

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 19. No. 15.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

An economist rejoicing in the good old British name of Schwartz, writing in the *Sunday Times* (a paper which ought to know better), remarks "We do not hear so much today of the facile and absurd doctrine that the problem of production has been solved, and that it only remains to distribute the superabundance."

How true that is, and what a tribute to the success of the Planners, and their able advisers, the Schwartzes.

• • •

A correspondent has been intrigued with the finance of bulk purchase where the payment is in dollars, and, by the exercise of persistence combined with a long official training, has elicited the following answer to an inquiry as to where he can find an item in Government Accounts showing a credit for sales of the goods bought, it being obvious that the public is expected to repay the dollars:—

"I think the answer to your enquiry is that *as such* the proceeds of commodities acquired out of the American loan do not figure in the Government accounts at all. What happens is that in the first instance the Government creates external debt (which does figure in the returns) in exchange for dollars. The dollars are then sold to the Exchange Equalisation Account in return for *internal debt* which is cancelled; finally when the Exchange Account sells dollars to finance imports it receives sterling which is invested in internal debt, such as Treasury Bills."

So now you know. As usual, and as in the case of such "Government Surplus" as you are allowed to acquire, you will pay twice—once in taxation, and again in price.

• • •

On the face of it, the suggestion that a book of which the immediate thesis is that there is ground for belief that William Rufus and Thomas A'Becket were voluntary sacrifices in a cult which involved ritual murder has an important bearing on contemporary politics might appear fantastic. But in *The Arrow and the Sword* (Faber) Mr. Hugh Ross-Williamson covers ground which anyone with a knowledge of the wickedness which forms the hidden side of history must consider contemplatively. The Mysteries, whether Eleusinian, Orphic, Druidic, Mithraic or Gnostic, and possibly their modern counterpart, certain brands of Freemasonry, have been at the heart of High Policy for many centuries; and if not identical with sex perversion, have always had a thread of sex perversion, with its peculiar psychology, running through them. The whole argument is far too tortuous to be summarised. The genealogy of Catharism, Templarism, Puritanism, and Whiggism, all demonstrably related and ancestral to our "Austerity" (Initiates excluded), is beyond question. We quoted recently Mr. Pemberton Billing's conviction, based on extensive information, that certain practices were not merely carefully

fostered with a view to rotting the moral fibre, but were an avenue to high office.

How much of all this Mr. Ross-Williamson knows or suspects (as Assistant-editor of *The Yorkshire Post*, 1925-30, *inter alia*, he would have wide sources of information) we cannot do more than conjecture. We are confident, however, that it is a line of investigation which will have to be explored; it is one of the Devil's Schools; and the curious spate of 'New Order' pseudo-Messianism (generally connected with vague monetary "reform," "Divine Plans," Perfection through Suffering, and what-have-you) is an exoteric indication that the Deadly Thing is coming to the surface.

• • •

We do not pay undue attention to the collapse of Conservative hopes in regard to the bye-elections of Gravesend and East Edinburgh, because we are confident beyond all argument both that, primarily, the majority-electorate principle is so fundamentally fallacious and potentially vicious that it cannot produce good results, and secondarily, that until Mr. Churchill and Mr. Harold Macmillan are eliminated, as a minimum, the Conservative Party has no future under any system. But, anyway, it is clear that ripe fate is in the saddle.

Realisation

"Your education is You, realising God's Meaning . . . These three sum up the purpose and also the history of the University. Historically, the University developed precisely in that order. Historically it will decline in precisely that order reversed . . . Historically, universities began with 'Man is the Measure.' It was at that point that Athens qualified for the title, because of all the cities of antiquity she really believed that dangerous doctrine. She has taught us the Humanities ever since . . . Humanism is not enough. For, having become the measure, Man becomes the circumference, the All. He begins imperceptibly to take it for granted that truth and goodness are only functions of himself, his profit, his utility; he puts beauty before them; and beauty only as a means to pleasure. When that instinct of exploitation takes possession of him, and he thinks he is a god, a Socrates has to die to teach him that reality cannot be distorted, and Aristotle has to live upon the lowly and laborious spade-work of science. By slow experience he discovers such a thing as *Jus—Law, Right,*—and the lesson stated at the opening of Justinian's *Institutes*—'Justice is the perpetual will to give to everything its own.' . . . Such realising is science. That is, to obey and to share the being of things that are not himself [a man's self], are *not* his property. That is to say, the core and essence of science is precisely not that part of it which is 'technique.'"—T. S. Gregory to the Joint Christian Societies of the University of Liverpool.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 24, 1947.

Dispossessed Farmer (Libel Case)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Agriculture how much the Odlum v. Stratton dispossessed farmer's case has now cost the taxpayer.

Mr. T. Williams: The total cost of this case amounted to £6,034 17s. 8d. . . .

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Agriculture in what category Mr. Odlum's farm was classified immediately before the Odlum v. Stratton trial commenced.

Mr. T. Williams: It is not my practice to disclose the grading of any particular farm except, on occasion, to the occupier himself.

Sir W. Smithers: But is not the Minister aware that the essence of the Odlum v. Stratton case was the classification of Mr. Odlum's farm immediately before? May I ask him further, were all the relevant papers asked for submitted at the trial by the Ministry?

Mr. Williams: The fact that this was the one case where libel ensued is a warning not to repeat the offence later.

Mr. Gooch: Does not my right hon. Friend agree that questions dealing with these matters should have been addressed to his predecessor in Office?

National Assistance Bill—Second Reading

The Minister of National Insurance (Mr. James Griffiths): . . . Since there has been some question about the history of the Bill, perhaps I might recall some of the recent history, which will be within the memories of many hon. Members who are here. In its present form, the Bill and other Bills make one great scheme. The process began one day in 1941 when my right hon. Friend the Member for Wakefield (Mr. Arthur Greenwood) announced to the House that he was setting up a committee to examine the whole field of social insurance and allied services, and to report what should be their future. That was the first step, taken not by a Conservative Government, but under a Coalition Government, and under the inspiration and drive of Labour Members of that Government. There came the committee, and later the report. Perhaps I may recall—I am only doing this because the right hon. and gallant Gentleman has done it—when the Beveridge Report came up for consideration in the House how the spirit and the temper of the speeches made by two members of the Conservative Party shocked everybody, and led our party into the Lobby for the first time against the Coalition Government. As a result of that Debate, raised by our own party, and in which I had the privilege of taking part, we had very quickly the White Paper and then the Bill to set up the Ministry of National Insurance.

The first of the series of five Bills, the Family Allowances Bill, was introduced during the Coalition Government by the first Minister of National Insurance, who is now the Lord Chancellor. It went through all its stages in this House, and then came the break up of the Coalition Government. In the last days of that Parliament, the Family Allowances Bill was allowed to go on the Statute Book by the consent of all the House. When I became Minister of National

Insurance, there was no date in that Bill as to when it should commence. I had to fill in the date, and I filled it in as 6th August, 1945. The only contribution which came from the Opposition was that I was hasty in putting in that date. Beatrice Webb used to say that it took 30 years from the publication of a Report until that Report became embodied in an Act of Parliament. The Beveridge Report was produced on 20th November, 1942, just over five years ago. One Bill, the smallest of the five, though not unimportant, was produced in the dying days of the Coalition Government. All the rest have been produced by this Government, and the complete scheme is being brought into operation next July, within five years of that Report. That is an achievement of which the Government are entitled to be proud.

Because there has been general agreement on all sides with the main provisions and indeed with the purpose of this Bill to end the Poor Law, the Debate has been very largely on points, not unimportant, but of detail. We are all agreed on the main provisions in the Bill and upon the main division it makes of functions. . . .

Dominion Routes (Waiting Lists)

Mr. Hector Hughes asked the Minister of Transport how many persons now await transport to South Africa, New Zealand and Canada, respectively; how long they have been waiting; how long they are likely to have to wait for transport; and what steps he is taking to reduce the waiting list and at what rate.

Mr. Callaghan: The applications registered with the shipping lines during the last two years and still outstanding total for South Africa 95,000, New Zealand 20,000 and Canada 50,000. The position will be somewhat eased as passenger ships return to these routes after reconversion from military service during the next few months, and by new building. I regret that I cannot say when the waiting lists will be cleared.

House of Commons: November 26, 1947.

Royal Wedding (Commemorative Stamps)

Dr. Segal asked the Postmaster-General why no special stamp has been issued to commemorate the Royal Wedding.

Mr. J. H. Hare asked the Postmaster-General why no special issue of postage stamps to commemorate the Royal Wedding has been made.

Mr. Hobson: Much to my regret, the time available between the announcement and the date of the wedding did not suffice for the design, printing and issue of a special postage stamp worthy of the occasion, but a special commemorative cancellation mark, which the hon. Members have no doubt seen, was designed and brought into use throughout the United Kingdom.

Dr. Segal: How was it possible for the Dominions, which are many thousands of miles away from the scene of this celebration, to find time to issue commemorative stamps, whereas all our own Post Office found time to do was to get itself tied up in knots over this matter?

Mr. Hobson: The Dominions and Great Britain are not comparable in this matter. Their requirements in the number of stamps are considerably different from ours. We require 350 million stamps, and they take a long time to print.

Dr. Segal: Is not this another instance of the almost

total lack of imagination shown by the Post Office?

Mr. Hobson: No, it takes approximately nine months to design, print, and have in circulation a postage stamp—[HON. MEMBERS: "Why?"]—under the procedure usually adopted by the Department. The design of the stamp alone takes three months, and then it has to be submitted to His Majesty the King.

Mr. Skeffington-Lodge: Will my hon. Friend consider that it is still not too late—[HON. MEMBERS: "It is."]—to take action as desired by the questioner? May I have an answer?

Mr. Hobson: Put that question down, and we will have a look at it.

Mr. Skeffington-Lodge asked the Postmaster-General whether he will take steps to issue a commemorative stamp for the recent Royal Wedding.

Mr. Hobson: No, Sir. A commemorative cancellation mark specially designed for the occasion is already in use throughout the United Kingdom. Much to my regret, the time available between the announcement and the date of the wedding did not suffice for the design, printing and issue of a special postage stamp worthy of the occasion.

House of Commons, November 27, 1947.

Aliens (Naturalisation)

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Thomas Moore asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many naturalisation applications have been granted during the nine months ending 30th September; how this figure compares with the same period in 1938; and how many applications still remain to be examined.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede): As the figures for last month are available, I am, with permission, including these in my reply. Fifteen thousand and twenty-two certificates of naturalisation were granted in the ten months ended 31st October, 1947, and 1,786 were granted in the same period in 1938. Approximately 19,300 cases, most of them in the Metropolitan area, still remain to be examined.

Sir T. Moore: When does the right hon. Gentleman anticipate that he will be able to overtake arrears and accumulations which have mounted up during the war, and which he refers to now as being about 19,000?

Mr. Ede: No, the 19,000 include a substantial number of people who have applied since naturalisation was reopened. I think the comparative figures I have given indicate that the authorities are dealing with this subject with considerable expedition, having regard to the important inquiries which must be made before this great privilege is granted to anyone.

Mr. Hector Hughes: Is the Minister in a position to say whether all these naturalised persons are absorbed into industry, and whether they are all doing useful work, and earning their keep?

Mr. Ede: No, I cannot give any idea of that, but if a Question is put down, I will endeavour to give the House as much information as is in my possession.

WANTED URGENTLY: A typewriter, any good model with standard fingering, though office-model with elite type preferred; and preferably cheap. Write: Mrs. C. G. Dobbs, c/o K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria St., Liverpool, 2.

House of Commons, November 28, 1947.

American Fiction (British Magazine Purchases)

Mr. Skeffington-Lodge (Bedford): I wish to draw the attention of the House this afternoon to a matter of considerable importance from several points of view. I refer to the practice and habit of editors of many of our British weekly and monthly magazines in buying on a big scale the second rights of American light fiction, instead of making use of the output of our own authors, and artists. In the same way, illustrations are purchased by these magazines and, outside the periodical field, certain newspapers are even buying some of their strip cartoons from across the Atlantic. This is almost entirely a one-way traffic.

I know that "Jane" appears occasionally in various American publications, and I know that my right hon. Friend on hearing that, will assume that I am thinking of the "Daily Mirror," in which journal she appears day after day with all her romantic background, but I would like to explain in considerable detail what is actually happening in a situation in which up to 80 per cent. of the fiction published in this country is of American origin. It has, of course, previously appeared in magazines like "McCall's," "Colliers," "The Ladies Home Journal," the "Saturday Evening Post" and others of a similar type across the Atlantic. A small group of agents in this country circulate these periodicals to British editors, and three competing publishing houses of Odhams, Newnes and Pearson, and the Amalgamated Press, who in their turn select their stories from these magazines at prices ranging from 20 to 50 guineas each. They get them appropriately Anglicised, so that they pass as British stories and then they put them on our bookstalls in such journals as "Woman and Beauty," "Home Notes," "Woman's Own," "Woman's Journal" and "Woman's Pictorial," copies of which, incidentally, I have with me here.

Odhams's weekly paper "Woman" is, generally, more yankee than the rest, and is sometimes 100 per cent. American in its fiction. I am sure that the readers of that, as of other journals I have mentioned, do not realise this, and, like the majority of women who are aimed at by most of the surviving magazines in this country, they are grossly deceived. They cannot recognise the Trans-Atlantic source of these stories. They do not know, for example, that "Florida" has been struck out and "Maidenhead" put in, and that for "Birmingham" they should really read "Detroit," and for "St. James's Park," "Central Park, New York." In every way, in my judgment, this represents a very dangerous trend, having regard to the fact that their readers are unconsciously absorbing propaganda for the American way of life.

I have no objection to the American way of life for Americans, but let them keep it, I suggest, in America. In regard to the strip cartoons which are keeping our own artists out of a job, there is Rip Kirby, who battles with gangsters every morning in the "Daily Mail." He always drives his big American car on the right hand side of the road, with the result that his country of origin cannot be concealed. Then there is the comic strip that appears nightly in "The Star" newspaper. The mischievous twins depicted in that paper appear to have access to an endless quantity of ice-cream and bananas—a disheartening thing for those British youngsters who follow daily their adventures.

No one wants to stop important literature or real art, any more than great music from moving freely across

(continued on page 7).

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 19. No. 15.

Saturday, December 13, 1947.

State Control of Medicine: "The Last Round"

Despite the last-minute advocacy of a 'trial' by such medical politicians as Professor Henry Cohen (introduced by the press as a member of the "Negotiating Committee" but not, as we believe he is, as an "advisor" to the Minister), neither doctors nor their patients have yet agreed to submit to the State control of medical practice. "The Last Round" remains to be fought.

Under this heading, the Medical Policy Association returns to the fight with its Bulletin No. 18, which begins well with a quotation from Hegel: "The owl of Minerva does not start upon her flight till the evening twilight has begun to fall." It continues as well as it begins, and we commend its advice to readers of this journal in full confidence that they will respond to its call upon their efforts. The history of the dispute is admirably summarised in the following paragraphs:—

"In 1943 the M.P.A. conducted a plebiscite, in which 77 per cent. of replies from doctors were opposed to control of the medical profession by any form of central authority. In view of this result the M.P.A. both took and advised action to endeavour to ensure that the Executive of the B.M.A. carried out the policy of the majority of its members, i.e., a refusal to have anything to do with the proposed totalitarian organization of the profession.

"Despite the clear policy of the profession, thus formulated, the B.M.A. Executive with representatives of other medical organisations formed the first "Negotiating" Committee. To negotiate what? Not the primary question whether or no the profession desired to surrender the freedom of its individual members and to submit to control by a central authority, but, assuming the facts of surrender and submission as already accepted, to discuss the terms on which the profession would give its consent.

"In 1945, after the general election, when the totalitarian intention of the Government had become quite plain in its *National Health Act*—an Act cleverly devised to enable the Minister and his successors to rule the profession by Regulations without limit or qualification—the B.M.A. Executive itself conducted a plebiscite. In spite of the obscure form of question asked, a majority of the profession again revealed its opposition to central control by any authority. It rejected any further negotiations with the Minister. Once more, however, the Executive over-rode the wishes of the majority of the members. . . . A new committee was appointed and

resumed negotiations, which were secret, with the agents and planners of totalitarianism. Thereby, for there must be a limit short of catastrophe, the B.M.A. forfeited the confidence of the profession.

"Nevertheless, the danger does not end there. A good deal of the negotiating is a smoke-screen to keep the profession quiet. Behind this cover the machinery of authoritarian control is being quietly and steadily set up. . . ."

We can confirm that opinion. More than one university is waking up to the nature of what has been done affecting itself by servants who have played a political game, and the coming fight to preserve intellectual freedom is thereby assisted. Also, such developments lend support to the opinion that "the owl of Minerva" may alight timeously. But there is much to be done. What is done will not be valueless, whether the Planners win the round or not. The awakening of the conscience of the country (and of the world) is proceeding, and it is not impossible that the Devil will win every battle but the last. The decision of that issue nevertheless depends upon the conduct of previous engagements, of which the question troubling the Medical Profession is by no means the least important.

"The Report of the unauthorised Negotiating Committee must appear shortly," the statement proceeds. "The various sub-committees have apparently ended their deliberations, and all that remains is a final interview with the Minister. Now that, contrary to the expectations and desires of the majority of doctors (and patients), Mr. Aneurin Bevan has been allowed to retain his post, it is certain that no curtailment of principle or concession of any significance can be expected. . . ."

"After the veil of secrecy has been withdrawn by the publication of both the Committee's case and the decisions of the Minister, the B.M.A. is committed to yet another plebiscite."

This opinion will probably be confirmed before these lines appear in print. The Medical Policy Association asks that no doctor will pledge himself to work the Act as it stands, for the one thing that dominates its provisions is central control. Perhaps our readers can stiffen the fibres of resistance in their medical advisors, whose interest, though sight is often lost of the fact, is but secondary to their own.

The Patriot

"Our Munition is all of it Spent" heads the melancholy announcement on the front page of our contemporary, *The Patriot*, for December 4 that it has been decided that "*The Patriot* could not go on after the end of this month, at any rate in its present form." We applaud the rejection recorded of advances "from several sources for taking over the paper." Policies are acceptable or unacceptable, irrespective of the hand which offers them.

Personation

It has reached our knowledge that "the Editor's Compliments" have accompanied marked copies of *The Social Crediter* to individuals who might not normally receive this attention, and who have not, in fact, received it in the cases cited. The motive appears to be to provide "proof" of communication. Our very well-mannered regular readers are not suspected of indiscretion and will not, we know, abate their appropriate efforts to extend our influence.

That Old Serpent*

By NORMAN F. WEBB

(II)

The Whigs of the post-Napoleonic era early found themselves in a cleft stick, metaphorically sold to the City. Through their heavy investment in the National Debt, they were forced to be the unwilling exponents of a calvinistic and anti-monarchical creed, quite alien to their culture and national outlook. And when the country, so to speak, split over its agricultural, versus its industrial policy, the one strongly tinged with economic nationalism and the other international in impulse, its rulers discovered themselves collectively and individually divided—unable, or unfitted, to solve its economic problems. As landowners they favoured high agricultural prices, as henchmen of the City low. And in consequence they vacillated, and lost all confidence and unity of purpose, taking their direction at second-hand and in a doctrinaire form. The duty on imported grain, which had been removed without any desirable effect, was precipitately re-imposed in 1825 on an elaborate sliding scale, with equally little effect on what was in fact not so much a domestic as an international phenomenon—the persistently depreciating purchasing-power of Money—which, up to the time of Disraeli, no one but that stalwart champion of depressed agriculture, William Cobbett, had the penetration to see was the focus of trouble.

But in spite of the reimposed tariffs, the price of wheat continued to rise, owing directly as we now know, to the defects of the system by which it was regulated, and the popular cry, started no doubt by “authoritative reports” from the City, was that the trouble lay in the tariffs themselves, which, it was insisted, had been applied by the Government for their own personal gain.

In these circumstances, and at this particular juncture, arose Richard Cobden, possibly as honest a man as Cobbett, but not nearly so far-sighted. Largely, no doubt, from humanitarian impulses, but completely ignoring the needs of the nation as a whole, Cobden ranged himself at the head of what he regarded as the cause of the industrial worker, and organised the Anti-Corn Law League for the repeal of the duties on imported wheat. But because his movement was partisan and doctrinaire—of the City, though he may not have known it,—it paid the inevitable penalty of its partiality. Immediately what came to be known as Free Trade—in the Mercantile days, the mere removal of an import duty as an expedient means—was elevated into an economic thesis and the battle-cry of the industrial interests. Inevitably, and by implication, its antithesis, Protection, received the same rarified distinction from its followers, mainly the agricultural interests. Means became ends; principles, upon which political parties, and industrial, and agricultural, and even class interests could fatally divide. Fatally, because they were only methods, and more or less discredited methods at that, being quite inadequate to cope with the rapidly emerging and radical defects of the Money System, and in the fight over them the true policy of the nation was almost completely lost sight of.

This was the Great Issue into which the rising young Jewish parliamentarian, Benjamin Disraeli, precipitated himself; indeed he may be said to have precipitated it, to a very large extent, by his objective outlook. And by the

*Observations from Vol. II of *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli*, by W. J. Moneypeny.

irony of fate, although it was he who almost alone saw both Free Trade and Protection in a sane and balanced light,—as Mercantile expedients, the one as good as the other, or as bad according as they were employed,—it was he who by force of circumstances quite beyond his control, came to be the acknowledged exponent of Tariffs with a capital T. as an end in themselves. Thus Protection, as the final end and goal of society, grew to be the dialectical antithesis of the City doctrine of unrestricted internationalism, Free Trade, which is the money-monger’s Elysium; for the investor, jam, perhaps, but for the average individual member of society, —Henry Wallace’s Common Man: sucker at High Levels—unmitigated work, Full Employment, Sisyphism. There can never have been a more striking example of alternative means elevated into dialectically opposed ends and hypothetically rival national policies.

All this, of course, was hidden from the actual protagonists; as it always is or they would not lend themselves to it as they invariably do. And as the century advanced the fight grew hotter and fiercer between the champions of what the Germans so happily christened *Manchesterism* and the Economic Nationalism of the Protectionists. In reality Disraeli, it is quite evident, belonged to neither camp. He saw the opposed ideologists, essentially indistinguishable from one another in the mental fog in which they were enveloped, like the National Socialists and Democrats who fought it out in the Germany of the early thirties of this century, and he saw with equal clarity the Influence behind them and by whom they were inevitably controlled and incited. But beyond the two blindly opposed economic ideologists he saw something else, a body he called the Tories, Toryism, which was both and neither, and which was to him England, a balanced organism. This entity was not divided in policy as to what was best for England and what was best for the world. It was united on the single principle that what was *really* best for England, the nation as a whole and not sectionally and therefore in an “enlightened” sense, must in the long run be best for the world as a whole; which manifestly is to approach the problem from the right, the practicable end, as distinct from the uncomprehending cry for One World arising from the spokesmen of innumerable nations in themselves completely distracted and divided.

Like the Sixteenth century Mercantilists of England’s Great Age, when realism—Reality, Truth; Christianity perhaps—came to its most perfect and instinctive flowering, and which his father had taught him to study and admire, the Tories, the National Party of Disraeli’s imagining, saw England’s problem of the 1830’s and 40’s as really a single whole—so to say, an illusion of division. And as in every kind of situation, that singleness and simplicity of outlook, creating a “unity” in the individual mind itself, gave them above their contemporaries a clear and enlightened outlook. “If thine eye be single, thy whole body will be full of light.” But this was only in an extremely limited degree, for it must be recognised that Disraeli’s National Party was in fact largely a projection of his own mind, and failed to materialise. For it must be admitted that, in spite of his remarkable personal achievement in assisting to spread Great Britain’s imperial influence, there was never any really effective political counter-balance to the overwhelming weight of *Manchesterism* in Nineteenth century England, any more than there is to Laskiism—or would *Moscowism* be a prettier name for our present afflictions?—today. The best, perhaps the only, modern example of democratic Political Principle in more or less effective operation, *i.e.*

alive in a body of men as distinct from the mind of a leader, is to be seen and studied in the Canadian state of Alberta.

There can be no doubt, however, that this Principle was alive and exceptionally self-conscious one hundred years ago in this fantastical Jew, who, personally and in the person of his ageing literary sire in his retreat in Buckinghamshire, had not repudiated the Truth. But who, on the other hand, had succeeded to a very remarkable degree in mentally defeating and disarming the social stigma still clinging to his race, of having done so. He had studied England objectively, swotted her up, so to speak, and quite literally had learned to "love" his subject, the nation, the unique social organism his study had disclosed. And through, and out of his conscious love, which had come into his heart via his intellect and was therefore fully conscious, he was able to see both the dangers and the possibilities of the situation much more clearly than any of the then ruling class, whose love and enjoyment of their country and its comparatively free way of life, in which, quite literally, they revelled, was too instinctive, too subconsciously material, too unself-conscious to be proof against dialectical attack from without. In short, their "self-interest" was not sufficiently "enlightened" to withstand the temptings of "that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan"; for Truth must come to the surface and grow intellectually self-conscious. It is its inalienable property and virtue that it does so. From being an instinctive matter of sound common-sense, it must, if it is to survive, become scientific knowledge in order to defend itself against insidious mental manipulation and propaganda. Otherwise even the best of us must ultimately capitulate to that Dark Force within the human heart "which accused them before our God day and night," and lose all their integrity and self-conviction. It was in that knowledge, which is understanding, love, that Disraeli surpassed his peers. Their love was still too much of their bones and not enough of their heads for them to be able to resist the arguments of the Progressives of their day—the Radical-Liberalism of the Cobdenites,—or to have shown them the common-sense of abstaining from such courses as gave a handle to the humanitarian arguments of their opponents.

This need, to become self-conscious, to convert instinct into intellectual conviction and let it come to the surface—a need that is terribly urgent for the creation of a national movement today—was made very clear a century ago when the Tory Party, new-born by presumption and from its long sojourn in the political wilderness, came into power under Peel in 1834 with the new title of Conservatives. The Whigs might be the henchmen of the City, but the Conservative mandate was to preserve the national integrity, and counter the claim that what was required was Free Trade with cheap food and depressed agriculture. But from the very start Peel and his Cabinet, if not the Party, of which Disraeli formed one, showed themselves to be subject to exactly the same influence and pressure, if not to quite the same degree, as the Whigs, much to Disraeli's disgust, and the undeclared rift between him and his leader was soon very wide. There is a passage from Coningsby, written at this time, giving a conversation between the two political hangers-on in the novel, which might be aptly applied to our political parties today, and which shows his sardonic contempt for the lack of integrity in the contemporary political thinking.

"That we should live to see a Tory government again! We have reason to be very thankful."

"Hush!" said Mr. Tadpole, "The time has gone by for Tory governments; what the country requires is a sound Conservative Government."

"A sound Conservative Government," said Mr. Taper, musingly, "I understand: Tory men and Whig measures."

That was a hundred years ago, and written by a Jew who would have had England break herself free from the demoralising international pressure that was bent on making her abandon her national policy designed to serve the interests of the population as a whole, and accept one instead that was destined to enrich a section only, and that the comparatively small one, of investors. William Cobbett was dead, and scarcely one individual besides himself among all the increasing millions, saw the true issue. All the rest, either inflamed by industrial success, or in the case of the aristocracy, silenced by the not entirely groundless accusations that they sought to preserve their very handsome revenues from the land, were giving way before the insistent international strains of *Manchesterism*. Peel and his Cabinet, without a fraction of Disraeli's sympathetic understanding of Cobden's humanitarian appeal, were yet becoming daunted by the Cobdenite dialectic, just as our own Conservatives are daunted by totalitarian arguments today. The stage seemed set, as it is today, for a complete political collapse, and the rise of a single chamber Government wholly under the Internationalists.

And then, in the Autumn of 1845, the potato fell sick, and the ensuing famine in Ireland brought not only death in its train, but the psychological atmosphere of crisis in British politics judged necessary and suitable for a further advance by the internationalists of the day. The issue was immense, as it is clear Disraeli fully recognised, even if the immediate excuse was relatively trivial. "This mysterious but universal sickness of a single root," he says significantly in *Endymion*, "was to change the whole history of the world." No less than that! Suddenly, and without a pretence even of logical necessity, intense pressure was applied to Peel and his cabinet to remove the duty on corn, as the only means of putting a stop to the tragic holocaust in Ireland. They gave way,—broke down, as the Duke of Wellington said, "It was the damned potatoes that put Peel in a fright"—just as today it might be coal, or even potatoes again, with the Conservatives in our own time. The Prime Minister of a party elected as Protectionists, gave way and, in effect, handed their electors over to Free Trade and the Cobdenites and Liberals. Whereupon Disraeli, with Lord George Bentinck and a very considerable section of the Conservatives, seceded from the Party; Nineteenth Century England was saved from Single Party Government.

Elements of Social Credit

This work is now available bound in full cloth with stiff cover.

7/6d. nett. (Postage 3d).

"full of interest"—*Western Morning News*."

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

LIVERPOOL.

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

national frontiers. Indeed, the more that happens, the better I should be pleased. But some 4,000 stories, bought at the prices I have named, represent a serious dollar leakage, which should be plugged. Moreover, their coming here definitely penalises our own writers and artists, and at the same time does incalculable harm to the minds and outlook of their readers. . . .

The large sum of money which is literally going West every month unless something is done by my right hon. Friend to stop it, seems a disgraceful thing in this time of economic crisis. Almost worse is the fact that this country should become the dumping ground for a vast amount of trash which would be better kept at home. This export of hokum to Britain should be stopped, both for our sake, and for the sake of America herself. It constitutes a veritable Niagara of piffle and slush, which hides the true America behind a facade of synthetic sentimentality, cheap cynicism and sex turned on and off like a tap.

I strongly believe our British way of life is second to none. Why, therefore, cannot our magazine readers have stories which tell of the way we think and feel in this country today? Our attitude to divorce, for instance, is quite different from that of our cousins over the seas, yet one magazine I have seen appealing to working girls recently published a story in which the young heroine had been married four times, and was contemplating a fifth adventure. It all happened, I would add, for the much-deceived readers, in Dewsbury, or Rochdale—

Dr. Morgan (Rochdale): God forbid.

Mr. Skeffington-Lodge:—and certainly not in Chicago, or Hollywood. The very titles of the stories are utterly revolting and revealing and hon. Members would be amazed if I quoted them at any length. I will mention a few for their edification: "Date Tonight," "Kisses that really count," "Pick-up Secrets," "Love is an Art," "Every Paradise has a Serpent." These are some of the sloppy catchphrases which are used.

Thousands of our young people of both sexes read these stories and, unfortunately, they are unconsciously as a result absorbing the American more casual attitude toward marriage, infidelity, divorce, and indeed, to life itself. They find portrayed for them in these stories boys and girls of school age involved in romantic and passionate affairs. The stories are mostly set against a background of plenty, and the driving motive of the heroes and heroines is almost invariably one of blatant self-interest. The hero is very often a rich predatory type of man, and the heroine a woman whose main purpose in life is to grab a man at all costs, preferably a rich one. . . .

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Glenvil Hall): . . . Let me briefly indicate what the situation is. In those far off, dim, distant days before the war, there was no restriction whatever on what literature could pass between countries. There was no limit to what one imported nor, within limits, of course, to the kind of literature one imported. When the war came, and shipping space was short and exchange difficulties developed, it became absolutely impossible to allow that kind of thing to continue. Imports were, therefore, completely restricted, and no imports of fiction of any kind were allowed from the United States of America. After the war, the prohibition on fiction from the United States continued. On the other hand, an open general licence, issued by the Board of Trade, was given to importers

who desired to import literature—children's books, fiction, stories, and all the rest of it—from Commonwealth countries.

The object of this—and I think it was a worthy object, and one which we should try to support—was to reinstate and get going again the free flow of ideas, contained in books and literature of all sorts, between the Old Country and the Dominions. I am glad to think that this trade which, before the war was small, began to grow after the war, for reasons which we all appreciate, such as the shortage of paper and the difficulties of publication in this country. The trade not only began to grow but reached fairly considerable dimensions. At the end of 1946, with the American Loan Agreement in being, and Article 9 of that Agreement laying down certain conditions, it became absolutely essential that we should look at this matter again. As the House will remember, we undertook as from 1st January, 1947, not to discriminate against the United States in import restrictions on any product whatever.

That being so, it was quite obvious that we could not continue to refuse to allow American fiction to come in and, at the same time, without limit permit any type of book including fiction, to come in from the Dominions. We could not extend the open licensing system to the United States of America, because we had not the dollars to permit it. Nor could we place—indeed we thought it would be unfair to try to place—a quota system on the Commonwealth countries, because, as I say, their exports to this country went up by leaps and bounds after the war and it would have been unfair to go back, as far as they were concerned, to a pre-war quota. It was therefore decided to permit anyone to import freely into this country any literature he pleased. No limit was placed on the imports whatever.

But another limitation of another kind was instituted, and that was that importers who, in the main, were those who imported literature of all sorts before the war, should undertake that 50 per cent. by value of what they imported would be re-exported. That obligation was global. It did not mean they had to re-export to the country from which they imported. So long as they re-exported to any country up to 50 per cent. of what they imported, licences were given to them quite freely to import anything they desired to bring in. Bound, as we are, under Article 9 of the Loan Agreement not to discriminate against the United States of America, we cannot follow the suggestion made by my hon. Friend the Member for Bedford, because, if we did, it would mean that we should also have to discriminate against and cut off books, and magazines, and literature of all kinds coming to us from the Dominions.

He asked why it was that Exchange Control permitted this traffic to go on, and why we allowed dollars to be drained away in this direction. The situation being as I have described, the Exchange Control has found the currency necessary to pay for any copyrights or publication rights of music, books, cartoons, and all the rest of it, subject only to satisfactory evidence being forthcoming that the debt was due. We cannot go beyond that. . . .

Aphorism

"The notion, extraordinary prevalent in England, that in forgiving your enemy you both placate and reform him is a fallacy; you merely crystallize his animosity; for only the generous nature can accept a kindness with grace."—Sir Lionel Lindsay, *Addled Art*.

The Peremptory Challenge of Jurors

Discussion in the House of Commons on the Criminal Justice Bill (which on November 27 and 28 passed a Second Reading without a vote) was mainly on the detail of the Bill, where indeed great scope was offered. The principle of capital punishment will come before the House at a later stage of the Bill, when a vote will be taken on it.

One clause which occasioned little comment but which may well prove important in the next few years was thus referred to by the Solicitor-General (Mr. Frank Soskice):

"... There are two ways in which juries can be challenged. One is the peremptory challenge, without any cause being given; the other is challenge for cause shown. The second affords to the subject, we think, a great measure of protection, and it is doubtful whether he gets any further protection by his right of mere peremptory challenge.

"In cases of high treason the accused can challenge without cause shown, up to 35 jurors; in cases of other types of treason and felony the accused person has the right to challenge, without cause shown, up to 20 jurors. He can simply say he does not like them and they have to go. In addition to that, he has the right, without any limit of numbers to challenge jurors on cause shown: that is to say, he or his counsel can raise an objection, which must then be justified, before the juror is discharged from the jury. . . ."

In practice, the peremptory challenge of jurors is so rarely exercised that Mr. Frank Soskice called it obsolete—but he was interrupted. This privilege is to be abolished, and the challenge for cause shown is undergoing some modification.

Now it is plain that the intention behind the peremptory challenge was particularly concerned to safeguard the accused in political cases: for in cases of high treason more jurors may be dismissed this way than in other cases. In political trials the most valid objection to a juror might be ideological antipathy, but this might be impossible to 'prove' in order to challenge by cause shown; and the attempt would probably convert a passively disapproving into an actively hostile atmosphere. The peremptory challenge is a neat way of bye-passing this difficulty, to give the accused fair play with the minimum of prejudice; its use should be revived not abolished.

As we move into a time of political prosecutions, we may think of Mr. Isaacs, directing mob-opinion against 'spivs'; observe the mountebank political acrobatics of the communists in their determination to manipulate mob-opinion against the individual; and consider the ominous but integral part played by 'demonstration trials' in the economy of the U.S.S.R.

To leave a man accused by mob-opinion at the mercy of mob-prejudice with no answer in its proper place to his own prejudice is a treacherous deed.

U.S. Bankers Indicted

According to a Washington message of the Associated Press, seventeen of the largest investment banking firms of New York are to be indicted by the United States government in a Civil anti-trust suit, charging conspiracy to monopolize the handling of securities issues.

The firms are Morgan Stanley and Company; Kuhn Loeb and Company; Eastman, Dillon and Company; Kidder, Peabody and

Company; Goldman, Sachs and Company; Lehman Brothers; Smith, Barney and Company; Glore, Forgan and Company; White Weld and Company; Drexel and Company; the First Boston Corporation, Dillon, Read and Company, Inc.; Blyth and Company, Inc.; Harriman Ripley and Company, Inc.; Stone and Webster Securities Corporation, Harriss, Hall and Company, Inc., and Union Securities Corp.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart...	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
The French Revolution by Nesta H. Webster	10/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit.....	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...	7/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	5/-
Odlum v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceedings)	2/6

Does it Fit the Facts?..... 4/-
Communism in Action

U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
Protocols of Zion	1/6
The Smear Terror	1/3
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
This Freedom	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...	8d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson...	6d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
Social Credit: An Explanation for New Readers 1½d. each, or 50 copies for 5/-.	
"Pages from <i>The Social Crediter</i> ".....	1½d.
"Private View" for Industrialists	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

FROM K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.