

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 5. No. 14.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1940.

6d. Weekly.

FEDERAL NAZISM

By C. G. D.

The British Commonwealth is the only major experiment in the free and peaceable association of nations which has been able to show a large measure of success. This Commonwealth is now fighting for its existence against a centralised state, the historical product of the loose German Confederacy of the last century, which has already to some extent succeeded in imposing a New United Order upon Europe, and is attempting to impose it upon the World.

In so far as there is any meaning in the statement that this is a war of ideas, as well as of men and armaments, the two 'ideas' which are at stake are, on the one hand, that of free, voluntary association, carrying with it the right to secede at any time, and on the other, the idea of Union, backed by force, the merging of smaller political units with larger ones in such a way as to admit of no possibility of secession except by armed rebellion against a necessarily remote centralised government.

That the British are in practice, rather than precept, fighting for independence, and not to impose some New Order upon the World is shown clearly by their behaviour; by the fact that, unlike the Germans, they could not be persuaded to take much interest in the war until they were threatened with invasion, by the fact that Eire, a small, militarily weak member of the Commonwealth, has been allowed to secede, and to remain neutral, to the great danger and inconvenience of the rest of Britain, and by the fact that the free forces of all the nations which had been over-run, and who seek to regain their lost independence, have rallied to the side of Britain, and are helping to defend her shores.

It is a thing both pitiable and

deserving of anger that at this particular moment in time the young, especially in our schools and Universities, and indeed the population generally, should be openly and shamelessly taught to deride the very independence for which we are fighting, and to pin their faith in Federal Union, a plan which explicitly aims at destroying that freedom of association which is the basis of the British Commonwealth as well as of the present co-operation between Britain and her allies.

The fundamentals of this plan are those of the Hitlerian Plan for Europe, namely, the establishment of a Union of sub-states to be maintained by economic, military and police powers in the hands of one central Government. The German Army is to have its counterpart in the Federal Army, against which no single sub-state will be able to stand; that scourge of Europe, the *Luftwaffe*, is to have its counterpart in a Federal Air Force, able and willing to bomb into submission any nation which dares to attempt to secede from the Union; the *Gestapo* is to have its counterpart in the Federal Police, with power to arrest any individual in any country in the Union who takes action against the New Order; and finally, finance and economic power are to be even more centralised in the Federal Government than in Hitler's, although we know his aims are in the same direction.

Naturally, such a scheme has no chance of being received with approbation in this country unless it is presented in a very different light, but it is a fact that all the above proposals are not only included, but heavily stressed as essentials of the Plan by all Federal Union speakers and writers. All the devices of propaganda, however, are used to throw an emotional and sympathetic

light on these proposals, and to disguise their fundamental similarity with those of the enemy. 'Federal' services, for instance, are being held, and even the ordinary gatherings carry the atmosphere of a revivalist meeting. The speakers are for the most part effective, well-meaning, and obviously earnest and sincere. Furthermore they have been centrally trained and instructed which questions to answer, how to answer them, and which to avoid answering altogether. The same arguments, the same similes, the same conclusions are being reiterated again and again all over the country, and are inevitably producing a definite effect upon the opinions of the people.

To find a comparison in my own experience I have to go back to the pre-Hitler days in Germany when Nazi speakers (mostly operating under another name e.g. the *Verein für Deutschtum in Ausland*), launched a similar campaign throughout Germany, in which the same basic theme—the need for effective centralised power in Europe to enforce Peace—was effectively 'put over' on the German people by persistent repetition. The same picture of a happy, prosperous, peaceful Europe (and later, World) united under the leadership of persons of the speakers' way of thinking was made attractive to the Germans by a very different terminology and set of emotional trimmings from those used by Federal Unionists in the English setting. Nevertheless, the essential similarity between two campaigns remains.

It is of course no part of my purpose to suggest that Federal Unionists are wholly in sympathy with the Nazis, or that their proposals are not very different from Hitler's practice in that they are alleged to be 'democratic.' Indeed, Federal Unionists are quite

sincere in detesting Nazis and other 'totalitarians' with all the loathing which one sect of a single religion can feel for another, but it is necessary only to examine their practical proposals to see that they are seeking to impose upon the World the very kind of 'democracy' which existed in Germany before 1933, and in which financially backed demagogues of the Hitler type quite naturally rise to the top.

I am not sure that I do not prefer the brutal, but relatively honest Nazi attempt at overlordship to this deceitful smothering of an equally deadly threat of centralisation of power with the sickly syrup of pseudo-democracy. Obviously, the Nazi threat has now matured out of the pure talking stage and is now at its maximum in the field of practical malignant action (the conversion of a part of the city in which I write into a flaming ruin adds a certain point to this remark!) The Goebbels stage has given place to the Goering stage. Federal Union, however, is still in the Goebbels stage, by which, with the assistance of the present war without which it would have had no chance of success, it hopes to attain its aims. That the Goebbels stage can achieve much has already been proved by the prototype, but in addition, one Federal Union speaker has actually admitted when challenged that in his view Hitler, assuming his eventual defeat, will have done useful work in breaking down the obstinate independence of the smaller nations of Europe. I do not know whether the more discreet leaders of the Movement would support this view—Mr. Streit's citation of the American Civil War 'in favour of the Union System' would suggest so—but in any case this attitude of mind is widespread, and is being openly fostered among Federal Unionists.

The statements quoted below from 'the well-known Washington correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News*, Edgar Ansel Mowrer' (taken from the *Daily Telegraph*, November 25, 1940) show that in the home of the Union idea sympathy with Nazi aims is even less disguised:

"German propagandists and many prominent Americans, who perhaps do not realise how they are being used, are now engaged," says Mowrer, "in spreading such arguments as the following:

"Europe has long been awaiting unity and the Nazis are rapidly achieving its unification."

"That way lies stability and

stability means prosperity."

"Why, therefore, not recognise German superiority, avoid a revolution, get in on the ground floor and secure a larger share of the 'new order' trade?"

Why not indeed, since 'unification' is the aim?

Just what play the astute Nazi propagandists will be able to make with the Union idea in this country remains to be seen, but it is quite certain that they have not failed to recognise in it a valuable ally of which they will make full use if they are not already doing so.

It should be clear that the existence in this country of an organised body of propagandists actively pursuing the enemy's chief aim, namely, the destruction of our national sovereignty and that of our allies, is an appalling menace to our morale and war effort, notwithstanding the fact that they are at present rivals of the Nazis in that they seek to centralise power in different hands and by slightly different, and possibly less objectionable means. Although, therefore, many Federal Unionists are now to be seen opposing the Nazis with every sign of enthusiasm, that state of affairs cannot be relied upon to continue under all circumstances. The sudden *rapprochement* when it suited their purpose of those old rivals in World Unification, the Nazis and Communists, should have taught us that lesson. And as to the means being different as they are professed to be, I am not so sure, for at a recent Federal Union Meeting it was stated, without protest from anyone but me, that under the Federal Order a useful outlet would be found for Prussian pugnacity and military ability in the Federal Army, and furthermore it was suggested that it would be advisable to post units of the Federal Army to countries other than their own, to avoid the dangers of local patriotism corrupting the troops! So it is not even certain that we should escape the Prussian jack-boot upon our necks under Federal Union.

The chief danger from this Movement, however, is more immediate, and lies in their attempt to get their policy adopted by the Government as its official War Aim. In this they have already almost succeeded, for a majority of the Cabinet support their views, and only expediency delays the pronouncement. This has already been shown by the disastrous attempt at Union with France which was actually made by the

present Prime Minister very soon after his accession to power. For that we are now paying a dreadful price in the enmity of the Vichy French who, faced with a choice between Union with this country and a continuance of limited national sovereignty under German domination, deliberately choose the latter. The French are known to be a realistic, clear-sighted, and intensely independent race, and it is quite certain that the suggestion of merging the identity of *La France* in an Anglo-French Union would infuriate many of them. The decision to cease co-operation with Britain was made by a small majority, and it seems impossible to suppose that the Union offer did not tip the balance against us. Furthermore the Vichy Government has since shown its sincerity in opposing union by resisting up to the present the violent pressure by which their conquerors are trying to force them to join Hitler's New Order in Europe.

The appalling danger is that we also should be presented by the same Government with the same dreadful choice between the Scylla and Charybdis of Nazi or Federal Union. The result would certainly be the same as in France; despair, disillusionment, and such internal disruption as would lose us the War in a week. Fortunately the Prime Minister's political sense has told him this, and we can rely on him to suppress the demand for an official announcement on War Aims until we are either on the verge of defeat, or in the first flush of victory. Then it will come, and it will be some more or less well wrapped up step towards Federal Union, according to the circumstances at the time. At least, that is what I think. What do you?

As I survey the still smouldering ruins in an old and very English City, I ask myself, as many others are doing, "Is it worth enduring all this, and if so, to what end?" And the answer is still "Yes!" but the reason is not easy to formulate, and the majority of the inarticulate English can never put it into words, because it is not a verbal thing at all, but a practice, the practice of voluntary co-operation which we call freedom, which is native to this island, and has expressed itself on a world-wide scale in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Take that away, and the answer is "No! Let the Nazis come! there is nothing left to fight for!"

EYE ON PARLIAMENT

The following passages are taken from the House of Commons Official Report (Editor, P. Cornelius), known as 'Hansard'. The date and occasion of the words are given above each section, and the speakers' names by the side. The number of columns occupied by the printed report of each section cited is also given. Lack of space imposes a severe limitation on the selection of matter for reproduction.

November, 26.

Oral Answers (45 columns)

NATIONAL FINANCE.

BANKERS' DEPOSITS.

Mr. Craven-Ellis asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what are the advantages to the taxpayers of the use by the Treasury of bankers' deposits instead of Treasury Bills for financing the war; and is this practice likely to restrict the amount of credit available to industry?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Kingsley Wood): The system of borrowing from the banks by means of Treasury deposit receipts enables the Treasury to adjust its borrowings to the weekly variations in Government expenditure with less disturbance to the market than would be caused by additional issue of Treasury Bills. I see no reason to anticipate that such borrowings will adversely affect the amount of credit available to industry for purposes essential to the national war effort.

Mr. Craven-Ellis: Is not this policy of financing the war contributing to inflation?

Sir K. Wood: No, Sir, I do not think so.

MONETARY POLICY.

Mr. Craven-Ellis asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the recent discussions between Mr. Morgenthau, of the United States of America, and a Treasury official, included a proposal for Britain to return to the gold standard; what conclusions were arrived at, or recommendations made; and will he assure the House that no fundamental change will be made in our financial system without first giving Parliament an opportunity of expressing its view?

Sir K. Wood: The answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative, and the second part does not arise. Subject to the exigencies of the war, our monetary policy remains as set out in the second paragraph of the Monetary Agreement of 25th September, 1936, and aims at the greatest possible equilibrium

in the system of international exchanges.

Mr. Craven-Ellis: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this House and the country appreciate very much indeed what America is doing to help us to win the war; and will he draw the attention of America to the fact that it is essential that we should have financial facilities, and that would require a modification of the Neutrality Act and the Johnson Act?

Sir K. Wood: I could not now go into that matter.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

(16 columns).

The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill): I beg to move,

"That during the present Session, Government Business do have precedence at every Sitting and that no Public Bills other than Government Bills be introduced."

I made it clear on Thursday, when I spoke on the Adjournment, that it would be necessary for the Government to move such a Motion as this. The course we are taking is agreeable with precedent, as set last Session, and also during the last war. Broadly speaking, it is felt that our deliberations must be concentrated on those matters or Measures which are vitally connected with the effective prosecution of the war, and that the times are inappropriate for bringing forward controversial legislation or matters of academic interest. . . .

Mr. A. Bevan (Ebbw Vale): I beg to move, at the end, to add:

"Provided that if a Member rises in his place after Questions and proposes that a specified Notice of Motion, standing on the Notice Paper, be given precedence over Government business and not less than 40 Members shall thereupon rise in their places to support the proposal, Mr. Speaker shall put the Question thereupon and such Question shall be decided without Amendment or Debate."—[*Mr. A. Bevan.*]

I am sorry that this has to be a manuscript Amendment, but there was no other course open to me, because the Prime Minister's Motion was not on the Order Paper in time. There can be no mis-apprehension about the purpose of the Amendment. There must be a notice of motion in the name of hon. Members on the Notice Paper, and then

the hon. Member who wishes to move it must rise in his place and ask permission of the House to raise the matter then. Mr. Speaker will not ask the House to decide that simple question unless 40 hon. Members support the hon. Member who wishes to raise the matter; and then the house will, by a Division, decide whether that matter is to be taken. Under my proposal a private Member's Motion—not a Bill—has to overcome two very important obstacles before it takes precedence over Government Business. First, it must secure the support of 40 Members which is not easy; and then it must secure the support of the majority of the House, before the Motion can be taken. I think it will be agreed that the Government have very considerable protection in preventing academic—to use the Prime Minister's word—and frivolous or contentious Motions from being taken in war time, because my Amendment provides that more than half the Members of the House, on a Division, must agree that the Resolution may be debated. . . .

. . . It says, in effect, that instead of asking the consent of the Government to the discussion of a Motion, Members must ask the consent of the House.

. . . In the first place, I am not suggesting that the Government should not have full command of Parliamentary time. They must in war-time. They have very important legislation to bring forward, and it would be unreasonable that the usual procedure should not be adopted. My Amendment in no way takes power out of the hands of the Government. The Government have an immense ascendancy in the House. More than one quarter of the Members of the House are associated with the Government in one form or another. I do not know whether hon. Members realise it, but in the present House there are 75 immediate Members of the Government not taking into account those who are loosely connected with the Government in various ways. Is it reasonable to suppose that any contentious interference with Government business is likely to take place in the circumstances? The Government might say that, after all, we have the opportunity of making our complaints to the Government through

the usual channels. I would answer that the usual channels, if not completely choked at present, are slightly twisted. All the principal parties in the House form the Government. It is very unreasonable to allow a culprit to decide, not only the court which is to try him, but whether he is to have a trial at all. In circumstances of this sort, it seems entirely reasonable that private Members should retain some initiative. If the Prime Minister's Motion is carried, we shall, for the current Session, have not only locked the door upon ourselves, but have thrown away the key. We shall be unable to discuss anything except what the Government permit.

I thought the Prime Minister last Thursday sub-edited history a bit in order to make his case. He said that the House of Commons had obtained great ascendancy in the country by general Debates of the character that we had last Session. The Prime Minister knows, even better than I that that is not the case—that in the days to which he referred the House of Commons debated specific Motions, and had Divisions upon them. Indeed, legislation in those days originated by private Member's Motions in the House, and could not originate in any other way. Therefore, the House had the opportunity of addressing itself to a specific Motion. That is not the case now. Even if an hon. Member persuades the usual channels that he wishes to raise a matter in the House, he can only do it on the Adjournment, which is an exceedingly unsatisfactory way of raising many matters and enabling the House to form a judgment. The Prime Minister bitterly complained, on the occasion of the Debate which led to the downfall of the last Government, that the Adjournment Motion was being made into a Vote of Censure. He said that it was much more desirable that important matters of that sort should be placed upon the Order Paper of the House of Commons in the form of a Motion that could be understood. When the Prime Minister wound up the Debate on that very important occasion he complained bitterly that the fate of the Government was being determined upon a Motion which did not address itself to any other question than the mere Adjournment of the House.

The Prime Minister may say—and I dare say he has already been advised—that on this occasion it is open to the Opposition to put a Motion upon the Order Paper, for which permission would be given. But the Opposition is not there. The Opposition has now dis-

appeared and the House is debating this matter in unique circumstances. The Prime Minister made reference to the precedent of the last war, but nobody knows better than he, because he was an active participant, that after the middle of 1916 a very formidable Opposition formed itself in this House and the Government of that day could not have failed to have given attention to the Opposition, if they wanted to raise any matter. After the resignation of Mr. Asquith a very considerable influential body of Members formed themselves around him and they were able by their authority to demand from time to time the examination of very important matters. That is not the position today. There is no such Opposition in the House of Commons, but there is a very great deal of slackness on the part of Ministers because they are now immune from effective Parliamentary control. I regard this matter as one of very great importance. If a Motion appeared on the Order Paper under the terms of my Amendment, the position would be that the Minister would know that such a Motion was there and that his conduct or administration was being referred to, but he would realise that the Member moving the Motion would have to secure a majority of the House of Commons in order to have it discussed. That very fact itself would be a spur to the Minister, and would assert the authority of the House of Commons over the Minister.

Hon. Members realise that the present House of Commons is old; it has not been refreshed by contact with the constituencies for five years. Most of the Members of the House of Commons support the main purpose of the policy of the Government. There is no danger under my proposal that we would be misunderstood in what we do by any nation outside, but we would be asserting the effective executive of the country. The House of Commons no longer derives its authority from a majority in the House elected at the election but from 615 Members who no longer are able to appeal to the country. I therefore submit that the Government ought to secure their majority by debate in the House of Commons itself. Furthermore, it would be highly desirable if hon. Members were given this opportunity in order that they themselves might make an effective contribution to the conduct of the war.

Mr. Vernon Bartlett (Bridgwater): I beg to second the Amendment.

The proposal has been made with great ability by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Ebbw Vale (Mr. Bevan). It seems to me to be a very ingenious and effective way of co-ordinating the external difficulties between the Government of the day, whatever that Government may be, and the back benchers in this House, who are to a great extent the only channels through which the ordinary man in the street can make his grievances and difficulties felt. The Prime Minister has so often paid generous compliments to this House for the way in which it has maintained the conditions of free speech and discussion in war time, and we have to be careful that these conditions are not lost. The aggregate time given up to Questions has decreased now that we only meet on three days a week, and the number of Questions which might develop into dangerous issues has certainly increased. I do not think that this proposal is in any way an attempt to waste the time of the House or could be abused by those who might wish to raise unduly controversial issues.

The Prime Minister: My hon. Friend, who so ably represents the constituency for Ebbw Vale (Mr. Bevan), was speaking in his most dulcet tones this morning and exercised to the utmost the persuasive and even seductive arts in which he is efficient, and it is not without regret that I find myself compelled to disappoint his hopes and resist his proposal. I think that if my hon. Friend, and the hon. Member who seconded the Amendment, considered the position, they would see what a very impossible proposal they have submitted. On any day after Questions, if 40 Members rise, they can discuss anything they choose. [HON. MEMBERS: "No."] Allow me to continue. Anything they choose, provided the Motion is already on the Paper.

Mr. Bevan: My right hon. Friend has not seen the additional safeguard. The majority of the House, in Division, have to agree before it can be taken, but they cannot be asked unless 40 Members support the hon. Member's Motion.

The Prime Minister: Of course I have only just seen the Amendment, but it is perfectly clear. It says that:

"if a Member rises in his place after Questions and proposes that a specified notice of Motion standing on the Notice Paper be given precedence over Government business, and not less than 40 Members shall thereupon rise in their places in support of the

proposal, Mr. Speaker shall put the Question thereupon, and such Question shall be decided."

I submit to the House that this would be extremely inconvenient, and an impossible proposal. It would mean that any Question on the Paper might suddenly be subjected to the test of a division as to whether or not it should be discussed. That is to force upon the Government of the day the need to meet what I imagine would amount to a vote of confidence. It would mean that the most careful preparations would have to be made to secure a continuous majority at any moment. Think of the inconvenience which the House would suffer. Members travelling to the House ready to debate one subject would find themselves suddenly confronted with another.

Here is a list of some of the Questions on the Paper last Session, which is nothing to what there would be should the Amendment be accepted: Charity Commission Control, Abuse of the Privileges of the Courts of Law, ... Dominions' Peace Terms, Joint Allied Plans, and so forth. At any moment during the day 40 Members could rise to demand a Division which would be a matter of consequence for the Government, and unless the Government were in a position to resist that at any moment, they would have to alter the whole course of Business so that Mem-

bers arriving to discuss one matter could discuss another. Although there might be most urgent Government Business with regard to the carrying on of the war, that in itself would have to be side-tracked. It would be a far more severe procedure than anything which existed in peace-time. If the Amendment was carried or accepted, then Ministers would have to be ready at any moment to debate any one of the enormous panel of topics. They would not know until the actual Motion was moved what was coming on, and they would have to go about with their minds readily prepared for all this and many other varied topics.

I cannot conceive of a more inconvenient proposal, nor can I imagine that any Government would willingly subject itself to any force such as that. Conceive of the position at whatever hour the House meets. It would mean that the Government must have a majority which, in war-time, would be a matter of great inconvenience. Besides, what is the point of having all these Divisions? There would be Members saying that now was the time to discuss one or other of these matters, whether it was important, trifling or inconvenient, and it would be brought to the test of a Division. We might have a Division every day; in fact, there is nothing to prevent this procedure being invoked on

any day on any question, and I regret it very much. We may, as Parliament has had from time to time, have Divisions. We have not had many so far. We were by the way of being united, but to have this procedure, which would force the Government to reject Motions day after day, would mean an impossible impediment to, and a burden on, our duties, and would weaken the authority of the House. It would be a fertile cause of friction and disagreement, whereas under the procedure we have adopted almost any great question which either House hopes to discuss can receive early and proper attention.

[After some discussion].

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The House divided: Ayes, 22; Noes, 183.

AYES.

Acland, Sir R. T. D.; Barnes, A. J.; Barr, J.; Bartlett, C. V. O.; Cove, W. G.; Daggar, G.; Davies, Clement (Montgomery); Green, W. H. (Deptford); Harvey, T. E.; Horabin, T. L.; Leslie, J. R.; Lunn, W.; McGovern, J.; Maxton, J.; Price, M. P.; Salter, Dr. A. (Bermondsey); Silverman, S. S.; Sorenson, R. W.; Stephen C.; Strauss, G. R. (Lambeth, N.); Wilson, C. H. (Attercliffe); Woods, G. S. (Finsbury).

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—

Mr. Aneurin Bevan and Mr. Stokes.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

YOUR COPY OF THE SOCIAL CREDITER

K.R.P. Publications Limited wish to announce that owing to increased costs of production and the necessity to adjust their returns to wholesalers a position may arise at short notice that readers may no longer be able to obtain their copy of *The Social Crediter* from a newsagent. It is possible that wholesalers may not be able to continue their co-operation on the new terms.

Should this happen *The Social Crediter* will only be obtainable by direct subscription. K.R.P. Publications recognise that this may impose difficulties on some readers. In order to assist such readers and as a general plan to get the paper more widely read, readers in all towns in Great Britain are invited, whether individually or in co-operation with other local social crediters, to pay for a copy of *The Social Crediter* to be sent to each of the local public libraries, and to get the librarian's consent to accept the paper on these terms.

A special price of 4½d per copy

only, including postage, will be charged for copies of *The Social Crediter* sent to public libraries. This will be payable quarterly, yearly or annually in advance, and the paper will be sent direct to the library. A subscription form giving the name and address of librarians to be supplied should be filled in.

K.R.P. Publications cannot agree to send the paper to any group or individual for them to deliver weekly to a library.

ACCORDING TO OTHERS—

News Review

December 5, 1940

MACHINE-TOOLS FOR RUSSIA

"Most intriguing news of the past few days has been the request by Soviet Ambassador Oumansky for an interview with Sumner Welles, U.S. Under-Secretary of State.

"A Washington authority on foreign affairs comments:

"The U.S. moving in parallel

with London, is adopting a policy of appeasement to Russia. Vitally important machine-tools and other materials have been released for export."

"By skilful diplomacy and by providing Russia with capital and industrial aid, the U.S. Government is hoping to make her strong enough to challenge the Nazis."

VIEWPOINT

"Lindbergh—and, reportedly, Kennedy—hold the view that white civilisation depends on a Western Wall of race and arms which can hold back the infiltration of 'inferior blood.'

"Everthing depends on 'an English fleet, a German air force, a French army, and the American nation standing together as guardians of a common heritage.'"

CHRISTMAS GIFT—
The Social Crediter

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..

Editorial Office:

4, ACREFIELD ROAD,
WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL.
Telephone: Gateacre 1561.

Vol. 5. No. 14.

Business Office:

12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.
Telephone: Bank 5260.

Saturday, December 14, 1940.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

A Mr. D. E. E. Gibson, City Architect of Coventry, has been shooting off his mouth. "National planning is also required . . . Private interests must be subordinated to Public ones. The only solution," (you see he knows them all), "for Great Britain now lies in some form of nationalisation of all land. . ."

The only thing you can say for Hitler is that he does this sort of thing better than Mr. Gibson. He recently subordinated private interests to public interests, in Coventry, very effectively from his point of view, which is just as likely to be right as that of any other of these planning enthusiasts, from Genghis Khan down to Mr. Moses Sieff, and the Mr. Gibsons.

Mr. Joseph Kennedy, the ex-U.S. Ambassador, says that England will be National Socialist after the War. Not Nazi, you know—National Socialist. All the difference in the world—just as great as between Hitler and Stalin.

The method has that massive simplicity which characterises all great schemes. By taxation, monopoly of credit, and a multitude of fantastic restrictions, you deprive private enterprise of the power to do anything independently. You then say it has failed, and that nationalisation ("We welcome it," as Mr. Montagu Norman, of the Bank which financed Hitler, and forced the sale of thousands of British ships to Germany and Japan, said) is the only solution. And then you have a world like Germany and Russia.

"Is there anything in this talk about you Jews working for world Supremacy?" "Of course there is. In three or four

years, we shall have achieved it. Nothing can stop us." Conversation overheard in 1938.

Mussolini was financed and brought to power by Volpi and Pirelli, both Jews. Russia was knocked out of the First World War by Stalin, who was financed by the Schiffs, Jews. Hitler was financed through Thyssen, by Jews, probably the same Jews.

Morgenthau, the U.S. Secretary to the Treasury, whose idea of helping Britain to win America's War is to fleece her of all her liquid securities in return for such munitions as the U.S. doesn't want, and make her take them away in her own ships, is a Jew.

The Jews have always been the friends of Britain.

In the Utopia so carefully prepared for us, "Liberty," says *The Times*, "will imply not so much freedom from interference, but a chance for all [to work]." You have been warned.

If the leading article (December 5) from which the preceding quotation is taken, which contains the word "sacrifice" fourteen times repeated, is any criterion of the level of intelligence and understanding of this country, which we do not believe, then indeed the agonies of this war and the last have been borne in vain, and still more terrible scourges will be necessary to bring us to our senses.

On the same date as *The Times* leader, December 5, Mr. Winston Churchill was elected Vice-Grand Master of the Primrose Lodge of Freemasons.

Evidently an old Craftsman.

HOBSON v. JAY

"Capital Tax is the only way," writes Mr. Douglas Jay of the *Daily Herald*. Mr. Jay means Capital Tax Now. This enables Mr. Hobson to spend 10½ inches of space in the *News Chronicle* explaining, not that Capital Tax is not the way, but that Capital Tax Now is not the way. A Capital Levy after the war will be a different matter; because there will be an industrial boom while we renew our shattered towns.

"The post-war slump will come again, but not till much later," he remarks quite cheerfully, "There will be plenty of time for the big capital levy before 'deflation' becomes a danger."

Somebody should point out to Mr. Hobson that one of the things that is going to be smashed in this war, along with Hitlerism and bureaucracy, is the Inexorable Economic Law of Slump after Boom.

Meanwhile Mr. Jay, confusing the simple-minded further, utters a modicum of good sense with reference to the finance talks between Great Britain and the United States:

"It is vital, however, that lasting economic and political difficulties should not be caused by the form which any new 'war debt' takes. . . ."

"Behind the present credit negotiations lies the deeper problem how Britain is going to pay for her imports of food and raw materials after the war when we have sold most of our foreign investments and perhaps borrowed from the United States as well.

"That problem can only be avoided if the United States joins fully in Britain's resistance to Hitler and supplies us with war materials as a gift and not as a loan at all."

Social Credit Secretariat

REVENUE

The Treasurer wishes to thank the Belfast Social Credit Group for contributions to the funds amounting to £100, which have been raised since the spring by the various non-taxing revenue schemes. A sum of £20 was sent in the early spring, another £30 in the summer and last month a further £50.

FREEMASONRY (I)

By John Mitchell

"Freemasonry is international and world-wide. . . . Most probably it is the mechanism by which policy selects its administrators, just as Finance is the mechanism by which the administrators recruit their servants and keep them obedient. . . ."

— from "Whose Service is Perfect Freedom," by C. H. DOUGLAS.

Possibly the most mysterious and deceptive organisation existing in the world is Freemasonry. It professes the most exalted aims, which might be expressed as the betterment of mankind, but which upon examination could be more accurately described as the bettering of mankind than as making things better for mankind. Among the high officials of the Grand Lodge of England and the Provincial and District Grand Lodges will be found persons belonging to the highest aristocratic families, politicians, governors, generals, prominent judges and clergymen. There are probably few among the readers of this journal who do not number among their relatives, friends or acquaintances Freemasons whose character they can attest to as being normal. Freemasonry is in fact eminently "respectable."

One would be justified in expecting that an organisation boasting the almost, if not totally, undivided support of all the elite and powerful elements in the community would implement the high aims it professes. Against such a combination of powerful elements pursuing objectives which it is alleged would make mankind happier and which therefore, if this is really so, could hardly fail to command the support of the general public, what power exists which could prevent the ordinary achievement of these aims? But instead of the ordinary man obtaining peace and prosperity and individual freedom in security, which are the only conditions which can give him happiness, the world has for long been afflicted with the opposite results—a growing maladministration in Government, less individual freedom, poverty amidst plenty and innumerable other evils. The world now knows that France has for years suffered under the most corrupt governments she has ever experienced. It is known that every member of the Reynaud Government was a Freemason.

What then is the nature of Freemasonry? It is only necessary to refer to books written by ardent Freemasons to discover enough evidence to reveal Freemasonry as a most pernicious and dangerous organisation. Freemasonry is closely related to Puritanism, Judaism and Finance. A book published in 1940 entitled, *What Masonry Means* by William R. Hammond, gives us in the opening paragraph of the first chapter one of the keys to the nature of Freemasonry: "Masonry is primarily a moral discipline. It rests on certain fundamental ethical principles. These test the fitness of those seeking admission into its ranks, constitute its fraternal bond and set the standard of conduct required of its members. The principal purpose of Masonry is to produce the finest type of character and culture through fellowship and mutual helpfulness." We shall see shortly what is meant by "finest type of character." Later in his book Hammond says: "Personal discipline is not an end in itself. The great purpose of Masonry is to qualify men to take their rightful places in society, contributing to its strength and stability. As a unit of a vast, social structure, the individual may be of small intrinsic value; his real

worth depends on his co-operative usefulness. For this service he must qualify by the aid of the working tools of a Fellowcraft. By them Masons test the basic rightness of their actions."

A judge of the French Supreme Court of Appeal, Herion de Pensey, has said: "The true Freemason is the guardian of morals. Only he who has morals is worthy to rule his equals. . . . Morals and the Law are the pillars upon which the welfare of humanity rests. The possession of morals can make the law superfluous, but where immorality prevails the wisest regulations are worthless."

This aspect of Masonry, that it is primarily a moral discipline, is continually emphasised in Hammond's book: "A Lodge," we are told, "is a place in which to learn to apply moral laws and principles to everyday life. . . ."

"The founders of modern Masonry were not especially interested in questions of philosophy and metaphysics. They were primarily concerned with human behaviour and its possible improvement."

Not all who become Freemasons, of course, appreciate its purpose. Eugene Lennhof in *The Freemasons* says: "A so-called seeker will find nothing worth seeking here, even if he seek for a thousand years, unless he has within him, when he makes his entry into the Temple, that natural tendency to what constitutes the essential character, and the virtues of, a genuine Freemason. Without this he will be in the same position as the illiterate man who bought a pair of spectacles in order to read and was quite surprised when he discovered that one must first be able to read before the spectacles can assist."

In Tolstoi's *War and Peace* Masons have been divided into four categories: "(1) Those who took no interest in the transactions of the Lodges, or in human affairs in general, but were exclusively absorbed in the mysterious doctrines of Solomon's Temple. (2) Those seekers inclined to waver, not yet successful in walking the straight and intelligent way of Masonry, but all the time striving to walk in it. (3) Those who saw in Freemasonry nothing but superficial formalities and ceremonies and who insisted on the fulfilment of these external forms, caring nothing for their real essence and significance. (4) Those who believed nothing, desired nothing, and entered the Brotherhood simply for the sake of bringing themselves into intimate relations with the rich young men endowed with influential connections, who abounded in the Lodges."

The organisation of Masonry is designed as a sieve which selects individuals whose character allied to competence is suitable to the purpose of the organisation. Masonry, says Hammond: ". . . starts its candidates on an endless quest. The light received at initiation is the beginning of a long, progressive unfolding. A musician, artist or scientist is familiar with a host of facts of which

the uninitiated are ignorant. Similarly the more penetrating insights of Masonry are reserved for those who familiarise themselves most completely with its teachings. Moreover, those who apply themselves most diligently to a mastery of its truths are most aware of the vastness and richness of the veins of its ethical instructions. Light gradually increases, imparting fresh insights and larger truths. The situation of a Mason is not dissimilar to that of one proceeding out of a long tunnel. . . ."

Freemasonry, which is frequently referred to as the Royal Art, is one of the major instruments of the art of Government. Professor Adam Weishaupt, the founder of the Order of the *Illuminati* in his work *Pythagoras oder Betrachtungen uber die geheime Weltund Regierungskunst*, described the object he had in mind as being, "permanently to unite thinking men from all parts of the world, of all classes and religions, in a single society, by means of a given higher interest, without prejudice to their freedom of thought, and in spite of all their different opinions and emotions, and to make them, whether they be inferiors or equals, enthusiastic and responsive to such a degree that the many may act as one and desire and do of their own volition and with the truest conviction, that which no public compulsion has been able to effect since the world and mankind have existed. Such a society is the Masterpiece of human reason, in it and through it the art of government has reached its highest perfection."

That is the object of modern Freemasonry: to bring the "art of government" to "its highest perfection." It is the natural objective of those who want to continue to govern. Frederick the Great spoke of Freemasonry, of which he was a ruler, as being "a means of educating the people to be better members of society, to be more virtuous and more charitable." Freemasonry, as already stated is a moral discipline. This is not disputed by Freemasons. One of the commonest terms met with in Masonry is "Rough Ashlar." *Ashlar* is a Hebrew word for stone. "The Mason is constantly reminded," says Lennhof, "that he is a 'rough ashlar,' which must be polished if he is to be rendered a fit member of civilised society. And therefore the masonic neophyte is constantly exhorted by the *Gnothi seauton* of the Greek philosopher, that is to say:

KNOW THYSELF

and also

CONTROL THYSELF
MAKE THYSELF NOBLE,

"Else wilt thou be unable to help build the Temple of Humanity, and forget not that the fundamentals of the same

BOMB HITLER AND SHORTEN THE WAR!

By C. H. DOUGLAS

This leaflet is rousing great interest, particularly in districts that have suffered under heavy bombing.

Prices: 1/3 for 100; 5/- for 500; 9/- for 1,000.

Obtainable from
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

are three pillars:

WISDOM: the intellectual power which directs the work,
STRENGTH: the moral force which executes it, and
BEAUTY: which constitutes the harmony of the intellectual power, the consonance between design and deed."

William Hammond says: "It is natural for men to be small, mean, envious, deceitful, selfish and licentious, at least in thought, if not in action."

"Masonic discipline represents the apprentice stage. It is the period when a Mason learns to manipulate skillfully the elements at his disposal. For until such time as he becomes a master, he is the slave of passions and habits and the victim of circumstances. In short, he is not free to determine his own course. He is incapable of choice, being bound, and at the mercy of his master, to wit, enslaving appetites, desires and passions."

Freemasonry and Puritanism

The moral discipline and instruction of Freemasonry are built, at any rate ostensibly, upon the same conception as Puritanism—Original Sin.

It was Calvin's opinion that "out of man proceedeth no good thing." His biographer R. N. C. Hunt has written: "For Calvin's distrust of human nature arises not only from his conception of God, but from his overpowering belief in sin as the cardinal factor in human experience."

Calvinism struck at the doctrine that the human will is free and must work through a free intelligence; that the "kingdom of God is within you." In the words of Hilaire Belloc:

"Calvin could prove to you that a man chooses not at all. He does not damn himself but *is* damned; he is no one in the matter, save that he goes through the necessary motions of the part assigned to him.

"The race of man was accursed. It had fallen not from a supernatural to a natural state (as Catholics did vainly pretend), but to a diabolical one, and was native to Hell. Such as might be excepted owed their strange good fortune to no act of their own, but solely to the merits of a Divine Saviour which merits were, by a lawyer's fiction, 'imputed' to the elect.

"... That overwhelming God of Calvin's was seen with the eyes of the spirit, an enormous figure, holy by definition, but more terrible than holy, and wreaking angry vengeance against those who rebelled against Him. He was that Jehovah, compeer of Chemosh and Moloch. . . . To this towering Thing—enormously alive—was all mankind subjected. By this was all mankind thrust down—a negligible victim, but a victim horribly suffering. By this also were certain exceptions picked out of the welter of the foredoomed; and these were the Elect, the Saints, the chosen of God who repose under his protection and are commissioned to wreak vengeance on his enemies, with eternal beatitude for their end. . . .

"It was as the *chosen* of that immensity that they retained their zeal. They were the Saints, and those whom they opposed were the reprobate of God. *That* was the driving power, *that* was the steam in the machine."

The idea of Authority behind Judaism is identical with

that of Calvinism. Jehovah has the same relation to the Jews, the Chosen People, as Calvin's God had to Puritans. It is known that Calvin studied Hebrew before he published his book *The Institute* in the year 1536, the same year as the looting of the Church in England under the direction of Oliver Cromwell's ancestor, Thomas Cromwell.

Puritanism is the antithesis of the sovereignty of the individual. Christ taught personal sovereignty and how it could be reconciled with group associations; the doctrine of the exercise of personal will and initiative subject through personal responsibility to the laws governing the universe—natural laws, which become known to the individual through the experience of the natural penalties of disobeying them. He had faith in the individual and the individual had faith in himself. Freemasonry, Puritanism and Judaism have inverted this reality; they have no faith in the individual; he must be subordinated to an external Moral Institution, the Elect of which determine the rules governing moral conduct. R. N. C. Hunt says: "Calvin's theology rests upon the central principle of the absolute sovereignty of God, with its corollary, the utter worthlessness of man. God is the Eternal Judge and Lawgiver, and His will is the centre of the moral order. Inscrutable and unapproachable by any human means, He is utterly remote from sinful humanity, and it was Calvin's deliberate intention that he should appear so."

"This conception of superiority proceeding from the New Religion of Calvin," says Hilaire Belloc, "involved a determination to impose one's will upon others, more especially if they should be weaker than oneself." The Elect of Puritanism quite naturally adopt the attitude of a chosen race. Calvin always placed the God of the Old Testament in the foreground. "He was," says Hunt, "the messenger of that Jehovah who had appeared to Moses upon Mount Horeb and Who, in their wanderings, had gone before the Children of Israel in a pillar of fire. To order the people in the way of that awful and terrifying Deity had been his life's work. . . ."

Freemasonry, Judaism and Puritanism are identical in their attitude to the individual; the individual in his behaviour must conform to an external will. God is useful to Freemasonry to get discipline. ". . . the founders of Masonry," says the Mason, Hammond, "felt it necessary to find a place in their system of morals for the postulate of eternal life. Its founders knew that when life is devoid of all rewarding prospects ethical discipline is powerless to command loyalty and patient, self-sacrificial endurance. The value, therefore, of the Masonic assumption of immortality lies not in any abstract theory of the future life, but in the regulation of to-day's activities in the light of tomorrow's possibilities. Masonry is not chiefly concerned in the possible gains of a post-mortem existence; its emphasis is on qualifying to-day for a richer life tomorrow, wherever to-morrow may find us. In short it is a thing to be lived, rather than merely believed; a conviction designed to influence daily conduct. . . ."

Heaven is referred to in Masonry as the "Celestial Lodge," and a Lambskin is symbolic to Masons of the purity of character necessary to gain admittance to the "Celestial Lodge." In this connection it is interesting to recall verses 5 and 6 in the *Book of Revelations*, where the seer identifies the Lion of Judah with a Slain Lamb: "And one of the elders saith unto me, 'weep not: behold,

the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loosen the seven seals thereof.' And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne . . . stood a Lamb as it had been slain And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne." This refers of course, to the Book of Life. The sacrificial Lamb in olden times was the symbol of emancipation. It atoned for the sins of the people. This is linked with the Masonic idea that only through sacrificial service can life be lived as the Masons deem it should be lived.

Conforming to Centralised Policy

The medium of instruction in Masonry is Ritual. "Ritual, symbol, history, codes are so many instruments utilised to teach certain valuable moral lessons and to inculcate certain essential ethical principles." Masonic symbolism is derived from stonemasonry. It is directly derived from the building of Solomon's Temple. God is referred to as the "Supreme Architect," and this is based on the reasoning, "as King Solomon's Temple pre-supposes an architect and definite plans, so creation demands a Creator"; the universe a "Supreme Architect."

". . . A Supreme Architect, to whom the homage of Masons is due, was held essential to Masonic discipline. Otherwise neither its value nor its permanency was assured. . . ."

The circle is one of the Masonic symbols. Concerning this Hammond says: "There is for instance, a certain point within a circle—a piece of symbolism already referred to. The point represents the individual Mason; the Circle the boundary line of personal freedom beyond which he must not allow his passions, prejudices and interests to stray. The Compass serves a similar purpose. Desires and passions must be kept within due bounds. Neglect of this precaution may result in the direst consequences. To keep within these circumscribed limitations may not always be easy. It necessitates vigilant care and control. The most rigorous discipline of thoughts, impulses and desires must be exercised and enforced."

Masonry is devoted to the building of a social structure, and the individual is regarded as something to be built into the social structure. In reference to this Hammond says:

". . . Masons are taught to think of themselves as 'living stones' of a vast, social structure. The value of the individual unit lies in its contribution to the larger edifice. Moreover, the nature of the vaster structure is determined by the quality and coordination of its numerous parts. Hence its insistence on personal discipline. Each stone must be squared, levelled and plumbed if strength, symmetry and safety are to be known. Whatever unusual qualities a stone may have—strength, striking proportions, beauty—it is placed at considerable disadvantage if its setting does not harmonise with the rest of the building. Similarly, whatever qualifications a person may have his value is negligible if he is not used in, and cannot be adapted to the needs of, the larger social group. Consequently, Masonry not only admonishes its members to subdue such passions as make for discord and to cultivate those virtues which lessen the possibility of friction; it

insists on its members maintaining harmonious relations with all men, more especially with their brother Masons."

This idea of unity, of an imposed harmony, to accord with the plan of an architect, runs through all masonic thought. It suggests the origin of the thought of the present day Planners, to whom the individual, like the mason's rough stone, is something to be worked upon and subordinated to a plan, to an institution. The idea is to get unity to a set purpose, a purpose set by the "architect." To the Mason, the Trestle Board symbolises the value of a definite, clearly defined purpose. It is centralisation of Policy. Those who serve its policy best will be selected for advancement. It is a scientific despotism, not democracy.

Masonry is a training in the art of conforming to and administering a centrally directed policy.

Now, of course, the aspect of reality which Christ taught was the development of individuality, the free expansion of individuality; which involves the freeing of the individual to select his own objectives, while recognising that individuals have certain objectives in common which can be achieved more easily by association with others; and the opposition which Christ met with was from orthodox religionists and Masons who were determined that individuals should conform to an objective *chosen for them*. Two symbols focus attention on this aspect of Masonry—the Trowel and Cement. Masonry endeavours to cement men together in pursuance of a common objective.

"Individuals must be cemented into a solid entity if endurance and achievement are to be known. Masons are constantly reminded that harmony is the strength and support of all societies, more especially of theirs. . . ." says Hammond, ". . . Disparate interests play havoc with relationships; they are the cause of most friction."

Individuals *have in fact* disparate interests, although they may have some common interests, and the attempt which is continually made by governments to act contrary to this fact produces automatically the social troubles which we see disrupting the world. War provides the greatest

opportunity to cement people to a common objective, but quite *naturally* when their purpose is consummated they drift apart again. This presents a problem to those who wish to govern the world. It is the problem which confronts the leader-writer in *The Times* on December 5, 1940. He classifies unemployment with war, as "the great twin scourges" of our time. He says: "To formulate a social end, other than war, which will inspire such sacrifices is the cardinal problem of our time."

"... It must not be said that we are more ready to risk our lives than our vested interests [our freedom], or that peace—unlike war—holds no purpose worthy of the sacrifice of things we prize for a greater common good. The British people will shrink from no sacrifice for a purpose in which it believes. In war it has gladly accepted—indeed demanded—leadership which calls for sacrifice from all. The planning of peace calls for a leader who will have the courage and the vision to make the same appeal."

The article is clearly tainted with Freemasonry. It is the social end, not the individual end, which concerns the writer, and sacrifice is the means to achieve a social objective. Well paid unemployment, which the modern industrialist system is capable of providing for a large proportion of the population (with the remainder working voluntarily and only for short hours), would serve the ends of the individual; it would allow the individual to expand his individuality by pursuing his own objectives. But *The Times's* leader-writer regards unemployment as a "cancer," and, "Any new international order will be still-born so long as this cancer is not eradicated from the social system.

"... To create the new social order does not, like war, call for sacrifice of life and limb. But it does call for many of those other sacrifices of profits and luxuries, of rights and privileges, which we make unquestioningly in war."

The Times is the mouthpiece of Government policy, and *The Times* is preaching Freemasonry.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

'THE HOPE OF A NEW WORLD'

Sir,

The article written by the Archbishop of York for *The Listener* of October 24, and the article thereon which was published in *The Social Crediter* on November 23, give prominence to an issue which sooner or later has to be faced by all who accept the principles of Social Credit for which *The Social Crediter* stands.

Your contributor states that the Archbishop's declaration of principles is "the most important pronouncement made by a 'leading' public man since the war began. Indeed it is in the writer's opinion the first and only independent profession of our true war

aims."

Our object as stated by the Archbishop is:

"To reverse that reversal of the natural order which is characteristic of our phase of civilisation; the natural order is that consumption should control production and production should control finance. And this must be done in the way that will secure both freedom and order, both initiative and security, and may promote the only real progress which is the development of the personality in fellowship."

This is a statement of policy which every one of us can accept. But the technical proposals outlined by the Archbishop would not result in the achievement of this policy.

We have no means of knowing whether he is unable to distinguish between policy and technique; but we do know that his statement of war aims will be ineffective unless it can be dissociated from his technical proposals.

It has been well said that the non-ability to distinguish between means and ends is the tragedy of human effort. We can trace our failure through history, a trail of ruin in its wake.

The truth which is slowly becoming manifest is that, ultimately, we do not know the end. The destiny of man is unknown, as Douglas puts it. So that in one sense, any statement of policy must be in itself a means. There must always be a way through. As the Archbishop writes "the only real pro-

gress [which] is the development of the personality in fellowship." The whole thing is dynamic. It is a picture of life more abundant leading we know not whither. All that we can assume, and it is an assumption without which the universe has no meaning, is that the way is good, and that if in the fullness of time the end be manifest, that too will be good.

In 1909 William Temple wrote: "And speaking generally, the moment we agree with anyone that a thing is good it never occurs to us to ask why it should exist. There is no problem of the existence of good. Purpose is a principle which we have already gauged in our own experience and which, where it is applicable, gives a final answer to the question, why; and there is no other principle known, at any rate to me, that does give a final answer to the question Why. We have already seen that the principle of Causation in the ordinary sense does not. It can only state facts of history, and you may always say, Why this history? The only principle then that will satisfy the scientific demand for complete intellectual satisfaction is the principle of Purpose; science requires, therefore, that there should be a real Purpose in the world."*

But no man knows that purpose. No man can see God and live. That it is possible for one man to know that purpose, or for a group of men to know it, while their fellow men remain in ignorance is the colossal assumption made by the World Planners. They aspire to see God and interpret him to their fellow men, and indeed to control other lives in the light of their assumed knowledge. This is the doctrine of non-immanent sovereignty.

"Every extension of extraneous control—if you prefer it, of non-immanent sovereignty—is demonstrably against the inherent nature of the human individual, i.e. is contrary to reality. If this non-immanent sovereignty possesses virtues in itself, i.e. has some reality peculiar to itself, superior to those possessed by any individual—let us say by Jesus of Nazareth—then it ought to be possible to point to them. Where are they?"†

Those words state the issue which has to be faced by every institution in existence. The church itself must answer the challenge. There is only one

answer possible as far as we are concerned, the acceptance of the policy set forth by the Archbishop, "both freedom and order, both initiative and security—the only real progress which is the development of the personality in fellowship."

Where two or three are gathered together. . . .

For an important churchman with responsibilities like those of the Archbishop of York to accept the doctrine of the inherent sovereignty of the individual—which is democracy—to know what he is saying, and to relate his statement to the philosophy of Christianity—a philosophy which we have hardly begun to understand—this might well mean the turning point towards the dawn.

Yours sincerely,

B. M. PALMER.

Sidcup, Kent; December 4, 1940.

EXPLOITABILITY

Sir,

In cold print my letter to you on the above gives the impression of censoriousness that was not intended. And, doubtless through that failing, has provoked what might very easily become a controversy; which would be a mistake. I am sorry for its tone.

In reference to Mrs. Eddy's predictions of Anglo-American reunion, don't we all wish for such an event granted that it is of those concrete realities which it is the objective of Social Crediters to segregate and foster—the real Britain and the real America? Everything in Mrs. Eddy's philosophy and writings goes to prove that it is the real always that she has in mind. And, as I said, no one knew better the Dark Counterfeit that stands over against each and every reality.

As well might Douglas be cited as advocating Federal Union because he quotes the American declaration of Independence in *Economic Democracy*. That his words are not being so used is another matter entirely; and was my whole point, which the error of my manner of approach has led T.J. to ignore. There may be what amounts in T.J.'s mind to a case against the Christian Science Church. I am compelled to be silent on that point simply because I don't know; and for the same reason I wished that T.J. had remained silent as to Mrs. Eddy's statements on things both physical and metaphysical.

T.J. speaks quite truly when he says that no view of reality had been

fully and successfully formulated. It is, as Douglas says in *Economic Democracy*—"probably outside the scope of any words not too symbolical for daily use." Luckily for humanity, however, the basis of Science is not the written word, but demonstration, results, as I know T.J. would agree. The Christian Ethic if it were not based on scientific (no commas, please) demonstration, would not exist to-day; would be nothing, an abstraction—a fact which Douglas allows in his reference to the Incarnation in *Social Credit*.

In mentioning my own experience, after a good deal of consideration and only because I felt the necessity to make a point that could be made in no other way, I was quite aware that I was presenting T.J. with my head on a charger. I have to record a shade of shock that the gift was accepted so readily.

Let me admit again, if the tone of my letter had been more tempered it would better have served the sole purpose for which it was written. I hope Major Douglas will forgive me for dragging him in so frequently. Knowing his enormous patience, I feel sure he will.

I am, etc.,

NORMAN F. WEBB.

Randalstown, Northern Ireland;
November, 1940.

T.J. writes:—

I think Mr. Norman Webb's disarming rejoinder shows that I have made my point clear. But I may say that I have been completely silent concerning all of Mrs. Eddy's statements but one, namely her reported approval of Anglo-American reunion, for which I certainly do not wish: I wish for the elevation of the real America and the real England into effective forces. I expect that, if that occurred, the two forces would be found complementary. It is no use to wish they were complementary or to wish for their union whether they were complementary or not.

International Women's News

October - November, 1940

REBECCA SIEFF, CHAIRMAN W.P.P.A.*

"With enthusiasm she recalls those early days when her father [Michael Marks of Marks and Spencer], a fine Liberal and great humanitarian, inspired in her the desire to use the talents she had in the service of the community. Her house in Park Lane testifies to-day to the way in which she has lived up to this ideal."

*Women's Publicity Planning Association, which has taken over *International Women's News*.

**The Faith and Modern Thought* by William Temple.

†*Whose Service is Perfect Freedom* by C. H. Douglas. (*The Social Crediter*, December 16, 1939.)

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

BIRMINGHAM and District Social Crediters will find friends over tea and light refreshments at Prince's Cafe, Temple Street, on Friday evenings, from 6 p.m., in the King's Room.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Association: Weekly meetings every Tuesday evening at 7-30 p.m. at the Friends Meeting House, King Street, Blackburn. All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow, Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats. Enquiries to R. J. Northin, 11, Centre Street, Bradford.

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER is obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Meets regularly on the first and third Sundays in the month. Time 2-30 p.m. Enquiries to Secretary: Miss J. E. Taylor, 11, Nook Rise, Liverpool 15.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP. Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association. It is important that all Social Crediters on Tyneside should maintain contact. Write Hon. Secretary, R. Thomson, 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; or 50, Ripley Grove, Copnor.

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.

The Social Crediter

If you are not a subscriber to THE SOCIAL CREDITER, send this order without delay.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

Please send THE SOCIAL CREDITER to me

Name

Address

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-
Six 15/-
Three 7/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer, Social Credit Expansion Fund, c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

I enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name

Address

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND.)

Name.....

Address.....

TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE, THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT, 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Advisory Chairmanship of Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute

£ : : , { per month, per quarter, per year,

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

I herewith enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the above mentioned funds.

Signature.....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.)

Books to Read

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy (edition exhausted)
Social Credit 3/6
Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
The Monopoly of Credit 3/6
Warning Democracy (edition exhausted)
The Tragedy of Human Effort ... 6d.
The Use of Money 6d.
Approach to Reality 3d.
Money and the Price System ... 3d.
Nature of Democracy 2d.
Social Credit Principles 1d.
Tyranny 1d.
and
'This 'American' Business' 3d. each
12 for 2/-

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster 4d.
The Nature of Social Credit 4d.
Debt and Taxation 2d.

ALSO

- The Douglas Manual 5/-
The Economic Crisis: Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report 6d.
The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold 4/6
Economics for Everybody by Elles Dee 3d.
The Power of Money by J. B. Galway 3d.
The Purpose of Politics by H. E. 3d.
Tax-Bonds or Bondage and the Answer to Federal Union by John Mitchell...1/- (Postage 2½)

Leaflets

- Invincible Britain by John Mitchell 2d. each, 1/6 doz.
What We Are About by H. E. 50 for 1/6
Hitler and Churchill Finance by John Mitchell..... 50 for 1/9
Bomb Hitler! by C. H. Douglas..... 100 for 1/3

All from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

BELFAST D.S.C. GROUP

Public meeting on December 18, Subject: Why Fear Dominates the World. In the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at 8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon. Sec., 17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., at 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.