starting such a rumour in Scotland, and it couldn't spread.) Pieces of the Montrose *once* decorated the walls of Aberdeen. And so...

Broadcasting from Germany

Of the newspaper comments we have seen on the performance of "Lord Haw-Haw's latest stable companion" John Amery, the *Jewish Chronicle* blackens his character best, and it alone discloses his relationship as 'the son of a British Cabinet Minister.' John Amery broadcast from Germany an appeal for a negotiated peace and "interspersed his speech with a typical Goebbels-like sneer at such facts as the recent candidature of two Jews—'gangsters in the city'—for the Lord Mayoralty of London." (*Jewish Chronicle*). Perhaps these two facts will convince those who do not know that papa Amery is an 'Arian.' John is a grandson of Elizabeth Leitner.

"B."B.C. Verdict

Mr. Austin Hopkinson asked the Minister of Information whether he was aware that an hon. Member of the House, at the request of the B.B.C., prepared a script for a Sunday night postscript broadcast, "the said script being a careful paraphrase of the Sermon on the Mount," and that it was rejected on three grounds; firstly, that it was Fascist; secondly, that it was anti-working-class; thirdly, that it was anti-Christian?"

Mr. Bracken did not know of the case mentioned, "but the B.B.C. is strongly opposed to repetition."

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. 9. No. 13.

Saturday, December 5, 1942.

THE PIT OF LETTERS

Leonardo da Vinci, himself an artist, embodied his conceptions of the future Man-with-Wings in mechanical structures, dissections and drawings of the anatomy of the wings of birds and moths, brief notes reflecting bare facts (e.g., "The *pannicola* flies with four wings, and when those in front are raised those behind are lowered. But it is necessary for each pair to be of itself sufficient to sustain the whole weight."). *Post hoc ergo propter hoc* intimations of the *quantum* have been discerned in Goethe's lines beginning, *Am Anfang war das Wort*; but neither the dynamo, nor the internal combustion engine, nor even the steam engine, nor London Bridge, so far as we can see, was first enshrined in an elaborate literary, or musical, or plastic tradition before it came into being. They burst upon the consciousness of mankind as current for electric light bulbs, jolting four-seated conveyances cut short without horses in front, puffing iron monsters pulling more than one coach at a time, a dry road to cross the Thames.

Anyone who admires Bach's *Chaconne* would surely prefer to know the whole of Bach's mind when he wrote it?

These ideas are suggested by the presentation by a reader of a copy of a novel (second impression July, 1942) by Ronald Fraser. The name is *Financial Times*.

Anyone who knows that Mr. Arthur Ronald Fraser has written eleven other novels is as likely to be surprised by the book as anyone who knows that he has been a Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George since 1934, is an Assistant Secretary to the Board of Trade and has participated in important political and economic discussions since 1923.

The 'hero' of *Financial Times* is a swine called 'Titian.' Many terrible stories have been written about the poor little artistic genius, the desperately ugly duckling, born unpropitiously into a family of brutish philistines, a name applied by German students to shopkeepers and others not connected with the university. Titian's plight is far worse. Unwisely (see Samuel Butler) he has chosen for his parents one William Longfellow Woolacombe, the Royal Academician, whose famous cows adorn even the walls of the Public Art Gallery of Galashiels, and the Painter's Wife, Ella, the poetess, widely-known as Love-in-a-Mist when she was eighteen. Twelve very different beings (beings, indeed, who 'took after' their almost perfect parents) were sent to try Titian, and did. They were Leonardo, Perugino, Rubens, Carpaccio (or Carp), Holbein and Raphael, besides six girls, Veronese, Francesca, Gentile, Claude, Ingres and Lippi, Titian's brothers and sisters.

To the shocked but scarcely tolerant amusement of the

whole lot (Woolacombe, "the brushes trembling a little" came out onto the gallery over the hall, and "stood there in a still intensity as of silent imprecation") he made his own arrangements to go to school to learn useful things such as commercial arithmetic. "That the head master, and all the other masters, had no skill in teaching didn't worry him at all. He wasn't conscious of it. He was there to learn, and he learnt notwithstanding; with the consequence that the masters were a good deal surprised and slightly awestruck at their own powers."

Yes, Titian became a banker. And thus Mr. Fraser is able to publicise certain views on Finance low and high (whichever is which).

"Good-bye, my boy," he said. "In a sense, you are now entering a wider world. You will have a greater responsibility in the application of the broad principles of banking, which are, to lend to every man who has any a proportion of his own money, to charge him an exorbitant rate, to invest the proceeds in property for the aggrandisement of the bank, to reward the directors ever more richly, and always to extend your activities, geographically I mean and not morally, with a view to obtaining a stranglehold over the life of the nation. . . . In other words," the Painter continued after a thoughtful pause, "the great principle of banking is, where there are already resources to participate and where there are not to destroy. Whereas it should be the function of a bank to provide those who have no money with funds. . ." — "Good-bye, father," he said. "I can bear no more."

This is not now very significant. Nor is it quite accurate. It might have been more important a few years ago, before *The Times* and *The Economist* had learnt to say much the same thing, punctuated by the evidences of their different varieties of economic and philosophical indigestion. But there's more and better in Mr. Fraser:—

"All Utopias are tragic," said Iris. "Some of them are revolting as well, like those ones we hear about with more and better gadgets and everyone all modern. . . . But Michael could take an argument like this in his stride. 'I have no objection to science,' he said, 'when it applies itself to improving musical instruments. . . .' 'This is most interesting,' said Charles Wilbraham. 'You don't want a mechanical Utopia. You don't want the sentimental communism of William Morris. What do you want, if I may be so impertinent as to ask?' . . . 'It isn't that one wants anything. . . .' 'But you must have an idea what happiness consists in.' 'Happiness?' Charles was baffled. 'When I was a young man,' he said, 'which seems about four million years ago, but it isn't quite forty, we all had ideas about how we would rebuild the world.' 'Wouldn't that be rather an impertinence?' Iris inquired. 'Mightn't other people have other ideas? They do, I believe. And wouldn't that lead to a struggle, and one set of people imposing themselves on another? Like teetotallers? Or Fascists? Or Anti-Fascists?'"

We can leave it at that.

The dreadful thought crosses our mind that we should prefer to see Social Credit than to read the 'Social Credit Philosophy' in a book, or see it in a picture, or hear it in music. ("Seek ye *first* the Kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you.") We have no wish, to see Social Credit poured into the bottomless pit of letters. T.J.

"I Know You Not Whence Ye Are—"

By B. M. PALMER

A B.B.C. announcement that all Christian denominations would unite with the Jewish in Thanksgiving day services was withdrawn a few days later. We were told that each would minister to his own flock. This is recorded as one of the curious incidents of the last few days. Whatever the explanation, Christianity as presented by the established Churches both here and in America is a strange faith indeed. It seems to have lost everything that made it Christian; adherence to the creeds of Sir Stafford Cripps and Sir William Beveridge being all that is required of church members, in this country at least.

The appearance of these two gentlemen at church meetings and conferences, and the statement of one of them that he had not been brought up in any religious faith and had never been a member of any religious community, recalls an incident of some six years ago, when no secret was made of the fact that nothing could be done in England without the support of the clergy and the old maids. Without labouring the point, the political colour of most schools is unmistakable. The Church of England will soon be a flaming red. Witness the Rochester Diocesan Conference.

This Conference was far more fully reported in the Kentish papers than in the London press. According to the *Kentish Times*, Dr. C. M. Chavasse said that Christians are social reformers or they are not Christians at all... The Church's mandate for concerning itself passionately with social reconstruction was to be found in the two words which sum up the Christian revelation:—"Our Father." Having laid down the principle of non-immanent sovereignty, the whole of the rest of his address was based on the implied assertion that wherever the Kingdom of Heaven may be, it is certainly not within us.

Reports of Sir William Beveridge's speech were given by the *Kent Messenger* and the *West Kent Mercury*. In the course of his address he said that family life, its responsibilities and its cares, were the material of which most human happiness for most people is made. Charles Darwin summed up his happiness as "work and the domestic affections." [Consider the Lilies; but of course what higher authority than Charles Darwin could be quoted at a Church Conference?]

Sir William said that the work which different men found to do was of differing degrees of importance and interest. For some a complete life in itself, for many it must be dull and heavy... The family was the means of vicarious immortality through children... [Yes, this was supposedly a Christian Conference]. The family is the most general of all human institutions. The passion to do the best one can for one's own children is nearly universal... He added that the family was an institution aiming at inequality of opportunity, but despite that he favoured its retention... The church spoke only of abolishing extreme inequality—not all inequality. That was right in practice and principle... Economic rewards and punishments for failure of effort were the alternative to the slave gang.

Those of us who are familiar with the doctrines of the London School of Economics are not particularly startled by the intellectual arrogance of these remarks. A man pre-

sumptuous enough to present an opinion concerning the abolition or retention of the family, and to imagine his views will have the slightest weight *in the long run*, will be equal to anything. It is, however, interesting to notice that the papers which reported the more impudent parts of his speech were the more local weeklies. His speech did not appear in *The Times*, so far as I am aware.

On November 13 Sir Stafford Cripps, speaking at St. Martins-in-the-Fields, urged the church to give direct guidance on social and economic problems. "Empty phrases praising a democracy that is not democratic would taste bitter in the mouths of those who have given their all for a great deal."

On November 16 in a broadcast to the *New York Herald Tribune*, he told the Americans what we were fighting for: "The power of the air, which daily shows itself in growing strength, provides an opportunity which never before existed for the control of world order. An international air force would reach the most remote corners of the world and could strike at any who sought to break the peace for their own advantage." But not for someone else's advantage?

Peace by Force.

Sir Stafford has now left the War Cabinet for the Ministry of Air Craft Production.

To the four freedoms of President Roosevelt, Sir William has added another, "Freedom from Idleness." And it is quite plain that *The Times* thinks this by far the most important of the Five Freedoms, for a whole article—a leader—was devoted to its consideration alone. With this freedom is doubtless connected one of the provisos from the Plan for British Industry, signed by 120 leading industrialists, and including some members of the Economic Reform Club:—"A man out of work through no fault of his own is entitled to a subsistence allowance as of right, and not of charity. This must be coupled with *an obligation to accept alternative employment elsewhere* under suitable safeguards."

Mobile compulsory labour.

England, the Workers' Paradise, the Land of the Free.

It cannot be too clearly stressed that all these slaveries masquerading as "freedoms" follow inevitably upon the doctrine of non-immanent sovereignty, the faith of the Old Testament, the rule of law as against the rule of love. The strange reluctance of the Archbishop of Canterbury to quote the words of Jesus Christ; his predilection for the Law and the Prophets, or even Paul; the quiet shelving of the doctrine of the Incarnation, which so many clerics will neither accept nor deny; the constant suggestion from many quarters that after all there is not so much difference between Judaism and Christianity—what do they mean?

That the religion of Christ is leaving the Churches—that the Reformers are driving it out—to replace it by Judaic Monotheism. And as surely as the terrible ideologies of Sir Stafford Cripps and Sir William Beveridge will be overthrown—though they may cause untold suffering in their downfall—so the Church of England will fall with them.

General Election?

Mr. George Griffiths voiced in Parliament a rumour that registration officers had some instructions about getting ready for an election immediately after Christmas.

Mr. Morrison denied knowledge of such instructions.

Points from Parliament

HOUSE OF COMMONS: NOVEMBER 17

ADMIRAL DARLAN

Mr. Arthur Greenwood (by *Private Notice*) asked the Prime Minister whether he can make any statement as to the negotiations with Admiral Darlan in North Africa?

Mr. Attlee: These negotiations have taken place between the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Forces and Admiral Darlan and others with a view to the immediate military situation in North Africa. It is not possible at this stage to make any further statement on this matter.

Mr. Greenwood: May I take it from what my right hon. Friend said at the end of his reply that, as early as possible, a fuller statement will be made about the position of Admiral Darlan?

Mr. Attlee: I will convey that to my right hon. Friend.

Mr. Bellenger: My right hon. Friend has referred to the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Forces in North Africa. Are we to understand that British troops are under the command of an American Commander-in-Chief?

Mr. Attlee: Yes, Sir.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: NOVEMBER 19

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS

Mr. Austin Hopkinson (*Mossley*): I think I ought to take up the challenge which was thrown down by an hon. Member earlier in the Debate to-day. He was putting forward his view of a wonderful new world in which there is to be complete freedom from unemployment and complete security from want, and said that no member would deny that those were ideals which must be put into practice immediately the war is over... if we were to guarantee everyone freedom from unemployment and freedom from want it could only be in a state of abject slavery. It is utterly impossible to guarantee people against unemployment unless the State can say at what occupation a man must work, where he shall work, for what remuneration he shall work, and with what intensity. In no other circumstances, as it has been found out in Germany and in Russia, is it possible to bring about a security attainable only in a state of complete slavery in which every activity of a man's life is subject to overriding dictatorship... I have heard from young officers in all three Services during the present war—that there is a sort of feeling that the real battle is the one being fought at home rather than the hostilities in which they themselves take part. The battle being fought at home is the battle for an England worthy of those who are serving abroad at the present time, but there are features in the present situation which undoubtedly raise the gravest disquiet in the minds of young men of all ranks in our fighting Services.

Take one example. From the purely economic point of view, what is being prepared for them after the war? I venture to say that one of the things which arouses more

disquiet in their minds than anything is that there is a strong movement in this country towards having the life of every man and woman planned out by some superior authority, and there is no doubt they regard that with the utmost distaste. Again, there is a section of the community which we call 'big business.' Big business has nothing to do with legitimate commerce and industry, nothing whatever; it is a purely parasitic growth, living upon the life-blood of industry and of the workers. It is obvious that big business, in collusion with the labour boss of the syndicalist type, is preparing a brave new world for these young men when they come home. Many hon. Members will have seen a manifesto by big business recently. What did it mean? It meant that great monopolistic bodies will be set up in each industry, vested with statutory powers whereby they may crush every form of independent industry by making one great monopoly. By collusion with the labour boss they would always have a majority on the council for each industry and, by their statutory powers, they could enforce their will upon everybody else...

That is not the first time we have had to fight against this sort of thing. Many hon. Members will remember the "peace in industry" stunt of the late Lord Melchett some years ago, which was exactly the same thing as is being prepared in this country to-day... If we allow big business and the labour boss between them to close up all the openings for enterprise and brains and energy we shall betray all these young men in the lowest possible fashion.

Again, there is no doubt that among those in the Fighting Services there is a feeling that they are being let down in other directions. They are told again and again by Government spokesmen that the war is a crusade. They ask, "A crusade for what?" They are answered that it is for the Christian faith. Unhappily, they then ask, "What is the Christian faith?" They want to know to whom they go for guidance on these matters. They ask, "Are we to believe those who preach to us that a high standard of living is an essential preliminary to spiritual progress? Is that the Christian faith?" They do not believe it. To some extent they have read the books which laid down in the earliest days what was the Christian faith, but they cannot see anything there which says that nobody can be good unless possessing an excellent house with three bedrooms, a bathroom, and a little garden in front and behind. There is very grave misgiving among the young people of to-day as to whether what was officially told them as being the Christian faith has anything at all to do with that faith...

Nothing is said about the parents or about anything except the material environment, which is all that is regarded as necessary to make a home. That house may be a magnificent modern house, but it is not a home unless the parents are such that they are capable of making it a home. That child has no more chance in life, and particularly of moral and spiritual progress, in that magnificent house than he would have with other parents in the most miserable hovel in the land. I maintain—and I am backed by the vast number of young people that I come across—that that is not the Christian faith, and it is wrong that those in authority in the Church should put such a form of so-called idealism before the young people...

In our political life I have always been a revolutionary,

and I hope I shall continue to be one to the end of my days. Where I differ from my colleagues above the gangway is in my interpretation of what a revolution should be. As far as I can gather from them, their idea of a revolution is simply exchanging one tyrant for another, exchanging the tyranny of wealth which exists at the present moment for that of the frozen hell of Socialism. They do not realise that the reason why the rich now have such preponderating power in this country, and practically throughout the world, is the love of money on the part of the poor. As long as the poor love money and worship money and believe that it is the *summum bonum* of life so long will the rich man dominate the poor as he does to-day. The young people are beginning to realise it. They realise that revolution does not mean change of tyrants, but means a change in our way of looking at the problems of the day. . . .

These young people feel that they are being let down in politics as well, and they are realising what perhaps the wisest man in the world—needless to say I mean Plato—told us many centuries ago realising that the whole secret of politics boils down to one thing. In his *Republic* Plato sets forth a most elaborate system for the political constitution of a city, worked out skilfully in every detail. And, having done so, he contemplates his work, and almost in despair he says that the conclusion of the whole matter is this, that. . . .—

“Until philosophers are kings, or the princes and rulers of this world have the spirit of philosophy, so that political power and wisdom meet in one; and until those commoner natures, who follow the former to the exclusion of the latter, are compelled to stand aside; till then cities will never cease from evil; No, nor the human race as I believe. And never will this, our City of God, behold the light of the sun.”

That is the whole secret of politics. No matter how ingenious or wise your wisdom, everything depends upon those who are placed in authority and upon the way in which they regard their duties and responsibilities to their fellow-citizens. . . .

Age after age the rising generation has found built for it very much what the previous generation thought was the best thing for it without any consultation with the unfortunate generation which was to inhabit the building they erected. The result has been that each generation in its turn has had to spend its whole time pulling down the Bastille erected for it by its progenitors, and has never had to time to build anything substantial for itself. I hope the young people will understand that people of my age do realise that now, and all

we want to do is this: If you young people will give us some sort of idea as to what sort of building you want to erect, we will clear the site, and possibly, if we are spared long enough, we will lay some of the foundations for you, and then you can devote yourselves to building up a world such as you want, which may be completely different from what we think may be good for you. . . .

I wish to dissociate myself and those of my generation from what are called Youth movements with a capital ‘Y.’ There is nothing on earth that irritates the young more than Youth with a capital ‘Y.’ For there is a tendency for these movements to fall into the hands and under the direction of old women, mostly of the male sex. Therefore, on behalf of my generation, as far as I can carry them with me, and in face of the demands from the youth of to-day, I repudiate Youth movements, lock, stock, and barrel. They need not be considered to be more than a temporary pimple on the body politic. . . .

The struggle is between the two ideas of the Superman, the German idea and what we believe to be our own idea.

Hitherto, the whole of animal and human development has been instigated and driven forward by one urge only, the urge for material security, which has developed the human race from its non-human ancestors through untold ages. In all progress that has been made, both physical and intellectual, the spur has been all the time the desire for material security. Man has now reached the point when, if that same motive continues to prevail, degeneration must inevitably be the fate of the whole race. It is obvious, as the experience of Europe has shown, that the most complete material security can be obtained only by the sacrifice of everything that makes men different from the animal race. Material security, as Russia, Germany, and Italy have proved, means the complete destruction of liberty and of the individual mind, the deliberate making of a mass mind, eliminating the individual, and to that extent degrading men to the position from which they have gradually been emerging for ages and ages. The ideal of Nazism and Communism, as it is practised to-day, is the ideal of the beehive, where every individual has a certain material function in the community, and must carry out that function, and then the dictators can guarantee him a standard of material security. To what end? To the end of eternal death. The Superman of our enemies to-day is the man who in other countries has made himself the leader, who has had yielded to him the whole of the liberties and the possibilities of progress of the people, and who in return has guaranteed them this material security. That Superman is the quintessence of self-assertion in material things. He crushes the weak, he boasts, he bullies and marches triumphant to nowhere but to eternal death.

There is another form of Superman, and it is that ideal which I think lies in the mind of all that which is best in our nation at the present day. His ideal is undoubtedly that message of our race, and there are few people who can bring themselves, as I am doing to-day, to speak of things of such immense depth and interest to everyone of us. It is only a crisis like that that can induce one of us to break through that reticence which nature and training and custom have hallowed, and, dragging his very soul from its solitude, expose it, it may be, to sneers. That is my excuse for saying this: that the Superman whom this nation may ultimately produce and who will justify our nation for ever is the exact opposite of the Superman of the Germans of the present day.

“The Tragedy of Human Effort”

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Major Douglas's Liverpool Address, October, 1936.

ALSO

“The Policy of a Philosophy”

The first republication in pamphlet form of the address given to a conference of social creditors in June, 1937.

Price: 7d. Each.

from all booksellers, or from the publishers (postage 1d.)

K. R. P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL. 15.

The Superman which we wish the human race to develop in the time to come is he who is "despised and rejected," who goes forward ultimately to crucifixion and becomes that Son of Man who is the end to which the whole creation moves.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: NOVEMBER 25

DOMINIONS (DEFINITION)

Mr. Granville asked the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs in what terms it is the practice of His Majesty's Government officially to refer collectively to the British Nations defined in the Statute of Westminster, 1931, as, "the Dominion of Canada," "the Commonwealth of Australia," "the Dominion of New Zealand," "the Union of South Africa" and "the Irish Free State"?

The Under-Secretary of State for the Dominions (Mr. Emrys-Evans): There is no standardised practice for referring collectively to the countries mentioned. They were included in the definition of Dominions in the Statute of Westminster, 1931. In the report of the Inter-Imperial Relations Committee of the Imperial Conference of 1926 the "group of self-governing communities composed of Great Britain and the Dominions" were described as being "autonomous communities within the British Empire" and as being "freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Mr. Granville: May I ask whether it is the practice of His Majesty's Government to refer to the British Nations as the British Commonwealth, in view of the fact that Field-Marshal Smuts and other Dominion statesmen use that term; and, if so, will he ask his right hon. Friend to see that Whitehall Departments and Ministers use the term "British Commonwealth"?

Mr. Leslie Boyce: Will the hon. Gentleman bear in mind that nine-tenths of the people who live in the British Empire overseas are proud of the fact that they belong to the British Empire, and of the name?

To be continued

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer,
Social Credit Expansion Fund,
c/o The Social Credit Secretariat,
49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

I enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H.

Douglas

Name

Address

Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to the Social Credit Expansion Fund and crossed "& Co. account payee only."

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 Big Idea2/6
- The Tragedy of Human Effort7d.
- The Policy of a Philosophy7d.
- 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 Finance (out of print)
- Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....9d.
- The Rulers of Russia by Rev Denis Fahey.. (out of print)

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 December 17.
- 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.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is now in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.