

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 14. No. 7.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The Co-operative Wholesale Society, which does not make a profit, you know, Clarence, and therefore pays no taxes on it, has bought Stanford Hall, Loughborough, from the executors of the late Sir Julien Cahn, the multi-millionaire. It is to be used as a college.

Stanford is one of the most luxurious houses in the country, with a private theatre, marble lined bathrooms in dozens and beautiful grounds. It is interesting to note that everywhere the same process is in operation. The Brave New World, unable or unwilling to deal with the simplest housing problem, is placing its nominees in the monuments of an age and system which, if it did not wholly defeat the simple needs of food, clothes and shelter, left memorials to them which our Stalins are careful to annex for their own use. Meanwhile, we notice that suggestions, and even samples, of the temporary, or tin can, type come only from capitalist countries. Russia, if it is building anything, is too busy with Government Offices to bother about the proletariat.

It is significant that in Rumania, now under Russian domination, the land belonging to the co-operative societies has not been confiscated.

We have previously referred to a publication calling itself *The Protestant* the editorial board of which comprises Ruth Nanda Anshen, Karl M. Charowsky, Antoni Gronowicz, Joseph Haroutonian, Leonhard Ragaz and Henry N. Wieman. It emanates from New York and a recent number consists in the main of blatant communist propaganda, (including an attack on Great Britain for 'the guns turned against the heroic Greeks' by the Dean of Canterbury) an attack on the Polish Government in London, two attacks on Roman Catholicism and an article to prove that Sovietism is Christian. None of this would be worth attention but, in view of the obviously inspired origin of the production, the following extract from its editorial is important . . . "It is a new capitalism, matured, less reckless, conscious of a strength commensurate with the strength of empires, ready to embark on the business of empire for itself." (Our emphasis. Ed.)

"This cartel-capitalism will be controlled from this hemisphere, particularly the United States. . . *The curtain rises on the Stettinian-Stalin era of Capitalist-Socialist emulation.*" (Our emphasis. Ed.)

Well, you have been warned. If you don't believe it, observe the threats to starve you into submission.

A man's worst foes are those of his own household, and it is perhaps fitting, and not unfortunate that Mr. Mackenzie

King's declaration that Canadian troops used in the Pacific theatre of war would fight with the United States Army and not with their British comrades should be made within a few months of what will undoubtedly be the end of his long reign.

We have never seen the slightest reason to alter the belief that this war—and of course we include its 1914-18 stage—has one primary objective, and one only—to destroy the culture which had its roots in these islands and the bonds of association which have grown from it. There are further objectives, but they are unattainable until this is achieved. Mr. King has of course only been a minor agent; but the enthusiasm of the C.C.F., the Communist Party ("Progressive Labour") and the Canadian "Chatham House" organisations for him would suggest that what he can do to break us up he has done. The end is not yet, however.

It is an unfortunate fact that only a handful of individuals have at once the aptitude and the opportunity to appraise the forces threatening us with destruction. "The British are everywhere, and in potential conflict with the national interests of virtually every nation. Whether it be by ownership of distant colonies and coaling stations, or by the far-flung investment structure which is as powerful in Iran, Mexico and the Argentine as it is in India, Britain stands to-day destined to become world-enemy number one. She possesses what a great many people want and is at the same time vulnerable—a fatal combination. The very existence of her system makes her the symbol of the *ancien régime* against which all the world is now in revolt."

No, that is not a quotation from *Mein Kampf*. It is from a book by a gentleman called Zitt published by Macmillans of New York, and attracting wide attention. And not one *per cent* of its readers observes that it is the *nouveau régime*, the soulless era of mass factory production, and not the *ancien régime*, against which the whole world is in revolt, and America is its latest home.

"Among all the Entente economists, there is no doubt that Mr. John Maynard Keynes, British economic adviser at the Peace Conference, is entitled to the palm as the champion blunderer. As will be more and more clearly proved by the force of events, Mr. Keynes made himself the promoter of a formula of economic peace with Germany. This formula was so favourable to Germany's foreign trade that, without a doubt, it is largely responsible for the industrial crisis now [1922] affecting all the allied countries, and particularly Great Britain."

— *The Mystification of the Allied Peoples* by André Chéradame, p. 45.

Well, Lord Keynes represented us at Bretton Woods,

Clarence. You guess who will advise us at the next Peace Conference, if any.

In 1921 Edward Bernstein, the German leader of the Majority Socialists, publicly stated that he had proof that the Great German General Staff had furnished, in 1917, more than fifty million gold marks (£2,250,000) to Lenin.

“The Jew Rosenfeld [Red-field], alias Kameneff, in a report presented to the Congress [of Soviets], on March 15, 1921, did not beat about the bush in explaining why these concessions ought to be reserved for foreigners, to the exclusion of Russians. ‘If we recall the Russian capitalists, we shall be obliged to turn over the power to them; whereas foreign capitalists will be satisfied with improving the natural resources of Russia, without wishing to take possession of the sovereign power. *We shall grant them an economic concession, precisely because we wish to remain in power.*’” — Quoted in *La Liberté*, April 2, 1921.

The concessions were practically all given to German-Jews, either in Germany, or in the United States.

Within the orbit of their intelligence, the Germans are not fools, nor are they greatly given to useless, *i.e.*, objectless, public pronouncements. When, therefore, Hitler and Goebbels announce that the Germans will still win, it is worth while considering what they may have in mind.

The first consideration to recall is that, unlike the British public in general, the German makes no distinction between losing the war and winning the peace. If he wins the peace, what happened in the war doesn't matter. The soldiers were only cannon fodder, anyway, and the material damage, as in the armistice period, he can make the Allies pay for. That is to say, he has recent historic justification for believing that *having produced a widespread disintegration of morale by war, and having his agents carefully placed amongst the Allies to exploit “Labour” sentiment*, he can repeat, on a larger and possibly final scale, his uninterrupted drive to a Pan-Germanism of which the essentials are in process of construction by dupes of the Trades Union movement and their manipulators of the Royal Institute of International Affairs and P.E.P

“Early in 1939, four months before Hitler invaded Poland, war was ‘decided upon.’ Ambassador William C. Bullitt so informed Karl H. von Wiegand, dean of American foreign correspondents, on April 25, 1939, in the American Embassy in Paris. Von Wiegand, who first told this story in a dispatch of April 23, 1944, said Bullitt did not tell him who had made the decision. ‘He let me infer it,’ said von Wiegand.” — Carl Mote, Indianapolis.

Amidst the welter of statement and counter-statement in regard to the merits of Socialism, more particularly as exemplified by that earthly paradise, Russia, we think that one point, which is beyond dispute, ought to be kept before the people of this country, who are urged to become Socialists. Germany is the birthplace of Socialism; from the time of Bismarck and his assistant Karl Marx, Germany has had one primary national industry, war. The next exemplar of Socialism was Russia, her primary preoccupation since 1918 has been preparation for war. The next convert to Socialism

was Italy, whose particular brand it is convenient to call by its local name of Fascism, just as the Fabian cohorts never refer to National Socialism but always to Nazism. Italy immediately prepared for, and embarked on an unprovoked war.

If you want a war every few years, you know how to set about getting it.

The technique now almost universal in camouflaged agencies of the Bank “of England” such as the Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, the Lands Improvement Company, *etc.*, of charging twice the market rate of interest on loans, and calling half of it repayment of “capital,” has the effect of increasing the B costs in the A + B Theorem, thus increasing the normal disparity between price and cost. In war time, of course, this disparity disappears into war loans and war credits, and nobody pays for the articles produced—they are given away to the Germans and the Japanese. But wait a little, and see what happens to the war loans and war credits.

The art of “presenting” a ruler to the public is so highly developed that (as we have recently seen in the case of Earl Lloyd George) the raw material makes little difference to the picture.

For this reason, it is difficult to assess the effect of the death of President Roosevelt. The items of fact are (a) The Presidency of the United States is a much more powerful office than any European King ever was. (b) Mrs. Roosevelt was educated in England. (c) President Truman was not Mr. Roosevelt's choice or the New Dealers' choice, which was Mr. Wallace.

All that it is safe to say at the moment is that the chances of a useful outcome of San Francisco are worsened, and that Mr. Mackenzie King has had his *coup de grace*.

POLITICAL JIU-JITSU

“The war of political science bears the same relation to military warfare that Japanese jiu-jitsu bears to other forms of wrestling. Jiu-jitsu, based on a special knowledge of human anatomy, enables a very weak man, by means of a slight effort, by scientifically applying pressure to certain muscles at well chosen spots, or by holding certain joints motionless, under clearly-determined conditions, to master a much stronger man, *even though the latter is familiar with every other kind of wrestling, but on condition that the latter does not know jiu-jitsu.*” — André Chéradame: *The Mystification of the Allied Peoples*, 1922.

ROSENCRANTZ AND GUILDENSTERN

A correspondent points out that to our list of Rot-s and Geld-s we must add Rosencratz and Guildenstern in *Hamlet*:—

Ham. . . . Will you play upon this pipe?

Guil. My Lord, I cannot.

Ham. It is as easy as lying. . . Why, look you now, 'how unworthy a thing you make of me! You would play upon me; you would seem to know my stops. . .

— Act III, Sc. ii.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 20, 1945.

CIVIL SERVICE

Sir S. Reed asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the number of civil servants employed in 1939 and at the present time, distinguishing them from workmen employed in Government factories and dock-yards, etc.; and how the number now employed compares with that employed at any other time during the war.

Sir J. Anderson: On April 1, 1939, the number of non-industrial civil servants, counting each part-timer as a half, was 399,599, including 208,429 Post Office employees; the corresponding figure for January 1, 1945, was 716,044, including 218,846 Post Office employees. The number has declined during the past eighteen months. The Service reached its peak on July 1, 1943, when the figure was 730,625. Workmen employed in Government factories and dockyards are included in Government industrial employees and confusion is sometimes caused by adding the industrial figure to the non-industrial. In April 1, 1939, the number of Government industrial employees was 240,181 and on January 1, 1945, it was 675,326.

Sir F. Sanderson asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury if all civil servants who have endured evacuation from their homes for more than five years will be given an opportunity of returning to their home town after the war, in fulfilment of the assurance given in 1939.

Mr. Peake: No assurance has ever been given that civil servants evacuated from London in the early years of the war would eventually be brought back to London. As my hon. Friend is aware, some of the work which has been evacuated will have to remain in the provinces for a considerable time after the end of hostilities in Europe, and it has been decided that one branch of the Ministry of National Insurance will be located permanently in the provinces. It is obviously not possible to promise an opportunity of return to London to all civil servants working in these Departments if they wish to retain their posts, although efforts will be made, in consultation with staff representatives, to provide for such exchanges as are practicable.

Colonel Carver asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury whether in view of the figures published by the Ministry of Labour showing that industrial wages are now 82 per cent. above the pre-war average, he will publish similar statistics showing how much Civil Service salaries have increased over the same period.

Mr. Peake: I regret that this information is not available. In any event I am advised that in view of the very great changes which have taken place in the composition of the Civil Service during the war no valid comparison could be made.

PETROL USER (INQUIRIES)

Miss Ward asked the Minister of Fuel and Power (1) if he will give an assurance that in future when he has charges to make against any specific person he will do so through a court of summary jurisdiction where evidence must be publicly disclosed and not through officers of his Department;

(2) under what authority one of his enforcement officers

from the Northern Region cross-questioned a member of the public, whose name has been supplied to him, on evidence undisclosed as to its source alleging improper use of petrol, made inquiries at a hotel and refused when the allegation proved unfounded to tender an apology.

Major Lloyd George: In this case, information was received by officers of my Ministry that the individual concerned had travelled from his home to the seaside and was believed to have used his private motor-car for the purpose in circumstances suggesting a contravention of the Control of Motor Fuel Order. Inquiries were made into the matter by my officers in the ordinary course of their duties, first, in order to confirm the fact of the visit, and secondly in order to give the person concerned an opportunity of furnishing any information or explanation he wished. I have no reason to think that the inquiries were not made with courtesy and discretion. As a result of these inquiries, it did not appear that the Order had in fact been contravened. If, as a result of information received and of inquiries made by my officers, there is reason to believe that there has been a breach of the law, and I am advised that the case is one for prosecution, a charge against the person concerned is only made in a Court of Law.

House of Commons: March 21, 1945.

DISTRIBUTION OF INDUSTRY BILL

Sir John Wardlaw-Milne (Kiddermminster): ... every one of us wants to try to ensure that our depressed areas will be depressed no longer, and that they will receive a sufficient and natural growth of successful industry in the years to come. That is the object which the right hon. Gentleman has said is to be served by this Bill.

The point we have to consider, however, is what action the Government can take to achieve that object, and whether this Bill and its operations are likely to achieve it. I desire to be brief, and to make my position perfectly clear. I am confident that all a Government can do to try and promote industry in a depressed area is, in consultation with the local authorities, to give every possible facility for the construction of new works and for the development of new enterprises. I am confident that no Government can dictate or decide where an industry should be placed. I am aware that certain hon. Members opposite completely disagree with the views I am expressing, but that is the object of our being here and I desire to express my view clearly. I want to repeat that no Government, however constituted, is in a position to assist industry by deciding where that industry should go.

Mr. R. J. Taylor (Morpeth): Nonsense.

Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne: Any person desiring to found a new industry has to consider many questions regarding which this Government, or any Government, have no knowledge at all. I say it quite frankly—no knowledge at all. There are all sorts of conditions in the founding of a new industry which an industrialist has to take into consideration, such as water supply, labour supply, electricity, markets and climate. An interesting example of this last point is to remember the great changes which took place in this country centuries ago when industry changed from the East to the West Coast. The development of Lancashire is a definite example of the influence of climate upon the situation of industry. To my mind none of those things are matters

(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. 7.

Saturday, April 21, 1945.

More Voting

The first "Scottish Nationalist" has been elected to Parliament at Motherwell by a minority. In the Scottish Universities Constituency, an expert on nutrition has been elected by another minority. This expert (Sir John Boyd Orr) promised (or said it would be his duty) "to express the *ex parte* opinions of a man of science," quoted "the words of a leading financier [*sic*]: 'Whatever is desirable and physically possible is financially possible,'" and gave his opinion that "some form of world government is inevitable," views which Dr. O. H. Mavor ("James Bridie") thought to be wholly inconsistent with the surrender of policy determination into the candidate's hands, for, as he said in a letter to *The Scotsman*, "that is not a thing that well-informed voters ever do." The Motherwell electors may not be so uniformly in favour of practical socialism as they were before Mr. Bevin, *etc.*, demonstrated some of its effects.

It is, however, not of much use to develop a high degree of skill in the prompt closing of stable doors on empty stables, which is the only point of superiority we can see at present which the Motherwell electors might claim over their 'well-informed' contemporaries in the Scottish Universities.

Now that the technocratic Sir John Orr has 'got in,' to some extent at least, by quoting 'a leading financier,' our monetary reformers may at last see the point which we have submitted to their attention so often, namely that it is not the mechanism that matters but what you do with it.

This ballot-box democracy simply will not do. The prospect before us all, if we remain any longer at the mercy of even a properly-constituted House of Commons, is bleak in the extreme. Gladstone was right, as Kitson was right in pointing to the fact that it should be made impossible for any government to interfere in the slightest degree with money: to 'tamper with the monetary system.' The 'money-vote' is a constantly effective, continuing, voting system, and its integrity as a mechanism is destroyed when it is subjected to 'management' of any kind, always assuming that its 'full-employment' is directed to its presumed objective of distributing goods and services. Ration-cards, quotas, permits, *etc.*, *etc.*, destroy the use of money: they are the last stage of disfranchisement of the consumer and the elector. This situation is both intolerable and disastrous, and instead of extricating themselves from it, people are supinely awaiting each next instance of governmental encroachment upon their rights. "What are they going to do next?"—As soon as anyone gets into that frame of mind, the game is up: he need no longer concern himself with his rights: he has

52

already relinquished them. The situation must not be 'what can't I do now?' but that there is nothing that I cannot do within the law, and no government can impair that fundamental right.

The "C."B.C. and Communism

The following letter from Mr. Norman Jaques, M.P., to the Hon. L. R. LaFleche, Dept. of National War Services, Ottawa, reinforces the evidence of world-wide collusion in current political propaganda:—

Dear General LaFleche,

Thank you for your letter dated February 7 enclosing the report of the News Editor of the C.B.C. . .

I am familiar with the report of the Parliamentary Committee, with which I cannot agree. To say, as the News Editor does, that Mr. Coldwell has not received, for years, free publicity by the C.B.C. out of all proportion to his political importance seems to me to be grotesque.

The C.C.F. have no real claims to more free publicity than is given to Social Credit, but compare the publicity given by the C.B.C. to Mr. Coldwell with that accorded to the Hon. Solon Low. One very rarely hears Mr. Low's name mentioned in the C.B.C. news, but continual mention is made of Mr. Coldwell.

The truth is that from the beginning there has been rank discrimination against the Social Credit movement.

As for the Communists, they have "infiltrated" the C.B.C. as they have every other organisation. Of course Communists deny this; as Stalin has said, "Words must have no relation to actions. Words are one thing, actions another." (Such as the "Progressive Labour" Party). I suppose Messrs. Philpott, Davies (Davinsky), Lewis (Leverstein), M. Halton *et al.*, would deny their Communism, but when people consistently advocate its policies it's a safe bet they believe in them. With regards to "Comrade" Philpott, the C.B.C. told me that, due to paper shortage, they could not send me copies of his broadcasts which backed the E.L.A.S. against the British.

To-day a friend in Ottawa writes of a broadcast by H. L. Stewart and Jerome Davis lauding Russia—"Which does not want to push its doctrines in any other country." (Dr. Stewart is, or was a director of Union Now). Next week Comrade Philpott is to broadcast more "words without relation to actions." When will the C.B.C. broadcast the outrages perpetrated by the E.L.A.S. in Greece as published by the British Government?

The C.B.C. claim they play no favourites. Let them put those words into action by granting Social Crediters adequate facilities for answering Messrs. Coldwell, Davies, Philpott, *etc.* Until they do, my charge stands—the C.B.C. is exploited by Communism, confessed or denied, in the interests of Moscow.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Frigon, to the President of the Social Credit Association of Canada and to the Secretaries of our organisations in each Province, inviting publication of its contents.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) NORMAN JAQUES.

Mirror, Alberta, February 20, 1945.

An Open Challenge to Freedom Lovers

By BEATRICE C. BEST

There is a question—and it is surely the supreme acid test question of the day—that one feels constrained to ask all those who are sincere defenders of our liberties and champions of our individual freedom. (It is necessary to stress the word 'sincere' by reason of the lip service paid to freedom by those who use the word to camouflage their very different and contrary purposes.)

The test question is: "Do you believe in full employment?" Although it is a question of crucial importance, it is one that is begged from the outset in all discussions, political or otherwise, into which it in any way enters, and it should therefore be subjected to careful scrutiny.

It is necessary, first, to agree about the meaning attached to the term 'full employment,' for it can be used in a purely academic sense to mean the employment of all the labour necessary to develop "to the full" the resources of the nation. Thus, if one man pulling a few levers, and pressing a few buttons could produce all the community wanted, that would mean full employment. However, that is not the general meaning attached to the term; and a man whose living depended upon his getting a job would not be interested in it.

To avoid misunderstanding then, one might recast the question as follows: "Do you believe that industry should provide everyone with a paid job, or enable everyone to procure a paid job?"—industry, of course, being taken to include the various services as well as the production of goods. It is necessary to be exact, because the question is not intended to mean "Do you think people should work?"; it means "Do you believe economic compulsion should be applied to make people work?*"

So far as can be judged from the writings and public utterances of those who would defend our freedom one feels entitled to assume that their answer to this question would be 'yes,' less from anything they say, however, than from the fact that they never raise this important question. So one can only suppose that in this, if in nothing else, they join forces with all those who put 'full employment' in the forefront of their political aims.

If one is correct in this surmise one is entitled to ask further, "Why then do you oppose, and inveigh against, government planning and controls? Is it not evident that private enterprise in a power production age cannot work economically, efficiently, and profitably, and at the same time provide full employment? Unless, that is, you are prepared to assess the efficiency of industry by the amount of time spent, and labour employed. But a government concerned, primarily, with full employment can disregard questions of efficiency, and by means of planning, and the necessary controls due to planning, can multiply jobs in any amount of wasteful ways not open to private enterprise. Hence to insist on the maintenance of private enterprise, and to favour at the same time a policy of full employment is a case of trying to have it both ways."

However the answer to this question of full employ-

*The first question relates to a matter of opinion or belief alone; but the second relates to, and implies, a desire to impose, or enforce, action in accordance with a belief, on others; i.e., to dictate.

ment might be in the negative. It might be acknowledged that the advent of the 'power age' made full employment and efficiency impossible partners in industry. In that case it would be necessary to ask, "What, if you are prepared to sacrifice full employment to efficiency, are you going to do about the unemployed? You object to the increasing extension of the Social Services, and the high taxation extorted by the State for such a purpose. What do you propose? Support provided by public and private charities, accompanied by a moral 'means test,' i.e., charitable support given to the deserving poor?—Or what?"

Well, it must be left to the lovers of freedom, and the champions of private enterprise and individual responsibility to extricate themselves from this impasse, since they have ignored, rejected, or damned with faint praise the one man who has revealed the one and only way out of it.

A review by Mr. George Orwell of *The Unquiet Grave: A Word Cycle* by "Palinurus," which appeared in *The Observer* on January 14, throws, perhaps, some light on the curious phenomenon presented by the refusal of the champions of freedom to face the issues involved in this fundamental question of full employment, and come down to "brass tacks." It may explain this refusal, or the lack of appreciation that the question is fundamental, and the failure to acknowledge that, until it is faced, all talk of freedom and independence, all opposition to state control and high taxation, must appear as "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

When examined, the object of this review appears to have been less one of literary criticism than an exposition of Mr. Orwell's views on the subject of an *unearned income*. A few examples may serve to illustrate Mr. Orwell's bias: He says for instance, "On almost every page this book exhibits that queer product of capitalist democracy, an inferiority complex resulting from a private income." Again, "It is a cry of despair from the *rentier* who feels that he has no right to exist. . . ."* And he speaks of one ". . . carrying the burden of an unearned income."

Now whether Mr. Orwell is right in supposing that "Palinurus" suffers from an "inferiority complex," or a feeling of "Despair" due to the fact that he is "carrying the burden of an unearned income," or whether Mr. Orwell is indulging in wishful thinking doesn't matter, for, as already suggested, the interest and importance of the review lies in the revelation of Mr. Orwell's own mind on the subject. It is pretty clear from it that, at any rate, Mr. Orwell thinks "Palinurus" *ought* to suffer from an "inferiority complex," and a feeling of "despair." That he himself would so suffer, and feel he had "no right to exist" if he had to carry the "burden of an unearned income." Furthermore it may be inferred that Mr. Orwell would not approve of lightening this sense of burden by recommending that others also might be allowed to bear this 'affliction.' For Mr. Orwell, being of the 'Left,' does not believe in an unearned income, he believes in the Work State; hence the sense of guilt is attached to the fact that, 'I have an unearned income,' and *not to the fact that others are without.*

In this Mr. Orwell is consistent; he is out for the Work State, and no nonsense about it. His attitude possesses an integrity and single mindedness of purpose which makes it easy for him, and for those who think like him, to support

*Mr. Orwell would, it seems, see eye to eye with Lord Keynes who is out for the euthanasia of the *rentier*.

and follow a policy of full employment without misgivings relating either to taxation or controls. But integrity and single-mindedness give strength to any cause, whether good or bad, in which they are enlisted. Therefore this attitude is extremely useful and important to those who also pursue a policy of full employment, not for its own sake, but for the sake of the necessity it creates for increasing state control, and ultimately for the power to order men's lives that such control delivers into their hands.

This integrity and single-mindedness are lacking in those who have no bias against an unearned income. Far from regarding it as a 'burden,' they recognise the value in both the freedom and independence it bestows on its possessor. The weakness of their position lies in the fact that, though their belief in freedom supposedly rests on Christian principles, their belief in the validity of inheritance rests on no such absolute foundation. It is subject to conditions. For they would limit it—and therefore, and in consequence, the freedom it gives—to those who by good luck or good management have been able to save and invest—and thus may be said to inherit from their own past endeavour—or to the rights of family inheritance or generically to transfer of ownership. Their belief in freedom is therefore reserved, and they are guilty of a divided loyalty, and subject to the weakness inherent in such a division. For they stand, as it were, with one foot in the Old dispensation which decreed that man must earn his living by the sweat of his brow, and the other in the New, which enjoined us to regard the "Lilies of the Field." But the Christian has no warrant for this reservation, for if he believes, in fact, that we are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ then this inheritance, and the freedom it gives, must be open to all.

The facts of the case should be examined in the light of the statement that the truth shall make us free. What are they? They are (1) that the power of industry to-day to produce increasing wealth with decreasing labour is an inheritance due to men's work in the past, their inventions, their researches, their discoveries and scientific achievements down the ages, resulting in what we know as the Power Age. (2) That this "cultural inheritance" is, in reality, an "un-earned increment of association" deriving from this past. It would not be necessary to draw attention to these obvious truisms if their implication was not entirely ignored. This neglect is a sin against the Holy Ghost. For can it be denied that this heritage is the fruit of the spirit operating in man to help and inspire him—whether he has been directly conscious of it or not—to throw off the yoke of bondage to purely material ends? Or is it contended that the object of this process has been for the sake of ever expanding trade, the struggle for markets, the development of 'backward' countries, the endless multiplication of gadgets, full employment, and in the end, again, and inevitably, war?†

One might draw this conclusion from a notice of Sir William Beveridge's *Full Employment in a Free Society* that appeared in a contemporary monthly Christian Review. In this the reviewer, referring to unemployment, states that "the main cause is that effective demand for the products of industry is not large enough to employ all available man

power."‡ And he goes on to point out that to ensure full employment "a policy must be designed to maintain a total outlay of purchasing power so that the demands for the products of industry is so high that it cannot be satisfied without using all the available manpower." It takes one's breath to find a Christian body endorsing a policy so grossly materialistic, and so subversive of the natural order, as to insist on a surfeit of consumer demand, not for need or desire, but solely in order that industry may maintain full employment. It is a dreadful witness to the misleading, corrupt and degrading influence exercised by the fetish, or *idée fixe* of 'full employment.'

But what have the devotees of freedom to offer as an alternative to this materialistic aim? Are they prepared to remain silent while this age-old inheritance continues, as heretofore, to be held back or wantonly destroyed; or (as appears to be the plan now) perverted from its true and righteous end of implementing freedom, to that of establishing a work-slave state? If not are they prepared to demand its distribution in the only way an inheritance can be distributed, by means of a dividend? And because this inheritance is national (and in the nature of the case cannot be specifically assigned to particular persons, or group of persons) to distribute it through a National Dividend to every individual by right, and not by favour? Or do they, after all, agree with Mr. Orwell that—with certain exceptions—an unearned income is, or should be regarded, as a somewhat shameful burden, instead of what it really is—a guarantee of freedom—freedom to choose, to act, to say 'no,' to contract out? Does their love of freedom fall short of faith in its efficacy? Are they held back by fear of its results?

In all this it is not ignored that the plot was well and truly laid. First, the contrivance of years of depression, and needless and wanton unemployment, and the degradation of the means test and the dole. Thus a paid job could be made to seem the be-all and end-all of existence, and full employment to have a prior call on all political aims. Then war again, and relief from unemployment, and prospects of post war employment to repair the damage, wastage and losses of war.* Furthermore the situation thus created has also been exploited to attack and throw discredit on private enterprise. With the aim of full employment placed well to the fore, along with the tacit assumption that its provision is the function of industry, we are now being told that private enterprise has failed because it cannot employ "the whole available man-power." Therefore it must be taken over, or controlled by the state, which has the means and the power to provide full employment, such means and power being inaccessible and denied to private enterprise.

Thus it may be seen how the final phase—perhaps—of a long term policy, the diabolical ingenuity of which could hardly have been greater, has first fostered, by satanic means, and then utilised the belief in full employment to serve as an occasion, an excuse, and a means whereby man's activities may increasingly be brought under the direction and control of the State.

It may then, in conclusion, be justly asked what the true lovers and defenders of freedom are doing to oppose

†Referring to the unity of the Big Three, Mr. Eden is reported as having said that he believed that if they could hold this unity they could establish peace for 25 or 50 years—who could say?

‡Note the implication that the function of industry is to employ labour, and the function of 'effective demand' to enable it to do so.

*Though certain statements made by Mr. Maxton in the House of Commons on June 22, 1944, and quoted in *The Social Crediter* of July 8, 1944, throw certain doubts on this prospect.

the forces which, in the name of freedom itself "Freedom in Security" are working to complete man's regimentation, and condition him to fit the place assigned him in the World Work State that is being so carefully planned?

So far as one can see their attempts at opposition are confined to the exposure and denunciation of what one may call the end results† of a system expressly designed to implement a policy inimical to the welfare, and destructive of the freedom of mankind. This serves the purpose of the designers of that policy well, for if people can be kept busy in this way the odds are their attention will be diverted from the primary cause of the several evils they fight to counteract. For the rest, they confine themselves to lamenting our lost freedoms, and some cast nostalgic backward glances to what *The Times* has been pleased to call "19th century prosperity."

But the true way to freedom is known, and there is still a chance for those who really love freedom to help in the defeat of the powers that would enslave us. Only there is not much time left now before the prison gates close finally upon us.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

on which the Government have full information, or upon which I, as an industrialist, would trust Government knowledge and opinion.

The description which my right hon. Friend gave of the excellent work of the Ministry of Production in war-time as a reason for continuing it in peace-time, was a little unfair. There is no comparison at all between the conditions which this country has tolerated—I use that word deliberately—from the Ministry of Production and other Government Departments for the purposes of the war, and the continuance of those conditions into peace. To use that as an illustration was, frankly, a little unfair. I want to make it clear to the House that, from my point of view, it is fundamentally wrong to try to bring about the objectives on which we are all in agreement by a Bill of this sort, which imposes restrictions in every direction, and will hamper industry all round. The President of the Board of Trade described at great length how he was acting in accordance with the White Paper on Employment and he read certain cogent and interesting extracts from the White Paper. He said that paragraph

†An interesting analogy may be drawn here between Social Credit and F. Matthias Alexander's discovery that the physical ills afflicting us are due in the main to the wrong use of the mechanism of the self. Until the right use of this mechanism has replaced the wrong one, doctors will continue to fight a losing battle in their efforts to cure what are, in effect, the end results of the wrong use. In a corresponding sense Social Credit has revealed the wrong use of the mechanism of money, and the appalling results of this misdirection, and the futility of the efforts of social reformers to eradicate these evil results while continuing to ignore their initial cause. A further correspondence can be seen in the fact that, as Mr. Alexander shows, this wrong use of the mechanism, owing to long persistence in it, feels 'right' and any effort to use the mechanism correctly feels 'wrong.' In the same way our wrong use of the mechanism of money feels 'right,' i.e., it is 'right' to have to earn a living, it is 'right' to expect industry to give full employment. Equally the right use would be felt 'wrong,' i.e., the idea of a national dividend is regarded with disapproval, even scorn, as 'money for nothing,' and the absolute displacement of men in industry by progress in the application of scientific methods is felt as a calamity. It is easy to see how useful this 'right' feeling attached to the wrong use of money is to the 'powers that be,' and how important it is to them to foster it.

30 showed quite clearly how the Board of Trade are going to consult with various Departments, because

"no single Department could conveniently undertake the responsibility for formulating and administering the policy for the distribution of industry."

The White Paper goes on to describe the various Departments that will be consulted. Where is this in the Bill? There is not a word of this in the Bill. There is nothing whatever to prevent the Board of Trade from telling any industrialist, "We will not have your factory, or you cannot build your extension," without consulting with anybody. It is no use the right hon. Gentleman saying to the House, "I am responsible for planning, I am working together with my dear friend the Minister of Town and Country Planning and my bosom friend the Minister of Production; we are working in the closest harmony and nothing is done without consultation." There is not a word to demand this consultation in the Bill and there is not the slightest reason why the right hon. Gentleman, or anybody who may be his successor in any future Government, should not absolutely veto any extension of an industry and thereby possibly even destroy it. There is in one Clause, a ridiculous provision, that nobody may build an extension to a factory over 3,000 square feet. This is control carried to a most absurd limit. If the House tolerates this kind of thing, it will be putting the industrialists entirely under the heel of the Board of Trade and nobody else. . .

Mr. Kirkwood (Dumbarton Burghs): The hon. Member for Kidderminster (Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne) wants private enterprise.

Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne: I understand the hon. Member's interruption, he realises that this is the very antithesis of private enterprise. This is bureaucracy and Socialism carried to the last limit. The right hon. Gentleman went on to quote from the White Paper the statement that there must be a single channel through which the Government's policy can be expressed, and that is to be the Board of Trade; but let hon. Members note that the White Paper adds: "suitably strengthened to undertake the heavier responsibilities." There is not a word in the Bill about how the Board of Trade is to be strengthened. All these ideas about what the Government are going to do by way of consultation will mean nothing to the people who will have to act under this Bill if it becomes an Act of Parliament. It may be perfectly sound to exert pressure to induce new industries to go into the depressed areas, as we all desire, and I have not the slightest doubt that inducements can be given in consultation with the local authorities in those areas; but it is fantastic to believe that you will make prosperous industries in the depressed areas by putting all kinds of restrictions on industry as a whole. . .

Sir George Schuster (Walsall): . . . I submit that this is a very serious Measure. It is our first practical step in a consciously planned economy. It gets beyond White Papers and general principles; it has got teeth. In effect, it says that priority in post-war industrial development is to be given to certain parts of the North-East Coast, West Cumberland, South Wales and Scotland. . .

Now, I wish to make clear that I am not myself particularly in favour of the exact Barlow Commission plan. In fact, the Commission was divided and put up a number of different plans. I certainly do not want to speak as one who advocates setting up an independent authority with great powers outside the control of Parliament. But I do accept

the Barlow Commission's recommendation to the extent that I want to see some body which stands outside the political field, which is capable of making an entirely independent and objective review of our position and to keep it under constant survey...

In my view the prosperity of South Wales must be linked with the development of the natural resources of South Wales—chiefly coal—so as to make it a centre of cheap power, a home for new electro-metallurgical industries, or for using the derivatives of coal to start new chemical industries... In the first place I want to see recognition that *all* areas deserve consideration as part of a national plan... I want to urge the need for proper surveys in all regions. I want decentralised and continuous surveys—it can be done...

It will be clear from what I have said that I do not exactly support the Barlow Commission's Report. Nor do I want an over-centralised machine under the Board of Trade. I want central guidance, and a spirit of co-operation between the Government and industry, with industry being given the information that it wants, so that it can respond intelligently...

A GUILD OF CATHOLIC DOCTORS

Artificial insemination and the encroachment of the State on the liberty of the medical practitioner were the immediate reasons given by the Archbishop of Westminster at a recent meeting in London for his invitation to form a diocesan guild of Catholic doctors, which he said was well known to be needed to give the Catholic doctor the guidance and backing required to combat the forces of materialism. A Catholic doctor would not be a party to an operation for the production of what had been described as test-tube babies. Concerning the proposed National Health Service, we had been informed that the Government had made certain changes, but the public was not permitted to know what those changes were. It reminded him of the famous Green Book which was issued before the White Paper on Education. The Minister had stated that the public would have supreme control through the normal machinery of Parliament. Theoretically that might sound true, but "you and I know how little say the public has in these matters when once they are settled by statute."

IDENTIFICATION

"A parent who enrolled his infant son on the National Register the other day discovered that the baby's identity card was valid "until 1960 only." This must not be taken to mean that by 1960 we shall no longer be using identity cards. Pressure, we learn, is being placed on the Government to retain the cards after the war, and presumably some people would like us to be officially tagged all our lives.

"Besides, why should we not have a secret police in this country? There is little use in turning people into filing cards unless you can periodically frighten them out of their skins by summary check-ups. And there is nothing like a secret police for making the populace respect red tape.

"As things are at present, there are so many laws that people are breaking them all the time and getting away with it. There must, for instance, be hundreds of people who have sent shell eggs by post in a criminal way, without being found out. Other bestial practices also flourish unchecked. What this country badly needs is more policemen."

—A Scotsman's Log in *The Scotsman*.

THE ISSUE

Electoral Canvass for an Anti-Bureaucratic Representation.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd. 1d. each, 3/6 a hundred.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy.....	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(<i>reprinting</i>)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Warning Democracy.....	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction.....	6d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	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.	
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate.....	3d.
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
The Issue: Electoral Canvass for an Anti-Bureaucratic Representation.....	1d. each; 3/6 a hundred.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.).....	1d.
The Representative's Job.....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
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.