

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 14. No. 21.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

In its 8 a.m. "News" Bulletin, Beelzebub's Brethren Calling on July 13 broadcast *in extenso* a resolution attacking the Greek Government, and, without giving any evidence to rebut the overwhelming condemnation of E.L.A.S. by, for instance, our own troops, calling for support of that organisation.

It is evident that some deal was made when the Socialists condescended at high rates of pay to help in the defence of this country in 1940, and that deal included practically unfettered use of the "B."B.C. for Socialist and other Left Wing propaganda. Such a compact is a matter of public concern: and its disclosure should be enforced.

"Le quatorze juillet," the French public holiday to commemorate the French Revolution, is being celebrated by a gigantic flood-lit *Red V* sign above the city. Well, Clarence, if you don't know who was responsible for the massacres and murders of the French Revolution, for the first American Civil War (the American Revolution), for the thirty millions or more sacrificed to the Glorious Soviets, for the European War of 1914-18, and the World War of 1939-45, not to mention the present state of the world and the Armageddon which is coming, it isn't because they don't tell you.

One of the most curious features in the picture dominated by the Grand Orient is Mr. de Valera. Since intense nationalism, carried almost to the point of absurdity, is said to be (we are a little doubtful) the essence of the Irish question, it is rather odd that Irishmen should choose to be represented to the world by the son of an Iberian Jew. And since Mr. de Valera is said to be a fervent Roman Catholic, and the Grand Orient is the deadly enemy of Catholic culture, the transfer of the Grand Orient archives from Prague to Rushbrooke, County Cork, seems queer.

But unless we are much mistaken, General de Gaulle, the son of a Catholic Professor, is "playing in" with the same Dark Forces. The whole subject is mysterious in the extreme. But there is one fact which we can observe from history. FROM THE INTELLIGENTSIA OF THE FRENCH SALONS TO THE VICTIMS OF THE RUSSIAN AND GERMAN "PURGES," THE TOOLS OF THE GRAND ORIENT HAVE BEEN RUTHLESSLY SACRIFICED WHEN THEY HAVE SERVED THEIR TURN. This fact confirms the impression which both common sense and a technical examination of the Masonic system of organisation would convey—that its prime objective is to make its dupes work willingly and even eagerly for their own ultimate destruction as well as that of anyone who stands in the way of the tiny group in ultimate control.

We are quite aware that there is any amount of Masonic activity which is not *much* more than that of a dining club.

And that probably ninety-nine *per cent.* of English Freemasonry is of this character. What could be more helpful, and indeed, indispensable?

We should place few limits to the ineptitude of a bureaucracy outside the very narrow field of its usefulness, but the handling of the housing situation is much too bad to be true. It is clear enough that the fostering of unrest, discontent, and if possible, unreasoning resentment, is an essential to the political situation which the Plotters are working to create—in fact, such an atmosphere is the "peace" equivalent of P.E.P.'s postulate that "only in war, or under threat of war" would a British Government do thus and such. Everyone knows the remedy for the housing situation—it is to permit, or assist, individuals and builders to build houses. But of course, if that were allowed, the unrest would subside, and the opportunity to break down the safeguards of private property by the seizure of somebody else's house if it is empty for five minutes, would disappear. The technique is exactly that of Bolshevism in Russia and Poland—to egg on the landless to seize and partition the property of the landlord, give the small proprietor about six months' possession, accuse him of "inefficiency" and then collectivise him, which leaves the bureaucracy without an effective opponent.

Anyone can read for themselves the appropriate atmosphere in process of creation in those curious illustrated news tabloids specially produced for mass-mind conditioning. And, of course, the "B."B.C. we have always with us.

Although none were returned, the candidature of Quebec Social Crediters, according to our local information, was most popular. It increased the value of a vote for a Mackenzie King Liberal candidate to fifteen dollars per head, unlimited drinks, and as many joy rides as desired. The French Canadians, in fact, found that Social Credit paid the National Dividend on the spot, without the formality of voting for a Social Credit candidate. The threat was enough.

"Only recently our race has given the world a new prophet, but he has two faces and bears two names: on the one side, his name is Rothschild, leader of all capitalists, and on the other side, Karl Marx, the apostle of all those who want to destroy the others."

—Blumenthal, Editor of *Judisk Tidskrift* (Sweden) No. 57.

As the *Patriot* remarks, "We are witnessing a series of demands from the Soviet Government which inevitably bring to mind how Hitler's similar treatment of Europe finally brought about this devastating war." But, of course. *Plus ça change, plus que c'est la même chose.*

We should be prepared to agree that in technical

ability, and, in the narrow sense, moral integrity, the upper *administrative* personnel of the Bank "of England" is equal, if not superior to that of any institution of its kind in the world. At least since 1920, its structure has been modelled on the German-Jew cartel-controlling Banks, each industry having one or more Directors who have only to make a case to get practically all the finance they need. Other mechanisms, such as Nuffield Trusts, *etc.*, mould science, art and thought.

This being so, it is difficult to assess the activities of various monetary reformers, and their schools of thought, which agitate for "the restoration of money issue to the Government (or 'the people') to spend money into circulation to keep prices constant."

We are not concerned at the moment with the technical falsity of the objective; what we should like to get at is the nature of the idea they have in mind. If corruption, in the ordinary sense, is ruled out (as it is), what do they think they can 'do' to the Bank "of England"? Do they seriously think Parliamentary mechanisms can control it?

As things are, we consider that the demand, under various names, for the further centralisation of money-creation is the most dangerous activity extant. And many monetary reformers, who appear to be more concerned to damage private banking than to achieve individual benefit, are doing their half-baked best to assist.

The one fact which becomes clearer daily is that the value of the Parliamentary system DEPENDED ALMOST ENTIRELY ON THE FACT THAT IN THE DAYS OF METAL-COINAGE money SYSTEMS, the CENTRAL Government, whether it was King or Prime Minister, HAD TO GET ITS FINANCE FROM INDIVIDUALS.

The foundation of the Bank "of England," the Whig shop-window for Amsterdam and Frankfurt, struck a mortal blow, as it was intended to do, at the English governmental system. To "nationalise" the Bank, or to transfer its functions to the Treasury, would be merely to put what little remains of the lady inside the tiger.

The appointment of Mr. J. B. Chifley as Prime Minister of Australia in succession to Mr. Curtin is evidence of the smooth working of Wall Street control. Mr. Chifley has been Treasurer to the Commonwealth—the equivalent of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and is an instance of the strong preference of High Finance for the politician of humble origin as being more pliable and willing to take orders, however abominable. Australian finance has been pretty near the border-line of highway robbery for a good many years, even before the war: and Mr. Chifley has acquired a reputation, in good company, of leaving little to the Australian taxpayer over and above his car-fare. With Dr. Evatt to transmit the orders from Headquarters, there seems to be every probability that in Australia, as elsewhere, a good time will be had by all.

## DeFoe

Chapter heading to Pt. II. Chap. VII of DeFoe's *History of the Devil*:—"Whether is most hurtful to the world, the Devil walking about with his cloven foot, or the cloven foot walking about without the Devil?"

## A Portmanteau Parliament

(From Our Correspondent)

Canberra, July 6, 1945.

We have entered the phase of full steam ahead towards socialisation. Parliament is enjoying one of its longest sessions, but it sits only because it is constitutionally necessary for it to pass the legislation. Mr. Menzies has recently warned the public that to all intents and purposes Parliament has been suspended. He is right. 'Labour' has a clear and solid majority in both Houses, and legislation goes through substantially without amendment. The latest is the Banking Bills, and they, like the Repatriation legislation which preceded them, were 'guillotined' through. They are, of course, exceedingly complex, but the effect is simply to amalgamate the powers of Government and Central Banking. There has been a good deal of noise in the Press, but bank shares remain steady. When Lang attempted to interfere in the financial system, we were on the verge of civil war as a result; but not this time.

The next step is to ratify the UNCIO Charter and the signs are that this will be pushed through as soon as possible. The reason for this is that Evatt (Attorney General) believes that the fact that the Charter contains provisions for the promotion of full employment in all the signatory nations will give the Federal Government under the External Affairs powers of the Constitution the powers over the States which are excluded by the Constitution and which were denied in the Referendum. It is not certain that this is the case, but it is certainly the assumption on which Evatt is working. The matter can only be determined by testing the power in the High Court, which means that an Act must be passed, implemented, and then challenged by some individual or organisation affected by its operation. In the meantime there is nothing to prevent the whole legal system of the socialist State being set up complete, nothing being implemented and thereby laid open to challenge until it is complete; and how much notice would be taken of the High Court then is another matter.

The Mort Dock strike, which challenged the control of the Communists, appears to have had a salutary effect on the workers, and has probably loosened the control which the Communists had achieved. If, however, the Evatt-Copland plan comes off, the Communists would be redundant anyway. In the meantime they provide a distraction (though undoubtedly they take themselves seriously) and if necessary can be promoted in importance.

The reporting of the British electioneering has made it appear that Churchill is the main issue. References of his to the bureaucrats have been reported, but no others. We have been told, however, that the Prohibitionists have advised electors to write 'A drink-free Britain' across their ballot papers.

A correspondent named Richard Kisch supplies reports to the (Sydney) *Telegraph*, (Daily and Sunday). He links Mosley and the British Fascists, *via* The Independent National Party which is on the same floor as an anti-Semitic bookshop managed by Arthur Winn, 'a former member of the Fascist Party.' "The Independent National Party is also campaigning on behalf of the Conservative election candidates." "The Medical Policy Association has also captured public attention as a potentially dangerous organisation because of its dissemination of Hitler's raci-

anti-Semitic theories among doctors." *The Telegraph*, however, rather gave the show away by publishing an account from Kisch of Churchill's London tour; Kisch left him an aged and broken man, utterly defeated; but it published also the A.A.P. account, in which Churchill had a rough time, but came through well. *The Sydney Morning Herald* published more of the A.A.P. report, which revealed that Churchill got round after round of applause when the candidate moved a vote of thanks.

Curtin died yesterday, and it is not yet known who will succeed him. Chifley has been getting a good write-up in the 'Conservative' Press. In any case the chances of internal disruption in the Labour Party are increased, though to a lesser extent than would have been the case before the programme of socialisation was got under way.

## Enemy Patents

(The following from the Official Report of the House of Lords debate of March 22, 1945 is recorded for information and reference:—)

Lord Vansittart had the following Notice on the Paper: To ask His Majesty's Government—

1. Why the power to vest enemy patents in the Custodian of Enemy Property has not been exercised;
2. What is the number of enemy applications lodged with the Patent Office and still secret;
3. What facilities, if any, have been granted to industry to make the subject matter of such applications available for investigation and potential working;
4. Whether the system adopted in this country in regard to the granting of Emergency Licences to work enemy inventions is held to be as adequate and satisfactory as the procedure adopted in the United States;
5. Whether enemy patents will remain in the possession of, or revert to, the enemy after the cessation of hostilities; and to move for Papers.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, on previous occasions when I have had the honour to address this House I have tried to confine myself to subjects on which I could claim to speak with some expert knowledge. On this particular occasion I think it will be manifest to you all that I have no claims whatever as a lawyer, scientist or inventor. My approach to the problem is entirely that of national security, and on that ground perhaps I may recover some of my claim. Now I do not propose to detain the House with any account of the activities of German cartels. They, I think, have been well defined in one sentence of a Report of the United States Senate Sub-Committee which runs:

"They waged systematic economic warfare as a prelude to their military aggressions."

That, I think, is very largely true. But I am here to-day to speak about cartels as a whole, or even German cartels as a whole, but only about a part—the patent—a part which I think has been very greatly abused and on which the Attorney-General of the United States said some very harsh words as lately as the beginning of this week. Briefly, the complaint is this: that the Germans used this system, the patent system, as a means of preventing or discouraging manufacture and research in the countries of intended victims and thereby set up their own preparations for aggression while keeping their neighbours as short as possible.

Our experience in this respect has, of course, been in no way comparable with that of the United States. In the United States the story is almost incredible. It is exactly what President Roosevelt called it—a detective story. I would only add that it is a detective story with a multiplicity of villains and you know from the start that most of them are guilty. None the less, it makes a very exciting story. Although our experience has not been comparable, we also have not been entirely immune from these coils and toils, and among the secret war weapons of the Germans in peace-time one consisted of the laxities and indulgencies of the laws of other countries. That is rather a bitter reflection. It was a definite joint in the harness from the point of view of national security.

In what I am about to say to the House to-day, I am, of course, voicing my own strongly-held opinions, but it would be a great mistake to suppose that I am alone in holding them. On the contrary, I have a very considerable amount of support, I believe—indeed I know—both in science and industry, and I propose to quote very freely from those opinions. I confess that I do not, as a rule, like quotations, unless they are either beautiful or funny, and these are mostly sad. I also do not really very much relish quotations because I think it is better to have an opinion of one's own. But when I find a great body of opinion holding my views and holding them with much better authority and experience than I, I should be very foolish indeed not to make some use of them. I cannot do better than begin with the opinion on the great German chemical combine, I.G. Farben, of one of our own leading industrialists, and this is what he says:

"The world plan of I. G. Farben was conceived and brought into being by the protection obtained in all parts of the world through patents and trade marks by the use of each country's legislation, guided by legal experts of these countries."

Perhaps that is rather a humiliating thing to look back upon, and I am not sure that we have not got the roots of the trouble still with us. He goes on:

"Practically every conceivable industry was covered. Many vital and important products were not made at all in this country owing to the existence of these patents, which not only prevented their manufacture but also hampered research in the wide field covered by the patent."

In other words, he is saying very nearly what I said at the beginning of my speech.

That is a complaint looking to the past. Here is an equally authoritative complaint looking to the future:

"If the necessary steps be not taken to prevent it, we shall find a continuance of the same state of affairs after the war. The I. G. Farben will be able to proceed with large numbers of patent applications at present lying dormant at the Patent Office, as well as new applications for not only their own war-time inventions but for those which they have obtained from countries occupied by them."

I should like to be assured that that danger is not going to be allowed to subsist in the future. I might point out that according to the best of my information, which is strongly confirmed by all the researches carried out in the United States, the Germans hit upon and exploited the device of putting in applications for patents drawn in very wide and vague terms and covering all kinds of projects, and the purpose of that, in many instances, was to prevent exploration by others. That led naturally to the next item in the complaints of some of our own people:

"Whole fields of research are at present closed against us

(Continued on page 7)

## 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: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 14. No. 21.

Saturday, July 28, 1945.

### The "U.S.A.", "Germany" and "Russia"

Dean Inge has offered the opinion that "the upper and middle classes have no kick left in them; they are lying down to have their throats cut—largely, no doubt, out of patriotism." Failing to see anything specially patriotic about such a motive for self-immolation, and heavily discounting the view advanced by Dean Inge that the "large class of small rentiers, who have a certain stake in the country" alleged to have been created by the government "in the hope of staving off a violent revolution," and identified with the "new privileged class, organised Labour," will jib when they discover that there is no one but themselves to bear the cost of the "unlimited blackmail" they are levying, we suggest that Dean Inge might usefully try to discover a more realistic explanation for the prevailing lethargy, and do his best to make it as widely known as his considerable prestige will enable him. Whatever it is, it isn't patriotism which leads organised labour to lie down and have its throat cut, which is as truly what it is doing as what Dean Inge thinks the upper and middle classes are doing.

There is a prohibited way to look for an explanation of current events. The prohibited way to look is in the direction of the explanation. Look any other way you like. And Dean Inge, for some of whose sentiments we have the greatest respect, differs from most of his contemporaries chiefly in his having looked more consistently than they in one direction, instead of a variety of directions according to the prevailing 'climate of opinion.' "If" such and such happens, says Dean Inge, 'I shall not be obliged to look in the right direction.' In his own words, "We have struck a very bad patch in our history, but if we may look forward to a long peace, and I think we may, I have hopes that our civilisation will survive."

"If."

And, if not? Dean Inge thinks that what is abhorrent to "nine Englishmen out of ten" cannot possibly happen. It is happening all the time, and nothing can possibly stop it except to disclose to a sufficient number of people the true reason for its happening, which cannot possibly be their subjective attitude to its results, for that makes no difference.

The *Sunday Times* correspondent at Potsdam announced last week-end that 'the Allies' were believed to have abandoned finally the idea of breaking Germany up into several small States. We read the information, notwithstanding the formal dubiety, side by side with some passages quoted in this country from a report now a month old by Mr. Leo

Crowley, the American administrator of economic aid to foreign countries, and both informations with *The Tablet's* statement (July 21) that "The Russian authorities are to-day anxious to borrow from the United States immense sums, which Mr. Crowley has announced that the United States proposes to lend." If this happens, clearly the real rulers of Russia, wherever they may be, will not be in Russia.

*The Tablet* seems to be of the opinion that the centralisation of control over Germany is directed against, not to assist, the movement disclosed by Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of the American Senate's Sub-Committee on War Mobilisation, to provide "apparent anti-Nazi cover" for German heavy industry, which, "keeping all its ramifications abroad, is to give a secret home for the spirit and activities of the Nazi party."

Mr. Crowley said Germany had the "better part of her economic and industrial strength to-day, even though she could not marshal it immediately for a third World War." "Materially, Germany could recover and become a military menace in a very few years."

The only doubt seems to be whether we could not have at least the next two wars "right now"—if "we" wanted to. So much for Dean Inge's "if."

### The Unteachable

"Out of this war, a deep revolutionary crisis is growing. It is possible that I may be mistaken; but I seem to sense in this country the same atmosphere that was in Russia in 1916, and in Germany in 1917 to 1921. In many ways, Great Britain now resembles the Russia of 1916... my friend forwarded (this) to one of the most prominent men amongst the Conservative M.P.s who replied 'I do not think that the Continental people can teach us anything.' Oh, my dear Sir, it is not only the Continental people who cannot teach you anything—it is your own people also."

—*Centropress Bulletin*, July 12, 1945.

There are (according to various estimators from Max Eastman to Dr. Dallin) from seven to twenty million native slaves in Russia. To these must be added probably three to four million German prisoners and other "displaced" persons. France expects to "employ" about two million German prisoners who will be paid for to the French State, but only as State property, *i.e.*, the slaves themselves will merely be kept alive.

Between the years 1914 and 1945, Europe, under the influence of the Darwinian theory of automatic progress and the action of forces set in operation by the French Revolution, checked for a time by the failure of the attempts of 1848, and again reinforced by the Bolshevik success of 1917, has regressed materially, morally and spiritually by an amount which represents the laborious ascent of a thousand years. It is true that, for the moment, the blueprints of our lost achievements remain; but signs are not wanting to suggest that we are losing the ability to read them. The housing difficulty with its concomitant of tin-can miniature dwellings is only one example; we are reconciled to, and almost glory in, a general entropy which we do not recognise for what it is—the stampede of the Gadarene swine.

Their Majesties the King and Queen flew to Northern Ireland in a *Dakota*. Showing the flag, as you might say.

## “Where There Is No Vision . . .”

By BEATRICE C. BEST

The first number of *The New English Review* which appeared in May of this year is disappointing. Granted that it is an old review with a new name\* one expected, or hoped any way, to find in it a greater sense of reality and regard for fact than characterises most current publications. Indeed one may say that such a sense, and such a regard constitute the only excuse to-day for bringing out a new publication, or refurbishing up an old one.

Unfortunately one is bound to say that, judging by the first number, *The New English Review* can offer no such excuse. Two of its articles cancel each other out; one by Mr. D. R. Davies entitled “The Peril of Secularism,”—the other by Mr. Quintin Hogg entitled “British Industry After the War.” This fact alone challenges any claim to integrity and consistency of editorial outlook or policy.

Briefly, Mr. Quintin Hogg is all out for expansion—increased efficiency—increased productivity, resulting in the multiplication of ‘things.’ Within the framework of the present monstrous and unrealistic† system, Mr. Quintin Hogg is a realist, for the system demands endless proliferation as the price of its continued existence. His contemptuous dismissal of Social Credit as a quack panacea can therefore as contemptuously be ignored, since he nowhere questions the validity of the system, nor of the expansionist policy it demands. His indictment is a practical one based on the need for increased efficiency in production, and our failure to achieve it.

Mr. Davies’s indictment is a moral one, and based on a contrary contention, for he accuses modern man of an *obsession* with ‘things’; an accusation which, by implication, refutes the charge and deplors the aim of Mr. Quintin Hogg. He speaks of “the contemporary obsession with things,” of “modern man’s obsession with expanding consumption,” of “this obsession with material aims,” of “greedy appetite,” and says: “there can be no doubt that our Society regards the consumption of ‘things’ as the supreme end,” and much more to the same effect. His indictment might, perhaps, be summed up as an arraignment of the ‘Greedy Consumer.’

The first objection to be raised against Mr. Davies’s complaint is the simple and obvious one that man has always been obsessed—if ‘obsessed’ is the right word—with ‘things’; there is nothing new or contemporary about this ‘obsession.’ Our museums bear striking and incontestible witness to man’s interest in, and love for ‘things,’ both useful and ornamental. So far, however, as contemporary man is concerned the evidence shows that, in regard to some things at least, his taste has moved towards a greater simplification. A comparison between the Victorian taste in clothes and furniture and our own should convince us of this.

The second objection concerns the reason given for this ‘obsession,’ in so far as it may be said to exist, and characterise, in particular, contemporary man. From the extracts quoted above it is evident that Mr. Davies blames

the greedy consumer, and the “supremacy,” as he calls it “of expanding appetite.” It must be said at once that it is difficult to understand how anyone who sets out to instruct and advise on the “Peril of Secularism” can so misunderstand and misread the nature of the peril, and its underlying cause. Mr. Davies accuses the Daily Press of being characterised by an almost “complete absence of any discussion of fundamental assumptions.” But what can one say about Mr. Davies’s fundamental assumption, which he neither examines nor questions, namely that it is the consumer with his “expanding appetite,” his “unlimited needs” who is the cause of “the contemporary obsession with ‘things,’” of the “modern religion of material progress.”? Surely a superficial examination of his assumption would have led him to see that this “modern obsession with things” cannot be attributed to the consumer as such, that it is man as producer who is responsible, and even then only because he is the victim of a policy that forces this obsession upon him.

“How can you satisfy unlimited needs with limited material resources?” asks Mr. Davies. The picture suggested here of industry panting to keep up with the insatiable demands of the consumer would be funny, if such distortion and misrepresentation of the facts involved were not too seriously misleading.\* How does Mr. Davies’s picture square with destruction, sabotage, restriction, rationalisation, and all the various devices resorted to between the wars to keep production down to a level that could be reached by the consumer? How does it square with hire-purchase, and endless advertising efforts all with the object of getting this ‘greedy’ consumer to purchase the ‘things’ the producer has to sell, and indeed must sell if he is to live? These facts should make it plain to the most obtuse that it is not the consumer who forces, or tries to force the pace.

It is a mistake, Mr. Davies contends, to think of this “obsession with material consumption” in terms of a “struggle for mere existence.” He also says that: “In the modern man’s obsession with expanding consumption . . . physical necessity has become entangled with social and moral values.” But from the point of view of the producer the “obsession with material consumption” is a struggle for existence, and often for mere existence, being a struggle to sell, in competition with others, the ‘things’ he is able to offer to a consumer with insufficient purchasing power to buy them. Hence the desperate attempts at adjustment already alluded to, ‘hire-purchase,’ ‘rationalisation,’ etc. As for entanglement with moral values, Mr. Davies omits to mention the one overriding entanglement with the moral value attached to work; work here meaning a paid job, an obligation to earn your living. But as industry, owing to technical improvements (efficiency), is increasingly able to dispense with human labour this moral obligation becomes increasingly difficult to fulfil, and the whole struggle is intensified. Efforts must be made to make more ‘things,’ or devise more services to employ the displaced labour.† The *final* result is the making of ‘things’ in the guise of

\*At one point, however, Mr. Davies appears to contradict himself, for he says:—“To multiply the powers of production one must likewise multiply the capacities of consumption,” which suggests a contrary picture of industry trying to ginger up the consumer!

†A good example of the needless multiplication of goods and service is that of a business started with the object of placing small automatic cigarette machines in private houses. The person who placed them served them regularly with cigarettes,

\*Formerly published under the title of *Home and Empire*.

†That is, unrealistic in the sense of failing to reflect reality; but realistic from the point of view of those who find in it a perfect instrument for our enslavement.

bigger and better bombs; then all have 'work,' and the first phase of the struggle is over, for a time.

It is surprising the moralist cannot see that if 'things' were easily accessible an 'obsession' with them would decline and cease. This accessibility, or its possibility, exists to-day. The fact, however, is denied or obscured by those who have control over the claims to 'things,' ("the terrible power of the purse") and who, in order to use this power to control the lives of people must maintain an illusion of scarcity, or even by the destruction of war, contrive its actuality. It is nevertheless a deplorable fact that the power maniac finds, in the moralist, one of the chief supports for his diabolical policy. The reason for this is the moralist's fear of the corrupting influence of wealth, of possessions, and belief in the discipline of having to do without. But what the 'moralist' fails to see—or admit—is that this corrupting effect is due, when it occurs, to the power, the prestige, the privilege that *exclusive* possession bestows. This gives to 'things' an undue importance, and a false glamour to the thought of possessing them. "To the modern man," says Mr. Davies, "the pursuit of material wealth...embodies the will to self-affirmation, to excess, to glory." The pursuit of wealth for these ends has always existed; but in a society where an ample sufficiency for all was possible, in which to be 'rich' or 'poor' was a matter of choice and taste, the pursuit of wealth for "self-affirmation," for "excess," for "glory" would become meaningless and absurd. In such a society, it might be the 'poor' man who would gain distinction, being recognised as one who had ample resources within himself, and thus was more independent of 'things.' Indeed *voluntary* poverty has always conferred a certain distinction.

There is a verse in the Bible that says: "He giveth us richly all things to enjoy." It would be interesting to know Mr. Davies's reaction to it. Would he regard it as one of those prophetic utterances that can always conveniently be relegated to a remote future, and so, happily, need not concern us? To many, at any rate, it must always have seemed like a bad joke. The significant words are "giveth," and "to enjoy," words anathema to Government, and suspect to the 'puritan.' Both, however, make an exception in favour of 'charitable' gifts to the deserving poor. But when it is a case of the gifts of nature, or, as the Christian would say, the gifts of God, which might be bestowed freely both upon the 'just and unjust,' that is a different matter. These cannot be distributed, but must be classed as burdensome surpluses, or, as *The Times* once chose to express it—"The Malignant bounty of nature;" and this because the arbitrary laws of the economists, backed by the inexorable rulings of the moralists decree that a man may not eat unless he 'works.'

"Men do not create values; they discover them," is a statement of Mr. Davies's with which we can agree. Discovery, however, involves a search for something *we believe already exists*. It therefore involves a strict and impartial

and remunerated himself with the difference between the wholesale and retail price. The consumer neither demanded nor particularly wanted the machine; the hardest part of the work was canvassing to induce him to accept it. The whole business, from the making of the machines, to the placing and servicing of them, was with the object of enabling those concerned in it to earn a living, albeit in many cases a meagre one. So the struggle to get hold of the means of existence was accompanied by the further one of trying to make ends meet.

fidelity to, and a correct interpretation of all the facts which may lead to discovery. Without this integrity any research must be fruitless, and may be dangerous.

Furthermore, when Mr. Davies says:—"...belief in the reality of a divine, transcendent order, can alone break the Satanic tyranny of things which is strangling Western Civilisation..." one is constrained to add that this belief will be powerless to break such a tyranny while we disregard the realities of the temporal order in which it operates to our destruction.

"Where there is no vision the people perish." Unfortunately the idea of vision is generally associated with some imagined Utopia calculated to arouse starry-eyed wonder and admiration. But vision literally means sight—the power to see, and the only vision that can save a people from perishing is a vision of the truth. Mr. Davies does not help us to attain this vision. The 'Satanic Tyranny' of 'things' which is strangling 'European Civilisation' is not due, as he would have us believe, to man's greed, or the "supremacy of expanding appetite;" all the facts of the case are against his conclusion. The policy of Full Employment is alone responsible for this tyranny, by fastening on man the obligation to 'work,' irrespective of whether the fruits of his labour (whether in 'things' or services) are wanted or not. Nevertheless the *purpose* of this policy is not to multiply things, but to deprive man of freedom, and it is a perfect instrument for that end. For Full Employment, being no longer necessary in a power age to produce all we want, is an arbitrary imposition, and can therefore only be achieved by centralised control. Under this control work can be concentrated on grandiose schemes of doubtful worth to the consumer. These schemes will create a multitude of jobs, and with the multiplication of officials, inseparable from Government control, incomes can be distributed for claiming the consumer goods that will be permitted us. Thus a policy of Full Employment and comparative scarcity could be harmonised. The scheme is diabolically suited to the end in view. 'Satanic Tyranny' would be an apt title for it.

It is customary to-day to castigate mankind, and to lay at the door of his moral delinquencies the responsibility for the appalling mess in which he finds himself. All that is required apparently, to right matters, is a change of heart and a readiness to make ever more sacrifices. Mr. Davies has reinforced this view by adding to the list of man's failings "the supremacy of expanding appetite." It is unlikely that his charge will be disputed. For people are, by dint of repetition, convinced they need a change of heart, and must make more sacrifices; even if they are somewhat vague as to the direction of the change, and the nature of the further sacrifices to be exacted from them. Man needs castigating, it is true, and if Mr. Davies had charged him with sheer stupidity, instead of greed, such a charge might have helped towards his enlightenment. Man accepts himself as a moral delinquent; but how if he were accused of assinine, not to say criminal imbecility? That might touch his pride, and help to open his eyes.

"Come, let us reason together," is a biblical exhortation that should be heeded to-day. Only by obeying it may we hope to arrive at that vision of the truth that will save us from perishing. In the light of reason, then, it surely can be seen that in an age of increasing industrial efficiency—which, according to Mr. Quintin Hogg, means increasing

mechanisation, therefore decreasing need for human labour—a more absurd and idiotic policy, or moral direction, than that of Full Employment could hardly be imagined; nor it must be added, a more perfect one from the point of view of those who intend to master us.

Notwithstanding, Mr. Davies does not allude to it, and it is fair to suppose he takes the general view. Yet the policy is bound up with his subject, "The Peril of Secularism." For can a more secular aim be devised than work, not for the sake of wanted goods and services, not even for work's sake; but because of the arbitrary rules of a system, enforced by those who control it, that keep man bound to the ancient curse from which, by his discoveries, resulting from patient research, and obedience to the spirit of truth, he might, by now, so easily be delivered?

To spend most of your life earning your living, in obedience to the policy of 'High Finance,' is about as good a secular aim as any that could be devised by those who hope to destroy us.

The following words of Major Douglas point to the direction that should be given to the people by those who set out to help them in the present crisis. "But it has always been my personal opinion that the force on which we had to rely was not principally propaganda, but rather the awakening of public opinion, once it had been given the lead, to the explanation of the facts of the everyday world."\* (My italics.)

Judged from this standpoint Mr. Davies's article, and the Review in which it appeared, must be counted as having signally failed.

#### ENEMY PATENTS

(Continued from page 3)

and anyone except the holder of a patent containing such wide claims as are customarily made."

In many cases our enemy had no intention whatever of manufacturing themselves, so we come to the next complaint by a sufferer. Here it is, and again it is from a high source:

"We are to-day supplying many vital and important drugs which, prior to the war, were a monopoly of the Germans, thanks to a patent system in this country which afforded them protection, even though they did not manufacture here."

Vicious circles are rather hard to break, but even with my own limited observations of these matters, I have known cases where it has taken British firms eighteen months of expensive and protracted litigation to establish, in the teeth of the most obstructive and I might almost say, calculated and treacherous German opposition, a claim to a licence which should never have been in doubt. And so we come naturally to the next in the series of complaints:

"At the outbreak of war British manufacturers had perforce to apply, under emergency legislation, for licences to work enemy patents in order to supply the country's need of vital products protected by such patents."

That, again, is a complaint looking backwards, but in turn this complainant looks forward also, and he goes on:

"Unless definite action is taken to protect the situation, every manufacturer in this country who has engaged himself in any of these productions will, after the war, be barred from exportation to any countries covered by German patents."

This may sound to a good many people to be a very dry, barren and technical subject, but it is not really. I

repeat, it is what President Roosevelt called it, a detective story; or, if you like to put it another way, it is what it was said to be by a recent writer in the *Chemical Age*, a man who knows Germany very well. He said:

"This subject of enemy patents is a vital part of the problem of how to win the peace."

He went on to say that this is a subject which should not be of interest only to specialists and technicians (and that is one of the reasons why I have taken it up), but it concerns ultimately men, women and children the world over. I think that is hardly an exaggeration.

By way of rounding off this brief introduction to the subject matter of my Motion, I would mention one other point. Neither in applications for patents nor in agreements for the exchange of patents did the Germans habitually play fair. They very frequently concealed the "know-how"—that is, the special experience necessary to make a process commercially workable. They contrived also to extract royalties and, in the case of the United States at least, to extract a very considerable amount of military information while giving nothing in return. I submit to the House that it is essential that these royalties bought for use by British manufacturers in war-time should not be allowed in peace to revert to or get into the hands of our enemies, either directly or indirectly by means of cartels or any other arrangements. If these royalties are bought at all they should surely be brought into a fund on reparations account.

With that brief introduction I would pass to the specific points raised in my Motion. I understand that some three thousand odd emergency licences have been applied for comprising all sorts of products covered by enemy patents and therefore unavailable to this country at the outbreak of war, in the hour of our greatest need. I believe, moreover, that these patents are still on the file in the name of the enemy. I submit that there is a very great potential difference between licences still standing in the name of our enemies and licences vested in the Custodian of Enemy Property. I submit also that there is a very great difference between patents already granted and patents merely applied for and therefore still secret. There may be a great number of these and as none of them are available for inspection they are unavailable to British industry, however important. I want to know whether that secret information is going to remain the property of the enemy after the war and I hope I shall be met with a most indignant denial, but in any case I also want to know how many applications there are and at what date they were made. That I think covers the first three points of my Motion.

As regards the fourth I would like the House to know that in the United States power has been taken to vest in the Controller not only patents but applications for patents. In this country all applicants have to apply for an emergency licence and have also, I believe, to pay 5 per cent. royalty. In the United States licences are automatically available to anyone who cares to ask for one and I believe the royalty to be nominal. It would seem to me that the system prevalent in the United States is superior to our own. Our own Patent Office have defined their policy and I propose to give your Lordships the exact words. They have said their policy is "not to vest the enemy-owned patents in the Custodian" (as I think is authorised by the Enemy

\*Warning Democracy.

Trading Act, 1939) "but to empower the Controller to grant licences under such patents." I wonder what the reason for that is. I wonder all the more because I understand, in the case of patents granted for inventions in food and medicines, that licences are automatically granted to any applicant unless the Controller sees any good reason to the contrary. I wonder what the reason for that differentiation is, why that latter system has not been extended to wider fields, and what is the point and purpose of this half-way house?

(To be continued)

## Clearing House for Women

The following quotations, excluding the parentheses in square brackets, are taken from a penny folder issued by the Women for Westminster Movement:

*"How the Women for Westminster Movement Came into Being."*

"It has become evident that there will not be an adequate proportion of women in Parliament as an automatic result of their enfranchisement. Efforts in this direction have been made from time to time in the last few years by Mrs. Billington-Greig's Committee and by the Six Point Group. Dr. Edith Summerskill, M.P., [MRS. E. J. SAMUEL, M.P. FOR WEST FULHAM SINCE 1938, MEMBER OF THE LABOUR PARTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, PROFESSOR LASKI, IS AN ALDERMAN OF FULHAM, VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIALIST MEDICAL ASSOCIATION] has steadily urged women to organise to this end. In 1942 the Committee of Women's Publicity Planning Association, under the Chairmanship of Rebecca D. Sieff [ALSO CHAIRMAN OF W.I.Z.O., WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ZIONIST ORGANISATION, PRESIDENT OF F.W.Z., FEDERATION OF WOMEN ZIONISTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND,—WIFE OF ISRAEL MOSES SIEFF, OF P.E.P., POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PLANNING, ZIONIST FEDERATION OF G.B. & I., THE ORDER OF ANCIENT MACCABEANS, AND MARKS AND SPENCER'S; ADDRESS BROOK HOUSE, PARK LANE, W.1.] invited her to expound her plans; they were enthusiastically taken up, and Women for Westminster was launched. It has evoked response from women all over the country and with an amazing variety of suitable experience and qualifications."

"Women's Publicity Planning Association has given a fine central headquarters at 14, Dartmouth Street, S.W.1. which is serving as a clearing house for women who feel the call to perform public service in Parliament or on local councils. The Chairman of the Central Committee is Rebecca D. Sieff. For the initial work within the Parties there were at first Committees of influential women within each Party under the Chairmanship of Councillor Dorothy A. Bowker (Unionist), Dr. Edith Summerskill, M.P. (Labour), Mrs. Corbett Ashby (Liberal) and Miss Christina Foyle (Non-Party). Branches have developed in many of the large towns of England, Scotland and Wales on inter-party lines and the special Party Committees have been merged into a general all-Party Committee."

On the previous page appears the intimation that now is the time for women "not merely to patch the social scheme but to reshape it—not merely to man the party boat

but to navigate it." Also:

"The names of women with suitable qualifications will be recommended by individual members of Women for Westminster within the party concerned for inclusion in the party panel of candidates, and assistance is offered also in interesting organisations within the constituencies in promoting such candidates."

Under the heading "Speakers' Classes" appears (italics in original):—

"*Tuition by practised propagandists, rather than lessons in voice production*, is what we propose to offer to those who feel that they need such help. Practical lessons on the soap box in Hyde Park are a regular feature." Lectures chosen for mention as "typical of the education at Headquarters and other centres" are those by Alderman A. Emil-Davies [FORMERLY OF FRANKFORT, HON. TREASURER OF THE FABIAN SOCIETY] Jane Benney, (Editor of International Women's News) Rebecca Sieff, Dr. Edith Summerskill.

The obvious linkages of personnel, and similarity in policy and mode of operation, between this "clearing house for women," and the P.E.P.-Fabian Complex of planning, permeating and proliferating organisations, needs no emphasising.

A poster, which was first noticed on hoardings in central London on July 12, 1945, i.e., a fortnight before the publication of the results of the General Election, is of some interest. It advertises a Public Meeting to be held at the Central Hall Westminster on July 31, under the Chairmanship of Mrs. Corbett Ashby [a co-founder, with Mesdames Sieff and Samuel, of Women for Westminster]: "*Newly elected Women M.P.s*", it says, "will speak on 'Women in the Post-War World.'" Tickets may be obtained from the following addresses:—

- "Federation of Business and Professional Women, 20, Regent Street.
- National Union of Women Teachers, Flat 7, 5, De Vere Gardens, W.8.
- St. Joan's Social and Political Alliance, 55, Berners Street, S.W.1.
- Women's Freedom League, 144, High Holborn, W.C.1.
- Women's Publicity Planning Association, 14, Dartmouth Street, S.W.1."

The Central Hall Westminster is not a cheap place to book, and the certainty of those responsible for this poster that future 'representatives' in Parliament, of electorates at present unknown who will prove on July 26 to have chosen feminine M.P.'s will be willing to toe *their* line on July 31, is an indication of the extent to which control of women in politics has been for the time being successfully established.

C. G. D.

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

By C. H. DOUGLAS  
Price 2s. (Postage extra).

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.