

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 19. No. 16.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

There appears to be a general feeling that the Conservative Party has no underlying principles. May we suggest Honesty and Honour?

“... as Burke reminded us, people will not look forward to posterity, who will not look backward to their ancestors”. The *causa causans* of our present discontents, is not the economic upheaval in which the whole world is involved [*sic*] but the crass ignorance of the people, the lack of interest they evince in the history of their country, and the rapid and progressive deterioration in the education and efficiency of those in whose hands the destiny of England lies.” —Sir Arthur Page, K.C., in *The National Review*.

There is ground to believe that heredity is so much stronger than environment that families with strongly marked characteristics die out in an environment which does not give those characteristics freedom for the exercise of their particular ability. This is of course the converse of the meretricious Socialist theory that environment is decisive; and the ultimate result of a policy based on the fallacy is to lower the general environment—a process in operation on a wide scale to-day.

Anyone who doubts that we are suffering from a long-term policy of which the French Revolution was a modern episode has only to consider the constant re-appearance of expedients which favour it, under widely different names—a device which is used for the purpose of defeating the lessons of such history as cannot be suppressed. The French Encyclopaedists were the ancestors of the Fabians and P.E.P.; the present House of Commons bears a close resemblance to the Constituent Assembly which prepared the way for the Commune; and, on a larger canvas, U.N.O. is merely the League of Nations which made the Second World War inevitable.

“French institutions, which have rapidly led to a state of disorder and impotence, are the outcome, pure and simple, of intellectual planning. Deprived of all genuine foundation, their inherent vices have been aggravated still more by that inadequacy of public opinion which is the real evil from which our country is suffering.”—*The Causes of Political Unrest in France*, Baron Humbert Michaud. *XIX Century*.

We understand that Mrs. Manning, the wife of the Premier of Alberta, found STELLA, Marchioness of Reading (Mrs Rufus Isaacs) most charming and helpful on the latter's very quiet visit to Alberta about eighteen months ago.

“Social Credit Leader Solon Low, ex-champion pugilist, Gene Tunney, Broadway columnist Walter Winchell, and Dominion Mines Minister James A. Glen will be among

guests at Yellowknife, N.W.T., when the first *gold brick* is poured from the Beaulieu Mine . . . ”—*Vancouver Daily Province*, November 28, 1947.

Evidently there will be a number of others.

In order that the situation may be understood as it develops both in Alberta and Canada generally, it appears to be desirable to re-state the objects of the 1939-45 War exactly as we stated them on September 23, 1939, in these columns. We have not had occasion to change or modify one word of that forecast:—

- (1) The establishment of the International Police State on the Russian model, beginning with Great Britain.
- (2) The restoration of the Gold Standard (*i.e.*, Dollar Standard), and the Debt System.
- (3) The elimination of Great Britain in the cultural sense, and the substitution of Jewish-American ideals.
- (4) The establishment of the Zionist State in Palestine as a geographical centre of World Control, with New York as the centre of World Financial Control.

It is not necessary to re-emphasise the fact that Social Credit, both in philosophy and policy, is incompatible and fatal to each and every one of these objectives, and as a preliminary, its disruption and disappearance is essential. Since its strategic position, at least superficially, is strongest in Canada, and its “advertising site” most favourable in Alberta, it is there that we should expect the enemy to deploy most obviously, although it is important not to lose sight of other positions.

Three tactical methods are open to the enemy, and he is employing all of them. The first is to block all Provincial Legislation which strengthens the Social Credit position (not anything which is *called* Social Credit but *is* Socialism). The next is to work for the absorption of Canada by the United States. The third, and most subtle and deadly, is to flatter and foster the ambitions of key men, or/and procure the appointment of nominees so that, by the prosperity which their measures, backed by unlimited but strictly controlled credit, can ensure, Social Credit attacks on the *control* of credit may be emasculated. We may remark that the identity of several of these key men is known to us. In principle the latter strategy is a variant, but only a variant, of the Slave State, in which the slaves are well fed and managed, in the manner of the Mond-Turner proposals.

Of the ultimate outcome we have no doubt whatever, but a great deal depends on whether men at once established in leading positions, and incorruptible, can be found to take the right line. One of the most pathetic of the delusions which afflict politicians is that they can take the devil's wages without doing the devil's work. We were far from seeing eye to eye with Mr. Aberhart in his early efforts; but he was honest and was learning fast when he “died.” There are not too many Aberharts about.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 3, 1947.

Registration for Employment Order

Mr. Frank Byers (Dorset, Northern): I beg to move,

"That the Registration for Employment Order, 1947 (S.R. & O., 1947, No. 2409), dated November 11, 1947, a copy of which was presented on November 11, be annulled."

... The object of the order is to complete a list of spivs, drones, eels and butterflies, and to compel them to take up essential work. But there is no definition of any of these classes in this order. In the evidence given before the Select Committee on Statutory Rules and Orders, Sir Harold Wiles, of the Ministry of Labour, said that what the Prime Minister loosely called "spivs and drones" were not easily definable, and that the Ministry would have to find, by trial and error, whether they were getting the people the Government were after. As a Liberal that made me shudder. The idea of trial and error—[*Interruption.*] I am entitled to shudder if I want to, or am I not? The Select Committee on Statutory Rules and Orders, in their Third Special Report, on page xxvii, drew attention to the undesirability of what is called "Five-tier legislation." I believe that this is vitally important from the point of view of the future of our Parliamentary democracy. The Committee stated:

"Your committee have sometimes had to take note of a pedigree of five generations—

- (a) the statute;
- (b) the Defence Regulations made under the statute;
- (c) the orders made under the Defence Regulations;
- (d) directions made under the orders; and
- (e) licences issued under the directions."

They then went on to say:

"Your Committee hope that, now that hostilities have ceased, Departments may find themselves able so to frame any order made under Defence Regulations that it will be self-contained—in other words, to be content with the grandchildren of the statute and not to bring its great-grandchildren or great-great-grandchildren upon the scene. It is by no means clear that Parliament contemplated these cumulative delegations. They tend to postpone the formulation of an exact and definite law and they encourage the taking of powers meanwhile in wider terms than may ultimately be required."

I believe that it is most important that the House should recognise a considered statement from the Committee. That statement, taken together with the words of Sir Harold Wiles, which appeared in the White Paper issued on Monday, shows to what extent this order is at variance with the British conception of Parliamentary Government. Where a person's liberty is infringed—and whether hon. Members agree with it or not this registration is an infringement—the citizen has a right to know precisely what his rights and obligations are; to know exactly where he stands. He cannot tell that from the order as it is at present. That was quite clearly revealed in the evidence given before the Select Committee. It was also quite clear that the Government could not define the people they want to register. Hence this phase of trial and error. They will not know until this thing has been working for some considerable time and a number of people whom they do not want have registered, who it is they are trying to catch. Trial and error means indignity and suffering to some people.

... I say that no Parliament should accept the view that a Government should be given powers as wide and undefined as those which will enable the Executive to tamper with the lives of citizens upon the basis of trial and error, without

reference to any principle whatsoever. I think that we know the key to all this. It is to be found—and I hope that this will not be interpreted as a personal attack on the witnesses who gave evidence, because I do not intend that; they are very able and competent people—in the answer given by one witness, when he was asked:

"You do not feel any difficulty about this sub-delegation?"

His answer was:

"Administratively it is much easier."

That is the danger, that administratively it is much easier if a notice can be put up defining the sort of people that are wanted, and if it does not do what is wanted, then another notice is put up. I do not believe that pays sufficient respect to human personality and to the individual. As I said, when I read the evidence given before the Committee, I shuddered, because here we have people saying that there is nothing new about it and that it is just the old system that we used during the war and we are just carrying it on.

... I want to say a word about public notices which seemed to creep into this matter of the relation of the order to the individual. Having our attention directed to delegated legislation, we find people compelled to register not by an order but by a public notice. We are told that the public notices will tell everyone within certain age groups and categories that they have to go and register at the employment exchanges, and it will warn them what the penalties are. There does not appear to be any notice in the order about what the penalties are for not registering. Are the penalties to be exactly the same for registering as for failure to obey a direction? I should like that to be cleared up. I did not think there would be such a penalty, but definitely it is to be put up in a public notice. Who the people responsible for the public notices are is not quite clear. One of the witnesses was asked to give a definition of what was a public notice. His answer was:

"A public notice is in fact a poster which is put up at Employment Exchanges, Post Offices, and so on. Secondly, a public notice is always given on the B.B.C., and it is announced in the national Press. Those are the three ways in which it is done.

Would you consider that, say, some notice put up, shall we say, somewhere in London, would constitute a public notice?—No.

Is it put up at every Post Office in the country?—I am not quite sure about that. I cannot answer that.

In other words the definition of a 'public notice' is somewhat vague?—Yes."

Are we really going to allow legislation of this sort to go through? It is going to be important to the people who are called upon to register that they should know—they have a right to know—exactly what they are going to undertake. [*Interruption.*] This is going to affect hundreds and thousands of people, and if this House is not prepared to go into the details of an order of this sort, then we might as well pack up British democracy. . . .

... this may well be a turning point in democracy, as it was in prewar Germany. If hon. Members will look at the Measures passed under the Brüning Government, they will discover that they paved the way, not for any misuse by Brüning, but for a legal revolution by Hitler. I am not saying that will happen here, or that there is any intention whatsoever—I am sure there is no intention whatsoever—on the part of the Government Front Bench to do anything of that sort, but the power which the Minister is taking in this order could be used by an unscrupulous government to stifle opposition in this country. That is true.

Powers very little wider than these are being so used to-day on the Continent of Europe.

... If I were an unscrupulous dictator, I would ask for very little more than the powers in this order to break the opposition. I do not propose to show hon. Gentlemen how to do it. There is a power in this order to register married men with a view to taking them away from their homes.

Mr. McKinlay (Dumbartonshire): Is that something new? ... Is the hon. Member postulating that the only people who should be directed are the people who are hungry?

Mr. Byers: The hon. Member perhaps does not know that I was fighting side by side with the Labour Party in the inter-war years, trying to remedy the very conditions about which he is talking. I spent my time up in Newcastle, Jarrow, and elsewhere, and then came back here trying to persuade people to do something about the miserable conditions. However, the mere fact that there was that unemployment and compulsion of labour in those days is no reason why it should be done by order to-day. I cannot understand hon. Members opposite who call themselves progressive. The only argument they have in favour of this order is that it happened before the war. That is Conservatism. . . .

Mr. Hollis (Devizes): I should like to associate myself very strongly with what the hon. Member for North Dorset (Mr. Byers) said in his appeal to the Minister to withdraw this order. Unapparent as it may seem, there is a very large measure of common ground and agreement between practically all hon. Members on certain points. The first point upon which there is general agreement is that direction of labour in itself is a hateful and intolerable thing. I think there can be very few hon. Members who do not agree with that. The hon. Member for Westhoughton (Mr. Rhys Davies) was on completely unassailable historical ground when he said that the whole idea of the direction of labour was not only contrary to the general traditions of this country, but also contrary to the traditions of the Labour Party, and I think there will be general agreement on that.

There must be general agreement also on the second point, which is a question of fact, and that is that the opinions of the Government and of hon. Members opposite have been changing with kaleidoscopic rapidity. Not long ago, the Prime Minister said that he was opposed to the direction of labour, and the Trades Union Congress were opposed to it. The right hon. Gentleman himself was opposed to it then. He said that, if we had direction of labour, we would have very little of it and no one must be moved from his house. Then they would sometimes be moved. So that changes of view have taken place. The last time we discussed this matter, the right hon. Gentleman said that nobody would be directed unless offered an alternative job, but it turned out a few days afterwards that a gentleman was directed without being offered an alternative job. When the matter was raised in this House, the right hon. Gentleman did something which always wins and will, I hope, always win, the sympathy of this House. He replied that there had been a mistake, he apologised and he said the mistake would be rectified. It is because he made that reply in that spirit that I make this appeal to him to act in a similar spirit on this much larger question that we are discussing tonight.

It is quite obvious that, since opinions are changing so rapidly we cannot be content with mere assurances from the

right hon. Gentleman or his Parliamentary Secretary that, up to the present, only a very small number of people have been directed. We cannot be content with that for two reasons. The first reason is that nobody in this House can be content with an assurance that an injustice has only been imposed upon a few. That is an intolerable proposition. An injustice is still an injustice, whether imposed upon a few or whether the number runs into five figures. The second reason is that we cannot be content with such an assurance because we cannot know what sort of a situation we are likely to face in future. At present, we are in a sort of half-way house, which is nonsensical. There is one point of view which is held on this side of the House, and it is that we object to the direction of labour at all because it attacks traditional British freedom. The other point of view is to incur the enormous odium of the decision to impose this new system on the country. It is absurd for the Government to impose the new system, incur the odium, and, at the same time, say that they are not going to use those powers.

Nobody can be content with the situation at present. If this particular situation is changing with kaleidoscopic rapidity, obviously, so also is the general economic situation of the country changing with equal rapidity. We have the word of Ministers themselves that there is a possibility of catastrophe facing this country, and, if that happens, one of two things may happen. Some people may say that this policy of the Government on the direction of labour had not only been tyrannical but futile, while some others may use the wholly contrary argument and say that, in this new totalitarianism an illogical compromise had been adopted in attempting to preserve some relics of the old freedom. That being so, surely, the more sincere the right hon. Gentleman is about not wishing these things to happen, the more sensible it is for him to go very cautiously, and to take the House hand in hand in his policy, and not to take wide powers of which he himself does not in the least wish to make use. Instead of that, we find this order. Far from having delegated legislation, we have here a delegation of a delegation of legislation through this use of a public notice, a word which nobody can define, and of which a citizen is under obligation to know, though, he may well not know of it. And if the interpretation of the hon. Member on the Front Bench is correct, which I hope that the Minister will tell us it is not, a man is to be punished if he does not listen to the B.B.C., and does not know that such a public notice has been issued. Instead of definite and intelligible obligations being placed upon citizens, we have absolutely undefined and unlimited obligations such as we find under paragraph 3 (b) or under paragraph 7 (d). Paragraph 3 (b) says:

"at any time and from time to time furnish to the Minister such particulars about himself in addition to any particulars already registered by him (whether by virtue of the provisions of this Order or otherwise) on such date, at such times, in such manner and at such places as the Minister may require."

What is the use of debating any liberties when such powers are given to a Minister to impose these things by public notice, and when nobody knows what a public notice is? Similar obligations are imposed on employers under paragraph 7 (d), which says:

"give notice to any persons employed in the undertaking in such manner as the Minister may from time to time by notice direct of any matters that the Minister may consider necessary for the purpose

(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, Tele-
phone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 19. No. 16.

Saturday, December 20, 1947.

An (Interim) Warning

There is a well-known tactic which consists in giving an organisation an omnibus name, not taken seriously in the neighbourhood of its origin (*e.g.*, "We, the people of England" by the three tailors of Tooley Street, and some would-be political "Parties," but exploitable by imposition of its name, in combination with unconsciousness of its promoters' objectives, in distant countries such as Australia and New Zealand.

As a preliminary to the warning we propose to give to Social Crediters in those Dominions, we may recall the remark made in the Kremlin ten years ago: "Social Credit? We know all about that. It is the only thing of which we are afraid."

We do not say it ourselves—events are demonstrating that the world is split between the philosophies of Christ and anti-Christ, and the policy which is irreconcilably and consciously opposed to anti-Christ is that of Social Credit. We have no wish to put it higher than that.

It must be obvious that genuine Social Crediters are fighting the good fight of all the ages. To suppose that theirs can be an easy victory; can indeed be less than the triumph of Christianity, is infantile. Whether by direct opposition, such as that of the disallowment of Mr. Aberhart's later legislation, or by Fifth Columnism, of which the Alberta Communists are effective exponents, Social Credit must be killed everywhere, preferably by its own titular exponents.

Before 1935, Mr. Aberhart's first electoral victory, probably not ten *per cent.* of the British population could have named the capital of Alberta, and not many more were sure whether Alberta was in North America or the Pacific Archipelago.

We will, for the moment, merely record the relevant facts.

Shortly after the election of Mr. Manning to succeed Mr. Aberhart, Lady Reading, (Mrs. Rufus Isaacs) visited Alberta. So far as we know, no mention of this visit appeared in the English Press. Mr. Manning became a Zionist. On November 28 (1947) Mr. Manning, in a public speech stated that Alberta had become the leading Province of Canada.

The interim warning we wish to offer is "Consider with care Social Credit news from Alberta, and the more triumphant the Provincial Government appears to be *at this stage* the greater the caution which should be exercised."

Eliminating Christianity

The Vancouver Sun for December 5, 1947, p. 12 in its noon edition printed an Associated Press Telegram from New York of the same date:—

An assistant superintendent of schools Thursday banned the singing of Christmas carols making reference to the Nativity and celebrations having "religious significance" in 23 Brooklyn schools.

It drew an immediate protest from the New York State Council of the Knights of Columbus, which termed it "an insult to all Christians" and demanded an investigation to have the order revoked.

Isaac Bildersee, in charge of the public schools of two districts declared in his order:

"Christmas, and other similar occasions, may be celebrated only as season, pre-vacation occurrences. There must not be any reference in dramatizations, song or other aspects of the occasion to any religious significance involved.

"Christmas carols with reference to the Nativity may not be sung, nor may decorations include religious symbols of any faith."

Explaining his order, Bildersee said "personal jollity and merrymaking" are fine for the children of the public schools, "but the religious features of the day should be eliminated.

We wish our Readers

A Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year

The "Nihilistic Moderns"

"The pretence of creating without representing would never have received a moment's consideration if the impossible claim had not been made in mystical and pseudo-scientific terms. It was made by writers on art after the appearance of the various inventions which were to displace all accepted values, and set up the mountebanks in the seats of the mighty. As all drawing except that employed in mechanics and architecture is concerned with the delineation of natural forms, this concerted attack on representation was equivalent to the dynamiting of all the art of the past—a consummation devoutly suggested by more than one of the morons of the Ecole de Paris.

"Drawing stands at the very threshold of civilisation, for what is all tool and weapon-making but shaping, which is drawing? Prehistoric man, in chipping his flint axes and arrowheads, invented sculpture; and in scratching on bone with a splinter of flint discovered the graphic arts. The tradition established by those wonderful first artists is, or should be, our proudest boast and inheritance. To the nihilistic moderns it has been anathema. And for the simplest of reasons. Unable to go farther with drawing than the first fling of line, they were humiliated by fine drawing, and they took the self-protective course in asseverating that their own vagaries were superior to it in expression, drama, and significance. Casuistry did the rest. It identified representation with photography, though no connexion exists for the representation of any object can be made by means of line, tone, or the scratch of a needle on copper. . . . The tactics of the international Communists would serve: corrupt, undermine, flatter the groundlings; but put the boot in. The thing was to kick the stuffing out of the aristocrat drawing."

—Sir Lionel Lindsay.

The Prophet of Hughenden*

By NORMAN F. WEBB

It could only be by some mesmeric mental manipulation, some persuasive argument that was more than half threat, that the Whigs were induced to back Free Trade as a national policy—a policy so adverse, not only to the country as a whole, but to their own land-owning interests. We have the same strange force operative to-day, undermining the integrity and conviction of those who find themselves, in most cases by force of circumstances, responsible for keeping the present shape of society from wholly collapsing. There is no authority to voice, or at least no ears to hear, the statement: Let him who is without fault cast the first stone; and in consequence the air is black with missiles, and the not-so-bad appears to be retreating on all fronts before the worse.

For what the promoters of Free Trade put forward as a doctrinal article of faith, demanded for its realization a premature disintegration of the more or less voluntary national coalescence, in the interests of an international and global monopoly of credit-creation; a world-wide compulsion, masquerading as Universal Peace. The League of Nations—that Palace of Peace, in Calvin's native city—had not been thought out in Disraeli's day, and in any case would not have appealed to the sons and grandsons of the builders of such local splendours as Blenheim and Castle Howard. The fashion among the Progressives of that age was, as Disraeli says in his novel "Sybil," "Venetian Republicanism, then the study and admiration of all speculative politicians;" no doubt with a good lacing of Machiavelli. That, of course, was the cult of the commercial oligarchy, a ruling faction, dominated and in league with those who controlled the hidden and concentrated power of credit-creation, the peculiar invention of the goldsmiths of near-by Florence. The modern version of this partnership, which C. H. Douglas refers to as Mond-Turnerism, *i.e.*, Big Business and finance-controlled Trades Unionism, that exploits and manipulates through governments, even more effectively to-day than then, the Dark Forces of envy and puritanical self-righteousness. That it is that makes governments what they are in spite of themselves, for it becomes the objective of those that find themselves in possession of these immense powers—control of what amounts to the blood circulation of society—to confuse and divide and leave defenseless, all those, both individuals and nations, to unite and protect whom, rather than to rule, is the proper function of Church and State. This is the coalition that first consciously raised its head in modern England as the City-backed Commons, in the days of the Commonwealth, when the Hitler of those times had his brief triumph in Whitehall.

Under this technically traitorous creed of de-nationalization, which it is impossible to conceive as anything but occultly imposed, the Whigs were led to embrace an entirely unbalanced policy of International Trade; foreign lending, at the expense of their country's agricultural and economic health, and their own agrarian interests in particular. For what in effect it amounted to was a Drive for manufactured Exports, and no protection for agriculture which had ceased to export. And here we come to this interesting statement of Disraeli's, in describing what he calls Dutch Finance, which had by his time become what is known as City Finance, and is now Wall Street Finance, that its objective and its effect

was, "to mortgage industry in order to protect property. Abstractly, nothing can be conceived more unjust, its practice in England has been equally injurious. . . . It has made debt a national habit; it has made credit a ruling power, not the exceptional auxiliary of all transactions; it has introduced a loose, inexact, haphazard and dishonest spirit in the conduct of both public and private life, a spirit dazzling yet dastardly, reckless of consequences and yet shrinking from responsibility. And in the end it has so often stimulated the energies of the population to maintain the material engagements of the State and of society at large that the moral condition of the people has been entirely lost sight of."

His precise meaning here is very subtle indeed, and the policy he attributes to the operating minds behind International Finance extremely long-term; for it is inconceivable that the openly-avowed objective of the campaign for Free Trade, and of the propaganda behind it, can have been "to mortgage industry." The joint offspring of the City of London and Manchester, the two chief *foci* of International activity in the Nineteenth Century, its ostensible and publicised intention was the promotion of industrial expansion—really the financing of the Industrial Revolution—and the conversion of Great Britain into the Workshop of the World, by the artificial stimulation of her industrial fertility, as Disraeli so brilliantly describes, at the expense of her natural fertility and, incidentally, of her organic balance. Actually the effect produced on the body politic was exactly that of an over-active gland—thyroid or endocrine, or whatnot—on the individual physique. Financially it was equivalent in its results to a forced levy on landed property, in the form of depressed agricultural prices and lowered wages, in favour of mechanical manufacture. With this was combined a policy of lending abroad as a priority to lending at home, and of lending at home primarily for capital production, which is what a policy of exports in excess of imports amounts to. It seems hardly necessary to emphasise the striking resemblance to the present time, or to suggest that the obvious alternative would have been the financing of the production of goods for home consumption, which is the solution of Social Credit.

Did Disraeli, who, as we know, was almost completely incapable, in the conventional business sense, where his personal finances were concerned, grasp all this intellectually one hundred years ago, at a time when it was only implicit, scarcely actual at all? Or was it an affair of intuition? In a sense all great discoveries are intuitive in the final analysis; revealed, it used to be called. What he saw, like that other enlightened Jewish seer before him, on the island of Patmos, was something which had not as yet emerged into general view; for the gap between prices and consumer purchasing-power, which was to develop with such menacing rapidity under the influence of technological progress and the consequent increase of series-production, had not as yet declared itself to anything like the present extent. As we now know, it was, and is, the necessity for closing this gap, making good the inherent and purely book-keeping discrepancy in the national ledger, with credit fallaciously assumed to be the "property" of the Banking System which administered and advanced it, that is relentlessly—and inevitably, as long as it is allowed to operate unrecognised and unaltered—bringing the whole of national industry, and with it all real wealth and property, into the condition of being mortgaged; pledged as collateral security against mathematically unrepayable bank

* *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli*, by W. F. Moneypenny, vol. II.

advances. By some form of clairvoyance this whole prospect was spread out in Disraeli's sight. Not only that, he clearly saw the Dark Influences, partly of negative ignorance and partly of positive occultism, a deliberate masking of the truth, that was operating to hide what he saw from the view of his contemporaries. And he warned them of it, this conscious and deliberate masking of the Truth, which he alludes to as "a ruinous mystification." But the nation's government, the comparatively recently-created aristocracy who, many of them, were so blind as not to be able to see on which side their own bread was buttered, were not calculated to be able to follow his vision, which embraced the whole nation's daily bread, spiritual no less than material.

Disraeli for his part, as far back as 1832, before even he had got a seat in Parliament, had had his own quite realistic ideas of what should be done in the immediate crisis. "Reduce the burdens that so heavily press upon the farmer," he said, "and then reduce his protection in the same ratio. That is the way to have cheap bread . . . without destroying the interest which is the basis of all social happiness." The *interest*; that is the reward, both spiritual and material, which is the only thing that induces individuals to embark on anything that implies hard work, or renunciation of any kind, without compulsion; whether it be investment, the investment of their savings, or of their human energy, which we call work. Disraeli's plea was for a scientific economy; an economy as much as is humanly possible detached from political ideology or sectional prejudice, and founded on a sound corporate sense of the interest of the nation as a whole; one that is, based firmly on the social credit of the whole community, and applied with scientific realism and detachment and conscious understanding. Surely he must turn in his grave every time a Dalton or a Cripps or a Strachey gets on his hind-legs to make one of the present Government's biassed, and sectional, and theoretical pronouncements!

But to date that ideal has not proved attainable. And in that sense, and to that degree, it has to be allowed that Disraeli was an idealist. He failed to realize his vision for lack of the men, the individuals with sufficient conscious understanding to help him put it into practice. And also in part because he himself lacked the reinforcement of a fully conscious understanding; he could hardly be blamed if he failed to supply everything. But given the conjunction in space and time of another Disraeli, an embodiment of dynamic political force and intuition such as, in his very different and lesser way, William Aberhart, the late premier of Alberta, supplied an example of; given that in conjunction with the technique, the textbook requisite knowledge to implement scientifically the necessary credit and currency management, and who can say what might not happen. Even more is necessary, however, than was to Disraeli's hand a hundred years ago, in the shape of a body of supporters with the required philosophic schooling in that scientific detachment and understanding which Benjamin Disraeli, almost alone among the statesmen of his day, seems to have naturally possessed; "that absolute freedom from prejudice," to quote the man himself, where he describes the Jew, Sidonia, in his novel, *Coringsby*, "which is the compensatory possession of the man without a country." Mr. Huxley's word for it is "non-attachment"; the idea expressed in the Gospels by the advice "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth . . ." an undistracted singleness of outlook which enables one, as Disraeli continues: "to fathom, as it were by intuition, the

depths of every question, however different, and profound."

Given that understanding in a body of men, even if only a comparatively small one, supporting their leader inside, without being wholly committed to the party machine, and the odds are he might be able, in a situation so extraordinarily similar at all points as exists to-day to achieve a major economic transformation, where Disraeli, with the support of Stanley and his half-baked Protectionists, merely succeeded in saving the country from a single chamber oligarchic tyranny, that would have been free to rule without any counteracting party pressure in the interests of International Finance. Disraeli's real aim was other and far more than that. It is interesting to read in the general preface to his novels, written in 1870, where he describes the aims of that group of young parliamentarians called Young England, of whom for a time he was the acknowledged leader, "To bring back oligarchy into a generous aristocracy round a real throne; to infuse life and vigour into the Church, as the trainer of the nation . . . to elevate the physical as well as the moral conditions of the people by establishing *that labour requires regulation as much as property*; and all this rather by the use of ancient forms and the restoration of the past than by political revolutions founded on abstract ideas." The emphasis is not Disraeli's, but the point is surely significant. To couple "labour" with "property" as requiring regulation in the sense, presumably, of protection, both of their rights and from their abuses, is surely a sound and interesting conjunction?

In an absolute sense, and particularly in his economic ideas, it is obvious that Benjamin Disraeli failed. That is human destiny: absolute failure. But relatively, and by effective human standards, his achievement was immense. Undoubtedly it was the very serious defect of the Victorian era that it was so greatly preoccupied with this almost entirely technical issue of Free Trade *versus* Protection, methods masquerading as alternative principles of national policy. And we can, if we choose to look more deeply into the matter, blame Disraeli for the distracting controversy. But from another point of view, and one much more likely to be near the truth, it was the salvation of Nineteenth Century Great Britain and the foundation from which the modern British Imperial idea arose, that in place of the utterly confusing cosmopolitan fog in which a hundred years ago our national destiny was enveloped and looked like being entirely lost; a mist which seemed to be settling down on the political scene and paralyzing all intelligent, self-interested action, there was one party at east that stood out for the British nation as a political and cultural force, and, with however little informed knowledge on the point, for political economics applied *at the spot*, and nationally in the first place, instead of entirely in the interests of International Finance. If that is a justifiable attitude to assume toward the problems and events of the time; events which are recurring to-day, just one hundred years later, with almost uncanny exactitude, then equally with the blame can be given to one man the major part of the credit. A Jew, an Englishman only by adoption, but with that strongest of all possible patriotic claims, a high degree of sympathy and identification with the needs and cultural and organic spirit of the nation as a whole, by his courage and insight he retrieved the political, if not the economic situation, and set the ship of state on a new tack.

The following is taken from the peroration to one of his anti-repeal speeches. Overlooking its more elaborate orator-

ical trimmings, one can see the thoughtful consistency and genuineness of the garment underneath: "I have confidence in the common sense, I will say, the common spirit, of our countrymen . . . I know that we appeal to a people debauched by public gambling . . . that the public mind is polluted with economic fancies . . . that all confidence in public men is lost. . . . But, sir, I have faith in the primitive but enduring elements of the English character." And then he addresses himself to the Cobdenites, those fellow-sufferers with the Irish potatoes from their own peculiar blight of *Manchesterismus*. "It may be vain now in the midnight of their intoxication to tell them that there will be an awakening of bitterness, it may be idle now in the springtide of their economic frenzy, to warn them that there will be an ebb of trouble. But the dark and inevitable hour will arise. Then, when their spirits are softened by misfortune, they will recur to those principles . . . which in our belief made England great . . . principles the most popular, sentiments the most entirely national, the cause of labour, the cause of the people, the cause of England."

"'Mr. Disraeli,' it is recorded, 'resumed his seat amid cheers which for duration and vehemance, are seldom heard within the walls of Parliament.'" After all, there's nothing to beat that warm glow which comes from listening to a really good stimulating speech, followed by a resounding cheer, and then to go home to a good dinner. But the spirit of those times was not yet sufficiently "softened by misfortune," even the spirit of Disraeli's own following; after all "the ebb of trouble" which he predicted had scarcely begun. But look at the country to-day, almost high and dry on the beach of our economic misfortune, and still unheeding of the lessons Disraeli had to teach, and his warnings of what the consequence would be if we gave way entirely to the occult pressure of those who have been maddened by the taste of international speculation and the heady sense of power that accompanies it. And who seek, by any and every insane means—even at the risk of the extermination of our present civilisation—to hide the economic truth that would put an end to their domination.

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

of securing compliance with this Order or any requirement, direction or notice issued thereunder."

Therefore, we not only have a public notice, but a notice under a public notice under an order under an Act of Parliament. Has anybody ever heard such an intolerable genealogy as that? When we speak of things that happen now and compare them with things that happened in the past, there are always some hon. Members opposite who are apt to remind us that we now live under a planned economy. As the Duke of Wellington would say, "If anybody believes that, they could believe anything." I could understand the position of some great dictator who had an exact plan in his mind as to how every person in the country should be directed and put into his appropriate hole, although that would be a horrible thing, a Dostoevski nightmare, to my mind. But the whole basis on which these powers rest is, as the Lord President of the Council told the House in August, that they need not be afraid of giving the Government these powers because they had not the least idea of how they were going to use them. That seems to be the most fantastic situation.

In one of the earliest Debates in this House, I recollect the Chancellor of the Exchequer, then the President of the Board of Trade, telling us, with that sincerity with which he always speaks, that he hoped this Government would do

something which he frankly admitted had never been done before in human history. He said it was his sincere hope that the Government would be able to build a planned economy without direction of labour. That was a few years ago. Now we look round and what do we see? We see direction of labour without one vestige of a planned economy. We see a world of chaos, confusion, contradiction and slavery.

Mr. Frederick Lee (Manchester, Hulme): May we now hope that the House will agree to discuss this order against the background of the economic condition of the country at the present time? . . . I agree with the hon. Member for Devizes (*Mr. Hollis*) that every Member of this House detests in any form the direction of labour. But I believe that there are many Members who prefer the direction of labour rather than that this country should go down in poverty, and our people never attain a decent standard of life. When we hear from Members opposite of their sudden desire to free the people we should remember that for two years, since the end of the war, thousands of our workmen have been under the Essential Work Order. We have never heard any protest from the benches opposite about that—

Mr. Hollis: My hon. Friend the Member for Kingston-upon-Thames (*Mr. Boyd-Carpenter*) pointed out that on two occasions we divided the House on that matter.

Hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Lee: I ask the hon. Member this question: Have the Tory Party or the Federation of British Industries ever demanded the withdrawal of the Essential Work Order?

Mr. Hollis: We divided the House.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter (Kingston-upon-Thames) rose—

. . . I am sure that the Minister of Labour will recollect that in October, 1946, a Motion to annul the then Control of Engagement Order was moved by my hon. Friend the Member for Sutton Coldfield (*Sir J. Mellor*), seconded by myself, and taken to a Division. There was also another occasion, which I think the Minister will recollect, when we did the same.

Mr. Lee: The Tory Party or the Federation of British Industries will not ask the Minister to withdraw the Essential Work Order, embracing mining, agriculture, and foundry work. . . . Therefore, it is quite untrue for the Mover, or for other hon. Members opposite, to infer that we are now getting direction of labour for the first time in peacetime.

. . . We have direction by the Essential Work Order, and have had it ever since the war finished. During the period of mass unemployment—I can speak personally on this issue—I could go along to the employment exchange and be handed a green card by the man behind the counter. He would tell me to go to a particular job, and if I did not go, I forfeited my right to draw benefit. Is not that direction of labour? Why is it now suggested that because of the concern of my Party and of the Government to pull the nation through this economic blizzard we are abrogating the rights of freedom, and the rights for which the trade unions fought?

[following *Mr. Isaacs*, who replied to points made in the Debate]

Major Sir David Maxwell Fyfe (Liverpool, West Derby): . . . The right hon. Gentleman [*The Minister of Labour, Mr. Isaacs*] in a forty-minute speech . . . did not deal at all with the point which has been reiterated by the Select Committee and by every speaker on this side of the House as to why he takes powers which are infinitely greater

on his own confession, on the confession of his officials and of his supporters, than are necessary to attain the objectives he has put to the House. There has been no attempt—the right hon. Gentleman has not really told us why—to find definitions in any order which can be debated by the representative of the people concerned with their liberty. There has been no attempt to give a definition to those he wants to reach by this order and bring into his net of registration today. He admitted that he had chosen the words specified in the notice as words which could not be debated by the House, and he gave the reason—it is within the memory of everyone—that he thought that even a Debate of this sort, a truncated Debate on a Prayer when there is no opportunity of amendment or for consideration of any of the details of the proposal, might slow up the operations of these orders. He knew, and a moment's consideration would remind him, that the orders come into force at once and the only reason, when one deducts that empty reason he has already given, which remains is that he does not want a discussion of the specification and does not want a system by which the House can hear the methods adopted with regard to those to be affected by the Order, and the reasons. . . .

. . . The right hon. Gentleman may talk about freedom, but judging by the applause that he gave to this order—which first leaves to the unfettered discretion of the Minister, not to be questioned by this House, how he is to specify the people who are to be called up, and then leaves to that unfettered discretion what particulars they are to give—I can only ask, is anything so bankrupt of forethought in matters which concern the people's lives as an order drafted in the way of saying, first, that they may be asked to give the information in the schedule, and then may be asked to give such other information as to the Minister may seem good?

The same applies when we come to employers. The Minister has made his justification for being able to proceed by something other than a public notice. He has given no justification that I have heard for putting the request for information—for it applies both ways, to the employer as well as the workman—to give this additional and unspecified information that may be demanded. He has given no justification that I have heard for giving to his officials the right to enter, without warrant apparently, into any businesses in order that they may see—not for the past but for the future—that everything is going according to their desires. He has certainly given no explanation of this extraordinary provision in paragraph 7 (d):

"give notice to any persons employed in the undertaking in such manner as the Minister may from time to time by notice direct of any matters that the Minister may consider necessary for the purpose or securing compliance with this Order or any requirement, direction or notice issued thereunder."

He takes powers to make an informer of anyone who may be employed to whom he may give the notice.

Again I say, this is not good legislation. If it is the legislation that the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues want, then for Heaven's sake let them put it in a Bill, let them produce the Clauses so that Amendments can be moved, and let the right hon. Gentleman and those who have cheered him have the privilege of voting in the Lobbies against Amendments to try to strike out proposals of that sort. They know that we have to accept this miserable Order *en bloc*, or vote against it to the extent of our power. They know very well that if they put forward an industrial conscription Bill, and it were debated line by line, Clause by Clause, and Amendment by Amendment, hon. Members behind them would have

to declare their votes, and afterwards face up to their votes on matters that they would greatly shrink from before the electorate.

I have listened with the greatest attention to the right hon. Gentleman and the hon. Member for Hulme (Mr. Lee), who defended this matter on general grounds. There seemed to be a ring of remembrance in these general grounds and it came to me, not with great astonishment, but some surprise, that there is no argument on the general case they advanced that Wilberforce did not have to meet when he brought forward his proposals against slavery 140 years ago. . . . The right hon. Gentleman did not harmonise this order which he has defended tonight with a document which, as he knows, the Government issued only a few months ago. I refer to the International Bill of Human Rights, which was put forward by the Government in a White Paper from the Foreign Office in June of this year for consideration by the appropriate committee of U.N.O. Paragraph 9 of that document is in two parts. The first part is, "No form of slavery shall be permitted." Part two, as we might well expect, consists of square brackets within which are the words, "A text on the subject of compulsory labour will be inserted here later." The right hon. Gentleman, I hoped, would fill up what is to go into these square brackets so that it would harmonise the attack on compulsory labour which the Government was making a short time ago with their defence and furtherance of it tonight. . . .

[The Prayer was defeated by 223 votes to 178. Mr. Quintin Hogg (Oxford) also made a vigorous speech which we should quote but for lack of space].

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

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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