

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 15. No. 12.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"New York City. Mass Meeting to celebrate the victory of the British Labour Party in Town Hall, Friday, September 14 at 8-30 p.m. Prominent speakers of the British Labour Party, C.C.F. of Canada, Social Democratic Federation and Jewish Socialist Verband will salute our British Comrades.

Three outstanding Social Democrats are candidates for public office—Louis P. Goldberg for Councilman, Brooklyn; Harry Kavesh, for Municipal Court Justice and Mark Starr for Councilman."

—The *New Leader* (U.S.A.), August 25, 1945.

Hands across the sea, ithn't it?

The same number of the *New Leader* in which the foregoing notice appears contains an obviously honest, and desperately funny comment on Social Credit. The following extract will serve to illustrate the level of criticism:

"Douglas's theories dealt largely with the use of credit as a means of manipulating the economy. (Our emphasis)... He accepted the notion that the expansion and contraction of credit leads to inflation or deflation, and that the amount and velocity of money in circulation raised or depressed the price levels. He claimed basically, that the fault of the system was that it was controlled by private bankers...." Waal, waal, waal.

Two incidents in this week's Parliamentary proceedings will if we are not mistaken be seen in retrospect as historic. The first has been carefully played down in the Press—the announcement by Mr. Chuter Ede of a complex ruling which, as far as it can be understood, provides for the admission of approximately five alien Jews for each of the "refugees from Hitler's tyranny" to this country. And the second is the four and a half hours debate on the Scottish Hydro-electric Schemes, concluding with a statement that the Government would put on the whips and stand or fall by it. We intend to return to the subject of both of these incidents, which are clearly connected with the conditions under which the Socialists have been assisted to office, although entirely unconnected with such mandate (purely negative) as they possess. In the meantime, we hasten to advise the so-called Conservative Party to disabuse themselves of any idea that the strong resentment evoked by the Tummel-Garry proceedings is a step to their reinstatement. We have had some.

There is going to be something quite other than the fraternal passing of the baby which enables Mr. Churchill to take a holiday where the food is better.

The first fact which it is necessary for the people of

these islands to grasp is that they are in the grip—not of the "Workers" but of the most genuinely reactionary elements in the country, the Big Business men, who again are being led by alien influences which they think they can use as they use "Labour." The real control of this country has not changed since 1931, at least. The Tory politicians of the nineteenth century were as far ahead of the tycoons of the Clyde (the curse of Scotland), and the Cartels as Florence Nightingale of Charlotte Corday. But "Toryism" has been cleverly besmirched because of its implicit claims to culture. And d'markrazi will bear anything if only it is "common." "Commonness" is a synonym for reaction and failure.

According to the "B."B.C. news bulletin of November 16, 8 am., there are fourteen and a half millions of people in civilian employment in these islands at this time—nearly one third of the total population of men, women, and children.

We have rarely heard a more frightening statement. What are they doing? What are we getting for their employment? How many more of the men, women and infants must be employed before the standard of living approaches that of a devastated country? For how many years has this country to be at the mercy of people like Sir Stafford Cripps before the general population can buy a motor car?

It is obvious that this "full employment" racket is rising to the dimensions of delirium, and no great gifts of prophecy are necessary to predict an industrial cataclysm which will leave 1929-32 as a landmark of prosperity.

The 'Monetary Reform' Hoax

The *Canadian Social Crediter* for October 18 admirably summarises the results of confusing Monetary Reform with Social Credit in an article on *The "Monetary Reform" Hoax* in its issue for October 18.

"Once again," says the newspaper, "we find it necessary to stress that probably the most deadly menace which threatens to weaken and disrupt the Social Credit Movement everywhere is the well-meaning, but misplaced trust, of some supporters of Social Credit in 'monetary reform' and 'national control of money.'

"As we have pointed out repeatedly, the term 'monetary reform' is meaningless. It can be made to mean anything. It can be applied to the nationalisation of the banks, to a change in the size and colour of currency notes, to a change from a national to an international monetary system, or any interpretation which any slickster cares to place upon the term.

"Likewise the expressions 'national control of money' or 'national control of the monetary system' are just about

as futile but even more dangerous. It can be—and, for that matter, is being—used to describe the brand of 'monetary reform' introduced by Hitler as the basis of the Nazi economy—namely, the nationalisation of the banking institutions without any fundamental change in the system. This simply had the effect of transferring the centralised power of finance over human life and every aspect of the national economy, from a gang of private adventurers operating a monopoly to a gang of political adventurers operating a monopoly—namely, the political party in office. The only difference being that the latter could operate the system in the name of 'the State' with all the sanctions of the law and the forces of the State to back up their control.

"This is the financial policy of State Socialism and Communism wherever they rear their heads. And the record tells the story."

The following instances are given:—

IN RUSSIA AND GERMANY. The nationalisation of the banking system as a highly centralised State Monopoly under the control of "the Party" was carried out in Russia and Germany. It has been the official policy of socialist parties the world over.

NEW ZEALAND. In New Zealand, the strong Social Credit Movement which existed there, became obsessed with the "monetary reform—national control of money" complex, and was tricked into giving its support to the socialist Labour Party and probably was instrumental in that party's election. All they got for their pains was the nationalisation of the Central bank without any change in system. Taxation rose to fantastic heights. Debt increased. The shackles of "the State" were fastened on the people with increasing rigour. And once entrenched, the socialist government became the bitterest antagonist of Social Credit.

IN CANADA. In Canada the Liberal Government embarked on a "progressive" policy of State Socialism. It "nationalised" the Bank of Canada without changing the system. Since then the money power has become more strongly entrenched, while, as in the case of New Zealand, taxation and debt have been increased by leaps and bounds behind the camouflage of war demands and of bogus social security measures.

ELSEWHERE. The story is the same in Australia during the short term its socialist government has been in office.

"And now," the article goes on, "with a Labour Government committed to State Socialism in Great Britain we shall see the same policy being faithfully carried out.

"What seems so difficult to get into the heads of some Social Crediters is that the mere transfer of the centralised power of monopoly control from several private institutions to a single State institution possesses no magic. Far from minimising the threat of financial dictatorship, it increases the danger.

"State monopoly is far more vicious than private monopoly, because there is no escape from its domination. Revolt against a private monopoly is simply a matter of exercising the ordinary rights of citizenship—but revolt against a State monopoly constitutes revolution.

"A political group elected to office—*i.e.*, a group of party politicians, probably having the support of a minority of the people under our present electoral system—with a monopoly control of finance, industry, commerce and trade, backed by the sanctions of the law, the police and

the armed forces, are virtually dictators of the nation. They have a complete concentration of power in their hands. And wherever there is a concentration of power, you will find the would-be dictators scrambling to fill the positions of control. Furthermore, while all power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely.

"Yet this monopoly control by the party in office exercised in the name of the State is the official policy of socialist and communist political groups—whatever they may call themselves—and it is put forward in the name of 'democracy.'

"Here in Canada it is most significant that the leaders of the avowed socialist party—the C.C.F.—who hitherto have been jeering at Social Crediters for their 'monetary reform' ideas, have suddenly become fanatical 'monetary reformers' themselves. They urge 'national control.' They denounce the financiers and pillory their scarce money racket. Yet analyse their policy and it simply boils down to the nationalisation of the banking institutions—the transfer of their private monopoly control to the State and that means the C.C.F. Party. The system would remain the same.

"None of these socialists will admit that there is any fundamental defect in the monetary system. They assert that there is no chronic shortage of purchasing power—but simply a mal-distribution. All that need be done is to soak the rich and distribute the proceeds in increased wages.

"As Major Douglas has pointed out, any criticism of the financial system which is not a complete criticism automatically plays into the hands of the international financial gang. That is why the Socialists are so beloved by them. They can depend upon a socialist government not only preserving the essential features of their system, but by setting up a State dictatorship and reducing everybody down to a subsistence level by means of taxation and expropriation—thereby rendering them subservient to 'the Supreme State'—such a government provides the quickest short-cut to the World Servile State.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT OBJECTIVE. "The thing which every Social Crediter should keep unfalteringly before him is the objective to which all the reform measures of Social Credit—both political and financial—are directed, namely the freedom of the individual within a properly functioning democracy. Every restriction, every control, every prohibition—whether carried out by means of money, rationing, bureaucratic interference, or otherwise is directed against the individual's freedom and democracy.

"Do not let us be blinded by slogans, meaningless labels and plausible trick phrases. And we shall not be, if we stick faithfully to first principles and apply the acid test to every proposition with which we are confronted: 'Will this increase the freedom of the individual?' If it cannot stand up to that test it is a snare and a delusion.

"Oppose it."

Sir John Anderson joins Vickers

The following have joined the board of directors of Vickers Ltd.: Sir John Anderson, Sir Clifford Figg, Sir Thomas Merton and Lieut.-General Sir Ronald Weeks. Sir John Anderson is rejoining the board, from which he resigned in November, 1938, on his appointment as Lord Privy Seal.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 8, 1945.

INCOME TAX PAYERS

Sir F. Sanderson asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the number of Income Tax payers for the year ended April 1, 1939, and the total estimated number at the present time.

Mr. Dalton: 3,800,000 and 13,000,000 respectively.

PRIME MINISTER (VISIT TO UNITED STATES)

Major Vernon asked the Prime Minister the names of the principal officials, service chiefs and others who will accompany him on his forthcoming visit to President Truman.

The Prime Minister: As I have already informed the House, I shall be accompanied in an advisory capacity on my visit to President Truman by the Right Hon. Sir John Anderson, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., M.P., Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Atomic Energy.

In addition to my personal staff, the following principal officers and officials will go with me:

Mr. N. M. Butler, C.M.G., C.V.O.—Foreign Office.

Major-General E. I. C. Jacob, C.B., C.B.E.—Office of the Minister of Defence.

Mr. D. H. F. Rickett—Cabinet Office.

November 9, 1945.

TEACHERS (RELEASES): DIRECT GRANT SCHOOLS

Mrs. Nichol (Bradford, North): ... I consider that the people have been fooled. They expected the kind of secondary education with which they have always been familiar, but now there have been clamped down—and I think “clamped down” is the right term—on all the State schools in this country a set of restrictions and degradations which have made of this Act the apotheosis of mediocrity, because these restrictions have deprived the grammar schools, which have done such excellent work, of that freedom, of that variety and of the chances to experiment which have made them so good in the past. We have now got what is called a grammar school dispute...

Mr. King (Penryn and Falmouth): ... On the other hand, economic circumstances have made me accept very many children who had not the brains to benefit from the education we tried to give them but whose parents had got the money. It was perhaps that experience more than any other which first led me to membership of the party to which I have the honour to belong, and ultimately to my place in this House. I was faced throughout that time with what seemed to me a tragic waste of ability and brain, because boys of high intelligence and capacity were robbed of what ought to have been their birthright. I think we are at one on all sides in this House in demanding that that waste shall cease and that there shall be equality of opportunity for all. I am sure, at least, that behind me there is no divergence of opinion on that subject.

It is when we come to apply that principle that we fall into disagreement. Equality of opportunity is not the same as equality of education. I want to refer to what I believe is not based upon theories or opinions but on facts. The first fact we have to face is that all men, despite what may have been said to the contrary, are not born equal. Every

child, even whilst

“mewling and puking in the nurse’s arms,”

is different, from its very inception, in brains, character, physique and potentiality from any other child. We have to make our education fit the child and not make the child fit our education, if we are to achieve anything. There is a widespread illusion, embodied in the Debates on the Education Act passed by Parliament many months ago, that this House can create an educated nation by laying brick upon brick, and exuding teachers from training colleges...

The party to which I have the honour to belong states in its initial charter that it represents workers by brain as well as workers by hand. I cannot help thinking that there is a danger that this may sometimes be forgotten. We have heard much about the phrase “parity of esteem.” I cannot help thinking that there rests in many people’s minds the idea that all places of education must be held in parity of esteem in the sense that their intellectual content is equal. I believe that to be a complete illusion. Every individual soul should indeed be held in parity of esteem but when we apply this phrase to educational institutions I believe we are suggesting something wildly impracticable. I do not think anyone honestly believes that the University of Oxford and a village school can ever be held in parity of esteem in intellectual content. They are worthy of it, in the sense that you give to each of them its maximum attention, but that is not always what is meant by that phrase...

... I earnestly ask the Minister to consider this question afresh. I am a little nervous, and I think any normal person must be, of the temptation to treat the chain of schools which exists throughout Great Britain like a chain of Marks and Spencer’s stores. I believe it is true that in France 20 years ago it was possible for the French Minister of Education to ask his secretary what the schools in France were doing that day and he could be told in reply that at 10-25 every school in France was studying the geographical configuration of North Western Europe. God forbid that that situation should ever arise in England. I have already heard of a local director of education who can say—and did say—“I am giving all my schools a half holiday on such and such a date.” The point I wish to make is that, if we are to make progress, the centre of gravity of the school must be in the school itself and not in any outside body.

I am nervous, and I think any good thoughtful Socialist must be nervous, of the degree of uniformity which can be attained under unimaginative administration. I am certain that Socialism is practicable without proceeding to the extreme limits which I have tried to indicate, and if there is one sphere in which uniformity is undesirable and impracticable, I believe it is education. That is why I have tried in this my first speech to deal with that subject. I feel with all sincerity that in the question of these direct grant schools we are in danger of killing something that is really worthwhile. I do not like killing. I appeal to the Minister to try at least in some cases to reconsider these matters.

Lieut.-Colonel Amory (Tiverton): ... One reason why I am not a Socialist—there may be others—is that I am frankly afraid that the logical application of Socialist principles will lead to over-standardisation, excessive uniformity, and a danger—I put it no higher—of reduced standards. Equality is a very laudable objective in many matters, but

(Continued on page 6)

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. 15. No. 12. Saturday, November 24, 1945.

The Sabotage of British Agriculture

It is not often, except in regard to its financial views, that we find ourselves in serious disagreement with *Truth*, but we could hardly be more uncompromisingly opposed to any opinion than to that expressed on agricultural policy in the article "Hardship or Injustice?" in its issue of November 9. The most charitable general criticism which can be made of it is that the writer of it cannot know anything of the conditions under which farming in this country can be made a success.

The suggestion is that the War Agricultural Committees not only will be, but should be continued, with the totalitarian powers of eviction conferred upon them on the recommendation of P.E.P. "in war or under threat of war." We really cannot imagine that anyone with a superficial acquaintance with land management, and the inevitable vagaries of weather, crops, redundant and never-ending legislation, Trade Union Labour agitation, tariffs, marketing boards and many other factors, could suppose that a farmer would carry all the risks which farmers and farm owners did carry, under the threat of dispossession and the constant supervision of an irresponsible bureaucracy, itself open to the influence of anyone with some new fad to exploit. If it be said that the risks will be taken off him, then he becomes a manager for the Agricultural Committee. That is Socialist Bureaucracy, which is of course what P.E.P. announced we should have, but requires quite new farmers. It is nothing less than terrifying that a journal of the character of *Truth* should lend its influence to the rank materialism which cannot see that farming is a life, not a business. But of course it is this incredible panic which has already obliterated the memory of the immense agricultural gluts of only fifteen years ago—a state of mind which is being sedulously fostered by "coupons," "points," waste and sabotage which seem to engender a rapturous craving for "control" in the face of the world which its policies have made.

The whole article is repugnant to British ideas and is apparently an out-and-out plea for delegated legislation. The suggestion that land is held in fee simple from the King, as it is, is particularly inapposite. The essence of tenure in fee simple is stability—there is every difference in the world between either fee simple, or feudal tenure, and a never ceasing threat of eviction.

The outlook in this country is black, and is getting blacker. If the best we can do is to turn every pursuit and avocation into a ticket-of-leave institution, the sooner the atomic bomb gets in its *coup-de-grace* the better. In the meantime, perhaps *Truth* would be wise to stick to the City.

Agriculture, and especially British agriculture, is beginning to compete with Russia as a subject for distortion, misstatement, and misleading propaganda, and the similarity

is probably not adventitious. In the days before the Socialist Sixth of the World introduced for our admiration the liquidation of the farmer as an aid to more production, Russia was the largest exporter of wheat in the world, and fed its own population adequately, if not luxuriously. Lord Keynes announced in 1919 that the cessation of Russian wheat exports would send wheat to £5 per quarter instead of being, as it was, almost immediately replaced by Canadian and Argentine grain. The wreck of British farming is not, and never was, due to incompetent farmers. A body of competent American farmers who made a tour of "Britain" a few months ago testified to the fact that farming production in this country was nearly three times greater, per acre, than in the United States. The blast of propaganda for veiled or open collectivism comes from the same quarter as that from which most of our troubles proceed—the influence which has been behind P.E.P. since its inception, the international financier. And we should imagine that the long visits with which we have been favoured by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, Jr. (U.S.A.), sedulously unpublicised as they are, are not wholly inspired by love of his "hosts" (in the parasitic sense) or unconnected with the project of incorporating farming into the factory system, and teaching farmers that they must punch the clock at six a.m. if they do not wish to share the fate of the *kulaks*.

Cardinal Newman

"Born in the City of London not far from the Bank, February 21, 1801, John Henry was the son of John Newman and Jemima Fourdrinier, his wife the eldest of six children, three boys and three girls. His father was of a family of small landed proprietors in Cambridgeshire, and had an hereditary taste for music of which he had a practical and scientific knowledge, together with much general culture. He was chief clerk and afterwards partner in a banking firm and was also a Freemason, with a high standing in the craft. An admirer of Franklin and an enthusiastic reader of Shakespeare, these particulars, except the last, will prepare us for the fact that in an earlier generation the family had spelt its signature 'Newmann'; that it was understood to be of Dutch origin; and that its real descent was Hebrew. The talent for music, calculation, and business, the untiring energy, legal acumen, and dislike of speculative metaphysics, which were conspicuous in John Henry, bear out this interesting genealogy. A large part of his character and writings will become intelligible if we keep it in mind. . . .

"But the qualities which he inherited from his mother's family cannot be left out of account. The Fourdriniers were French by descent and Huguenots into the bargain; they had come into England on the revocation in 1685, of the Edict of Nantes: had settled in London as engravers and paper-makers: and had conformed to the Established Church instead of lapsing—as the Martineous did, for example,—to Unitarian heterodoxy. Mrs. Newman taught her children a 'modified Calvinism,' and they were expected at the proper age to go through the spiritual process known as 'conviction of sin,' to be followed in due course by 'conversion.' These experiences John Henry felt and has recorded; they were very real to him. But equally lasting in its effects was the acquaintance made during the tenderest years of childhood with the Bible in King James's version, as he learned it at his mother's knee. 'It would hardly be too much to say,' writes one observer, 'that he knew the Bible by heart.'"

—Newman by William Barry, p. 8.

Anti-Cyclone

There is an expression, the climate of opinion, lately becoming very popular with sociologists and historians, that has, I think, considerable bearing on the activities of those who have, or conceive themselves as having, some light to shed on human problems. If there is one experience more persistently brought home to Social Crediters than any other to-day, it is that an economically realistic outlook can only be achieved in a certain frame of mind and that lacking it, economic facts just don't exist. The vital question, then, for us who have cooled our heels so long while the economic quacks and witch doctors have held the public ear, reduces itself to this: Are "events" operating to bring about a better frame of mind—a more favourable climate—for the Social Credit "message," or aren't they? Is light to be admitted to the economic problems of the world, or is this present phase of civilisation to go down in an even deeper darkness and confusion? What are the odds? And where do we look for the deciding factor? Because, manifestly, though Economic Democracy—both the concept and the book—contains the solution, we Social Crediters possess of ourselves no dialectical power to make society accept it. On that point, in spite of all our intellectual enlightenment, we are as frustrated in this postwar *mêlée* as our neighbour. Something must happen—we don't know what, and therefore something of the nature of "a miracle"—to relieve the atmospheric pressure and allow the catalytic properties contained in the idea of the Compensated Price to manifest themselves to more than a few.

It may well be that Western civilisation is approaching such a crisis; a situation in which what appears like a series of gratuitously malign calamities of a positively Job-like adversity were conspiring to defeat the human spirit. It almost looks like that to-day—though it is possible that they are no more than the persisting results of persistent bad practices on our part—and as though either the whole civilised world were destined to "go mental," in the popular jargon, and break up like central Europe, or else there must occur some regenerative illumination of the super-logical kind we term miraculous.

While it seems unlikely that one could base a successful programme of action on the belief in what are termed miracles, it is quite certain that if all that the term implies is to be ruled out of one's calculations, it must result in almost completely sterilising the fruitfulness of whatever plan of action is adopted. As popularly conceived, a miracle is an external occurrence, an unlikely event in our environment, which traverses known laws. But the truth as to "miracles" is that they happen within us, in our consciousness, and are, I suspect, the most natural and inevitable occurrences, if we only knew the circumstances, which we don't or we wouldn't call them miracles. The balance of this world is a very nice one, and the decisive factors that incline it one way or the other, proportionately fine, and possibly what appears to us as comparatively small and trivial. It is at this point that I propose to indulge in a little speculation.

It is my conviction in regard to what we call Western civilisation, and pre-eminently Anglo-Saxon culture—the English-speaking nations,—that it bears the impress of a Christianity different in some essential respects from that of Central and Southern Europe. Sceptics may object to such a statement, as loose generalisation, and enquire what pre-

cisely I mean by the term Christianity. I mean by it something very concrete and tangible, although it may not be very easy to define. Perhaps I cannot put it better than by saying of what I mean by 'Christianity that "I feel it in my bones"; and I am, I hope, a not exceptional unit of the English-speaking world. You can accept it or not, but that is the nature of my Christian conviction—and I believe it to be true of all genuine conviction. I *feel it* before I *think it*. Or possibly the two are simultaneous.

But to return to my speculation, it may be that the Anglo-Saxon brand of Christianity has escaped at least partially from the more crippling and disastrous disabilities of its Judaic-Roman origin, such as we see bearing such terrible fruit on the continent of Europe to-day. Don't misunderstand me, I am not doing anything so futile as to attempt to disparage the past; for the past is no more than the road that brought us where we are. But to each stage of the journey belong its particular impedimenta, and the great art of travelling is to know what to bring along with you, and what to leave behind. There is nothing intrinsically either right or wrong with arctic furs, but they are out of place in warmer climes, and therefore automatically become limitations and disabilities there, possibly fatal ones.

I suggest that it is not the destiny of Anglo-Saxondom, whatever the world may look like to-day, to succumb to what the Eighteenth Century called—let us hope ironically—Pure Reason. We call it Dialectical Materialism nowadays, and it might be described as the illusion that man can experience life in a hurry; a sort of counterfeit of the vital urge to live and feel. And further, I suggest that the speculations of the late Nineteenth and Twentieth Century European thinkers, such as Neitzsche and Spengler, on the question of survival, are completely out, largely because there is no place in their philosophy for the things they don't know,—and that must be quite a lot,—because they have art to calculate the incalculable. They have no belief in miracles because they have too much belief in the highly questionable product of their own little thinking mechanism. Only the future, of course, can confirm their judgment, or lack of it, but I am prepared to put up my Christian conviction against their word, as a target if you like. I place my confidence in the future of this civilisation entirely on the Christian fact I have defined as biological (incarnate) Truth, which, as I know, contains the nature and guarantee of what religionists call salvation, and the evolutionists survival.

But to see daylight through the cloud of pressing post-war threats and problems, at home and abroad, is intellectually beyond me, and I would submit, any other isolated individual consciousness. I don't know what to do about it, any more than I know what to do about a community that is still unable to see—what appears to me daily more unavoidably obvious—the discrepancy between incomes and prices. What I am conscious of is the comfortable fact—foundation of all sanity—that although it is my destiny to go on sweating and struggling, the issue does not depend on me alone, that is, on my unaided intelligence, to produce a satisfactory blue-print solution. Paradoxically, that is the basis of a true sense of individual responsibility; the realisation that in as much as it is up to me, it is equally up to you, and you, and you, so that from the same source rises the conviction that there lies ahead of each one of us a line of fruitful co-operation with "events"—the common interaction of our fellows—as they transpire.

Doctrinaire Planners and Puritans regard the Christian dictum "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof" as an invitation to slackness and "muddling through," only because they fail to grasp the fact that through intellectual humility—the "meekness" that is destined to "inherit the earth"—lies the true road to realism; and that on the contrary the only lasting and reliable antidote to slackness and apathy is a sense of Reality—of something that is not in one, and yet of which one is part.

What we know as Dialectical Materialism, then, is simply philosophised collective neurasthenia—the threat of nervous break-down on a world-wide scale, accompanied by all the symptoms well known in the case of individuals. The exhausting, and yet intoxicating feeling that "everything depends on us"; the megalomaniacal sense of indispensability, that accompanies an unbalanced notion of our individual importance. And as with individuals, so it is with groups of individuals. What may be called the Herrenvolk illusion, that a particular nation is destined to rule the world; whether it is based on a trumped-up Aryan myth; or, as with the Jews, upon a palpable misinterpretation of the figurative content of the Old Testament; or even the comparatively harmless and disarming concept of the British Israelites, is pathological, and unchecked, leads to organic collapse. It is, of course, the sin—or, if you prefer, disease—of intellectual pride, presaging a fall. If we will allow no more than we know intellectually; no more than is superficially apparent to us, in short, if we can make no allowances for miracles, for things getting done without our conscious assistance, and even in spite of our incorrigible ignorance, we automatically put a period to all further advance and expansion of the human spirit, for all real advance takes place, and can only take place, in the unknown, what we call the future. The truth is, that no individual or nation is indispensable to Truth; but Truth (Christianity) is indispensable to all individuals and nations.

NORMAN WEBB.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

in education there is something which is even more important than equality, and that is quality. It is because I feel that if we deal harshly with the direct grant schools we are in danger of losing something in quality without gaining anything in equality of opportunity that I am opposed to the proposals of the right hon. Lady. I do not want to push that argument too far, because I am one of those who feel that some rigidity is inevitable within the scope of the State educational system, and my own experience has been that the officials of the Ministry of Education are very alive to that danger and that their attitude is invariably tolerant and sympathetic. I am not so sure, however, that the danger

DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT: BELFAST GROUP

PUBLIC ADDRESS

in Grand Central Hotel

Tuesday, November 27 at 7-30 p.m.

Subject: SOCIAL SECURITY.

Questions and Discussion.

is not present in some of our local authorities. Some of them guide their schools wisely and with a loose reign, but there are others which, in the alleged interests of efficiency, maintain too tight a control. It is there, I think, that the risk lies. . . .

November 12, 1945.

GERMANY (CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION)

Mr. A. Nutting asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any statement to make regarding the decision of Britain, the U.S.A. and Russia to establish a central German administration in Berlin.

Mr. Noel-Baker: As the hon. Member is aware, it was agreed by the British, United States and Soviet Governments at Potsdam that certain essential central German administrative departments should be set up. Discussions are still going on as to how this decision can best be carried out. The French Government, who had no representative at Potsdam, have expressed some misgivings about the plan, but I hope that an agreement may be reached without undue delay.

MANPOWER COMMITTEE

Mr. Garry Allighan asked the Prime Minister whether he will state the names of the Chairman and members of the Manpower Committee.

Mr. H. Morrison: No, Sir. The arrangements made by the Cabinet for the discharge of the business for which it is collectively responsible are matters for the Cabinet itself and are not customarily disclosed.

Mr. Garry Allighan: Will the Lord President of the Council say whether this Committee is entirely advisory, or can take decisions in regard to matters?

Mr. Morrison: To answer that would be a breach of the doctrine to which I have just referred.

DOCK WORKERS (EMPLOYMENT) BILL

Mr. Clement Davies (Montgomery): . . . Neither should any workers in this country be regimented, under any circumstances. Except in time of war, there has only been one Act of regimentation put upon the Statute Book; it was passed in the interests of employers in a time of stress, to stop the workmen of this country selling their labour freely; it was the Act referred to by the hon. Member for Nelson and Colne (*Mr. S. Silverman*) the Statute of Labourers, which followed the Black Death. Since that fell into disuse, men have been free either to sell or withdraw their labour, until that period came when it was regarded as an offence if they made an agreement together to withdraw their labour. . . .

. . . Then the Bevin scheme was invented and boys were allocated to their employers. But that was during the war; is it intended to make it permanent? The hon. Gentleman shakes his head, but it is here in the Bill. I am glad to see that he disapproves of such a scheme as that, which would do away with the right of a Britisher to choose where and for whom he will work. It is one of the most fundamental rights that we possess, one of our spiritual rights—the right to express your view freely, your right to worship your own God, your right to choose your associates and your right to withhold or sell your labour. I agree that those rights

have not been enjoyed to the full in the past because they have not made for economic security, but economic security ought to be given to enable men everywhere to enjoy those spiritual rights to the full. It should not however be done by taking away one of those very spiritual rights. . . .

. . . There will be the fullest support from us all for putting an end to casual labour, but let the Government think again before they do away with the greatest of all constitutional rights, the right of a man to choose for himself his associates and his employer, or to withhold his labour if he wants to, without being sent to prison. . . .

Mr. Peter Thorneycroft (Monmouth): . . . As I read this Clause, which is entirely permissive in character, it is designed simply to exclude blackleg employers or workers from starting up a bit of dock work on their own, and so torpedoing the whole scheme. With that desire, I do not think anybody in the House would quarrel. . . .

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour (Mr. Ness Edwards): . . . we will take further advice on this point, and I give this House an assurance that an ordinary breach of contract by a docker under these schemes shall not be regarded as, and shall not be deemed to be, a crime which will bring him before the criminal court. . . .

MURDER OF BRIGADIER MALLABY (B.B.C. ANNOUNCEMENT)

Mr. Godfrey Nicholson (Farnham): This morning I received a letter which shocked me deeply. I think it is only right that I should read it to the House, and I hope that hon. Members will feel, not only that I was justified in raising this matter this evening, but that I was, in fact, bound to do so at the earliest possible moment. The date is November 8, and the letter is as follows:

"Dear Mr. Nicholson: As one of your constituents, I hope you will forgive me writing to bother you.

My husband, Brigadier A. W. S. Mallaby, was murdered at Sourabaya on October 30. This news was released by the B.B.C. on the 7 a.m. and 8 a.m. news the following morning, when I first heard it. I was notified officially by the India Office on November 1. A day later the B.B.C. put forward three alternatives as to how my husband was killed—all of which were guesses, and one at least which did not bear thinking of. The actual facts were announced 24 hours after this.

That I have been inundated with telephone calls from the Press within 20 minutes of first hearing the news, and reporters themselves walking into my house without ringing, I can forgive, but I find the behaviour of the B.B.C. unpardonable. I would not bother you with this letter if all I wanted was an apology from them. Nothing they could say would undo what they have done, but I wonder if any statement or question you might think fit to make in the House would save anyone else from a similar experience?

Surely the B.B.C. should keep back news until the next-of-kin are informed, and only broadcast further details when they are founded on fact?

If you wish to use my name, or my husband's, please do so. . . .

. . . Now for the B.B.C. I accuse them of heartless and unnecessary sensationalism. They should have more sense of responsibility than the gutter Press. . . .

. . . She specifically excluded "*The Times*" and "*Daily Telegraph*," but her impression was that almost all the other national penny papers were guilty. She specifically excluded the local Press, which has treated her with the greatest possible consideration. I do not suppose it is much good my

condemning the action of the Press on this occasion, as it is not the first time, and I am quite sure it will not be the last, that this disgusting behaviour has occurred, and I am quite sure that whatever we say about the Press in this connection will not be reported.

But I wish to register my indignation and shame that the Press of this country should so pander to what it deems, and I believe deems erroneously, to be the taste of the nation, in that constantly the homes and privacy of bereaved persons are invaded in a way that not only exceeds all the bounds of manners and good taste, but the very canons of humanity. . . .

Mr. Orr-Ewing (Western-super-mare): I thank the Minister for giving way again, but is he really suggesting to this House now that it is a decent thing for the B.B.C. to broadcast conjectures—some of them extremely unpleasant conjectures—as to how this gallant officer met his death? Does he really consider that it is part of the duty of the B.B.C. to enter into that low type of publicity in this country, wherever it comes from?

Crime and Punishment

A recent review in *The Social Crediter* (The Reality of Russia, September 1, 1945) gives the following quotation from *The Yogi and the Commissar* by Arthur Koestler:—

"The Russian revolution has failed in its aim to create a new type of human society or a new moral climate. The ultimate reason for its failure was the arid nineteenth century materialism of its doctrine. It had to fall back on the old opiates because it did not recognise man's need for spiritual nourishment."

Dostoevsky was making very much the same point about the teaching current in his time, and pointing out its inevitable failure in application, when he wrote *Crime and Punishment* in 1866.

Razumihin says indignantly of his friends, (Heinemann 1945 edition p. 179) "Would you believe, they insist on complete absence of individualism"—"Not to be themselves, to be as unlike themselves as they can. That's what they regard as the highest point of progress. If only their nonsense were their own, but as it is—" "We prefer to live on other people's ideas, it's what we are used to." (Or in the Everyman edition, translated by way of the French, "We Russians have chosen to live on other people's ideas and we are saturated with them.")

Porphyry Petrovitch, speaking of what he has read in pamphlets of the "socialist doctrine" says, (p. 227) "... they believe that a social system that has come out of some mathematical brain is going to organise all humanity at once and make it just and sinless in an instant, quicker than any living process. That's why they instinctively dislike history, 'nothing but ugliness and stupidity in it,' and they explain it all as stupidity. That's why they so dislike the *living* process of life; they don't want a *living soul*. The living soul demands life, the soul won't obey the rules of mechanics, the soul is an object of suspicion, the soul is retrograde. But what they want though it smells of death and can be made of india-rubber, at least is not alive, has no will, is servile and won't revolt. And it comes in the end to their reducing everything to the building of walls and the planning of rooms and passages in a phalanstery. The

phalanstery is ready, indeed, but your human nature is not ready for the phalanstery—it wants life, it hasn't completed its vital process, it's too soon for the graveyard. You can't skip over nature by logic. Logic presupposes three possibilities, but there are millions." (This is reminiscent of C. S. Lewis's recent portrayal of his conception of the Planners' Paradise in *This Hideous Strength*.)

Fear of the political gangs was active. Luzhin wished to be connected with "progressive circles" only because he feared to be shown up by them; he took little interest in Lebeziatnikov's expositions of Fourier and the Darwinian theory, the "emancipation" of women, the right of breaking down personal privacy or the "cesspool question." (p. 326.)

Against this background we see Sonia in her humility relying on God, and Raskolnikov.

Raskolnikov adds to the general fund of modern ideas that of the right of a specially-endowed individual to shed blood. To put this idea into practice he has to suppress the human and natural part of himself, as well as that part of his mind which retained reverence for Christianity. While he remains in this negative and impersonal state he is lost. His pride would hold him there, recognising in his gentler impulses nothing but unreasoning weakness. He denies Immanent Sovereignty—not only in himself but in others. When he has bent to kiss Sonia's feet he is still so much under "modern" influences and bound by pride as to wish to excuse a right impulse by giving it a general and meaningless interpretation, "I did not bow down to you, I bowed to all the suffering of humanity."

Laurence Irving in his preface to the Everyman edition suggests that these words of Raskolnikov perhaps best epitomise the animating spirit of Dostoevsky—but in *Crime and Punishment* Dostoevsky is careful to show us that not until Raskolnikov is able to fling himself *truly* at Sonia's feet does he become himself. Only then "Life had stepped into the place of theory."

Dostoevsky believed that the pride which leads to desire for power (or desire to plan and control) is not *in the end so strong* as the living power of love which wishes only to serve, although he does not under-estimate the devastation which can be wrought before the gentler, almost imperceptible power can be perceived, nor the difficulty of the surrender of the will to this power.

"Living things can cope with dead"—but it is always possible that by mistake we may have *chosen* to be among the dead. The situation needs reviewing constantly.

— J. H.

"Interfering with the Law"

"On August 5 [1924], Campbell was brought to trial under the Incitement to Mutiny Act, and on the following day one or two Socialist M.P.'s protested in the House against the prosecution. When the affair came before the court for a second hearing, the case was withdrawn, on the advice of Sir Patrick Hastings, our Attorney-General, who told us that it would be inadvisable to proceed with it at the moment on political grounds. . . . Baldwin, always a master at inflaming the emotions of the public accused us of having tampered with the Law. . . . All Governments, and most of all Tory Governments, 'interfere with the Law,' inasmuch as they decide whether certain prosecutions are

good policy or not. If they are not, they do not take place.

"Later, when I was discussing this matter with Lord Haldane, an acknowledged authority, he laughed at the suggestion that Governments should *not* interfere with political prosecutions. . . . Indeed, the Law officers of the Crown are constantly advising Ministers whether or not certain proceedings should be instituted. If this were not the case, what is the use of these officers? Governments, in fact, appoint Law officers for this very purpose!"

— The Right Hon. J. R. Clynes, Home Secretary, 1929-31, in *Memoirs*, 1927.

Parties versus Electors

An "Electors' Candidate" goes to the poll in a Quebec provincial by-election in Beauce constituency on November 21 as a test of progress in the practice of pressure politics. An all-out battle is expected, with no holds barred. The Government's Party (Union Nationale) and the opposition Party (Liberal) will bring driving forces from the rest of the province to win the seat. So will the Electors.

THE BRIEF for the PROSECUTION

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

8/6 net.

"... Major Douglas possesses one of the most penetrating intellects of our time; he has a profound knowledge of the 'set-up' behind governments—and he is fearless—a combination of gifts most rare in a time-serving world."

"Major Douglas at his best."

— Truth.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, Victoria Street, LIVERPOOL, 2.