

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 22.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"Living, says Eric Fromm, is an art. Its object is not merely existence, but the developing into that of which one is capable. The end towards which the individual strives is inherent in his potentialities; he is both artist and the object of his art. The excellence of his achievement is proportional to knowledge of his potentialities. Hence, the science of living—psychology—can make no valid propositions regarding human behaviour unless it starts out with the premise that 'something, say x , is reacting to environmental influences in ascertainable ways that follow from its properties.'

"The ethical norm of living—what is 'good' or 'bad' living—are not external to the man but flow from the requirements of his nature. They are not relativistic, merely matters of preference, and cannot be treated on a 'take it or leave it basis'; for man's values are part of him, he cannot live without them, and, consciously or unconsciously, they affect his mental reactions. Ethics is a blood-relation of psychology. . . .

"To the layman (like this reviewer), to the one who picks up his knowledge from its vulgarisation in novels, biographies and magazine articles, this association of psychology with ethics is somewhat startling. For the impression one gets from these sources is that the individual is the product of his ethical environment and has no hand in its making. . . .

"This approach to psychology lends itself all too rapidly to the socialistic doctrine that human nature is autoplatic; it is the 'system' that makes the man and not the other way around. To that doctrine the inclination of psychologists toward an authoritarian ethics is highly complimentary, and the individualist, the non-conformist, is likely to suspect psychology of being a form of socialistic propaganda.

"Hence, it is a relief when a psychologist of some eminence speaks of 'inherent potentialities.' That to each of us is given a 'mode of reaction'—which Fromm calls temperament, as distinguished from character—that is 'constitutional and not changeable' is obvious to the observant father or travelling salesman; but in a book of psychology the statement is rare. It is refreshing, therefore, to find Mr. Fromm saying: 'The idea that all men are created equal meant that all men have the same right to be considered as ends in themselves and not as means. Today, equality has become the equivalent of interchangeability, and is the very negation of individuality. Equality, instead of being a condition for the development of each man's peculiarity, means the extinction of individuality.'"—A review in *Human Events of Man for Himself* by Eric Fromm.

Nothing is more necessary, at all times but particularly at the present time, than the turning of a non-clear-cut opinion into a clear-cut opinion; and nothing is so decisive in effecting it than the effort (whenever the individual submits to the inconvenience of making it) to wrest meaning from propositions which (owing to their entanglements in

convention or prejudice) appear either to lack meaning altogether or to possess false meaning. It is not entirely fortuitous that the ancient philosophical trinity: logic, metaphysics, ethics, which sufficed until the full development of the revolutionary era, is now complicated by the presentation of a pseudo-psychology which does, whether it is intended to do so or not, make havoc of them all. This is, we are assured, a transient phenomenon. "Philosophy, in the end, always buries its undertakers" is a salutary notion. In the short extracts we have quoted above from an American book review there is much sense and some ground for hopefulness. Plato said it differently.

"I would define the middle-class Communist convert as an 'Aginner'—the type of person who, as the result of psychological strains and stresses endured in childhood or adolescence, rebuts the discipline in which he has been brought up, but is compelled to seek another still more rigorous, who has an emotional need for direction, who, however eminent intellectually, can find no inner peace save on the basis of surrendering his individual moral and political judgment to 'democratic centralism.'"—Charlotte Haldane: *Truth Will Out*.

And, as Mrs. Haldane's book-title observes "Truth will out." She returned to England from Russia and resigned from the Communist Party to record that she did so with "profound relief and release from a sense of guilt." "I kept on repeating to myself, I'm free, free, free!" There is no freedom but freedom.

Mr. Herbert Morrison, as well as Sir John Anderson, has observed and read the omens in the entrails of the Ballot Boxes. Says he: "it would be undesirable for voters to seek to create a situation in which no party had a clear Parliamentary majority." But not nearly so undesirable as Mr. Herbert Morrison.

"Since the war, Mr. Bevin said, the United Kingdom had paid to the Asian countries about £750m. in loans, grants, releases from sterling balances, and unrequited exports of all kinds. This was roughly half of the total sum—£1,500m.—which the United Kingdom had paid out since the war throughout the world in *unrequited exports* and in help of all kinds, from U.N.R.R.A. to aid for Europe." (Our emphasis).

So what? Do we concentrate attention upon the fact that these colossal exports were "unrequited" or on Mr. Bevin's personal opinion that the salvation of Asia (unnecessarily at our expense) requites us?

The bat seen at Bucks Hill out hunting at 5 p.m. on January 10 had something on our reputable economists.

Blind as he was, he could see that Spring must come someday; and why not on January 10?

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 15, 1949.

Control of Engagement Order

(The Debate continued)

[We regret that the following termination to Mr. Rhys Davies's speech was omitted last week:—]

... I hope I shall not be thought to be blaspheming when I say that the Architect of this universe planned and regulated the world. He made the earth, moon and stars, divided the earth from the waters and so forth—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This is the Control of Engagement Order which has nothing to do with the sun or the moon.

Mr. Rhys Davies: That was what I was coming to. But the Almighty never imposed a Control of Engagements Order. He made man free, and I am here to say once more that whatever Government is in power, my voice, for what it is worth, will be raised in favour of the rights of the man to choose his own job and determine his own fate.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter (Kingston-upon-Thames): ... The Minister of Labour said he had heard nothing but the old arguments and the old speeches. Whether that be true or not, one is entitled to make the comment that the right hon. Gentleman himself even now did not grasp the two points some of us have been putting for three years: first, that compulsion is an extremely inefficient method of effecting the necessary re-distribution of labour; and secondly, that even if it were efficient, it is subject to considerable moral disadvantages. He did not address himself to either argument but the right hon. Gentleman made an announcement of considerable importance about abandoning the ring fence round agriculture and mining. The report of the Ministry of Labour for last year issued last month informs us that of the 302 directions which were issued during the course of the year, no fewer than 288 were for the purpose of maintaining this ring fence round agriculture and mining. Now the right hon. Gentleman is abandoning that. We are surely entitled to ask him why it is necessary to retain, for the sake of apparently no more than 14 directions a year, this elaborate structure of compulsion. Is it really worth while to face all the difficulties and rouse all the antagonisms which this system inevitably will arouse for the sake of directing 14 people in the course of a year? Clearly it is not. Before this Debate closes I want to get from the right hon. Gentleman some clear indication of what it is that he really has in mind. ...

... The right hon. Gentleman has again and again denied there is any coercion behind this persuasion, but if that is true, if that is the essence of the matter, surely the right hon. Gentleman is not going to maintain all this elaborate machinery for the sake of directing 14 unfortunate persons in the course of a year? Must it not be the case that when the right hon. Gentleman used the word "persuasion" in that report, he used it in the sense in which it is used in many totalitarian countries, in the same sense in which the Jews were persuaded voluntarily to hand over their property in Nazi Germany—the polite request masking the power behind the request. It is surely wrong for the right hon. Gentleman not to be frank about this. Which of these two alternatives is he pursuing in maintaining these powers? To direct 14 people a year or as a power in reserve to back the persuasion of his officers if their eloquence for any reason in any case should happen to fail?

There is another point on which I think we should say

something before we part with this order. The right hon. Gentleman said he had no intention of making this order permanent. He said very much the same thing when he introduced it two years ago, in column 1361 of the OFFICIAL REPORT of 3rd November, 1947. Let us test it. He told the House that this is the last time he can use this power under the present Act. The right hon. Gentleman the Lord President of the Council said at Blackpool in May that it was the Government's intention to introduce a new Supplies and Services Act on a permanent basis. Is it intended to include in that Act power to make orders of this kind?

... We feel it is utterly wrong in these circumstances to do what is done here—to deprive the people of the right to select the work by which they seek to earn their living. It is not an answer to say there have been and are other limitations upon that right. All we are seeking to achieve is to give to the people the right to seek the work of their choice without legal interference by the State. We are under no illusion that that confers absolute freedom. Absolute freedom is probably not to be found on this side of the grave. What we are seeking to do is to remove any legal barrier in the way of those who desire, however foolish it may be, to try out their abilities and capacities in the work of their own choice. I cannot put it better than in some words which I should like to quote to the House:

"Any sort of compulsion on the individual in his choice of a civilian job in peacetime involves an infringement of essential human liberty, which is utterly incompatible with the views of democracy and Socialism."

Those words are those of the Economic Secretary to the Treasury, and he used them in his recent book "The Socialist Case." ...

The House divided: Ayes, 69; Noes, 131.

House of Commons: December 16, 1949.

ROYAL ASSENT

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and having returned—

Mr. Speaker (standing in the Clerk's place at the Table): I have to acquaint the House that the House has been to the House of Peers where a Commission under the Great Seal was read authorising the Royal Assent to—

1. Armed Forces (Housing Loans) Act, 1949.
2. Married Women (Restraint upon Anticipation) Act, 1949.
3. Coal Industry (No. 2) Act, 1949.
4. Telegraph Act, 1949.
5. British North America (No. 2) Act, 1949.
6. Public Works Loans Act, 1949.
7. Local Government Boundary Commission (Dissolution) Act, 1949.
8. War Damaged Sites Act, 1949.
9. Distribution of German Enemy Property Act, 1949.
10. Electoral Registers Act, 1949.
11. Patents Act, 1949.
12. Registered Designs Act, 1949.
13. Vehicles (Excise) Act, 1949.
14. Election Commissioners Act, 1949.
15. Air Corporations Act, 1949.
16. India (Consequential Provisions) Act, 1949.
17. National Health Service (Amendment) Act, 1949.
18. Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act, 1949.
19. Nurses (Scotland) Act, 1949.

20. Auxiliary and Reserve Forces Act, 1949.
21. National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, 1949.
22. Adoption of Children Act, 1949.
23. Married Women (Maintenance) Act, 1949.
24. Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1949.
25. Justices of the Peace Act, 1949.
26. Festival of Britain (Supplementary Provisions) Act, 1949.
27. Parliament Square (Improvements) Act, 1949.
28. Fife County Council Order Confirmation Act, 1949.
29. Stanley's Charity (West Bromwich) Scheme Confirmation Act, 1949.
30. Shoreham Harbour Act, 1949.
31. River Great Ouse (Flood Protection) Act, 1949.

And to the following Measures passed under the provisions of the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act, 1919:

Benefices (Suspension of Presentation) Measure, 1946 (Amendment) Measure, 1949.

Reorganisation Areas Measure, 1944 (Amendment) Measure, 1949.

And to the following Act passed under the provisions of the Parliament Act, 1911:

Parliament Act, 1949.

[After Prorogation:—]

End of the Fifth Session (opened 26th October, 1948) of the Thirty-eighth Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in the Fourteenth Year of the Reign of His Majesty King George the Sixth.

A Short Open Letter to Mr. J. B. Priestley

Dear Sir,

I listened with interest to your broadcast last night, and as you have now emerged as a propagandist for support of the Labour Party, I wish to address you in this capacity.

As a successful novelist, your reputation has been based on one or two realistic books, notably *Wonder Hero* and *The Good Companions*, the latter being the more popular. No fiction writer can write good books without introducing into them something of his philosophy and in *Wonder Hero* your character Slakeby said:—

... If I thought it would get us out of this I'd turn Bolshie to-morrow. But it won't. And I don't like Bolshevism. I don't like Committees, fools who win elections, officials, half-witted comrades and damned interference with everything and everybody. I don't like public ownership of property. What the public owns nobody owns. . . . There's only one thing, young man that the government should look after . . . and that's money . . . though if you've ever met a rich man you'll find he manages almost entirely on a system of credit and hardly touches a bob . . . The next time you're asked your opinion about anything for the Daily . . . shout that at the top of your voice. . . .

Since you wrote that book you have associated with P.E.P. the organisation that stated that "Only in war or the threat of war, will the Government engage in large-scale planning." You have also been prominent in the 1941

Committee with Sir Richard Acland, Horrabin, Zilliacus, Kingsley Martin, Julian Huxley and Hulton. The Socialist organisation of Sir Richard Acland referred in its typescript report IV to "our struggle" as "a rallying point provided by a Committee presided over by Mr. J. B. Priestley" and in January the Committee (1941) declared:

"Where great monopolies provide such essential services as transport, fuel and power they must be owned by the community and run exclusively in the public interest."

Subsequently, I understand you have been engaged with that mysterious organisation U.N.E.S.C.O., fitting the minds of people into a predetermined groove created by the planners.

You now state that it is not desirable generally for authors to engage in political discussion any more than politicians should be authors, though I would remind you of Disraeli, a noted politician and author who said on one occasion "While forms and customs keep up the semblance of a creed the rule of practice is to submit to the passions or combinations of the hour." You evidently have submitted to the combination of the Labour ideology, which *ex hypothesi*, has made this country ten times better than it was in 1938.

I can only express my astonishment.

At present, the Government seizes a man's property: compels him to obtain a licence for every activity: decides what he can buy or sell: prevents him from building a hen house; refuses to pay him money illegally extracted: refuses to allow him to take his money abroad: conscripts him: controls his employment: steals his credit: debases his money: raises M.P.'s and Ministers' salaries by forty *per cent.*; organises monopolies, *e.g.*, the Coal Board, *etc.*, lends money to aliens with the proceeds of a nationalised Bank of England, and liquidates the British Empire. If that is progress I understand not the meaning of words, for it is no use your exalting the better feeding of children and the National slave measures of the Health Act if the dinners or treatment is brought in or carried out by the jailers.

You are still under the delusion that the nineteenth century poverty was the creation of the Tories or wicked capitalists; that the rich created the poor, though Professor Bowley and C. H. Douglas torpedoed that falsity years ago.

Yours faithfully,

E. J. PANKHURST.

Mr. Priestley's broadcast has called forth more uncomplimentary comment than has been spared for some time upon a partisan. *Truth* begins a criticism of over a column's length: "By choosing Mr. J. B. Priestley to lead the assault on the more gullible members of the middle class Mr. Morrison and the other Socialist tacticians evidently considered an oleaginous voice to be best suited for the purpose." "As a politician he is a great simpleton" summarises an article from which signs of respect are absent.

The Tablet devotes a page to "The Paradox of Mr. Priestley," from which the following are extracts:—

"But then it is very surprising that he should be in the Socialist camp at all; and this gives him a certain representative importance; for he is typical of many less distinguished members of the English middle classes who

(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. 23. No. 22.

Saturday, January 28, 1950.

There's No Hurry

We can now, after five years, answer with facts, not with arguments, those critics who asked what good it did that they should go to the polling booths and, by some quite simple sign, and the simpler the better, repudiate an 'election' which was not an election, not a choice of one policy and a rejection of its opposite.

At that time, the time of the defeat of Mr. Churchill's Party, we said that a demonstration of the very existence of even a minority opinion which clearly understood that a change of government should be dependent upon a change of policy would be, whatever might be said about it in the market place, ominous to the understanding of every wire-puller in politics, and, if that minority could make it known that it acted with deliberation and was of set purpose and immovable, it would constitute a greater real check to the unprincipled exercise of Power than such majorities as are the objective of the parties.

One after another, the party leaders have come forward to confirm our opinion. Apathy may exist. Doubtless it does. Certainly there is abundant ground for it among those who are incapable of establishing any sensible relationship between their political actions and the results which actually they experience. Apathy may be an obstacle to many a plan which the administration entertains, and it may become, finally, destructive of all plans; but this is not what at present moves those who have their ears to the ground. When the election of five years ago ended, there was great reluctance to disclose any information which might cast light upon the varieties and guises of 'apathy'; and much was said to suggest that carelessness, illiteracy, unfamiliarity with the technique of the ballot box were the only possible causes of 'spoiled' voting papers. Now the purposeful "wasting" of a vote is specifically mentioned in the first hundred words of the broadcast by the "Conservative" leader, together with abstention, as a political evil to be avoided at all costs. The 'secrecy of the ballot' comes in as a refrain. He need not worry, so far as we are concerned. We have moved five years on. It is the next election but one that he should now have his eyes on. We are satisfied, for the time being, that we have no occasion for hurry. Many people are not hurrying besides ourselves: they know that there is nothing to be gained by hurry if you are going the wrong way. When Mr. Churchill (or Mr. Churchill's successor in the leadership of a true Conservative Party) faces the issue of his 'basic' standard of life properly, and shows a disposition to distinguish between a right and a wrong basis, a change of policy in

government will be in sight. Then, the quicker, consistently with order, the better. It is not yet in sight; but 'things are working round that way.'

The Enemy Without the Gate

1940 'Capitalist' America, 'appeasement' successfully scotched, proceeds to acquire British overseas investments, over £6,000 million, at bargain prices.

1942 'Capitalist' America, now in command of Allied strategy, makes straight the path for 'Communist' conquests in Eastern Europe, China and elsewhere.

1945 'Capitalist' America, through U.N.R.R.A. and other agencies, proceeds to the provision of Soviet controlled territories.

1946 'Capitalist' America, cutting Lend-Lease overnight, rushes to the relief of its stranded British 'Ally' with a £1,000 million loan *in dollars*—to finance Socialism and thereby the ruin and enslavement of the British Empire.

1949 'Capitalist' America, successful in its insistence on Sterling Devaluation, proposes a 'bold new plan,' Point Four, for the acquisition of the British Empire at bargain-basement prices.

"... the moulding of events and governments to procure a World Dominion for 'Israel.' The objective involves a perfectly clear, coherent and continuous policy on the part of the Zionists. The conditions for successive and major crises must be created and maintained in the world."—C. H. Douglas, *The Brief for the Prosecution*, p. 23.

Quite So

Senator MacLean, a well-known Canadian business-man, made a speech in the Canadian Senate on October 6, from which the following passages are taken. (Translated from *Vers Demain*, Montreal, November 1.):

"... a large proportion of England's present exports are unproductive, since they serve to pay capital and interest on war debts. Since the end of the war England has given Europe, without any return, exports to a value of more than £900 million... Even if England could perform a miracle and wipe out its commercial deficit with the U.S.A. (\$1,600 million) the rest of the world would still have an unfavourable balance of \$5,600 million with the U.S.A... Without a vast internal readjustment, the present economic system of the U.S.A. is such that they cannot absorb enough imports to equalise their exports... A nation has only the fruits of its production with which to pay its debts... Imports can only be paid for by exports (Proposals for Goods-Credit payment and Seven Year Prescription-of-debt passed at Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the Commonwealth, Johannesburg, 1948 advocated)... The British Empire could become the most important centre of commercial exchange in the world, since it has more raw materials suitable for foreign trade than either the U.S.A. or U.S.S.R... The debt system has had its day. The world has contracted enormous debts which have attained incredible proportions, a large part of which can never be paid off. *World debts between 1939/1946 have increased ten times as much as all the public debts accumulated from the days of Adam to 1939.*" (our italics).

The Labour Party Manifesto

Some Axioms Underlying it

Election manifestos are like the comic supplements to American papers: a strip of gaily coloured and highly style-ised pictures tracing the adventures of an X-ray-eyed dream-hero to the haven desired by the 'reader.' Truth is irrelevant. Why should 'Superman' need to be true? He is far more potent as a fiction conditioning the subconscious minds of his 'fans' to axioms whose assumption guides the future.

So it is with election programmes, and the first responsibility of the responsible voter is to penetrate behind the propositions to the axioms. He must then decide whether he would openly back the axioms (which the propositions entail) with his vote, and whether he would further back his vote with his money, to win were the propositions profitable, to lose were they not. Only if he would stake something that matters to him on the issue to win or to lose is he voting responsibly.

Obviously he will only want to back a programme which will do what it is said to do. The way he can judge this is by applying the results of his own experience of similar propositions already put into action.

Set out below are the main propositions of the Labour Manifesto *Let Us Win Through Together*, which was the first of the party programmes to appear.* With them we print some axioms implicit in the propositions, and the sort of questions which might serve as a guide in deciding if the propositions would really lead to the haven desired.

Nationalisation

Cement, sugar, cold storage, meat wholesaling and water supply undertakings are marked down for outright nationalisation, and in vaguer terms the chemical industry, 'many thousands of acres of marginal land' where 'the job is too big for individual farmers to tackle' and 'all suitable minerals.'

AXIOM: That the benefits of private ownership will be transferred to the electors when ownership is vested in a popularly elected government; the benefits being the monetary profits of the business, the power to direct it, and to a lesser degree the power to give or to withhold service—the implication being that service it withheld by private ownership.

Most people have direct experience† of some among the coal, gas and electricity industries and the railways, which have all been nationalised recently. Out of this experience, consider whether you can get more coal or less since nationalisation; and is it dearer or cheaper, better or stonier? Is electric current more or less dependable—used load-shedding to be the feature it now is; was current cheaper or dearer? Is gas cheaper or dearer? Is the railway service quicker and more frequent, and were fares cheaper or dearer? How is it that since the war the best train from Manchester to Euston takes exactly the same time as the service in 1902, but is slower than even the service of 1905?

*The *Daily Herald* of January 18 says: "It sets out, in twelve pages packed with positive proposals and powerful electoral punches, how the next period of Labour rule will be used." The "used" is a pity: may we proffer 'perpetrated'?

†It is important to take for comparison a period when the institutions concerned were really under private control and not, as they were during and since the war, nationalised in all but name.

Housewives

Housewives are offered an independent "consumer advice centre," which will test merchandise and report on its value.

The AXIOM here is *That British Housewives do not want to judge for themselves.*

This, it should be noted, is issued at just about the time when the abolition of food rationing, except for sugar, has been announced in Germany as from March 1.

Social Services

"Wise development" of services provided by existing Acts is promised.

AXIOM: That any development of these would be an effective means of meeting the needs they are understood to meet. This implies at least two further axioms about the nature of the Social Services:

Firstly, *That by centralising the control of money, services which most people cannot afford as individuals can be afforded in aggregate, with the addition of the expenses of the administrative organisation.*

Secondly, *That the services provided under such central control are the same or superior to those hitherto received by the individual from members of the professions concerned, responsible solely to that individual, and not to administrators.*

Has your everyday business been more or less the subject of official forms, official snoopers and official rulings since the 'welfare' state took charge of you; and has the interposition of these officials and forms helped or hindered your relationship with your employers and your professional experts?

Education

More teachers are being trained so that the size of classes can be reduced.

AXIOM: The obvious axiom here—that education cannot be effective with classes of the present size is one that no one will deny. But behind it is another axiom:

That the broad outline of the 1944 Education Act implying the compulsory schooling of children from infancy to fifteen years by State-trained teachers with or without the consent of the parents (unless they can afford private schools twice as expensive since the Act) is sound.

Why do well-qualified men and women fight shy of teaching as a career? Is it that the teaching of knowledge has declined, and that they are required to be a cross between ersatz parents and ersatz masters-of-apprentices instead?

Do you wish to vote for a system whereby teachers and government officials, in their rôle of ersatz parents, may legally over-rule the experience and affection of real parents in deciding the future of the children?

Housing

Rent controls and rent tribunals will be continued, but a review of existing rent restrictions is promised.

The AXIOM here is *That tenants would rather have rooms scarce because cheaper than the landlords are willing to let, than more plentiful over a range of prices which satisfy those letting.*

The factor that should properly limit rent is the existence of desirable houses and house-room for everyone.

Apart from the label 'Nationalisation' for the type of monopoly favoured by 'Labour,' these propositions might just

as well have been made by either of the other parties which adhere to the policy of the Welfare State. This is based upon the axiom *That money is more important than anything else, in the sense that freedom from control by money is worth sacrificing every other sort of freedom to get.* Thus the very word 'free' has come to mean compulsory, and we have a 'free' and compulsory education and 'free' but controlled medical services. Is that what you mean by free?—Freedom from choice instead of freedom of choice!

All the propositions in the programme are designed to relieve the individual of responsibility and choice. It is therefore most properly voted for by going into a cubicle and making a secret mark which will involve the voter in no responsibility whatever. As choice necessarily involves responsibility he has of course made no choice. (Think that out!).

A responsible vote cannot be cast in such a way.

To cast an open and responsible vote for this programme would involve being prepared in the future to be held responsible for the extension and accentuation of present experience of the abdication of personal responsibility in all the fields mentioned.—E.S.D.

Like-Mindedness

The only sound basis for useful dialectical argument between two or more intelligent individuals, is that they should mutually discover what it is they really *want*, presumably of life; If it is not the same thing, all discussion and argument seems to me to be so much waste time.

This fact is, I suspect, the reason why all those who are granted "a vision" of life's potentialities,—as Douglas put it in one of his addresses, "have glimpsed reality."—sooner or later either abandon their vision altogether, or else retreat to a study of the springs of human action. This last implies a change of mental concentration from physics (action, or effects) to metaphysics (causes, impulses, wants), which is what you and I, if we are to argue profitably, need to get down to. When I got my "glimpse of reality" it not only confirmed and crystallised my existing conviction of the world I wanted to live in, but showed me how it could be realised, and in doing so it achieved an atonement between my heart and my head, or intellect that has been an extraordinary comfort ever since. It is I suppose, this unity, or atonement, that I have been trying to make generally communicable ever since,—typified by a practical universe, or society operating automatically and naturally so as to harness the soaring dynamism of the human intellect to the fundamental needs of the human heart, or psyche.

My diagnosis is confirmed when a man writes, "You make assumptions to which my heart assents, though my mind must challenge them." This would seem to imply that he hasn't yet come to a conclusive agreement within himself as to what he really does want of life. If that is so, how can one expect the intellect to appreciate any steps to be taken to realise it, or the heart to supply the impulse to take these steps.

It comes, then, to this—I am a Social Crediter, because I *want* certain conditions of life to which I believe what is known as Social Credit will conduce. If we can decide that we want the same conditions of life, then we can usefully argue how best they can be promoted, and I will even try to convince my correspondent dialectically that Social

Credit is one way at least of promoting them. But the first thing to be done is to make sure that we are both whole-heartedly after the same thing, and unless we are it would be useless for me to argue "Douglas."

Shall I say then what to the best of my belief I want of life, of my environment? Now the first thing I want of my social environment is that it should be one of a relatively free and voluntary co-operation, containing the maximum of individual liberty within the Law. I am asked, What Law?, I say, the Natural Law, the scientist's law of Cause and Effect—"Action and reaction are equal and opposite . . ." I don't want the law to be otherwise, *even in my case*, because I want my world to be realistic and simple rather than arbitrary and complex, and therefore it needs to be one in which the social conditions are such as to make the operations of the law of Cause and Effect as immediately recognisable as possible, so that individuals may learn wisdom from experience; and it takes wisdom to build up and maintain a relatively free community such as I want. Society will have to learn—and is learning today, or else it is hell-bent—that only on Principle (a universal, scientific law freely and intelligently recognised and acknowledged, and not on a prince, or personal dictator, except in so far as he is purely a symbol or regent of Principle), can fruitful co-operative association be founded.

The universal law, or Principle for me and, according to my firmly-held faith, for my neighbour is the Natural Law that recognises action and reaction as equal and opposite, and unless my correspondent wants to see that Natural or Common Law established—which I am quite sure he really does, if he probes deeply enough into that region we call the heart—he and I don't want the same conditions of life, and therefore don't speak the same language, or rather, we use the same words but mean something quite different, in most cases the opposite thing, by them.

I had meant to enumerate several more or less fundamental conditions I wanted to see established. But on further consideration I realise that they are all comprised in, and stem from, a common acceptance or understanding of the Natural Law as outlined above. On this interpretation the Law is the Principle of life functioning through individuals, but external to them. As to its nature, inviolable—"given," if you like—and absolutely outside our jurisdiction; but within those natural limits, completely at the service of those who recognise and understand it.

As a secondary condition of my social environment, I want Tolerance, for myself and—on the understanding that "action and reaction are equal and opposite"—for my neighbour; freedom within the spirit of the Law to contract out of collective obligations to the extent that I am prepared to forfeit the functional benefits and authority that belong specifically to them.

Predictability is another secondary condition I want of my environment, and I cannot seriously believe that others do not do so also. But to me, it is so obvious that this condition is entirely dependent on whether or not there is an operating principle or law at the root of human consciousness and activity, that it hardly requires separate mention. As I have said, I find the whole situation covered by the statement of Equity contained in the words "Action and reaction are equal and opposite . . .," whatever one wants on that basis one wants for one's neighbour and *vice versa*. Such would be the Age of Reason.

To sum up then, I want my social environment to con-

tain the maximum of realism; that is, to be one in which the cause of every effect, and the effect of every cause is as self-evident as possible, and freely acknowledged.

I want it to be tolerant and equitable and law-abiding; which means that members of a society must recognise some common Principle, or Law in nature outside themselves.

If I can be convinced that my correspondent would like to see society move appreciably in that direction, and not, as it is doing at the present time continue to move rapidly in the opposite direction, then I think I could undertake to show him, not only how it could be so moved—in a reasonable manner; that is, for the benefit of all, and not only a section of society—by a sufficient minority like-minded with ourselves, but also why and how it is being manœuvred so unerringly in the opposite direction at the present moment. Because these conditions which make for an approach to the things I want are all fulfilled by what are called the Social Credit, or Douglas Proposals, and the reason why society has been receding from them with increasing rapidity since, say 1914, is shown with equal clearness in the Social Credit analysis of the existing economic and social system, which is today visibly disintegrating about us. But unless the reversal of this progression is what is desired, it would be useless waste of time to try to explain how that can be effected.

Since what I say hinges to such an extent on the concept of Natural Law, which not everyone regards as 'given' or inviolable, I feel I had better make my attitude in the matter a little clearer, if I can.

To me consciousness and what I understand to be the Natural Law, as abstract ideas, are fundamental and interdependent, and as far as my understanding goes, without their accepted existence there can be nothing—*i.e.* the denial of them, or even doubt as to their reality, amounts to Nihilism. I deny Nihilism. I deny it in quite a lot of ways, ideological and otherwise; but most emphatically by the mere fact of my conscious existence in an Order of things, which implies a Law—an existence embracing, in some obscure way, both myself and my environment, which last obviously includes my opponents as part of its furniture. But if the idea of an Order of Things, "beyond yea and nay," cannot be accepted, it seems to be that not only is my own conscious existence denied but my opponent's as well. So how can we hope to come to an agreement, or even to disagree?

I feel pretty sure that it is this fact that makes all purely dialectical discussion so futile, and ideological differences so unbridgeable—the fact that either one or both parties in denying or doubting the existence of Natural Law, as something common to both sides, unconsciously denies reality not only his opponent's argument, but also to his very existence: in short, attempts to annihilate him. We see this psychological process carried out today to its logical conclusion more nearly consciously and openly than ever before in the world's history in such exhibitions as the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty.

—N.F.W.

MR. PRIESTLEY

(continued from page 3)

make the same quite unnecessary and disastrous identification of progress for the mass of the people with the extension of collectivism and the ever firmer controlling hand of the Government, in the home as well as in the factory and the office. Mr. Priestley himself would never have evolved or invented Socialism. But he has let it be put across him not only as progress, but as the right and necessary form for social progress to take.

"A few months ago Mr. Priestley issued an attractive volume which dispelled, and perhaps was meant to dispel, the idea that in his successful middle life he had grown unduly formidable and bear-like. It is a volume of all the things in which he takes delight, and it reflects his mind more fully and truthfully than do his appearances as a barker outside the Socialist booth. . . ."

" . . . Mr. Priestley, the private man, writes in *Delight* with real feeling about travel in Europe. 'Give me, I say, the Desert or the Mediterranean, or, better still, for a long stay, our exquisitely temperate Southern England'—while the North moves him and calls to him even more strongly. It is true that elsewhere he calls travel today a very dubious enterprise, . . . ; but Mr. Priestley, the party broadcaster, talking to people who cannot travel much, and needing to identify himself with them, thought it necessary to say he disliked travel, and that it was business that took him abroad.

"But he had to say he went abroad, for he needed authority for what he wanted to say next, which was that 'wealthy people in cocktail bars' might praise the good living they found among foreigners, but that really this good living represented the worst kind of inequality. One man eating five men's rations, and two of the empty four then not unnaturally joining the Communist Party, was the picture. In the same way people even further to the Left than Mr. Priestley would describe his home and home-farm in just the same way, as one man taking the room and land of fifty or a hundred men.

"Yet Mr. Priestley has one great advantage, from Mr. Morrison's point of view, as a man to lull the middle classes. He is a good anaesthetist to tell them that what is to happen to them next will not hurt, because he is quite in the dark himself about what is projected. He has lived with only a passing eye for what has happened in Westminster and Whitehall these past five years. . . ."

" . . . collectivism is a regression into which communities decline, and its advance in Britain is not a sign that we are advancing forward and upward to greater things than the men of Mr. Priestley's boyhood knew. It has grown out of nervousness and perplexity among sections of the people new to great responsibilities, who are being shouted and stampeded into accepting apparently simple solutions that will only make a real national recovery harder to achieve.

"The particular evil of this century is precisely this confusion of the community with the State, which is only a part of the community and its life. Everybody is increasingly reduced to politics; and literary men, especially when they have the popular ear, have an invaluable part to play in keeping the great distinction clear, instead of spreading the confusion and, with voice and pen, serving that continual extension of bureaucracy which is what, in practical, everyday terms, the main activity of the Labour movement proves to be."

"Who Would Be Free Themselves Must Strike The Blow"

Extracts from Speeches by the Late
NORMAN JACQUES, M.P.

Price: TWO PENCE (Postage extra)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

LIVERPOOL.

No Jews in Australian Parliament

A Sydney message to *The Jewish Chronicle* of January 6 stated that no Jews were elected to Parliament in the recent Australian general elections.

"Mr. S. M. Falstein (Labour)," says the newspaper, "the only Jewish Member in the outgoing Parliament, did not receive his party's support in the latest election. He stood as an Independent Labour candidate but was defeated by the official Labour Party nominee.

"Two other Jewish candidates—Mr. J. Meltzer (Labour), of Melbourne, and Mr. G. de Vahl Davies (Liberal), of Sydney—were also defeated."

The New Times (Melbourne) for December 2 dealt in a front page article with Zionist-Communist infiltration into Australia saying that:

"Over the past few years this journal has published considerable evidence proving that there is a direct connection between the Communists and the Zionists, both groups furthering international conspiracies directed towards the destruction of the British Empire and the establishment of the World Monopoly State. The technique of infiltration has been skilfully used to further the conspiracy. We have in the past drawn attention to the grave dangers of an immigration policy which enables Communist agents to enter this country posing as 'refugees.' It is particularly significant that a large number of Jewish 'refugees' coming to this country make no secret of their sympathy for Communism."

It proceeds: "As there are probably many who have thought our charges concerning Communist infiltration exaggerated, we draw attention to an alarming report which appeared in the Melbourne *Sun* of November 22. This report, which, as far as we know, did not appear in any other Melbourne paper, dealt with charges made by a Mr. Palankay, who worked with the Field Security Service in the British zone of Austria for eighteen months. Mr. Palankay claims that Communists are arriving in Australia as migrants as part of a planned Soviet move. He said he could identify and knew the names of four Communists who travelled to Australia on the same ship as himself—the Dundalk Bay. These Communists 'were well-dressed, wealthy men.'

"Mr. Palankay is also reported as saying: "Slav officers of the International Refugee Organisation, themselves Communists, were preventing security reports from reaching Australian migrant selection officers . . . I.R.O. officers were accepting bribes for passages from people certified as too unhealthy or undesirable to come here as migrants."

"In considering Mr. Palankay's charges, it is necessary to recall that the International Refugee Organisation has continued many of the activities of U.N.R.R.A., the organisation which had as its first controller the prominent Zionist, Mr. Lehmann. It will be remembered that Mr. Lehmann was very wrathful when the first British administrator for U.N.R.R.A. in Eastern Europe, the distinguished British General, Sir Frederick Morgan claimed that U.N.R.R.A. was being used as a cover to get well-fed and well-financed Jewish "refugees" out of Eastern Europe. He charged that there was a powerful international organisation behind this move, which was enabling specially trained Communist agents to infiltrate into other countries. Sir Frederick Morgan was eventually compelled to resign his post as a result of Zionist pressure."

Spanish Gold

Gold valued at £5,700,000 has been flown to London as part of a guarantee for an £18,000,000 Chase Bank loan.

According to the *Daily Graphic* for January 16, the United States expects that Britain will join in restoring full recognition to Franco Spain before the General Election.

REALISTIC CONSTITUTIONALISM

(Notes for an Address to the Constitutional Research Association at Brown's Hotel, Mayfair, May 8, 1947)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

K.R.P. Publications

SIXPENCE (Postage 1d.)

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 Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

Secret Societies and Subversive Movements	
by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....	(Cloth Edition) 7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage	7/-
Odium v. Stratton	
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans	
by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

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