

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 24.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

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

by C. H. DOUGLAS

I have endeavoured to indicate in the preceding pages that the solution of the land question depends on a decision on two prior matters of intention, separate in themselves, but probably interconnected in practice: just as there is no fundamental difference between an economic monopoly relying on Finance for its sanctions and a State Monopoly relying on Police, other than the relative unpleasantness of being starved to death on the one hand, and "liquidated" by the Ogpu on the other.

The first of these matters has, I think temporarily, been decided. In order that anyone who will consider the situation with an open mind may draw his own conclusion, I would ask merely consideration of the three factors which can be easily verified:—

(1) The announcement of "the Government" that "it" will "pursue a policy of full employment for all after the war."

(2) The fact that with considerable unemployment, the armistice years were outstandingly characterised by the fact, not of "poverty amidst plenty" which was certainly far older, but that the recognition of the fact and its source in the financial system was forced down the throats of the orthodox, or London School of Economics, Economists.

(3) That under cover of an arranged war, with its unparalleled waste, a propaganda for increased production and still more "work," identical with that which failed in 1919-1920, and was succeeded by the slump and ruin of 1921, is under way, with "Reports" for "greater efficiency" of this, that or the other appearing, at public expense and for individual disadvantage, at short and fairly regular intervals.

All of this is implemented by the component parts of the New Order which, for some reason, awaited a World War. I have already expressed the opinion that the object of the New Order is to prevent any effective remedy of the defects of the Old Order.

The most outstanding feature of the past seventy-five years has been the extension of both economic and political insecurity. In spite of immense increase in productivity, not merely "the poor" but every section of the population, is far less secure in his station and person, and far less able to improve that condition, than he was in his father's day. The New Political Technique is to admit this, to plead repentance and a change of heart, appoint a Royal Commission

and issue a Report. That is the procedure which has been followed since we came under the rule of P.E.P., and the Uthwatt Report is the Outline of Things to Come in regard to Land.

It may be premised that the Chairman, from whom the Report takes its name, is an Australian, brought up to University age in Australia. He is, of course, none the worse for that. But if there is a worse administered land than Australia, except Russia, I have yet to learn of it.

I feel that I cannot do better, in indicating the advance to "security" contemplated in our New Order, than to quote at some length from an admirable letter which appeared over an initial, in the *Scotsman* of February 10, 1943. It is specifically written in regard to Scotland, but applies with equal force to England and Wales. For the benefit of those who are not familiar with Scottish Law and custom, it may be explained that a "feu" is practically the equivalent of an English hereditary Freehold with restrictions, the main practical difference being that an English Freehold with restrictive covenants says what you may *not* do, while a Scottish Feu Charter says what you *may* do, usually providing a simple mechanism for varying this use by consent:—

"The proposals in question are those, that (a) not only is future 'feuing' to cease, terminable Crown-leases to be the sole house-tenure of the future, but also (b) that existing feus be converted into Crown-leaseholds, and all conform to the oppressive English leasehold system, under which the lessor, at the end of the 'term,' acquires the tenants' buildings without compensation; (c) the yearly mulcting of the tenants on five-yearly 'valuations' of alleged site-value increases, as often as not merely reflecting modern versions of the old offence of 'debasement of the currency.'

"As regards private leases, at least of rural subjects (as is well known), tenants after a long fight obtained 'compensation for improvements,' but under these new proposals not only the new 'Crown tenants' but even the about-to-be-converted feuars are to be shorn of that long-fought-for right. Worse still, the doctrine of the English Crown-lease is apparently to be applied—that the tenant is responsible for leaving the building in order, and will be held responsible for the cost of doing that (maybe thousands of pounds) to the State's satisfaction.

"There are two aspects of the matter: the personal and the municipal or 'constitutional.' As regards the former, the hundreds of thousands of small feuars (many of whom have built their houses out of savings and through the aid of building societies) seem likely to be faced with eventual forfeiture of their little heritages, and, pending that, subjected to periodical extortions, and a 'stand and deliver' at the

'evictable' term—when on each occasion they will have to repurchase.

"Feuars will only now begin to appreciate the tremendous social value and security of the 'feu charter' and the Scottish feuving system, which was devised just to give the security of tenure of the home, which is now threatened.

"There is, of course, nothing new in the Uthwatt suggestions; on the contrary, they are a well-worn form of reactionary measures of which Scottish history shows previous examples—*i.e.*, efforts by the Crown to get cancellation of charters and to substitute Crown-leases. Scotland resolutely opposed that policy, realising the tremendous implications of the 'freehold' (to use that term in its primitive sense of permanent and independent), and particularly that of the 'houseplace' or retirance, which even in England has held until now a sacred character—and even in England the oppressive 'Crown-lease' has been comparatively limited in extent. The effect on the character and independence of the people, of a nation-wide 'Crown-lease' system (a Sword of Damocles over the home!) can only produce an abject, timid, and servile race."

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Economic Democracy | (<i>edition exhausted</i>) |
| Social Credit..... | 3/6 |
| The Monopoly of Credit..... | 3/6 |
| Credit Power and Democracy..... | (<i>edition exhausted</i>) |
| Warning Democracy..... | (<i>edition exhausted</i>) |
| 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. |
| Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt | 3d. |

Leaflets

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell..... | 9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6 |
| 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.

THE GREAT MYTH

"He who would do good to others must do it in Minute Particulars. General Good is the plea of the scoundrel, the hypocrite, and the flatterer. For Art and Science cannot exist but in minutely organised Particulars and not generalising Demonstrations of Rational Power." — WILLIAM BLAKE.

Douglas has suggested in *The Big Idea* (VI) that Socialism is the cult of the Group-soul, implying inevitably the subordination of the higher to the lower, and of variety to standardisation. In which case Socialism, or Dialectical Materialism, to give it its philosophical title, is just the forcible assertion of that subordination by means of propaganda. Now propaganda, the subject of this book*, is simply the instrument of Experimental or Objective Psychology; the application of a few observed facts of the physics of the human body to human beings regarded as an aggregate, *i.e.*, in the mass.

This technique is what is coming to be known as Social Science (that is how the Archbishop of Canterbury speaks of it); but it would be a closer definition, I think, to call it Social Physics—the knowledge of (human) masses. What it boils down to is the application of Newtonian mathematics to abstract mass-humanity, accepting the idea of "absolute mass" (the abstract thing in itself) as a working hypothesis. No one looking round the world of mechanics to-day can deny that the Newtonian hypothesis, as applied to what the nineteenth century biologists called "non-living matter," has worked; that is, produced results—so far of rather a disastrous kind. And now, according to bio-chemistry and on the formulae of Professor Pavlov, we are to see (or rather, are seeing) what it can do applied to what the Victorian biologists actually named "living matter." That is, as soon as the human individual can be collectivised and reduced to a common denominator—in short manoeuvred into such a situation and so "conditioned" that he can be mathematically dealt with in the physical mass.

But the truth about Newtonian physics is that it is a method, a technique, but not an objective; a collection of relative (related) facts, but not the truth. Einstein demonstrated its inexactitude by introducing as an additional factor into his mathematical calculations, the Observer—yours truly, who is, of course, the crux of the whole matter. Without the Observer (individual consciousness), there can be no objective, and therefore no policy—really, there can be "no nothing," which was Bishop Berkeley's contention. The assertion of the Dialectical Materialist of the predominance of conscious (living) matter or human physics implies a denial of metaphysics, which is in reality just the "little something more" that in combination with physics constitutes what we know of living reality.

Mr. Chakotin is in no doubt as to the modern origin of Experimental Psychology, which he dates from "the rise of rationalism, a movement which continued to the French Revolution, when there was a true explosion of agitation and propaganda"—the spark which, as he says, "at a distance of more than a hundred years lit the great flame of the Russian Revolution." And he quotes Lenin's advice to "young militants to rediscover the bold spirit of the Encyclopaedists." "All eyes are fixed on France," he writes (the book was first published in Paris in 1939), "the champion of Liberty a century and a half ago, the champion of human progress for

**The Rape of the Masses* by SERGE CHAKOTIN.

decades past, and in these critical times the solid buckler of the humanitarian idea. It is often hinted that she is not united. What an error!" Have the searing events of 1940 and since had no modifying effect on Mr. Chakotin's outlook, one wonders? Or that of Mr. H. G. Wells, to whom his book is dedicated?

Crowds are abstractions. Aggregation has a definite bio-chemical effect on individuals, so that collectively their behaviour bears little resemblance to their individual behaviour. By and large, the tendency is for individuals to be realists, and not amenable to abstract symbols such, for instance, as Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. The exact reverse is true of crowds, who can be more easily led by the appeal of symbols than by the realities for which they are supposed to stand, and who, the more they are denied the reality, clamour for the symbol. This is how Mr. Chakotin with his interests concentrated exclusively on humanity in the bulk, puts it. "If men are pursuing an aim, the reason is that they are not content with things as they are; they are in search for something more attractive, and if this is unattainable they create a myth. . . . The myth belongs to the collective, it justifies, maintains, inspires the existence of the community, be it a people, a profession, or a secret society." "The important thing," he says elsewhere in his book in regard to the specific aims of Socialism, "is to find for the doctrine the equivalent of a mysticism—a myth and suggested expression, rites, symbols, slogans. . . . The myth for our emotional programme exists, and is entirely in conformity with the democratic doctrine. This is *the wonderful myth of human Liberty, of the French Revolution. . .*" (My italics.)

Translated into terms of Socialist propaganda it becomes " . . . the constant inoculation of the community in all its members, by means of propagandist practice. . . . of the ideas of the true, the good, the beautiful, and of faith in human progress, and in its true instrument *the principle of social duty.*" (My italics.) In short, the recommendation to society at large of certain abstract courses, by salaried individuals who themselves have no faith (biological conviction) in their validity or ultimate usefulness. The parallel here with official religion, on its admittedly worse side, is so obvious as to be unavoidable.

In action, this becomes in the language of Experimental Psychology, "Eubiotics, the improvement of the conditions of existence—a sufficient wage, guaranteed rest, the removal of family or industrial anxieties in a word, the assurance of all the features of a rational and hygienic existence." And, one might surely add, the quite impossible aim of extracting from the environment of the human organism of every element by and with which it can alone express its conscious existence—that is, live.

This is the state of nihilism, the cult of Nothingness—apathy, "what's the good of anything?" In short, it is Dialectical Materialism brought to its logical conclusion. And so after all the apparent fire, and passion, and enthusiasm of Mr. Chakotin's book, it ends like a dim scene from a Russian novel of the last century, in the despairing ennui of a provincial drawing-room. The following passages are all taken from the last two or three pages. I felt they needed the trailing finish of the proper names, which I have added, to bring out their full flavour. The italics are also mine.

"Human culture is biologically negative, it leads humanity to ultimate ruin," Alexandra Alexandrovna.

"Human culture engenders notions of morality and of

social duty. From *the biologically healthier point of view of the cave-man*, these are injurious ideas," Nicholai Nicholaiovich.

"Altruism is biologically inept, culture creates the altruistic idea; hence culture is biologically negative. Such is the inexorable syllogism of pessimism," Alexandra Alexandrovna.

What seems evident is that to Mr. Chakotin's simple, Russian mind (and perhaps not alone the Russian mind), the more recent, external, material trappings of Western civilisation, those arising particularly from the application of mass production, have been confused and identified with culture—which seems a strange mistake for a noted biologist to make. Western culture for him resides in its cinema, and radio, and its clever adaptation of peasant arts, and its slick advertising presentation of the emotional creations of previous generations and epochs; its intellectual aptitude for pre-digesting and 'pep'-tonising, and dishing-up, and exploiting the work of others; in short, in living by abstraction. To all that, Mr. Chakotin has been taught to respond as representing culture, just as he himself taught Pavlov's dogs to salivate to luminous discs as if they were food.

In the notes on the Russia of 1939 in her book *Looking For Trouble*, Virginia Cowles remarks on the constant and pathetically inept use of the adjective 'cultured,' as for instance when the waiter recommended roast chicken as more cultured; and one recalls the sickening reiteration of "Kultur" in the early days of our last little difference with Germany. This, it may be, is Russia's Blue Bird, her myth, the fruit of long racial suppression and frustration; of "conditioning" by adepts in Experimental Psychology. Just as generations of subjection of the simple individual German to the "conditioning" influence of Prussia (or whoever inspired Prussia) has given birth to the Nazi Blue Bird (Lord Vansittart calls it a Bird of Prey)—the ideal of racial world domination.

Men must believe in reality—ultimately, in the sanctity of the individual human consciousness. The mechanistic creed is not a creed at all. Those who adopt it are led into the spiritual wilderness and left there to die. Listen finally to this, from Mr. Chakotin's last paragraph (half-way to London and meeting Sir William Beveridge, "half-way to Moscow"), as he struggles with the problem of Life More (or Less) Abundant.

"One must be ready to say, if long life is incompatible with culture, it is life that must be sacrificed, better renounce perfect biological health than the spiritual felicity we gain from culture," Alexandra Alexandrovna.

"Such is the philosophy of what we might call 'compensated pessimism.' Culture leads ultimately to destruction, but it gives us compensations," Nicholai Nicholaiovich.

"Let us then be guided by the Great Myth of Socialism, of love of humanity, of Liberty," Alexandra Alexandrovna.

It was another investigator of biological truth, and of the possibility of realising abundance, who asked, "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" Or, it might be added, succeed in lining warm nests with Blue Birds' feathers? But then the founder of Christianity placed no reliance on propaganda, or myths—even the myth of Liberty. He approached the problem in the right and only way, from the point of view of the individual soul and not of the "group" soul. What he said was, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." First things first, in short.

N.F.W.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 9. No. 24.

Saturday, February 20, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"The situation to-day is the most dangerous the world has ever been in," declared Sir George Paish, the economist, at Manchester yesterday. "We are on the road to victory, but what is disturbing me is that there may be an outbreak of peace at any time, and the world is not prepared for peace, and has not thought out the problems peace will bring."
 — *The Scotsman*, January 30, 1943.

Still, Sir George, we *are* getting on, aren't we? We imprison people without trial and keep them imprisoned; we have established the Ogpu in every Government Ministry to "enforce" decrees made under three thousand Orders in Council which have never been submitted to Parliament ("The New Despotism"); by the same means we enact differential legislation "which does not affect multiple shops (chain stores) or the Co-operative Wholesale Society." We have abolished the right of private property and private contract. There may be more to do to reduce us to the condition of the most backward nations in the world, but we *are getting on*.

The following extract from a letter to the *Scotsman* of February 9, by the famous naturalist, Seton Gordon, indicates the reckless interference with natural life which is becoming so prevalent: —

THE PROPOSED DESTRUCTION OF HAWKS IN ARGYLL

"Sir,—In your issue of yesterday is a paragraph which should not be allowed to go unchallenged. It is that the farmers of Argyll have petitioned that 'all hawks' be removed from the list of protected birds because of the harm they do by preying upon small birds which live on insects injurious to sheep.

"To any farmer who is a naturalist the grouping together of 'all hawks' for destruction will be recognised as a piece of utter folly. In the north of Skye we should like to see many kestrels at the present time. Because kestrels have been killed off mice have increased to such an extent that they have been a plague for the last eighteen months. They swarm everywhere, eating the corn stacks. Their destruction is more difficult by far than the destruction of rats. The chief food of the kestrel is mice and rats. Far from being removed from the list of protected birds, the kestrel should be specially protected, and a heavy fine should be exacted from anyone killing that bird or taking its eggs or young.

It is one of the farmer's very best friends."

The letter is dated *Upper Duntuilim, Isle of Skye, February 5*.

In other parts of the country agitations are proceeding for the destruction of small birds.

No, Clarence, we do not know how to win the war. Each change of command makes us giddy, and progressively surer that we haven't got that kind of Great Brain.

The Times's correspondent at Canberra reported on February 4:—"Unless the Tasmanian Legislative Council can be induced to reverse its rejection of the Commonwealth Powers Transfer Bill, it is feared that the Bill must lapse, as the Victorian Legislative Assembly has inserted a clause providing that its Bill shall not operate unless all the other States pass a substantially similar measure. Present indications are, therefore, that the reference method adopted by the Constitutional Convention will fail, in which event the Commonwealth Government will have to decide whether it will seek powers by a popular referendum."

Mr. John Murray, Principal of the University College of the South-West, gave an address on "The United States of America" at Okehampton, Devon, recently.

In the course of his address he said:—"It is refreshing and salutary to read what was written by American leaders in the early days of the Republic. Thomas Jefferson, for instance, has a message for us in England to-day. His doctrine can be summed up simply: 'Take care of the pence, and the pounds will take care of themselves.' By the pence he means the ultimate local units of responsible free citizens, intimately acquainted and managing their own affairs, neither ruled by officials in their midst nor superseded by other officials at a distance or at headquarters.

"By the 'pounds' he meant the concentrations of political or other power in central Governments and Government offices. He thought the 'pounds' would always look after themselves at the expense of the 'pence.' 'What,' he asks, 'has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every Government which has ever existed under the sun?' His answer is: 'Concentration of power.'

"Here are sayings of his: (a) 'Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread'; (b) 'Every Government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone.' He was all for the country and distrustful of big towns. The England of to-day, with overgrown cities and a strong urban bias prevailing, for example, in its education, would have dismayed him.

"The small local community, he held, offered the best guarantees for all the democratic virtues, close acquaintance and goodwill, freedom, sincerity, truth, sense and efficiency, with mutual forbearance. Citizenship for him meant thinking and acting scrupulously and responsibly. Personal responsibility was often his text. He thought true democrats should take public affairs to heart and to conscience, being superior to groups and programmes and even to public opinion. Here are two of his dicta: (c) 'The inquisition of public opinion overwhelms in practice the freedom asserted by the laws in theory'; (d) 'If I could not go to heaven but with a party I would not go there at all.'"

SAUL OF TARSUS (I)

By BORGE JENSEN

"The great ideal of Judaism is... that the whole world shall be imbued with Jewish teachings, and that in a Universal Brotherhood of Nations—a greater Judaism in fact—all the separate races and religions shall disappear."

— *Jewish World*, February 9, 1883.

There is, says Douglas in *The Big Idea*, "an organic connection between peoples, races and individuals and the soils of particular portions of the earth's surface which are individualistic." It is impossible to imagine a greater contrast between two neighbouring portions of the earth's surface than the one, in the time of Jesus, between the forbidding, barren desert-land of Judea and the charming highlands of Galilee described by Ernest Renan in his *Vie de Jésus* thus:—

"Une nature ravissante contribuait à former cet esprit beaucoup moins austère, moins âprement monothéiste, si j'ose le dire, qui imprimait à tous les rêves de la Galilée un tour idyllique et charmant. Le plus triste pays du monde est peut-être la région voisine de Jérusalem. La Galilée, au contraire, était un pays très-vert, très-ombragé, très-souriant... En aucun pays du monde les montagnes ne se déploient avec plus d'harmonie et n'inspirent de plus hautes pensées. Jésus semble les avoir particulièrement aimées."

While Judea was completely dominated by the city of Jerusalem, Galilee was a country of numerous villages and townlets, except for Tiberias, which was planned and imported, so to speak, by the 'Romans.' Judea was peopled by the tribes of Benjamin and Levi from which the priestly Bureaucracy of Jerusalem was recruited. The population of Galilee was, on the other hand, as Mr. Rénan tells us, very mixed. The province contained among its inhabitants numerous non-Jews, Phenicians, Syrians, Arabs and even Greeks. "Conversions to Judaism are not rare in these mixed countries."

To the Jews of Judea the word Galilean was synonymous with Gentile. *Matthew* IV, 15 speaks of Jesus sojourning "in Galilee, of the Gentiles." Peter, during his night of trial was accused by the maid at the Palace as being a "Galilean, and thy speech betrayeth thee." All the disciples of Jesus were Galileans except Judas, a Jew of Judea, of whom the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* writes:—

"In all likelihood Judas, being of the district of Judah, while the rest were all Galileans, was not impressed with the Messianic character claimed by Jesus, and therefore, merely to obtain immunity for himself, committed the cowardly act of betraying him to the soldiers and officers of the priests..."

The Galileans appear, then, to have been no more Jews than they were Romans, or only 'Jews' and 'Romans' in the same sense that the average Englishman is Church of 'England' and a tax-payer, and in all probability the rustic Galilean undertook the annual trip of sacrifice to the capital of Judah with the same mixed feelings that a British farmer goes up to the City to settle a piece of bothersome income-tax business. Jesus preached in the synagogue, engaging the Rabbis ("ye are of your Father the Devil") in controversy much in the same manner as the Social Crediter of yesterday crossed swords at public meetings with the paid emissaries

of the City of London, *alias* the Bank of 'England,' and probably for the same reason: publicity for the cause.

It was not to be expected that the world of the synagogue would take the same view of Jesus as did his fellow-Galileans, and the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, which echoes the opinions of that world, half petulantly remarks that the sympathetic and human aspect of Jesus's character was only shown to his immediate circle:—

"In almost all of his public utterances he was harsh, severe, and distinctly unjust toward the ruling and well-to-do classes. After reading his diatribes against the Pharisees, the Scribes and the rich, it is scarcely to be wondered at that these were concerned in silencing him."

If we are to judge by the acts and behaviour of Jesus, it would appear that his harshness and severity was directed exclusively against the priestly hierarchy and not at all against the rich as such, for we find him sitting down to a meal with the wealthy sinner with the same ease of manner as when he shared his food with the multitudes on the shores of the lake of Galilee. The quarrel was not then, and is not now, one between rich and poor but between the adherents of two warring philosophies. Jesus's crime was not that he was an extremist leader of the poor against the rich, but that he was an aristocrat who by his example demonstrated the worth of the individual, the sacredness of privacy and solitude. It was precisely that he taught rich and poor alike (and the difference between them was not nearly so marked in Galilee as in the neighbouring district of Judah) to listen to the voice of God within them, thus showing them how to lift the curse of perpetual cattle-dom, it was this, together with his utter refusal to organise or plan, that incurred the wrath of the Jerusalem Elders, whose planning habits have been mentioned:

"The whole tendency of his work was against the very idea of organisation"... "He did not make general plans, but dealt with each spiritual problem as it arose," says the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.

That was the sin for which the priests of collectivism could find no forgiveness, and for which death was the only fitting punishment. The rousing welcome that greeted his entrance into Jerusalem appears to have surprised Jesus, for he would not have expected much from the rabble of Jerusalem. It was the same 'people,' organised no doubt by the powerful political clubs, the *haburah* (members of which a few years later betrayed their people and brought about the Fall of Jerusalem) who 'democratically' decided against him. The crucifixion itself was the result of the collaboration of the Inner Jewish Circle and the 'Roman' Powers. The *Jewish Encyclopaedia* says:—

"In handing over their prisoner to the procurator, Pontius Pilate, the Jewish officials refused to enter the pretorium as being ground forbidden to the Jews. They thereby at any rate showed their confidence in the condemnation of the Roman Power."

It was the *death* of Him who had wanted to give mankind *life* more abundantly which especially fascinated Saul of Tarsus, who was a disciple of the Pharisees of Jerusalem and a Roman citizen. Golgotha is the natural *point de départ* for Judaeo-Christianity, and Saul the Pharisee, *alias* Paul the Roman, its indisputed founder. To him belongs "the credit of having brought the teachings of monotheistic truth and the ethics of Judaism, however mixed up with heathen

Gnosticism and asceticism, home to the Pagan world" and, still more clearly: "He was the instrument in the hand of Divine Providence to win the heathen nations for Israel's God of righteousness." (— *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.)

Lest it be thought that this is but the bigoted view-point of orthodox Judaism let me quote a statement by Dr. Sigmund Freud, a professed agnostic who regarded 'religion' as a symptom of neurosis, who in his last work (completed 'after Hitler' in 'kind and hospitable' England) proves himself an admirer of Jewish monotheism which he thinks has helped the Jewish people to advance in 'spirituality' and to avoid the danger of 'mysticism.' In *Moses and Monotheism*, in dealing with the 'new religion of Paul,' he says, "No other part of religious history has become so abundantly clear as the establishment of monotheism among the Jewish people and its *continuation in Christianity*." (my italics.)

To this end may be added the opinion of a Gentile writer such as Lionel Curtis, who in *Civitas Dei* characterises the Christianity of Paul as "Judaism freed from its limitations," a definition with which the Chief Rabbi of England (born in Slovakia and educated in New York) may not agree, although neither he nor the heads of the Churches of 'England' and 'Scotland' have any hesitation in describing the relationship between Judaism and Christianity as one between mother and daughter. In common with most 'Christians' who attend Service anywhere they would agree with the following Jewish definition of the Christian faith:

"Christianity is the system of religious truth based upon the belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the expected Messiah, or Christ, and that in him all the hopes and the prophecies of Israel concerning the future have been fulfilled."

(— *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.)

Canterbury is a town which has had a Jewish settlement since the twelfth century. Speed's map of the town shows a Jewry Lane opposite All Souls. The present Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Hewlett Johnson, who has 'progressed' from Social Credit to the 'wider horizons' of Bureaucratic Socialism *à la Moscou*, has written the preface to a work entitled *In Spirit and in Truth: Aspects of Judaism and Christianity*, from which this is an extract:

"For here [in Judaism] is the very seed-ground of our faith, and the Christian Church cannot sever itself with impunity from its ancient moorings. In earlier days the temptation to cut herself adrift was grave indeed, and the Montanist with fierce zeal brought it to a head when he asserted that the New Testament came from God and the Old from the Devil. Wise counsels prevailed and, binding both volumes in one common cover, Christianity reasserted the place of its origin."

The word 'Christ' is defined by the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* as "Messiah or Lord Anointed of Jewish prophecy," and secondly, "as title, now treated as name, given to Jesus as fulfilling this." The Messiah-title, Christ, Christos, Christna, etc., has, it will be remembered, been conferred on founders of other religions as well.

It is not difficult to see how the emphatic Talmudic rejection of Jesus as Christ, or Messiah, should make the Gentiles all the more anxious to accept him as such, another instance of how two apparently opposite policies (expressive of two seemingly different attitudes) can be conducive to the same result: *in casu*, the changing of Jesus, the divinely

inspired Son of Man, into a being best described as Jehovah Junior.

The curious contents of the Talmudic *Sepher Yeshu*, a caricature or skit on the birth and life of Jesus were treasured by the Ghetto Jew in the same way as stories about Hitler are cherished by the Bloomsbury refugee from the Nazi persecution. It is this strange sterile self-degrading way of 'getting their own back' which has made of the Jews expert caricaturists, a fact which is sometimes taken for proof of their possessing a sense of humour. But the caricaturist, in contradistinction to the humorist, generally obtains his effects by hard hitting.

In the German language the complex emotion thus evoked has a name all to itself: *Schadenfreude*, i.e., joy caused by the fact that somebody else has been hurt. The German is very good at laughing at the discomfiture of somebody else but inept at the gentle art of laughing at himself, or *with* somebody else, a laughter expressing another compound emotion the ingredients of which are sympathy, tolerance and detachment, and which is called humour. If we are to believe Dr. Oscar Levy, who knows the Germans and is a Jew, the former are but the 'caricatures,' the competitors of the Jews in "dispensing the Jewish plague." Note the strong element of malicious caricature in the numerous little risqué magazines which are now so prominently displayed at British railway stations and which remind Mr. Douglas Reed of the sort of stuff which was sold at the kiosques of *Unter den Linden* 'before the Nazis,' and of which Hitler promised to rid the Germans, and did. Note also the names of the contributors.

The hero of the Yeshu-story is, as we would expect, the fruit of a rape and he is killed, when trying to perform a miracle, by a stone falling on his head. His epitaph: "So let all thine enemies perish, O Lord."

In commenting on this story, the Rev. Herbert Danby, Residentiary Canon of St. George's Cathedral at Jerusalem, writes in his *The Jew and Christianity* that it is "an unseemly relic of ancient times, a pitiful device by which the tortured imaginations of the Jews revenged themselves on the Christians" . . . "there is plenty of evidence showing how widespread it was throughout the Middle Ages, from the sixth century onwards. There are several versions of it, all delighting in the most odious details, all mixed up with wonder-stories and low comedy and word-play, which Jewish wit then, as now, takes great delight in."

The *Sepher Yeshu* is the type of a wide stream of satires, farces and skits, from Voltaire to Shaw, which have caused numerous generations of Jews and Gentiles to laugh at the foibles of society without pointing a way to effectively curing them. There is, in fact, a close affinity between the Utopian and the Satirist (often combined in the same person) and the one as well as the other will mostly be quite willing to lean on the strong arm of the Police for punishing the idiocies of the present or for blazing a trail for the ideals of the Hereafter. In his recent book *The Idiocy of Idealism*, Dr. Oscar Levy, 'that tactless Nietzschean Jew' as Bernard Shaw calls him on the cover of it, suffers, like most of his co-racialists from the grievous psychic wound inflicted on the Talmudic masses by the *Sepher Yeshu*. Like M. Rénan, Dr. Danby and the other writers I have quoted, Dr. Levy takes it for granted that Jesus was a Jew. ("The first Christians were all Jews and the latest Christians are mostly Jews too"). Jesus began the 'Mess of the Messiahs.' He was a

proletarian whose fight to the death against the rich, the learned and the cultured was continued by Mahomet, Luther, Calvin, Cromwell, Robespierre and Lenin-Trotsky. Not content with enlisting Jesus in this crude company, he returns at any and every point in his story of that "Jewish Puritanism and moral fanaticism which has reigned with all too few interruptions during the dark ages" to pour the vials of his wrath over the 'Bolshevik of Bethlehem' and the 'Nazi of Nazareth': as the Old Testament is responsible for Nazi-ism, and the New for Bolshevism, and as Jesus is responsible for fulfilling the prophecy of the Old Law and for propagating the 'New,' he can easily be seen to be the real villain of the piece! To anyone who thinks that the warped psyche of the Jew has been corrected by liberation from the Ghetto and emancipation from the synagogue I can recommend this truly simian misconception by one of the most 'emancipated' Jews of our day, of the fight between Good and Evil.

In brief, the noisy Jewish-Gentile quarrel for and against the Christ-ship of Jesus, has only contributed towards the externalisation of the Kingdom of God by blurring the line of demarcation between Judea and Galilee ('The Holy Land') between the Old and the New Testament ('The Holy Book') and, consequently, between the vindictive Jehovah of Sinai and the all-merciful 'Father' of the Preacher of the Sermon of the Mount (Jesus Christ, Our Holy Lord).

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: February 2, 1943

DEFENCE REGULATIONS

Colonel Arthur Evans asked the Prime Minister how many orders, rules or by-laws, made in pursuance of Defence Regulations, are now in operation; and how many of these are inconsistent with enactments other than the Emergency Powers (Defence) Act, 1939?

Mr. Attlee: By an express provision in Section I of the Emergency Powers (Defence) Act, Parliament provided that statutory enactments might be modified by Defence Regulations so far as is requisite for the defence of the realm or the successful prosecution of the war. Special care is taken to make public the use of this power; and for this purpose there is prefixed to the consolidated reprint of the Defence (General) Regulations (which is published three or four times a year) a Table showing the Acts affected by Defence Regulations and Orders thereunder. The number of Statutory Rules and Orders made under Defence Regulations which are now in operation (including many which directly affect limited classes of people only, for example, those engaged in a particular trade) is about 2,100.

Colonel Evans: What control, if any, has the House of Commons over these Regulations?

Mr. Attlee: Perhaps the hon. and gallant Gentleman will put that Question on the Paper.

Sir H. Williams: What steps can any Member take, who thinks one of these Rules, Orders or By-laws is not in the public interest, to have it annulled?

Mr. Attlee: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will put that question down? . . .

Mr. Levy: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a large number of these Orders have never been laid on the Table at all, that they are made outside the jurisdiction of the House, and they are really taking unto themselves powers

which ought to be vested in this House and which it is the duty of Members of Parliament to see vested in the House of Commons and not in bureaucratic control?

Mr. Attlee: All these powers are being exercised under Section I of the Emergency Powers (Defence) Act.

Mr. Levy: Yes, but they should have been laid on the Table.

Mr. Neil Maclean: On a point of Order. Is it not the case that any Orders which have to be made under particular Acts should be laid on the Table, and that that is not being done with a number of them?

Mr. Speaker: I could not tell whether that does or does not apply to these particular Regulations.

NATIONAL FINANCE

Budget Statement (National Balance-Sheet)

Mr. Mathers asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in presenting his next annual Budget and the usual Statements of Income and Expenditure, he will also furnish information regarding national assets so that his statements, taken as a whole, may more nearly represent a proper national balance-sheet?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Kingsley Wood): As I indicated during the Debate on the Vote of Credit on January 26, I will consider this suggestion in connection with my next Budget, although the matter is not without its difficulties.

Mr. Mathers: Could not the right hon. Gentleman go a little further than that, in view of the nebulous nature of the statement he made?

Sir K. Wood: I think that I have gone some considerable way towards meeting the hon. Gentleman.

Mr. Thorne: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of telling the country in his Budget Statement the national income during the war?

Sir K. Wood: I will certainly consider that.

House of Commons: February 10, 1943

WIRELESS LICENCE FEE

Mr. Messer asked the Postmaster General whether he has considered a number of communications from wireless licence holders expressing their intention to withhold part of their fee; what reason has been given for this action; and what action he proposes to take?

The Postmaster-General (Captain Crookshank): I understand that the persons in question base their intention on dissatisfaction with an aspect of the B.B.C. programme policy. Licences will not be issued unless they pay the whole of the fee.

MILK PASTEURISATION

Dr. Russell Thomas asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food, as the death rate per 1,000 excluding county boroughs, due to non-pulmonary tuberculosis, showed a decrease in 1941, as compared to 1938, of 29 per cent. in the county of Huntingdon, of 30 per cent. in Dorset and remained stationary in Somerset in spite of an additional child population of nearly 60,000 in 1941 in these three

counties, what percentage of milk sold for domestic purposes in these counties is pasteurised?

Mr. Mabane: I regret that the information asked for is not available.

Dr. Thomas: Is the Minister aware that the percentage of milk pasteurised in these areas is practically nil?

Dr. Thomas asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food, as the death-rate per 1,000 due to non-pulmonary tuberculosis showed an increase in 1941 as compared to 1938 of 85 per cent. in Liverpool, of 37½ per cent. in Glasgow and of 36 per cent. in Manchester in spite of a reduction in child population in 1939 of at least 170,000 in these three cities, what percentage of milk sold for domestic purposes in these three cities is pasteurised?

Mr. Mabane: Approximately 76 per cent. of the milk sold in Liverpool for domestic purposes is pasteurised and approximately 80 per cent. in Glasgow and Manchester.

UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES (TRUSTS) BILL (Third Reading)

Mr. MacLaren (Burslem): Before the Bill passes I want to say that I hope the day is not far distant when universities will not have to rely for raising their funds upon such processes as are embodied in the Bill. The consolidation of these funds is all to the good; it is expedient and business-like, to say the least of it, but, in view of the changes that are bound to take place over the face of our educational system, the universities should look to the future and try to come to some arrangement about their funds. In future I am sure that universities will have to depend upon the financial backing of the State rather than upon these private endowments, and that the day is coming when universities, like other educational institutions, will be better advised to pursue their true object of promoting education rather than to be constantly evolving new ways and means of raising money.

I always thought it was rather despicable to find educational institutions engaged in land speculation and finding out new ways of getting rents in order to support colleges and universities rather than in using their opportunities to dissipate this system of society. Nevertheless we find these organisations rather backing this system in order to obtain their funds. I hope they will take a different view of things in the future and will try to reach a compromise with the Government, through the President of the Board of Education or some independent education commission, whereby the funds of universities shall come from honourable sources rather than from the sources from which they are now derived. . . . The universities will now go on to consolidate their funds, and I hope they will come to some arrangement with the Government in the future by making over their funds to the State and getting on to a more respectable and dignified basis of existence.

Mr. Edmund Harvey (Combined English Universities): I did not intend to speak on the Bill, but as I am the only University Member present, I cannot allow the speech just made by the hon. Member to pass without reply. I think that he has misjudged the whole purpose and position of the universities and colleges. There may have been some instances in the past in which they have not been the best of landlords, but, taken as a whole, I think they are now exceedingly good landlords and most desirous of doing justice

to their tenants, treating them as friends and doing the very best for them. While I recognise, as we all must, that it will be necessary in the future for more national money to be given for the work of the universities, it would be a great loss to the country if the universities were put entirely in a position of dependence upon grants received from the State. . .

Mr. MacLaren: The Bill empowers the universities to enter into the market to buy more land. That is a most undignified function for a university to perform.

The Attorney-General, (Sir Donald Somervell): I gather that the hon. Member for Burslem (Mr. MacLaren) is not proposing in his will to leave any of his fortune to a university. I want to make one word of protest. When he implied that those who, in the past, have left money and great benefactions to our Seats of learning do not constitute an honourable source—

Mr. MacLaren: Oh, no.

The Attorney-General: With great respect to him, it may have been unintentional, but he said he hoped that universities would look to more honourable, or to honourable, sources for their funds. . . .

Mr. MacLaren: I would not like that impression to go out. In the past, as we know, these bequests were made by distinguished people to promote learning. That is past and finished with now. [An HON MEMBER: "Why?"] The Bill empowers universities to buy land in order to secure rents to sustain universities and colleges. That is in the Bill. I am referring to the future. Now that we are marching into a period of communal responsibility for education I hope that the universities will move in that direction rather than under the powers of the Bill, entering the markets to buy and sell land. That is a most undignified source from which to get their money.

(Bill read the Third time, and passed.)

Sir Barry Domville

The debate of Sir Barry Domville's intercepted letter to *The Times* on the adjournment was reported, in substance,

The 'Consortium'

Says *The Economist*: "The news that the consortium, headed by the Bank of England, which holds the prior lien debentures of Richard Thomas, has consented to a reduction in the rate of interest from 4½ to 4 per cent. is satisfactory to the equity holders so far as it goes. . . . What the market would like to see is, however, the total disappearance of the remaining £3,355,000 of prior lien debentures and with it the present system of control. Rightly or wrongly, it has always been assumed that the banking consortium has run the company in the interests of the tinplate industry rather than those of the shareholders. . . ." And what is the tinplate industry?—competitor firms? the 'consortium'?

Bevin 'Browned Off'

"Sir Kingsley Wood is, apparently, going on with this scheme [the setting up of a Civil Service College], so, whereas we are to-day being chastised with bureaucratic whips, in the near future the clever graduates of the new Civil Service College, the Bachelors of Bureaucracy, will scourge us with scorpions." — *Truth*.