

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 15. No. 8.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The Times is still busy "Saving Mankind from Suicide" at the cost of its life.

"Test Tube Babies May Guard Atom-bomb Secret"—
Sunday Wisdom Distributor.

"The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and fating together; and a little child shall lead them."

Dr. E. W. Smith, President of the Institute of Fuel and Power, while fittingly engaged in distributing medals to commemorate the first Lord Melchett (Mond) remarked that it was a matter of very little importance who owned an industry—what mattered was who were the administrators and the technicians.

We hope Dr. Smith is a better technician than he is a political economist, because a more fatuous (and at the same time, mischievous) statement it would be difficult to imagine.

The issue is that which is arising in an acute form everywhere, and Dr. Smith's thesis is well illustrated by the storm in connection with the Tummel-Garry hydro-electric proposal. It has not even been suggested that the technicians and administrators of the scheme would be incapable—perhaps Dr. Smith could tell us authoritatively who they would be. The point at issue is that of ownership—not "private," but "local" ownership.

And it is a point which may bring down the politics closely associated with "Fuel and Power" in a crash which will shake the world.

Isn't it wondrous, Clarence, that all the war criminals are on one side?

Clausewitz up to date: "Justice is the prosecution of war and politics by firing squads."

The rapturous iconoclasm of certain groups of "monetary reformers" to whom "usury," the sparring-partner of the bankers "inflation," is the Scarlet Woman of Babylon, has had the inevitable effect of encouraging the financial authorities to abolish, for practical purposes, the interest paid on undrawn current balances, and deposit accounts. We do not say they would not have done it anyway—the one thoroughly sound feature of the banking system was its dividends to shareholders and its interest payments to depositors which jointly with the insignificant mint issues, provided almost the only fresh unattached purchasing-power. It is obviously lost time to beg of our amateur currency

experts to consider whether they really mean what they ask which is the replacement of unattached purchasing-power by loans. But they must not complain if we, and others with us, regard them as propagandists for totalitarianism.

There are some curious features about the present strikes, which should induce careful observation—if possible either on the spot or as near the spot as it is possible to get. One general observation is that the strikers know perfectly that what they should do is to stop the strike instantly, sack their leaders, choose new (and if possible honest) leaders and from the vantage point of a cleansed doorstep say what they have to say to the Mond-Turnerists posing as a 'Labour' administration. But they are mad to discover that they cannot sack their orthodox Union leaders because the machinery has been centralised, and to do anything with them would take almost as long as a conversation between a municipality and the 'Government' about building a house. The strikers' 'grievances' are a various and miscellaneous collection which have been allowed to accumulate here there are everywhere to serve as strike-material on demand. The misreporting of the strike by the newspapers is noticed by the strikers. The part played by the 'revolutionary communists' is uncertain and obscure: it may be largely a fiction.

In conjunction with the virtual refusal of men in the forces awaiting demobilisation to exchange military for industrial conscription there may be some surprises for the planners, who are nevertheless behaving as though the managerial revolution were all over 'bar the shouting.'

Marvellous thing, modern 'science' ("the art of seeking without ever finding the truth"): we can destroy whole continents, but can't build a cottage.

Typical of the prevailing vogue of intellectualism is the evident desire to generalise about all sorts of things which cannot be generalised. Children up to a certain (or uncertain) age are much better for being ruled—that is to say, ruled by children of a certain (or uncertain) age who have grown from the good-to-be-ruled stage to the good-to-rule stage. The fact alone makes one flat system ridiculous.

Paper Control

"It could easily happen, now, that the normal waxing and waning of newspapers and publications of all kinds... will be artificially petrified and arrested... That is one example of a field in which a rigidity imposed by the Government, if continued, must interfere with growth and decline; with very far-reaching effects, because paper is the medium through which ideas grow and decline."

— *The Tablet*.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: October 9, 1945.

FUEL AND POWER

Petrol (Stocks and Rationing)

The Minister of Fuel and Power (Mr. Shinwell): ... In considering this question of relaxations in this country it is necessary to bear in mind also the position in other parts of the Commonwealth, where measures for the conservation of petrol supplies have also been taken during the war and which would be affected if we made any relaxation here.

Under conditions which have obtained until recently only negligible quantities of petrol have been brought to this country from sterling sources, including Trinidad and the Persian Gulf. These supplies have been used, in order to conserve tanker tonnage, in areas nearer to the sources of supply than the United Kingdom. In any event the petrol produced from sterling sources is insufficient to meet the needs of the sterling area. The deficiency can only be met by the purchase of oil from dollar sources; at present the dollar expenditure is very considerable and we must seek to reduce it.

In order to move the quantities of petroleum products which are produced from British controlled sources, we have not sufficient tanker tonnage under the British flag to meet our requirements. We are thus involved, not only in purchasing large quantities of oil products from dollar sources, but in having to pay dollar freights in regard to a material proportion of the tanker tonnage required.

This is why in present circumstances it is not possible to abolish petrol rationing, or to increase the ration at present.

(After other questions):

Mr. Stokes: May I ask my right hon. Friend whether he can tell us—if not now, if I put a Question down will he do so?—where the greatly increased supplies from the Persian Gulf are going; and further, whether, in view of his decision not to let us off petrol rationing, he proposes to take any steps to stop the ever-increasing black market in petrol?

Mr. Shinwell: If my hon. Friend cares to put down a Question at any time, I shall do all I can to furnish an answer.

Squadron-Leader Donner: Is the Ministry aware of the statement of his predecessor that it would only require one extra tanker a week to double the petrol ration in this country?

Mr. Shinwell: I am not unaware of that.

ETHIOPIA (OIL AGREEMENT)

Captain Gammans asked the Minister of Fuel and Power if His Majesty's Government was consulted by the Emperor of Abyssinia before an exclusive oil monopoly was granted by him to an American company.

Sir Waldron Smithers asked the Minister of Fuel and Power if His Majesty's Government were consulted before the Abyssinian oil concession was sold to an American syndicate.

Mr. Shinwell: I have no detailed information regarding

the agreement referred to, which, according to Press reports, is not between the Governments of the U.S.A. and Ethiopia, but between the Government of Ethiopia and an American Oil Company. His Majesty's Government were not consulted in this matter.

CIVIL SERVICE (STAFFS)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury if he will, as a first step, take the necessary action to make an immediate cut of 20 per cent. in the number of civil servants.

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Glenvil Hall): My right hon. Friend the Prime Minister has already issued directions for the speediest possible reduction in staffs engaged on war duties. I am afraid, however, that an arbitrary cut of the kind suggested by the hon. Member is not feasible.

Sir W. Smithers: Does not the hon. Gentleman realise that an arbitrary cut of this kind would reduce immediately that amount of interference with trade and industry, and thus initiate and encourage our vital exports?

Mr. Glenvil Hall: My right hon. Friend the Chancellor wants to encourage exports, but I am afraid that a reduction of 20 per cent. in the Civil Service would not help that desirable end.

PETROL RESTRICTIONS

Sir G. Fox asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what amount of petrol would be required to double the present ration; and what proportion the total amount of petrol then being used in this country would bear to the total amount used in 1939.

Mr. Shinwell: An additional 394,000 tons of petrol per annum would, it is estimated, be required in order to double the present basic ration. If the basic ration was doubled but no increases were made in the supplementary rations for cars and motor-cycles, the total annual consumption of petrol by such vehicles would be approximately 52 per cent. of that in 1938. This estimate is based on the number of cars at present in use, and takes no account of the large increase which would result from doubling the ration.

Mr. A. Edwards asked the Minister of Fuel and Power if it is his intention to continue control of petrol under the pool distribution scheme or if it is intended to revert to the competitive system.

Mr. Shinwell: I have this matter under consideration, but I am not yet in a position to make a statement.

MINISTRY OF FUEL AND POWER

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Fuel and Power the annual amount paid in salaries and expenses in the Mines Department in 1938; and what is the amount payable in the salaries and expenses of officials of his Ministry at the latest available date.

Mr. Shinwell: The expenditure on salaries and expenses of officers of the Mines Department in the year ended March 31, 1939, was approximately £208,000. The approximate cost of salaries and expenses of officers of the Ministry of Fuel and Power for the year ending March 31,

(Continued on page 7)

A Call to Resistance

Following upon a striking letter by Mr. D. S. MacColl, under the sub-heading "A Call to Resistance," *The Times* has opened up discussion of the Highland Water Power Scheme. Such discussions, when they cannot be prevented, lend colour to the claim that there is "more than one side" to a "question," without necessarily either revealing the essentials of any side or clearly representing its true weight.

Publicity, insofar as it is enforced by public opinion (and probably no further) is a useful thing. In the present case it is reinforced by strong local and national opinion, as is shown in the following appeal which is circulating widely in the Dundee area. As readers of *The Social Crediter* know, the handing over of Scotland to Big Business concerns the inhabitants of Eastbourne and Blackpool as vitally as the people of the threatened glens. It is not only "Scottish sentiment" which is flouted. Every constituency has its Member of Parliament:—

WHY SHOULD I PROTEST AGAINST THE TUMMEL-GARRY HYDRO ELECTRIC SCHEME?

No one acquainted with the scenic beauty of the Pitlochry district can fail to feel dismay at the prospect of that beautiful and historic piece of country being desecrated by the proposed Tummel-Garry scheme. River beds will be dried up; the Falls of Bruar will become a mere trickle; Clunie Bridge, the Recreation Park, and many homes and farms will be submerged; and the Queen's View and many other delightful scenes will be altered out of all recognition. There will, too, be great monetary loss to the township of Pitlochry, where many a weary city dweller has spent a pleasant and restful holiday.

Against the above, the advocates of the scheme speak of "progress," "a great future for Scotland," and draw beautiful and dramatic pictures of the benefits to be obtained by the introduction of electricity to Scottish homes, crofts, farms, and industry, and the work that will be given to Scotsmen during the period of construction.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

Objections to the scheme are not based solely on destruction of natural beauty, loss of tourist traffic, fishing facilities, and Scottish sentiment, important as these may be.

1. No Scot objects to the wise utilisation of Scotland's water power, but in the estimation of many people in all walks of life, including the Government's own appointed Amenity Committee, the Tummel-Garry scheme in its present form is not wise utilisation. There are other ways of utilising the waters of the Garry and Tummel that would not cause the upheaval the present proposed scheme entails.

2. Work on the scheme will be of a temporary navying nature, and no doubt imported labour will be used in abundance as usual. In any case, how many true Scots look forward to such a job as the result of the homes and farms of fellow Scots being destroyed?

3. Scotland already generates far more electricity than she herself will be able to use for many years to come, and "exports" many millions kilowatts to England.

4. 80 per cent. of the Tummel-Garry power is booked for English factories, possibly to the detriment of Scottish competitors.

5. Recent scientific "atomic energy" discoveries promise to make available limitless sources of power entailing no corresponding sacrifice of our native land. Should such power become available, as it likely will, the Tummel-Garry scheme may be an old-fashioned eye-sore before it is completed, with no means of rectifying the irreparable damage.

6. The Government's own Amenity Committee voted against the scheme in its present form.

7. Alternative methods of utilising Garry and Tummel are being purposely ignored.

8. A country's rivers are its life blood and no Parliament (particularly a Parliament sitting outside the country) should have power to destroy, divert, or tamper with these UNNECESSARILY. These rivers are, in many cases, essential for the well-being of the farming community—on whom YOUR daily bread depends.

9. The Hydro Board makes it absolutely clear that it does not intend to supply light and power to Highland homes, crofts, farms, and small and medium-sized Scottish industries, AND NOT A MILE OF SCOTTISH RAILWAYS WILL BE ELECTRIFIED BY THIS POWER ON THEIR DOORSTEP. Then, who IS to benefit? See 3, 4, and 10.

10. The Hydro Board's intention is to supply cheap electricity chiefly to certain imported electro-chemical industries. These industries give employment to the least possible number of workers (one or two for every 300, 240, or 170 that would be employed if similar power was used for vehicle trades, woodwork, or textiles). It will be ironical if electricity, the "clean servant," should introduce to the Highlands the worst type of polluted air and dirty smoke!

11. So great will be the drying up of natural watersheds, so infinitesimal the number of people receiving employment (an uncongenial employment at that), that this and others of the Board's contemplated schemes may well be the initial step towards another and final "Highland Clearance."

12. If the Board is allowed to carry on with the Tummel-Garry scheme it can the more easily put the remaining number of its 102 schemes into operation and make a desert of Scotland if it so feels inclined.

13. Scotland's tourist traffic can mean £50,000,000 annually. Destruction in Pitlochry area (a chief centre of the traffic) will adversely affect this Scottish revenue.

14. A miniature census of Scottish public opinion taken in a district about 50 miles from Pitlochry by an Advertising Agency revealed that only one in fifty or sixty was in favour of the Scheme.

15. The English people would not allow Parliament to destroy the English Lake District for power. Why flout Scottish sentiment?

ACT NOW!

If by now you do not favour this scheme YOU can and must do something about it. Talk about it, sign a protest or organise a protest in your own street, and WRITE YOUR MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT. Ask him to vote against it. The matter is urgent, however, so do it NOW while it is fresh in your mind.

10 Reform Street, Dundee.

DAVID S. GRAHAM

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. 8.

Saturday, October 27, 1945.

"I Will Fear No Evil"

The Italians have a phrase, *Il seminatore delle spine*, the sower of thorns, and Bacon, "the wise and witty Francis," quotes Lysander, "that children were to be decoyed with sweetmeats and men by false oaths," adding that "there are numerous other corrupt and pernicious maxims of the same kind, more indeed, as in all other cases, than of such as are just and sound."

We who never open a book save at the right page, and as though (as the unguided may think) by chance, often wonder why this is not so of everyone, and are prone to imagine that they must wilfully see everything but the image thrown into their eyes, and thus condemn themselves to live eternally in the bleak discomforts of yesterday and the stark fears of tomorrow and the evil thereof.

A Social Crediter has written to another, "I had even wondered if anything had happened at the Secretariat as in September, 1938. All I have been able to gather from *The Social Crediter* is that the situation is quite hopeless, and that there is nothing to be done about it." We are invited to extract the thorn, to which end we are at once assisted by another remark on the page which mentions it by name in its Italian dress, that "God... exacts from all men the tenth part of their substance and the seventh of their time." The emphasis is ours, and falls upon a reminder which is rarely heard, in a form which emphasises at least one disobedience of the Social Credit movement (not to us but to themselves), for if they voluntarily have given up a seventh of their substance, it is doubtful whether they have given a tenth of their time, and that is more than a reversal of the traditional tribute. There is even more to the same effect but three lines away, that "whilst men are projecting and every way racking their thoughts to provide and take care for their fortunes, they ought, in the midst of all, to have an eye to the Divine Providence, which frequently overturns and brings to naught the machinations and deep devices of the wicked, according to that of the Scripture, 'He has conceived iniquity, and shall bring forth vanity.' And although men were not in this pursuit to practise injustice and unlawful acts, yet a continual and restless search and striving after fortune, takes up too much of their time, who have nobler things to observe..."

The special function of the Secretariat is to communicate advice, and its special responsibility is to communicate advice correctly. There is no suggestion of which we are aware that both these special functions have not been faithfully performed. When Major Douglas said that action, and only action, would meet the requirements of the external situation, his advice was not heeded; but rather what was probably the numerical majority of the

'movement' preferred another and an admittedly easier course. Largely for this reason (for the Social Credit movement *has been* strong enough to act effectually) a situation has developed which calls for fresh advice, advice which envisages realistically the situation as it is. To give a direct answer to the question (if it is a question) is the Secretariat endangered as in 1938? Not so far as we are aware. After the attack of which our supporter speaks, the peculiar people made circles in a mood of fussy gravity, became to some extent the tolerated butt for the false archery of the opposition, or drifted to the scrap heaps of the political movements of the world. Some seem half-heartedly supported, 'in case' they may still serve a purpose almost overpassed by the strong tide of corruption which afflicts our civilisation. The prestige of the real Social Credit movement has risen steadily in direct proportion as it has managed to cast aside the conception of itself, which was hardly its own at any time, but with which it was invested, as a Little Bethel, the single vessel of the one pure and holy doctrine of Regeneration. It had, and has, its philosophy, the policy which arises from its philosophy. Its limited function is the advancement of that policy. Coldly perhaps, but correctly, a part of its function is certainly not to spread alarm and despondency, not to countenance them or to heed them, but, if they exist, to pursue its course in the midst of them. And so for all concerned. The development of the world plot has taken over very largely the development of the little plot. We are back again in the religious sphere of controversy, and each conscious mind among us is confronted by fundamental questions, questions as fundamental as What is the end and aim of Man? This does not mean that there is nothing we can do.

We are seeking still to find anything, anywhere, which has an objective, a policy, with real fighting sanctions behind it. We have shown one thing after another that has no substance. We can get away as soon as we like from any notion that any manipulation of the present machinery of 'Government' can do what we want. Compared to a productive enterprise on proved and standard lines—a company of men, with an agreed and stated objective, limited liability, and properly drawn up articles of association, the 'Government' of to-day is an unlimited company without any articles at all. The final conquest of politics is the realisation that all politics is bad, that mankind has no business with politics—that man's business is *with himself*. We have shown by practising with it that only a negative "mandate" is a workable proposition: that on any but negative lines any appeal to "votes" is an appeal to Bill Sikes.

The recorded recipe for the possible defeat of the Devil incarnate who rules our affairs (his own recipe) is individual initiative backed by genius. It is not, be it noticed, genius backed by individual initiative. The starting point is initiative. The answer to the subordination of the individual to the group is the insubordination of the individual to the group. Alarm and despondency is the individual's subordination of himself to the group which alarms him and induces his despondency. "I will fear no evil" is a very different proposition from "Happily for me there is no evil to fear." One begins with "I," the other with the fear-creator. To build up from the bottom, not down from the top, begins with the bottom of the group, the unitary member. "I" is always at the bottom of the group, and from "I" alone can anything be built.

Facets

By B. M. PALMER

The London *Times* has Zionist sympathies, and its special correspondent supports partition of Palestine. Zionists assert that God promised Palestine to the Hebrews, and that therefore they "ought" to possess it. This argument would seem to have great weight in certain quarters, especially with those who have not troubled to distinguish between the Jews and the Hebrews, and who take the assertion on its face-value. Recent correspondents to the *Times* pointed to the great benefits conferred on Palestine by Jewish emigrants, in regard to social services, trade and improved amenities. Mr. Edward Atiyah, from the Arab Office in London, replied that forcibly conferred benefits were not desired, they were a "mockery"; partition would provide a national base from which imperialistic ambition could be extended with unfortunate consequences in the middle East, and he concluded thus:—"But the most astonishing and least edifying part of your correspondent's case is its implied conclusion that since, (on his attempted showing) the Arab League is impotent and the Arab states unable and unlikely to resort to force in defence of the Arabs in Palestine, while on the other hand the Zionists possess a formidable striking force which they could use to support their claims, Arab opposition to partition can be safely ignored and the Jewish National State established in a part of Palestine. The Arabs, taking their stand on the unassailable morality of their case, on their elementary right to the land they have possessed for thirteen centuries, cannot believe that the British would endorse such an argument, even if its premises were true. . . ."

Another correspondent wrote:—"... The people of the U.S.A. confine their efforts to giving us bad advice and keeping Jewish refugees out of their vast, rich, and under-populated country. That much of it is under-populated no one can deny. So is Canada, so is Australia, so is New Zealand, so is much of Africa. But we cannot compel these countries to admit millions of Jews. No. And we think we can compel the Arabs. We are wrong."

But it is not merely a simple question of finding a home for the Jews. They have decided that only one home will suit them—Palestine. If it were once admitted that any reasonably comfortable home would do, the whole case of Zionism would fall to the ground. For this reason Kenya was refused in 1902—and other territories at other times. The world must be made to admit that Jews are the Chosen Race. It is said that the Palestinian Jews complain that the Zionists are atheists. They may be, but atheists may have a religion.

There are certain aspects of the Jewish problem which are consistently overlooked, even by those who realise the dangers in Zionism, and who admit the urgency, as Social Crediters most certainly do, of finding a suitable home for this problem race as quickly as possible.

At the present time Zionists employ three-fold tactics:—race, religion, and the double-passport, which Zionist propaganda insists that every "Palestinian" must have. He may be either a "British" Jew, or a Palestinian Jew, as suits his purpose. This arrangement, made possible under the Geneva convention, makes a mockery of patriotism and national sovereignty; and it is not generally realised that every Jew is perfectly aware of the material

advantages to himself of double nationality. Whether he actually possesses the passports or not, he acts on the assumption that he has every right to possess them. As a "British" Jew (not usually English or Scottish, but frequently "Scotch") he will put it to you that you must not discriminate against him because he is your fellow Britisher, but merely goes to a different church. But as a racial Jew with a promised land in Palestine, he invariably discriminates against you because you are not a Jew. Nothing is more widely experienced or more bitterly resented by business people than this discrimination in the business world. If a Jew gets a job, he gets another Jew another job as quickly as possible, and the two work together to get the goyim out as soon as may be. This is simply an attribute of oriental morality. Some Jews do not do these things. But not many. Those who wish to solve this problem will not help by trying to gloss over this attribute, quite legitimate in an oriental country where it is accepted by all, but calculated only to make bitter trouble in a nation which still retains the vestiges of a Christian religion.

Atheists or not, the Jews and their religion and their racial policy are one. And the whole is preserved in the national consciousness by means of a rigid system of ritual, a careful training of the young from earliest years, during which a great deal is committed to memory, and lastly by marriage within the tribe. The result is that the majority of Jews would appear to understand the policy of their philosophy.

Unfortunately, the majority of the native British do not understand, except in part, the British policy. It has even been said that it does not exist. This, of course, is impossible. But while it is undoubtedly the case that the Christian religion and the British way of life cannot be separated except to the destruction of both, such decisions as are now made to safeguard them are in almost every case purely intuitive. The time has gone by when the *grounds* of correct decisions were generally understood. How many electors in the recent election fully understood the meaning of the principle of Habeas Corpus, or of the decentralising policy hitherto inseparable from the British Empire? Very few, or there would not have been returned a body of men and women pledged to *centralisation*.

It is curious to observe the struggle that is going on to-day, sometimes in the same individual, between the instinct to preserve the British way of life, and the perverted reason clamouring for the totalitarian state. The astounding idea prevails that the "educated citizen" will have read the White Paper on National Insurance, or at least its 3d digest (how can there be an abridged edition of something so significant?) while the great principles of Christian policy are smothered in a maze of Orders in Council. If they are still alive, it is only the intuitive will that keeps them so.

The problem of the British people, and the Christian religion, if they are to survive, is closely bound up with the relationship between ritual and the training of the young, and with both to the philosophy of marriage. The Jewish race have developed a technique which brings them the required results—a racial nation which understands its own policy, and which attempts to apply that policy through the doctrine of non-immanent sovereignty. And the British once had a conscious technique, "a national ritual arrived at by centuries of trial and elimination. It is in the failure

to present that tradition as a living force of which to be immeasurably proud, instead of as something for which to make apology, that the so-called Conservative Party—a body, as such, without a soul—has been guilty of the unforgivable sin, and must suffer for it. And the most deadly error we can make is to look to it, in its present form, for salvation." ("Culture and Ritual" in *The Social Crediter*, August 25, 1945.)

The wide-spread attack made on ritual and tradition under Cromwell's Commonwealth in the seventeenth century presents at least one strange feature. To the Roundheads the Old Testament was "Mein Kampf"—yet as they desecrated the English altars in its name, shouting against every form of ceremony as idolatory, they failed to see that the Old Testament in itself is a complete system of rigid ritualism. The "Law" enshrines the doctrine of non-immanent sovereignty. And, moreover, the bigoted followers of Cromwell appeared to have no inkling that no association can be conducted without ritual, or tradition. In the simple companionship between friends, there will not be much to value until "Do you remember?" has some significance; and in national associations, if ritual and tradition do not exist, it becomes necessary to invent them. Thus among the 500 sects that held riot after the Civil Wars in England, each developed its own rites—total immersion, or sitting in silence until the spirit moved—or shutting out the sunlight on Sunday—or wearing a special costume like the Quakers, or the Salvation army of a later date (but the same genealogy) with their penitent forms and their brass bands. What would the Red Czar be without his Red Army, his salvos, and his specially composed Soviet Anthem? (that highly sophisticated work). In proportion as these rituals are designed correctly to their purpose, so is their success—though of course, a wrong policy must eventually destroy any ritual and a perverted ritual destroy a correct policy. It is a question of means and ends—neither "justifies" the other. This was the mistake made by the Roman Catholic church, which led to the tragedy of the "Northern" Reformation, whereby millions were given over to Lutheranism, Calvinism and Marxism—for the church had retained, possibly without retaining understanding of it, more Christian doctrine than any other. But they had allowed their "ends" to be corrupted by their "means."

All that it is necessary to do, to destroy a policy, is to prevent its ritual or tradition. The tradition is far more vulnerable than the policy itself. The Puritans attacked ours as idolatory; the intellectuals (the Puritans of the 19th and 20th centuries) attack it as irrational. But it is not a frontal attack. They simply place undue emphasis on pure reason. It has gradually become generally accepted that people should accept nothing which they can not rationalise. Churchmen of the Reformation have spent hours, lifetimes, over Christian Apologetics. And found themselves no further. It has been justly said (*Social Crediter*, "Trahison des Clercs," February, 1944) "Dogma as such is naturally suspect, but it is quite possible that there are vital truths which the ordinary individual, in his present state of development, can only receive, if at all, as dogma."

The academic rule which has invaded not only the Church, but education and all spheres of government asserts that everything ought to be capable of explanation to everyone. Hence the demand for an educated electorate, and for intelligent churchmen. It is true that everything is capable of explanation if you know it first, but the explanation may

necessarily be on a narrow wave-band. Ninety-nine per cent. of people confuse "reasoning" with intelligence. What you can do with a slide-rule depends wholly on what you can put into it. It will do the reasoning. For those outside the narrow waveband on which can be explained the vital truths underlying British policy and its religion there must be throughout the whole of national life, rites, traditions, creeds and carefully stated axioms for which a hierarchy accepts responsibility, handing on the immaculate policy as one generation evolves from another. They hold the keys of the kingdom. In mediaeval times erring boys were beaten at parish boundaries; the idea, if crude, was sound. There certainly seems to be a case for learning by heart in childhood other things besides the catechism. Children do not understand the multiplication table, but unless this is learned, parrot-like, before the age of ten, there is no learning arithmetic in after life. Pity those children who were brought up by those cranks who, some years ago, decreed that *nothing* should be learned by heart, not even the alphabet, and children taught to keep an "open mind" until they were adults, and able to choose a religion for themselves. At the same time they were fed with abstract ethics and scientific theories! What could be more pernicious? The results of the "open minds" filled with theories we see around us—And they are so proud of their "agnosticism!"

The vital need now, and it cannot be too soon, is for a hierarchy, incorruptible and of the highest competency, who will undertake the responsibility of reconciling tradition with policy, and present both as flawless. If these men are not forthcoming in the places where they should be, they must be found. For if the Doctrine of the Incarnation, of the Trinity as set forth in the Athanasian creed, and the reality of the Kingdom of Heaven are not mere words, but part of ultimate reality, increasing in "facets" as they come down to earth, they must be realisable in real substance. It seems certain that a Christian religion, catholic towards the whole of life, would acknowledge that the Habeas Corpus Act is but one "facet of the crystal" of the Incarnation—; that the decentralisation policy until now active in the British Empire is only possible where it is acknowledged that the Kingdom of Heaven is within, *i.e.*, that God is immanent—while the compensated price is the practical aspect of the redemption of debt. There are parables about these things.

The whole matter can be summed up in the words of Dr. Bryan W. Monahan, writing in *The Social Crediter*, July 29, 1944, on the *Aims of Education*:—"This whole trend of evolution can be understood, has meaning, only from the point of view of immanent sovereignty, whether or not this has a transcendent component; sovereignty of purpose as an aspect of a more comprehensive reality."

The writer is of the opinion that until there is sufficient understanding and acceptance of these things in this country, the Jewish problem will be insoluble. For it goes to the very heart of the difference between the doctrines of immanent and non-immanent sovereignty. And yet it can be solved without undue hardship to anyone, in the terms of contracting out—"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom"—words spoken in our church services every day of the year. But while the vast majority of those who speak them pay homage to practical Judaism as soon as they leave the altar and mount the pulpit steps we may expect strife and bloodshed at home and abroad. Where there is no vision the people perish.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 2)

1946, including the cost of the Coal Control Opencast Coal Operations and petrol rationing, is £3,000,000.

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Fuel and Power how many officials there were in the Mines Department in 1938; and how many there were in his Ministry at the latest available date.

Mr. Shinwell: The number of staff employed in the Mines Department in 1938 was 518. The number of officials employed by the Ministry of Fuel and Power on September 1, 1945 was 8,659. This includes a Petroleum staff of 1,993, of whom 1,875 are employed on petrol rationing; and an Opencast Coal Production staff of 3,165, of whom 1,156 are directly employed industrial staff. The responsibilities of this Ministry are, of course, very much wider than those of the former Mines Department owing to, for example, added functions in regard to the gas and electricity industries, and wartime developments, such as petrol rationing and opencast coal production.

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Fuel and Power the annual cost of the Mines Department in 1938; and what is the latest available figure of annual cost of the coal department of his Ministry.

Mr. Shinwell: The net expenditure of the Mines Department for the year ended March 31, 1939, was £217,146. The current cost of the salaries and administrative expenses of the Coal Division and Regional Coal organisation, excluding staff engaged on production of opencast coal, of the Ministry of Fuel and Power is approximately £1,030,000 per annum.

CIVIL AVIATION

Airport Facilities, United Kingdom

Sir W. Darling asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Civil Aviation whether his attention has been drawn to the establishment of an aerodrome on the west coast of Eire, where unlimited commercial rights have been granted to U.S.A., by the Government of Eire; and, in view of the competition this represents to the development of British Civil Aviation, what steps are being taken to secure for the United Kingdom the full use of the airport at Prestwick.

Mr. Ivor Thomas: I am aware that the airport established by the Eire Government at Rineanna before the war will be available to the civil airlines of the U.S.A. under the Agreement concluded between the United States and Eire Governments in February of this year. As regards the second part of the question, my Noble Friend hopes to make a statement shortly on the designation of airports in the U.K. for the use of international civil airlines.

ALIENS (STATISTICS)

Sir J. Mellor asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will give an estimate of the number of aliens now in the United Kingdom, classified according to nationality and military or civilian status; and if he will indicate in each category the proportion expected to leave the United Kingdom before the end of 1945 and 1946, respectively.

Mr. Ede: According to the latest figures available, the numbers of civilian aliens registered with the Police in the United Kingdom are as follows:

Nationality.	Number.	Nationality.	Number.
Austrian	16,086	Latvian	636
Belgian	17,101	Lithuanian	1,280
Bulgarian	82	Luxemburger	232
Chinese	13,616	Norwegian	14,205
Czechoslovak	11,683	Polish	22,704
Danish	5,407	Portuguese	798
Danziger	204	Roumanian	2,609
Dutch	19,396	Russian	41,716
Estonian	948	Spanish	4,251
Finnish	664	Swedish	3,679
French	14,683	Swiss	8,941
German	38,712	Turkish	1,064
Greek	4,295	United States	13,129
Hungarian	2,971	Yugo-Slav	1,113
Italian	17,693	Stateless	2,515
Japanese	457	Others	4,248

Of this total of 287,118, some 148,000 have long been established in residence in the United Kingdom. 139,000 including 41,000 Allied merchant seamen, are here on a temporary basis, but without examination of each individual file I cannot say how many are expected to leave the country by any particular date.

Aliens who are serving members of British or Allied forces, persons entitled to diplomatic privilege, British Protected Persons, and children under sixteen years of age are not required to register with the Police and the Home Office keeps no statistics of them.

SUPPLIES AND SERVICES
(TRANSITIONAL POWERS) BILL

Major Guy Lloyd (Renfrew, Eastern): ... To take some details of the Clauses, such phrases are used throughout, as "essential to the well-being of the country." Who is to decide what is essential to the well-being of the country? [HON. MEMBERS: "We are."] It is going to be decided in a purely arbitrary way and with the most deliberate political bias—[Interruption.] It is quite obvious that is so...

It is stretching things too far to suggest that this is an innocuous Bill to which no one can really object. I was shocked to find more than one hon. Member on this side of the House, including the hon. Member for The High Peak (Mr. Molson), using the expression that he welcomed the Bill. I want to make it clear that I do not. I hope the House will, at any rate, hear some pretty strong criticism of the Bill when we come to the Committee stage, and at this stage those on this side of the House should make it clear to the country that they do represent those who strongly object to controls being imposed, quite unnecessarily in many cases, in peace time, which were originally imposed under the stress of war...

Lieut.-Colonel Dower (Penrith and Cockermouth): ... I was not quite sure whether the Home Secretary, who is now back in his place again, was pleased with this Bill or whether he was not. He began by saying that he did not approve of control for control's sake. Yet there was applause from back benchers behind him when he spoke of the necessity for controlling industry very closely. Later he said that he commended this Bill to the House. I would like to know whether the right hon. Gentleman regards this Bill as a very necessary Bill, but a very unpleasant one, or whether he says "We really believe in a system of planned scarcity." Does he want to see abundance or does he merely want to set up a machine which may exist for a considerable number

of years, based on the fact that there is to be scarcity? I regard it as fundamental that we should step up production so that there is abundance for everybody at the first available moment. I think it is a rather dangerous attitude to say that we shall all be hard up for everything we want for years and years and that therefore we are to set up a more or less permanent machine to make sure about the cutting of a very inadequate cake....

The kind of economic system that works under legal orders is not really a happy one. Take the case of the building industry, which has been mentioned by several hon. Members. The right hon. Gentleman said that he disapproved of the cost-plus system. It is a vicious system, and if we forget our parties hon. Members will agree that there is little good that can be said of the cost-plus system which is now working in the building industry....

... There are a large number of men in the Government and on the Opposition Benches who do wish to see a healthy economy with as much freedom for the individual worker as can possibly be obtained. I wonder if during the Committee stage of this Bill it would be possible for an Amendment to be tabled—not the one in the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Woodford (Mr. Churchill)—which would set a period of three years, with powers of extension for a further two years, if necessary. I am not at all sure that it would not get a certain amount of support in all parts of the House....

Sir William Darling (Edinburgh, South): I had not intended to join in this Debate, but I think I should like to support my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for East Renfrew (Major Lloyd) and express the view, which is more widely held in the country than in this House, that these controls are detested, disliked, hated and abominated by the greater portion of the people of this country. I have heard many speakers on the other side, and some on this side, say that the people of this country like these controls. Queues, we are told, are not detestable—they are only a lesser evil. That was one of the observations we heard this afternoon. The situation would be very unreal if I did not take this opportunity of joining with the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrew in repeating what public opinion has been saying much more vehemently. An hon. Member, earlier in the Debate, said he left the Conservative Party in 1922 because of this question of control. It is strangely paradoxical that I left the Socialist Party at about the same time, because I found it was not a proper custodian of human liberties. I joined that Party which had the honour of making a somewhat tepid protest against the further loss of liberty of the people of this land. This is the party which for half a century, since James Keir Hardie—whose name was not referred to when we spoke of the Tolpuddle martyrs—raised the banner of Socialism, and preached Socialism and the doctrine of freedom and liberty for mankind till it got into power. It is a significant confirmation of what Lord Dickinson well said that absolute power corrupts absolutely. Their first public demand since coming to power has been to ask this House of Commons to lay chains on the people of this country for five long years.

I am not a young man, but I was eager to believe that, having fought in two wars, I might look forward to the approach of three score years and ten with a degree of liberty. What is the sentence pronounced on me this afternoon? I was born a free citizen, I have lived

THE BRIEF for the PROSECUTION

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

8/6 net.

The publishers announce that orders can now be accepted for delivery early in November.

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

as a free citizen, and I have, as a soldier, been prompted to fight for this land of liberty. Yet, at the conclusion, I have no hopes that the bonds of serfdom will be lifted from me. Five years is the sentence which, if the consent of this House is obtained—as I anticipate it will be—will be laid upon us. These are sad feelings. Where is Robert Blatchford to-day? Where is William Morris? Where are those who laid the foundations of this movement which has now sold itself to the most authoritarian government of any government in the history of this country? We can go back to the government of the Kings or to the government of the Peers, but we will not find a government which attempted to impose measures of this character on a free people. This is a sad day for me because I find there have been only two voices raised on the other side, and hon. Members on the Front Bench know well that there is a case for human liberty and freedom, and that that case is being outraged and denied by the proposal to impose these five years of penal servitude on Britain.

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