

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 10. No. 1.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 13, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

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

by C. H. DOUGLAS

"A hair divides the false and true." — OMAR KHAYYAM.

Judging from personal experience in persuasive activity, there is a widespread inability to recognise the futility of making suggestions which run counter to effective policy.

Equally, it has to be realised that not for thousands of years have the people of these islands been so completely enslaved as they are at present, and the primary characteristic of the slave is not bad treatment. It is that he is without any say in his own policy.

The steps by which this situation has been produced are easy enough to enumerate. By the tricks of the money system, an obviously inequitable distribution system has been installed and perpetuated. The control of this system has given control of the Press and other reading matter, supplemented more recently by broadcasting and the cinema. Skilfully injected propaganda, always avoiding Finance, has fostered attacks on the 'haves' by the 'have nots' so that any economic independents, not the servants of Finance, might be stripped of their independence, under the name of Socialism. That is to say, Big Business and Socialism are the same thing, though some Socialists may not know it, and the present state of servitude could never have been brought about by Big Business alone. We owe our present position to brains in Big Business, and votes in Socialism. Stated otherwise, the coming of Socialism is the triumph of Big Business.

I have recapitulated this somewhat wearying aspect because there are many things which could be said about land management, if it were of use to enumerate them at this juncture. They are not discoveries; there is probably little in the situation which is not known to any experienced landowner, on the one hand, and the "Planners" on the other, in the intellectual sense of the word 'knowledge.' If, in the main, the land situation is being mishandled, the cause lies in the realm of policy, and the cure must also begin in that realm.

Big Business, Monopoly, Socialism, State Capitalism, call it what you like, is in control and it is the Policy of Big Business with which we have to reckon. What is that policy?

Now, it is convenient to refer to Groups as if they had a separate existence, but, if we are careful to allow for what may be called the Group Spirit, we make no mistake in looking for the men, the living forces, who activate it. And it may easily be true that we shall get more information as to the way they think, if we look for it in places where its

expression is less conscious than in the Board Rooms of the Central Banks or the International Combines. For this reason let us consider the recent address to a mixed body of industrialists, bankers, and uplifters, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple.

He is a convenient example, because it is possible to see at once in his case the absurdity of many of the explanations given for the kind of views he holds. There are few positions in this world of which it may be said that they are the End of the Road—that the occupant can go no further; and still fewer in which that position, once attained, is secure. But the Archbishopric of Canterbury is definitely one of them, and by no means the least important. It is self-evident, therefore, that Dr. Temple does not desire to advance his fortunes or even to secure them. What it does mean, is that his views are not inconsistent with the very carefully supervised rise to that eminence. Equally, he is a man of education and culture, with considerable experience of life as viewed from outside. All this is important because it clears the ground. We can say with certainty that we are dealing with a man who is sincere in what he thinks he says; that we are dealing with a man of far more than average ability; and we are dealing with a man occupying a position so important that accident has little to do with his choice for it, and that the choosing is a prerogative of the effective power in the State. So that we can conclude that there is nothing in Dr. Temple's known and expressed opinions and actions in the past which has excited disapproval in quarters able to affect his advancement.

In fact, it is legitimate to suppose that he would be regarded as an exponent of the philosophy of which the policy is operative in the world, to-day.

Now, if I were asked to explain to someone quite unfamiliar with our institutions the function of the Archbishops of Canterbury, I should reply that they are the Chief Public Relations Officer of the dominant philosophy, which can be variously described as Judaeo-Christianity or Liberal Judaism, Big Business or Centralisation of Power, depending on the aspect of it with which one happens to be dealing. No Public Relations Officer can be effective unless he believes his brief.

In the light of this conception, Dr. Temple's insistence on the idea of control—"we need supremely the control of human purpose" are his exact words as reported—becomes intelligible and logical. It is exactly what the "Planners"—the Socialist side of Big Business—are absolutely determined to acquire. That this is, from another aspect, Judaism, can easily be confirmed by the little catechism—"Is God Omnipotent?" "Of course." "Then why doesn't God control human purpose?" "Because that would interfere with free will." "Oh, so you know better than God what 'we need

supremely'?" That is the essence of the Talmud.

I don't quite know how Dr. Temple reconciles the indisputable fact that control of human purpose is now almost absolute and world-wide. Is this the perfect world to which we look forward? Or is it just that we've elected one more wrong Führer? Because, as a well-read man, he will recall that all military, political and economic devastators, from Genghis Khan to Pierpoint Morgan (who stipulated that the hymn, "For all thy Saints who from their labours rest," which ends with the Hebrew incantation, Alleluia, should be sung at his funeral) have always stoutly asserted that they were chosen of the Lord. And, of course, there is our first controller of human purpose, Cromwell, who is said to have died screaming that the Devil had come for him.

This Public Relations business is supremely important. If you say to a large mixed audience, "We want to establish an omnipotent Bureaucracy, supported by an Ogpu-Gestapo, and punctuated by periodical 'purges' of anyone who ventures to object," some of your hearers are sure to observe, "On the whole, we think we'll sit out this one." But if you talk of the glorious Russian victories, omitting any mention of Finland and Poland, and the Dawn of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Rise of the Red Star of David, you can do anything with them. Or so some people think.

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

THE BEDOUIN SHEYKH

"Bedouin society is still patriarchal... The Sheykh... must be a lavish host and entertainer and in his youth a fearless leader. He must be the protector to his own people and to his guests..."

"The inheritance of the Sheykh is not certain; often it depends on the favour of his tribe, and especially on his courage and personal power as leader. A despot and tyrant will only reign a short while. Ordinarily, however, the Sheykh's supreme position is inherited by his nearest male relative (son, grandson, cousin, uncle) but very few families have held it for more than a century.

"Though they own a Sheykh, Bedouins do not become subjects, but remain free to do as they please. They are never ordered to do anything, but follow voluntarily the example of their Sheykh. Following an example, however, requires a certain amount of obedience and submission to their leader. A man joins voluntarily in a raid, or even in a war; an individual family cannot be ordered even to join the migrating tribe. A Bedouin does everything out of necessity, but never by command or compulsion.

"The Sheykh is not allowed to pronounce a judgement, he may only 'suggest' the way (or way out) for punishment or peace. There are no taxes to be paid, but each man shares his spoils with his neighbour or 'raider in arms.' A family (or a whole clan) are permitted to join another tribe without first asking the permission of their own chief or that of the tribe which they adopt, even if they go over to avowed enemies.

"To-day, however, many of the chieftains do not live permanently with their tribes. They receive support from European Powers, living a settled life in some village or town. Their subjects are kept in restraint by the large number of their relatives and slaves, whom they have armed with cars and machine guns. The weak must submit..."

— CARL R. RASWAN in *The Black Tents of Arabia*.

"GENTLEMEN, THE KING!"

By B. M. PALMER

A correspondent wrote from New South Wales, Australia, in August, 1942:—

When Douglas refers to a difference between "Monarchy" and "Kingship" in *The Big Idea* he indicates a difference which I find it impossible to locate, and a difference which I feel sure is real and for us here a very vital and important thing. For this reason: we find through the experience of conversation (both with and without interpreters) with Americans, that they would never countenance a King; it is obvious that there will be no Federal Union while we have a King. The natural development is, of course, an attack upon the Throne. This has started here already, and takes the form of silence about the Royal Family in the "Free" Press.

Without the Presence of historical buildings, traditional institutions and customs, and all the evidence England possesses of the race's development for handy reference, the attack of silence by the Press ("Free") upon the Throne and the Royal Family is more menacing than say, in England itself....

Notwithstanding the reported accounts of the military operations of the Allied and Axis Powers, evidence grows day by day to support the fact there will always be an England and it is good to feel in some small part responsible for that evidence.

Upon the King!—let us our lives, our souls,
Our debts, our careful wives, our children, and
Our sins lay on the King! We must bear all.
O hard condition, twin-born with greatness,
Subject to the breath of every fool,
Whose sense no more, can feel but his own wringing!
What infinite heart's-ease must kings neglect
That private men enjoy!

If it is true, as I think it is, that until the blessing of *compulsory education* most Englishmen learned their history from Shakespeare, then it seems that to him we owe in part the safeguarding for at least three hundred years of the hereditary policy of the nation. Consider the historical dramas: Whether King John were as base, or King Hal as heroic is beside the point; the Elizabethans knew the quality of the sovereign they wanted on the throne. In this series of masterly character studies a picture gallery was before them. Shakespeare did not write for an exclusive and "educated" clique. That his audience thoroughly agreed with him there is no doubt. Whether they or their fathers had ever enjoyed the blessings of good kingship for long periods is doubtful; but at least they knew what it was.

But ironically enough, at the very time the plays were being written the decline had already set in. Elizabeth's reign, so glorious in outward seeming, when first men came to understand the meaning of "this England," was marked by the rise to power of a new class of wealthy landowners, enriched by loot from the church, and even from Crown Lands. Elizabeth's reign may be said to be the reign of the Cecils—or rather the rule of a small group of men all bent

on enriching themselves, of whom William Cecil was the chief. Power was passing from the Queen to others.

Charles I was born in 1600.

Some historians think of English history in the seventeenth century as merely the struggle of Monarchy against money power. Such a view, though infinitely nearer reality than the distorted Whig picture of 1689 as "the most glorious revolution in our history" leaves out of account the peculiar contribution we as a people have made—and in all probability will carry to fruition in some not too far distant future—the meaning of personal sovereignty, and the function of the sovereign in regard to it.

In *The Big Idea* Douglas writes, "International Financiers may be said to have a key 'affix,' the mono-syllable 'Mon'—*Money, Monopoly, monotheism, monarchy* (not kingship, but totalitarianism), *monstrous*."

We English do not refer to our king as a monarch.

The word "monarch" comes from a Greek root meaning "alone." But "king" is a word confined in its origin to north-west Europe. "A.S. *cyning*, a king; literally 'a man of good birth', (cf. A.S. *cyme-*, royal, Icelandic *konnr*, one of gentle birth); A.S. *cyn*, a tribe, kin, race," is the derivation given in Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary*.

The attempt to overthrow King-ship in England involved first a weakening of the Sovereign's sanctions (Charles I) and then an attack on his legitimate right to the title (James III and Bonnie Prince Charlie).

One of the false premises of Whig historians concerns their claim that we were far less free five or six hundred years ago than we are now; that English history consists in a struggle for the supremacy of Parliament, and that since the advent of adult suffrage we have been freer and freer (with the proviso that, of course, you have to give up some liberty in order to get "real freedom"): the more laws, taxes and licenses you have to pay the more freedom. This view attempts to conceal the fact that in mediaeval times, even until the seventeenth century, the income of the government was based upon endowment, and not upon taxes. It was derived from its own administration of its own estates—and the government was the King. "Taxes" meant a special payment made to meet a special crisis and not to be repeated. "Even when they had to be frequently begged for by the King because war was prolonged (the most usual reason) they were always thought of as exceptional; they were not felt to be part of the regular revenue." — H. BELLOC in *Charles the First*.

It is, of course, true that the Stuart cause might have had better protagonists—and yet the position in which they found themselves would have tried to the uttermost characters far wiser and stronger than they.

Charles ascended the throne in a period of steady inflation due to the influx of gold from America to Europe. In 1625 the English pound would buy less than a quarter of what it had bought a century before, and it continued steadily to rise. At the same time it became imperative to have a navy. John Hampden's refusal to pay 2½ per cent. Ship money on his enormous income was backed up by many of the small freeholders, in their perfectly justifiable hatred of taxation. A real threat from invasion might have saved Charles—the Ship money would have been forthcoming—but the country was left to itself, and the

impoverished King amid the rapidly growing expenses of the modern state was left to struggle with his people over a maze of unrealities. First the wealthy landowners took advantage of the situation, with their committee or "parliament" of rich men and lawyers; instinctively, at first, perhaps; but it was not long before the advantages of committee rule became known to them. By the middle of the century the Jews were back; it seems unlikely that they did not understand the technique required in a period of rising prices.† And under Cromwell the people paid more taxes than they had ever paid before, thus having sold their birthright for a mess of pottage; for never again could they make a direct appeal to the King. Committees stood between them.

It is not necessary here to deal more fully with the philosophy that lay behind the policy of the Roundheads—that has been done.* But I think that behind the unreality of the Divine Right of Kings lay the roots of something real, and something that was real to Charles, when he told Parliament in 1628 that it was the first duty of kingship to see to the safety of the state, whether they did *their* duty or no; adding, "Take not this as threatening (I scorn to threaten any but my equals), but as an admonition from him that both by nature and duty has most cares of your preservations and prosperities."

This spirit has been described somewhat poetically as the "incarnation of the people of England in one man"—nevertheless other instances come to mind—Richard II riding out to meet the rebels, and the man who said something must be done.

It seems that in England there is inherent in Kingship an idea destined to transcend both monarchy and money-power, related to the fact that the essential nature of the state is a democracy of consumers accrediting and being served by an aristocracy of producers. Only through such a relationship can the people's policy be implemented; and it is the King's function to safeguard that policy. Whiggery objects that you might have a bad King; and that therefore the more closely he resembles a figurehead the better. This is the delusion that the abuse of personal responsibility can be prevented by investing it in a committee. It has not been found that the financiers, masquerading behind a screen of bureaucratic committees, have given the people a better deal than almost the worst of our hereditary sovereigns, and even in these days Kings compare very favourably with Presidents. It is of the nature of responsibility that it cannot be divided. Any attempt to do so will result first in a hidden, and then in an open dictatorship.

Douglas has said that the survival of our civilisation (and it is in Anglo-Saxon keeping) depends on the development of a use of force that shall be sympathetic with the new culture.‡ He has also said that it awaits a renewed understanding of the meaning of aristocracy and service.

The words "Whose service is perfect freedom" are more than three hundred years old. They ante-date committees.

†Not the least of Montrose's difficulties arose from the fact that he had to reward his Highlanders with loot. Cromwell's soldiers received regular pay advanced by the Jews. "Cromwell's mercenaries," said the Cavaliers.

**The Policy of a Philosophy*. Speech by C. H. DOUGLAS, June, 1937.

‡*Warning Democracy*.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 10. No. 1.

Saturday, March 13, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The fantastic whisky situation is a demonstration, if any were needed, that we have a totalitarian Power Government differing only in technique from the others whose peoples we are fighting.

There are millions of gallons of whisky in the country—agitations are proceeding in several Scottish towns for the dispersal of the dangerously large stocks. But whisky in bulk, *i.e.*, in bottle or cask, is practically unobtainable by the general public, even at the astronomical prices now ruling. Nine tenths of the whisky sold is sold over the counter at prices which amount to about £2 10s. Od., per bottle and is bought in practically unlimited quantities by weekly wage earners who simply don't care what they pay, they are making such a good thing out of the war. And what does the rest of the public matter anyway?

By the simple process of listening to the little bird which whispers that this public will buy at any price, the distillers judge that another doubling of the tax can now be put over. They draw a few hundred thousand gallons out of Bonded Store into "Issue Store" paying the current tax, all fair and proper. A few weeks later the tax goes up obediently and the distiller sells at the new rate plus profit thus transferring the tax into his own pocket, as well as the increased profit on it. Obviously a rising tax is a one-way street.

"Only in War or under threat of War—"

Evidently the Archbishop of Canterbury is one of those fortunate people who are born acrobats—every time they open their mouth they put their foot in it. On the, not infrequent, occasions on which he addresses that curious body, the Industrial Christian Fellowship (described in one important newspaper as the International Christian Fellowship) he performs the surprising trick of putting both feet in it. He appears, quite sincerely, to be incapable of grasping the elementary fact that if you change the name of a thing, all you have done, so far, is to change its name.

His enthusiasm as "psychologically sound" for Hitler's "Führer-Prinzip" is one of the most amazing distortions of the central philosophy of Christianity which has ever, so far as we are aware, been voiced by a responsible prelate ("Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"). As reported, after demanding pure collectivism in land and water ("air and water are still"—temporarily—"free") "whether or not this carries with it national ownership," he observes,

"we need supremely the control of human purpose."

Control by whom?

The most charitable comment on all this, is, we believe, the correct one. The Archbishop does not understand what he is talking about, or the realistic implication of the words he uses.

How Mr. Montagu Norman must laugh.

We have received through a third-party channel a copy of an article which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen*, entitled *A Third World War?* It is written by the Hon. W. D. Herridge, D.S.O., M.C., at one time Canadian Ambassador to Washington. It will be remembered that Mr. Herridge was elected Leader of the Dominion Social Credit Party (New Democracy) but failed to win a seat and seriously impaired the immediate future of the Party.

We propose to deal with this article at some length in a future issue, not because of anything particularly novel which it contains, because it is merely a naive presentation of the "Communist versus Fascist" red herring.

But it is a further example in Canada of that rapturous folly which cannot or will not see that size is merely an attribute of dialectical materialism and that to be obsessed by size is to be possessed by the Devil; that dialectical materialism, as its name implies, is war incarnate; and that Germany and Russia are at war, not because they are representatives of opposites, but because they are representatives of the same philosophy which cannot embody peace.

"In speaking of the Jewish element in Christianity, it must be remembered that the cradle of our faith was not Judea, but Galilee, and that the Galileans had not a drop of Jewish blood in their veins." — DEAN INGE, in an introduction to *The Parting of the Ways*.

Crippitic

Who are THEY, who are THEY,
 Sir Stafford Cripps?

Who are THEY whom you flay
 With your lips?

Who are THEY who can frustrate
 Both the humble and the great?

Tell us pray, tell us pray,
 Sir Stafford Cripps.

You should know, you should know,
 Sir Stafford Cripps,

For you go to and fro
 On some trips

Where the markings of their feet
 (With the Webbs and all complete)

Clearly show, clearly show,
 Sir Stafford Cripps.

If you find this unkind,
 Sir Stafford Cripps,

Never mind, never mind,
 Sir Stafford Cripps.

For if THEY achieve their way
 You'll be leader one fine day

Of the blind, of the blind,
 Sir Stafford Cripps.

EXCALIBUR

SAUL OF TARSUS (II)

The Birth of Judaeo-Christianity

By BORGE JENSEN

"To offer to the great Gentile world the Jewish truth adapted to its psychic and intellectual capacities—this was the providential mission of Christianity".... "The Jewish Propaganda, begun in the Babylonian exile and systematically pursued in Alexandria and Rome was to be left far behind, and, by battering down the barriers of the Law and the Abrahamic faith, was to be rendered elastic enough to suit the needs of a polytheistic world. Such was the view of the missionary of Tarsus."

—*Jewish Encyclopaedia*: 'Christianity in its relation to Judaism.'

Any historical sketch of the beginnings of the Christian Church is rendered impossible by the fact that the influences interested in the obliteration of standards can be seen to have been as active during the centuries preceding the appearance of the first manuscript of the New Testament (which coincided with the end of the persecutions of the Christians and the triumph of *organised* Christianity) as several hundred years later when we meet the first manuscript of the Hebrew scriptures.

"The records containing the views and opinions of the opponents of Paul and Paulinism," says the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* (Saul of Tarsus), "are no longer in existence; and the history of the early Church has been coloured by the writers of the second century who were anxious to suppress or smooth over the controversies of the preceding period."

That the Acts of the Apostles, as well as the Epistles, form, roundly, one half of what we call the New Testament strikes one as being nothing more than a sustained propaganda effort to 'smooth over' the difference between the doctrines of Jesus as handed down especially to his flesh and blood companion Peter, the trusted disciple whose house was his favourite meeting-place in Galilee and from whose boat he addressed his fellow Galileans, and his 'spiritual' follower Paul who proclaims himself to be a 'Hebrew of the Hebrews.' It is obvious that the four Gospels themselves have not come unscathed through a process of 'editing' which lasted a couple of centuries: note the typical Old Testament opening of the first Gospel, where Matthew makes Jesus the direct descendant of one of the most lascivious kings of 'history'; remark the Rabbinical bit about divorce and fornication which has crept into this apostle's version of the Sermon of the Mount; observe the attempt by all four evangelists to present Jesus as the disciple of another 'Hebrew of the Hebrews,' the austerity-suited John the Baptist, at one and the same time the last of a long series of Jewish repent-your-sin prophets and the prototype of an equally numerous class of 'Christian' hot-gospellers. But even so there is a marked degree of difference of temperature and climate between the Gospels and the Acts: Galilee has been left far behind, we are in the midst of Judea. The geographical shift is inexplicable, and unexplained: Jerusalem is the radiant centre of the young movement, and we are informed that the Jerusalem Church, the first fifteen bishops of which were circumcised Jews, observed the Mosaic Law and held friendly intercourse with the leaders of the Synagogue. In fact, there was hardly any difference at all: "For a long time Christianity regarded itself as part of Judaism," says the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, and had it not been for that anti-

semitic trouble-maker Paul, we conclude, Christianity would have remained a mildly heretical Judaic sect like the Essenes, Nazarenes, etc. But Paul's effort at 'Romanising the Church' split the Congregation of the Early Saints in twain and resulted in those deplorable squabbles between the Petrine faction *alias* the Jerusalem Saints ('The Circumcisionist Party') on the one hand, and the Pauline, pro-Gentile faction ('The Anti-Circumcisionist Party') on the other, leading in turn to the split between Synagogue and Church and the consequent hatred between Jew and Gentile. That is the story; and it is accepted, the violent finale of the gospels notwithstanding, without a murmur by the majority of the adherents of such apparently differing schools of thought as Orthodox Judaism, Reformed Christianity and Modern Theosophy,* and he who is content with it need read no further.

Like so many other formers, and reformers, of religions, Paul was at times a verbally violent anti-semitite, as well as subject to an acute form of nervous disorder. His anti-semitism, according to the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, "rendered the earth unbearable for God's priest-people," a fact which in no way prevents him from labouring incessantly towards 'conditioning' the Gentiles to acceptance of Judaic institutions. While his lips are denying the 'Bondwoman' and all her deeds, his hands are pushing open the door to let her in.

Like all people who suffer from an inferiority complex, he recapitulates his life-story at the slightest provocation and what we don't know about it, after having worked our way through the Acts and the Epistles, is not worth knowing; but, that there may be no mistake about it, Christendom has since the Reformation been blessed with an ever increasing stream of Pauline biographies. In the municipal library in one of the largest and 'pinkest' towns in Britain, the writer counted, out of a dozen works under the heading of 'New Testament Biography,' nine or ten books describing the life of Paul, while none had those of Jesus, or his favourite disciple Peter, for its subject.

Saul of Tarsus was one of the most promising of the disciples of the Pharisees and was, on his own showing, a very efficient tool of theirs in nipping the young Christian movement in the bud. It was, as we all know, on one of his executionary travels that he in a vision (of the genuineness of which there is no need to doubt) 'meets Christ,' and almost immediately, with the same incandescent zeal that he had hitherto 'preached Jehovah' straightway 'preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the son of God.' (*Acts IX, 20*).

After an initial oversight on the part of the propagandist(s) responsible for the 'Acts' we catch a last glimpse of Peter firmly admonishing his followers *against* circumcision ("Why tempt ye God; to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear") and another of a momentarily back-sliding Saul circumcising his companion Timothy, but after that there is hardly anything to mar the theory of Peter the Gentile fighting for the traditions of the Synagogue and Paul the Jew upholding those of the Christian Church: Peter and

*Madame Blavatsky, in spite of her warning against accepting anything that comes from a Jewish source at its face value, agrees with many shades of 'enlightened' thought in regarding Paul as the most important apostle: "brave, outspoken, sincere, and very learned," and Peter as "the Apostle of the Circumcision, cowardly, cautious, insincere and very ignorant."

Vide Isis Unveiled.

the others are pushed more and more in the background and when, at intervals, they are brought forward, the hearty Galilean fishermen have been changed into colourless, Romanised Church Elders of the immaculate congregations which sprang up everywhere in the Alexandrian-Roman world under the magic touch of Paul's organising power.

As a Roman citizen Paul's proselytising possibilities were as vast as the Empire itself. He naturally looked upon himself, as Mr. Lionel Curtis tells us, "as the instrument ordained to convey his message to the whole Roman Empire," and it is no accident that his first Epistles are addressed to 'the Romans.' His burning interest in organisation is everywhere evident, and he has furnished many a modern planner with a 'New' Testament authority for justifying Better and Larger Controls. In a recent correspondence in *The Scotsman* on 'Bureaucracy After the War' a planning enthusiast referred his readers to Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians and Romans, saying:—

"The Essence of St. Paul's teaching is that the individual should sacrifice the personal self, and find the larger individuality in the Church or brotherhood, in a group knit together in a common belief and allegiance. The whole body, of which the head is Christ, is 'fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth,' (*Ephesians* iv, 16). The group is within the state but strict obedience to the state is enjoined (*Romans* xiii)."

Paul was first and foremost an organiser. He was not content with being a 'fisher of men'; having caught them, he wanted to make sure that they 'stayed put.' Revealingly he says about himself (*I Corinthians* iii, v. 10): "As a wise Master-builder I have laid the foundation," and this is, as Madame Blavatsky points out in *Isis Unveiled* the only time in the whole Bible that this term is used. She reminds us that the third part of the Greek Mysteries is called *Epotheia*, a compound word signifying 'to look,' and hence 'overseer,' 'inspector,' and that it is also used for master-builder:

"The title of master-mason, in Freemasonry, is derived from this in the sense used in the Mysteries. Therefore when Paul entitles himself a 'master-builder' he is using a word pre-eminently kabalistic, theurgic, and masonic. He thus declares himself an adept, with the right to initiate others."

Whether Paul, as Madame Blavatsky believes, was a member of a powerful secret society, an 'illumine,' or not, it is incontestable that he had patrons in the highest circles of the Roman administration. In fact, the protection of that Roman Power to which the Jews had so confidently entrusted the Crucifixion of Jesus, everywhere lightened his task, not least, one imagines, when, as a 'prisoner,' he was accompanied on his travels by a Roman escort. It was under this kind of tangible protection that he arrived in the city of his dreams, *anno* 61, being received both on landing at Puteoli and later at Rome "with due formalities" by a considerable number of Jews "who had become Christians":

"It was to Rome that his efforts gravitated. Not Athens, whose wisdom he decried as 'folly,' but Rome's Imperial City, whose administrative system he had learnt to admire, attracted and fascinated his mind by its world-wide horizon and power." (— *Jewish Encyclopaedia*).

In his *Jewish Contribution to Civilisation* Mr. Cecil Roth tells us that when Christianity began to spread throughout the known world "under the aegis of Paul and his companions, the first centres of missionary activities were

the synagogues, to be found by now in all the most important cities of the Roman Empire. These, rather than the Pagan Temples, formed the model and the ideal of the new sect." (My italics.)

The *Jewish Encyclopaedia* corroborates this statement by saying, "... only the Jewish propaganda work along the Mediterranean sea made it possible for Paul and his associates to establish Christianity among the Gentiles, as is expressly recorded in the *Acts* (X, 2) and it is exactly from such synagogue manuals for proselytes as the *Didache* and the *Didaschalia* that the ethical teachings of Paul and Peter were derived." (My italics.)

Paul's deep admiration for the 'greatness' of the Roman Empire and the efficiency of its administration is interesting, for to-day we find his co-racialists, from this fear of life and incapacity to grapple with its problems, once again finding refuge in vast schemes for administering other people's present and future lives. It is not difficult to perceive that the nervousness of the planner has something to do with the Rabbinical belief in Original Sin which Paul did so much to propagate among the Gentiles:

"Paul shrank from life as from the domain of Satan and all his host of evil. He longed for the redemption by the deadening of all desires for life, and strove for another world, which he saw in his ecstatic visions." (— *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.)

The birth of a child, "so glorious to Jesus, assumed a sombre aspect in the words of Paul," remarks Mr. Goldberg in his *Sex in Religion*, while Dr. Sigmund Freud correctly points out (in *Moses and Monotheism*) that "Original Sin and Salvation through sacrificial death became the basis of the new religion founded by Paul." Being inherently evil we can do nothing by our own efforts, but as 'God' is as all-powerful as we are powerless he can afford to sacrifice even his only Son, and only by accepting this inexplicably altruistic act can we obtain a permit of entry into the Kingdom of Heaven. The dogma of Original Sin and that of Vicarious Atonement are two ends of the same stick with which the 'Church' for eighteen centuries has castigated the individual. Whenever and wherever the individual proved recalcitrant another ell was added to this stick, and we are presented with the Fatalism of a Mahomet and a Marx or the Predestination of a Calvin and a Malthus: the acceptance of the 'sacrifice' is no longer a matter for individual choice:

Salvation... alone is the object; yet this is the privilege only of those chosen and predestined "to be conformed to the image of his son." (*Romans* viii, 28-30).

The idea that Jesus's chief contribution was that he was prepared to be the sacrificial lamb, whose blood was to wash away the sins of all the world (as they say in the Salvation Army, an institution which flourishes in New York under benign Wall Street protection) is, of course, in the best Rabbinical, or Old Testament tradition. The God Paul saw in his visions was always the thorn-crowned man of Golgotha. He initiated that cult of the Cross which grew ever stronger as the Church gained in temporal power, and by the early Middle Ages, if not before, the supreme Church Hierarchy was in full sympathy with what one might call the 'Calvarian' attitude to God. The word Calvary, Fr. Calvaire is derived from the Latin *calvaria*, skull (*calvus*, bald), a translation of Golgotha, and the word is extremely fitting when one considers the death and destruction which

have resulted from the scorched-earth policy often pursued by the 'Calvarians' of history.

It is well known how the story of the Passion became ritualised, priests and artists alike dwelt increasingly on its physical details. The Cross itself became the centre of ritualistic worship, and the Church building, orientated like the synagogue towards Jerusalem, was often built in the shape of a cross.

Mr. Aldous Huxley has pointed out in *Grey Eminence* that constant contemplation of, and concentration on, a deed of horror "may in some lead to a growth of compassion, but that it all too often results in war and cold-blooded cruelty." His story of Father Joseph who founded a Calvarian Order of Nuns, and whose extraordinary powers of endurance and concentration were put at the service of Richelieu's centralising policies which did so much to prolong the Thirty Years' War, and to promote the Cause of Bureaucracy both in Germany and France, is certainly a striking case in point.

Whatever may have been the effects produced in the spectators of the scenes of horror presented by the Church in the medieval Mysteries (and later by the Masonic Lodges in their literally shocking enactments of the Crucifixion) it is quite certain that the emotional reactions engendered by the sight of the Cross, as also by the word, were often favourable to the launching of heresy-hunts in the Medieval Church.

The Crusaders who set out, at the invitation of the Pope, to liberate the tomb of Christ were anti-semites to a man, pillaging all the Jewish communities they met *en route*, and thus chasing the bulk of European Jewry into Poland, whose vast Ghettoes have ever since hatched most of the legalists (Rabbis for the Jewish, Lawyers for the Gentile communities) that the world could be expected to absorb. It will be remembered that a vast number of the Liberators of the Holy Grave, recruited from the flower of the European hereditary aristocracy were themselves entombed in the 'Holy' Land, while the militant Christian Orders, like the Knights Templars, *etc.*, soon degenerated into international fraternities of credit-mongers. During modern wars the Red Cross organisation whose international sanctions evoked the enthusiasm of the late Jacob Schiff of New York, has acted as a clearing office for communications between the United Nations and the countries composing Hitler's New Order.

An M.O.I. Appointment

The *Jewish Chronicle* quotes the *World's Press News* that Mr. W. E. D. Allen, Chairman of David Allen and Sons, has been seconded to the Ministry of Information. "William Edward David Allen," says the *Jewish Chronicle*, "served in the Household Cavalry in the early part of the war, and subsequently was attached to the Military Mission against the Italians in Abyssinia. He accompanied the Turkish journalists during their recent tour of Britain. According to the report he is shortly going overseas.

"Mr. Allen, who is 42, was Unionist M.P. for W. Belfast in 1929-31. He has acted as special correspondent of the *Morning Post*.

"He was one of Sir Oswald Mosley's earliest associates, and was in the New Party before he joined the B.U.F."

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: March 2, 1943.

TRADE AND COMMERCE SEARCH WARRANTS

Sir H. Williams asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he will give an undertaking not to use the powers assumed by the Board under paragraph 2 of the Board of Trade (Information and Inspection) Order, 1943, S.R.O. 1943, No. 102, without notice to the principals of the trade or business against which they are invoked and unless something may have been done by or in relation to the carrying on of that trade or business which constitutes an offence against some Statute, Regulation or Order?

Mr. Dalton: It is not intended under this Order that my officers should enter any premises without asking to see the person in charge; but I cannot give any undertaking to confine its use to cases in which an offence has been committed. As I explained to my hon. Friend on Tuesday last, the Order is not designed to detect crimes, but to assist the Board of Trade to carry out their day-to-day duties in relation to the general war-time control of industry.

Sir H. Williams: Are we to understand the object is to introduce a new form of snooping?

Mr. Dalton: No, Sir. The hon. Gentleman is constantly seeking to sow ill will between the Board of Trade and the general public, but he is singularly unsuccessful. These visits are welcomed in the great majority of cases.

Sir H. Williams: How can the right hon. Gentleman say that the traders welcome these visits, having regard to the fact that none have taken place?

Major Lyons asked the President of the Board of Trade the occasions to date on which he has found it necessary to invoke the machinery of Statutory Rules and Orders, No. 102 of 1943?

Mr. Dalton: Up to the present on one occasion only.

Major Lyons: In view of the welcome to which the right hon. Gentleman has just referred does he not think there has been extraordinarily little co-operation in the exercise of these large powers on only one occasion?

Mr. Dalton: No, Sir. This is one particular Order. We are not talking about other Orders.

Sir H. Williams: Having regard to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman said these visits are welcomed, is he aware that the only one who has been visited has written me a most indignant letter?

Major Lyons: Does the right hon. Gentleman not know that on the contrary to any welcome to this Order, all sober-minded traders who have considered it regard it as the most monstrous piece of Gestapo machinery his Department has yet introduced?

Miss Ward asked the President of the Board of Trade for what reason an official of his Department sought to search the premises of Delaney & Son, Limited, 18, Tib Lane, Manchester, 2?

Mr. Dalton: No officer of the Board of Trade has sought to search, or has forcibly entered, the premises referred to. An officer paid a routine visit to Mr. Delaney's

shop recently to inspect his coupon records and give any advice he might require about the Consumer Rationing Order. Such visits are primarily intended to assist traders and are normally welcomed by them. . . .

House of Commons: March 3, 1943.

FOREIGN RESEARCH AND PRESS DEPARTMENT

Mr. Parker asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is to be the position of the Foreign Research and Press service branch of Chatham House under the forthcoming Foreign Office reform scheme; and what functions will it perform?

Mr. Eden: The Foreign Research and Press Service was organised at the outbreak of war by the public-spirited initiative of the Royal Institute for International Affairs. Its work has been of increasing value to the Foreign Office and other Government departments and it will shortly be transferred from administration by Chatham House to the direct control of the Foreign Office. It is, however, a war-time organisation and as such has no position in the Foreign Service reform scheme.

Mr. Parker: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that some of the Allied Governments feel disquiet about some of the personnel to be taken over? Should not the whole question of personnel be looked into?

Mr. Eden: That is my responsibility; I shoulder that.

Mr. Quintin Hogg: Will my right hon. Friend do what he can to maintain an independent status for this organisation?

Anti-Gentilism

DOUGLAS REED, in *Disgrace Abounding*, quotes from a letter he received:—

"Not anti-Semitism was first, but anti-Gentilism. You have heard a lot in recent years about Hitler's Nuremberg anti-Jewish laws, with their ban on inter-marriage, which the Germans call race-defilement.

"A most intelligent and cultured and open-minded Jew in Budapest said to me, 'After all, the Nuremberg laws are only the translation into German of our own Mosaic laws, with their ban on inter-marriage with the Gentiles.'

"Race-antagonism began, not with the Gentiles, but with the Jews. Their religion is based on it. This racial lunacy which you detest in the Germans has possessed the Jews for thousands of years. When they become powerful they practise it; as they consolidate their position in one trade after another, in one profession or another, the squeeze-out of Gentiles begins. That was why you found, in Berlin and Vienna and Budapest and Prague and Bucharest, newspapers with hardly a Gentile on the editorial staff, theatres owned and managed by Jews presenting Jewish actors and actresses in Jewish plays praised by the Jewish critics of Jewish newspapers, whole streets with hardly a non-Jewish shop in them. . . .

"Jews, if you know them well enough and understand these things enough for them to talk openly with you, will admit this. They cannot deny it.

"In the beginning was anti-Gentilism. This, not the perfidy of the Gentiles, prevents the assimilation of the Jews.

This prevents them from ever becoming Germans or Poles or Italians. This keeps them welded together as alien communities in foreign lands, communities ultimately hostile to the Gentiles.

"It is their religion? Good, but it is the reason why they cannot be assimilated."

"In the defeated countries the Jews did not use the great power they achieved to promote and accelerate assimilation. They used it to increase the power and wealth of the Jews, and their intensive mutual collaboration, in that era, to oust non-Jews from professions, trades, and callings, was the outward and visible sign that anti-Gentilism remained within them. The race barriers that had existed against the Jews were broken down, every path was open; but the race-barrier within themselves still existed, and thus you had the misuse of this freedom and those grave signs of its abuse, the exploitation of cheap labour and of young non-Jewish womanhood, which were so repugnant a feature of life in Berlin and Vienna, and still are seen to-day, as I write, in Budapest and Prague."

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.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	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.