

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 3.

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

### Lothair

By H. SWABEY

Disraeli wrote *Lothair* more than twenty years after *Tancred*, his last novel, and it appeared in 1870. He had been Prime Minister for most of 1868, but in this book he mentions only one date (1867) and no British politicians. Disraeli concentrates attention on the struggle between the Secret Societies and the Roman Church, and Lothair himself is involved in both vortices in such a way as to suggest that they were something like conspiracy and counter conspiracy. The Roman Church then was still a temporal power, and Disraeli hints, I think, that temporal power is always liable to use deceit. A third influence is that of the Church of England. Disraeli had not spared this Church in his earlier books, but by this time it was, apparently, fulfilling its function. Just what this function was, in his eyes and in reality, is one of the vital considerations that arise out of *Lothair*. Each influence has its lady president, and Lothair is charmed by all three: but the rebel is killed, the Roman enters a convent, and he is more than satisfied with the Church of England Lady. Disraeli treats the three positions clearly and, with the one reservation mentioned, fairly, and also makes some valuable remarks in defence of Religion against scientists and German liberals.

One curious omission is that this champion of the soil, who had parted with Peel when he betrayed the landed interest, has nothing to say about a single crop near any of the country mansions he describes. The British country house appears in an "essentially romantic" Wordsworthian or in a suburban setting, and exotic fruit seems to be its only product. Crops are described in an Aegean isle and near Jerusalem, but not at home. It was, in fact, during the seventies that the great agricultural decline began in England. Another fault in the background is caused by Disraeli's failure to pursue his investigation of Dutch finance. As C. Hollis wrote, in *The Breakdown of Money*, "The Act of 1819 rendered the Government impotent against the banks; the Act of 1844 rendered the banks impotent against the acceptance houses, or the joint stock banks impotent against the Bank of England." The discoveries of gold in California (1848) and in Australia (1851) somewhat offset the restrictive legislation.

It would probably be simplest first to show what Rome thought of the secret societies, and then to see what the secret societies and Disraeli thought of Rome. To give the devil his due, freemasons probably first met in secret to escape the attentions of the Holy Office with the object of doing something to repair Rome's inertia. Pope Benedict's letter *Vix Pervenit*, of 1745, it is true rejected the idea that usury was legitimate if it was to be used for productive purposes, while he allowed partnership and legitimate interest. And the laws restricting usury were abrogated in France in 1789. But the illuminati used freemasonry on the continent as a

violent instrument. Not the least of the services rendered to the community by Major Douglas and the T.S.C. has been that of reviving the wisdom humanity has collected. And *corruptio optimi pessima* is the phrase applicable to the whole Rome-secret societies situation.

Lothair himself has social views: "You cannot have too much education provided it be founded on a religious basis. I would sooner renounce the whole of my inheritance than consent to secular education . . . Pauperism is the terror of Europe and the disgrace of Britain. It is not so much an affair of wages as of dwellings." And he knows a little about the world: "No doubt if your lordship went into the street and said you wanted £10,000, fifty people would supply you immediately. But you would have to pay for it. Some enormous usury." He was possibly aware that Queen Anne's law restricting usury to 5 per cent. had been abrogated, together with all other restrictions on usury, in 1854. But it is the Cardinal who puts the Roman point of view on educational matters and then brings him more fully into the know.

"I cannot understand why religion should be inconsistent with civilisation," said Lothair.

"Religion is civilisation," said the Cardinal, "the highest: it is the reclamation of man from savageness by the Almighty. What the world calls civilisation, as distinguished from religion, is a retrograde movement, and will ultimately lead us back to the barbarism from which we have escaped. For instance, you talk of progress. What is the chief social movement of all countries that three centuries ago separated from the unity of the Church of Christ? The rejection of the sacrament of Christian matrimony. The introduction of the law of divorce, which is, in fact, only a middle term to the abolition of marriage. What does this mean? The extinction of the home and the household on which God has rested civilisation. If there be no home, the child belongs to the state, not to the parent. The state educates the child, and without religion. . . . And this system, which would substitute for domestic sentiment and Divine belief the unlimited and licentious action of human intellect and human will, is called progress. . . ."

"What I regret, sir, . . . is that the Church of Rome should have placed itself in antagonism with political liberty."

"I cannot admit," replied the Cardinal, "that the Church is in antagonism with political freedom . . . there can be no political freedom which is not founded on Divine authority; otherwise it can be at best a specious phantom of license inevitably terminating in anarchy. The rights and liberties of the people of Ireland have no advocates except the Church; because there political freedom is founded on Divine authority; but if you mean by political freedom the schemes of the illuminati and the freemasons, which perpetually torture the Continent, all the dark conspiracies of the secret societies, there, I admit, the Church is in antagonism with

such aspirations after liberty; those aspirations, in fact, are blasphemy and plunder; and if the Church were to be destroyed, Europe would be divided between the Atheist and the Communist.”

Lothair had only had experience of a Fenian meeting at the time, where he heard a speech on the advantages of education. “Education taught them to know their rights. But what was the use of knowing their rights unless they enforced them? That was not to be done by prayer books but by something else, and something else wanted a subscription.” His plea that he already belonged to “the Church of my fathers” is brushed aside by the Cardinal. “The Church of England . . . was mine. I think of it ever with tenderness and pity. Parliament made the Church of England and Parliament will unmake the Church of England. The Church of England is not the Church of the English. Its fate is sealed. It will soon become a sect, and all sects are fantastic.” The Cardinal ends his discourse by suggesting that Lothair should go to Rome. “Almost all that Europe contains is derived from Rome. . . . I believe the Roman people to be the best that ever lived, and this too while the secret societies have their agents in every quarter, trying to corrupt them. . . . If an act of political violence occurs, you may be sure it is confined entirely to foreigners.”

The Monsignore Berwick continues the complaint, but not to Lothair: “If I had only to deal with men, I would not admit of failure; but when your antagonists are human thoughts, represented by invisible powers, there is something that might baffle a Machiavel and appal a Borgia. . . . A month ago, the revolution seemed lifeless, penniless. At present, they are assembling by thousands on our frontiers; they have received two large consignments of small arms, and apparently have unlimited credit with the trade, both in Birmingham and Liege. . . . Something has happened to us also during the last month.”

“The secret societies? . . . the facts are startling. A month ago, the secret societies in France were only a name . . . at present we know that they are in complete organisation . . . the prefects write that the Mary-Anne associations, which are essentially republican and are scattered about the provinces, are all revived and are astir. *Mary-Anne*, as you know, was the red name for the Republic years ago. . . I wish I could induce you to consider more favourably the suggestion that His Holiness should content himself with the ancient city, and, in possession of St. Peter's and the Vatican, leave the rest of Rome to the . . . mundane anxieties of the transient generation.”

“*Non possumus*,’ said Berwick, ‘sooner than that Attila, the Constable of Bourbon, or the blasphemous orgies of the Red Republic! After all, it is the Church against the secret societies. They are the only two strong things in Europe, and will survive kings, emperors, or parliaments.’”

Lothair did in fact visit Rome, but not under circumstances of which the Cardinal would have approved, for he came as a member of the revolutionary army. Disraeli examines the movement from the inside, quite sympathetically. “In France,” according to Lothair's general, “the name of Mary-Anne is a name of magic . . . There are more secret societies in France at this moment than at any period since '85.” To the minds of his new companions Rome was “that country which first impressed upon the world a general and enduring form of masculine virtue; the land of liberty, and law, and eloquence, and military

genius, now garrisoned by monks and governed by a doting priest.” The leading lady “embarked on that perilous enterprise of personally conferring with the chiefs of those secret societies of France which had been fancifully baptised by her popular name.” On her return she reports, “The heads of the societies have met in council and resolved that if France will refuse to interfere, no domestic disturbance shall be attempted during this reign. . . . They did something like this before the Italian war, when he hesitated about heading the army from the fear of domestic revolution. Anxious to secure the freedom of Italy, they apprised him that if he personally entered the field they would undertake to ensure tranquillity at home. The engagement was scrupulously fulfilled. . . . It is a mighty struggle; it is a struggle between the Church and the secret societies; and it is a death struggle.” She continues: “Clear your mind of all these dark feelings about the *Madre Natura*. All that we require is that the most powerful and the most secret association in Europe should ratify what the local societies of France have already intimated. It will be enough.”

At this point Disraeli gives a description of the *Madre Natura*, which “is the oldest, the most powerful and the most occult of the secret societies of Italy. . . . the brotherhood assumed many outward forms: sometimes they were freemasons, sometimes they were soldiers, artists, men of letters. But their inward purpose . . . was to cherish the memory, and, if possible, to secure the restoration of the Roman Republic, and to expel from the Aryan settlement of Romulus the creeds and sovereignty of what they styled the Semitic invasion. The *Madre Natura* have a tradition that one of the most celebrated of the Popes was admitted to their fraternity as Cardinal dei Medici, and that when he ascended the throne, mainly through their labours, he was called upon to co-operate in the fulfilment of the great idea. An individual who in his youth has been a member of a secret society, and subsequently ascends a throne, may find himself in an embarrassing position. This, however, according to tradition, which there is some documentary ground to accredit, was not the perplexing position of his Holiness, Pope Leo X. His tastes and convictions were in entire unison with his early engagements. . . . The chief tenet of the society is denoted by its name. They could conceive nothing more benignant and beautiful . . . than that system of creative order to which they owed their being . . . they recognised the inability of the Latin race to pursue the worship of nature in an abstract spirit, and they desired to revive those exquisite personifications of the abounding qualities of the mighty mother, which the Aryan genius had bequeathed to the admiration of man. . . . They guarded against the corruptions and abuses of the religion of nature by the entire abolition of the priestly order. . . .”

The General has misgivings before accepting this help: “I had hoped I had heard the last of the *Madre Natura* . . . Its last effort appalled and outraged Europe.” Another influential personage also needs persuading. “Rome can only be freed by the Romans,” he is told. “He looks upon the secret societies of his own country as he does upon the universal suffrage: a wild beast, and dangerous, but which may be watched and tamed and managed by the police . . . we can make great offers. Make them. The revolution in Gaul is ever a mimicry of Italian thought and life. Their great affair of the last century, which they have so marred and muddled, would never have occurred had it not been for Tuscan reform; 1848 was the echo of our societies . . .”

Let him consent to Roman freedom, and *Madre Natura* will guarantee him . . . he knows that what is registered by the most ancient power in the world is sacred. . . . It is *Madre Natura* against *St. Peter's*. Never was the abomination of the world so active as at present.”

The murders of 1793 and the tyranny of the Convention are almost as well known as more recent revolutionary glories. It might be worth noting two of the achievements of that time which are also significant: “The Constitution, in failing to supply any counterpoise between the powers, has prepared a continuous struggle between the king and the legislative body. Government is a kind of seesaw.” (Marck, 10th October, 1791). More ominously, “The French have made a discovery more disastrous to the human race than gunpowder when they said, Let us make every man into a soldier.” (Pellenc, 29th October, 1793). An unstable constitution and totalitarian war were indeed grim scalps on *Madre Natura's* girdle.

In the middle of the clash, Disraeli notes some of the spectators: “The Jews in their quarter spoke nothing, but exchanged a curious glance, as if to say: ‘Has it come at last? And will they indeed serve her as she served Sion?’”

But Lothair's friends lose the day, and he is taken into a Roman hospital. “Cardinal Berwick had gained . . . the great object of a churchman's ambition, which even our Laud was thinking at one time of accepting, although he was to remain a firm Anglican. In the death-struggle between the Church and the Secret Societies, Berwick had been the victor, and no one in the Sacred College more truly deserved the scarlet hat.”

Lothair, meanwhile, recovers but is never left alone. The Cardinal shows him the Propaganda and the Holy Office, and claims that “complete popular education only existed at Rome.” There was, it had to be admitted, a garrison, “but not against the Romans . . . It is the Secret Societies of Atheism who have established their lodges in this city, entirely consisting of foreigners, that have rendered these lamentable precautions necessary. They will not rest until they have extirpated the religious principle from the soul of man, and reduced him to the condition of wild beasts.” But Lothair was not happy. “The despair came over him that involves a man engaged in a hopeless contest with a remorseless power.” The petty plot in London “was only a part of a great and unceasing and triumphant conspiracy.” In his desperation he “made a distinction between the Cardinal and the conspirators.” But the Cardinal is content enough: “Some of the most notorious atheists of Rome have already solicited to be admitted to the offices of the Church; the Secret Societies have received their death-blow; I look to the alienation of England as virtually over.” Lothair is not consoled, and manages to slip away.

He joins a friend, who takes him to an Aegean island and bids him, “Welcome to an Aryan clime, an Aryan landscape, and an Aryan race. It will do you good after your Semitic hallucinations.” This character had an interesting dialogue with Lothair:

“ . . . might I venture to ask what you may consider the true principles of art?”

“*Aryan* principles,” said Mr. Phoebus; ‘not merely the study of nature, but of beautiful nature; the art of design in a country inhabited by a first-rate race . . . these conditions prevailed from the age of Pericles to the age of Hadrian in pure Aryan communities, but Semitism then began to prevail,

and ultimately triumphed. Semitism has destroyed art; it taught man to despise his own body. . . .’

“But if by Semitism you mean religion, surely the Italian painters inspired by Semitism did something?”

“Semitism gave them subjects but the Renaissance gave them Aryan art, and it gave that art to a purely Aryan race. But Semitism rallied in the shape of the Reformation, and swept all away. When Leo X was Pope, popery was pagan; popery is now Christian and art is extinct.”

Mr. Phoebus had little objection to the Greek priest on the island, for he “is not at all Semitic; there is nothing to counteract his Aryan tendencies.” But Disraeli's religious attitude needs the closest scrutiny. At times, Christianity appears to be in his eyes the instrument of Semitism. He called it *Judaism for the multitude in Tancred*. I see no reason to accept this definition, any more than to accept the point of view of Mr. Phoebus that the corrosive Reformation bigots were particularly Christian. It is true enough that much “reformed” Christianity was overloaded with the Old Testament, of the oldest strata; but Christianity made little headway among the semites, and the Church drew as freely and as legitimately on the “Aryan” heritage as on the Jewish. It might well be argued that the alarming power complex of Rome, which he alleges, was its most semitic feature. Absolute power, of course, was not liked among the Jews, who based their state on a curious type of tripod consisting of Jehovah, King and People. But middle eastern despots are notorious.

In one passage Disraeli seems to express a more just, and more Anglican, point of view: “God works by races, and one was appointed to reveal and expound the spiritual nature of man. The Aryan and the Semite are of the same blood, but when they quitted their central land they were ordained to follow opposite courses. Each division has developed one portion of the double nature of humanity, till after all their wanderings they met again, and, represented by their two choicest families, the Hellenes and the Hebrews, brought together the treasures of their accumulated wisdom and secured the civilisation of man.”

Disraeli answered the opponents of religion more deftly than the ecclesiastics of the time: “They have declared war against the Church, the State and the domestic principle. All the great truths and laws on which the family reposes are denounced. . . . Instead of Adam, our ancestry is traced to the most grotesque of creatures; thought is phosphorus, the soul complex nerves, and our moral sense a secretion of sugar.” That was the Monsignore's view: the author goes deeper. “Chance, necessity, atomic theories, nebular hypotheses, development, evolution, the origin of worlds, human ancestry; here were high topics; . . . and what then? There must be design, and if there were design there must be intelligence. . . . The brain that teems with illimitable thought will never recognise as his creator any power of nature, however irresistible, that is not gifted with consciousness . . . ethics and atheism are impossible and without ethics no human order can be strong or permanent.” Further remarks occur here and there which, practically speaking, turn the Marxist front: “Science may prove the insignificance of this globe in the scale of creation, but it cannot prove the insignificance of man. . . . The belief in a Creator who is unconscious of creating is more monstrous than any dogma . . . the natural forces to which all creation is now attributed

(Continued on Page 8).

## 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. 25. No. 3. Saturday, September, 16, 1950.

### From Week to Week

#### THE BRUSSELS REVOLUTION:

"It is a fallacy to believe that the Belgian crisis will have no reactions, for it is a flagrant imposition of the will of the minority on the majority in the name of liberal democracy. Force breeds force. This was the democracy of conspiracy and secret societies."—*The Catholic Times*, August 11, 1950.

"We have been looking on at a classic example, almost at our own doors, of precisely the 'evil things' we are called upon to resist in more distant scenes.

"There is no need to take any particular view of the merits of the controversy about King Leopold's action in 1940. That subject has been judged by the Belgian people who by a larger majority than that enjoyed by most governments of the world decided in favour of the King. That verdict has been challenged and defeated by violence.

"We are quite unable to follow the logic by which anyone can condemn this in Korea and defend it in Brussels.

"With a few exceptions, the attitude of the British Press has been deplorable."—*The Universe*, August 4.

It is increasingly clear that the occult forces behind the present World Revolution attach great importance to the conception of two-dimensional reality. The past is past, the future never comes; there is nothing but the Eternal Now.

It is quite possible that, properly understood, but not as the Devil would have us understand it, a four-dimensional Now is a permanent reality. What we call cause and effect may be the same thing in a space-time continuum. Whether this is so or not, it is quite certain that the past, the present and the future are indissolubly linked; and to suppose anything else is to believe that you can begin to build a brick chimney half its height from the ground.

But you can build a chimney half way up, and then pull it down; and it is quite evident that our New Order is doing just that, and that centuries, and perhaps milleniums of human effort are being reduced to rubble. The checks on entropy are nearly gone; the economist calls it sabotage, but in essence it is the same thing.

From *The Australian Social Crediter* (August 26):—

#### THE PRIZE FIGHT.

On another page we publish information relating to the Jews in key positions of control in Russia. Although the system of government in the U.S.A. renders it somewhat less

obvious, it is a fact that a large number of positions of direct and indirect importance are held by Jews in that country. The influence they exert was made manifest in the 'American' attitude towards the Zionist claim to Palestine, and the subsequent recognition by President Truman of Israel when the Jews conquered it in direct defiance of the United Nations. Bernard Baruch, the "elder statesman" and "adviser" of "Presidents," is one example, and Felix Frankfurter, whose nominees, like Alger Hiss and Dean Acheson, have so largely staffed Government offices, is another. It is notorious that the great international banking houses, now headquartered in New York, are almost exclusively Jewish controlled; and as money is created and controlled by banks, and not by Governments, the significance of Jewish control in this sphere requires no emphasis.

Of all the races in the world, the Jews are the most race-conscious. Their psychology is largely conditioned by the Chosen People myth on the one hand, and "anti-semitism" on the other. The basis of either the Chosen People myth or of anti-semitism is irrelevant in this connection; both things exist as powerful social forces acting on the Jews. As a result, Jews the whole world over, and whether they are religious or not, are profoundly conscious of their Jewishness, and feel thickness of the blood-connection as no other race does.

These are facts of great importance, and to ignore them in a study of the world crisis is like ignoring the force of gravity in the study of aero-dynamics.

World politics are occurring at the present time in a field of force of which the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia are the poles. We have in mind the analogy of the magnetic field; and just as such a field is generated by the two poles of *one* magnet, so the preponderant Jewish element in the control of both the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia is one entity. There may or may not be real conflict between the U.S.A. and Russia, with the rest of the world dragged in; but if there is, it will be the Gentiles of the belligerent countries who will fight to their mutual destruction. In this process, the populations involved will become enslaved to their Governments, because that is the mode of total war; and those Governments are effectively Jewish, with a veneer of gentile politicians.

The Jew, perhaps rightly, despises the Gentile for his lack of subtlety and imagination. It does seem to be true that the comprehension of such a vast and daring evil design is beyond the grasp of the Gentile mind. If it is explained to him, he cannot imagine it, and therefore does not believe it. This is probably the result, not of any lack of natural endowment, but of a persistent and deliberate demoralisation and degradation, beginning in school 'education,' and carried to finality through the Press and the film. A statement such as this appears to be extravagant to the Gentile mind. Again he cannot imagine it. Yet he knows that the Nazi Party did it in Germany; he knows that the Communists are doing it now, even in Australia. For a long time the Communist influence in education, both school and University, and in public Associations like youth organisations and scientific bodies, was hardly even suspected, and in fact was largely disbelieved when first exposed. There is, however, an exactly similar Jewish infiltration, amounting to control of the main organs of news and opinion. "The control of news and the control of finance are concentric."

The present world situation is fraught with awful peril,  
 (Continued on Page 8).

## "Full Employment" II.

By JAMES GUTHRIE\*

The political battlecry "Full Employment," backed by high pressure salesmanship, has become "accepted" by large sections of the population as the alternative to the "unemployment" caused by financial "depressions." That "Full Employment" appears the only answer to unemployment seems natural enough, that is if unemployment is the thing that we are trying to eliminate. But it is necessary here, to be sure, that we are not being tricked by abstract words into doing something in complete opposition to all we desire and believe.

If we examine the matter more closely we find certain facts which make us wonder. Is it not a fact that intelligent men and women, from the beginning of time, have tried to do away with unnecessary labour, *i.e.*, full employment? Is it not a fact that the highest paid men in the community, such as managers and technicians, are paid to do away with unnecessary labour? Is it not a fact that the function of industry is not to supply us with full employment but to do away with the need for full employment, or to reduce official employment to a minimum? To clinch the matter, let us remove the doing of a job of work from the treacherous, fog-bound marshes of politics, and let us look at it as it has been looked at for countless centuries.

What kind of a reception do you think a salesman would get if, when visiting housewives, instead of trying to sell labour-saving gadgets, he tried to sell something that would ensure full employment for the housewife, for all day, and every day, irrespective of what she did or wanted to do and irrespective of time and place and the needs of her particular household? Ridiculous as it may appear, this is exactly the idea that high-pressure political salesmen, of all colours, are trying to sell us.

Unemployment is not a sign that industry has failed in its responsibilities; rather, it is a sign that it has succeeded in its special function of doing a job with a minimum amount of labour, *i.e.*, a minimum claim on the services of the community.

Financial "Depressions" are produced by those in control of the financial system. The means of causing depressions and of eliminating them are well known to those in control, and the mass unemployment caused by a financial depression over large areas is neither necessary nor natural; it is purely an instrument of policy—a policy of terrorisation similar to the policy behind the atomic bomb.

At the present time we are enjoying, or suffering, a period of "Full Employment." I won't say everybody is fully employed, but everyone who wants to, can punch a clock and draw an income.

The tremendous demand for labour at the present time is due chiefly to, let us say, a man called Hitler. Hitler, with the help of the Allies, having destroyed many towns in Europe, and having withdrawn millions of men from useful production for five years, has given us all a big job to catch up with the devastation they have wrought.

All I wish to point out here is that full employment, in these days of power driven machinery, is not possible unless means are used, as in war, to destroy capital and consumption goods on a vast scale; and the "Full Employment" of these

post-war years is singularly without profit for vast numbers of people, and collectively does not re-imburse the population for the heavy losses of past years.

In the forefront of preventives advocated for future unemployment is the planning of large "Public Works" to absorb the idle labour. Apart from the fact that jobs so supplied are almost useless for any other than the pick and shovel men, there are other points of importance to be noticed.

A community, having produced its immediate requirements, can devote some of its spare time to making labour-saving tools. Now, labour-saving tools mean tools to do away with labour, *i.e.*, to do away with "Full Employment," and as each labour-saving device is produced, then, naturally more time and labour can be freed to produce more labour-saving devices, and so on *ad infinitum*.

It should be noted that labour-saving devices are not limited to power driven tools; a means of bringing criminals in high places to justice would eliminate the labour involved in war, in killing and maiming millions of innocent people.

The result of the increasing use of labour-saving devices should be a progressive reduction in the hours of labour, or in prices, or in both together. But the cost of everything has increased steadily during four hundred years, and there is nothing to indicate that it will not keep on increasing.

Here then we come face to face with a blatant contradiction of all the physical facts of a modern power driven production system, a contradiction so outrageous that no serious student of politics can escape its terrible implications. Mr. Menzies' explanation that the workers are not working hard enough has sufficient truth in it to satisfy many people, but just how much of the truth does it represent? It is certainly not the whole truth because the increase in prices has gone on since Henry the Eighth's time, and that's a few years before Mr. Menzies' time; and it has gone on in all countries, pre-war and post-war.

One definition of an engineer is: "A man who could make for 1/- what anybody else could make for a £1." But it would appear, with the aid of "science," "invention," modern "education" and "full employment" we can now make for £1 what our great grandfathers made better for 5/- and what the 14th century Englishman made for about 1d.

Whatever 'policy' lies behind "Full Employment" there are certain things we do know, and these are that the international policy makers responsible for this policy are socialists to a man, or rather they use the socialists and communists and the whole leftist apparatus as their willing tools. We also know that socialists and communists look upon profit as an evil thing. And as profit means the "natural reward of successful effort" we are justified in assuming that the policy of "Full Employment" is designed to keep every man fully employed without profit to himself or to his family.

It should be noticed that since the 40-hour week has been instituted, men with any responsibilities are probably working more hours per week than ever before. There are also more married women seeking employment outside their homes in order to balance the family budget. This means that "Full Employment" has not only reduced the leisure hours of the population, it has also failed to deliver the goods and services required in the home. It has failed to do this even though the average size of family has been very

\*In *The Australian Social Crediter*.

greatly reduced. Truly, the socialists have achieved their objective—that whatever a man shall work for, contrive for, or fight for, it will be without profit for himself, his family and his country.

### III.

In days not so remote, outside the larger towns what men were, what they did and what contribution they made to society was fairly well known; secondly, the rural population was larger in numbers than the urban population; and thirdly, such organisations as the armed forces, the civil service, and financial, industrial and commercial organisations claimed only a very small percentage of the population.

The result of these conditions was that life was more intimate, and information, at least for the active members of the community, was first hand, instead of being reported from "reliable sources." If there were treachery one knew whom to deal with. The unstable and irresponsible sections of the community, which were found in large towns, were swamped by the overwhelming health and strength of the rural population, and there was nothing like the large collection of clock punchers, which have turned our industrial centres into the political, social and economic plague spots of the world.

In earlier times, most urban families must have been connected closely with rural families living on their farms; this meant that many city dwellers were connected, if not permanently, at least in emergency, with a source of abundant food and shelter, and could live on a farm for a year or so, and have plenty of food to eat, and beer to drink, without upsetting the economy of the farm. In fact it is recorded that up to the "Reformation," in the 16th century, men could travel throughout the country and be sure of a bed and food wherever they went, and without paying a penny for it.

All these things meant that the interruption to a person's financial income did not assume the serious proportions that it does today. After all it is not in the nature of things that the same income should arrive each week or month; the interruption to a person's financial income only becomes serious under certain unnatural conditions. These are important to remember:—

- (1) When a person has no direct access to food;
- (2) When a person has no reserves;
- (3) When a person is cut off from the accumulated wealth of his tribe or race.

Reserves in the hands of individuals, or private incomes, are what "Full Employment" is aimed at. That is why they are being systematically destroyed. We shall discuss them again later. Meanwhile, it is important to notice that the implementation of the policy of full employment is only possible by stripping the individual of all reserves. Having said this, we will accept the fact that today the only access most people have to food and clothes is through money tokens issued by the banking system, and obtained mostly by punching a clock in some organisation. This means, of course, that what a person can buy will depend largely on prices.

Before the Industrial Revolution the cost of goods was almost entirely a labour cost; today, especially in heavily mechanised industries, the cost charged against machinery is often many times that charged against labour; also, when

the population was largely rural, cash transactions were not necessary for many commodities made and grown on the farm. When a man bought anything from his neighbour he got for a day's earnings the equivalent of a day's labour, or something very near to it.

Even in the days before the chemical combines, kerosene tractors and agricultural colleges, even before the use of selected seed and pedigree stock, even as far back as the 14th century, a labourer in England could obtain for a day's labour as much or more food as a labourer working in the most favoured countries today. In the light of "Modern Education," "Modern Science" and Invention, modern management and of power driven tools, these facts are astounding.

Today with the use of machinery, credit finance, re-investments and a variety of charges not represented by payments to individuals, overhead charges have assumed a larger proportion of prices than cash disbursements to individuals in the form of wages, salaries and dividends. The result is that the community has not the purchasing power to buy the goods and services it collectively produces, and, in spite of, or because of, mass production, inferior quality, rationalisation of industry, amalgamations, chain stores, co-operative stores, etc., the prices in shops become more and more of a nightmare to housewives; entering a shop is like entering a sub-branch of the taxation department, and one leaves in a similar fashion—a numbed, subdued and resentful pauper.

In an editorial in *The Australian Social Crediter* (May 20, 1950), an analysis of seventeen thousand public companies in Britain showed that disbursements to individuals amounted to only 46 per cent. of the total prices which were charged to the community. This bears out the analysis made by Major Douglas thirty years ago, and this analysis was probably the greatest contribution made to economic thought during the last 100 years. Needless to say, the professors of the London School of Economics (the socialists' staff college) did not think much of this contribution.

Nevertheless the fact remains that the people cannot buy the current goods and services they collectively contribute. During periods of intense activity in the production of capital goods sufficient money is paid out in wages, etc., to buy all the consumption goods for sale, but the cost of the capital goods still remains a charge against the future, i.e., against future consumption goods. And as modern industry is progressively producing more capital goods in proportion to consumption goods, the prices charged to the public become progressively more impossible to pay. Hence the increasing use of hire-purchase systems (consumer credits).

This then is the reason why reduction in labour charges has not reduced prices as it logically should, and you can imagine what contribution Mr. Menzies is likely to make, with graduates of the London School of Economics in the key positions in Australia, and with Dr. Coombs selected as Chairman of the new Commonwealth Bank Board (appointed by the Menzies government).

The irritation caused by rising prices is playing right into the hands of the communists, and the communists are correct when they say that there is no solution under the present "capitalist" system: they would be more correct if they said "under the present financial system."

The communists are quite correct when they say "private enterprise" cannot provide "Full Employment"; they are

quite wrong when they think it should do this. What private enterprise can do, and has done, is to reduce the labour required to produce goods and services. The fact that banking policy is controlled by a centralised super-government is not the fault of private enterprise. Production and the issue of credit are two separate functions, and the fact that the latter is not a strict reflection of the former is a tragedy that no newspaper cares to discuss.

### Social Credit

The Deputy Chairman of the Social Credit Secretariat has replied as follows to a correspondent abroad:—

“August 16, 1950.

“Dear Mr. . . . . ,

“In reply to your letter of July 20, you say (1) that you have been a Social Crediter for a number of years, and (2) that someone has told you that you cannot be a Social Crediter and an Atheist, as you claim to be.

“ . . . From our point of view, the matter does not present very great difficulty. The whole question is one of the correspondence between labels and what the labels are held to represent. Quite clearly, you personally see no incompatibility between your being a Social Crediter and an Atheist at the same time: that is to say that, as you understand Social Credit on the one hand and Atheism on the other, there is, for you, no incompatibility between the two philosophies (if you are willing to go so far as to call Atheism a philosophy). If this is so, surely no one can contradict you—you are the authority on this matter. But it is equally clear that, allowing the terms “Social Credit” and “Atheism” to stand for some reality, whether tangible or intangible, one or other or both of *these realities* may bear little or no relation to the conception formed about them in some individual mind. That is to say, Atheism may not be, in reality what you deem it to be; or Social Credit may not be in reality what you deem it to be; and, if one or other or both are essentially different from what you deem them to be, it is quite possible for them to be incompatible with one another, though there is no incompatibility between your ideas of them. It is useless for me to speculate about this, isn't it?

“I am a professional biologist, and as such I think I understand the nature of the differences which separate people concerning, say, evolution or Darwinism. I am old enough to have seen something of the progressive change or shift of ideas since, say, 1890. The only people claiming to be Atheists with whom I have come in contact (outside of books) have been, also, either Marxists or people who share with the Marxists the notion that the universe is sustained by a ‘dialectic’ which has no attributes except the power to sustain the universe. Notice that this is not, however, true Philosophical Atheism: It does not envisage the absence of a power sustaining the universe; it asserts its existence, on the contrary; and, in addition, it asserts that *IT* has no attribute besides the attribute of sustaining the universe. Belief in the thesis put forward by Major Douglas (known as the A + B Theorem) is consistent with the dogma I have described, and *vice versa*—*i.e.*, so far as I can see: one might believe both propositions to be true without inconsistency. But, if one did believe both of these propositions, there would seem to me to be lacking any reason at all why the believer should act upon either of them. What I mean is this: what is the use of a technique for ‘adjusting,’ if there is nothing to *ad-*just to, and even the bare notion of just, or correct, or compliant,

the whole notion of *re-*lationship, referring back, as it does, to something consistent external to phenomena, is just blah? In other words, why trouble yourself to put the world, or anything else, ‘straight’ when there is no such thing as ‘straight’?

“Only you can answer these questions—for yourself.

“So far as we are concerned, the Reality we have discerned (see *Social Credit: The Policy of a Philosophy*, by C. H. Douglas) is a Reality which comprises not only a flaw in the accepted system of cost accountancy but also the reasons why it should be acknowledged to be a flaw and the reasons why the flaw should be corrected, removed. It seems to me that, if what you say concerning your desire to continue to ‘work for Social Credit’ is true (and I have no reason to doubt it), you cannot really entertain a view of the universe which gives no ground for continuous effort of any kind. But this is your affair. What I should strongly urge you to do is to cease from arguing with your Social Credit friends about the opinions you embraced before you became acquainted with us, while quietly trying to see where we have got to in the great conflict which is being waged all around us.”

### The Perpetual Power Machine Electricity for Ever?

Under the above heading the following appeared in the *North Wales Chronicle* for August 25:—

Sir,—I was exasperated to read in your account (on August 11) of the tour of proposed hydro-electric sites by Welsh M.P.'s conducted by officials of the British Electricity Authority that the Divisional Controller, Mr. A. R. Cooper, told the M.P.'s that “from their (*i.e.* the B.E.A.'s) point of view the mountains provided power in perpetuity.”

It is a seductive notion, well calculated to divert attention from the enormous cost of these schemes in relation to their output. Granted the capital cost is high, once you have built your dams and installed your equipment, the idea is put about that you have provided posterity with a perpetual power machine which will supply electricity for ever—subject, of course, to the small cost of maintaining equipment.

Mr. Cooper must know that this is nonsense; but I suppose it is good enough for M.P.'s and the public until it is exposed. Even a natural lake has a limited life: the Nant Ffrancon was once a lake, and is now one no longer; but the life of an artificial lake made by suddenly throwing a dam across a river valley is necessarily shorter.

Everyone (and especially an angler) knows that the Ogwen in spate is clouded with silt, a large proportion of which must be deposited in the reservoir if the river is dammed. Here are some figures from other countries: The Austin Dam, Texas, U.S.A., lost 72 *per cent.* of its storage capacity in seven years; the Guthrie Dam, Okla., U.S.A., lost 15 *per cent.* in 15 years; the Elephant Butte Dam, U.S.A., controlling an irrigated area of two million acres, is expected to have a useful life of eighty years. In Australia, at Cunningham Creek, N.S.W., a dam 42 feet high, built in 1912, was rendered completely useless by siltation in 17 years; the Laanecoorie Reservoir has had its capacity reduced from 14 thousand to six thousand acre feet, and so on.

These results come from bigger rivers and more rapidly eroding soils in drier climates, but I think they make my point. The only thing which remains “in perpetuity” is a

great mass of concrete (with associated mess of metal and other junk) holding up a vast mass of silt, on top of what was once a cultivated valley, which, for a small proportion of the capital cost, could have been made more fertile.

It is true that the climate here is less favourable to erosion, and that the rivers of Snowdonia are short and carry little water so that the life of reservoirs may be longer; especially if afforestation and other anti-erosion measures are carried out on the hills. Presumably, while talking about "perpetuity" to the public, the B.E.A. has been making calculations of the estimated life of the various reservoirs proposed and it would be interesting to know what the estimates are. But they cannot have it both ways. If the estimated life is long it can be only because a large amount of land has been drowned to provide a relatively small amount of power from a small flow of water.

However, in the present state of the world the natural life of a dam may become a very theoretical figure. As our airmen showed in Germany, a dam is a most vulnerable thing to modern explosives, and the consequences of its breaking for those below it are well-known, particularly, alas! in North Wales. Every large dam will need elaborate defence in war, and so long as it exists, those below it are in danger in event of war, or sabotage. It is wishful thinking to suppose that the men whose policies now guide the world where it is going can erect anything which will endure "in perpetuity" except a monument to their own homicidal megalomania.—Yours, etc.,  
Bangor.

C. G. DOBBS.

**LOTHIAN** (Continued from page 3).

are unconscious, while consciousness is as inevitable a portion of our existence as the hand or the eye . . . by the various families of the nations, the designs of the Creator are accomplished." If the Anglican dignitaries had used intelligence of this kind, and not largely surrendered to what the *Daily Express* calls Butlerism—a half way house to mass propaganda and the loss of individual mind—one of them could hardly have recently described the Church of England as "an episcopal sect." The Anglican Church would more probably have fulfilled "that regeneration of the national spirit."

Disraeli claimed that the volumes of *Lothair* had been "more extensively read both by the people of the United Kingdom and of the United States than any work that has appeared for the last half century." He wrote this in the year Dickens died (1870), not seven years after Thackeray's death, while Trollope and George Eliot were well established. Evidently few who read the volumes took them very seriously. Possibly they deserved Mr. Phoebus's censure: "Man is born to observe, but if he falls into psychology he observes nothing . . . it is the eye that must be occupied and cultivated." But it is reasonable to suppose that Disraeli's purpose was to instruct as well as to amuse: to warn, in fact. The Cardinal is suave to the end:

"The very assembly of the Fathers of the Church will astound the Freemasons and the Secret Societies and the Atheists." But he tries at least to impress upon *Lothair* that these societies mean business:

"The anti-Christian societies are opposed to the principle of home. When they have destroyed the hearth, the morality of society will perish. . . . The Secret Societies are hurrying the civil governments of the world, and mostly the governments who disbelieve in their existence, to the brink

of a precipice, over which monarchies and law and civil order will ultimately fall and perish together."

In spite of the supposed derivation of masonry from Abiram, who is described in *Kilvert's Diary*, vol. 2, as "Solomon's chief builder of the Temple," the secret societies generally in *Lothair* are represented as "anti-semitic." Nor is there any hint of a connection between them and the Shem-ite money masters whom Disraeli had previously noted. It is of course continental masonry to which Disraeli refers, not to the British benefit societies. He makes it plain that on the continent they were used for other purposes. *Lothair*, in fact, draws attention to a further nexus of irresponsible power. The Rothschilds and the secret societies have such a large share of *de facto* government between them, Disraeli shows in his political novels, that the *de jure* rulers can be little more than puppets.

**FROM WEEK TO WEEK** (Continued from page 4).

for the Gentiles. It could never have come about but for 'American' policy during and after the 1939-45 war, when Allied strategy was distorted in favour of Russia. Our salvation at this stage may require war with Russia; but that by itself will certainly not be enough. Either with or without war, the Jew must be deposed from his control; and the first step in that direction is to understand its necessity.

**BOOKS TO READ**

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy .....	6/6
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**

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)
Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson .....	21/-
Odlum 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.