

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 22.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

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

by C. H. DOUGLAS

The subject of industrial sabotage—the destruction of valuable material, goods, and products—has received much attention during the past twenty-five years, and its place in current political economy is both well known and reasonably well understood by students of that alleged science.

But there are certain curious aspects of generalised sabotage which have an important bearing on the land question, and I am doubtful whether their nature is at all widely recognised. I refer to the mass slaughter of animals, not for food, but in accord with some prevalent, and quite probably evanescent, theory. To illustrate the peculiar characteristics of this organised life-sabotage, which runs parallel to the human sabotage of mechanised war, it is instructive to take, out of many, three instances which I have chosen consciously as presenting at first sight a good case for the saboteurs, if we accept the present civilisation as a basis of policy. These are (1) Rabbit extermination; (2) Red (Highland) Deer destruction; (3) The slaughter of immense numbers of valuable cattle on the appearance of a small number of cases of foot-and-mouth disease.

I can imagine many people whose knowledge of the country is either theoretical, or wholly financial, observing at once that anyone who will defend the wild rabbit must be merely perverse. Perhaps; there are odd features about this wild rabbit business, however. The first of these is that, like the red deer, the rabbit is indigenous to these islands. Until the Ground Game Act of 1880, which is popularly supposed to have caused the death by apoplexy of a large number of sporting squires, I do not think that the rabbit figured in history or legislation other than as game to be reserved for the landowner. The point I have in mind is that, although far fewer persons had the right to destroy rabbits and the penalties for the destruction of them by unauthorised persons were incredibly severe and barbaric (suggesting that they were highly valued), there is no record, so far as I am aware, that they were a special nuisance, or that they increased unduly—rather a remarkable fact in view of the prolific breeding rate of the rabbit.

"But, my dear fellow," observes Mr. Pink-Geranium, O.B.E., (né Rosenblum) of Whitehall, "what has all that got to do with it? Don't you know that rabbits are destructive to crops? I have here a report (sponsored by a really *international*, my dear fellow, chemical combine, which makes cyanide for exterminating rabbits and human beings) which puts the matter beyond doubt." To this the obvious reply is that all the rabbits in Christendom have not destroyed as

much food in a century as Mr. Pink-Geranium and his London-School-of-Economics policies have destroyed in the last ten years, and that if these policies are to prevail, why not let the rabbits save the trouble of sowing, reaping, storing, and then burning the millions of bushels of wheat Mr. Pink-Geranium won't let anyone buy? To pretend that the rabbit eats only crops, and has no contra-account, is typical.

There is, of course, the alternative of cyaniding Mr. Pink-Geranium.

The red-deer racket is even more confusing. Most of the propaganda in connection with it seems to be emitted by the London Scottish domiciled in the wild fastnesses of St. John's Wood. For some time the public, which mostly believes that a deer-forest is an impenetrable thicket of valuable hardwoods, was sprayed with complaints as to the number of sheep which weren't grazed in Scotland because of the deer whose only excuse was to provide blood-sports for the effete rich. (The complaint of owners of deer forests for many years has been that they have to employ paid hunters, because so many people who like stalking, dislike shooting.) Not one, but several, landowners offered to give large tracts of deer-land to nominees of the agitators, on the single condition that they would pay the taxes, and farm the land. Not a single acceptance was obtained. Then, at the expense of the general public, not of the agitators, several thousand sheep were placed by "Public Bodies" on deer forests expropriated by taxation. Most of the sheep died—at public expense. It has been demonstrated that, at high levels, even if it is only a question of weight of animal food grown, deer are more productive than sheep.

But the subject becomes more involved the further you look into it. Not only is the human population of Scotland decreasing (by nearly one per cent. in the last census decade) but it is becoming overwhelmingly an urban population, nearly a quarter of it being comprised in one city—Glasgow.

As an obvious consequence (even if no other factors were involved, which is far from being the case) there are fewer families to work even existing workable land. What is the argument, then? Are the deer on the high lands driving the population into the towns and even out of the country? Is there any evidence whatever (more especially since the spectacular failure of forced evacuation) that even if given free land, any considerable proportion of the urban population would, or could, work the high tops? If so, I have not heard of it. Can it be that the red-deer is the very symbol of freedom, and so, hateful to Mr. Pink-Geranium? Perhaps I may disclaim, at this juncture, any intention or desire to pose as an agricultural expert, in the sense that, I have no doubt, Lord Lymington or Lord Northbourne are agricultural experts. But I am very doubtful whether the politics of land has any connection with that kind of *expertise*,

or I should leave it with them.

So long as it is clear to anyone of ordinary common sense that the outstanding intention of the present time is not scientifically organised production, but scientifically organised destruction, nothing will convince me that much real unavoidable scarcity exists, or that any improvement of either productive process or organisation is the primary necessity.

You do not cure sabotage by more sabotage, and better technique in the employment of bad intention simply involves bigger and better sabotage. Our problem is better *effective* intention.

I do not believe that Mr. Pink-Geranium, O.B.E., his clan, and his Fabian friends, really care two debased kopecks about the land, but it is something with which to confuse the issues. If they did care, they would have had a land of their own, long ago. But they recognise that land, the money system, and the police are the raw material of control, and control they are determined to have. They also recognise that a majority is always ruled by a minority, and it is therefore essential that the legal title to these things shall be taken from a minority and vested in a majority—the "Public."

The heavy-handed, crude, mass methods of a Government Department are wholly unsuited to land administration. But they can, and do, sabotage humanised management.

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

Australian Commonwealth Powers Transfer Bill Opposed

The Times of January 26 reports that in view of the conflict of legal opinion on the Commonwealth Powers Transfer Bill, Mr. Dunstan has inserted new clauses in the Bill before the Legislative Assembly providing (1) that the Act will be operative only when legislation substantially similar has been enacted in each of the other States, and (2) if the High Court holds it is illegal to refer powers to the Commonwealth for a limited period, such as five years after the war, which the Act provides, the Act becomes void.

Counsel's opinion which has been obtained by the Victorian Government and the Chambers of Commerce and the Manufacturers' and Employers' Federation, declares that the States cannot limit the duration of any grant of powers, which must be permanent. The Solicitor-General, Sir George Knowles; the ex-Solicitor-General, Sir Robert Garran; and Professor Kenneth Bailey, of Melbourne University, who is advising Dr. Evatt, dissent from these opinions, declaring that the Bill as passed by the Convention is perfectly constitutional.

Considerable opposition is being offered to the passage of the Bill in South Australia, West Australia, and Tasmania, on the ground that the powers proposed to be transferred are not sufficiently clearly defined.

**READY SHORTLY:—A new edition of
How Alberta is Fighting Finance**

Price: 4d. (Postage extra.)

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

'The New Tyranny'

"Hungary is a particularly good example of the country which produces the Jew who is a good Hungarian to-day, good Englishman to-morrow, good German next week, good Chinese next month; and which in my view still affords the best example to-day where the Jew, by this method of squeeze-out collaboration, rises to heights of influence and affluence far beyond his deserts and his numbers."

"... In 1938, the Jews in Hungary were richer and more powerfully established than ever before. ... On paper, as always, the proportion of the Jews to the population was very small—about 600,000, or 6.5 per cent, of the total, including confessing Jews, baptised Jews, and half-Jews.

"In this matter of the Jews, figures are great prevaricators, for the actual picture that Hungary presented to the human eye was a completely different one. It was a picture of Jewish predominance, in very many walks of life, out of all proportion to their numbers, even assuming that these were much greater than the statistics showed. They were a group with a standard of well-being and power far above any other in the country.

"They owned 46 per cent. of all industrial undertakings. They manned 70 per cent. of the boards of all companies representing big business. On the boards of the leading banking-houses their share was between 75 and 80 per cent.; 67.2 per cent. of private brokers and 36 per cent. of banking clerks were Jews. They had even gained possession of 11.7 per cent. of all land in Hungary. ...

"Of the bigger estates, 17.6 per cent, were in Jewish hands; 34.4 per cent. of all doctors were Jews, 49.2 per cent. of all lawyers, 31.6 per cent. of all journalists. In Budapest, the capital, where between a quarter and a third of the entire population is Jewish, the proportion was much higher. The publishing and printing trades were almost exclusively Jewish, all privately-owned theatres were Jewish, and 40.5 per cent. of film theatres.

"To get a clearer picture of this almost monopolistic control take the boards of the twenty leading industrial undertakings in Hungary in 1934-35. Of 336 names, 235 were Jewish; 290 of the biggest industrial concerns in Hungary were under the control of the ten biggest banks. Of 319 names on the boards 223 were Jewish.

"In 1936, 19 newspapers in Budapest employed 418 editors, journalists and contributors; 306 were Jewish.

"Now leave the figures and look at Budapest, at the retail trade, the mightiest of all the Jewish strongholds. Here the Jewish preponderance is clearest to the naked eye, because it is behind the counter, not upstairs in the board-room. In Budapest, there are miles of streets where you may search vainly for a non-Jewish shop. It is very difficult, if you wish to buy anything, not to buy it from a Jew.

"It is, in its way, a new tyranny, comparable with that of the nobles and the Church in the Middle Ages, the tyranny of money-power instead of the tyranny of inherited privilege, and it needs remedying just as much as those other tyrannies, which still linger on.

"This is the problem that has to be solved, as it seems to me; that the Jews, given full equality of opportunity, use it to oust the others and acquire the status of a privileged class."

— DOUGLAS REED in *Disgrace Abounding*.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

1933: "France was rapidly becoming a bureau-anarchy. Superimposed upon an extremely flexible political system was a caste of permanent officialdom which had one purpose in life—the exploitation of its privileges. This was true of all French civil servants. . . ."

—HELEN LOMBARD: *Washington Waltz*, p. 97.

Well, we know what happened to France. Are we going to sit down and watch the same thing happen here, if not in this war, in the next?

It is becoming clear to the most casual observer that the future of this country, and sooner or later every country, is bound up with the defeat or victory of "Employment for its own sake, no matter what else goes." Victory for that policy means first slavery, then war, then anarchy. Defeat of it means freedom in security.

An Australian weekly publishes a letter from an aspiring politician in this country which emphasises once again that stern determination to push at open doors, no matter who opened them.

In the course of a recapitulation of events in Alberta the letter continues: "I . . . acted as Economic Adviser to the Aberhart Government Planning Committee." (Capitals in original.)

As a literary critic observed on another occasion "Mr. H— has not merely bent the (long) bow of Ulysses, he has broken it."

We are waiting for our copy of the *Fiji Times and Solomon Islands Advertiser* to learn that the same aspirant is "acting as Economic Adviser" to Mr. Churchill, Josef Stalin, the King of Italy, and the Mikado.

The Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Wales, urge that the Jews who are being persecuted by Hitler should be given a haven in the British Empire.

Did the individuals who are now Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Wales, urge the Government of the United Kingdom that the Russians, amounting to many times the alleged total of all the Jews in Europe, who were murdered, robbed, and enslaved by the Jew coterie which seized power in 1918, should be given a haven in the British Empire?

Steward, quick!

We have never, so far as we are aware, had any contact or communication with Mr. Harold L. Weir, who we understand is an honest-to-God Canadian of five generations of Canadianism.

But we read Mr. Weir's articles, which appear on the leader page of the *Edmonton (Alberta) Bulletin*, and we have no hesitation in saying that if the "B." B.C. were the B.B.C. it would offer him a very handsome inducement to come over and do a little explaining of the British to the large number of aliens who seem to be unable to understand us.

It is difficult to over-rate the value of work of this character, and we hope that Mr. Weir will see this appreciation of its excellence.

The put-the-builder-out-of-business racket, run in this country by the Ministry of Works and Planning, appears to

be conducted on essentially the same lines in Canada, except that it has proceeded to the next step by the formation of a concern to annex the business. The *Edmonton Bulletin*, in a leader dated December 3, remarks, "The upshot of the negotiations with Wartime Housing Limited, and with the Dominion real property Administrator is that no new houses are being built in Edmonton, or in prospect of being built here, by either. And meantime the need for living quarters becomes greater, and the over-crowding more serious."

Dear, dear, Clarence, isn't the world getting to be a small place?

"I listened to the Bishop [Yu Pin] explaining to the late Senator Pittman just why he is hopeful of ultimate Chinese victory. His chief reason for optimism was extremely unexpected: 'China will win the war because she is completely unorganised.'" —*Washington Waltz*, p. 191.

A "Non-Elected Industrial Dictatorship"

Lord Provost Darling of Edinburgh has taken up the challenge of Major Douglas's letter to *The Scotsman* of December 19, concerning the Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Bill.

Writing to *The Scotsman* of January 29 from the Edinburgh City Chambers, Lord Provost Darling describes himself as "an unrepentant, and, I hope, tireless critic of bureaucracy wherever I have been able to discover it barring progress."

"For myself," he says, "I feel if there is to be State management of hydro-electric undertakings, it must not be entrusted. . . . to an unfettered Commission. The House of Commons, through the Secretary of State, must retain a measure of control over both policy and practice. The North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board may not be the last word on the subject.

"Surely the handing over of such absolute powers would produce a bureaucracy out of all keeping with the pattern of democracy. This Bill, on the other hand, seeks to impose the minimum restrictions on the work of the Board, while retaining the essential feature of a public service undertaking—that the Secretary of State is finally responsible to Parliament and to the country for what is done at every stage. No less safeguard of Scottish interests is acceptable. It would be small comfort to Scots who place great hopes in these reconstruction schemes if there should emerge a non-elected industrial dictatorship, running riot about the Highlands, damming here, blasting there, with powers to transform the country and its future unshackled by the need to pause for approval. For Parliament to hand over such a portion of their powers—even if they could be persuaded to do so—would be an act of irresponsibility, a product of which would not be efficiency or the achievement in full measure of the objects in view."

In his earlier letter, Major Douglas said:—

"Under a thin veneer of park-preservation, the report exhibits the implacable determination of the international 'Capitalist' (the 'Big Idea') to press forward the industrialised structure of the world in the teeth of any or all opposition. 'No vested interests will be allowed to intervene to delay'—this vested interest. That is a clear challenge. Is there anyone in Scotland who will answer it?"

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.22.

Saturday, February 6, 1943.

Prompt Reply

On Saturday, January 23, Major C. H. Douglas contributed an article to this paper on the threat to our country of "the rule of the *Organised Functional Expert*—the engineer, the architect and the chemist, amongst others." The following Monday *The Times* replied with an article on P.E.P. The leader writer agreed that the expert "should be 'on tap, not on top—,' but there is more commonly a risk that his services will not be invited or employed." Men and women with special technical knowledge are, individually, isolated specialists, "with little influence on affairs that are dominated by the powerful organisations of political parties, or of capital and labour. The system of group consultation and research enables possessors of special knowledge to transcend the limitations of the specialist outlook by pooling their intellectual resources with those of their peers in other departments of work and study; thereby it releases power for the service of the commonwealth."

It appears, then, that the purpose of P.E.P. is to force the nation to employ a particular set of experts; a Brains Trust in actual being, more comprehensive even than Unilever, Limited.

The article also states, "There is nothing new in the contention that policy should be the outcome of research and knowledge. But to P.E.P. belongs the credit of founding itself expressly upon this belief..." Because of the above considerations the party controversy must be suspended in order to safeguard the accomplishment of "another vital task of self-preservation after victory has been won."

This betrays the intention to sabotage the whole machinery of government and to substitute for it the dictatorship of the intelligentsia, who, of course, are the creatures of the millionaire socialists and chain store influences. The whole of the bought press has been full for some time of hints of the shortcomings of the party system—Sir Ernest Benn's Individualists received a radio puff last week concerning their expressed determination to fight it—and on January 2 *The Times* leader wrote, "The ordinary man will not retain his loyalty to Parliamentary parties if he is given reason to suspect that their policies are governed primarily, not by the voters, but by the powerful organisations from which the bulk of the party funds are drawn." This admission, which wild horses would not have drawn from them four or five years ago, is not, I think, due to their having seen the light. It is an astute change of tactics. The fact that the party system has never been anything but a convenient

device for imposing policy upon the electors was until recently almost entirely unperceived by them; but now that it is rapidly becoming common knowledge—the party system, of course, is crude though indispensable to democracy, "but not adapted to the special needs that will confront this country and the world [!] during the early years of peace." (*The Times*, January 25.)

Let the party system go, then, it has served its turn, but see you have ready a super party to take its place, a party of Organised Functional Experts whose right to decide policy none will dare to challenge; for should not policy be based on knowledge, and do not these people know more than anyone else, far more than the electors can possibly know—and moreover are they not ready to "serve"? The suggestion made by *The Times* in this article is quite clear—a coalition government at the end of the war, taking its orders in the shape of advice from P.E.P., which, if it is not now, will probably soon be, the most powerful political party ever known. If this programme is fully carried out there will not be much left of our machinery of government.

But anything rather than that the services of the expert be not invited, for time in which the expert is employed in not being expert is time wasted to his employers.

There are two things which the electors need to know:—first, the sort of life which they personally desire to lead—not the sort of life which they think their neighbours ought to lead—and secondly how best to make their wishes known to their own Member of Parliament. Without this all other knowledge is completely vain. As Social Crediters let us each make sure that our own knowledge is securely founded. And then act on it.

B.M.P.

Compulsory Pasteurisation Threatened

Speaking at the Chelmsford Branch of the Essex Farmers' Union, Mr. R. W. Haddon, managing editor of the *Farmer and Stock-breeder*, chairman of the Ministry of Agriculture's Publicity Fund and chairman of the Red Cross Agriculture Fund, said that the English farmer has no rivals, with the possible exception of the New Zealand farmer. To-day we were producing 4½ days' food a week. In 1943 the farmers had been asked to produce 6½ days' food. He said:—

"There is a danger at the present time that the Government, with its very wide powers, may force on an unwilling industry compulsory pasteurisation. I do not know that conditions are any more serious to-day than they were when the country turned down pasteurisation. I feel the N.F.U. must fight this in the interests of the small man and in the interests of producers as a whole."

—*Essex Weekly News*, January 15, 1943.

A consumer writes:—"I think compulsory pasteurisation a very retrograde step. The milk industry has been trying to raise the standard of milk and make it all T.T. Pasteurisation to my mind is only to the benefit of the big combines so that their milk will keep for long periods. But good milk of a high standard should keep for a reasonable time without pasteurisation. If I lived in a town I should feel strongly if my child were forced to have pasteurised milk when T.T. milk is perfectly possible."

THE POT AND THE KETTLE

"Can the blind lead the blind? Shall they not both fall into the ditch?" —Luke VI, 39.

He was indeed an intelligent school-boy who described Mr. H. G. Wells's *History of the World* as "a veritable mill-stone on the round to learning," and I have often thought the same description might be aptly applied to the dubious semi-science known as Mass-Psychology which is the subject of this most contradictory book*—a work that at once and by turns condemns as damned and belauds as blessed the matter of which it treats.

Behaviourism, the name given to that body of deductive knowledge (mostly compiled in America), which is based on the biological experiments of Professor Pavlov, is to my way of thinking a very ugly thing indeed. To say so is not to condemn the exhaustive and scientifically accurate work carried out by Pavlov in Russia upon the reflex (automatic) actions of animals, but rather the attempts which can be and have been made by minds that have a bent that way, to employ it to analyse the human animal down to no more than an automaton, acted on exclusively by external, material circumstances. Such deductive attempts appear to me as just our old friend Dialectical Materialism up to his old tricks.

Mr. Chakotin, the author of this book, who was Pavlov's pupil and collaborator, is a Behaviourist, and he presents himself, appropriately enough since the book is dedicated to him, inside a dust-cover appreciation from the pen of Mr. H. G. Wells. The book itself launches forth with a significant quotation from the latter's *Shape of Things to Come*, anent "an aggressive order of religiously devoted men and women who will try out and establish and impose" (my italics) "a new pattern of living on our race." It seems clear from this that we must regard the London School of Economics, that potent offspring of the eugenic mating of Sir Ernest Cassel and Mr. Wells's own Fabian Society, as the modern equivalent to the Jesuit Colleges of the Counter-Reformation. One has always felt that those distinctly polyglot neophytes of the L.S.E. were up to something, and here in this rather naive book we get a glimpse of the 'religious' spirit in which the job is tackled. Frankly, to anyone who still retains some balance and compassion, the sight is neither pleasant nor reassuring. We must squarely face the fact that Materialism, which it is high time we all recognised for what it is, just the modern version of Pagan superstition, reacts in all ages and circumstances in its own way. There is no difference here, so far as individual suffering (sacrifice) is concerned, between the spectacle of Europe to-day, and what goes on "in darkest Africa" (or in Peru two thousand years ago) except that of scale—victims in millions instead of dozens, that is all.

We do need constantly to keep in mind that Christianity is just the cult of *discovery*, Light—"I am the Light of the World"), and its challenge is literally and directly to Paganism and Darkness; that is, to occultism, the cult of what might be called "covery," secretiveness. In that sense Social Credit is a light—a little candle—by the aid of which we can see some way into the obscure corners not only of

credit creation but of the human heart. And if we have accepted the light, we must also accept what it shows up to us, and not turn away squeamishly. I think that is obvious. So there can never really be enough of analysing and stripping and laying bare the workings of the Pagan propensity to darkness; "so always, that this prospect be with pity and not with swelling or pride"—to quote wise, tolerant Francis Bacon.

Mr. Chakotin is what to-day we call a scientist—"an outstanding scientific worker" is the description of him by Mr. Wells, who goes on, "I feel proud and sustained to realise how completely I am in agreement with this masterly and up-to-date book." That is our author. And Mr. Wells is—Mr. Wells; a writer with possibly the widest international reputation alive to-day. It seems presumptuous on the face of it for an amateur reviewer to take on such a team, but how is it to be avoided in the circumstances; that is, in attempting an appreciation of a book based on the following thesis? Firstly (and on this point Mr. Chakotin and Mr. Wells and myself are in entire agreement), that mass-psychology (which is the scientific term for the technique practised in ordinary commercial advertising) as, and when applied by National Socialists, *i.e.* Hitler's Germany, constitutes the Rape of the Masses of the title of this book. It could not, in my opinion, be more justly described. But (and this is where I am left hopelessly behind), on the other hand that this exact same technique, when employed by Russian Socialists *is not the same thing*; not only different in degree and intent, but entirely different in kind and in results.

Now, if that is the language of science, then I am forced to admit I don't speak it—can't understand it. To me that is non-science (nonsense). To Mr. Wells this book, entirely based on the above premises, represents a masterly review of the "historical process in the light of the most modern criticism; . . . which . . . leads its author to a convincing statement of what has to be done." No proof of the validity of the above astonishing transformation is attempted, nor any analysis of its cause given. Either you accept this quite unscientific statement without asking for proof, or else you don't. Those are the alternatives.

One can see from the heady nature of its contents that to those like Mr. Wells, who can swallow its thesis, Mr. Chakotin's book is liable to prove as intoxicating as a bath of vodka. For if, in fact, *as* a Socialist without the prefix National, you can employ mass-suggestion with absolute moral justification, there is literally nothing you can't legitimately do with "the other fellow." You can set him eating nuts, if you like, and climbing trees; even regrowing a tail to hang by!—always provided that he doesn't *illegitimately* put it over you first. Hence one supposes, the urgency there always is in these matters, and the need for slickness! But if, unlike Mr. Wells and Mr. Chakotin, I find acceptance of such a picture of this world quite impossible, I am forced to fall back on the lesser, but perhaps more enduring joys of objective speculation as to the precise nature and origin of this simple faith in Socialist alchemy.

What, in the minds of Mr. Chakotin and Mr. Wells and all the rest, *is* Socialism—apart, that is, from the allegation that it gives a quality of the highest value to a practice that by every test known to science and common sense appears to be the bane of human existence? One studies this book in vain for a clue. Active National-Socialism spells "psy-

**The Rape of the Masses*, by SERGE CHAKOTIN; Rutledge.

chical rape." Active Socialism (International?) spells—what? Our own clear-minded Will Shakespeare questioned the value of labels more than three hundred years ago among the Warwickshire meadows, and suggested results as a more scientifically reliable test—at least in the case of roses. What then is the illusive quality; this "it" that is so abundantly bestowed upon Russia, as it is upon some lucky girls, and denied to Germany, so that when Hitler employs propaganda ("American methods on an American scale," as Goebbels described it at the time of the 1932 elections) it constitutes not only "psychical rape," but a menace to all civilisations? Whereas in Socialist hands its results can be confidently calculated to be such that, to quote Mr. Chakotin, "not only will the nightmare of immanent peril to humanity be dissipated, but the advance of mankind to the sublime goals of human culture will be assured. The danger of the psychical rape of the masses by usurpers will be removed and demagoguery will give place to true psychagogy, to the *leading* of men to a bright future of peace, well-being, and freedom?" (my italics).

One must give it up. Mr. Chakotin won't, or can't tell us. From the Introduction, where he describes his book as "an essay in the basing of political action on a rigorously scientific foundation," he takes you by the hand, and if you travel with him through his book, it can, as I say, be only on this (to me) quite unacceptable assumption which is implicit in every one of its three hundred pages. The alternative is what would be to Mr. Chakotin the unthinkable conclusion indicated by the title of this review. N.F.W.

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: January 26, 1943.

NATIONAL FINANCE

Great Britain and United States (Currency and Credit)

Captain Ramsay asked the Prime Minister whether any agreement has been reached, or is under negotiation, with the United States of America for the establishment, after the war, of a world bank entrusted with the right to issue and recall the currency and credit of this country?

Sir K. Wood: I have been asked to reply. The answer is "No, Sir."

MINISTER OF TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING BILL

Major Petherick (Penryn and Falmouth): ... I come to my last point, which is the question of the Title, to which I take very strong objection. There is much more substance in my objection to the Title. I have a deep and, I think, justified loathing for the word "planning." Everybody makes plans. You do not go from this Chamber aimlessly. You have to plan your journey whether you go this way or that way, and you also plan your object when you get there. It might be a cup of tea or a talk about some important legislation or even a whisky and soda. Everybody makes a plan, unless you float about at the mercy of wind and tide like a cork. In the last 20 years there has been a move to give to the word "planning" a special connotation and to my mind a specially dangerous one. Where it came from I do not know, but I suspect that the origin of this ultra-modern

system of government to which we are all supposed to bow the knee may very well have come from abroad. A small group called "P.E.P." used to deluge us with a great deal of literature before the war. Planning in itself therefore might mean nothing. Stripped of all its verbiage, you see it exposed in all its stark nakedness as bureaucratic control at the centre. It is an extremely dangerous thing, and it behoves all of us to watch carefully lest it spread and become part of the general and established policy of this country. Town and country planning was first introduced in 1909, and we had the Act of 1932, but it was dangerous and wrong to include the name "Planning" in the Title of the 1932 Act, and in the Title of this Bill. It seems to imply that that general system of planning, that is to say, bureaucratic control, has now become an ancient and venerable part of the Constitution of this country. Therefore I ask the House to exercise very great caution when giving any fresh powers to the right hon. and learned Gentleman to order the daily lives and plan the whole of this country, and to remember that, while they are watching, there is a risk that innocent people of these islands may see with their own eyes the chains which are being forged with which to enslave them.

[During the Committee stage of the Bill on January 27 *Major Petherick* moved, but later withdrew an amendment on the same point.]

House of Lords: January 26, 1943

BRITISH NATIONALITY AND STATUS OF ALIENS BILL—COMMITTEE

Clause 2:

British nationality of persons born in foreign countries where His Majesty exercises jurisdiction.

2.—(1) Any person born, whether before or after the commencement of this Act, in a place where by treaty, capitulation, grant, usage, sufferance, or other lawful means, His Majesty was at the time of that person's birth exercising jurisdiction over British subjects, shall, if at the time of his birth his father was a British subject, be deemed to be and, in the case of a person born before the commencement of this Act, always to have been, a natural-born British subject.

Lord Strabolgi moved, in sub-section (1), after "capitulation," to insert "mandate." The noble Lord said: The Amendments which my noble friend Lord Wedgwood and myself have put down all hang together. There are two others on this clause—namely, after "means," to insert "Palestine," and after "British," where that word occurs for the second time, to insert "or Palestinian." They were really put down with the intention of drawing attention to the anomalous position of Palestinians who come here on their lawful occasions and are treated as aliens...

The Lord Chancellor (Viscount Simon): [after explaining that a mandate is already covered by the word 'treaty'] ... A much more important question is the second one raised by the noble Lord, to insert the words "or Palestinian" after "British" in line 5. ... One of the actual terms under which this country holds the mandate for Palestine is that there shall be a separate Palestinian nationality. We are not entitled to say of people who are Palestinians that we will by Act of Parliament declare that they are British; there must be a separate Palestinian nationality, as separate as any other foreign nationality. It is very important not only that we should observe the provisions of the mandate, but that we should recognise that Palestine and Palestinians have a separate international existence and are not merely

part of our own Empire.

It would be quite wrong, therefore, to insert the words "or Palestinian," and it would further have this very odd result, that if indeed you were to enact that the son born in Palestine of any Palestinian was a British subject, the son would be a British subject but the father would not be a British subject. The father would be Palestinian and the son British. . . .

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

[Clause 2 and 3 agreed to.]

Clause 4:

Special power to grant certificates of naturalisation to French nationals serving in His Majesty's Forces.

4. If at any time during the present war period an application for a certificate of naturalisation is made to the Secretary of State by any person appearing to him to be or to have been at any time during that period a French national, then if the Secretary of State is satisfied that the applicant—

(a) is, or has at any time during that period been, a member of His Majesty's Forces; and

(b) is a proper person to be naturalised as a British subject, the Secretary of State may grant to the applicant a certificate of naturalisation under Section two of the principal Act notwithstanding that the requirements of subsection (1)* of that section are not complied with.

Lord Addison moved to leave out "appearing to him to be or to have been at any time during that period a French national."

The Lord Chancellor: . . . I must remind the House that the reason why Clause 4 is expressed as it is is that which I explained on Second Reading; it would not be here at all if it were not for that. . . . The Prime Minister, I think with the general approval of Parliament and the Country, made a public declaration that if, in those circumstances, when we had lost the support of France, there were individual Frenchmen who would come over here and would serve in the British Forces, the Government would propose to Parliament that they should have special facilities for acquiring British nationality, if they wished. . . .

It is a very different matter indeed to transform that, which is the fulfilment of a pledge, into a general provision that any foreigner who has at any time—because he need not be doing it now—served in the British Army or in the Pioneer Corps, should have this special facility for applying to become a British subject. The Home Office inform me that they would in fact find it quite impossible to make the necessary inquiries, and of course we none of us desire to add foreigners to our own nation unless the proper inquiries are made. I know very well, from rather a long experience of the Home Office, that in peace-time these inquiries are very careful and thorough. There are quite a large number of people who are at the present time in the Pioneer Corps more especially—which is part of the Forces—who have been accepted when they came over here and been placed in the Pioneer Corps on the terms and stipulation that they will not on that account claim to become British subjects, but on the contrary, recognise that their right to remain here is temporary. This, therefore, would be a very serious thing. There will be some individuals perhaps who, before the war is over, may satisfy this condition about five years. . . . So long as the man is in the British Army he has got every protection which the British Army can give. On the other hand, I have to tell the Committee that the Government are not able to make this extension, which no doubt makes a certain

*That the man should have been in this country for five years out of the last eight. —Ed.

appeal, but which ought not to be made, because our rules about naturalisation are perfectly well-established, and they are not unduly severe. Those are the reasons why. . . .

Lord Strabolgi moved, after "national," to insert "or Stateless." The noble Lord said: On behalf of my noble friend Lord Wedgwood, I beg to move this Amendment.

The Lord Chancellor: . . . One of the very first questions that would be asked, as the Home Office has pointed out to me, would be this: Is the individual a Stateless person? He is not a Stateless person because, for example, he is a Jew, even a non-British Jew. This would involve an inquiry as to whether or not he is, or was formerly, of a particular foreign nationality. . . .

I am quite sure that that sort of inquiry cannot be conducted when the foreign country in question is at war with us. You cannot establish in this country that A.B. is an ex-German Jew, an ex-Russian Jew, or an ex-Polish Jew with anything like the precision that would be necessary if you were to put in such a provision as this. I am not speaking in the least plausibly or superficially. I feel the deepest possible sympathy with these people who are without a country, and I would gladly see some practical means by which their position could be relieved; but having gone through this, as I have done, with the Home Office, and having had the advantage of the advice not only of their officials but of the Home Secretary himself in more than one communication, I must accept it that the machinery for making such an investigation simply cannot be worked during war-time. . . .

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5 and 6 agreed to.

House of Commons: January 26, 1943

EMERGENCY POWERS (DEFENCE) ACTS (REGULATIONS)

Commander Bower (Cleveland) moved that an humble Address be presented to His Majesty praying that the Order in Council dated October 14, 1942, amending various Defence Regulations, be annulled. He drew special attention to two of the Regulations, and went on:—

. . . Last week the Home Secretary was inclined to suggest that the present facilities for examining and dealing with these Orders were adequate, that Members of Parliament in the ordinary exercise of their duties could find out which of them were objectionable and take the necessary action. That is exactly what my hon. Friends and I are doing. We are taking action. We have been through 100 or more of these Statutory Rules and Orders and we have found that not more than 30 per cent. of them are in any way objectionable. By a simple process of arithmetic it will be seen that by raising these points every day—it is of course exempted Business—one ought to be able, with good will on both sides, from both the Minister and ourselves, to give the House a day off from exempted Business perhaps once a month. We feel that these Orders have lain on the Table of the House far too long unwept, unhonoured and unsung, or at any rate unexamined by the ordinary Member of Parliament, and we have taken upon ourselves the duty of examining

*On January 19 Flight-Lieutenant Raikes (Essex, South Eastern) moved a Prayer against another Order. He was supported in debate by Mr. Levy (Elland), Sir Herbert Williams (Croydon, South), Flight-Lieutenant Challen (Hampstead), Sir Edward Grigg (Altrincham), Sir Archibald Southby (Epsom), and Major Petherick (Penryn and Falmouth).

them. It is an arduous duty particularly having regard to the fact that we are expected to carry out our researches in the Library in perpetual twilight these days. I want to make it clear that we shall never bring up any Order just for the sake of being nuisances. We are not trying to create a nuisance value. We are trying to retain the supremacy of Parliament over Ministers.

In the course of my research I found very valuable reports of a Committee in 1932 which was presided over by Lord Donoughmore. It was called the Committee on Ministers' Powers and it has a great deal to say on these various Rules and Orders. It appears to me, having read it carefully, to be a very valuable report...

The Donoughmore Report deals with delegated legislation in some detail and if I cut out any generalities, which, I gather, would not be in Order, I can, I think, within the Rules of Order deal with the question of drafting, which in the case of this Order and many other Orders is extremely obscure. I hope that I may be able to read what this very excellent report says about the question of drafting. It says:

"There is one aspect of the unsystematised character of our constitutional procedure for delegated legislation to which we wish to draw special attention. Whereas the drafting of Government Bills is done in the Office of the Parliamentary counsel by barristers selected for that office and, by long training, acquiring a high skill as draughtsmen, the drafting of Regulations is only in certain cases, for example, Regulations which are made by the Treasury, done by or under the supervision of Parliamentary counsel. In other cases it is done by the authorised department, usually though not invariably by their legal branches. The work is there largely in the hands of persons who, however able and experienced in their own work, do not possess the very special drafting experience of Parliamentary counsel. We do not attach so much importance to the fact that occasionally the draftsmen are not lawyers. A man may be either a solicitor or counsel and yet not have had the training essential to make a good draughtsman, for good draughtsmanship is one which calls for special qualifications and long experience."

I submit that in these Orders to which I have referred, and in other Orders, the draftsmen have often been at fault....

If you, Sir, find that I am out of Order I shall sit down and my hon. Friends and I will have to seek another occasion when we can make our points within the Rules of Order. Now, with respect to the two Orders I have read, the question of delegation is, naturally, very complicated and all we are trying to do is to suggest to the Government that the setting up of a Committee to deal with these and other Orders would be of value. I do not propose to go further into the Donoughmore Report because I should almost certainly be out of Order if I did so, but I want to make it clear that my hon. Friends and I are not unaware of the intricacies of Parliamentary procedure and if on this occasion we have failed to bring forward what we wished to do, all that can happen is that the procedure which I am seeking to carry out to-day will have to be carried out day after day in the future. That will not worry us very much. We and the Ministers will be able to get to know each other very much better than at present and I hope a good time will be had by all. What we want is a Standing or Select Committee on the lines recommended in the Donoughmore Report, which I am sorry to say is out of print. I would like to suggest to the Government that it ought to be printed again. That is all we want.

[Lieut.-Commander Gurney Braithwaite (Holderness) supported Commander Bower. The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Peake) confined his reply to the two Regulations particularly criticised.]

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Economic Democracy | (edition exhausted) |
| Social Credit | 3/6 |
| The Monopoly of Credit | 3/6 |
| Credit Power and Democracy | (edition exhausted) |
| Warning Democracy | (edition exhausted) |
| The Big Idea | 2/6 |
| The Tragedy of Human Effort | 7d. |
| The Policy of a Philosophy | 7d. |
| The Use of Money | 6d. |
| "This 'American' Business" | 3d. |
| Social Credit Principles | 1½d. |

ALSO

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold | 4/6 |
| Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson | 6d. |
| Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne | 4d. |
| How Alberta is Fighting Finance | 4d. |
| Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee..... | 9d. |

Leaflets

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell | 9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6 |
| Taxation is Robbery | 50 for 1/9; 100 for 3/- |
| Carthorse Conditions for All (the Beveridge Report issue of <i>The Social Crediter</i>) | 2d. |
| World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.) | 1d. |

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

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."