

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 27. No. 13.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

The Next Act

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*,
Sir,

Your readers will, for the most part, already have realised that the next Act in the drama, "The Great Plan" (under distinguished patronage) now playing to crowded if apathetic houses, is a war between the Lord's Anointed and Egypt, the fighting to be done as usual, by Britain, the arsenal of d'markracy to supply the weapons, and Israel to have the swag. The permanent command of the Middle East, including the Suez Canal and Persian oil, with Dead Sea chemicals, form a firm basis for World Credit Control.

Not much perspicacity is necessary to see the Plan, and the Front Line Commander, Lord Mountbatten, is no doubt already in the wings. What does not seem sufficiently appreciated is that once again the back-room boys show every sign of cashing in on the battle without sustaining a scratch.

It may seem, and no doubt is elementary, but the only hope for the decent man and woman is to ensure that the back-room boys burn their fingers to an extent which will put them permanently in the discard. The fact that it appears to be desperately difficult of achievement merely emphasises our nearness to final disaster.

I am, etc.,

C. H. DOUGLAS.

From Week to Week

ISRAEL WANTS. . . .

"Jerusalem, Sunday—The British-owned Palestine Potash Company, which has a concession to extract minerals from the Dead Sea, will be unable to resume its operations—which stopped at the outbreak of the Arab-Jewish war in 1947—unless it takes the Israeli Government into partnership, according to a reported decision of the Israeli Cabinet.

"Refusal to do so will result in the cancellation of the concession.

"It is stated that the partnership offer, which represents a compromise over the original plan completely to nationalise the industry was finally dictated as a result of the British elections.—*Exchange*." (The *Daily Mail* for November 12).

In regard to the foregoing, data concerning "The British-owned Palestine Potash Company's" concession have been published by Captain Arthur Rogers as an *Appendix* to "The Palestine Mystery." (Sterling Press, 50, Old Brompton Road, S.W.7. 1948. 2/-.)

This little publication cites a report issued in 1925 by the Crown Agent for the Colonies, on behalf of the Government of Palestine, on "Production of Minerals from the waters of the Dead Sea." This report ceased to be avail-

able for purchase soon after its publication, and the publishers (a Government Department) have refused permission for the photostatic reproduction of copies, although the British Museum authorities have courteously consented to provide them. There are copies in the Museum, the Colonial Office and the House of Commons. The following appears in the report:—

"From the foregoing figures the quantities of the salts in the Dead Sea are therefore approximately:

Potassium chloride	...	2,000	million metric tons.
Magnesium bromide	...	980	" " "
Sodium chloride	...	11,000	" " "
Magnesium chloride	...	22,000	" " "
Calcium chloride	...	6,000	" " "

For practical purposes, the supply of potash may be considered inexhaustible."

Captain Rogers then states: "In 1925, when the publication was issued, the market price of Magnesium chloride in the United Kingdom was £6 per ton. The Magnesium chloride alone was therefore worth £132,000,000,000 (One-hundred-and-thirty-two-thousand-million pounds sterling) at market prices. The value of the Potassium chloride, also based upon the same market prices, was the £16,000,000,000; and the value of the other chemicals mentioned also reached figures at which one's imagination boggles, the total being about £240,000,000,000 (two-hundred-and-forty-thousand-million pounds sterling). Since 1925, however, the market prices have increased greatly, in some cases to more than double the prices of that time. Moreover, the demand for chemicals is not decreasing. The rising demand is so great in relation to known and developed sources of supply that it would not be rash to say that it is likely to prove a major cause of the next world war."

What did Mr. Churchill say in 1951?—No, not about wars, but about monopolies?

The old *Morning Post* expired on a note of bean-spilling. Reading *The Guardian* on what is presumed to be its death-bed, we reflect that someone should tell Lord Nuffield that while he cannot undo the immense mischief his lavish endowments of 'RE-search' have effected, are effecting and will effect, the recording angel *might* hesitate before adding any more black marks if he were to give *The Guardian* a cool million—*bis dat qui cito dat!* (To intercede successfully for ourselves we are loth to try, since that might cause the angel to destroy his lordship's tablets and place most undeservedly a black mark on our own in vexation. And we are not on our deathbed.)

Says *The Guardian*:—

"Why are proposals like those made by Mr. Truman,

Mr. Acheson and Mr. Vishinsky made at all? Why should any Power make any proposals when it knows they will not, and cannot, be accepted? It would seem that all governments, whether Communist or non-Communist, feel it necessary to convince the world in general and their own people in particular that they are working for peace. Both are preparing for war—the Communist Coalition for offensive, the Atlantic Powers for defensive war. But whether the preparations are offensive or defensive, the public everywhere must be convinced by plausible declarations or world-embracing 'peace plans' that only peace is intended.

"Such plans are unrelated to the strategic realities of the situation or to the real aims of the Powers concerned.

"There are sheep in sheep's clothing just as there are wolves in sheep's clothing. The 'peace plans' are the clothing."

• • •

It might be well to keep in mind the names of the six back-bench 'Tories' who voted against the Schuman plan in the last Parliament. They were Air-Commodore Harvey (who also voted against the American Loan in the 1945 Parliament) Mr. Harry Legge-Bourke, Sir John Mellor (who also opposed the U.S. loan), Mr. Enoch Powell, Mr. Stephen McAdden, and Mr. Gerald Nabarro.

"Cross-Bencher" in the *Sunday Express* says of them:—

"They all have ability, courage, and drive. But not one, I am sorry to see, has a place in the new Tory Government."

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 7, 1951.

Debate on the Address

Mr. Angus Maude (Ealing, South): . . . My right hon. Friend the Chancellor dealt at some length with the question of profits. It is true that in the last six years, since the war ended, it has been easier to make high profits without being really efficient than probably at any period in my lifetime. Of course, in a time of inflation and rising prices profits inevitably rise, and the root cause of overeasy profits is not removed merely by taxing more of the profits away. The only effect of that is at one remove to tax the consumer who is paying the higher prices.

The effect of these controls on managements has, in many cases, been most unfortunate. To my way of thinking, managements, of which I have examined quite a number, have, in the least efficient sectors of industry, got into the habit of thinking that in certain lines they could make easy sales at guaranteed profits. We must cut out these easy profits by making competition a little stronger by ensuring that the man who has a good idea and the desire to expand, with a real urge to earn his profits by selling better quality goods cheaper, can increase his share of the market and put the rest of the industry on its toes.

Many businessmen have said to me what I know to be true, that since 1939 there has grown up in this country a generation of younger managers—they are by no means all like this, of course, but too many are—who have come to rely overmuch on the Ministry, the Government Department, to solve their problems for them. When some difficulty arises

about getting raw materials, when anything at all is held up, it is all too easy to pick up the telephone and ring up a civil servant in the hope that he will solve the problem, instead of doing what the older generation of businessmen would have done—getting a train, a car, or even an aeroplane, and going out to solve the problem themselves. We need far more inducements to efficiency in this country at the present moment.

I know the Government realise this, but I hope they will give an early assurance of their intention to do something which I believe to be vitally necessary, and that is the encouragement of individual initiative and the real instinct for self-help which exists in our people. During the lifetime of the last Government we saw too much of the attitude of mind evidenced during the fuel cuts of 1947, when because the use of electricity had to be cut for those who took their electricity from coal burning installations a man who generated his electricity from a wind pump had to be stopped from using it in case he should get an unfair advantage. That sort of restriction, which carries egalitarianism to the most ridiculous extreme, must go.

We have an immense but frustrated volume of self-help and instinct for self-preservation, and of the desire to do things to help the country to get out of its present difficulties. For example, I know of people who are doggedly, bit by bit and year by year, building their own houses with their own hands, using £100 worth of their own labour and materials every year, building one room a year and putting a tarpaulin over it until they get the timber to finish the job. That sort of initiative and energy could, if properly harnessed, do an immense amount to help this country. But it has not been harnessed; it has been almost deliberately frustrated at every point. We do not even yet know how great is this potential energy which is only awaiting a signal from the Government to be released.

I am sure that my right hon. Friends realise that the whole of the future type of society in which we will live is at stake and depends upon the atmosphere the Government produce for us now. Ministers are at this moment having to grapple with urgent and immediate problems, which we know must be tackled urgently and immediately, but I do not think there is any reason whatever to forget the more important long-term aim. We need an early encouragement of our best and most energetic people, who have for so long been frustrated. We need a little less of telling people what they must not do and a little more of telling them what they can do, and of encouraging them to do it.

Mr. Robert Crouch (Dorset, North): . . . I wish to address myself to that part of the Gracious Speech which says:

"My Ministers will vigorously encourage production of food by the basic industries of agriculture, horticulture and fisheries."

During the last five or six years we have heard a great deal from the late Government about continued increase in agricultural production, but that has been in monetary value and not in the actual amount of food produced. My colleagues and I were alarmed when we saw the last September returns of British agriculture. The most alarming decrease is that of some 3½ per cent. in the agricultural labour force. The position is even more serious than that. We have some 66,000 fewer male workers in agriculture than we had in 1936.

The late Minister of Agriculture went to very great pains to tell the House and the country about the increase in wages that had taken place during the last 10 years, but this fall in the number of workers has taken place despite the increase in wages. It has not only been a question of wages that has been concerning our workpeople, and if we are to overcome our present difficulties as outlined this afternoon by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the first thing we have to do is to see that we get a return of our workers to the industry. Unless we have a sufficient labour force, we shall be unable to turn out the production that is at present so urgently needed. . .

I return again to the September figures. We have lost 200,000 head of livestock during the last 12 months, and our livestock figures today are less by nearly one million than in the period before the war. This downward trend has, I know, been accelerated in recent months by the failure of the Government to buy elsewhere the meat that was required for the people, and undue emphasis has been laid upon meat production; but nevertheless we have that leeway to make up. Our sheep population is now very much less than before the war; there has been no increase in the last few years. As far as pigs are concerned, while there may have been a great increase in the last 12 months, the numbers are still a million short compared with 1939. I am much more concerned about figures of this kind than about the monetary values of agricultural products.

The poultry industry has 21,000 fewer poultry than before the war, and this is a very high percentage when the pre-war figure was some 74,000. It has been reflected in the output of eggs. I know that during the Election the previous Prime Minister suggested we had many more eggs now than we did before the war. With less poultry, however, that would be impossible. Not many days before the last Parliament broke up, I asked the then Minister of Food what was the number of eggs that went through the packing stations before the war as compared with the present figures. The right hon. Gentleman told me that the figures were not really comparable because before the war the scheme was voluntary whereas now it is compulsory. The pre-war figure was 1,200,000 standard cases of 30 dozen eggs, as compared with 10,200,000 eggs today—and that is where the previous Prime Minister got his figures about the production of eggs. . . .

. . . What we want, however, is a more stable food policy. We must stop the continual swing, the continual robbing of Peter to pay Paul, year by year if we are to get full production and prosperity from our industry.

This year, the emphasis has been put upon meat at the expense of milk and eggs, with the result that the numbers of livestock have decreased, and in less than 18 months we shall have a very serious milk crisis. I believe, and it is my honest opinion, that what we have to do is to see that each commodity is awarded a price which will cover the cost of production. When we have that we will begin to start full production of industry. If each commodity is awarded a proper price, we shall get each area of the country producing the commodities for which it is most suited and we will not have very thin hill farms trying to produce beef as some are trying at present. Immediately that we get a change of emphasis a great loss of production occurs. We must have a very much more steady policy than we have had in the last few years.

Mr. Manuel: Before the hon. Member leaves that point, I feel that he is painting far too gloomy a picture. Surely he is aware that our agricultural policy, over all, has been much more stable during the past six years than ever, and that there has been a 50 per cent. increase in production over all—[HON. MEMBERS: "Oh."] These figures cannot be refuted and, if hon. Members want a better figure, Scotland can provide it.

Mr. Crouch: The hon. Member is following the example of his hon. and right hon. Friends by quoting monetary values.

Mr. Manuel: No.

Mr. Crouch: Yes, Sir. I would suggest that he goes into the Library, where he will find, in "The Farmer and Stock-Breeder," the actual figures, not monetary values, the figures of the commodities I have mentioned. There are something like one million less livestock than before.

I feel that the late Government failed the country and the industry by not providing sufficient feedingstuffs. If they had brought in more feedingstuffs instead of buying the finished product we would have had considerably more food than we have had and than we have at present. I believe it very much wiser to spend our foreign exchange on raw materials than on finished products. It would have been wiser to let our merchants go to Canada and spend as many dollars as were available to buy coarse grains which were for sale. Unfortunately, that grain went to the United States of America. I hope and believe that the new Government will encourage the importation of very much larger quantities of coarse grains so that our farmers can produce the food so urgently required by the people of this country today.

House of Commons: November 8,

Lieut.-Colonel Walter Elliot (Glasgow, Kelvingrove):

. . . I want to follow a moment the line that was embarked upon by the Leader of the Liberal Party in his opening remarks. He pointed out that for the first time for a long period of years the government of Scotland and the government of Wales occupied the first place in the Gracious Speech from the Throne. . . .

. . . The two countries of Scotland and Wales are exactly in the position with which we are wrestling both here and in other parts of the world, in linking up national units, with strong national self-consciousness, into associations, so as to obtain or retain the advantages of association without their losing their own identity. Some, like the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Montgomery (Mr. C. Davies), the Leader of the Liberal Party, wish to go to the length of breaking Parliamentary association, which would seem to me to be a pity. Others of us think more practical steps would be useful.

We have advanced here practical proposals, and I beg the attention, more particularly of the hon. Member for Fulham, East, but also of other hon. and right hon. Gentlemen, to these very points. I hesitate after the rather active controversy which arose over de-centralisation even to mention it in this connection, but, after all, the whole problem of government is the problem of de-centralisation, and somehow decentralisation in our modern political set-up must be achieved. We propose to do it by means of largely

(Continued on page 7).

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENtral 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: SEFton Park 435.

Vol. 27. No. 13.

Saturday, November 24, 1951.

Radcliffe (II)

Power and authority, *exousia* and *dynamis*, were confused by the Greeks themselves. So it is not remarkable that St. Paul places the two words in juxtaposition in 1 Corinthians, XV, 24:—"Christ is the first-fruits, and after him follow those that belong to him, those who have put their trust in his return. Full completion comes after that, when he places his kingship in the hands of God, his Father, having first dispossessed every other sort of rule, *authority, and power.*" (our emphasis.) Yet even here, the words used by the translator (Mgr. Knox) distinguish which is which. *Exousia* is rendered as authority and *dynamis* as power. Yes, *exousia* is derived from *exesti*, which implies power in the sense of possibility, an illuminating connection. You *may* (or even *must*) grow cabbages in golf-bunkers; but you can't.

Faithful to our premonition in this column last week, Lord Radcliffe, as reported in *The Listener* for November 15, persistently throws cold water on "the supposition" that "there is a fixed order of the world valid for all peoples and at all times." "What is remarkable about the thought of the Middle Ages [the "learned, imaginative and credulous" mediaeval mind (Radcliffe)] is that it made the idea of a supreme law of nature into something that was commonly even universally accepted and it took the idea so seriously as to work out of it a regular system. Nor has it proved an idea that it *has been easy to kill,*" (emphasis is ours). Also: "Blackstone, an eighteenth-century judge, lays it down that no human laws have any validity if they are contrary to the laws of nature. I do not think he meant it: but even in his day, apparently, it did not seem absurd to write it. If you tried to apply such a proposition, it would reduce to chaos and anarchy the modern highly organised State." As though he read our thoughts, Lord Radcliffe goes on straightway: "Anarchy, of course is a relative term." Yes, relative to archy: archy, an-archy. But which is which?

Readers who protest (as some still do) against the high standard of *The Social Crediter* will notice that this sort of discussion is launched on the Home Service programme. The Light programme is awaiting its Aristophanes in the person of the Lord Rector of Aberdeen University (Mr. 'Jimmy' Edwards), who may invoke *The Clouds* to pour scorn, and for the same reasons?, on the citizens of England as Aristophanes did on the citizens of Athens (no, not upon Socrates, as was—or was it ever?—supposed). Lord Radcliffe obviously is to be feared rather than scorned. Apart from polemics, he has given us at least two pointers to what lies ahead of him:—"If there is a fixed order 'of the world,' then "mankind is one community; a belief to which despite every set-back, the world is now struggling to return," and "Power is so greedy a thing

that it cannot even share the world between two thrones." This time Lord Radcliffe has forborne to attract undesired attention to the relativity of the two statements. We make good the omission.

Having written the agenda for them, it would be a pity if we absented ourselves altogether from the conference table, and we intend not to do so.

LEBENSBEJAHUNG. (Continued from page 8.)

means. Too many of us are inclined to look upon prosperity in American terms of motor cars, electric washing-machines and private bathing pools in every garden. Before the war, when I could ill-afford it, I ran a car, today, when I can afford a car, I find I prefer a cycle by which to see the country-side.

In respect of food too, there are false conceptions of plenty, and many imagine that every meal should be a Christmas dinner. Without being ascetic, it is possible to be truly healthy only when we live on simple and wholesome foods, the bulk of which should be made up of fruits and vegetables, and not of starchy and fleshy foods, which so many think as concomitant with plenty.

Most of us are obliged to work or earn sufficient to pay our way: fewer and fewer have private means to be independent. Here the Enemy, so far, has us caught tight in an inescapable ambush. Very little of our work is truly creative and many of us cannot put enthusiasm into labour. There is nevertheless a small means of relief, if we will but apply it: we can make ourselves so efficient and capable that the work we do can be done with the least effort, which for some will leave even during working hours time for our own thoughts. Even in dreary work, we can find means of expressing ourselves. We must aim high, increase our capabilities and not accept work which is beneath us.

If we Social Crediters are to achieve still greater successes in the future, we must know what it is to be *lebensbejahend*—faithful in the face of the enemy, as we are at all times, positive, cheerful, never depressed and, above all, never depressing. We may spend our quiet moments understanding the theory of Social Credit, but we must never forget that nothing in this world is real* either to ourselves or to others until it is made flesh. Our theories to our friends are as nothing until they can see that we are their embodiment. Our credo must bear fruit in society: our belief must be recognized by our acts. G.G.B.

*Nothing in this world is *actual* . . . until it is made flesh. This journal entertains the Christian notion of Reality, which is not what our contributor, perhaps inadvertently, expresses.

THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

By

C. H. DOUGLAS.

The Revised and Enlarged Edition published in 1937
is again on sale.

12/- net.

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

Six Years in an Essex Village*

(ADDRESS GIVEN TO THE RURAL DEANERY CHAPTER,
18TH JULY, 1951).

The years of which I am going to give some account leave a succession of unanswered questions in my mind. The first question must be faced at once: is Lindsell a village? Most people are familiar with the idealistic Goldsmith's *Deserted Village* and with the realistic Crabbe's *The Village*. Goldsmith's eulogy of the peasant's quality suggests that a village's desertion or abolition entails the loss of a quality. Crabbe describes a rural slum, and jolts our conventional idea of a village. In the 19th century de Stendhal made a brilliant study of a grasping and brutal peasant, who violently interrupted his son's attempts at study. Perhaps the sharp observation of the Frenchman still throws a light on rural character. During the present day, an accurate social analyst remarked that there are no villages left: the population is cinema-going and radio-listening, and the village has been reduced to a suburb. Of course a village sometimes becomes a hamlet instead, or as well.

It is undoubtedly true that the "village" is under fire and has all the big tendencies against it, including *machinery*. We are told that the village, which at least until 1775 was a basic part of the social structure, is not "economic," "progressive," "educational," "free," etc. There was a small post-war back-to-the-land movement, sponsored by an advertisement to "own your own plot" which was quickly withdrawn, but in fact few women can tolerate a country life. They miss, precisely, the cinema and the bright lights, as well as "the company," and I have seen several hurry back to their town and (real) suburb. The rural slum, mercifully, has been largely abolished, but mechanisation reduces the need for men in the villages. Only Gandhi, in fact, among all known modern "reformers" had suggested a *decentralised* order which should include rural industries (The Japanese, I have read, make bicycle parts in their homes and only assemble them at a large centre). A writer on country matters said recently that villages were "perishing through disbelief," but did not specify further.

In spite of all this, Essex, which the stranger imagines to be an enlarged London-over-the-Border, is full of surprises. The churches and houses are of a rustic beauty not seen in many counties, and the countryside is pleasantly rolling and varied. But this lovely area is intensely mechanised. One day the wind blew a yellow-green cloud into my garden and a selection of the vegetables died at once. And this fatal weed-killer suggests another important question: are modern methods as *healthy* as could be wished? There is a marked shortage of stock (prices have quite recently improved), straw is burned and so is the vegetation of the roadside verges. This would shock the continental peasant.

Many traces of an order remain, and provide interesting field-work for the social historian. I do not know if this order last worked satisfactorily to all concerned in the 18th century or before Henry VIII. This order conserved the soil, which is real capital, and a large variety of skill. I do not know how well the fertility is standing up to the new treatment. The village is being eliminated in matters of education and Church, yet each village in this area is still *different*. A hundred years ago the population of them all (in the area) was at least double, quite consistently, as the

"Parochial Guide for the County of Essex, 1841," shews. Yet Cobbett, who died in 1835, noted the huge churches in many villages and reasoned that the population he saw must be only a fraction of the numbers before his time.

Henry James, in his tour of America during the first decade of this century, missed the Squire and the Parson from the American scene. The Squire has, of course, vanished from Britain and the Parson is vanishing now from the villages. I do not know much about experiments made with a centre from which a vicar and curates minister to a number of villages, but such experiments are being widely tried and doubtless resented.

I have, I feel, said enough about the new educational system of central schools to which village children are transported. The people of Lindsell made their stand (by running their own school for a year, 1949) and their children are now being transported just the same. The moral, however, is still important. For Policy, Administrations and Sanctions are now all in the same hands, those of the "Experts," and the balance has been destroyed. We held that Policy (ends) was the natural concern of the parents for whom the administration was bound to supply the means. Instead of this we were threatened with sanctions, financial and legal, and the parents came to feel that it would be taken out on their children. I doubt whether this fear was justified.

Personally, I believe in Balance, for ours is a Trinitarian and balanced faith. The matchless beauty of this faith has never been fully realised—the Kingdom on Earth has never quite come—but the alternative to Balance is not pleasant. It is tyranny. But our partial success was noted by Montesquieu, who called the British constitution "The Mirror of Liberty"; Blackstone was an uncompromising Trinitarian; and the U.S.A. owes much to Britain. The destruction of the balance between town and country is still more reprehensible when the theological facts are not obscured. Otherwise, Christianity tends to lose the contrast with Judaism, and the very different faiths are merged in "Liberal Judaism" or "Liberal Christianity." Such is the result of blaming dogma instead of applying it.

The Church, in the village, has the nature of a "remnant." This is not all to the bad, if we recall that at the first Whitsun the whole Church consisted of 120 people who considered themselves as The Remnant. I have received great loyalty and unobtrusive help of all kinds from the churchwardens, and been fortunate in having a good church council who sought to help and not to hinder. It shews, I think, that Christianity does *work*. In the choir we have had a dominating voice, which is a feature in country choirs; and we have enjoyed many pleasant practices at the Vicarage. During one of these I was playing the piano and the Voice asked: "Shall we sing the right notes, Vicar, or the wrong ones you are playing?" As a visitor from Italy remarked—the *buona volenta* (good will) is what counts. When we came (1945), it was notable that the children stayed at Sunday School longer than in towns. But the age at which they leave is getting younger. Those from outside the village usually do not "stick." We found no women's organisation possible, but the W.I. is well established. My wife had a couple to her sewing party, for instance: it always seemed to be pea-picking time, potato lifting or sugar-beeting.

The Vicar's wife these days carries a heavy load, particularly when she has to try and manage an enormous out-of-date

*Reprinted by permission from *The Dunmow Deanery Magazine*.

vicarage. The former bishop started a fund to insure against future falls in clerical stipends: almost at once the pound was devalued and its purchasing power is diminishing rapidly. We do not know what it will buy in 1959. The glebe is rather much *on top* of other duties. The monk is able to fulfil his ideal—*laborare est orare*—because he has special times for husbandry. But we kept a number of animals: rabbits, chickens, goats, pigs, bees, ducks and geese. But the cost of food makes most of these quite unprofitable now.

An Archdeacon wrote to me when I accepted this country cure, and said that I must return to the "hurly-burly" of an industrial parish after a short stay among the gospel-hardened countrymen. But this is not quite my own conclusion: the very unexpected people at our farewell function suggests that a most tenuous tie still connects a considerable number with the Church. T. S. Eliot has called our religion "diluted" and our country "neutral" towards Christianity. Our relations with those of other communions—and we had as parishioners (parishers, as a local called them), Roman Catholics, Quakers, Christian Scientists, Strict Baptists and Congregationalists as well as the adherents of the "Gospel Barn" in the village. Sometimes relations seemed not only most cordial, but more cordial than those with Anglicans!

But we must recognise the *particular* anti-clerical feeling which is prevalent: a man has a different, and a much more pettily critical, attitude towards his parson than towards his doctor or lawyer. This is a hard problem which touches and distorts the whole idea of "coming to church" and of the "interest" which people have or lose. It is, I suppose, a legacy of puritanism, and it suggests the break-down of the parochial system, from within, in the country as in the town. The parochial system, like the manorial, is very old and fulfilled the idea of everyone having a church—and a parson if desired—within a walk. Lindsell, however, as a "parisher" remarked, is a "nice village." It may be weakness not to take too much notice of denominational differences in this opinion; or perhaps it is a survival of the catholic parochial idea. The oldest inhabitant, aged 92, who invariably attends the Gospel Barn if her health allows, told me very emphatically as she handed me some money for the church: "it is *our* church."

Much is written about the abuse of the sacrament of Baptism. Personally, I am more concerned about the instances in which I am a godfather myself. After Confirmations I have found that only those who are members of a church-going family still come to communion, even at festivals. I have never attempted a "Parish Communion," but remember that when I was a curate the daughter church complained bitterly that the communion service was at 9.

THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By

C. H. DOUGLAS:

(Postage 1d.)

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, LIVERPOOL.

We changed the hour, as requested, and it was disastrous. For a time we tried celebrations at 8 and 9 on alternate Sundays. A "Parish Meeting" is another idea which I have not tried—not because of my dislike for meetings as such, but because I acknowledge the wisdom of a priest-in-charge I knew who said: "We have no organisations: the Church is the organisation."

The shortage of clergy is alleged as a cause for sparse church attendance, by the Archbishop of York and others, but we who live in well-staffed country parishes know that it is an effect and not a cause. Servers stay a while and so do choristers until their voices break, or they go off to work. But I am sure that we have in this country a very deep spiritual malady and failure of faith to contend with. This question provokes another: Has the machine won?

What I have said is endorsed by two items, at least, of food. The old people used to go gleaning, thrash the corn with a flail, take it to the mill, (which existed in those days), knead it in a trough and make lasting bread. We still have a local baker—there is not much left of his mill now—but he will soon retire. Then there will be *one* baker only for the district. And there still seems to be a debate as to whether agene, added to the denatured flour, causes cardiac trouble or not. The bread, at any rate, is mouldy in two or three days. When we came, we had fresh milk from a farm down the road: then there were two roundsmen: now there is one, who delivers milk that has been pasteurised and carted 30 miles at least. The *quality* of the food has unquestionably deteriorated.

However, here (in the Rural Dean's house) traditional hospitality is maintained and the rural deanery is a unit that does work. There is great variety among the clergy of the deanery! Perhaps this is all to the good and is a "catholic" feature.

A speaker on the wireless recently said that a visitor to this country would be struck by the unique character of the village church. But this is not the age of George Herbert or of Thomas Hardy's "Under the Greenwood Tree." The visitor would be struck by the emptiness of the village church, probably, whatever his homeland.

Yet the village church is a useful training ground, being a microcosm in which the duties of an incumbent may be studied. It is probably inadvisable these days to stay too long in a small village, and few could afford to do so. And pleasant though friendship is, one feels that the personal factor influences people's attachment to the Church far too strongly. For while village "characters" are tending to die out, parochial characteristics remain. The great friends of one incumbent, for instance, seldom favour the next.

Probably much of the trouble is due to failure in understanding the Gospel.

H. S. SWABEY.

Grand Orient

FREEMASONRY UNMASKED

by MGR. GEORGE E. DILLON, D.D.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

5/-

PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from page 3).

administrative measures, and we have not only put forward that policy but we have taken steps to implement it.

The first step has already been taken—the appointment of the Minister of State. The next steps, I think, will be taken in a very short time by the introduction of the legislation which is necessary to produce the extra Under-Secretary of State for Wales, who has been promised, and the extra Under-Secretary of State for Scotland, which also forms part of our proposal. We shall be able to have a good administrative set-up, with first the Secretary of State, and then the Minister of State largely resident in the Northern Kingdom, and three Under-Secretaries of State covering all the main fields in the administrative work. Here I think we shall find a very useful line of development.

We wish to go further, of course, with the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the economic and financial relations of the two countries—with a full understanding, in the widest use of those words. Final decisions, of course, will have to be taken by the elected representatives of the people. No Government, drawn from either side of the House, could delegate to a body such as a Royal Commission great, important political decisions. These eventually will have to be taken under the responsibility of the Government themselves.

But we go further. We also say that the great economic blocks of activity which have been taken away—to our mind quite wantonly—and centralised here in London should be returned to Scotland where their natural home and habitat is. *[Interruption.]* I am not talking at all of the coal industry, but there are others, the gas industry, the electricity industry. The Scottish Gas Board, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, South (Mr. P. Noel-Baker), knows—he and I have discussed this matter long enough—is in no way an autonomous body. It is responsible to the Minister of Fuel and Power, and as far as the electricity boards, the South Eastern and South Western Boards are concerned, we have also discussed them at great length, in the Grand Committee upstairs, and he knows also—

Mr. Noel-Baker rose—

Lieut.-Colonel Elliot: Let me finish my sentence. The right hon. Gentleman has drawn an electrical frontier through Scotland and put the responsibility to the south of that upon the Minister of Fuel and Power. If the right hon. Gentleman wishes to intervene, I shall be only too happy to give way.

Mr. Noel-Baker: Is the right hon. and gallant Gentleman not aware that the gas boards are in fact fully autonomous both in the production and the sale of gas and that the Gas Council is an advisory body? Is he not aware that the electricity boards are autonomous in the supply of electricity, that they arrange their own tariffs and arrange everything to do with supply directly to their consumers?

Lieut.-Colonel Elliot: Does the right hon. Gentleman really expect a baby in arms to believe these things? What was he receiving his salary for as Minister of Fuel and Power.

Mr. Noel-Baker: Let the right hon. and gallant Gentleman consult the chairmen of the boards concerned.

Lieut.-Colonel Elliot: I have consulted the chairmen of the boards concerned, and if the right hon. Gentleman heard

what they said he would blush. Really, the right hon. Gentleman does not know where Scotland is. What does he expect? This is the sort of thing to which my fellow Members from Scotland object. This is the sort of casual instance of a jack-in-office that makes our people sick. The right hon. Gentleman and his party destroyed the influence of the elected representatives of the people. He has destroyed the electricity authority of Glasgow, a democratically-elected body and replaced it by a nominated body advised by a Consumers Council whose names nobody knows, whose address nobody has ever found out—and this is supposed to be a substitute for self-administration.

We say that we have already taken steps, and that we shall take further steps, and that we hope very much that the Government will press on vigorously with the steps which they propose to take, in accordance with our statement of policy, to transfer the administration of and the ultimate responsibility for the South Eastern and South Western Boards into Edinburgh, which is the natural centre for these things, and not down here in Whitehall.

We do not propose any derogation from the present position of the Scottish Hydro-Electric Board, as in addition to being a hydro-electric board it is a development board for the Highlands and should not suffer any diminution of its authority or of its duties in such a re-organisation. We have more than once given assurances to that effect, and I am sure these assurances will find a place in the legislation which we hope to see brought forward. Scottish Members on this side of the House will watch with great interest the antics of hon. Members opposite who sit for Scottish constituencies trying to explain to their constituents that they do not think Scotland is fit to run its own gas or electricity boards. . . .

We fully recognise the special duties of the Scottish Hydro-Electric Board. I said a minute or two ago that it had not only special tasks but special responsibilities. We recognise these to the full; we certainly do not wish to merge that with the South-Western and the South-Eastern Boards. It remains the Scottish Hydro-Electric Board, with its full responsibilities, but responsible to the Secretary of State for Scotland, to whom we think the other two boards should also be responsible. . . .

. . . On one or two occasions uneasiness has been expressed about the rashness of amalgamating it with the coal-fired stations of the South, and for the purpose of dispelling doubts I am repeating assurances repeatedly given on other occasions, that it is not our intention to amalgamate it with the coal-fired stations of the South.

. . . I am speaking in full agreement with my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State, and we both agree with the official party policy.

. . . I think that the immediate needs of the country are so great that we should seriously consider whether any steps should be taken which diminish immediate food production. I am referring in particular to afforestation of ground which is being used to produce wool and mutton. While I yield to no one in my admiration of forestry and the development of forest estates in this country, I would remind the House that for 40 or so years nothing will come out of any tree planted now. During that time, our sheep would have had 40 fleeces and some 40 lambs would have come from that sheep stock. For 40 years, by and large, trees will do nothing. I say that it is a great mistake to embark upon

an extended forestry programme at the present time.

... We should certainly look with the greatest caution at any programme of capital investment which is not going to yield a result within the fairly near future, because our crisis is now, and unless we do something to conquer it, it is little use aiming to conjure one away 40 years on.

Scotland is one of the great power houses of modern society. It is one of the foundation states of Europe, if not of the whole Western world. It is one of the ancient blocks of which Europe is built. I think that we have a contribution all our own to make both to the United Kingdom and to world politics.

Mr. Adams: And Wales.

Lieut.-Colonel Elliot: I will not venture to presume to talk about Wales. I am talking about my own country, and if other people would limit their observations to their own country, we might get along more quickly. I say that Scotland is a country with a great purpose, ancient traditions and full of power and force, which can yet make a great contribution to the solving of our modern problems. Let us be careful lest through mere centralisation or unification we trample out independence, originality, and efficiency in Scotland. Without her special gifts we should all be much the poorer. As Sir Walter Scott said:

"Un-Scotch us, if you will; but if you do, you will make us damned mischievous Englishmen."

"Lebensbejahung"

In the German language, we do not merely find words which are almost the equivalent of our English expressions, but, we may discover some, which open up fresh facets of thought. The word *Lebensbejahung* is one of these exclusively German words: it is as indigenous to Germany as the ever-popular and unique *Gemütlichkeit*. In general, it means saying 'yes' to life or being life-affirmative, which is a very clumsy English way of putting it. Germans speak of a *lebensbejahende Person*—a person who is affirmative or positive to life. They speak also of *lebensbejahende Begriffe*—conceptions which look upon life positively or affirmatively.

It is not easy at first to appreciate fully the meaning and application of this word, but if by experience we do, we shall impress an important aspect of life on our mental and spiritual make-up.

It is of the greatest importance, without in any sense becoming 'yes-men,' to be able to say 'yes' to life in all events and circumstances, even if they appear unfavourable, even if they give us pain, and even if they are brought about by enemies.

There is unquestionably a great need for a better and clearer appreciation of the conception *Lebensbejahung*, but also a still greater need for its practice. In spite of the fact that the idea has its origin in the German language, its realization is still somewhat rare in Germany. I have, however, a good German friend, who has suffered much since the war by the loss of his home in the Eastern Zone, by the difficulties of getting established in the Western Zone, and by old age creeping along, yet although I have known him during the whole of my six years' stay in Germany, through bad times before the Currency Reform, the severe winter of 1946/7 and through all the food shortages and

housing difficulties, I have never known my friend grumble once: throughout the years, he has always remained cheerful, optimistic and positive under all circumstances, and he has come through with banners flying—indeed a rare quality in Germany. My friend can well be described as a *lebensbejahender Mensch*, and is loved by all.

To be life-affirmative is to make flesh the inner conviction that nothing stands between man and his highest ideal: it embraces the optimistic and positive person, who under all circumstances endeavours to get the best out of life. The life-affirmant gives every event the same name, whether it is apparently positive or negative, and determines immediately to turn the event or circumstance into a success, and if he fails, he learns from his failures.

Social Crediters will do well to pay attention to this conception, *Lebensbejahung*. Much of their time is spent in recognizing the Enemy, but this important, essential activity should not be allowed to darken their outlook. During my twenty years' association with the movement, I have known unfortunately too many self-styled Social Crediters, who are almost wholly negative in their attitude to the enemy, continually dwelling, as they do, on the aims of the evil forces and on the omnipotence of their machinations. Such persons will never make progress, neither in their personal lives, nor on behalf of the movement. Although, intellectually, they are well-informed, they will certainly never induce others to take steps in the right direction, if they ever do themselves: their attitude to life is quite opposed to *Lebensbejahung*.

On the one hand, we must be wise and recognize the Enemy, and, on the other hand, we must be convinced by complete belief in truth that his evil works can be overcome, if not immediately on a world-wide scale, at least in small individual victories. We must attack and denounce the Enemy on all occasions, but we must not let him get the better of us by making major mistakes in the manner of our attacks. Although he may inflict occasional flesh wounds, we should make sure that he can never deal us a mortal blow as a result of a faulty attitude towards him.

We agree that the powers of darkness control the Press, but even if we read the papers for information and to know what the enemy is doing and conniving—thus turning our reading into our 'intelligence service'—we need not, if we will, become soured and pessimistic as a result of reading the 'National' Press.

We know that the enemy is endeavouring to weaken us by undermining our health through the medium of inoculations, injections, by adulterating our food, by disintergrating the soil on which our food is grown, and by other methods. We can circumvent these dangers fairly easily by refusing to be inoculated and by eating only fresh and unadulterated foods.

Financially and materially, we must ever claim our just inheritance and our National Dividend as a right. In the meantime, if the enemy in his continual attacks upon our personal incomes, makes us go short, and we can find no immediate redress, we must learn to make the best use cheerfully of what we have. We shall find that there is much joy in the simple way of living, and we may be surprised what we can achieve with a minimum of money and material

(Continued on page 4.)