

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 24. No. 1.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Isn't it odd that when, on the outbreak of war, the letter postage was increased at once to two-pence halfpenny, that they should have guessed so accurately how much of the value of the pound they would find it convenient to steal? As three half-pence is to twopence halfpenny so is the (official) cost of living in 1939 to that in 1950.

• • •

Assuming, which we do not, that the effective control or manipulation by the Sanhedrin of Stalin and Mao-t'se-Tung is the same thing as the control of the Russian and Chinese populations, the Western world is faced with a threat of extermination through the agency of six hundred million slaves. This situation has been evidently in train since that peculiar reptile, Franklin Delano Roosevelt connived first with Stalin and then with Chiang-kai-Shek to sell the British all the many raw deals prepared by the Baruch Morgenthau Gang. The fact that Chiang was sacrificed in turn does not in the least conflict with the main argument; it was no accident that a half-crazy megalomaniac with as much administrative ability as a Bantu graduate of the London School of Economics, was allowed to wreck Chiang's policy, and so clear the way for Mao-t'se-Tung.

What is so very difficult to understand is that there appears to be neither come-back nor even protest. We all have a tendency, perhaps derived from that popular scapegoat, "wishful thinking," to pretend that, hidden somewhere in the purlieus of Whitehall is a group of fabulously clever, cool-headed men who are preparing a surprise for our enemies much as G. K. Chesterton comforted us with the reference to "We are the People of England, we have not spoken yet." It may be so, for all we know; but the gambits of the clever, cool-headed men, like the stutterings of the Cahmon Man, do not inspire confidence.

• • •

Mr. Herbert Morrison says that the political atmosphere smells good to him. If we are speaking of the same thing, we should prefer to use the word which the Fourth Form applies to the study of Chemistry.

• • •

The heathen in his blindness, *genus* British Honduras, on being told that the value of his local dollar had been cut by one third overnight, to suit the theories now current in the London School of Economics, reacted in an uneducated manner by raising a first-class riot. This just shows how necessary it is to develop the intelligence of the White Man's Burden.

• • •

FOX OF U.S.A. NOW IN U.S.I.

Djakarta, Monday (A.A.P.-Reuter).

Former Hollywood film magnate Matthew Fox, who financed the Indonesian Republic during the guerilla war

against the Dutch, arrived by air in Djakarta today from Bangkok.

Fox, who told press representatives that he had been invited by the Indonesian Government to discuss financial problems, was met by Minister of Communications Laoh. His arrival aroused considerable speculation among politicians and financiers.

An American Embassy official said last night that the Embassy was "indifferent to Mr. Fox and his contacts—to us he is just another itinerant American businessman."

Indonesian businessmen said that Mr. Fox had a contract which they understood gave him a complete monopoly to buy and sell on behalf of the former Jogjakarta Government.

They said that it was uncertain whether the contract would be binding on the new United States of Indonesia Government.—*The Daily News*, (Perth, W.A.), January 9, 1950.

We don't know what Mr. Fox's original name was, but we are fairly sure what it wasn't.

• • •

To anyone closely in touch with affairs in the ten years before the outbreak of the second phase of the War, it was obvious that Keynes, and the Keynesian distortion of the Social Credit Thesis, were the Financiers' Answer to the attack on the Banks. Lord Keynes was an able man, and was furnished with the best assistance unlimited money could provide; and the Keynesian Proposals for Deficit Spending, by which the under-distribution of purchasing-power disclosed by the A + B Theorem, and rather cleverly admitted by Keynes, was paralleled by money issued to finance Public Works which were not for sale (the current British equivalent being the wages, salaries and dividends paid in respect of Exports which cannot be bought; these however serving as a tax on the whole community equivalent to coin clipping) were a brilliantly devised trick to put the population permanently to work for Lord Keynes's employers.

But it is evident from many quarters that Social Credit is a chiel' that winna ding; and one of the more recent items in the evidence is a production "intended mainly for the general reader" by a Dr. Klein, with acknowledgements to O. Lange, J. Letiche, J. Lintner, G. Malanos, F. T. Malm, J. Marschak, C. Myers, D. Patinkin, an S. Pu. And, last but not least, The London School of Economics.

In the decade preceding what may be termed the Keynesian Apocalypse, the Chairman of The Westminster Bank, an amiable and cultured banker, placidly repeated at yearly intervals a denial of the proposition that banks create financial credits—"the means of payment out of nothing." This denial of what had been almost universally admitted ten years earlier must have served some purpose; and Dr. Klein's book no doubt has much the same objective.

Indictment*

By L. D. BYRNE

The utter futility of Parliamentary Government under the present electoral system (as distinct from *responsible* Parliamentary Government under a *responsible* electoral system) should be evident from the complete absence of a single voice being raised in the respective Houses of Commons within the British Commonwealth to expose the evil conspiracy against His Majesty, his subjects and everything which the British Crown traditionally symbolises. In recent years the sole exception to this has been the late Norman Jaques, who, in the Canadian House, had the sense of responsibility, the courage and the ability to speak fearlessly on the one vital issue of our time.

It is difficult to believe that in the membership of the Parliaments of Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, there are not at least some with the mental capacity to grasp, from their contact with world and national affairs, that the present plight of humanity has not just happened—that the situation with which we are confronted has been, and is being, promoted. Is the party system, then, a thing so inherently evil that it destroys integrity and instils self-interest to the point of forcing men to sacrifice their ideals on the altar of expediency?

The facts must speak for themselves—and the facts are that week after week and month after month these British Parliaments submissively legislate to further the policy which is destroying civilisation and spreading tyranny, violence, death and destruction everywhere, without a single voice being raised to expose the conspiracy which is being aided by their irresponsibility.

The normal, balanced and healthy human mind, viewing the events of the last thirty-five years in retrospect, must boggle at the suggestion that it has all “just happened.”

The murder of an Austrian Archduke by an obscure Jewish assassin is the signal for plunging Europe into war in 1914. The British Empire enters the conflict to save Europe from German militarism.

The U.S.A. remains neutral at the outset and supplies the munitions to Great Britain, while its powerful “German-Jewish bankers . . . are toiling in a solid phalanx to encompass her destruction.” (Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador to U.S.). The controlling institution being Kuhn, Loeb and Co., under Jacob Schiff.

Russia, having entered the war unprepared, ordered huge supplies of munitions from the British munitions firm of Vickers, controlled by Sir Ernest Cassel, closely associated with Jacob Schiff.

The war drags on and, owing to the failure of Vickers to deliver munitions to Russia, the Russian army is hopelessly outmatched by the German army. Revolt follows, the Czar abdicates, and Kerensky forms a Russian socialist republic.

Jacob Schiff cables Kerensky, congratulating him on the revolution, and the United States declares war on Germany.

Lenin is taken in a sealed train, with a group of trained revolutionaries, across Germany to Sweden, and Trotsky (apparently financed by Kuhn, Loeb and Co) is sent to the same destination from the U.S.A. with another group of trained revolutionaries. Finances are provided by the German Imperial Bank and M. Warburg & Co. (closely associated

with Kuhn, Loeb & Co. of New York).

Follows the Bolshevik revolution, the overthrow of Kerensky, the murder of the Czar and his family, and an end of hostilities with Germany—the Bolshevik regime entering into close co-operation with Germany.

Then the Armistice and the consolidation of the predominantly Jewish Bolshevik regime; the abdication of the Kaiser and the setting up of a “democratic” constitution under Prince Max, advised by Max Warburg, head of M. Warburg and Co.

At the Peace Conference in the following year the German Delegation was headed by Max Warburg and his partner, Carl Melchior; the U.S. advisers included Paul Warburg (of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and brother of Max Warburg) and Bernard M. Baruch; while Mandel (of the Rothschild family) exercised dominant influence for France; and Lord Cunliffe (governor of the Bank of England, and partner in the international banking house of Goschens and Cunliffe) was financial adviser to the British Delegation.

The Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations were the result—the former laying the foundations for the next war, and the latter the foundations for the United States of Europe and United States of the World idea (World Federal Union).

“The League of Nations is a Jewish idea”—Nahum Sokolov, President of the Zionist Congress, on August 25, 1932.

“The task of the proletariat is to create a far more powerful fatherland, with far greater power of resistance—the Republican United States of Europe, as the foundation of the United States of the World.”—Leon Trotsky, 1918.

1919-39—Undermining Christendom

The next phase was the development of world economic organisation:

The centralisation of financial power throughout the British Commonwealth under the Bank of “England”—directed by Montagu Norman, Otto Niemeyer and Guggenheim Gregory.

Huge international cartels controlled by the international financial houses.

The “promotion” of a world economic crisis by the deliberate manipulation of finance by the predominantly German-Jewish controlled international banking houses. This led to the centralisation of financial and economic control in the U.S., and clamped the fetters of such control more firmly on other countries, leading to widespread suffering and discontent—and the discrediting of democratic government.

Meanwhile, millions of dollars’ worth of goods and technical aid are poured into Russia by the U.S. international banking houses.

Conditions in Germany under complete Jewish domination become increasingly intolerable. Hitler—a nonentity—appears on the scene. He attracts inexplicable attention and support. The discredited “democratic” regime provides a stepping stone for the Nazi regime—with support from the U.S. and British financial powers. Germany and Russia are supplied with all the materials required to build powerful war machines—as had been Mussolini (a Socialist newspaperman supported by the British Government in attaining power) in the case of Italy. Meanwhile, the Financial powers keep the “democracies” in a state of economic stress, unarmed and impotent.

*From the February number of *Social Credit*, the official organ of the Social Credit Movement in Canada.

Aggression by Mussolini is encouraged; aggression by Japan is encouraged, both under the impotence engendered through the League of Nations. Hitler begins to march. He continues until he gets into such a powerful position that war becomes the inevitable alternative to a totalitarian military conquest.

Great Britain and France are manoeuvred into sending an ultimatum to Germany to protect Poland—among other things to ensure that Soviet Russia remains opposed to Hitler Germany. Once committed to war, Great Britain finds that Hitler and Stalin have already arranged to divide Poland. Great Britain and France declare war on Germany *but not on Russia*, who is equally guilty of aggression against Poland.

Prior to the war a political institution, shrouded in mystery and having the support of Members of Parliament in all parties, known as "Political and Economic Planning," issued a scheme for a planned socialist state in Great Britain, stating that "only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large-scale planning." The head of P.E.P. was Israel Moses Sieff.

This reflected the words of Sir Stafford Cripps, speaking at Ipswich on October 13, 1935—"If war comes, as come it may, that war has to be used for the destruction of Capitalism. It will have to be used by the workers in this country to undermine the whole system." This was another way of repeating the utterance of Mr. Clement Attlee at the Annual Labour Congress in the previous year, where he stated: "We are deliberately putting a world order before our loyalty towards our country."

1939-50—Our Great Betrayal

The early stage of the war was concentrated on propaganda in favour of a "World Order"—a World "Federal Union"—under which a world government would supersede national sovereign states and exercise a highly centralised control. This stemmed from Zionist sources.

Then came the fall of France—crisis conditions in England—the adoption of sweeping government powers ("nothing matters but victory") and the systematic introduction of totalitarian measures "to fight totalitarianism."

Hitler's occupation of Europe destroys all sovereign states. His "persecution" of Jews results in a flow of Jews from Nazi-dominated Europe to England, the U.S.A. and Canada, where sympathy for their plight gives them a disproportionate influence.

Hitler attacks Soviet Russia. Churchill welcomes Russia as an ally in the cause of freedom. British and American aid flow into Russia. Propaganda is unleashed, exalting Bolshevism as an advanced form of democracy. Communist organisations, declared illegal on this continent at the outset of the war because of their subversive activities, are legalised. Propaganda for a New World Order as the objective of the war is put out.

The German army advances into Russia. It almost reaches Moscow—which, we learn subsequently, is defenceless against a major assault. The German advance is halted. The Red Army re-captures Stalingrad, and with it high officers of the German High Command, who then go over to the Soviet regime to direct the counter-attack against the Nazi forces.

The German army retreats in an orderly fashion. Meantime, at Teheran and Yalta secret meetings between Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin (with "advisers") ensure the consolidation of Communism in Europe following the war.

Great Britain and the United States, with their allies, invade Europe. The German army falls back. Follows the collapse of armed resistance by Germany. The Western allies' invading forces are halted to await the Russian advance.

Hitler disappears in the Soviet zone of occupation—is reported to have committed suicide on questionable evidence. Russia is in occupation of Eastern Europe and has effective control of Berlin.

The "United Nations" is born as a world organisation with a charter concocted in Moscow. The principal positions are occupied by Zionist Jews, or persons with Communist leanings.

Great Britain becomes "once great Britain." A socialist regime is elected under Clement Attlee with the dominant influence exercised by Laski (Communist-Atheist-Zionist), Emanuel Shinwell, Strachey (an avowed Communist), Isaacs—curiously all Jews. Bevin stands out as a patriotic British politician, but is criticised and abused by the Communists and Zionists alike.

The British Government introduces bread tickets, compulsory labour, hordes of officials, including official snoopers (gestapo), and imposes sweeping controls, restrictions and collectivist measures.

The British people's plight is worse than during the war. It is rendered still worse by devaluation.

Bernard M. Baruch heads the U.S. Atomic Committee to safeguard the "secret" of the atom bomb. He is followed by David Lilienthal—Russia gets the atomic bomb "secret."

Communism advances in Europe, China—on all fronts, under "the threat of war."

The foregoing is but the barest outline of the trend of events during the period under consideration. But even this should serve to indicate that there is a *design* and a *purpose* in what has happened—that there has been a *directing power* behind it.

Yet the lips of the men in Parliament and in high places remain sealed. Have our professedly democratic institutions been rendered so completely impotent? Are self-interest, stupidity or craven cowardice the only qualifications for political office and executive positions? Has the spirit which built the British Commonwealth been utterly destroyed? Have the Christian churches become so de-Christianised that they either cannot recognize the Devil or they dare not challenge him?

At least these questions should leave us in no doubt regarding our own personal responsibility.

Mr. Bevan

"Mr. Bevan and his wife, Jenny Lee, were both angry when a *Sunday Express* reporter spoke to them as they left Cliveden-place just after 7 o'clock last night. 'I was not at the Cabinet meeting because I was in the country,' he said sharply in reply to a question."

"Mr. Bevan's agent, suprised at the Minister's absence from the Cabinet meeting, telephoned him at his Cliveden-terrace home last night.

"'Mr. Bevan was at his home during the Cabinet meeting. His absence had nothing to do with politics,' he told a *Sunday Dispatch* reporter last night. 'I spoke to Mr. Bevan himself.'"

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. 24. No. 1.

Saturday, March 4, 1950.

Towards a Decision

For our part, what we want is a decision; and there is a strong indication in the immediate political situation that we shall get it, if not at once, soon.

The Times is already talking about 'the sooner the better'; but it is by no means certain, or indeed likely, that we are thinking of the same thing. We view with even greater satisfaction than a small "Conservative" majority, in the House of Commons the small "Labour" majority, even if we can see ways in which this position could be used disastrously—ways of crisis and force; but signs are not wanting that a current is beginning to flow against any false solution and for a greater realism. There is little here to assist those who want to exploit the present deadlock for revolutionary purposes. When Parliament meets, as it will before these lines appear, the near future may at once become clear, or a certain gloss may be cast over it. But that will soon wear away. Everyone is waiting, and not for the usual party manoeuvres.

Either a wide opportunity lies immediately before Social Crediters or none; but they should be alert to seize it if it comes.

The "Liberals"

"Most of the money came from Lord Sherwood and Mr. James de Rothschild."—*Sunday Express*.

Why drag in Lord Sherwood?

The Alien

"Sir, it is not so much to be lamented that old England is lost, as that the () have found it."

—Samuel Johnson.

Old Sam Johnson had his bug-bears, and with him it was the Scots. We can fill in the blank how we like.

Rationing Amidst Plenty

"The Department of Agriculture had 25 million bushels of hot potatoes on its hands. It had already, at a total cost of \$35 million, given away all it could—to deserving institutions, school-lunch programmes and overseas relief. To give the rest away, complained Agriculture Secretary Charles F. Brannan dolorously, would cost the Government another \$15 million.

"Putting the problem to Congress, Charlie Brannan was too politic to remind its members of what they already knew

too well: the potato glut was its baby. The Senate Agriculture Committee handed it back to Brannan, who decided to save the \$15 million and dump the spuds.

"Thus, in the next few weeks, potatoes which the Government will buy for about \$1.10 a bushel will be 'sold' back to the grower for fertiliser or feed for three-fifths of a cent a bushel. Just to make sure that no one then tries to sell them back to big-hearted Uncle Sam for another \$1.10 a bushel, the Department of Agriculture will, appropriately, dye its abandoned spuds a deep blue."—*Time*, February 13.

Two Candidates

Of two candidates mentioned by us in quotation from *Free Britain*, Captain Roy Farran, who publicly denied that the Jewish question played any part in his campaign, was beaten at Dudley by 13,031 votes, and, at Chorley, Lancs., Mr. Andrew Fountaine, who was adopted by local Conservatives against opposition from the Central Office "to satisfy the Jews," failed to secure election in a three-cornered fight by 361 votes, a "Liberal" candidate polling nearly 3,000 against Mr. Fountaine's 22,872.

Challenge

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*,

Dear Sir,

May I suggest that the following approach to the problem of restoring responsibility to politics receive consideration:—

After the Election individual Social Crediters to challenge their M.P. to pay them annually a sum equivalent to the increase in taxation and cost of living if any on £1,000 year income during the term his Party is in power, the Social Crediter in return to guarantee to pay the M.P. a sum equivalent to the reduction in taxation and cost of living, if any.

If the M.P. refuses to accept the challenge, throw it open to any elector in the constituency who voted for the Party in power.

The effects of action taken along these lines would appear to me likely to be:—

(1) If the M.P. accepted the challenge he would have an important incentive to press for results in Parliament; if he refused he could be pilloried and his bona-fides would be seriously prejudiced.

(2) If no elector accepted the challenge, the irresponsibility of the electorate would be glaringly exposed.

(3) The Social Crediter would have an opportunity of evading some of the evils threatened.

(4) Many electors other than Social Crediters convinced of the incompetence of the Party they did not vote for might seize on the idea for their own personal advantage.

If the stratagem meets with approval it would be advantageous to have a standard formula and legal agreement which all could use, thus saving legal expenses.

Record of all action taken throughout the country could be collated and marshalled and would provide valuable information and dynamite.

Yours faithfully,

Alton, Hants., February 16.

JOHN MITCHELL.

The Offensive

By NORMAN F. WEBB

"WOE UNTO THE WORLD BECAUSE OF OFFENCES, FOR IT MUST NEEDS BE THAT OFFENCES COME, BUT WOE TO THAT MAN BY WHOM THE OFFENCE COMETH."—*Luke*, 17.

The above appears a rather obscure statement at the first glance, but its direct meaning and its implications for the individual emerge with a little examination. Moffatt translates offences as hindrances; in a political or cultural context we might use the term recessions. They occur, not in spite of what we do, but because of it—"needs must",—and yet the recession leads on to the next advancing wave, mingles with it and is carried higher up the shore. One recognises that these natural analogies are not really adequate; but after all we have no means of inter-communication except by symbols, and this one serves to describe the rhythm of association as we have experience of it. Woe unto the world, if the majority of the community wilfully disobeys the Natural Law. But woe in a special sense to those that actively help to create and hasten a recession caused by disobedience to the Law. For though we must needs go with it, backsliding with the backsliders, keeping in touch with our fellows in retreat, and partake of the general decline of ideals and standards, yet it is our Christian duty to resist and protest; even though our opponents are, in an extraordinary and inverted way, doing the work of convincing society of its errors far more effectively than ever we can hope to do. In a far more immediate sense than we, they are the instruments of God's purpose, in helping to bring about the reaction to their own misguided philosophy; though, to their own comprehension, triumphing and vindicated all along the line against our reactionariness. Nevertheless; woe to them, those leaders of the negative offensive, whether of the Right or the Left, against the positive, Christian Order.

And what in essence is this offensive, or offence? In what primarily does it consist? From the long-term, philosophical aspect, it might be described as arising from the denial of the validity of the idea of hierarchy or degree *in space time*, which is equivalent to the denial of Natural Law—action and reaction are equal and opposite—as the reflection of an absolute and invisible Order, or God. In practice this amounts to a denial of the fact or principle of all ordered structure and organic growth; of such facts as that a crystal must have a nucleus round which to form, or a plant consist of a root, stem, and flower; or that in the construction of a building there must be stones in the foundation of the same composition, and of as much intrinsic worth and importance, as in the coping, or that an arch demands springing stones as well as its keystone.

The whole essence of this denial of what would appear to be the nature of things, the negative philosophy behind it and arising from it, can be summed up in the cry of the French Revolution for Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Now these are abstract conditions, belonging to what we call the realm or plane of the Absolute, not directly realizable in space-time except in the relative form of a reflection or earnest. That is axiomatic, and along with what has been said above regarding hierarchy—or the natural, organic sequence of things in space-time: ordered relationship—sums up into what has always been meant by the term God, the visible and invisible Order or unity in nature. These natural facts, which the religionists, in the light of their definition

of God, justifiably term the Will of God, are precisely what the dialectical materialists deny, and would sweep aside, asserting rather ridiculously but as events seem to suggest disastrously, that things shall not be according to the facts but according to the will of men. Is it any wonder that the deliberate and conscious employment of such unreasonable working principles should turn existence into an unholy Wonderland and counterfeit, and convert the mind of anyone who allows himself to succumb to the temptation to take a positive and prominent part in putting them into operation into an embodied contradiction, an enormity, an offence? In the now almost historic, but quite distracted words of Arnold Toynbee "We are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands." Such is the effect of a purely dialectical or intellectual approach to life, and it was the French Encyclopædists, the glorifiers of the intellect at the expense of the heart, who raised the cry of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.

Liberty, according to the Marxists, is the freedom of the individual mind to hold what intellectual beliefs appear to meet his immediate requirements, without the cramping necessity of fitting them into the space-time context. Equality is the denial by the dialectical materialists of natural order and organic structure, and consequently the nihilistic assertion of its opposite, of chaos and disorder—nothing in the face of something not directly definable, but plainly reflected in the lovely and palpable Order of the universe. And inevitably and naturally, this denial results in the introduction of division and disintegration and contradiction, beginning where everything conceivable begins, in men's minds. Fraternity, the arbitrary assertion of abstract brotherhood by those who are deliberately set on breaking down and destroying the only common and connecting link between individual and individual, the Natural Law, to which all, high and low in the hierarchical sense, must ultimately bow.

These are the natural and incontrovertible facts at the back of such contemporary space-time phenomena as—to take two outstanding political examples—Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Aneurin Bevan. Cripps, the man, who preaches Christianity and promotes totalitarianism or, as it would seem, anti-Christ; who allows himself to be manoeuvred into a position where he has to admit that his reiterated denials regarding devaluation were deliberately misleading falsehoods forced on him by political circumstances beyond his control. A sad exhibition of all-too-human frailty, no doubt, but in this country demanding our sympathy rather than condemnation had he immediately resigned. And resignation would have been inevitable even fifty years ago under the accepted rules of the political game, as played by quite ordinary and worldly men of infinitely less "moral" outlook and protestation than Sir Stafford, merely as a tribute to the common belief in sportsmanship and abstract consistency. The fact that he did not even offer to resign is bad and sad enough; but when cynically, and with apparent justification assuming the public's sense of realism—and that of the Church of England also,—to be at as low an ebb as his own, he makes his very next break into the news an appearance in the pulpit of St. Paul's Cathedral, one can only marvel ruefully at the rapidity of the all-round decline from Christian values. And really, the fact that the man is still, politically speaking, not only alive and breathing, but apparently a force in British politics, discloses a shocking state of ethical and social demoralisation.

So much for our first exhibit. What of the second, so superficially dissimilar, and fundamentally so like? The

country knows its Aneurin Bevan for a tough, embittered iconoclast; a man with such an itching inferiority complex that he can find no rest except in the feel and exercise of *power* over his supposed enemies. There was an article in *The Tribune* recently under his name which, if it really was by him and not written by his wife who is on the editorial board of the paper, displays the same yawning gap between protest and practice as Cripps's appearance in the pulpit in place of on the stool of repentance. In view of his bitter and prejudiced outlook, it is not to be wondered at if Mr. Bevan's deductions from the examination of any problem that confronts him, should be warped and deflected from commonsense by his soreness of spirit. His nature has no doubt been deeply wounded, and the mental atmosphere of South Wales in the interwar period cannot have been a healing one.

The theme of the article is not unnaturally the benefits, actual and to come, of Planning for Full Employment, beginning with the need to control capital investment. He writes: "... such large sums are involved in the heavy long-term investments of the basic industries that the saliva of private greed does not flow long enough to digest them into the economic system." The physiological imagery is significant—what in modern psychological jargon might be called (if it hasn't already been) the Little Red Riding Hood complex. Ideology apart, one might expect that the results of nationalisation as shown by the rapidly widening gap between the individual and any hope of influencing the conditions of his work or destiny, were beginning to be evident to everyone concerned in the State-controlled industries. Yet we are told in this article that the demand for the nationalisation means far more than the mere demand for guaranteed employment. "It means . . . that the citizen insists in the depth of his personality that he shall be reunited with the tools of his work, from which he was forcibly separated by the Industrial Revolution. Only those who have passed through the experience of idle hands surrounded by idle tools can begin to appreciate the deep serenity that will flow in time from the unity of man with the tools of his craft and the source of his wealth."

Thus do we, in our clumsy and slow British manner follow—but so far behind—our erstwhile ally and trusty friend, the Soviet Union, towards the "deep serenity" of the Siberian Labour Camps, where the weary citizen-of-the-world is finally and indissolubly "reunited with the tools of his craft." True to the Communist inversion of meaning, this journey is described as the road to Liberty; no doubt with Equality in the van, and Fraternity bringing up the rear. "We are now," the article continues, "Beginning to see the pattern of individual relationship as it emerges in those nations which are coming under the influence of Socialist principles. The background and prerequisite of this personal liberty implies that the serenities of private life shall not be invaded and disturbed by disharmonies arising from maladjustments in the economic machine." (Don't they talk attractively in South Wales!) "In short, the main economic structure must be planned, purposive and reasonably predictable." Like any day of the week in a Forced Labour Camp.

And then finally: "... It follows that if all the factors of production . . . are fully deployed"—note the military phraseology—"then any addition to the total of production . . . immediately gives rise to the question: What goes where? . . . This was the question that [*sic*] *Laissez-faire* Liberalism never had to answer—for it allowed human values

to emerge from the sum total of individual scrambling. The Liberal never knew what kind of a society he intended until he had, in fact, made it." The implication being, of course, our present official defenders and promoters of personal liberty and the "serenities of private life" know just where they are going. "If we, on the other hand, accept the obligation of planning . . . then we accept with it the burden of deciding who, or what, must first be served. In short, we determine the order of priorities." It would be more than human if one resisted the temptation to interpolate: Starting with our own salaries and expenses—"It would be fatal for the Socialists to underestimate the importance of this. Before the Industrial Revolution the order of priorities was decided by tradition, rank and usage . . ." Afterwards ". . . it was abandoned to the 'higgling' of the market and the compulsion of greed. Now the people, through their representative institutions must choose between a number of competing claims,"—the emphasis is the present writer's; and so too is the scepticism, remembering the competing claims of National Socialism in pre-war Germany between guns and butter—"and when that happens we have left the lower levels of economic planning and are treading the uplands of moral decision."

Now, whether all that high-falutin', London School of Economics rubbish—and rubbish it is, evolved by the splenetic Fabian introvert, and fed to the splenetic and embittered extrovert and iconoclast—is the work of Aneurin Lee or of Jenny Bevan, we must recognise them as a compact and formidable partnership, with a considerable armoury of effective weapons trained on the Order they have learned to hate. When Bevan, addressing 15,000 people at Wolverhampton recently said: "My memories are memories of harsh things," he spoke truly and one may suppose with moving and genuine emotion. No doubt his audience overlooked the pharisaical sanctimoniousness of what immediately followed,—“It is easy to forgive the wrongs that are done to oneself, but it is spiritual debility to forgive the wrongs that are done to others.” Which is cant. “So long as I remain in public life I shall consider it my duty to be a living memory for the things that some people are too anxious to forget, because unless we remember them, they may come back to us . . . I have sat in the Commons for 20 years and seen the extraordinary ones at work,—the Cecils, the Stanleys, the Churchills. I have watched them presiding over a decaying Britain—going from London to South Wales, Jarrow, Lancashire, Lanarkshire, Durham and Northumberland, seeing Britain dying at the roots, seeing some of the finest men and women I have ever known, breaking their hearts day by day . . . I remember all that, and you Tories—you did it,”

How tragically moving that is, and yet how false and weak and personal and fruitless the conclusion. And all because the man, in spite of his protestations, cannot forgive what he sees as a personal injury, or forget his personal spleen, and in consequence is ready to sacrifice his fellow men to satisfy his lust for revenge on his supposed enemies. And that is why his deductions are all warped and rendered nugatory by his bitter sense of inferiority. "They had the power that they needed," he continues, along the same false scent, "because they had double power—political power as well as economic power. We have not got the second even yet. We do not desire and it is not even part of our programme *this time*" (note the words I have emphasised) "that all private enterprise in Britain should be destroyed; but what is necessary is that the means of distribution and production

should be in the hands of the community."

And we see him blindly led by the hand of his lower, and worse, and revengeful self, round the garden of his desire, by a by-pass of self-deception, and speeded on his way on the other side into that wilderness of abstractionism, the Work State, where the Labour Camp awaits, if not actually himself or his bitter little helpmate, then the great majority of their fellows. And the Tories, the target of his venom—the Cecils, and Stanleys, and Churchills, with their background, and origin, and experience, all so completely different to that of life in the South Wales valleys—how do they also come to miss the gate into the garden, which to us Social Crediters stands so obviously and invitingly open, and discover such tantalising vistas? It is an intriguing and harrowing speculation. Can the public man and politician, in or out of office, never afford to take his eyes off the chart and study the sky, from whence light comes?

"Woe unto the world because of offences"—that is only too evident—"for it must needs be that offences come; but woe unto that man by whom the offence cometh." It is only left to the individual who can still discern light in any other direction to protest, and denounce, to fight a rearguard action, even in a sense to contract out. Without question it is painful; but we shall undoubtedly escape the especial woe reserved for those who are of the reaction of their times, the levellers, and deniers of Nature, the iconoclasts, the revolutionaries, the Progressives when progress is backwards.

Responsible Voting

The following four letters over the signature of Mr. John Mitchell appeared on February 3, 10, 17 and 24 respectively:—

(*Hampshire Chronicle*)

SIR,—If the claims of the various political parties as to their own and their opponents' programmes are taken at their face value, the electorate by their votes can decide whether the people of this country are to secure:—

- (1) A higher standard of living and more personal freedom of choice, or
- (2) Financial and economic ruin and less freedom of choice.

Some thirty odd million voters will have the opportunity of going into a polling booth to make a mark in secret on a piece of paper indicating which programme they vote for.

No responsibility will attach to any of the individual decisions made in this way on what is assumed to be a momentous issue, and those who do not vote for the successful party will have to bear just as much of the consequences of the failure of its policies or enjoy as much of the fruits of success, if there are any.

This is one illustration of our most serious sociological problem—the increasing separation of power from responsibility; and the starting point of corrective action is that the vote must be made responsible and must be made to carry a sanction, *i.e.*, the elector who wishes to vote must be made to back it with his money. Proposals have been put forward to effect this, and responsible people throughout the country are publicising the idea. It would bring responsibility back to politics and enable sane forces to gain control of the destiny of our country. There would, for instance, have been no ruinous devaluation if those who voted for the

party in power knew that they would have to bear in increased taxation two-thirds of the estimated cost, nor the economic troubles before the war deriving from Conservative Party policies if the same principle had been applicable.

(*Hampshire Herald*)

SIR,—The following questions are being put to Parliamentary candidates throughout the country:—

If you believe in the secret ballot, why refuse its protection to M.P.'s in Parliament against party boss intimidation? If you do not, will you press for all voting, in and out of Parliament, to be open, recorded and responsible?

The subject is made financially responsible at common law for the natural consequences of his acts. Why not for his votes?

All those who see that sound government and the salvation of our country can only be founded on a responsible electorate are asked to co-operate by pressing these questions.—Yours, etc.

(*Hampshire Herald*)

SIR,—When General Sir George Jeffreys was asked the question concerning responsible voting published in your last issue, he expressed himself in favour of the secret ballot for Parliamentary Elections, but for the continuance of the present system of open voting in Parliament, despite the fact that it is well known that this system exposes the M.P. who wishes to take an independent line on an important issue in the interests of his constituents to a series of penalties. These evils have been exposed in great detail by two well-known and fair-minded Englishmen, namely Hilaire Belloc and Cecil Chesterton in their book *The Party System*. Sir George Jeffreys, however, seems to live in a curious world of unreality of his own, for he says: "I have never known myself of such (Party boss) intimidation." It was odd that two days after receiving this reply I should read in the National Press that Mr. Churchill had said at Devonport "That if they sent Randolph back as their representative to Westminster whatever he (Mr. Churchill) lacked in parental authority would be reinforced by the efficient band of Whips at his disposal as Leader of the Party."

On the question of whether voting should be recorded and responsible and whether the voter should be made financially responsible at Common Law for his vote as he is for other acts, Sir George has taken refuge in reticence, *i.e.*, he has preferred to evade his responsibility in this matter.

If those who vote for General Sir George Jeffreys think that such feebleness can contribute anything worthwhile towards averting the very grave perils which threaten our country I can only assure them that they are in for a rude awakening in the near future, and my knowledge was sufficient to enable me to forecast exactly the outcome of the last war six months before it started.

The most junior officer in the Services can be court-martialled and punished for failing in his responsibility; the politician can get away with nearly anything. A minority of voters in this country can give power to a group of politicians to carry out policies which inflict far more harm on many more people than any officer in the Services is capable of doing. They are not made in the least responsible for this. As a great man has said recently:—"Just as a maniac is irresponsible so an irresponsible voter is a political maniac, and would know it if he were not. Power without responsibility is the broad way which leadeth to

destruction and the world of nightmare."

We are nearing the end of that road which we have been treading since the secret ballot was introduced in 1872.—Yours, etc.

(Hampshire Herald)

SIR,—Under further pressure General Sir George Jeffreys has now replied that the voter should not be "legally and financially responsible" for the consequences of his act, but he "is, of course, morally responsible."

I shall not have voted for the party returned to power on February 23, so I shall not, as Sir George admits, be "morally responsible" for the consequences of its actions, but willy-nilly I shall legally and financially have to bear the same consequences as the voters who will be "morally responsible" because they voted for it. Either Sir George is wrong when he says that the voter is "morally responsible" for his vote or he is in favour of the legal and financial systems being immoral.—Yours, etc.

Sidelight on "Opinion"

"John Batten, Eastbourne energetic—and soon to transfer his talents to brewers Watney, Combe and Reid—pinpricked the Newspaper Society when, with pardonable self-satisfaction, he made known just how much he had been able to get the Press to print about 'the sun trap of the south.'

"Now it's the turn of S. J. Byron, Press officer of the National Federation of Dyers and Cleaners, to demonstrate his indifference to possible criticism by publishers.

"He does so by writing to the trade Press about his annual report, in which he claims that editorial coverage secured by him for the NFDC reached 44,000,000 readers 'through national, provincial and county newspapers.'

"Some 29 feature articles and 'feature news stories' dealing with various aspects of dry cleaning and dyeing were run in national and leading daily and evening provincial papers, he says.

"Coverage, for a single month, was at its peak in May, when National Federation of Dyers and Cleaners stories went into papers with a total sale of 9,274,500.

"An impressive record, especially with a subject that probably calls for some hard working.

"I wonder, though, how far such a cards-on-the-table routine is likely to prejudice editors against future releases?"

—World's Press News, February 16.

Full Employment an "End in Itself"

The Church Times for February 24, published on its front page replies of candidates at Chelmsford to questions framed by the Rev. D. A. Rhymes, priest-in-charge of the Church of the Ascension. The candidates were Wing-Commander Ernest Millington (Labour Member in the last Parliament) and Mr. Herbert Ashton (Conservative), who was returned at the election.

The first question, headed boldly "Why Full Employment" by The Church Times, and the replies to this question were as follows:—

1. What do you conceive to be the fundamental pur-

poses of industry and commerce? Are "production" and "full employment" ends in themselves?

The Labour candidate's reply was: "The fundamental purpose of industry and commerce is to create and distribute the wealth, which is God's bounty to man, to the end that all his creatures may live a full life. 'Production' and 'full employment' are instruments of this purpose; for men compelled to see their dependants with empty stomachs cannot develop as Christ would like."

The Conservative candidate replied: "Yes, production and full employment are ends in themselves. We learn in Genesis that man is told, 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.' The fundamental purpose of industry and commerce is to provide good wages and good conditions for their employees, and reasonable returns to those who provide and risk the capital. As we live more than any other nation by export and import, we must produce competitively. If we do not, then social security and our standard of living will be gravely menaced."

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/-
Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan	5/- (cloth 8/6)
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.