

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 10. No. 10.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 15, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

Programme For the Third World War (VI)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

To those who wish for considerable elaboration on the point, there is available a mass of documentary and other evidence to establish three common factors in the essential nature of the Russian Revolution, the Fascist Coup d'Etat, and the National Socialism of Hitler's Germany. These factors are (1) They all claimed to be Socialism, and, in fact, are Socialism, in the only sense in which Socialism appears to have any definition—the subordination of the individual to the omnipotent State and those behind the State; (2) They were all financed from the richest and most powerful financial groups in the world, all three having verifiable connections with Wall and Pine Street, New York; (3) They all suppressed "the right to strike" with ruthless physical force.

Doubtless to a less degree, these three characteristics are identifiable in the United States, under the name of the New Deal, and in the peculiar rush of post-war control measures known as "Planning," in once-great Britain.

It is fairly obvious that we are faced, perhaps for the first time in history, with an attempt to superimpose on the entire world, from some pervasive and undisclosed centre, "overwhelming power behind Law." There are local variations; but the Big Idea can be identified without difficulty.

It is a situation which I think can be called formidable. To obtain a detached view of it, requires some reconsideration of the way things happen. It cannot be in the limits available a comprehensive survey; but it is essential that it should be realistic. Let us begin with slavery.

The word itself, which is probably German, meaning a Slavonic captive, is one of a group of magical words, the use of which can usually be guaranteed to create an illusory emotional picture in place of a reasoned idea. To most people in these islands, it is a curious mixture of brutal overseers flogging aged saints, and women and children on ice floes being chased by bloodhounds. Yet at the same time, its chronology in most people's minds is more or less in the far distant past.

The facts, of course, are that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is about as true a general picture of negro chattel slavery as that which is being presented to the American public at the present day of British rule in India. Negro slaves (to put the matter on the lowest grounds) were property, and continuous ill-treatment was bad business. I doubt very much whether ill-treatment of slaves in the Southern States ever compared with the vicious cruelty of English industrial conditions in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries,

or was even very much worse that the treatment of negroes in parts of the Southern States in recent years. That is not the point.

The second point which is curiously overlooked is that, if we regard the American war of Abolition as the end of official slavery in "white" countries, there are plenty of individual's still living who were born slaves. The point I wish to make is that the economic structure of the world from pre-historic times to within living memory was founded upon a slave class and some form of slavery was regarded as, and probably was, inevitable. And during this very long period, there is little evidence of unrest, and no evidence that such conditions as, for instance, the nail-makers of Cradley Heath, or the child labour which made the fortune of Engels, the patron of Karl Marx, endured, would have been, or was, tolerated by public opinion. Yet, not slavery, but conditions under which slavery operated, have undoubtedly been distorted and exaggerated.

When a false picture of something is circulated on a large scale, experience teaches us to look contemplatively at the remedy, and in this connection we can, I think, derive useful information from the well-known letter written by an "American" banker towards the close of the American Civil War:—

"Chattel slavery will be abolished by the war, and this we and our European friends are in favour of. For slavery is but the owning of labour, and involves the care of the slave. We can obtain the same result with less trouble by controlling the money."

We notice at once that the effect of the substitution of what labour agitators call wage-slavery, for chattel slavery was firstly to increase the demand for money, and so enhance the power of the banker and money-lender, and secondly to make economic insecurity of the "worker" an essential feature of the new system.

When, however, power-production made obvious the threat of economic plenty for all, it also made obvious the political impossibility of maintaining for much longer the sanction of economic security. It is perhaps not too much to say that the abolition of slavery became practicable with the invention of the steam engine.

Perhaps it now becomes clearer why "the right to strike," *i.e.*, the right to contract-out, is eliminated from the New Orders. It is, precisely, the dividing line between slavery and Freedom, and was first denied by the Trades Unions. We are, in fact, reverting to chattel slavery because of the breakdown of wage-slavery, and it is recognised that the slaves must be well fed and looked after, because they are property. And it will be remembered that no slave could own property, because it would enable him to contract-

out, so, for the slaves, property must be abolished, *i.e.*, "nationalised."

I am confident that we should be much helped in our consideration of the events of the past fifty years, if not before, if we had access to the records of the "*Alliance Universelle pour l'Action Maçonnique*" whose permanent headquarters are in Algiers—where General Eisenheuer's headquarters are, you know. Or even to the Minutes of the Meeting in 1920. Perhaps Admiral Leahy, until recently U.S. Ambassador to Vichy, who, if I am not mistaken, was present, could assist.

Meanwhile, it appears desirable to consider the truth, if any, in the statement that men are born free and equal, and in the light of our conclusions, why Columbus discovered America. There must be some excuse for him.

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

Points from Parliament

House of Lords: May 4, 1943

AGRICULTURAL HOUSING

Lord Brocket: ... I should like to suggest ... that the priority—if I may use that blessed word "priority"—for building labour for erecting these new cottages [the 3,000 promised by the Government] or for reconditioning old cottages be moved up. Small builders all over the country cannot compete either in building new cottages or in repairing or improving old ones with the larger firms, because they have no labour. In many cases, unfortunately, the little man who runs the firm has no labour left except himself. I sometimes go round, where repairs are being done, and say: "I am sorry that you cannot get on more quickly, because I want to put a new worker in this cottage." Then I am told: "I have no one except myself; all my people have been called up, so what can I do?" That is happening all over the country. These little firms cannot now estimate for new cottages, although in pre-war days in many cases their estimate would have been much lower than that of a bigger firm, because the man works himself and has not big overheads. These small firms are almost driven out of existence, and many have been driven out of existence already. I should therefore like to make a plea on their behalf to the Minister of Labour and National Service, and ask him to take a more sympathetic view before calling up the men employed by these small firms, and to make it possible for some of the men who have been called up, but are not in the AI category, to be returned to them so that they may carry on with their work...

... I particularly want farmers and landowners to be able to build these cottages, because many of them should be built near the farms and not necessarily all in the villages. I know that in the past this matter of the tied house, as it is called, has sometimes been regarded as a political battle cry. In theory it is very nice to be able to say that tied cottages should be abolished. But where you have an outlying farm, and that farm has stock and horses, you must have your cowman or your horseman living in the cottage which goes with the farm and which is a tied house. If that cowman or horseman has to go because he is inefficient, or if he wishes to leave because he does not like the farmer,

you cannot build another new house for the next cowman or the next horseman, and have a sort of avenue of houses for ex-cowmen and ex-horsemen living in them. They have to go somewhere else, and therefore in my view the tied cottage is very necessary, especially near farms for certain members of the farmer's staff. I hope that the political antagonism to the tied house will not prevent some of these new cottages being built, either by landowners or farmers, near the farms themselves, because it is absolutely necessary, particularly for cowmen in these days—and cows do not always calve in the daytime—to live near the farmhouse.

There is another point about the appearance of these cottages. I am sorry to say that council houses in the villages have almost always been the ugliest and most unattractive houses in the whole village. If one is motoring about the country and asks how to get to a certain place through a village one is told, "You go up to those ugly council houses and turn right." And it is a fact that the material that has been used is in many instances awful. In the beautiful village of Broadway, in the stone country of the Cotswolds, houses were put up with red roofs. You have these hideous council houses all over the country. I am not sure that the new edition is going to be any better than the old. I do not know what are the materials or the actual colourings, but I must confess I do not like the flat roof variety I see in the papers. I do not think that type fits in at all well with the English landscape. I would like to make this plea: the building material of the county should be used, and cottages should be of stone in stone counties and of brick in brick counties whether they are built by local council's landowners or farmers...

House of Commons: May 4, 1943

ALIENS

Mr. W. Brown asked the Secretary of State for War how many transfers from the Alien Pioneer Corps to combatant and other units have taken place since March 2?

Sir J. Grigg: Since March 2 175 transfers of aliens to technical corps have so far been authorised provided that the individuals concerned pass the requisite trade tests. In addition, officers commanding alien companies of the Pioneer Corps have been instructed to forward applications for transfer to the infantry, Royal Armoured Corps and other combatant arms and these applications are now awaited.

House of Commons: May 5, 1943

HYDRO-ELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT

(SCOTLAND) BILL

Considered in Committee

Among amendments moved to CLAUSE 1—(*Establishment of North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board*) one was pushed to a division and so rejected. This would have made the Board responsible to the Secretary of State for Scotland in respect of its general control and through him to Parliament. Mr. Johnston said that with the exception of the technical side of the operations the Secretary of State is responsible under the Bill.

Amendments to CLAUSE 2—(*General Powers and duties*)

of the Board) agreed to include one to make it clear that the Board are to be responsible for initiating and undertaking the development of a further means of generation, hydro-electricity, and is not to have a monopoly in the production of electricity by steam, thermal process or air process or any other process of producing electricity now in operation say in a local authority area.

In the course of the discussion Mr. Pethick-Lawrence said:—

"If this Amendment is carried, it will mean that anybody, either the Board or some existing authority, can carry out or extend a scheme for the provision of electricity by any means other than by water power but that only the Board can carry out a scheme for provision of electricity by water power?"

Mr. Johnston: "Subject to later provisions in the Bill. There are exceptions to that, under which private individuals who want to operate very small water power experiments or who get the consent of the Electricity Commission, may continue so to do. I want simply to meet the absolute statement of the right hon. Gentleman by saying that there are certain exceptions, but, speaking, by and large, it is the case that all future large-scale hydro-electric developments in the Highlands will be undertaken by this Board."

In the Bill the functions of the Board are divided into five categories. The first of these is "to provide supplies of electricity required to meet the demands of ordinary consumers in such parts of the North of Scotland District as are outside the limits of supply of other authorised undertakings." An Amendment was passed introducing into this category the words "including isolated areas."

Introducing an Amendment later negated the mover said:—"We consider that the supplies referred to in paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) should be obligatory and not left to the Board to decide as to whether or not they are practicable. For instance, if the Post Office was left to deliver letters where it considered it to be practicable, a considerable proportion of the people of this country would have to find some other method of collecting their mails, but the Post Office has to deliver letters wherever they are addressed."

In the debate that followed Mr. Buchanan said:—"As the Bill stands, large numbers of people will want electricity, and the Board will not supply it, and we shall have no redress. The Board is all-powerful. There ought to be a remedy other than the law courts for the citizen who feels aggrieved, and his only remedy is some form of public representation. The aggrieved citizen's only remedy now is to approach his Member and have the matter raised, but we only debate Scottish affairs for two days, and in that time there are three or four issues which must always be discussed, such as housing, health and education. We shall hardly ever have this matter discussed, and even if it is, it will be impossible to deal with individual cases. The Secretary of State must find some kind of bridge to give the aggrieved citizen the right of appeal against the conduct of the Board."

In the course of discussion on this Clause Professor Gruffyd said:—"... under Clause 2 there are four classes of contemplated customers for whom electricity is to be generated: firstly, authorised undertakers; secondly, the Central Electricity Board, the Grid, which is compelled to take the final residue of the power at a stated cost; thirdly,

houses, farms, crofts and so on—what I might call the home consumption; and, lastly—this is the crux of the Bill: it is upon this particular nail that I want to hang the hat of all the observations I am going to make—new industrial concerns, which will certainly be supplied at rates much lower than those of the Grid. These will be the heavy industries, the metallurgical and chemical concerns.

"What is the reason for the discrimination in cost between the four classes of consumers? Why has not this Clause been put in the form of an omnibus provision for supplying electricity to all consumers at a remunerative rate? The answer is to be found in the Cooper Report, in the speech of the Secretary of State and the remarks of many Members of this House on Second Reading, and, lastly, may I venture to suggest, in the schemes of certain commercial gentlemen in the metallurgical and chemical concerns, which have for many years planned, in and out of season—unsuccessfully up to now—to exploit our natural anxiety, not only in Scotland but in the whole of Britain, about the state of the Scottish Highlands, for purely commercial ends. All these responses and reactions have this idea in common: that the scheme will bring prosperity to Scotland, and that such a prosperity must be an industrial prosperity..."

"... Clause 2, which is only going to give the homesteads and farmsteads of Scotland a grudging and very reluctant provision of electricity, is not going to help the very object which the Cooper Report had in view, namely, the regeneration of the Highlands. May I quote one phrase from the Cooper Report which is very relevant to that part of Clause 2 which deals with the provision of electricity:

"It has become apparent to us that in certain quarters expectations are entertained as to the possibilities of electrical development in the remoter areas of Scotland, which under no circumstances can be realised."

We have heard to-day assurances that the small consumers, the crofters and farmers and so on, are to benefit by the provisions of the Bill and especially of this Clause. I suggest that what the Cooper Report says still stands, and that the idea that you can serve the Highlands of Scotland except by putting there large industrial concerns is mere fantasy. The framers of this Bill are perpetuating a vicious condition of the modern form of monopoly and capitalism..."

With regard to CLAUSE 3—(Powers of Board for discharge of their functions) Major Lloyd asked the Minister to consider the possibilities of limiting the powers of collecting information, as the wording is rather wide. The Lord Advocate consented to do this.

To be concluded.

Has Private Enterprise Failed? by Norman F. Webb (in *Thinking Ahead*) is available from K.R.P. Publications, price 7d. (limited supply). The writer surveys the pre-war world from the point of view of an industrialist.

NOW READY

The Planners and Bureaucracy

by

ELIZABETH EDWARDS

Price: 8d.

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. 10.

Saturday, May 15, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

GOING INTO POLITICS IN A BIG WAY:

"Sir Richard Acland and Mr. Alan Good had each agreed to *guarantee* [our italics] the funds of the Commonwealth Party to the extent of £500 per month for the next two years."

— Annual Conference of Commonwealth, April 24, 1943.

According to an Associated Press message printed in a Canadian paper, Mayor La Guardia is going to be Governor of Libya. La Guardia is the Italian-Jew Mayor of New York.

So now we know what made the Eighth Army fight so magnificently.

"La Guardia would work both with and behind the United Nations Armies. . . . In addition to administering the Italians living in conquered areas, he would participate in propaganda work."

Yes, Clarence, Governors of conquered areas are appointed on the principle of proportional representation, so that Mayor La Guardia would be mostly behind.

In December, 1940, U.S. Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, issued a flat, categorical denial that he had ever offered a hundred million dollar credit to General Franco, the Spanish Dictator.

According to Lieut. T. J. Hamilton, U.S. Navy, who was in Spain at the time, Alexander Weddell, the U.S. Ambassador, and, of course, an official of Mr. Hull's Department, offered the Spanish Government this credit in place of demanding an apology for a hostile demonstration outside the American Embassy in Madrid. The result of this was to encourage the anti-British policy in Tangier.

"A mass of evidence establishes the fact that there is in existence a persistent and well contrived system, intended to produce, and in practice, producing, a despotic power which at one and the same time places Government Departments above the Sovereignty of Parliament and beyond the jurisdiction of the Courts."

No, Clarence, that is not a quotation from *The Protocols of Zion*. It is from a book written by a former Lord Chief

Justice of England, the late Lord Hewart, entitled *The New Despotism*.

Die Zeitung (London) for April 30 gave currency to a report that the chief of the German Military Secret Service, Admiral Canaris, had been removed from office and replaced by the chief of the Security Police and Gestapo, Ernst Kaltenbrunner. "Canaris's name," said the writer, "and his pictures are both unknown to the German public. He is one of the most mysterious personages of the Third Reich and the correctness of this information cannot be verified. Should it be true, it would appear to fall within the framework of recent developments connected with the increase in power of the S.S. over the Military and the Bureaucracy."

A correspondent in Tasmania writes:—

"Viewpoints among Social Crediters, under the impact of Curtin and Evatt, are gradually converging; distrust of the Labour Party is growing apace, and the sell-out in New Zealand is driving home a much needed lesson. . . . I think we in Australia would be in a very great muddle without the guidance of Major Douglas and *The Social Crediter*. Always when I re-read his books I am amazed and surprised. . . ."

The "Money Myth"

The following letter appeared in *The Scotsman* of April 30:—

Sir,

I am so much in agreement with the main thesis of your correspondent, Mr. W. D. Clark, that I feel sure that he will permit me to register a note of warning against his plea for "stable prices."

Perhaps most of the calamities, and they are many, which derive from the money system can be traced to the general failure to insist, firstly, on the fundamental relationships between costs and prices, and, secondly, on the self-evident but generally unrecognised fact that a money system is simply an accounting system, and therefore it is tolerable only if it is a realistic and accurate accounting system.

The simple and incontestable fact is that a stable price level is not accurate, and therefore cannot be said to be "honest," and is very easily demonstrated to be both dishonest and undesirable. Without becoming too technical, I might point out that the primary object of modern production is to reduce man-hours per unit of production, an objective in which almost incredible success has been achieved. This means a fall of costs, and if properly accounted for, a falling price level, which is the same thing as a rise in the purchasing power of the unit of account. This is the most perfect, because accurate, method of passing on improvement to the consumer, who is the objective of production.

The methods of protecting the producer from the effects of a fall in prices under our present vicious system are quite well known, have been tried, and are quite effective.

I am, etc.,

April 27, 1943.

C. H. DOUGLAS.

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. 10.

Saturday, May 15, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

GOING INTO POLITICS IN A BIG WAY:

"Sir Richard Acland and Mr. Alan Good had each agreed to *guarantee* [our italics] the funds of the Commonwealth Party to the extent of £500 per month for the next two years."

— Annual Conference of Commonwealth, April 24, 1943.

According to an Associated Press message printed in a Canadian paper, Mayor La Guardia is going to be Governor of Libya. La Guardia is the Italian-Jew Mayor of New York.

So now we know what made the Eighth Army fight so magnificently.

"La Guardia would work both with and behind the United Nations Armies. . . . In addition to administering the Italians living in conquered areas, he would participate in propaganda work."

Yes, Clarence, Governors of conquered areas are appointed on the principle of proportional representation, so that Mayor La Guardia would be mostly behind.

In December, 1940, U.S. Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, issued a flat, categorical denial that he had ever offered a hundred million dollar credit to General Franco, the Spanish Dictator.

According to Lieut. T. J. Hamilton, U.S. Navy, who was in Spain at the time, Alexander Weddell, the U.S. Ambassador, and, of course, an official of Mr. Hull's Department, offered the Spanish Government this credit in place of demanding an apology for a hostile demonstration outside the American Embassy in Madrid. The result of this was to encourage the anti-British policy in Tangier.

"A mass of evidence establishes the fact that there is in existence a persistent and well contrived system, intended to produce, and in practice, producing, a despotic power which at one and the same time places Government Departments above the Sovereignty of Parliament and beyond the jurisdiction of the Courts."

No, Clarence, that is not a quotation from *The Protocols of Zion*. It is from a book written by a former Lord Chief

Justice of England, the late Lord Hewart, entitled *The New Despotism*.

Die Zeitung (London) for April 30 gave currency to a report that the chief of the German Military Secret Service, Admiral Canaris, had been removed from office and replaced by the chief of the Security Police and Gestapo, Ernst Kaltenbrunner. "Canaris's name," said the writer, "and his pictures are both unknown to the German public. He is one of the most mysterious personages of the Third Reich and the correctness of this information cannot be verified. Should it be true, it would appear to fall within the framework of recent developments connected with the increase in power of the S.S. over the Military and the Bureaucracy."

A correspondent in Tasmania writes:—

"Viewpoints among Social Crediters, under the impact of Curtin and Evatt, are gradually converging; distrust of the Labour Party is growing apace, and the sell-out in New Zealand is driving home a much needed lesson. . . . I think we in Australia would be in a very great muddle without the guidance of Major Douglas and *The Social Crediter*. Always when I re-read his books I am amazed and surprised. . . ."

The "Money Myth"

The following letter appeared in *The Scotsman* of April 30:—

Sir,

I am so much in agreement with the main thesis of your correspondent, Mr. W. D. Clark, that I feel sure that he will permit me to register a note of warning against his plea for "stable prices."

Perhaps most of the calamities, and they are many, which derive from the money system can be traced to the general failure to insist, firstly, on the fundamental relationships between costs and prices, and, secondly, on the self-evident but generally unrecognised fact that a money system is simply an accounting system, and therefore it is tolerable only if it is a realistic and accurate accounting system.

The simple and incontestable fact is that a stable price level is not accurate, and therefore cannot be said to be "honest," and is very easily demonstrated to be both dishonest and undesirable. Without becoming too technical, I might point out that the primary object of modern production is to reduce man-hours per unit of production, an objective in which almost incredible success has been achieved. This means a fall of costs, and if properly accounted for, a falling price level, which is the same thing as a rise in the purchasing power of the unit of account. This is the most perfect, because accurate, method of passing on improvement to the consumer, who is the objective of production.

The methods of protecting the producer from the effects of a fall in prices under our present vicious system are quite well known, have been tried, and are quite effective.

I am, etc.,

April 27, 1943.

C. H. DOUGLAS.

Unideological Misgivings over India

By KAIKHOSRU SHAPURJI SORABJI

Having once faced the danger of legal persecution (I say persecution deliberately, for that is what it boils down to) during the last Outbreak of Freedom and Democracy for my unimperial views about India expressed in private letters to my Father there, "incorrect" thoughts (though not necessarily *wrong* ones!) being already then as obnoxious to authority as they are now even when expressed in a private letter to one's nearest relative, I think I ought to be immune from being dubbed (but, of course, I shall NOT!) a counter revolutionary cut-throat, a Fascist fiend, a reactionary ruffian, a Czarist saboteur or whatever happens to be the fashionable epithet of ideological abuse at the moment.

In other places where the newly tricked-out old creeds have not yet become the State Church (as, for instance, in England and the U.S.A.) I shall be called an atheist, an anti-god infidel, an immoral monster and so on. The whereunto of this tortuous prelude is that my worst enemy can hardly with propriety or good sense accuse me of being an infatuated admirer of British Imperialism (any more than I am of Stalinist Imperialism or Hitlerism or Schiff-Sieff-Rothschild Imperialism). So perhaps in this event the expression of my ever-increasing doubts and misgivings as to some of the activities and aims of some of our Indian politicians may be seen to have more reason than those who disagree with me may care to admit.

Now no realistic observer, unhypnotised by the poisonous dope of the ideology-mongers and their hangers-on, has any excuse for being unaware, with the examples of recent European history before his eyes, that revolutions are, in fact, just what their name implies, that and nothing more; the wheel turns, *i.e.*, it *revolves*, and having done so returns to the place whence it started. And so far as any real amelioration—as distinct from a fraudulent cliché-catchword "progress"—in the condition of the vast mass of the people is concerned, the wheel might as well never have turned: indeed, had it not we should have been spared the ghastly grinding, grating and screeching, or in human terms the infinity of human agony and misery, all utterly futile, accompanying the "revolution." The other sinister fact that strikes any detached observer is that if only you bellow and bawl loud and long enough about Freedom and Democracy you can quietly filch even such poor scraps of liberty of action as still remained until recently to the propaganda-infatuated numskulls of this continent and can rivet upon them totalitarian tyrannies of an all-pervading and drastic ruthlessness that make the rule of a Caligula, a Tamerlane, an Ivan the Terrible, a Ghengis Khan seem like a kindergarten by comparison, and without their in the least being aware of what you are doing until they are hopelessly enmeshed. There are plenty of people in India blathering about Freedom and Democracy so loudly and so long, people belonging to a civilisation so old that they ought to know better than to repeat in all seriousness—assuming that they do, if they do—such Occidental baby-babble, that one is morally certain that like their opposite numbers in the Proletarian Paradise of Czar Stalin, or the echt-Deutsch Eden of Kaiser Adolf, they intend that their little finger shall be a great deal thicker than any one else's loins have ever been. All these people are Marx addicts (if we are disposed

to be charitable in our view of them) or conscious and deliberate users of Marxist dope (if we are not), using Marx as that opiate for the masses in the same way as he declared religion (the more ordinary kinds of religion) to be so used. There are other indications that support such a diagnosis, as for instance the insistence upon education, of the universal and compulsory sort, naturally, not the fine ancient traditional village-school kind indigenous to India through millennia. Now it is not any more possible, to-day, with the results of the investigations of the Cambridge geneticists before one's eyes (and no one who talks about education has any right not to know of or ignore them) of whom the leader is Dr. C. G. Hurst, for anyone to be bull-dosed by the notion of the desirability, usefulness or wholesomeness either to the individual or the community of universal and compulsory education. We now know, and have no excuse for not knowing, that not five people out of a hundred have the mental equipment which makes it possible for them to acquire with any profit to themselves or anyone else anything beyond the merest rudiments, that is to say, reading, writing and simple arithmetical processes. Anything beyond that is not only a complete waste of time and energy as far as they are concerned but merely serves to blunt and stunt such faculties as the "many too many" start with. Of course, the obviousness of this state of affairs has long been plain to the eyes of those who used them and it was difficult to shut one's ears to the audible demonstration of it in any public place. But it is at least grimly gratifying—even if unedifying—to have the evidence of one's own eyes and ears so conspicuously confirmed by distinguished scientific investigators, more especially when one remembers the readiness of the men of their type to commit what Julien Benda so well calls *La Trahison des Clercs*.

Insofar as concerns the Marxian-indoctrinated Indian politician's advocacy of the sort of education we all know only too well, one has more than a fear that it may lead, as indeed it may be intended to lead, to the production of a population of ferocious "patriotic" imbeciles after the best European manner, ready to rush to massacre and be massacred in millions to the tune of some pestilent and noxious patriotic catch-word at the indirect behest of the usual International Financial Usurer functioning, after his usual manner, behind the speciously imposing facade of a "Free democratic" "Indian" Government. At present it is fortunately impossible to lead the whole of India by the nose into a War whether for Freedom and Democracy or any other frantic nonsense, as Nehru is forced to admit, by implication, if not explicitly. (Nehru is, in my opinion, a very great man, whose utter honesty and invincible sincerity, coupled with what appears to be an equally invincible ignorance of the true inwardness of Banking and Finance, make him in many ways so dangerous to India and *real*, as opposed to the financiers' brand, of freedom for India). The universal and bitter anger among Indians of every caste and community at seeing themselves and their country plunged for a second time in twenty years into a War the other side of the earth at the fiat—apparently—of a functionary with a pink face sitting in an office in a damp, soggy, foggy hyperborean wilderness six thousand miles away, is, I feel, proof of this. I do NOT believe that whether "self" (*i.e.*, International-Usurer) governing or not, any Indian Government would dare, for all the noisy talk to that effect to try and bring India totally into a totalitarian war, and I rejoice to think so. It is no more, as I see it, any part of

India's "dharma" to pick the free democratic chestnuts out of the fire for the alleged democracies (*i.e.*, Political and Economic Planning, The Bank of "England," Messrs. Sieff, Warburg, *et al.*) than Czar Stalin considered it the U.S.S.R.'s; nor on the other hand to allow herself to be used as the ladle to fish the Dictatorship over the Proletariat dumping out of the stewpot for the Communazi party Bosses, the Persecution and Extortion Plotters and the Public Owners of the Dispossessed. To the declaration of her pro-Bolshevik politicians that India *cannot* remain neutral (that is to say, SHALL not, if they can help it) my reply is that that rests with herself and her own good sense.

Another fruitful cause for astonished apprehension is the thoroughly timid and conventional thinking of so many Indian "Leftish" political writers and publicists. No one, of course, expects the ordinary British labourite, parliamentary oaf or Leftist "intellectual" (God give us patience! say the Arabs) to have the sense to see, or having seen honesty and guts to admit that Stalinia has anything "left" about it to-day of Communist or Socialist *theory*; it is probably none the worse for that, indeed, it might even be said that that is the one thing to be said in its favour! Souvarine, Eugene Lyons, Max Eastman, A. B. Chamberlin, the Anarchist Group and the *Financial Times* U.S.S.R. Supplement of October, 7, 1937, have finally blown the gaff upon *that*. As Mussolini scrawled upon the walls of Italian houses in 1938, "*Il bolcevismo non è altra cosa che uno super-capitalismo di stato nella sua più feroce espressione...*" Shadwell *sometimes* deviates into sense in spite of Dryden... and with a work-slave proletariat kept well and truly in its place with a drastic severity that the lautomia of Hiero's Syracuse did not perhaps equal. But that Indians of any intelligence, bearing in mind India's incomparable traditions, the self-governing village council or Panchayat—the supreme archetype of all such institutions, should take the Stalinist system at its propagandised face value, should commend and spoon-feed it persistently to the people of India with any other object in view than the fixing upon them of a control as total and ruthless, is incomprehensible. It is not for nothing that the Lord Buddha makes *avidya* the unforgivable, the deadly sin, not ignorance merely, but a positive wilful unknowingness. And like their counterparts here in this land of mental and physical miasmas and gloom, our Indian politicians, even Nehru himself, seem utterly unaware that the really *evolutionary* as opposed to the mouse-in-cage "revolutionary" thinking has moved far away from the pitiful stale and barren clichés of the various schools of mutton-headedness from "Left" to "Right," and realises that in the Central Banking Systems and the International Financiers behind them must be sought AND FOUND the real *fons et origo* of all that economic tribulation, as the late V. C. Vickers—a one-time member of the governing board of the Bank of England—called it when he had learned to see the monstrous inhuman and utterly irrational system for the supreme Enemy of the human race that it is. And when one sees upon the platform of organisations whose overt and ostensible aim is the political freedom of India, people with known affiliations with High Finance and the Planning Plotters, people to whom the freedom and liberation of anybody from anything is a concern of the remotest, one can but marvel, rage or laugh according to one's temperament at the political obtuseness, the utter lack of common-sense or perception of realities as opposed to cliché and catchword, that can see in the presence of such people

thereat anything but an incongruity so glaring and so fantastic as never yet was, not to mention a real threat to everything for which those organisations profess to stand. To the open-eyed among us, Indian or other, the presence of those folk constitutes a threat to any semblance of liberty for our land compared with which ten British Raj's are almost anarchy. WE know what *those* people are after in supporting "Self" Government for *our* country; their Schusters and Niemeyers have shown all but those who WILL not see just WHAT they are after. A fat lot of good and "freedom" to India it forbodes.

Do they think that the non-aggression pact between the U.S.S.R. and Japan—which no one dares to mention nowadays, and at whose implications only the most realistic and undoped dare even indirectly to *hint*, will be used to induce the U.S.S.R. to bring her "friendly" pressure to bear upon Japan to persuade the latter to hold her hand in regard to India until there is an Indian army of millions ready to receive her with Mr. Churchill's "blood, sweat, toil and tears"? After all, is not Japan, according to official American circles quoted in a recent *Evening Standard*, placing no obstacle in the shipment of American planes to Russia for use against her own Axis partner, Germany?

Lastly, there is the attitude of fatuous and uncritically prostrate adoration before the alleged achievements of Soviet Russia in the direction of social amelioration and improvements in the standards of living, achievements which judged by the most independent evidence available, are as nothing compared with those attained in such small poor countries as Denmark, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway and Finland with not a hundredth part of Russia's astronomical natural wealth and resources among the whole lot of them, and most of them with a population less than that of London, and whose inhabitants enjoy standards of living plus a personal freedom that is beyond the wildest dreams of the work-slave of the Proletarian Paradise. THESE countries are never so much *mentioned* by the Leftish Indian (any more than they are by the British or "Britisch," Leftish ditto), which all goes to support one's conviction that the aim of many of these people is not in the least those high-sounding ones they use as a cloak but others which will not bear the light of day, else such suppression of the achievements of really progressive communities like those I have mentioned, results achieved without any of those concomitants of bloody revolution, horrors, indescribable suffering and misery so dear to the hearts of the "advanced" ones, would be impossible. But that is just the whole crux of the matter. Those countries are living demonstrations of the fact that such achievements ARE possible without the revolution stuff, AND THAT IS WHY NOTHING IS HEARD ABOUT THEM. They are also probably less under the heel of the High Financial Monster who is always close in the background behind the masks of the "advanced" and "leftish" ones.

As far as the ruling Monarchs of India are concerned, it is unhappily true to say that many of them are pretty poor specimens, owing their position to the worst of circumstances. The record of the treatment of some of these older rightful princes makes unsavoury reading. As an Indian Prince writing a few years ago on a London weekly pointed out, everything about the Indian Prince's education (conducted under the rigid control and supervision of the British Government) is perfectly calculated to make him an incompetent empty-headed ignoramus, toady and time-server. Any

indication that he takes his position seriously is frowned upon. Worse than this, however, was the systematic destruction of the primordial Indian village-school, an institution of immense value in keeping alive the cultural traditions of India. As heinous was the destruction and discouragement of the indigenous Ayurvedic system of medicine based so rationally and rightly, according to the most advanced modern ideas upon the subject, upon plants and herbs native to the land, in the interests of the Big Business of European chemical drug-manufacture, of which, as of so much else, our unhappy land has become the dumping ground to her infinite hurt and harm.

But I did not set out to make this in any way a conventional apologia for the Indian National Movement. Insofar as it really IS that it needs none, though certain aspects of it are open to the gravest criticism, but if it allows itself consciously or not to become, as have so many other "national" movements, the puppet and tool of Wall Street, the creature of the Rothschilds and such, it will call down and deserve the utmost of execration from its own people.

I cannot, however, in view of the favourite charge of addiction to nepotism and graft made against us by you English with your House of Commons, hand-picked (and packed) with members nominated by and wholly in the tow of Big Business to the extent of quite seven-eighths (*vide* Mr. Hugh Ross Williamson's *Who is for Liberty?* and *Tory M.P.*), forbear to make the cynical and realistic suggestion to you that assuming for a moment that the *worst* of what you say about is in this respect is true, what then? Does it not occur to you that whatever pickings in the way of graft and corruption and whatever nepotistical plums may be dropped on the way, surely these IN INDIA go with rather more propriety and appropriateness INTO INDIAN LAPS AND INTO INDIAN POCKETS than into those of aliens?

Islam: Submission to God

By BORGE JENSEN

"An acquaintance of the dogmatic movement in Islam and with the sects that have proceeded from it is of great importance for the study of the history of religious philosophy in Judaism, and of its expression in the Jewish literature of the Middle Ages." — *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.

Islam is an Arabic word, and means 'submission to God.' There is little, if any, secrecy on the part of Jewish writers about the birth of the second 'daughter'-religion.

Mohammed, like Paul, appears to have suffered from epileptic fits, and like him, his 'anti-Semitism' was of the apparently illogical kind which we are beginning to expect from Great Leaders. He went to Medina largely because, says the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, he "counted upon the support of certain influential Jews, by whom he expected to be regarded as the final messenger of God," and once established at Medina he set out to plunder the local Jewish tribes, killing the leader of the Jews of Khaibar, and marrying his widow on the battlefield.

His arrival in Medina, in A.D. 622, was the turning point in his life, and the Mohammedan Era, the Hegira (a distortion of the Arabic 'Hijra,' *i.e.*, 'departure from one's country') is reckoned from the year of his arrival there.

In *Civitas Dei* Mr. Lionel Curtis states that, "Medina was largely settled by Jews, and was, therefore, a centre where the monotheistic idea was already familiar."

In addition, the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* relates that those Medina kinsmen of Mohammed who had persuaded him to go to Medina had "been in close contact with the monotheistic ideas through their long sojourn among the Jewish tribes." There would therefore seem to have been little room for 'accident' in the building up of the career of the prophet.

It does not appear to have taken the Jewish Elders of Medina long to convert Mohammed to Monotheism: the idea that there is only one God, and that he, Mohammed, possessed the exclusive right of interpreting God's word, the Law, suited his temperament to perfection. His God even out-Jehovahed Jehovah, who, after all, had only made war obligatory with regard to *certain* tribes. The *Jewish Encyclopaedia* states: "The state law of Islam has divided the world into two categories: the territory of Islam, and the territory of war, *i.e.*, the territory against which it is the duty of the commander of the faithful to lead the community."

And just as Jehovah, through his Appointed Ones, was ever at pains to impress his children with his own omnipotence and their littleness, and remained as aloof from his people as they from the surrounding world, so Mohammed's aggressive Separatist Godhead through his prophet taught that all had been arranged from the beginning of the world by the Almighty God for his faithful people, who should do his Will by killing the infidel, when abroad, and bowing down to his Law, when at home: "The Mohammedan doctrine of predestination is equivalent to fatalism... the possession and the exercise of our free will is therefore futile and useless." (— *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.)

Like that other closed one-way philosophy Judaism, Islam has been described as 'law religionised,' every precept enforced being claimed as having Divine authority. "Religion and the state is not separated in Islam. Hence Mohammedan jurisprudence, civil and criminal, is mainly based on the Koran," says the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.

And what was the Koran based on?

"From the very beginning Jews versed in scriptures became of great importance in providing such details; and it was from information thus supplied that the meagre skeleton of the teachings of the Koran was built up and

MAJOR DOUGLAS'S LATEST COMPLETED
WORK IS NOW AVAILABLE IN PAMPHLET
FORM.

The "Land for the (Chosen)
People" Racket

Price 2s. (Postage extra).

clothed."... "The system of genealogy, so important among the Arabs, connecting early Arabian history with that of the Biblical patriarchs, also goes back to Jewish sources. In particular a Jewish scholar of Palmyra is mentioned who adapted the genealogical table of the Bible to the demands of Arabian genealogy..." "It was likewise such Jewish converts who offered the material for certain theories hostile to Judaism; for example the view... that it was Ishmael, not Isaac, who was consecrated as a sacrifice to God, originated from the teaching of a crafty convert who wished to ingratiate himself with his new associates." (*— Jewish Encyclopaedia.*)

The powerlessness of the individual, the uncertainty of a professional warrior's life, was counter-balanced by a belief in a Paradise in which "the eschatological details of Judaism served to embellish the original material." The Mohammedan Paradise was to provide everything the Old Adam of this earth craves, only more so. Some of the details can be found in Mr. Goldberg's *Sex in Religion*. Mohammed himself married many wives, at least two of them being Jewesses *par sang*. He was admittedly influenced by women, and it is related that his wife, Ayisha, "owned to having received the idea of the torments of the grave from Jewish women, and that Mohammed incorporated it in his teaching."

The *Koran* would appear, then, to be but a suitably modified edition of the *Talmud* (the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* says, "the study of the Law is one of the most important Mohammedan sciences... on the development of this science Roman and Talmudic law... have exercised a great influence") and the spread of Mohammedanism therefore carried with it the spread of legalism. When the final scheme for the extension of legalism (*i.e.*, the final extinction of the initiative of the individual) was launched more than a thousand years later by the Masonic lodges of Europe under the name of Socialism, its best advertised advocate, Karl (Moudechai) Marx, was greatly influenced by the Doctrine of Fatalism:

"Marx maintains that the industrial evolution of capitalistic society leads towards socialism, regardless of its ethical merits... it follows that no opposition is able to prevent the transformation of modern society on socialistic lines. It is evident that the adaptation of the theological dogma of predestination to sociology must beget much the same confidence in socialistic believers as was inspired by the teachings of Mohammed in Arab warriors."

— Jewish Encyclopaedia.

The source of Mohammed's inspiration for the introduction of an annual property tax, compulsory fasting, compulsory pilgrimage to Mecca (all variations on the sacrifice theme), as well as the collective duty of the *fibad*, the fight against the infidels (divided into those who 'possessed scripture,' who were to be let off with a fine, and those who did not, who were to be fought to the death) are, of course, the powers interested everywhere and at all times in limiting the domain of the individual to choose.

The members of the varying tribes who fought each other in the neighbourhood of Medina when Mohammed arrived in that city had since time immemorial possessed their right to choose their own leader or Sheikh. Mohammed set to work to alter all that: "His mind was now concentrated on the task of welding the Arab clans who obeyed him into one organised community. These clans were forbidden to

make war on each other and any matter at issue between them was to be brought for settlement to 'God and Mohammed.'"

They were all, continues Mr. Lionel Curtis, to unite to defend Medina (the stronghold of the Jews), and having succeeded, they all united to attack Mecca, the images of whose houses of worship Mohammed, Cromwell-wise, proceeded to destroy. From then to his death Mohammed was continuously engaged in welding more and more tribes into bigger and bigger units, and in so doing was constantly diminishing the 'territory of war' and extending the territory of those submitted to 'God and Mohammed.' He was on the point of attacking the Byzantine Empire when he suddenly died.

INQUISITIVE

"The Russians want a 'free and independent' Poland. They have said so. Yet is it absolutely certain that the terms are not being used ambiguously? Could 'free' mean 'Soviet'? Could 'independent' mean free only to opt for inclusion in the Soviet Union?" *— The Economist.*

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 "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
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.
The Job of a Representative.....	½d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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