

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 19.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 10, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"Ortega y Gasset sums up the situation in his well-known book *The Revolt of the Masses* with a harsh candour we shall do well to ponder. He says:

"The characteristic of the hour is that the commonplace mind, knowing itself to be commonplace, has the assurance to proclaim the rights of the commonplace and to impose them wherever it will . . . The mass crushes beneath it everything that is different, everything that is excellent, qualified and select. Anybody who is not like everybody, who does not think like everybody, runs the risk of being eliminated. And it is clear, of course, that this 'everybody' is not 'everybody.' 'Everybody' was normally the complex unity of the mass and the divergent specialised minorities. Nowadays, 'everybody' is the mass alone. Here we have the formidable fact of our times, described without any concealment of the brutality of its features.'"—F. M. R. Walshe.

If anyone has an explanation of majority rule which will meet this criticism, we should like to hear of it.

• • •

There is a well-known story, probably apocryphal, of a successful General in the American Civil War who was asked by a European officer what school of strategy he favoured. "Don't know nawthin' about this yer strategiee, but I gets there firstest with the mostest."

There is a lesson in this story which is important to Social Crediters, bearing in mind that the General was, pardonably, confusing strategy and tactics.

FIX YOUR OBJECTIVE IN RELATION TO YOUR RESOURCES. This is rather more than to say concentrate on a narrow front—it means narrowing your front until you *must* break through.

There are hundreds of spots in the present position which are vulnerable to quite weak forces. The Housewives face many of them.

• • •

Much of the prestige of the Church of England derived from the character and social status of its clergy, and its influence has declined *pari passu* with the change in the general type of individual attracted to its ministry.

Only that curious perversity which appears to form an essential component of dialectical materialism prevents the recognition of this factor in some of the wild nonsense attributed to many incumbents of Anglican Orders. The Communism which is rampant amongst them is often defended by the statement that Communism is an arrangement by which all things are held in common, and thus the Early Christian Fathers were Communists. We often wonder what meaning these people attach to the injunction "Thou shalt not steal," to take one example only of the matter contained in the Book of Common Prayer. How do you steal common property?

Ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The general argument is of course just as sensible as to assert that all First Class passengers on the "Queen Mary" are Communists because they share a common means of transport and have a common right to order from a common menu at meals. It is becoming increasingly clear that the touchstone of economic civilisation is freedom of association with the right to contract-out. All economic progress grows from property based on contract freely made and inviolable except by consent. We have retrograded thousands of years under the partly half-baked and partly traitorous teachings of the post-1848 Commu-Socialism absorbed by inexperienced "workers." Defective as the nineteenth century money system undoubtedly was, nothing has ever come so near to a perfect economic device, and its rectification would have made the present discontents not merely unreasonable but incredible. That is why the rectification was not permitted.

The fundamental of that system was *communism of claims* ("my money is as good as yours") *subject to rights of property*. Anything which was for sale could be bought by anyone with the money. Under even the half-baked socialism of the current Governments, both rights and money disappear. The fundamental idea is robbery.

• • •

For a century and a half, this country, under the lead of the "City", has crawled and pandered to the "United" States. As a result, the venomous misrepresentation of the British people and their politics has reached unique proportions. We have done so badly under this policy that it would appear (a) that the worshippers of Wall St. might be urged to emigrate there. (b) those of whom we can't rid ourselves should be debarred from politics.

• • •

The "B".B.C. (Vice-Chairman, STELLA, Mrs. Isaacs, Marchioness of Reading) is highly nervous of the secret ballot issue, and with reason. In announcing the coming elections in Finland, it went out of its way to suggest how perfectly d'markratic the water-tight nature of the ballot-box arrangements would make them. The degradation of British politics can almost be identified with the introduction of the secret ballot. A man who is ashamed or afraid to let it be known how he votes, is afraid to take responsibility for the consequences of his voting, and has no right to a vote.

Saskatchewan

According to *The Times's* Vancouver correspondent, Saskatchewan has returned its Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (Socialist) Government to office with a reduced majority. "This, the first Socialist Government in Canada, unseated the Liberals four years ago by winning 47 seats out of 55; now its representation has been cut to 30. . . . In spite of repudiation by the Government the Labour-Progressive (Communist) Party swung their votes to the C.C.F. as they did in the recent federal by-elections."

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 22, 1948.

National Insurance Regulations

The Minister of National Insurance (Mr. James Griffiths): I beg to move,

"That the Draft National Insurance (Married Women) Regulations, 1948, a copy of which was presented on June 7, be approved."

These regulations have been before the National Insurance Advisory Committee which has consulted the organisations interested in them. Since they are important, let me say they give married women the choice of paying or not paying to the national insurance scheme. We have prepared a guide for the women, and copies are available in the House; and I hope hon. Members will secure copies so that they will be able fully to answer all the questions which, no doubt, will be put to them concerning these provisions.

Mr. Richard Law (Kensington, South): . . . If I have one mild criticism to offer, it is not because I oppose the regulations but simply that the Minister may have an opportunity, if these regulations are ever revised, of taking into account the point I would put to him. The point is this. Under these regulations and I think, under the Act, if an individual contracts out of the insurance, the employer has to continue to pay the contribution even though the individual affected is not in the insurance scheme. I doubt very much whether that is a good principle.

However, in this particular case it does seem to me that it may be damaging to the employer concerned, and not only damaging to the employer, but damaging to the interest which, I am sure, the Government as a whole have in view. The point relates to part-time workers. I gather that it is the desire of the Government as far as possible to encourage women to come into industry even on a part-time basis. The effect of these regulations is that if an employer engages a married woman on part-time, and if she contracts out, he has to pay, so to speak, a whole-time contribution in respect of that woman. If he should, in order to make up his complement of workpeople, engage two married women on part-time, he has to pay a double tax on those married women. It seems to me that the effect of these regulations must be to discourage the employment of part-time women workers, if they elect to contract out of the insurance scheme. I hope that if he comes to revise these regulations the right hon. Gentleman will bear that point in mind.

Mr. J. Griffiths: I think the point the right hon. Gentleman has in mind is more relevant to another set of regulations dealing with part-time workers, but I note his comments and will look at this again. We permit an option to the married women to pay or not. We do that because the insurance scheme provides benefits for wives through their husbands' insurance. I am sure, however, that because of this we should not allow the employer to be exempt from paying his share. I know the point the right hon. Gentleman has in mind, but I think it is much more relevant to the other problem we shall be discussing—that of the part-time workers.

House of Commons: June 23, 1948.

Ships (Transfers to Foreign Governments)

Mr. J. P. L. Thomas asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state the policy of the Admiralty in respect of the disposal of His Majesty's ships

to foreign countries.

Mr. Dugdale: Only those ships which are surplus to the requirements of the Royal Navy are transferred to foreign Governments. The principles observed in such transfers are:

Firstly: the fulfilment of the strategic interests of the United Kingdom by assisting in the reconstruction of the navies of former allies and other friendly Powers.

Secondly: the strengthening of the close relations between the R.N. and these Navies, which grew up to their mutual advantage during the war.

Mr. Thomas: Are the Admiralty aware of the strength of feeling in this country against the sale of His Majesty's ships to countries still occupying British territory in the Antarctic, and especially against the possible sale of H.M.S. "Ajax" to the Chilean Government? In addition, has the hon. Gentleman any statement to make about the later stages of negotiations in regard to that ship?

Mr. Dugdale: No, Sir; that is another question. If there is any strong feeling, I have no doubt that it can be conveyed to my right hon. Friend, and no doubt he will take it into account.

Mr. Donner: In reference to the original reply, and to the sale of ships no longer required, has the cruiser strength of the Navy been lowered below 50?

Mr. Dugdale: No, Sir.

Mr. Platts-Mills: Will my hon. Friend not add, to complete his statement of policy, that the requirements of the Navy are now defined in Washington, and no longer in London?

Mr. Speaker: These constant and rather insulting references to a friendly Power do deserve reproof.

Hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Gallacher: On a point of Order—

Mr. Speaker: On a point of Order, very well.

Mr. Platts-Mills: May I not rise on a point of Order, first?

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member wishes to put a point of Order first, he may do so.

Mr. Platts-Mills: Perhaps my voice was not so loud as it should have been, but I did mean to make a point of Order. Is it not open to me continually and, if I think right, at all times, to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in my view certain right hon. Members are taking steps in relation to the United States of America that virtually amount to the betrayal of our country to certain powerful interests in that country? If I hold that view, may I not press that point, in season, and out of season?

Mr. Speaker: Not at Question Time. There is a rule that insinuations and imputations should not be made, either at the Table, or in supplementaries, and I reproofed the hon. Member because I thought his constant references to America were imputations and insinuations of an unfriendly character. That is my Ruling.

Mr. Gallacher: On a further point of Order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that you have given that Ruling, will you give a similar Ruling when not only innuendoes, but open slanders are made against a friendly Power, the Soviet Union?

Mr. Speaker: I am very careful about what I hear, but

these things are not always said in the same way.

Sir R. Ross: Will the Parliamentary Secretary add to the other conditions which he has mentioned the condition that he will not transfer warships of the British Navy to any country which is attempting to annexe British territory?

Mr. Dugdale: It is obvious that if any country is acting against the British Empire we will not transfer ships to that country.

Mr. Thomas: In view of the unsatisfactory nature of the answer, especially in regard to H.M.S. "Ajax," I give notice that I shall raise the matter on the earliest possible occasion.

Inspectors (Warrant Cards)

Brigadier Rayner asked the Minister of Food whether he is aware of the anxiety which has been caused to farmers' wives in some parts of the country who are visited by persons purporting to be inspectors of his Department but who carry no credentials to indicate that they are on legitimate Government business; to what extent it is intended to continue or increase such visitations; and whether arrangements will be made for the inspectors to carry adequate credentials.

Mr. Strachey: Visits to farms are an essential part of the work of food enforcement officers and must continue, but all our enforcement inspectors carry official warrant cards which they are instructed to show to the farmer or representative before beginning their inspection.

House of Commons: June 24, 1948.

Treatment and Drugs

Mr. Randall asked the Minister of Health how many instances of doctors informing their patients that there is a restriction on drugs which may be ordered for free supply for the proper treatment of patients under the new Health Service have been brought to his attention; what steps he has taken in the matter; and what action is open to patients so informed by their doctors.

[*Mrs. Leah Manning* also asked a question on this subject.]

Mr. Bevan: I trust there have not been many such cases, and I am confident that doctors will not attempt to discriminate between those who use the service and those who do not. Moreover, I welcome this opportunity to make it clear that patients are entitled under the new Health Service without restriction to every kind of drug and appliance necessary for their treatment. Indeed, any doctor who failed to prescribe these drugs would be breaking his terms of service. I hope this statement will receive the widest possible publicity.

Mr. Randall: Is my right hon. Friend aware that two such cases as are indicated in my Question have been brought to my attention, and I now propose to pass them on to my right hon. Friend? Will he give an assurance that he will make the fullest inquiry? Furthermore, will he answer the latter part of the Question in which I ask what appropriate steps can the patients take when a doctor makes this statement?

Mr. Bevan: The course open to the patient is to make a complaint to the local executive council and that council will investigate the complaint. There is machinery under the Act to deal with this matter.

Mrs. Manning: In view of the fact that I have also sent two cases to my right hon. Friend, and as this is a matter which is causing great anxiety among people of all parties and in many classes who have looked forward to the fact that they would not have to be burdened with doctors' bills in the future, can my right hon. Friend tell us what steps he himself will take to end this rather disgraceful action on the part of some doctors?

Mr. Bevan: All I can do is to answer the Questions here, to call general attention to the facts and to ask the public to note what is being said here and not to listen to what certain doctors, who have been acting well below the ethical standards of the profession, have said.

Colonel Stoddart-Scott: Will the Minister assure the House that doctors will not be surcharged for supplying certain drugs as they are at the present moment under the panel system?

Mr. Bevan: There are regulations that concern themselves with the nature of the drugs to be prescribed. There are certain things prescribed as drugs which are not drugs, champagne, for example.

Dr. Haden Guest: Is my right hon. Friend aware that the British Medical Association take the strongest view of the improper conduct which a few doctor have been following, as suggested in these Questions, and that they are taking action to bring this to the attention of the whole profession? Does not my right hon. Friend agree that since the B.M.A. are now co-operating in order to give the best possible service under the slogan of Dr. Dain that "Only the best is good enough," is it not desirable that their help in this matter should be welcomed by the Minister?

Mr. Bevan: I have already welcomed the help that has been given by Dr. Dain, especially in a letter which he wrote recently to *The Times*. I am happy to think that the vast majority of the medical profession frown disapprovingly upon these practices.

Committee of Supply: Coal

Major Sir David Maxwell Fyfe (Liverpool, West Derby):

... I will put the point in another way, to which I do not think the Minister can object. Let me consider it from what I think is the best test, namely, the number of tons produced per mine worker per week. That takes account of all factors, including output per shift, the number of shifts, absenteeism and holidays. Taking the years 1936 to 1939, the average of the four years before the war was 5.87; for 1937, it was 6.06; for 1946, it was 4.98 and for 1947 it was 5 per cent. I take the year 1937, because the right hon. Gentleman will appreciate that if we take the extra ton per week between 1937 and 1947, and multiply that by 52 weeks and by the number of men employed in the industry, we get the figure of 37 million tons. The right hon. Gentleman chided Sir Charles Reid for asking for between three-quarters and four-

(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. 20, No. 19.

Saturday, July 10, 1948.

Prognostic

Half this critical year has passed, and its burden is still veiled. As our readers go to refresh themselves at the 'green altar', 'by river or sea-shore', they may well ask themselves who are these coming to the sacrifice,

To what green altar, O mysterious priest,
Lead'st thou that heifer lowing at the skies,
And all her silken flanks with garlands drest?

The ensuing lines

(And, little town, thy streets for evermore
Will silent be; and not a soul to tell . . .)

may also come to memory, ambiguously; but unless the die of history is already cast, awaiting discovery, (as we more than half believe), all is still question; and we await the undisclosed—and groom and dress our flanks. There is something, if it is not we, that is coming to the sacrifice, though in the same breath we wonder whether Social Credit may be not unlike that grecian urn of which Keats sang:

She cannot fade, though thou hast not thy bliss,
For ever wilt thou love and she be fair!

But in this Time we fancy we inhabit, something is coming not to the sacrifice so much as to the surface. We mark it in the Primate's clear admonition at Canterbury, "There is a belief in having 'no belief' which makes man an impotent prey to his surroundings." We mark it in nearly every serious conversation: a tardy turning from confusion to at least awareness of confusion, that condition which alienists call 'insight', which is their prognostic of recovery of a sane mind.

"German Currency Reform"

Under the dates given, the following letters have appeared in *The Scotsman*:—

JUNE 22

Feadan, Lawers,

by Aberfeldy,

June 19, 1948.

Sir,—The so-called currency "reform" in Germany is the confiscation without compensation, in peace time, of German property, for the safeguarding of which Great Britain is morally responsible.

What have the Churches of Scotland, England, and Wales to say about this? What would they say if, six months hence, under a similar flimsy pretext, all British subjects were notified that their bank accounts would be reduced by nine-tenths after they have been urged to save?—I am etc.

W. L. RICHARDSON.

JUNE 26

The Hill, Balerno,

June 22, 1948.

Sir,—Mr. Richardson overlooks the fact that we do have confiscation in this country. Here it is euphemistically described as "draining off excess purchasing power." The politicians fondly hope that we do not notice that confiscation lurks in the phrase.—I am etc.

T. ELLIOTT.

June 23, 1948.

Sir,—Mr. Richardson, in his letter, denounces this so-called reform as mere confiscation without compensation. It is certainly a most glaring example of deliberate theft against a whole nation, but it is quite in keeping with the whole treatment meted out to Germany in the last three years. Her property, produce, and assets, her shipping, factories, and forests—all have been either stolen or destroyed to such an extent that she is reduced to the status of a serf nation, supplied with just enough food to keep her working for her alien masters.

Of course, the Allied Governments protest that these proceedings are justifiable and necessary, and that this currency reform betokens a plan for German economic restoration. But it is easy to clothe foul deeds in fair words. Penury and suicide are the most probable fruits in the immediate future.

Mr. Richardson asks what the various national Churches have to say about this confiscation. As a minister of the Church of Scotland, I can answer him in one word—"nothing." When the Churches, during all the ongoings since 1939, have acquiesced in all these without plea or protest, they are not likely to boggle at this latest deed of oppression. Men tread over the Churches "as graves which appear not."—I am etc.

P.H.N.

C. F. 6

The following has elicited from the Ministry the reply that there is no penalty for failure to sign C.F. 6:—

"The Minister of National Insurance,

"6, Curzon Street, London, W.1.

"Sir,

"The enclosed Declaration entitled 'National Insurance—The Right to Contract Out' represents the views of a considerable number of people, of whom I am one. You have seen it before, and doubtless you will see it again. The form C.F. 6 (Application for registration in insurance under the National Insurance Scheme) therefore places such people as myself in a certain difficulty.

"It is obvious that no person who has signed in good faith the Declaration that compulsory National Insurance is immoral and that they wish to have no part in it can also sign in good faith the form C.F. 6, so presumably the penalties to such persons for filling it in are those so blandly provided for knowingly making a false representation (Section 52, c, i, of the Act) viz: £100 fine or three months imprisonment or both.

"On the other hand the form itself contains a number of arbitrary imperatives of a type characteristic of totalitarian

(continued on page 8.)

The 'Cloven Hoof'

By BEATRICE C. BEST.

Whatever may have been the original intention in depicting the Devil with a cloven hoof it can be seen to hold a deeply symbolic significance and one of growing importance today. Cloven, of course, derives from the verb to cleave which itself means, according to the dictionary, "to divide, to split, to separate with violence" that which, presumably, was originally one and whole. As demonic power depends for its exercise and maintenance upon the use of force and therefore upon the existence of a state of conflict, actual or threatened, it can be seen how essential to it is the condition of cleavage, of separation. For opposition can arise, or be made to arise, between the now divided parts, and the necessary state of conflict or threatened warfare be thereby engendered. It can easily be seen then, that any *realistic* attempt to close or heal this gap, or cleft, and thus to counter this demonic policy of 'divide and rule', must at all costs be opposed. Nevertheless, efforts to contrive a fictional union can be encouraged, and may be regarded as a useful means to placate and play up to man's natural desire for real union and for peace. But the use or the threat of force would still be necessary to support and maintain such a fiction. Hence the value of U.N.O. as security for what one may call the continuance of the reign of the 'cloven hoof'. Regarding this, it is significant that the League of Nations was condemned because it had no 'teeth'. It has been decided, therefore, that U.N.O. shall have 'teeth'.

While all this will hardly be disputed it may not be so readily allowed that the 'cloven hoof' makes its appearance in the teaching of the Church. But it is important to note the difference between its activities in the State and its influence in the Church. This lies in the fact that the demonic power or Anti-Christ secretly promotes and uses conflict and divisions as a method or technique to forward its purpose and policy of obtaining absolute world dominion, whereas the Church openly teaches that the roots of this dichotomy are to be found in the heart of man himself. What is also important to observe is the attitude of the Church regarding this dichotomy. For she regards it not as something to be overcome, a breach to be repaired, but rather as something to be endured as an integral and ineradicable part of man, and one affecting his whole life.

An article supporting this contention can be read in the *Dublin Review* (1948 first quarter) entitled "The New Man. The Marxist and the Christian View," by Henri de Lubac. Considering its appearance in this quarterly, it is not unreasonable to assume that certain categorical statements to be found in it represent the views of the Church, and cannot be regarded as merely the personal views of the author.

We are told then, for instance, "... that the life of whoever would be faithful to the end will be in strife and contradiction to the last day." Also, "The state of warfare has its seeds in the heart of each one of us and will be the state of our earthly condition to the very end." The fatalistic note struck here can be paralleled by the statement that—'The world is and must ever remain a welter of power politics.' And it follows, of course, that if the political war is just the reflection of the seeds of warfare in our hearts, which is implied, then the two statements are in agreement and the same pessimistic conclusion is common to both. At least this would be so but for the fact that the author appears

optimistic about the good resulting from conflict. "Total warfare," he says, "is our *primaevae* condition and accompanies every step we take. Our most authentic powers, our most vital impulses, are far from being in spontaneous harmony. *Yet it is for this very reason that we progress at all.*" This last statement would seem to argue that a state of harmony would be inimical to progress. But, in fact, the statement is not true. Man progresses by the search for, and adherence to the truth. His discoveries and inventions are the result of patient investigation of nature's laws—of thought—of meditation—of what, in short, is referred to elsewhere in the article as "the activity of contemplation." But this activity requires the *unity* of man's powers and impulses and cannot be profitably pursued in a condition of disharmony and discord. That the results of this activity which could be used for man's advancement and emancipation are so often turned against him and used to destroy and enslave him does not alter this fact.

Coming down to the political and economic plane, the author, writing of what he alludes to as "the legitimate necessity of planned economy" appears to believe that the danger of complete totalitarianism could be avoided by "formulating a 'free zone' for man's better part alongside the 'directed zone'." This situation would provide the perfect condition for the activities of the 'cloven hoof'; for what would happen should the "better part", the "free zone", disapprove of the directions given to it by the "directed zone"? In such a case—of variance between the zones—a state of warfare must ensue, either within the individual, or between the individual and the directing power. But the author appears not to face this dilemma. It is important however. For the division of the individual into zones, one under the jurisdiction of his "better part", and the other under the state, raises the question of personality. However one may define personality—'personality, . . . for which even the Heavens wait,' as Maurice Nédoucelle has called it—it is characterised by wholeness, by integrity. You cannot divide it into zones, with separate allegiances. 'Split personality' is really a contradiction in terms, for the 'split' involves loss of personality; it is 'this body of death' from which Paul cried to be delivered.

In view of the foregoing the author's analysis of academic Marxism set forth in the article is of particular interest. He shows how the aim of perfectionism of the Marxist—'the withering away of the State'—the leap of the human race from the reign of necessity into the reign of liberty' is impossible of realisation. He supports this contention by pointing to the flaw inherent in the Marxian dialectic in which no logical reason can be found to suppose that the contradiction will ever be overcome and a final synthesis achieved. "Who guaranteed that, little by little, contradictions would wear themselves out?" he asks, and states that, "Not all Marxists have failed to perceive the inconsistency. Many refrain from thinking about it. Others throw it overboard."

According to this argument then, one may say that the Marxist and the Christian have this in common that they both believe in the coming of the Kingdom; also—though the Marxist disavows it in his case—the realisation of this kingdom is impossible in this world because the reign of the 'cloven hoof', the existence of the cleavage, the contradiction, and the consequent and recurring conflicts—wars or revolutions—can never be overcome. However, the Christian scores over the Marxist by his faith in what the Marxist

derisively and contemptuously refers to as 'pie-in-the-sky'. (The Marxist is barred, anyway, from this belief by his atheism, his denial of the transcendental and the supernatural, his absolute imminentism, his faith, that is, that man can, by his sole efforts, compass his own salvation. So the Marxist's contempt for 'pie-in-the-sky' smacks a little of 'sour grapes'.)

Yet one may reasonably ask if, as the author says, "... opposition breeds and perpetuates itself and final harmony cannot be born of contradiction," how a condition of "strife and contradiction to the last day" can be regarded as a fitting or indeed possible prelude to entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven?

But the importance and gravity of the author's argument lies, not in the exposure of Marxism, but in that it constitutes, virtually, a denial of Christianity, and if it represents the Church's attitude then the Christian is faced with the choice between faith in the Church, and faith in Jesus Christ.

For, in brief, what constitutes the paramount claim of Christianity on man's allegiance? Did not Christ's advent above all signify His claim to establish the Kingdom on earth? If not why the prayer, 'Thy Kingdom come on earth as it is in Heaven', why the command, 'Be ye perfect'? If Jesus Christ did not come to restore, to heal, to put an end to warfare, to reconcile and unite, why did He come? For the hope of a life after death in which man's aspiration after happiness, after perfection, may be realised is not specifically or exclusively Christian. What is one to make of the statement the Kingdom is *within* you? How can one square it with a condition of "strife and contradiction to the last day"?

The contradictions in a Christianity that ignores these questions become apparent as the author's argument proceeds. Though he distrusts the perfection ostensibly aimed at by a planned and directed economy—"a condition so perfect in its limited reality . . . that there would be no chink through which it could communicate with the mystery of being . . ." he yet believes, as pointed out, in planning and direction *up to a point*.

He believes that "a state of society which is *too* (my emphasis) wretched or unjust shuts man off from the life of the spirit." This seems to suggest that it is desirable to maintain a measure of wretchedness or injustice; enough at least to prevent man reaching that "so perfect" condition he distrusts. Yet then we read, "We should have no misgiving about working wholeheartedly for the healing of mankind and for its progress along all lines. Nor need we fear to go too far; we can never succeed to such an extent that the noble wound will heal."

"Christian realism", we are told, "is the realism of fulfilment." But fulfilment of what—and when—and where? Again, we are reminded that "Man's task . . . is not to escape from the world but to accept it." One has met with this gospel of acceptance elsewhere. Dr. Julian Huxley preaches it in his book *Reverent Agnosticism*. It is an ambiguous and non-committal exhortation. Precisely what world is it we are told it is our "task" to accept? And why must we accept it? And on whose authority? Is it the world that man, in bondage to the 'cloven hoof' has made of it; the world of conflict and warfare, of wretchedness and injustice, or the world of life and more abundant life that Christ came to bring to mankind?

The Mediaeval Church taught man to despise and reject the world. The modern Church teaches him to accept it.

But Jesus Christ said, "I have overcome the world."

In the end one is driven to ask if the 'Christianity' presented to us here by the author is the 'Christianity' against which "the gates of hell shall not prevail."

The answer is—they *are* prevailing.

The ordinary rank and file communist is not concerned with 'Das Kapital', he has probably never read it, and even if so, is unlikely to have understood it. He is not troubled about the dialectic and probably not much about equality. But he is concerned with doing away with misery and injustice, with, in short, refusing this world as he sees it and making a better one of it, that is with realising the 'Kingdom' on earth. And his instinct is right. The fact that those who lead him are working for his virtual destruction, that the state far from withering away is becoming stronger and stronger, that the 'leap from the reign of necessity into the reign of liberty' prophesied by Engels is a prospect that rapidly recedes as individual liberties are increasingly encroached on, merely turns him into a fanatic, with all the strength and ferocity of the fanatic who clings the more tenaciously to an idea the more facts and reason are against him. He and his like, however, compose the innumerable army of dupes and stooges without which no dictatorship can hope for long to hold and maintain its power, but with which it can become indomitable.

And what, briefly, has the Church to offer these in place of the hope and expectation of this materialistic, planned and man-made paradise, this "perfectly controlled machine," this "dungeon", she fears and despises? Part planning, a measure of social reform—that is, *she is prepared to go some of the way with the enemy*—and for the rest—a state of warfare to the very end, with a hope of heaven hereafter.

One may, perhaps, be excused for suspecting that the 'cloven hoof' is useful even to the Church; that she fears without its operation and activities, the warfare and the conflict, and the troubles arising therefrom, without a measure of wretchedness and injustice, her power and prestige, the pomp and circumstance of her organisation might decline.

Otherwise why does she preserve silence on the question of the truth claimed to be revealed by Social Credit? She cannot justify herself on the ground that what Social Credit deals with is not within her province. Her interest in mundane social reform, and even her somewhat reserved interest in monetary reform today, would make such an excuse invalid.

The answer is to be found in the nature of Social Credit itself. For Social Credit is not concerned with reforms, either social or monetary. It is concerned with restoration, with rectification and with rectification not by constant and repeated efforts to repair the results of an error, *but by a righting of the error itself*. Evil can only be defeated by abolishing it; reform, as the word itself denotes, only effects a change in its aspect.

If, as maintained, and as Social Credit reveals, the evil is due to a cleavage, a split, a gap, then it can only be repaired by a joining, a uniting of the separated parts. The real work of healing can then begin.

But reforms are useful to the power of the 'cloven hoof' for they can be used to direct attention away from cause to effects, and to the mitigation of these while leaving the real evil untouched. Indeed the whole history of reform is mainly one of mitigation and amelioration which can and does conceal the real nature of that which reform sets out, ostensibly, to cure. And in this work of reform the Church has been,

and is, a useful partner to the state; for by her criticisms, or approvals, and her own reforming activities she endorses this principle of mitigation, of camouflage and concealment. Moreover, her professions of belief in vocation, in personality, in the importance of the individual, and in freedom as a necessary condition for the exercise of choice and responsibility, in all those things, in short, which the power of Anti-Christ is seeking to destroy, savour of rank hypocrisy while she ignores the one man who has shown how these ideals could be actualised.

It will not doubt be said in refutation of this charge that (1) technical matters are not the concern of the Church, and (2) that, in any case, no radical change can be expected to take place by a mere rectification of our accounting system; that the change must be looked for to take place in the human heart.

With regard to (1) this excuse appears somewhat thin when it is recalled that at one period in her history the Church concerned herself with the question of the 'Just Price.' However, Social Credit is not primarily a question of technique. Primarily it is based on a claim to have detected an error, and revealed a truth, and this is one the Church cannot ignore without incurring guilt and peril. For she preaches the word of One who claimed to be the Truth, and who said: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Regarding (2) the innocent victims of the operating lie—their name is legion—cannot be held responsible for their sufferings, wrongs and injustices, on the ground of their need for a change of heart. It should be remembered that Jesus did not condemn the multitude because of the evil in their hearts, but had compassion on them because "they were as sheep having no shepherd."

But responsibility exists, and must be laid upon those who know, but keep silent, and those who do not wish to know, or who will not know, and upon those who will stop at *nothing* to conceal the truth from whomsoever might be ready, willing, and glad to hear it.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3)

fifths of that return to be made. I have considered this matter from every point of view from which it is usually considered, and I say that for the right hon. Gentleman to come to this Committee and not make the slightest effort, or beginning of an effort, to explain why we have not recovered the pre-war position is shadow boxing with something that demands far sterner fighting.

I thought the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Mr. Hubbard) put the position about absenteeism very well. He explained that he himself was doing his best to combat it. While we on our side realise the difficulty the men are in, these are the facts: the pre-war average, from 1935 to 1939 was 6.56 *per cent.* Conditions from 1935 to 1939 in the Lancashire pits—as the hon. Member for Ince knows—were not easy. . . . I agree that there has been an improvement but the figure for the last three years, 1946 to 1948, as far as we have gone, is 13.9. I hasten to add, because I do not want the right hon. Gentleman to think that I am misrepresenting any figure, that 1948 has improved and the figure is 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ if my information is right. That is twice as much as it was before the war, and, therefore, this is a problem with which we must deal. Again, we must have an answer. . . .

We come now to costs and prices. There again I ask

hon. Members on the other side of the Committee to remember that the Secretary of State for War said at Bournemouth in 1946:

"There is no doubt about the success of the financial side. We have seen to that. I am assured from a study of this problem and because of the advice that I have received that nationalisation will be a success and indeed it must be."

The right hon. Gentleman told us that there had been a rise from 1946 to the third quarter in 1947 in costs and proceeds. I made it out at 7s., which was slightly different from that of the right hon. Gentleman, but that was because he probably took slightly different comparisons. There are only a few pence in it, but the interesting point I want hon. Members from the coalfields to have in mind, because it is important in fairness to the miners, is that costs have risen 19 *per cent.* while wages have risen only 9 *per cent.*—from 25s. 5d. to 27s. 8d. per ton during the same period. I cannot myself understand the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman, in which some shillings are airily brushed aside on some matter connected with 5s. a week and in that way it is brought down a few pence. I cannot see why there should be this enormous rise in costs if it does not go on wages. . . .

I have a very short time remaining and I am not going to deal with the quality of stocks because I want to come straight away to the question of administration. On the vesting day the Prime Minister said that the National Coal Board was a fine team going in to bat on a sticky wicket, but he believed it would score a great many sixes. It is only about three years since the publication of the famous Reid Report which was, as has been said in this Debate, universally acclaimed as the quintessence of technical experience, diagnosis and prescription. Of the seven eminent mining engineers who signed that unanimous report, five joined the National Coal Board, and of those, no fewer than three have resigned—Sir Charles Reid, Mr. Hunter and Mr. Watson Smith. Since the Prime Minister spoke those words, members of the Board and a number of the principal officials have been hitting their wickets instead of sixes, running themselves out or retiring hurt.

What are the points which Sir Charles Reid made? He said that he put it to the Secretary of State for War in March, 1947, that the management was unhappy and uncertain of its position and the extent of its authority. That position has not only got worse, but, as Sir Charles said, some of our best mining engineers who can ill be spared have resigned. It did not stop there. On November 6, 1947, nearly eight months ago, he wrote to Lord Hyndley and said:

"I do not believe that the present cumbersome and uninspired organisation will produce for the country the coal it needs. . . . It will not accomplish the vital technical re-organisation. . . . It cannot give confident and effective leadership."

Then—this is the point upon which the Committee wants an answer from the hon. Gentleman—Sir Charles stated that he had then—last November—put forward proposals for the complete decentralisation. The right hon. Gentleman did not mention what those proposals were and did not attempt to deal with the problem of decentralisation in his speech. The Board have made an answer even if the right hon. Gentleman has not thought fit to take up the cudgels. Let us see what the Board said:

"the Board as a whole have often been unable to share his views on the extent to which it is practicable or desirable to retain certain

features of the organisation which existed under multiple private ownership but they have always given full consideration to his views."

If it is the view of the National Coal Board that decentralisation of a nationalised industry is an unfortunate feature analogous to private enterprise, then it is time that everyone concerned with nationalised industries thought again.

Decentralisation is not a weakness. My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Fylde (Colonel Lancaster) put in terms of great moderation and with deep consideration of the problems how he desired—and I am sure many people irrespective of party desire—that the power of decentralisation should be focussed on the producing point. If the Parliamentary Secretary can tell us how area managers are to be freed for production, and how that is to be done without decentralisation then even the ingenuity for which he is now famous since his performance in the Gas Bill will be something more than I could ever imagine.

As the hon. Gentleman will realise, I should have liked to develop these points a little more, but I want to give him time to reply. I have said many times in this House, and sometimes with the approval of hon. Gentlemen opposite who disagree with me profoundly on nationalisation, that there are three things that must be done if we are to make nationalisation workable. We must have a system by which we secure self-supporting finance, we must have a system for an efficiency audit, and we must have a true consumers' check. As I say, these were largely accepted by hon. Members in every part of the Committee. I say that when we have considered all these facets of the industry—production, recruitment, costs, prices—it will be found that with this failure to advance, this absolute refusal to consider the pre-war standards as being attainable or approachable, it is time for the efficiency audit to be applied. . . .

C.F. 6 (continued from page 4.)

officials, but with no indication whether these commands have any legal sanction behind them, or whether they are, like the 'ban' on periodicals of the Minister of Fuel last year, the mere impertinences of individuals with a mania for giving orders.

"I can find no mention of a duty to register in the Act, and I ask you, therefore, to inform me (with quotation of the relevant wording) under what regulation if any, made under what section of the Act, the signing of this form is enforced, and in particular, what penalties, if any, are provided for refusal to fill it in.

"The penalties for conscientious refusal to pay the Minister and his subordinates their very considerable rake-off for the 'service' of restricting everyman's access to his own savings appear to be:

- (1) Loss of employment—it is so typical of the 'labour' Party that it uses the employer to coerce the employee.
- (2) Reduction to pauperism by a *daily* fine of £10 (Section 52 (2) of the Act)—naturally this bears more lightly on the very rich.
- (3) Presumably followed by imprisonment for inability to pay the fines, or incarceration for being without means of support. Altogether, a very much more

severe punishment than that recently contemplated by the Government for an indefinite number of brutal murders.

"All this is quite understandable since if the scheme were voluntary none but very simple people with inability to understand arithmetic could be persuaded to contribute to it. The Right to Contract Out is the sole protection against fraud. The degree of coercion judged necessary in the Act of course gives a measure of the losses it was proposed to inflict on the community for the benefit of the Minister and his subordinates, and the amount of antipathy which it would be necessary to overcome. That is quite in line with what one has come to expect from politicians. I understand quite clearly that I have to pay up quietly—or else! But to expect, perhaps even to force, people to *apply* to be robbed in this way is surely carrying the indulgence of the sadistic instinct a shade far even for this Government!

"You will note that I have kept carefully to the facts, although I have not troubled to disguise my distaste for a group of people who live ostensibly by carrying out a Great Benevolent Scheme, actually by extracting money by threats of draconic penalties from others, for the most part much poorer than themselves.

"With regard to the coercive powers behind the form C.F. 6, which are obviously a matter of public interest, I reserve the right to publish your official reply. In the absence of such reply we shall assume that it is unnecessary to complete the form.

"I am, Sir,

"June 22, 1948."

"Yours truly," etc.

By
C. H. DOUGLAS:
**THE REALISTIC POSITION OF
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND**

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

(Postage 1d.)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, LIVERPOOL.

AN EDITOR ON TRIAL.

REX v. CAUNT.

Alleged Seditious Libel.

(Official shorthand transcript of the Trial at the Liverpool Assizes of James Caunt, Editor of *The Morecambe and Heysham Visitor*, for alleged seditious libel against the Jewish People).

2/- NETT (Postage 1½d.)

Obtainable from:

K.R.P. Publications Limited, 7, Victoria St., Liverpool, 2.