THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 22. No. 12. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper. Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1949. 6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"Contemporary civilisation is the product, in every one of its aspects, of intellectualism based on theory. As such, it is in sharp contrast to that of the 'Old Order,' which was the fruit of experience . . . .

"Humanity to-day is not unlike a man who uses certain articles for purposes quite other than those for which they were intended. . . . We live in a world where falsification has become the general rule, and our inner lives feel, as they are bound to do, the effects.

" . . . Hence the curious atmosphere of moral sickness which is abroad to-day—the feeling that some curse lies on everything we do, a feeling that is explicable in no other way."—Humbert Michaud: "Towards a New Orientation" in *The XIX Century, and After.*

• • •

We can restrain without difficulty the remnant of admiration we used, many years ago, to feel for *The Times*. But its Literary Supplement still has a certain dignity long departed from the threepenny edition of the *Daily Worker*. Thus a recent editorial commenting on a remark by Earl Russell observed that the popular revulsion from science and scientists (which is marked, and growing) is inspired by something more than the dread of recent inventions, and extends to the whole class of intellectuals. We agree.

Those of us who have devoted a good deal of attention to events in the world of the twentieth century, the groups of people who appear to be consciously involved with them, and their links with predecessors active in the French Revolution and the abortive wave of revolt which swept Europe in 1848, cannot fail to discern a certain pattern which has organic relations with the opinion expressed to *The Times Literary Supplement*, and stamps it with a certain honesty becoming only too rare. Because there is a tendency, perhaps not wholly justified, to assume that "literary" is a synonym for "intellectual."

But in fact, the distinguishing characteristic of the period under comment is the triumph of the Age of Reason heralded by the intellectuals who were the stalking-horse of the Terror—a triumph the fruits of which are already laden with an unimaginable bitterness. Behind events, persons and Race, there has been active the cult of Lucifer the Light Bringer, and *logic, rationalism,* is the hallmark of that cult.

Only a perverse obscurantism would deny the value of Reason properly regarded, just as it would be fatuous to condemn a slide-rule, with which it has an organic connection, as being in itself reprehensible. But the idea, if it can be so called, that "values" are ultimately physicomathematical (put forward, *e.g.*, by Sir Edmund Whittaker in the 1948 Herbert Spencer Lecture) seems to us to be a compact instance of the delirium of Idolatry not the less fatal because of its appeal to Rationality.

It is highly significant that the worship of logic is characteristic of immaturity, of youth. At the age of eighteen or so, logic presents an indisputable proof for every problem. And it will be noticed that there has been, and is, a conscious "youth movement" carrying with it the implication that wisdom reaches its apex in the early twenties.

Yet it must be plain to anyone that not only is evidence lacking that logic has solved any political problems of consequence in the past, but, conversely, that the policies now current in world affairs which pretend to base their appeal on logic, threaten us with final destruction.

There is no saying requiring attention more clamantly than "Unless ye become as little children ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom." There is nothing logical about a little child.

• • •

If anyone can explain, by logic or otherwise, just exactly why we should become hopelessly enmeshed in debt to the so-called United States while draining ourselves of the "benefits", if any, of dollars received from export, we should like to hear from them. Not one person in ten thousand understands that it is part of the "Marshall Plan" that we export the value of every dollar we obtain, at such prices as can be obtained in a fiercely competitive world market while importing raw material in a sellers market; an arrangement which is mathematically certain to leave us with large uncollectable credits in every country except U.S.A., and astronomical debts *to* U.S.A.

It is possible that the patriots who arranged this little deal would say but not believe, "If you owe a little money to the bank, the bank owns you; but if you owe a lot of money to the bank, you own the bank."

We think we can guess at the approximately true answer; but you guess first.

Don't omit a slight sketch as to (a) Who will be ruined (b) Who will collect the assets at the bankruptcy sale.

• • •

"If I have the word 'reactionary' in my mind correctly, it means people who wish to return to an old way of doing things . . . Anyone who has made any study of the history of economics knows that all the things that the present Administration is talking about, and the New Deal tried, are as old as the hills and loaded down with misery, if practiced for any length of time."—Mr. Monroe C. Babcock in *The Wall Street Journal.*

What Mr. Babcock doesn't realise is that most of the New Dealers, (with whom are associated the P.E.P. rank and file and the Fabians) are so entranced with striking the pretty matches in the powder magazine that they care less than nothing about the load of misery, and the Sanhedrin behind them confidently awaits the explosion which will wreck every power but their own.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: May 6, 1949.

Civil Service (Conditions)

Mr. Geoffrey Cooper (Middesborough, West): . . . Now I would bring the attention of the House to problems rather nearer home, but which also involve human understanding. I refer particularly to the conditions of work in the Civil Service. I have for a considerable period of time taken trouble to investigate this subject, because it is manifestly something which ought to be brought to the notice of the Government on occasion, and particularly to the notice of the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, who is primarily responsible, I believe, for the welfare of the Civil Service.

As I see it, a Labour Government, representing the interests of the workers, should aim to be the best employer possible in all the circumstances. As seen through the eyes of the workers in the Civil Service, the Government appear sometimes as one of the worst employers. I realise that the Government have inherited all sorts of difficulties. . . .

In the early days of this Government coming to power, I made representations to the Prime Minister, and suggested that the working conditions of the Civil Service, its methods and its organisation, would be a subject which should receive the attention of Labour Members, and a group of Members was set up to study this whole matter. When that group was first brought into being, some 40 or 50 Members showed an active interest in the question, but as the months and years have gone by less and less interest has been shown. I think that has been due to the fact that almost consistently the efforts made by individual Members or groups of Members to bring this matter to the attention of the Government and of the Departments have been frustrated. That has been unfortunate, but understandable to some extent because owing to the fact that we were bringing in many entirely fresh Measures it was expected that under a Socialist Government, Government Departments would be expected to function in a completely different way, and this seems to me a matter which ought to have received a high priority in those matters which the Government should have investigated. . . . In the Labour Party programme that was put before the electorate at the last General Election it was one of the seven main points of our industrial programme to which we said we would give our attention. The point was dealt with on page 7 of "Let Us Face the Future," and in it we advocated

> "the better organisation of Government Departments and the Civil Service for work in relation to these ends."

The concluding words were a reference to the six points of our industrial programme. The policy was described a little further in these words:

> "The economic purpose of government must be to spur industry forward and not to choke it with red tape."

. . . I am suggesting to my right hon. Friend that an investigation should be made into the Civil Service as a whole. That investigation is called for by the evidence which I hope to give to the House in a few moments. I suggest that it should deal with matters under three main heads: the conditions of offices and buildings; the work and pay of civil servants, including methods of staff management; thirdly, the relations of the Civil Service with the public. Under the last heading I note that a memorandum has recently been sent out to Civil Service Departments from the Civil Service National Whitley Council, dealing with the training of those who have contact with the public. The memorandum has some excellent advice to offer. It suggests for example that every Civil Servant, whatever his grade, shall understand his position as a servant of the public and take a pride in his job. In some measure we are tending to prevent certain sections of the Civil Service from taking the essential pride in their work which is required for a high standard of performance from this public service.

I will give one or two examples. . . .

. . . I ask the Financial Secretary whether he or the President of the Board of Trade, who is more directly responsible, has visited any of the 46 different Board of Trade offices throughout the London region. I remember I.C.I. House before the war. I go to it from time to time now and, recalling what it was like when the directors of the I.C.I. were on the same landing as the President and his immediate officials are now, the contrast is amazing. Of course, one has to allow for the war years, when it was difficult to maintain the same conditions in any offices, either those used by industry or by the Civil Service. Nevertheless, the deterioration and general standards of cleanliness and repair, and the general appearance of the place, does not bear comparison with the standards which still persist in the equivalent offices of large-scale industries. Now the building might be described as a dowdy and dirty edition of its former self, and there is an air around the place that nobody really cares. When that atmosphere is permeating a Department, it is bound to some extent to seep into the minds of the people working there, and adversely affect their work also.

If one goes to Shell Mex House where on one side of the building are the Shell Mex oil interests and, on the other side, are the offices of the Ministry of Supply, again the contrast from one side of the building to the other is only too noticeable. One has only to compare in that building the Government messengers, with their dreary appearance and down-trodden attitude to life, with the attitude of the men in the Corps of Commissionaires. It may be that the rates of pay are vastly different, but at least in the Corps of Commissionaires there is real pride in that service which seems so sadly lacking in the case of those who work as messengers in Government Departments.

Take, for example, Regent Street, where there are some of the best and most expensive offices in London. I visited the Offices of the Board of Trade recently; probably I was not supposed to be there, but it is the responsibility of a Member of Parliament to know the conditions under which public servants work. I had an opportunity of going round and I took it. I was very depressed in making even a short visit and the effect must be similar on the attitude of those who have to work there. It was quite appalling to me and I think the attitude of those who are there becomes depressed through the depressing conditions in which they have to work. The Carlton Hotel was the height of luxury before the war. It is now in the occupation of the Ministry of Food and one can only describe it as having been converted from a luxury to a slum.

In the Ministry of Health, where there should be a specially high standard of cleanliness, the walls do not seem to have been cleaned since before the war and there are still broad blue arrows indicating the direction to take to shelters underground in the event of air raids. They are still there with the dirt and dust around them, which seems to indicate that the walls have not been cleaned for a long

time. It seems a relic of wartime conditions and it appears that no great change has taken place since the war—four years is too long. I do not know whether the broad blue arrows are intended as a warning since the Lynskey Tribunal, but that may be one of the reasons why they have been left there.

The earlier Adjournment Debate this afternoon was on the subject of the Colonies, and I wish to refer to conditions in the Colonial Office. I visited certain offices in Victoria Street to which Colonial students go when they arrive in this country, or if they have particular problems to be dealt with by the welfare officer. They go to the most dreary and unsuitable offices in Victoria Street. A few months ago they went to a rather better building Kinnaird House near Trafalgar Square, which was more adequate for the purpose; but now their first impression is of a building and offices which is dreary and quite inadequate for its purpose. I am told that within a short time of their arrival these students are contacted as a matter of course by members of the Communist Party. If the reception they have when they come to this country is so indifferent, one cannot wonder that the seeds of Communism can be easily sown in their minds. When I visited some of these other offices I found the usual things; lights slung about on strings, appallingly bad ventilation and the smell of stale bodies. The windows had not been opened perhaps because some woman objects to a cold draught down her neck. That may be a good reason for closing the windows, but someone should be responsible for seeing that they are opened at the beginning and the end of the day and possibly at midday. There were old dirty milk botles about and the conditions under which tea was made were far from clean.

I was talking to the hon. Member for Rugby (Mr. W. J. Brown), who takes a personal interest in these matters affecting the Civil Service. I understand he could not remain for this Debate. He made the point that the regulations concerning offices do not apply to the Crown. If they did it would be an obligation on those responsible for the Departments to see that those regulations were observed. When we impose regulations upon industry to see that there is a minimum standard of office conditions, the Government should set a standard and see that its own office conditions are in no way inferior. I had a case brought to me in the last few days by a member of the Inland Revenue Department at Somerset House. The offices admittedly have now been painted and cleaned up quite a bit, but that did not happen until a case of tuberculosis probably brought about by the conditions was taken out of Somerset House. If we are to wait to be prompted by conditions having that sort of effect in the Departments, it is a sorry story.

I was shown the filing conditions in one office and the racks on which files are dispersed. When one sees them one understands why there is delay in answering Members' letters and why the public experience such delay in getting replies to their letters. I spoke to the man who has to handle these matters and he described precisely how he had to find letters in these files. He referred to one letter which was lost for six months and was eventually found on the table of the senior officer in charge of the Department, who was ill. . . .

I wish to mention the subject of personal problems of the work and pay of the staff. Some attempts have been made to improve the position in regard to human problems in the Departments by appointing certain officials to go round and speak to the people employed in the Departments. I am told that the methods of investigation do not inspire a great deal of confidence, and that visits by these officials are therefore treated rather as a farce, with the result that the real problems are not ventilated and little is said by those who still feel a keen sense of frustration. They are deterred by a sense that if they are critical, or perhaps what may be considered to be unduly critical, they will be labelled as "difficult," and there is nothing more damning to a civil servant's own progress than to have that label of "difficult" put on his secret dossier. It means that from then onwards his chances of promotion are practically nil. This is a real fear. I do not wish to exaggerate it, but there is a real inherent fear in the minds of civil servants, particularly at the lower levels, that things can get on to their dossiers which may be far from complimentary but which may not be sufficiently adverse for them to see and comment upon—that they are damned by faint praise from making progress.

One temporary civil servant told me he felt that his class were without a hope in the world. He said that they are continuously made to feel inferior to the established civil servant, that they have a feeling that there is little or no chance of promotion and that the established civil servant seems to have all the chances of making progress. . . . Sir Percival Waterfield, who is the head of the Civil Service Commission, in reply to a question put to him and as reported by the Select Committee on Estimates said that there was a considerable increase in the size of the Department over which he had direct control, and that it was due to the fact that there was a lower standard of performance. It does seem, in fact, as if more and more people were doing less and less effective work, and I suggest that a suggested 10 *per cent.* reduction, which the Prime Minister was willing to consider about two years ago, is a quite inadequate amount by which to deal with this highly important situation.

I could quote a considerable number of examples on this question, but I will pick out only two. One concerns the Ministry of Works. During the war, a woman architect was put on to a job under a man who had been a senior official of the Ministry of Works before the war. It was realised that he was not quite suitable to cope with the war situation, and so he was superseded and was put in a department of his own to work on post-war plans. In due time, when the post-war plans needed consideration, a completely fresh department was set up to look into that question, and then somebody remembered that there had been a certain amount of work done during the war years on this very subject. These plans were therefore called for, put up, displayed and considered, and it was found that they were entirely useless, as they had been considered in a vacuum without any adequate realisation of the conditions which would apply after the war. Therefore, the plans were found to be quite useless.

During the period of this qualified woman architect, the Department had been increasing in size, yet the work which had been done was later found to be of no use. The woman architect said that she had been brought into the Civil Service from the profession outside, and she said that it was not overstating the case to say that, once one went into a Civil Service Department, things became almost completely Alice in Wonderland and completely divorced from reality, and that people seemed to act in a way quite different from the way in which they would act if they had been

(*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. 22. *No.* 12. *Saturday, May* 21, 1949.

Lines About the English

" . . . But from the residence of a portion of these people in France, and from some effect of that powerful soil on their blood and manners, the Norman has come popularly to represent in England the aristocratic—and the Saxon the democratic principle. . . .

"These Saxons are the hands of mankind. They have the taste for toil, a distaste for pleasure or repose, and the telescopic appreciation of distant gain. They are the wealth-makers—and by dint of mental faculty, which has its own conditions. The Saxon works after liking, or, only for himself; and to set him to work, and to begin to draw his monstrous values out of barren Britain, all dishonour, fret, and barrier must be removed, and then his energies begin to play.

"The Scandinavian fancied himself surrounded by Trolls —a kind of goblin men, with vast powers of work and skilful production—divine stevedores, carpenters, reapers, smiths, and masons, swift to reward every kindness done them, with gifts of gold and silver. In all English history, this dream comes to pass. Certain Trolls or working brains, under the names of Alfred, Bede, Caxton, Bracton, Camden, Drake, Selden, Dugdale, Newton, Gibbon, Brindley, Watt, Wedgwood, dwell in the troll-mounts of Britain, and turn the sweat of their face to power and renown.

"If the race is good, so is the place. Nobody landed on this spell-bound island with impunity. The enchantments of barren shingle and rough weather, transformed every adventurer into a labourer. Each vagabond that arrived bent his neck to the yoke of gain or found the air too tense for him. The strong survived, the weaker went to the ground. Even the pleasure-hunters and sots of England are of a tougher texture. A hard temperament had been formed by Saxon and Saxon-Dane; and such of these French or Normans as could reach it, were naturalised in every sense.

"All the admirable expedients or means hit upon in England, must be looked at as growths or irresistible offshoots of the expanding mind of the race. A man of that brain thinks and acts thus; and his neighbour, being afflicted with the same kind of brain, though he is rich, and called a Baron, or a Duke, thinks the same thing, and is ready to allow the justice of the thought and act in his retainer or tenant, though sorely against his baronial or ducal will.

"The island was renowned in antiquity for its breed of mastiffs so fierce, that when their teeth were set, you must cut their heads off to part them. The man was like his dog. The people have that nervous bilious temperament, which is known by medical men to resist every means employed to make its possessor subservient to the will of others. . . . "—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Nuremberg

"In a week marked by a Congressional examination of the Malmedy trials, it is worth recalling that over a year ago our Mr. Lalley reviewed *Epitaph on Nuremberg,* by Montgomery Belgion, published in London in 1947. Belgion's essay at that time constituted the first real assault in book form on the legal and moral basis of the extraordinary business of the War Crime tribunals. Since then, Mr. Henry Regnery, a young and courageous American publisher has persuaded Mr. Belgion to expand his argument and material. The result is *Victor's Justice* (Henry Regnery Company, Hinsdale, Ill. 187 pages. 2.75 dollars). And the result has also been that the choir of cowardly book reviewers have not even mentioned this timely and valuable study. Mr. Belgion is an erudite Englishman, but besides marshalling facts and distributing citations he is capable of the following summation.

" 'The victors', says Belgion, 'were simply a coalition of States that went through the motions of legislating for and judging the governments and leaders of another State like themselves. Their legal and moral status was no more than that of a gang of lynchers dealing with a victim. They were able to do what they did as lynchers are able to lynch. That is to say, they were the stronger. Their only sanction was force; and although law needs force in order to ensure its respect, it is in no sense identical with force. At Nuremberg, the victors were but John Bull, Jonathan, Alphonse, and Uncle Bruin masquerading as the Ku Klux Klan.' "—Frank C. Hanighen in Supplement to *Human Events* (Washington, D.C.).

The Yangtze Incident

The Editor, *The Social Crediter.*

Dear Sir, I see in page 1 of *The Social Crediter* for May 7 that the question is asked why "no air cover was provided for British warships proceeding up Chinese waters."

The passage of our ships on a lawful and peaceful occasion required no air cover; and had it been in company of the warships—and still more so used—it could have been interpreted as an act of war. The white flag was flown at the mast-head which may have been regarded as a safeguard, though unnecessary. The whole incident indicates the loss of prestige which at one time accompanied the flying of the Union Jack. The act of firing on our ships was, no doubt, intended to exemplify it.—J. Creagh-Scott.

Our contributor comments:

"If the incident concerned military strategy, it would not occur to me to dispute it with Colonel Creagh-Scott. But it does not, it concerns political judgment of psychology and since it resulted in loss of life, prestige, and property, without any countervailing gain, was definitely at fault.

"Colonel Creagh-Scott would doubtless be the first to agree that there are altogether too many incidents of this character for which no one is to be blamed, and no countervailing action taken."

Freemasonry

Simultaneously with the suggestion, unintentionally conveyed, of the generation at Oxford of a fresh stream of opinion extenuating the effects of revived interest in Freemasonry as a chief engine of world demoralisation, there has come into our hands a copy of the Lectures delivered by Monsignor George F. Dillon, Missionary Apostolic, Sydney, in Edinburgh in 1884, under the title, "The War of Antichrist with the Church and Christian Civilization." That the source of the qualifying opinion just spoken of appears to be the same as that from which certain intangible reflections antagonistic to Social Credit economics proceed may have some wider application; but, as it is not our business to track scandal within the Church, but only to identify it, we leave this topic at least for the present. The inspiration of the Lectures was the Encyclical *Humanum Genus* of Leo XIII, from which a quotation, "Instruct the people as to the artifices used by societies of this kind in seducing men and enticing them into their ranks, and as to the depravity of their opinions and the wickedness of their acts," appears on the title page of the printed edition (Dublin, 1885); while other references to this Encyclical appear in the text. The work is "A review of the rise and progress of atheism; its extension through Voltaire; its use of Freemasonry and kindred secret societies for anti-christian war; the Union and 'Illuminism' of Masonry by Weishaupt; its progress under the leaders of the first French Revolution and under Nubius, Palmerston, and Mazzini; the control of its hidden 'inner circle' over all revolutionary organisations; its influence over British Freemasonry; its attempts upon Ireland; oaths, signs and passwords of the three Degrees, *etc., etc.*"

The dignity and lucidity of the presentation of the case against secret societies, the fair and patient grappling with the problem of affixing responsibility to agencies whose whole structure is designed to escape it, like "the ruses of a bird to draw away attention from the nest of its young" which is "but a faint resemblance of what every secret society does to avoid detection, either of itself or of its intentions or doings," the high place and reputation of many of the chief actors, the clear delineation of the characters, moral and mental, of leaders and led, and the familiarity of these traits among the denizens of every quarter of society to-day, inviting comparison and illuminating the events of the present, these are but some of the attractions of the most impressive sustained criticism of the revolutionary movement which we remember to have read, and we hope that by bringing it to the recollection of those to whom it must be more accessible than it is to us, any organised movement to extenuate and thus to assist an evil design of many years of growth, even now increasing as the surface of an expanding sphere increases as the *square* of its radius increases and not directly, may suffer some discouragement. The work contains the full text of many important relevant documents. Every movement enlisting the sympathies of the people in recent times has been touched at some point, or, in some cases, at so many points and so radically as to supplant it, by this infection. And so it is in our own time. But the methods do not change any more than the objective, tenaciously held and relentlessly pursued. We cite one passage:—

"Masonry, even in its most innocent form, is a criminal association. It is criminal in its oaths, which are at best rash; and it is criminal in promising obedience to unknown commands coming from hidden superiors. It always, therefore, sympathises with crime. It hates punishment of any repressive kind, and does what it can to destroy the death penalty even for murder. In revolution, its common practice is to open gaols, and let felons free upon society. When it cannot do this, it raises in their behalf a mock sympathy. Hence we have Victor Hugo pleading with every Government in Europe in favour of revolutionists; we have the French Republic liberating the Communists; and there is a motion before the French Parliament to repeal the laws against the party of dynamite—the Internationalists, whose aim is the destruction of every species of religion, law, order and property, and the establishment of absolute Socialism. With ourselves, there is not a revolutionary movement created, that we do not find at the same time an intellectual party apparently disconnected with it, often found condemning it, but in reality supporting it indirectly, but zealously . . . They secretly sustain what in public they strongly reprobate, and if necessary disown and denounce. This is a point worthy of deep consideration, and shows more than anything else, the ability and astuteness with which the whole organisation has been planned. . . . It is the deeply hidden Chief and his Council that concoct and direct all. They wield a power with which, as is well known, the diplomacy of every nation in the world must count. There are men either of this Council, or in the first line of its service, whom it will never permit to be molested. Weishaupt, *Nubius*, Mazzini, *Piccolo Tigre*, De Witt, Misley, Garibaldi, Number One, Hartmann, may have been arrested, banished, *etc.*, but they never found the prison that could contain them long, nor the country that would dare deliver them up for crime against law or even life. It is determined by the Supreme Directory that at any cost, the men of their first lines shall not suffer; and from the beginning they have found means to enforce that determination against all the crowned heads of Europe. Now you must be curious to know who succeeded to the Chieftaincy of this formidable conspiracy when Nubius passed away. It was one well known to you, at least by fame. It was no other than the late Lord Palmerston." Three chapters dealing with Lord Palmerston's history, his methods and effects, then follow. We should like to publish them. Incidentally, the secret of Palmerston's fascination for the 'multitude' is revealed, and we commend it, with some emphasis to the notice and the study of our friends:—It consisted in the exploitation of the fallacy of the elector that "that which I understand" and "that which is true" are identities. Palmerston chose to say only what would be understood by the meanest intelligence.

From America

A batch of "Jewish Christian" printed matter from California evokes the question whether responsible Christians in this country are likely to see it and what effect it is likely to have upon their minds if they do? Hollywood, semi-literate Jewry, Zionism, and the gambols of the American big baby, suffered separately, provide inadequate training for the impact of a conjunction of them all; but we fancy it might be unwise to dismiss the latest excesses as simply incredible. A five-thousand-word report from Pilate to Tiberius "copied from the Official Manuscripts and Scrolls made by the Senatorial Courts of Tiberius Cæsar, and by the Sanhedrin" for $2.10 a copy, postpaid, concluding "I am your most obedient servant, Pontius Pilate" is merely a second-page feature. Page 1 is devoted to various items concerning the submission to the Supreme Court of Israel of a petition asking for a retrial of the victim of Jewish fury

two thousand years ago. "Doctor Moshe Smoira, court president, is reported as saying that it is unfortunate that publicity has been given to the petition, "since there might be an impression, which would be wrong, that the court was treating the matter lightly." The organ is a monthly digest called "The Jews in the News." It is well-printed. The Jewish Christian Community Press is said to have published *in England* an account of a "rehearsal" of the "appeal" by Jewish students in Jerusalem in 1932. This account ends with the mention of "spiritual powers, which, at the moment, are invisible, but may come out into the open any day, these are the signs of the times." If Zionism is to be succeeded by a new Messianic movement it is probable that a variety of mechanisms will be launched to implement it. Is Christendom still capable of reacting to mortal offence?

Know Your Enemies

The following comparisons in tabular form are intended to stress the very important fact, so frequently repeated in these pages, that Social Credit is far more than a mere monetary reform. The necessity for some financial adjustments is part of our case, but they are comparatively simple and arise inevitably from the reversal of policy which we advocate. They are a means to an end, not an end in themselves.

There are two opposite, irreconcilable and inimical philosophies in the world. Social Crediters represent one of these, the other is unfortunately represented by almost all the men in the seats of Power the world over. The two sides are and always will be at war. It need no longer be stressed how far-reaching in its impact on all the people in the world and particularly in Great Britain will be the outcome.

One of the most important factors in any war is the ability to recognise your opponents and also any action or proposal likely to assist them. The aims, results and actions typical of the two sides are here presented under the headings of some human activities. On the one side stand the Social Crediters and their friends, on the other that at present highly organised and apparently successful body of men and women whom we need have no hesitation in describing as the Satanists.

RELIGION

The Christian conception of life and living.	The Jewish-pagan conception.
"Love thy neighbour as thyself."	"Thou shalt not, etc." The cult of aggressive selfishness.
The God of Mercy.	The angry vengeful Jehovah.
"The Sabbath (*i.e.* any organisation) is made for man, not man for the Sabbath."	Man exists to serve the "State" (an abstraction behind which hide one or more megalomaniacs).
The dignity of man. The individual is paramount.	The individual is but a cog in the machine and owes a duty to the "State."
Truth, absolute and indivisible in all things.	Promises and statements are but decoys, the better to catch the unwary. "Truth" is what serves the "State."

FINANCE

The money system is a mechanism to distribute goods and services as, when and where required.	It is controlled by hidden powers and used to suppress the rightful aspirations of the people.
What can be produced or achieved in physical fact, is financially possible.	Financial considerations decide production.
Money consists mainly of bank credit, and is but the reflection of the real credit of the community. Financial credit is a quality of and therefore the property of the community as a whole.	Money belongs to the banks, who "lend" it as and to whom they choose, demanding repayment. Even the "State" must borrow from them.
No avoidable taxation.	Oppressive and confiscatory taxation.

POLITICAL ECONOMY

The object of production is consumption.	The purpose of industry is to keep people employed.
The requirements of individuals decide what is to be produced.	Production is regulated by political, "ideological" considerations.
Decentralisation for technical efficiency.	Centralisation to establish control.
The aim is steadily to raise the standard of living.	"Full employment." The people must be kept in bondage.
This necessitates an adequate purchasing power. What a community can produce, it is entitled to consume.	The people can only be controlled by artificially keeping down their purchasing power. To justify this robbery, special "inexorable economic laws" are invented, *e.g.* the need for exports
Quality is of primary importance.	Mass production is encouraged, size and quantity aimed at.
The Just Price.	The highest price our article will fetch.
Private enterprise.	Monopoly.

POLITICS

The greatest possible liberty of the individual. Establishment of the right to contract out.	People must be led, and told what they must and must not do. The "leadership principle"; *i.e.* policy is decided at the apex of the political pyramid, generally in secret. The people have to obey Bureaucracy.
Parliamentary representation of the people's policies (objectives) not technical competency (methods).	Party politics. M.P.'s must obey party orders even against the interests of their constituents.

A policy of peace in relation to other peace-loving countries.	Recurring wars to prevent "unemployment" and to use as an excuse for further oppression.
The breaking down of associations to the point where those participating understand what they are doing: individual responsibility.	World Dominion by a minority of evil men, exploiting mass sentiment and converting it to their own uses.
Decentralisation of initiative.	Concentration of Power.

GENERALLY

The humility of the true scientist towards God and Nature.	Dialectical materialism.
Whatever may be the purpose of man, it is best served by letting him develop his many gifts in freedom.	A cloak of spurious scientific jargon and hypocritical religiosity is used to hypnotise the masses into accepting what they don't want, and what their conscience rejects. —H.R.P.

PARLIAMENT (*continued from page* 3.)

engaged in industry and had come up against the hard realities of industrial and commercial life. She also said that nothing was too fantastic or Alice in Wonderland for it to happen in a Department.

The other case which I shall quote concerns a man who had been in the Civil Service for 19 years and had moved about among various places, and who has given it as his opinion that it is not overstating the case to say that, in the Department in which he worked, a reduction of 50 *per cent.* could actually take place with the only effect of showing a considerable improvement in the service given. This man had even written to the papers about it, and it is such an unusual thing for a civil servant to express himself in public that I think what he said is worth noting. He had done an extremely fine job during the war as a civilian in one of the Fighting Forces. He had done this overseas, and had been commended for having done fine work in a situation in which many another man of the Fighting Forces would have been a brave man indeed if he had faced it. This man said that, before the war, he realised now he had not done an honest day's work in the Department in which he had been employed. He had been moved into a new Department which had been set up by the Labour Government, and which had recruited its staff very largely from the friendly societies and other insurance bodies. . . . He said he fully realised that he was now doing an average day's work, and he felt that was by comparison an adverse reflection on the conditions which, in the main, prevail in other Government Departments.

Dr. Morgan (Rochdale): May I ask the hon. Gentleman a question? His is an extraordinary speech, and rather an unfair one. Will he say whether, when he was making these inquiries, he consulted any of the trade unions associated with those employed in the Civil Service in order to justify or corroborate the statements he is now making?

Mr. Cooper: As my right hon. Friend the Financial Secretary will recall, I had conversations with people in his Department. In addition, I consulted with trade union officials who are associated with the Civil Service.

Dr. Morgan: Officially?

Mr. Cooper: I have not approached the actual executives, because I believe that to be outside my sphere. My approach must be either to the Financial Secretary or to colleagues in this House who have associations with the Civil Service trade unions; they are the channels I have used.

I wish to make one final point in regard to relations with the public. I say first, however, that my experience with the Ministry of Labour is that there has been a great improvement in the way contact is made with the public and those who go to the employment exchanges. I find that my relations with officials in my local employment exchange are excellent. On all occasions I have been given the greatest help by those officials. I think that, in a large measure, the same applies to the Ministry of Pensions, where a great deal more human understanding is expressed by the officials than applied under previous Governments. But, when interviewing constituents last weekend, a case was brought to my notice of an approach made to one of the other Departments where the official volunteered the suggestion—the man concerned was simply trying to get quite normal information relative to the problem he was discussing with the official—that the question he was asking was an insolent and an impertinent one. That sort of thing is not good. The man in question gave me this information in front of other people, and stated it in such a way that I have no reason to doubt its accuracy.

Again, quite recently, I had brought to my notice the case where an industrialist had been discussing a problem affecting his export trade—the possibility of starting a completely fresh production with a new model, and one which is earning foreign exchange—but when he tried to fix an appointment with the official he was told on a long-distance call that the official was too busy to speak to him. Eventually the official did speak to him, when he was told that he was too busy to fix an appointent for 10 days or a fortnight, even though it was known that it was a question that should have been settled right away because important matters were affected. If in moments of urgency industry cannot get rapid decisions on reasonable matters, or if the individual who is trying to get the matter cleared up is unable to state his case at an interview to the official concerned, it tends to undermine the confidence of the public in the way Departments work. I asked him why he did not complain straight away. I understand that there is a fear in the minds of some industrialists that if they do make requests in strong terms to officials, reprisals might be used by those in the Department. I know that I am using strong words, but I have heard these complaints on so many occasions that I think it right and proper to say this here and now. I want to give a final example which again is of a serious nature. I fully realise——

Mr. W. R. Williams: My hon. Friend has made some very serious allegations, and I think the House is entitled to ask him to give a specific instance in order that it can be traced, because if it is true, obviously there is responsibility upon the Financial Secretary to go after the individual or the department concerned. . . .

Mr. Cooper: . . . I fully realise that some of the remarks I have made are of a serious nature. I have made them advisedly and with all the evidence, written and otherwise, available, if need be, to substantiate every point I have made.

I am not mincing my words because I realise the situation is serious. . . .

My concern, and I think the concern of others on this side of the House as well as in other quarters of the House, and in the country generally where these views may also be held, is that there has grown up voluntarily—I do not think it is at all part of the Socialist policy but that it has happened in spite of it, and to some extent it is a hangover from the war—an ever-increasing power and influence on the part of bureaucracy. We must see that under Socialism it does not happen. In some places it happens because Socialist Ministers are preoccupied with big problems involving Labour policy, and introducing Bills which we promised the electorate we would do. It has been very difficult for Ministers to apply the time they should have devoted to matters concerning the organisation of their Departments.

An insurance company was very concerned because its income which was derived from property was seriously affected, and it could not get the property put in order because of the enormous delays, difficulties, obstructions and refusals which it met with when applying for licences and sanctions. The board of this insurance company met together to ask themselves, "Where does our loyalty lie—to our policy holders or elsewhere?" They decided that it lay to their policy holders and the decision of the board was to contact what was euphemistically described as a syndicate—not just one man named Stanley, but a syndicate. After that they had no trouble with their licences or sanctions. The obvious is implied—and I realise that this is a serious charge. When the Lynskey Tribunal was held the board asked the syndicate "What is your position now?" They made this point: "It does not matter because we realise that Stanley was a clumsy fellow; he was contacting Ministers and in that way was found out. We contact those in the Departments." This is a serious matter, and I believe a matter of that sort cannot be investigated as an individual item; it must be investigated as a matter affecting the whole of the Civil Service.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: I wonder whether now, openly in this House, my hon. Friend will undertake afterwards to give me privately the name of the board of the insurance company so that I may follow this up?

Mr. Cooper: Yes, I am prepared to give the evidence to my right hon. Friend, but obviously I should have to ask for an undertaking from him. From time to time I have given evidence to individual Ministers who have passed the evidence to their Departments and in due time, after some delay—obviously required to investigate the matter fully—I have received an evasive reply. I have not had satisfaction. What I suggest is this, and it is the point I have been trying to make in my speech this afternoon: the only way to deal with the matter is to investigate the Civil Service as a whole and not to investigate individual items. It is in investigating individual items that we have failed to obtain results and to make the deductions which otherwise we should have made.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: I understand that my hon. Friend will let me have the name of the company?

Mr. Cooper: I am prepared to give that to my hon. Friend provided I can have an undertaking from him—and I think this is a reasonable request for me to make—that he will not only safeguard the individuals concerned, but that he will make it part of his promise that there shall be an investigation of the whole Civil Service rather than on this one item.

Dr. Morgan: He cannot do that.

Mr. Cooper: At least he can consult the Prime Minister over this matter and see whether it cannot be done. Finally I ask, will he at least give consideration to the points I have tried to make, probably very badly, probably inadequately and probably sketchily? In every instance I can give him the fullest information required to substantiate every single point I have made.

Mr. Houghton (Sowerby): If I may say so, I think my hon. Friend the Member for West Middlesborough (Mr. Cooper) has spoiled his case by recounting to the House a lot of irresponsible and unsubstantiated tittle-tattle. I cannot really believe that much of what he has brought before us represents the evidence of responsible people of the Civil Service. . . .

Mr. Eric Fletcher (Islington, East): I want to interpose only one moment to say that I feel that my hon. Friend the Member for West Middlesborough (Mr. Cooper) has made a most unfortunate speech. . . .

Mr. W. R. Williams (Heston and Isleworth): All I want to say at this stage is that I very much regret that my hon. Friend the Member for West Middlesborough (Mr. Cooper), in his wisdom, has not allowed others of us the opportunity to discuss some of the very important statements he made today. He took an inordinately long time to make these allegations, some of which I should have liked to challenge in detail had I been given the opportunity. . . .

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Glenvil Hall): . . . I do not think we help our country or assist the Civil Service to give its best if we make charges such as we have heard this afternoon and which, if I may say so, have done my hon. Friend no good. His allegations have been far too sweeping. If he had been a little more generous in his references to the Civil Service than he has been, and had realised what a fine job it is doing, we should have been more inclined to listen to what he had to say.

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