

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 21. No. 1.

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

Social Credit in Alberta (1948)

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

(II)

The following statement appeared in the *Edmonton (Alta) Bulletin* of July 17, 1948:—

"An undertaking to implement the "Judge Commission report as far as provincial revenue make possible" is given among the more important planks in the 10 point platform of the Social Credit government released this morning.

"The sections of the Judge report specifically dealt with in the government's announced program include:

"1. Increased educational grants

"2. Road grants to municipalities based on motor, vehicle and fuel oil tax revenue of the province and construction and maintenance of provincial highways through towns and villages.

"3. The province to assume 80 per cent. of the cost of indigent relief, mothers' allowance and child welfare.

"4. All costs of Old Age Pensions and blind pensions to be assumed by the government.

"5. Repeal of the wild lands tax act and abolition of the business tax on fur farms.

"Payments of grants in lieu of taxes on government buildings used for commercial enterprises.

"TWO MONTHS

"The Judge report was compiled during a two-month series of meetings held by J. W. Judge, sitting as a one-man commission during the summer of 1947.

"The report was tabled at the last session of the legislature, but the government announced at that time implementation of the report would have to await further study.

"At that time the government undertook to prepare a legislative program for submission to the next sitting of the assembly.

"The ten planks of the government platform are:

"1. Greatly expanded program for development of natural resources with the crown retaining ownership of natural resources, except for land and further development of a lease-hold basis.

"2. Constant attention to the needs of agriculture with a greatly-expanded program of service to the farmers.

"3. Development of power resources and encouragement of rural electrification in accordance with the needs of the people.

"WELFARE

"4. Further expansion of the government's program of public health and welfare, which already includes such features as free maternity hospitalization.

"5. Implementation of the Judge report.

"6. Further improvement in educational system of the province, with costs reduced to land-owners by implementation of the Judge report.

"7. More and better roads promised. Already the province has a total of more than 80,000 miles of roads without incurring one cent of public debt.

"8. A vigorous program, already commenced, of encouragement to industry and immigrants to settle in the province.

"9. Full government co-operation with both industry and labor to make secure the just rights of both parties and uninterrupted production.

"10. A continuation of the government's fight for social justice, economic security and freedom. Allegiance to the principles of Social Credit is again expressed."

Except by implication, Mr. Manning's Manifesto is a Work Programme—not a political declaration—a programme not differing in type from the kind of thing with which Russia has made us familiar in its Five Year Plans. The Alberta Electorate has about as much say as have the Russians. Mr. Manning is saying, "This is what is going to be done, and *we* are going to do it. By that *we* mean that *you* will do the work to *our* instructions. *You* will be paid with what *we* have told *you* is *your* money, and you will discover that it *was* *your* money when we have taken it off you in open or concealed taxes to pay *you* with your own *money* for doing *your* own work. Where *we* come in is that we are handsomely paid for assuming the power to choose the direction in which you will expand your energies and your resources. *You give us a block vote to spend your money* instead of choosing, *i.e.* voting, at each purchase, *what you want, how much of it you want, what you think it is worth and whether you want it before or after something else.* And when you have paid in work or taxes to obtain the benefits I promise you, you won't own them, because 'public ownership' is just a trick to catch simpletons. *We shall control (and control is the important feature of ownership).* What *you* will get out of them depends on what we think is good for you and will consolidate our power." It is not *what* is going to be done, it is *how* and *why* which are significant.

There are, evidently, other ways of describing the situation.

It is a long step towards the Managerial State and is what is desired by the International Powers. That it is being put forward by something which calls itself Social Credit, but is in fact the exact opposite, Centralised Credit, instead of by the C.C.F., which stands for Centralised Credit, is doubtless a source of combined amusement and satisfaction to those who have arranged it. I should be prepared to believe that Mr. Manning has little or no understanding of the implications of "his" policy, although he

evidently feels that the first duty of a politician is to stay in Office. He would probably claim, and I certainly should not contest that "his" programme could be used to describe a good programme, in fact, it could be used to describe almost anything. He probably would not understand what I am trying to indicate, that the very achievement of that programme, by the methods he is committed to employ, however successful, and perhaps in proportion to its success, will rivet the chains of State slavery, which the electors supposed he wished to attack.

The most casual perusal of the Alberta Press is sufficient to make it evident that it was solidly behind Mr. Manning and entirely assured that he and his Cabinet are indifferent to any of the ideas which brought Mr. Aberhart to power. The Dark Forces, quite rightly, have taken Alberta seriously. They know far better than Mr. Manning that Power centralised in an Administration is power taken from the individual, and that far more effective pressure can be exercised, under present arrangements, by them than by the Alberta Electorate. When, in the course of time—not too much time—the electorate becomes dissatisfied, it will be a matter of the smallest consequence. It will merely be "Social Credit which failed in Alberta" and a fresh company of Office seekers will not be difficult to find.

The line which is taken by the Press is interesting and informative. "Social Credit as a theory is dead, but Mr. Manning's Government has given Alberta good Government, and ought to be *exclusively* supported." *i.e.* there should be as nearly as possible a dictatorship. Thus everyone agrees that Alberta's Social Credit Government is not a verdict for Social Credit—except the electorate.

(To be continued)

The Business

For more than a generation, for three generations perhaps, but scarcely five, it has been the habit of 'business' men, which always meant in some more or less subtle connection, the busy little fellows (though vastly distended in their own conceit of themselves) who bought and sold what better men conceived, rather than the Makers of Things, however shoddy those things became, to ride it insolently but mightily successfully over all others as they saved as well as the satisfied among men. We all know them, even the young: slick dodgers of margins they were, who fled the Roman dignity of the printed middles to scrape along the sides, raiders of intangibles, who turned *specio*, which means I behold, from its human-divine application, to mere money—by *speculation* (not of any philosophic sort). It is not without a touch of irony that, etymologically, the transition was effected by way of *speculator*, a word which has its low touch of the spy about it. The geniuses (that is to say all those whose gifts were sold—but not by themselves) writhed and poured scorn according to their capacity, as Shelley did. "It was his fancy [Peter had his fancies] to invite"—

Men of science, wit, and learning,
Who came to lend each other light;
He proudly thought that his gold's might
Had set those spirits burning.
And men of learning, science, wit,
Considered him as you or I

Think of some rotten tree, and sit
Lounging and dining under it,
Exposed to the wide sky.

However long they may have lounged they dined less well than he (when he wished it, which was usually to show them what a margin was, and how narrow. Even scorn might find a sale, and a seller; and if it did not 'twas but silent scorn). Peter prospered, or seemed to those who knew not the Canon to prosper exceedingly, and grew mellow in his prospering, for hypocrisy is not the only homage that vice pays to virtue. But the mellowing was not of the wine but of the bottle. Peter wouldn't change the bottle. It was a good old bottle. How often have we seen him brandish it: "Good old bottle. Ah, my son: you young fellows are not businesslike. Now look at me . . ." You did as you were bidden. If you rather liked what you saw, that made it worse rather than better than if you disliked what you saw. Always what you saw was a certain *per centage* of 'success,' or rather a certain *per centage* of objective gained or pretending to have been gained, for what is man's—any man's—objective? It is always somehow terrible to be confronted with Faith, and if one cannot distinguish self-assurance from Faith Yes, the results are different. For Faith is primarily, substance, not mass, not weight. The business man was a see-er (*speculator* I spy), not a beholder of the object of Hope. His evidences were of things seen, not of things unseen. But the things unseen are greater than things seen. As John Ruskin said, Peter, "You never more *can* be kind to them." The passage is in *The Political Economy of Art*:

" it is only by the fact of his seeming not to seek your approbation that you may conjecture he deserves it. But if he does deserve it, be sure that you give it him, else you not only run a chance of driving him from the right road For it is only the young who can receive much reward from man's praise: the old, when they are great, get too far beyond and above you to care what you think of them. You may urge them with sympathy, and surround them then with acclamation; but they will doubt your pleasure, and despise your praise. You might have cheered them in their race through the asphodel meadows of their youth; you might have brought the proud, bright scarlet into their faces, if you had but cried once to them 'well done,' as they dashed up to the first goal of their early ambition. But now, their pleasure is in memory, and their ambition is in heaven. *They can be kind to you, but you never more can be kind to them.*"

Poor Peter! Whose eyes will ever turn enviously towards him again? He and his old bottle, we have grown too old to care what he thinks of us; but who, if not we, can ever more be kind to him? Never again can he invoke the illusion of success. He has been beaten in the little games. An Unseen has brushed him contemptuously aside: an unseen that he denied. He was too shrewd for anyone to deceive, too competent for competition, too low for anyone to go any lower. He knew something (not by any means all) about bankruptcy—but nothing at all about Credit.

We shall never listen to him again (if we ever did): but we can still be kind to him—and we would, IF

If the thing that has licked him were not his very essence.

The Battle is Joined

The following from *The Times* of the same day (August 26) reflect developing strains:—

"Mr. J. Christie, leader of the South African Labour Party, today moved that the Government should give an undertaking that it would not infringe the present democratic rights and privileges of the South African people, especially the freedom of ministers of religion to teach according to their consciences, the freedom of workers to organise, the freedom of the Press, and the freedom of educational institutions from political influences. . . .

"Dr. Malan, answering on behalf of the Government, said the motion was an insult. The Government held to the principles of western democracy. The authoritarians were in the United Party, which had spied upon its political enemies and interned people without trial during the war and, in collaboration with labour, had turned South Africa into a police State."

"It is reported from Hyderabad that the Nizam has received a reply from the King to his recent letter asking for intervention in the dispute between Hyderabad and India. . . .

"A Reuter telegram from Lake Success says that the letter from Hyderabad asking the Security Council to intervene in its dispute with India was circulated on Tuesday to members of the Council. . . .

"The letter declared that Hyderabad had been exposed in recent months to violent intimidation, to threats of invasion, and to a crippling economic blockade which was intended to coerce it into a denunciation of its independence. The frontiers had been forcibly violated and Hyderabad villages had been occupied by Indian troops."

"Mr. Chifley, before the conference of Premiers of the Australian States ended, responded to renewed appeals for a more liberal grant in lieu of the States' lost income-tax receipts by agreeing to allow them £A53,680,000, compared with his previous allotment of £A51,160,000 and £A45m. allowed in 1947-48. The States have been further assured of a minimum increase in 1949-50 of £A6m. above this year's grant.

"The Premier of South Australia, Mr. Playford, says his Government will consider testing before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council the validity of the uniform

income-tax legislation which the High Court has sustained.

"As the proposed increase in the States' grant in 1949-50 is based partly on an estimated increase in population, and partly on an expected increase in average wages, it may be assumed that an increase in the Australian price level of between 10 and 15 per cent, is expected during the next 12 months."

Mond-Turnerism in Action

"It is not the employers we have to fight, it is our own union . . . It seems it is nepotism with the union. They say to the railways 'We will keep your railways going and without strikes providing you give us some nice plums.' . . . The position made one believe trade unionism had outlived its usefulness. They are more interested in politics than the workers who are paying them their wages."—S. Woods, a spokesman of Railway Catering Grades, according to a press report, August 23.

St. Paul's Cathedral

" . . . (Bonner) was never to be Bishop of London more, and with him disappeared much else that was more valuable. Ten years before his death, St. Paul's had become the prey of the spoiler. Mr. Froude's description of the wholesale robbery is but too true. 'In the autumn and winter of 1552-1553, no less than four commissions were appointed with this one object; four of whom were to go over the often-trodden ground, and glean the last spoils which could be gathered from the churches. In the business of plunder, the rapacity of the crown officials had been far distanced hitherto by private speculation. The halls of country-houses were hung with altar-cloths; tables and beds were quilted with copes; the knights and squires drank their claret out of chalices, and watered their horses in marble coffins. Pious clergy, gentlemen, or churchwardens had, in many places, secreted plate, images, or candlesticks, which force might bring to light. Bells, rich in silver, still hung silent in remote church towers, or were buried in the vaults. Organs still pealed through the aisles in notes unsuited to a regenerate worship; and damask napkins, rich robes, consecrated banners, pious offerings of men of another faith, remained in the chests of the vestries. . . . Who seized, who appropriated, who profaned the splendid banners which had waved over the processions in St. Paul's and from St. Paul's? To what baser uses were the countless gorgeous vestments—the copes, the albes, the chasubles, degraded? What became of the plate, the jewelled and enamelled vessels—the flagons, the chalices, the patens concealed? Whither went some of the splendid altar-cloths, singularly enough we can shew. Spanish cathedrals still boastfully deck themselves in the spoils of St. Paul's'

"A few years more, and profanation was added to spoliation. In Cromwell's time—of whom a strange story is told, that he meditated selling the cathedral to the Jews—the portico was let out for mean shops, to sempstresses and hucksters, with chambers above, and staircases leading to them. The body of the church, the sacred building, Dugdale who saw it, declares with sorrow and bitterness of heart, became a cavalry barrack, a cavalry stable. . . ."—From *Chamber's Journal*, February 27, 1869.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of *annual* subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.

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. 21. No. 1.

Saturday, September 4, 1948.

From Week to Week

A gentleman bearing the indigenous name of Hrothmar Habbakuk is instructing us over "our" "B".B.C. as to the manner in which "our" British Economy is changing.

And our favourite British names, too.

• • •

Extract from a Correspondent:—

"The results of the Quebec Elections are disappointing . . . it is ten to one that the results are falsified and the tellers bribed. We are asked to believe that the people of one Province in Canada are almost unanimously in favour of Social Credit, while those of the other Provinces almost unanimously oppose it. Is it likely?"

• • •

"Quebec's Election Sizzles over Fraud.

. . . The uproar centred in Montreal, where accusations of fraud and black market dealings in registration slips were freely tossed about. Police said thousands of voters in the metropolis may have been disfranchised . . . Deputy Director Beaugard of the Provincial Police said that black market operators were offering from \$2 to \$5 per slip. Later the price had risen to \$10. . . ."—Canadian Press, in Edmonton Bulletin, July 28.

• • •

Mr. M. J. Coldwell, M.P., the National Leader of the C.C.F. (Socialist) Party in Canada, speaking at Macleod, Alberta on July 28 said that "Financial interests" are now supporting the Social Credit Party in Alberta, and the Party can no longer be classed as progressive.

Mr. Coldwell ought to know—he met Mr. Nash of New Zealand at Regina, Saskatchewan when the C.C.F. was founded in Canada.

• • •

According to the "Arab News Bulletin" of August 13, both the President Dr. Weizmann, and the representative of the so-called State of Israel at the United Nations, are British subjects, and refuse to give up their British nationality.

The "British" Government, of course has no say in the matter.

• • •

Commenting on the refusal of the U.S. Government to give him a visa to visit the United States, Dr. Hewlett Johnson is reported to have said, "We always give Americans a cordial welcome to Canterbury Cathedral, but the *Dean of the Cathedral* is not to be welcomed in the United States." (Our emphasis).

We suggest to the Friends of Canterbury Cathedral,

who provide a good deal of the money for its upkeep, that they might be interested in the implications of the refusal of a visa to the *Dean of the Cathedral*.

A Tobacco Speculator

"A French newspaper makes the following statement:

"We learn that M. de Rothschild has arranged an affair which will insure him the monopoly of tobacco not only in France, but throughout the continent of Europe. He has for some time had agents in America to buy, by anticipation, the growth of all the plantations for a great many years to come.

"Thirty millions of francs have been appropriated to this vast speculation. The news has spread alarm among the capitalists who have entered into contracts with the royal tobacco manufactory, as it will soon be impossible for them to supply their tobacco at the stipulated prices."

"What an unheard-of proceeding! One man, by wealth, to acquire a power of money-squeezing or taxing over every one of his fellow-creatures who is addicted to a by no means rare habit!

"The Dutchman and German, who live in an atmosphere of tobacco smoke; the Parisian gentleman, who could not want his cigar; the operative, to whom the short pipe is equally indispensable; the old woman who would perish without her *tabatière*; all to become liable to a suffering in purse for the benefit of M. de Rothschild, because M. de Rothschild happens already to possess overgrown wealth.

"Is there not something alarming in this announcement, as if we were now to find the results of industry converted into the most serious of tyrannies? Why, at this rate, it would only require the profits of the tobacco monopoly to enable the monopolist to acquire monopoly over sugar or tea; the profits of these united, to establish a monopoly of corn; and then we should have Mr. D'Israeli's ideas of 'the Coming Man' realised with a vengeance—the ailment of the human race depending on the will and pleasure of an individual, and he a member of the house of Israel!

"Such may not practically result, but it is theoretically possible; and, on a simply philosophical consideration, nothing could be more curious. The profligate monopolies granted to courtiers, in the seventeenth century, for base and selfish reasons, here recur under totally different circumstances. Here reappears a power of units over multitudes, such as existed in similar force only in the earliest state of society."—From *Chamber's Edinburgh Journal*, May 2, 1846.

So Bad a Press

The Tablet quotes Mr. Driberg, before the Royal Commission on the Press, concerning the newspaper black list (called in the office the 'white' list):—

"Throughout practically the whole period that I was on the *Daily Express* the first two names on the white list were Hilaire Belloc and G. K. Chesterton; Chesterton was only released from the white list by death; that was the first occasion on which I had been allowed to write about him in my column."

We should like to see a list common to all newspapers with a circulation of over 100,000; and we doubt that there would be two names on it, but should be willing to bet on one if it was not against the rules to back a certainty.

The Gospel According to Marx

By NORMAN F. WEBB.

Some years ago this journal published a critique of mine of Dr. Temple's *Christianity and the Social Order*, under the title "Straws in the Wind," in which it was suggested that the late Archbishop of Canterbury's book must be taken rather as a pathological study than a sociological or literary achievement, and that in it he exposed himself as a victim of the prevailing epidemic of dialectical materialism. Along with Dr. Temple we had the Dean of Canterbury and his *Socialist Sixth of the World*, and his unnatural acceptance of concentration camps so long as they are not situated in Germany. And now, to complete the trio, comes the Bishop of Birmingham, with his book, *The Rise of Christianity* which might well have been written by that arch-sceptic and despair-monger H. G. Wells, for some popular series of Up-to-the-minute ethics. We may be sure that the more or less simultaneous rise to eminence of these three Church of England dignitaries was not fortuitous. Of Dr. Temple we know that he was a close friend of J. Pierpont Morgan, and the world teems with instances of the apparently unnatural affinity between High Finance and Communism. While Hewlett Johnson and Ernest William Barnes are both ecclesiastical creations of Ramsay MacDonald and the first Labour Cabinet; itself representing the political wing of the communistic reaction in this country.

Let us hope that this long, dreary, sordid campaign of defamation has reached its limits in Dr. Barnes's really pathetic testament of disbelief, and that we may regard what is in fact a remarkably callow and superficial book as a last, derisive, school-boy gesture from the retreating forces of mental tom-foolery and hooliganism from which contemporary society has been suffering so severely. What do they expect to gain, anyway, in their dialectical attempt to establish the absolute and comprehensive quality of human knowledge at the expense of all the hidden wonders of the spirit? It may seem paradoxical that this earnest, conscientious mathematician-turned-ecclesiastic should be classed as a hooligan; but the truth is that the sick are sick in complete disregard of their ethical aspirations, and even their apparent deserts, and this applies as much to sickness of the mind as of the body. But there are, happily, a few who have, as it were, been able to keep on their feet, and have not succumbed entirely, like Dr. Barnes, to the prevailing mental infection of *lawlessness*, and who still possess sufficient mental health to *desire*—that is the operative word!—and steadfastly anticipate, a return to a general and popular recognition of the existence of God.

The dreary campaign alluded to above, for the arrest of which we, and all those with any sense of realism left to them, piously hope, is what in the Eighteenth Century was known as Rationalism, and today bears the ugly and most apt name of dialectical materialism. It is not possible to point to any epoch as marking its actual origin—in one form or another it is no doubt as old as consciousness; but as we know it now and suffer from it, it may be said to have taken definite shape among the French Encyclopaedists who precipitated the Revolution. It arose alongside an apparently harmless, and even commendable belief in an absolute phenomenon called Progress, or mathematically-computable and progressive social betterment. The fallacy and harmfulness, however, of such a belief lies in its implication and

the false assumption which the conditions of its realisation demand; the assertion, by force if necessary, of the absolute supremacy of the human intellect; in short, the belief that everything that *is*—all things, that is, simultaneously existing,—can be *immediately* grasped by the human intellect, and that therefore we can safely ignore what we do not understand *i.e.*, that which is intellectually intangible. That is a tremendous and surely unwarranted assumption, that cannot fail to produce correspondingly great reactions; reactions which not only stretch back to the very origins of abstract human consciousness, but reach down to the depths of each separate individual mind, to where there reposes an *idea* of Order or Intelligent Co-ordinating Principle. Once lodged in that deep and little-understood mental area their false assumptions attack and contradict that implanted *idea*, with the most distressing and unforeseeable results in human behaviour. What such a belief forces on the individual entertaining it is an assertion of the absolute power (potent will) of the human intellect to achieve specified ends merely because he personally considers them desirable. Conversely, of course, such a belief is a denial of the *power* of God. In short, what it assumes is that if real Social Progress—progressive collective betterment—is what we want, and will to have, it must automatically come about regardless of human behaviour, *i.e.* regardless of whether or not the organisation of our society is based on an understanding and respect for Natural Law, or—a better term perhaps—The Canon.

To anyone who has succeeded in keeping his wits in what is admittedly a very mad world, a few minutes' quiet consideration will show that such a creed is just a childish flouting of what is, after all, common knowledge; a futile intellectual refusal to face the fact that wilful ignorance brings its own inevitable "punishment," through the operation of the Law of Cause and Effect. "In the beginning was the Word,"—that is, the Law, the Canon—"and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The Law of Cause and Effect is the current name for what to the modern thinking individual is the most immediate and intellectually tangible aspect of the infinite and marvellous interplay of ordered forces, visible and invisible, of which we are conscious, in ourselves and in the universe about us. You can, of course, avoid all this circumlocution—if that is what it really is?—by saying that the assumptions of Rationalism, or Marxism, entirely ignore the existence of God. But it seems quite useless these days to make simple statements of that nature, because Rationalist assumptions, and the accompanying flood of propaganda that their falsity necessitates being poured out in the attempt to support them, have so bedevilled the average man's standards and ideas—even those of bishops and archbishops!—that nothing remains simple to him. An additional cause of this crippling loss on the part of the individual of the ability to see things, including himself and his motives, clearly and whole, has been the fact that in this bedevilling process the very terms and symbols by which he used easily to identify and describe, and analyse them and himself have been rendered meaningless. In particular, and that applies to the primary and infinitely simple term God, implying comprehensively the Original Impulse behind his own and his fellow-individuals' implanted *idea* of Law and Order and all his aspiration in that direction. What this amounts to is that in terms of the Spirit or potential and imaginative future, the modern world is rapidly becoming inarticulate, from lack of words, or symbols, with any fixed and intelligible meaning attached to

* *The Rise of Christianity* by Ernest William Barnes: Lingman.

them. For if a word means anything you choose, it means nothing in terms of articulate intercommunication or—even more vital—self-communion. Babel is here; since the individual is losing both the will and the means required for the study and understanding of his universe *through* himself, and in consequence his existence and activities, instead of exhibiting as they did in more articulate times, a reasonable and ordered simplicity,—a reminder of which is to be seen in the happy and appropriate building operations of our forefathers—has become a complex of incalculable and featureless disorderly reactions.

I am aware that in what I have written I am setting up to teach the learned professors of a faculty their own job, or what should be their job. But the fact is,—and the Bishop of Birmingham's book brings this out most clearly—they have so entirely lost sight of their true objective, that at this terrific crisis in the world's history their strategy and tactics, if indeed they have any,—are of no effect whatsoever, and for some time now Clergymen have had to content themselves with being no more than exponents of a moral philosophy—only a comparatively small department of their function, which in reality embraces the whole art of living. Life on this plane is made up of reactions, and it is the Christian function, or duty, to teach moderation in reaction, since *all* evils, as we term them, have their origin in abuse or excess, of some sort. In all likelihood, the initial mistake was made at the time of the Reformation—a very understandable revolt against abuses—when instead of attempting to deflect and minimize reactionary elements, and act in a compensatory capacity, the Church herself reacted and tried to meet it head-on, thus greatly inflaming the issue and crystallizing and consolidating what was originally a not unreasonable protest, into what we now recognise as the fiercest attack known to human history on the very *idea* of individual authority, or the rights and power of the individual. For that is what ultimately the movement now known as Socialism amounts to. To the excesses of this reaction considerable elements of the Reformed Churches have fallen victim, so that although it displays every kind of un-Christian abuse and ambition, from Forced-Labour Camps to the purposed liquidation of the British Empire and the slow starvation of the forty-seven million inhabitants of these islands, we are faced with the phenomenon of these three conscientious ecclesiastics—in a crescendo of official eminence: Dean, Bishop, Archbishop,—all giving it their whole-hearted support.

Of the book itself there is really very little to be said, except that one might quote what was said by another Doctor, and a Johnson too, (Sam this time, not Hewlett), to an enquiry as to what he thought of, presumably, a somewhat similar partisan piece of writing. "Madam, for those that like that sort of thing, that is the sort of thing they will like." For after he is through with Dr. Barnes's book, there really remains only one issue for the reader: either there is no such thing as Christianity as a demonstrated fact, or alternatively, there is no such thing as the Bishop of Birmingham as a coherent thinker and critic—and that, in my view, is a foolhardy issue for even a bishop of the Church of England to pose.

One single quotation may be given, from the chapter on Passion Week. This is it: "The story of the resurrection is so intimately bound up with Christian feeling . . . that the need to abandon belief in it as a physical fact"—*i.e.* its history—"causes much distress. . . . Yet we cannot, out of deference to religious sentiment, reject the principle of the

uniformity of nature which is fundamental to modern science." The obvious comment upon which is, that neither we nor Dr. Barnes know all that is embraced or implied by "the principle of uniformity of nature"; for, in spite of Modern Science, there are some matters still hidden, even from the Royal Society. And so under pressure from the fetish of Modern Science, this dignitary of the Church of England proceeds to throw doubt upon almost every recorded act of Jesus of Nazareth, as though it was both his pleasure and his duty to establish their nothingness; and this notwithstanding the fact that he instances the words and acts of Paul and Luke and Pilate and the rest of Jesus's contemporaries, with no scrap more or less of warrant for doing so, as universally established historical figures. Such inconsistency can only arise from the partisan nature of modern so-called "scientific education," and is a terrible reflection on it. The mere suggestion that such an attitude bears any resemblance at all to the actual *scientific method* outlined by Francis Bacon and employed by those engaged in the specific function of physical research, is childish nonsense. But it does terribly represent the spirit of those *evil forces* that are today exploiting the physical energy discovered by the "scientific method" objectively employed by professional researchers; the very spirit against which the Bishop of Birmingham in his professional capacity should be warring, instead of bowing to it. This is the spirit "of the rulers of the darkness of this world"—those who take advantage of popular ignorance, lay or clerical—up against whom Paul warned us we were: ". . . spiritual wickedness in high places." Modern Science, alias Big Business, alias Internationalism and What-have-you, the crack-pot Gods of the Socialist System, to which far too great a percentage of modern society, including the Churches, have handed over their allegiance—these represent the "false Christs and false prophets" alluded to by an even more far-sighted individual than Paul, when he warned us of their coming, saying that they would show us signs and wonders—"such wonders as remote control, bombers and artificial insemination" to seduce if it were possible, even the very elect. Alas, it seems only too possible. And it is really the enlightened and enlightening authority of this universal Friend of the Individual that the exploiters and would-be monopolists of the fruits of modern physical research (miscalled Science) try to conceal under a blanket of their sophisticating propaganda.

Far more profitable is it to turn from all this complexity of material dialectic, to Sir Frederick Kenyon's modest and unopinionated essay *The Bible in Modern Scholarship**. This small and very readable book was expanded from the first of a series of lectures on Bible Archeology delivered last winter at London University and as published, intended as an answer to Dr. Barnes's scepticism. It is a pleasure to meet in it an authority in his subject who confines himself to it in a spirit so immeasurably more sane and scientific than that prevailing with Dr. Barnes. Unless Sir Frederick deliberately misstates his case,—and presumably his statements can be easily checked and verified—it would appear that the research of the particular period which colours all Dr. Barnes's arguments, is largely superceded. Associated as most of us know mainly with Germany, it flourished from the early thirties to about the last decade of last century; the turn of the tide being marked by the publication of Adolph Harnack's chief work in 1889. It seems incredible that anyone in the Bishop of Birmingham's position could have

* *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*. John Murray. 3/6.

been unaware of this fact, until one reflects that as this period marks the culmination of Rationalist Thought on this and many other matters, it has, presumably and not unnaturally, been preserved as the textbook basis of education in dialectical materialism.

We learn, as presumably Dr. Barnes could have learnt had he wished, that archeological research and discovery since then has been prodigious, far more than all that went before, and particularly the research of the thirties of the present century. The greater part of it has gone to confirm the basis of traditional belief; but since traditionalism has been so much the subject of attack, we need look no further for the cause of the lack of notice or publicity the fact has received. Besides a lot else, two points are outstanding, neither of which is even mentioned by Dr. Barnes. German scepticism regarding the Old Testament was built up largely on the belief that prior to about 1,000 B.C. writing was an unknown art, and all events therefore prior to that were merely hear-say legend. Modern discovery, however, shows this assumption to be out by at least two thousand years. And again, in regard to the Gospels, until the publication of the Chester-Beatty papyri in 1931, which show portions of written records of the Fourth Gospel dating from the end of the first century, and thus definitely place the Synoptic Gospels well within two generations of the Crucifixion,—there had been no earlier written versions than the parchment Codices, Sinaiticus, and the Vaticanus, both of the fourth century, which would have left an interval more than sufficient for the appearance of errors and glosses to almost any desired extent.

All this, and much more, the School—word of ill-omen—in which the Bishop of Birmingham was reared, which is that of Fabian-Labour-Socialism, chooses to ignore, for the purely partisan and therefore entirely unscientific reason that on the whole it goes to uphold tradition rather than the sceptical theory of Bismarkian Germany and the Marxists. If that is the spirit of the Modern Science to which, as Dr. Barnes reminds us, “the principle of the uniformity of nature is fundamental,” with its sentimental concept of mathematical Progress, and a Millennium achieved *primarily* through modern plumbing and assorted gadgetry, then it is no wonder that this so-called *scientific age* has got so comparatively swiftly to where it has got, and we, alas, are. For that is the Luciferian spirit of dialectical materialism, which, in the foolish belief that there can be a choice in the matter for any reasonable individual, chooses to ignore the whole vast field of the still-to-be-discovered, and therefore unknown and invisible, universe; the mighty realm, or whole state of affairs, of which the human intellect is still for the most part profoundly ignorant, and which Jesus of Nazareth named the Kingdom of God. This is the realm of correct mental sequence and of first things first, as it were, the Realm of Right Side Up, where “all these things,” definable as the aforesaid gadgetry—H. & C. basins in every room, company’s gas and water, *etc., etc.*, can, and may only be, secondary super-additions.

On page 49 Sir Frederick makes a sound observation to the effect that “Tradition makes a bad master, but a useful guide.” As is the way of the all-too-human being, the traditionalist, more from spiritual laziness than anything else, tends, if he can, to construct a tyranny out of his habits of mind. This incites to revolt and reaction; which equally tends to go as far, and further, on the other side and towards

the opposite tyranny, of the untried, this time—the heaven of the Utopian, let-me-show-you (and arn’t they, just) school, whose administrations we now enjoy as best we can. Such being the facts, can there be any doubt as to the attitude towards them of all sane individuals, whose Christian duty it is to resist all extremes of reaction, either of the Right or the Left, and particularly that of the Christian Church? It is high time the ignorant and misled public was warned that this worship of “scientific” jargon has gone far too far. But Dr. Barnes is wholly under the influence of the Left, as was the late Dr. Temple, with his theories of economical “withering capital” and the like, borrowed from Professor Laski and the “London” School, both were the unfortunate products of an almost entirely partisan education, subtly designed to lead its pupils, not out against the *abuses* of Tradition, but inward against Tradition itself, the whole corpus of painfully acquired, human knowledge. And as a consequence, since the objective of Socialism is excessive—abstract Excess, instead of abstract Moderation—its methods are, and must be, unscientific; an ugly mixture of threat and cajolery, of compulsion and propaganda.

Modern Science, dialectical materialism, in its present combination of Big Business and Totalitarian Government made its appearance in the 19th Century as the opponent of Christian Faith and the Church that was its guardian. It posed as an advance in practical knowledge, or more correctly, as the key to advanced and better living, *without* the necessity of any further and painful acquisition of knowledge. But knowledge ‘Science’ is experience, not textbook formulae; and living is not, strictly speaking, the application of textbook formulae but experience, the experiencing of Life. And the Christian Church as the official guardian of the Corpus Christi, or body of real knowledge, should from the first have recognised the assumptions of Modern Science for the theoretical nonsense they are, and shown its members how to laugh the infantile pretensions of the Marxists out of court. Instead, for the most part, the Church trembled, and argued, and stammered. And so, all about us to-day, we see the results of this lack of faith, in the devastation of two world wars, and the unchecked stampede of economic and totalitarian materialism that threatens to crush the individual out of existence.

The clergy should have recognised, and denounced, the Marxian assertions as immoderate from the very start, and their working out in practical Socialistic centralisation of power, as having long ago passed the point of moderation. But they did nothing of the kind; partly, no doubt, because of the infiltration of the anti-Christian and completely unscientific creed that “good can come of evil,” re-introduced at the end of the last Century by the Fabians, who translated it as the Common Good to be attained by the sacrifice of individual happiness.

They should have personal blame for the deliberately mis-educated lay product of our elementary and secondary Government schools, if they have inbibed the Pharaisaical Socialist belief that cleanliness comes so far before godliness that society can afford altogether to ignore the latter, at least till the great Battle of the Bathroom has been fought and won. But not so the clergy, who have—or are supposed to have—received a realistic theological training, which presumably puts the Kingdom of God, or Real Knowledge (‘Science’) *before* its application to “all these things” additional, including plumbing. Their concern was—or should have

been—with correct *sequence*, and in denouncing the wilful Socialist inversion of it. In this the Protestant Churches have especially failed. 'Can the position be retrieved? Dare the Church of England, for instance, take up the schoolboy challenge of its own Bishop of Birmingham; or is it beaten, like the schoolmaster who has lost the last shreds of his authority and can only quit the class-room? One speculates as to what has been happening inside the walls of Lambeth.

For the Record

"During the last thirty years Douglas Social Credit has suffered so bad a press that its supporters must have experienced a shock last week when the *News Chronicle*, in a leading article, wrote kind words about the Government of Alberta, which is the one place as yet where the movement has succeeded in gaining the confidence of the electors. The fact that one director of the *News Chronicle* is a governor of the Bank of England, while another has been a British financial representative at Basle, might suggest that the journal has a fondness for orthodox finance. Its praise of the Alberta regime, moreover, does not include any commendation of those monetary principles which in any case the Albertans have not been allowed by the Federal authorities to employ, but is confined to the efficiency and honesty of the Albertan Government. Even to mention Social Credit, except in terms of derision, is, however, so unusual that cynics must be casting round for an explanation. They may not need to look far.

"At the end of last year, as it happens, the Canadian Social Credit movement encountered violent storm and schism. Mr. Norman Jaques, fearless Social Credit M.P., was denied access to the columns of the movement's journal, the editor of which was dismissed, and an announcement was made that henceforth no allusion would be permitted to Jewish influences in world finance. According to the *British Social Crediter*, this followed a visit to Alberta by Lady Reading, but—whether or not that visit had anything to do with the matter—there is no doubt that previously the *Canadian Social Crediter* was critical of Jewish power and is critical no longer. Churlish, indeed, would be the *News Chronicle* if it failed to raise a cheer."—*Truth*, August 27, 1948.

Cromwell

"We shall now probably have a rage for Cromwell, to last some time, as a make-up for the injustice with which his memory has been treated during the past two centuries.

"Mr. Carlyle has set the fashion, and already Cromwell ribbons are sported at many inferior lapells. No one can now say a word against this celebrated personage, under pain of an imputation of Dryasdustism, flunkeyism, and many other *isms* terrible to weak brains. What perfect folly, nevertheless is all this! The man who slaughtered thousands of defenceless people, in order to terrify a nation into submission—a very pretty example, truly of the principle of 'doing evil that good might follow'—who, finding parliaments troublesome, made his council ordinances pass as laws—who, having overthrown a monarchy, professedly for the benefit of the people, was not unwilling to take the crown to himself and his own family—this man to be an object of undivided worship! Surely nothing but the hatred of something else could make men love Cromwell so much—

like Hazlitt lauding Napoleon because he was so detested by the legitimists. What on earth is there to object to in the good old plan of viewing a human being's errors in connexion with his glories—mixing his shades with his lights? Why should we not see that Cromwell was only one of the class of warrior tyrants, although comparatively a well-meaning one. Surely nothing but a ridiculous truckling dread of that to which he stood in opposition, could dictate an exclusivism of panegyric so utterly absurd?—From *Chamber's Journal*, April 11, 1846.

Spy Report Circulation

If, as has been stated in Parliament, only 4,116 copies of the Royal Commission's Canadian Spy Report were sold in "Britain," official agencies cannot have disposed of many.

Australian Judgment

According to a press report, Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, K.C., has been briefed to oppose the Australian Government in its appeal to the Privy Council against the Commonwealth High Court judgment in its disfavour.

Reissued in Canada:

DICTATORSHIP BY TAXATION

By MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS.

(The text of the Belfast Address of November 24, 1936).

PRICE: THREEPENCE.

From:

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., Liverpool or Electoral Campaign Headquarters, 207/413, Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C.

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.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.