

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 17.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

The Brief for the Prosecution

By C. H. DOUGLAS

CHAPTER X*

Alfred Moritz Mond, 1st Baron Melchett, died in 1930, his attempt to remove industrial policy from criticism of parliament and the general public having for the time being failed. Towards the end of his life he was much concerned with the New York group of Zionist Jews who controlled the Palestine Economic Corporation and were the force behind the "New Deal."

In 1931 two closely connected events coincided with a reorganisation of the Government and the final disappearance of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Philip (Viscount) Snowden from politics. The first was the setting up of the New Fabian Research Bureau, with Mr. Attlee, now (1944) Deputy Prime Minister, as Chairman, and the second was the private circulation of *Freedom and Planning* by the organisation known as P.E.P. of which the moving spirit was Mr. Israel Sieff, a Russian-speaking Jew.

For an admirable little analysis of the origins and activities of the Fabian Society and its offshoot, P.E.P., the reader should consult *The Planners and Bureaucracy* by E. Edwards (K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., Liverpool, 1943).

The public activities of P.E.P. emerged in 1933. In 1938, *Planning*, the publication dealing with such of its activities as it was desired that the public should apprehend, declared "Only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large scale planning." This is a key statement, and it requires careful examination.

It is frequently observed, by those who have given only superficial attention to the matter, that it is perverse to object to planning. The implication is that the planning to which reference is made is the alternative to what is commonly called "muddling through." The fact that practically every article we use, from a teaspoon to a motor-car, is the result of skilled, intensive, planning is apt to escape notice.

The planning which results in a teaspoon or a motor-car, however, is the outcome of a desire to produce a teaspoon or a motor-car of a particular pattern, and in a free economy the pattern is conceived in the hope that it will appeal to the individual, and will be bought in competition with alternative patterns. But the planning of the Fabian Society and its colleague P.E.P. is and must be precisely

the opposite. *It is the planning of whole peoples on the model of Germany by a totalitarian State which is designed as a whole to be the best instrument of war, the national objective of Germany. The teaspoon and the motor-car alike have to fit into this conception. Comprehensive planning requires one single objective which never varies and to which the individual is subordinate; and comprehensive planning is only justifiable on the assumption that military war is merely one aspect of continuous war. To repeat the dictum of Clausewitz, "War is the pursuit of policy by other means." Whose policy, and to where it leads, is undisclosed.*

Once this conception is grasped, it is not difficult to realise that "only in war or threat of war" could the social and political economy of Great Britain, the great barrier to World Dominion, be remodelled in the hierarchical pattern of the German Army.

That there is no contradiction between *practical* Socialism (Planning) and extreme militarism, was fully recognised in Germany fifty years ago. In 1892 August Bebel, a leading Social Democrat (Socialist) told Bismark that "the Imperial Chancellor can rest assured that German Social Democracy is a sort of preparatory school for militarism." It could not be anything else and remain socialism.

It is precisely at this point that the fundamental and irreconcilable antagonism between the German and the British, the socialist and the liberal (without a capital) conception of life becomes plain. It is not that the Briton is incapable of understanding, and, unless bedevilled by alien propaganda, appreciating, the necessity of rank and consequent discipline. His point of view has been put once for all by the poet of Scotland, Robert Burns. "The rank is but the guinea stamp, a man's a man, for a' that." The German outlook was put with even greater brevity by the Kaiser—"cannon-fodder."

The matter may be phrased somewhat differently, and in a manner more closely applicable to the present situation, by saying that the German, or socialist *proximate* objective is government *by* administration, whereas the English conception is government *of* administration. The first is the unbridled rule of the expert: the second is the subjection of the expert to the criticism and restraint of human need and desire.

It is a remarkable tribute to the sound instincts of the English that they have always distrusted experts in politics. If the average man, assuming that there is such a person, were to be told that this distrust is probably the root cause of their survival, and that it took the form of scepticism in regard to the Encyclopaedists who were responsible for the French Revolution, he would probably repudiate any understanding of the subject. But if the average craftsman, small trader, or farmer were asked why he voted for a Conservative,

*The extracts now being published in *The Social Crediter* from Major Douglas's forthcoming *The Brief for the Prosecution*, of which the first appeared on May 13, 1944, are published with a view to the existing situation, and not in the sequence or detail in which they will appear later.

he would be quite likely to reply, "These socialists are too clever. I don't trust 'em." Some instinct warns him that sympathy for the under-dog is one thing; an under-dog Party in the House of Lords, a School of Economics identifying the Gold Standard and international cartels with Under-Dog Economics and providing its picked graduates with desirable positions in the Bank "of England," and Somerset House, is quite another.

Where the unreasoning instinct of the Englishman (and in this, the Scot, and the Welshman are not so obviously included) has been so remarkable is that it has led him to a decision on a matter in regard to which reason would require an array of fact inaccessible to the great majority. Without argument, he accepts the bureaucratized state as largely inevitable in war; without argument, he indicates that it is unpleasant in war and intolerable in peace.

But it is doubtful to what extent it is generally realised that retreat from the centralised, Socialist State is much more difficult than progress towards it. Vested interests in bureaucracy are not alone the cause. The situation has been put with accuracy by Professor Brutzkus, from 1907 to 1922 occupant of the Chair of Agricultural Economics at St. Petersburg, who remarks: "it should not be forgotten that the communist state, with all resources at its free disposal and resting on an absolute dictatorship, is the most powerful in the world; while the subjects of such a state are the most impotent of all peoples." (*Economic Planning in Soviet Russia*, p. 136.)

The foregoing paragraph, and indeed the whole of the book from which it is taken, will repay careful study, since it contains either implicitly or explicitly indications of the tremendous problem with which the world is faced in the bureaucratized or "planning" State. Professor Brutzkus, who had unrivalled opportunities of observing the transition from Czarist to Communist Russia, and was highly critical of the former, concludes: "Russian experience bears out in the clearest manner our basic conclusion—namely, that the principle of socialism is not creative; that it leads the economic life not to fruition, but to ruin."

But it hardly requires insistence that such arguments as the many adduced from various sources on the unsatisfactory condition of Russia and Germany, both examples of the planned bureaucratic Socialist State, have little or no bearing on the likelihood of a change in the system. Its very defects strengthen the *System*. Can anyone seriously suggest that Hitler or Stalin, together with the Great German General Staff and the Moscow Communist Bureaucracy, will resign voluntarily? And if they will not resign voluntarily, "the most impotent of all peoples" are not exactly in the best strategic position to *force* a resignation. The Gestapo and the Ogpu can deal competently with anything of that nature.

There is no essential difference between the higher officials of a Trust, Cartel, or Trades Union, once they are free of Parliamentary control, and a Russian Commissar or an "Office General" of the Great German General Staff. None of them is creative; all of them are primarily concerned with their own positions and the perpetuation of the system which maintains them in positions of maximum power and minimum responsibility. And not one of them can pursue an independent policy. The policy is that of the type of organisation to which they belong—it is the organisation which makes the man, not the man the organisation.

Sir Alfred Mond's plan was one way of ending Parliamentary control of the bureaucrat; failing, resort was had to the New Despotism, "P.E.P."

Once again, there is a tendency to assume that we are witnessing an automatic, and to that extent, inevitable development. So far from this being true, it is possible to indicate exactly where, and by what steps the present situation has been reached, and in so doing, to place the conscious nature of the policy beyond dispute. One clue can be found in the nature, transformation, and mechanism of taxation.

The fundamental idea of taxation can be discerned in the maxim "*inter arma silent leges*." Taxation was originally a war measure; it was not law, it was not legal. It was simply a recognition of the fact that when the house is burning down, the mill race may have to be tapped to put the fire out. The income tax, introduced by Sir Robert Peel, was a temporary tax to replace the revenue lost by the abolition of import taxes on various articles and like Peel's Bank Charter Act, Police Legislation, and general policy, can be seen to have been a portion of a definite plan to familiarise permanent taxation, of which it is most improbable that his was the creative brain. During the whole of the nineteenth century we can see the conception of taxation as being a device to finance specific ends, changing into something entirely different—a political weapon, in the main aimed at agriculture but in general intended to make Finance the Supreme Government. The core of the plan was the National Debt and the Balanced Budget working in conjunction with the Bank of England. In order to avoid repetition, the reader who is not familiar with the technique of Government Finance may be referred to *The Monopoly of Credit*, Chap. V, for further detail.

Knowledge of finance was confined to a select few, and the general public was gradually trained to believe that in some unexplained way, life was becoming much more expensive. In actual fact, the general population was receiving a decreasing share of wealth produced. It never seems to have been generally observed that the "social services," which were often given as a reason for higher taxation, were almost wholly due to the inability of the individual to get by purchase what was physically obtainable, since public bodies did in fact obtain it, paying by loans which further increased taxation. The individual was not to be allowed to spend his own money. It seems so obvious to anyone who is completely ignorant of the subject that the poor are poor because the rich were rich, that no decent minded person could object to make the rich poor by taxation even if in some curious way the general body of the well-to-do became poor without the poor becoming perceptibly more well-to-do.

It has been proved repeatedly, by the most orthodox economists, that the distribution of surplus money income over the bare subsistence level would be quite inadequate to raise the general standard of living to any tolerable stage, and would kill any but elementary industries. Over twenty years ago, Dr. Bowley stated that the confiscation of all incomes over £160 would only provide £25 per family if the sum confiscated were completely and evenly distributed. It is being proved at this time, when we are spending £14,000,000 *per day* that the confiscation of the *money-wealth* of the well-to-do would not take us very far, since on Dr. Bowley's figures, when there were well-to-do, they, collectively, had only about two-thirds of a million a day to spend.

The detail of this question is intricate and far-reaching, but the main dominant fact is simple. It is that there is under existing financial methods no relation between wealth and money, and that taxation, which is always in *money*, is levied on price values which do not in themselves add one penny to the amount of *money* in existence. A landowner may have property, the *price value* of which is £100,000, but to pay his taxes, he must get *money* from somewhere. And the money is created, not by the ownership, or the cultivation of land or even by the sale of it, except to a bank, but by the banks—"out of nothing" as the Encyclopaedia Britannica puts it.

Had this been widely understood, the fantastic taxation of the past thirty years in particular, beginning with Mr. Lloyd George's Budget of 1910, would never have been tolerated. It was not widely understood, *but it was thoroughly understood both by the international forces which brought Mr. George to power, and by the German High Command* which realised that the landed proprietor was the backbone of the fighting strength of Great Britain, and that his elimination would leave the "internationalist" in a commanding position. *The German landowner is almost completely untaxed.*

An understanding of this matter is essential to even an elementary insight into the politics of at least the past two hundred and fifty years. The fact that *money* has been kept in short supply has deluded the vast majority into believing that *wealth* was in short supply. By keeping (no matter what the improvement of process and the increase of production) the less fortunate, short of *money*, a discontented body of the population could be, and has been, kept available for agitation against every type of property except the credit or money-creating mechanism. Skilfully financed propaganda against property itself as a "private" conception has provided votes to transfer it to institutions governed from the shadows, or has so depreciated market values as to amount to virtual confiscation, without in any case detaching the conception of ownership *by somebody or something*, from it.

Out of this has grown a feature new in British life—the idea that uninstructed criticism of one's neighbour's business is normal and proper, and can reasonably be extended to any infringement of his "privileges" which does not involve interference by the police.

The policy of "full employment" is perhaps the next evidence of conscious intention.

(Copyright.)

(All rights reserved.)

Demon est Deus Inversus

Why I am a Jew by EDMUND FLEG. Victor Gollancz Ltd., 2/6. (First published in French 1927. Published in English 1943.)

"Action results not only from clear reasoning, capable of intellectual exposition, but from an impulse as strong as its origin is obscure," says the author. Certainly no book of recent years has revealed more strikingly the nature and origin of those impulses which move members of the Jewish race to action. It is well known that there can be no action without a policy, governing the purpose of that action, just as

there can be no policy without a philosophy, governing the justification of that policy. It is the especial value of this book that it does disclose, most graphically and convincingly, both the policy and the philosophy by which the actions of the Jewish race are governed.

Among those impulses, the 'Messiah-complex' looms large. It is, indeed, the *sine qua non* of the Jewish race itself. "... that the Messiah may reign on earth... it is necessary that Israel, who is the hope of the Messiah, should remain Israel to the end of her days. Her special law, then, must be eternal, like the universal law."

Hence her priestly function: "A nation of priests... a holy people not for herself alone, but also for her mission... to make of herself, as the Talmud says, 'a cement' between the peoples... identifying, alone among all, her destiny with the destiny of all, she wishes to become a people of priests that she may become the priests of humanity."

This "mission" is the realisation of what the Jews call Unity, and the Gentiles perhaps Monopoly. "... a base and wretched people, loaded with sins and for ever back-sliding. God chose this mire only to show what he can do with mire... he is the God whom Israel must reveal to all mankind... Israel separates herself from others only to unite them... to work for the reign of justice and peace on earth with the coming of the Messiah... Now God is One, man ought to be One. By his divisions here on earth he shatters the divine Unity... greater and greater human groups create greater and greater images of the divine unity... Human unity is, for Israel, a revealed truth, a divine truth, which the people that proclaim it must make, down the ages, and with the other peoples, a human reality. Human Unity is for the Jew an article of faith, like the divine Unity... another Promised Land, the Land that will be when One Man will be... God following his people on their bloody road to human unity."

To achieve this Unity, New Men and New Orders are, of course, essential. The work of God's hand is found wanting. "That the Kingdom of God may come, man, created by God, must be re-created by man, until human unity reflects and reconstructs in this world the unity of God... Belief in the progress of mankind... in moral, social and international progress... that is the faith of Israel."

World war I had been 'billed' as the 'War to End War.' To Fleg such words could only mean that the Unity of man had been achieved, the Mission of Israel fulfilled, and the Messiah of the prophets was at hand. "We were told: this is the last war... and I would see in imagination all the countries, all the continents and everywhere, anxious confident men, all men, hoping, waiting... for the peace of the whole world, the Unity of man... And I said to myself: Then it did not cry in the wilderness, the voice of the prophets?... All men, then, are awaiting the Messiah of Israel? How is that possible?... Might it be the mission of Israel?"

The Unity of man was not achieved and disillusionment resulted: "And I was already writing in my thoughts the last song of the Jewish epic, *Le Mur des Pleurs*. The Wandering Jew stopped before the old wall where the Jews were lamenting over the ruins of the Temple; but they were not bewailing the Temple that had been destroyed; they were bewailing the Temple of the One Man, which man has

(Continued on page seven)

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. 12. No. 17.

Saturday, July 1, 1944.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"The old aristocracy of England, in his view, had made many mistakes, but certain things they had understood very well. The modern governing class 'cannot face a fact, or follow an argument, or feel a tradition, but least of all can they, on any persuasion read through a plain impartial book, English or foreign, that is not specially written to soothe their panic or please their pride.'

"There had been reality in the claim of the old aristocracy to understand matters not known to the people. They had read history: they were familiar with other languages and other lands. They had a great tradition of foreign diplomacy. Even the study of philosophy and theology, to-day confined to a handful of experts, was not alien to them...

"But to-day, 'They rule by the smiling terror of an ancient secret. They smile, and smile, but they have forgotten the secret.'" — *Gilbert Keith Chesterton* by MAISIE WARD, p. 372.

"It is time, said Chesterton, for an army of amateurs: for England is perishing of the professionals." — *Ibid.*

David Daiches, the son of the "Scottish" Rabbi, Salis Daiches, is employed by the British Information Services in New York. Well, there are lots of "Scotch" in New York, and they have most of the information, and other things.

"Mr. Maisky toured the Jewish colonies, settlements, and industries, and discussed with Zionist leaders the problem of Palestine's absorptive capacity and the post-war solution of the Jewish problem. There is little doubt that, upon his return to Moscow, he submitted a comprehensive report... It is also worth mentioning that according to rumour Stalin raised the Palestinian question at the Teheran Conference, thus serving notice on Churchill that henceforth Soviet Russia is no longer disinterested in the future disposition of Palestine and the Middle East." — *The Soviet Wooing of Palestine* by ELIAHU-BEN-HORIN in *Harper's Magazine*.

Altogether, it looks as though a good time would be had by all, Clarence.

"The Labour Party is pre-dominant in World Zionism."
 — *Ibid.*

Well, they're certainly both in it, like the tail and the dog.

"If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that, too."
 — SOMERSET MAUGHAM.

Large fortunes are being made by Jews in Paris by selling German exit visas to Portugal, to other Jews. The fee is about £10,000. It is not stated where the Jews go to from Portugal, but a look round some of our big towns would enable anyone to make a good guess.

BRAVE NEW WORLD: "Steadily falling standards of nutrition have had particularly telling effect; deficiency diseases are alarmingly prevalent. Eighty per cent. of the people in Tokyo have beri-beri... epidemics of typhoid and dysentery have been frequent... tuberculosis is definitely on the rise."

— *This is Tokyo To-day* by ARTHEMISE GOERTZ.

Perhaps the most sinister feature of the present situation everywhere is that it is supposed to be "modern" and therefore inevitably "progressive." Measured by any standard other than that of gadgets, civilisation has receded more in the last fifty years, than it advanced painfully in the preceding two hundred.

Serfdom, which was only partial, was abolished in Russia in 1861. It is now universal in Russia, and absolute.

LEST WE FORGET: The U.S. casualties in the First World War were less than two per cent. of the total of French and British casualties. She paid no war debts and received payment from every combatant. In February, 1918, when air-power was vital, General Pershing cabled Woodrow Wilson protesting against "bombastic claims" and stating: "There is not to-day a single American-made plane in Europe." — *Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters*; BAKER, Vol. VII, p. 572.

Yet, in October, Wilson entered into direct negotiations with Germany for an armistice, on his single responsibility and without reference to France or Great Britain. In 1917, he had written to Colonel House a plan "to force them. [France and Great Britain.] They need to be coerced."

His instruction would have left the Germans military victors. Colonel House advised: "I would suggest that you quietly diminish the transport of troops, giving as an excuse the prevalence of influenza or any other reason but the real one." (*Foreign Relations of the U.S.A. 1918: Supplement I, Vol. I, p. 424.*) He was blocked by the American Generals after stating that he wanted a peace which would leave a powerful German Army "because it is certain that too much success or security on the part of the Allies will make a genuine peace settlement difficult if not impossible."
 — *Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters*; BAKER, Vol. VIII, p. 523.

The German Army was to be made too weak to stand
 (Continued on page six, column two)

Some Impressions of a War-time Trip to Britain

by Mr. NORMAN JAQUES

A Broadcast delivered in Alberta in April, 1944.

Last summer I heard from Major Douglas who wrote to say he thought it desirable for me to visit Britain if possible, in order to consult with him, to meet some of the prominent Social Crediters over there, and to gain first-hand information of conditions in Britain.

Then followed a long delay, waiting for permission from the United Kingdom shipping control to cross the Atlantic, a most rigid priority being imposed upon civilians. Well, to cut a long story short, I eventually found myself at Halifax awaiting the order to "board ship." In Halifax I had my first reminder of the perils of the sea in war time, the centre of the hotel rotunda is occupied by a full-sized torpedo, presumably placed there to discourage would-be travellers from crossing the ocean.

Next day our armada of ships sailed and for two weeks we vanished from the rest of the world.

Meantime, we carried on, hoping for the best, but prepared for the worst, and ready for any emergency. Many of the ships carried explosives, high test gas and other dangerous cargoes, and it were well not to dwell on the possibilities of meeting a "sub." True, we had no alarm, but neither were we given the welcome "all clear," and I want to pay my very humble tribute to our gallant seamen who maintain the ocean supply routes against the ever-lurking foe who strikes without warning. Our sailors have carried on without flinching from the first and will continue until the last shot is fired. When we think about the terrific striking force now gathered in Britain, the vast assistance given to our Russian allies, the parcels delivered to our soldier sons, husbands and brothers, of our farm products marketed overseas, let us be grateful to, and offer prayers for, our dauntless sailors who have made all this possible by their sacrifices.

Well, everything comes to an end—even a voyage in a convoy, and finally we landed somewhere in the West of England, exactly two weeks after leaving Halifax, and one week from Christmas.

Meantime I wired my arrival to Douglas and presently received an answer to proceed to Scotland. Travelling in Britain in wartime is no snap, and I found myself submerged in two armies of soldiers and sailors—one army returning to duty after Christmas leave in England and the other going north to celebrate New Year's Day in Scotland. I had bought a first-class ticket and was on the platform an hour and a half before train time, but to no purpose—and I was lucky to get even standing room on the train. Well, eventually we started our journey to Edinburgh which, before the war took seven, but now takes twelve hours.

The prospects of standing up for twelve hours were not attractive, especially with the carriage jammed as full as a stock car, and without proper ventilation, owing to the "black-out." However, necessity knows no law, eventually somebody put out the lights and opened a window, and then I lay down on the floor for the night and consoled

myself that I had a carpet to lie on for the extra cost of a first-class ticket.

Next morning I changed trains, and evening found me by the side of a Scottish loch, within a few miles of my destination, and finally, on the last day of the Old Year, nearly a month after leaving Alberta, my long journey came to an end and I was greeted by Major Douglas, the founder of Social Credit.

I stayed two weeks in this delightful region of the Highlands of Scotland, and found the people as hospitable as their country is beautiful, and roses blooming in midwinter.

In this remote district the only reminder of the war was a large Polish hospital in what was formerly a great castle. The Polish soldiers have gained undying fame for their gallantry, and their airmen played a truly great part in the Battle of Britain in 1940. This battle really decided the war for had Britain fallen there could have been no bombing of Germany, no Germany, no help to Russia, and no invasion of Europe. It is well to remember Britain went to war in 1939 to keep faith with Poland, and although Poland was invaded by Russia as well as by Germany, the Poles have never ceased to fight and their government has never surrendered.

I saw Major Douglas every day for two weeks, and we discussed affairs in general, and Social Credit in particular.

He was very insistent that the people everywhere are faced with the greatest and most urgent crisis, and that their real enemy is monopoly—that the so-called planned economy means handing over the government to "big business," which is out to get control of "bed, board and clothes," and make no mistake about it. This means there is to be no competition, but rigid control—as the international planners say—"peace comes from overwhelming law supported by overwhelming power." But Social Crediters are builders, not wreckers, and we intend to restore every man in his own rights. This is the exact opposite of the Totalitarian State. Social Credit holds that the State is a mere abstraction, and should not be above the individuals comprising the State. The power of the State has increased, is increasing, but ought to be diminished. Power *must* be decentralised, and individuals *must* control policy, *all* should have enough power to *prevent* the individual next to them from taking it away from them. Social Crediters are anti-centralisation and anti-supreme State. We have a very broad working principle, we are not going to plan a *new* world, but to *confirm everyone* in what they have *got*, and *want* and *like*. We are the upholders of the *rights of individuals*. Let us be perfectly clear about this, we will have to *fight* monopoly, —*private and state*. We face the greatest crisis in history.

After discussing these, and other important matters with Major Douglas, I left him for the second part of my mission.

On my return to London from Scotland I met many Social Crediters and had most interesting discussions with them. I met many other people including M.P.'s interested in monetary reform. Among others were Mr. Leigh, of the London Chamber of Commerce, and Douglas Reed, a foreign correspondent of the *London Times* and author of several well-known books dealing with world affairs.

While in London I experienced several air raids. Imagine you are walking home late in the evening. The streets and roads are silent, deserted and pitch dark. Sud-

denly the silence is shattered by the wail of a siren, rising and falling for several minutes. Again silence prevails—deeper than before. After a time you think it must be a false alarm, and then, in the distance, a dull glow appears in the sky, and there are faint flashes, like summer lightning, of search lights far away. Presently a faint rumble can be heard, the first sounds of the approaching raid. These rumbles increase and, meantime, the searchlights concentrate in a few places in the sky and come nearer and nearer until the drone of the enemy planes can be heard even above the ever-increasing roar of the London barrage; but no planes can be seen, they are too high. And now the explosions of falling bombs add to the din, while the sky is filled with the sparks of bursting shells, and rockets which burst and then spread out in all directions, while dozens of German flares float down to light up the city. The glare of fires can be seen in all directions, but they do not spread, as they did during the “blitz”; the firefighters now are too well organised. And so the attack waxes and wanes, like a thunderstorm, as the enemy seek their targets and try to avoid the terrific barrage. Presently planes can be heard passing overhead, on their way home, pursued by shells and rockets until out of range. And so the storm dies away until the ever welcome “all clear” sounds, and silence reigns once more.

These raids are severe enough to give us some idea of the terrible scenes during the “blitz” of 1940, when they lasted for hours and even for days, when no real resistance was possible. But the people of Britain never faltered, even when things looked their darkest. For over a year Britain, and the British Empire, stood alone against the German might, and I was told over and over again that the support of Canada, and of the other Dominions, was of the greatest comfort and encouragement during that terrible ordeal.

Living conditions to-day in Britain are not pleasant, food is monotonous for civilians, there are restrictions of all kinds and travelling, beyond short distances, is avoided if possible.

Nobody complains, but the people look forward to peace and they long for the end of controls and “coupons.”

“There will always be an England.” I was reminded of this by a remarkable story told to me about the House of Commons by one of its members. The House itself is not very old, about one hundred years, but it is a part of the old palace of Westminster, of which Westminster Hall still stands. When this great Hall was being built, some eight hundred years ago, it was decided to build the noblest roof in Europe. “Very well, then,” the builders said, “we must use the finest oak in England.” This timber was found growing in Sussex, on land belonging to a then member of the House of Commons. And so the Hall, and its roof, was built, a noble monument to the skill and faith of those master builders of old. And Westminster Hall defied the elements for nearly a thousand years, and so it would have stood for another thousand years, had not an unseen, and alien enemy—the “death watch” beetle—bored its way into the very heart of the oak beams supporting the roof.

This was only discovered a few years ago, fortunately in time to save the structure. And modern builders realised they would need the finest of timber to restore this finest of roofs, and so they searched again for the best oak and found it—growing in the same spot as their ancestors had

found it centuries before—on the same land, still owned by a descendant of the same family, who was, in turn, a member of Parliament.

Surely we can learn a lesson from this remarkable and true story. When this grand old roof had to be repaired, people did not say “we no longer know how to build a sound roof, and therefore we must have an alien roof, built of alien materials.” People knew that alien insects were destroying the roof that had sheltered them, but that for British conditions nothing could equal a roof of British design, labour and materials.

And so they restored this British roof with British timber, taking care that never again will alien insects bore into the structure. And so it stands to-day, defying the elements and the “blitz,” a sublime monument to the skill and foresight of our ancestors—inspired by their faith that their work would stand—that “there would always be an England.”

And so it is with our constitutional roof of British justice and liberty which our ancestors took centuries to build in the faith that it would stand—that Britons always would be free.

To-day our British constitution is under attack from within and from without by the “death-watch” beetles of State Socialism, Fascism, Communism and International Financism. We are told we must have a “new order” designed by aliens for aliens—an alien structure of alien materials,—in place of our old, and tested British constitution of justice and liberty.

We do not need a “new order” of alien design. Let us rebuild on our old British foundations of liberty and justice, which our ancestors laid down through the centuries. Let us destroy these alien “death watch beetles,” these “isms” that would undermine our foundations of freedom.

We must repair *our own* Canadian structure. Let us renew our faith in *our own* ability to build as did our ancestors—to the end that there will always be a Sovereign Canada of justice and freedom.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK (Continued from page four)
against its combined adversaries, but strong enough to threaten the Allies without the United States. On October 30 Clemenceau asked House if he was threatening the Allies that if they did not accept Wilson’s terms to Germany, America would stop fighting. “That would amount to a separate peace between the United States and the Central Powers? It might,” said Colonel House. (*Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, Vol. IV p. 165.)

On December 11, 1918, the (Prussian) Guards Regiment returned to Berlin, and President Wilson’s ship was approaching the European coast. Ebert, the Socialist Chancellor of the new German Republic, made a speech celebrating the return of “our undefeated army.”

—*Schultess Europäischer Geschichtskalender*, 1918, Vol. I. p. 33.

A correspondent in India writes that the chief horror of the war, for him, up to the present, has been “having to listen to a lecture on ‘Post-War Belt-Tightening’ by our old friend Professor Gregory, who is apparently touring the East.”

DEMON EST DEUS INVERSUS

(Continued from page three)

not yet built. The Wandering Jew slept. . . And now, breaking in on the dream, come distant chants. Future generations are building the long awaited Temple, for from fratricide is born fraternity. The Holy Supper of humanity begins, the limbs of Adam, scattered over the earth, are joined once more; the blood of all men flows in his veins; in his heart beat all human hearts; as God, Man is One. . . The Wandering Jew awakes. . . the Jews are still weeping; the times are not yet come, he must wander still."

Fleg naively examines "this hatred of the Jew, which nothing appeases, which has existed ever since the Jews have existed, and which will no doubt endure as long as they endure." Judaism is not "revolutionary," except in a "progressive" sense, since the Ten Commandments forbid the Jew to covet the goods of others—but not to covet rule and dominion over others! Judaism is not "capitalist," since the Talmud exalts poverty—whilst declaring that 'It is a meritorious deed to get hold of a Gentile's possessions.' It cannot be that Judaism is "an international organisation, designed to conquer for the Jews material supremacy and world empire, as promised by the sacred books," since the persecutions "prove absence of an effective solidarity and lack of even a defensive organisation; and the world empire which the prophets announce, is to be built, not by a financial conspiracy but by the triumph of an effort wholly spiritual which will lead all mankind to its highest degree of development."

One fact alone explains everything: "the Jews are Jews; they wish to remain Jews. . . every minority seems suspect." It never occurs to Fleg that the Gentile may not desire "priests of humanity, separating themselves from others only to unite them." It never occurs to him that the Gentile may disagree that Bigger means Better, and Biggest an "image of the divine unity." Human Unity, the faith of the Jew, stands opposed to Sovereign Personality, the faith of the Christian; the regimented ant State to the state of personal freedom and security; the Kingdom of God, conceived as "world unity," to the Kingdom of God, conceived as within us; man in need of man's recreation to man, redeemed by his Saviour, in need of no man's "recreation." Fleg cares for none of these things. Blinded and as one possessed by the mission of his holy people, he has neither tolerance nor understanding of any philosophy other than the "mission." "From fratricide is born fraternity"—Fleg utters the phrase with all the sanctity of a beatitude, blissfully unaware that the very suspicion that such was the policy and philosophy of the Jewish race, the impulse of its actions, would itself sufficiently explain the Gentile's distrust and hatred of the Jew. Nor are we enlightened how a race, the victim of unappeasable hatred, will even be enabled to "lead all mankind to its highest degree of development," except by actions very far from spiritual.

Victor Gollancz, translator and publisher, regards this work as "the noblest exposition of Judaism and what is called 'Jewishness' that has come his way," an "urgent message of hope and obligation to the Jew, and an urgent call for understanding to the Gentile." "Understanding" is certainly provided, pressed down and overflowing. *Ipsi dixerunt.*

T. V. H.

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: June 21, 1944.

EMPLOYMENT POLICY

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson (Hastings): . . . A number of speakers have mentioned the dramatic interest of the opening words of the White Paper:

"The Government accept as one of their primary aims and responsibilities the maintenance of a high level of employment after the war."

That was one of the most important pronouncements from a Government we have ever heard, and one which I welcome, when it is made by the British Government; although secretly I congratulate myself that I am not a Member of the Government who have made that commitment. Apart from that, the White Paper does appear to me as being complete in itself. It is an admirable production, an admirable lay-out of the problems and difficulties with which the Government who have made this commitment will have to deal. As I read the opening chapters, I made notes, wondering whether or not the Government would have thought of this point or that point. I was very interested to find as I read through the document, before I got to the end, that every one of these points had been met; I will not say dealt with, I will not say solved, but they had all been acknowledged. The Government are to be congratulated on having produced a first-rate treatise on the problem of unemployment.

I would like to propose a general proposition which really is almost the same as that which the hon. Member for West Fife raised in slightly different words. . . My proposition is that it is only an authoritarian Government which can deal effectively with unemployment. If we examine the nature and causes of unemployment it can be shown in theory that the only effective technique in the prevention of unemployment which a Government can employ is interference with individual freedom of choice—that is to say interference with private enterprise—and not only can we show it in theory but also we have seen it in practice in the last 10 or 20 years. In those countries which have for a time made a success of dealing with unemployment the technique which they have employed for that purpose has been interference with freedom of individual choice. In Germany the Nazi Government took away from the people the right to make their own decisions. In this country we voluntarily gave our Government, for the purpose and period of this war the power to interfere with out freedom of choice. In Russia, a paternal government took over the running of the whole nation, and interfered with freedom of choice. In America, they tried to deal with unemployment, but so long as they refused to interfere with freedom of choice, they failed; and it was only when war came along and the Government got the powers to interfere, that unemployment was effectively dealt with. So I think I am saying, in a slightly different way, exactly what my hon. Friend the Member for West Fife said, that we cannot have private enterprise, and deal effectively with unemployment at the same time. I think that is true. It is going to be a question of choosing between the two. Which is, in the long run, the greater end in itself? Freedom of individual choice or dealing effectively with unemployment? . . .

Mr. Bowles: The hon. Member has used the phrase "freedom of choice" over and over again. Does he mean freedom of choice on the side of the employer to employ

or discharge labour, or freedom of choice to get a job where a worker wants to get a job?

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson: I meant much more, the freedom of the individual to say "I will—or will not—go to Brighton"; "I will—or will not—buy this particular hat"; "I will—or will not—start, or go into this particular business." All those things, in respect of which we are to-day limited in every way, are different aspects of what I meant by freedom of individual choice. I meant private negotiation, the idea of a man negotiating for his own advantage. That is private enterprise, a man negotiating for what he conceives to be his own advantage. I think therefore that what we have to consider is: Are the Government to continue to hold all the powers of interference which we have granted them for the period of the war? Are they to continue to hold their powers of rationing, licensing, control of production and supply and distribution? Are they to hold their power to direct labour of all kinds to what they shall work at, at what wage, and where it will be? That is the question we have really to decide in choosing between dealing effectively with unemployment on the one side, and the maintenance of what I call freedom of choice, or what my hon. Friend opposite called private enterprise on the other side.

Now without myself saying which I think is the better end of the two, I think it is possible to forecast which is most likely to find favour in this country. I doubt very much whether in this island, inhabited by 45,000,000 people, each of whom is rather the counterpart of an island in himself, or herself, we will continue indefinitely to grant those powers of interference to the Government. I do not think these powers of interference which we have given to this Government during the war will stick to the Government indefinitely. That is merely an expression of opinion. Without saying whether they ought or ought not to have it, I say I do not think they are going to, as a matter of business judgment.

There is another aspect of this, which is really the same thing stated in another way. As I read through all the proposals in this White Paper, this thought struck my mind that it would not be possible to put them through except by means of a Coalition Government. They involve so many compromises between different political philosophies that I believe the White Paper could only be made effective by a Coalition Government. What then? How are we to regard this? Is this a bid of the present Government to continue in office? Can we look at this as an election address?

Mr. Bowles: Of course it is.

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson: I rather though so myself. I am glad I am able to mention these matters from the position of security of a private Member who has no responsibility. [An HON. MEMBER: "Freedom of choice."] Exactly. Then my comment on that is that if this is an Election address, I think one may surely forecast that, during the period of post-war readjustment, it is very probable that the people of the country will grant to the Government those powers of interference which are necessary. But the problem with which the Government will have to deal during that period of readjustment will not be unemployment; the danger is very much more likely to be over-employment—the difficulty of dealing with runaway price markets, of commodity and money markets—and during that period I believe that we shall still be prepared to put up with the controls and the rationing and the licensing and so on. But, at the end of

that period, I do not think the country generally will allow the Government to retain those powers. In other words, when we reach the period, when we really want those powers for dealing with unemployment, I do not think the Government of the day will have them, for free citizens only grant such powers to their Government when they believe that the existence of the nation is at stake. . .

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

The Managership of K.R.P. Publications Limited, which is not permanently located at Liverpool, will become vacant during the summer. Applications are invited from Social Crediters with suitable experience.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
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.
Reconstruction	6d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...8d.	
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.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet)	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.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	1d.
The Representative's Job	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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