THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 7. No. 10. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1941. 6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

". . . . not actually, but in the metaphorical, or American, sense of the word." — E.M.D. in *Punch.*

• • •

The following letter is reprinted from the *Dundee Courier and Advertiser*:

The Nightmare of Official Forms

Sir,

We are all in the war. Our own human element must be considered.

Most in any trade, profession, or business are having their energy worn down very gradually but assuredly, not by enemy propaganda, not by consideration of friends in the forces or in the fighting line, nor by absent relatives, but by departmental forms to fill up. These are becoming the absolute stupid limit.

Government forms to fill up are coming in every morning, many contradicting each other—one to say one thing one month, one to say the next month that the position has "now been changed."

It is needless to say more to those who receive these—we know too well their absolute annoyance—but "the worm will turn." It is to be borne in mind that folk all over the country are trying to save paper, yet these departments are using a colossal amount of unnecessary paper, and already it is proved for no purpose whatsoever but to allow us to know that they are doing their job.

These folk could be done without; in fact we do not wish them. Many folk know not only far more than those who formulate these forms, but can carry out the war effort much more efficiently than those so-called people in charge. It is these offices who have taken away some of the best of our staff and left "those out of Government services or offices" to carry on, not only without anyone, but adding daily extra work to the various weakened organisations.

It is useless writing to any Government department to put a stop to this insane monster of so-called necessary statistics that has come amongst us, and it is high time we rose to protect ourselves against an absolute evil.

It is my suggestion that we form a British Protection Society against our own Government servants' issuing useless and wasteful forms.

I am, &c.,

H. W. COWPER.

Mains of Logie, Hillside, Montrose; October 30, 1941.

Now then, what about it?

• • •

In connection with the quotation from the speech of Mr. Arthur Greenwood in our issue of October 25, our attention has been drawn to a correction of the report in the Press, which now reads, "We will give of our help till it hurts."

We agree with our correspondent that we have neither the need nor the desire to misrepresent Mr. Greenwood.

• • •

The Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Barnes, has, in the name of freedom, denounced control of the industrial machine by Big Business and its chiefs. His solution, presumably also in the name of freedom, is control by the State.

"Some might argue," he added, "that, if the State is given the powers which a Socialist State must obviously have under modern conditions, it would become a tyrannical bureaucracy."

They might do more than argue, they might point to examples: but Dr. Barnes thinks that Independent Christian criticism would be the solution to that tendency to tyrannical bureaucracy.

Here again is the confusion of words and deeds: even the wisest criticism is no use unless the critics have some sanctions to back up their words, and it is the essence of democracy that channels to make such criticism (so far as it is genuinely acceptable) effective are an essential part of the framework of government. To transfer power from the individual to the bureaucrat or the State is to make democracy impracticable.

• • •

"The Forward March" is the new name for an organisation hitherto known as "Our Struggle." A bilious green leaflet says: —

"Is there any test which men and women must pass before they can join this organisation? Yes. Those who would join us must be quite sure that there is no hope for humanity unless men will think of themselves not as a collection of nations but as members of a single community and unless, throughout this community the motive of self interest is replaced by the motive of Service to our Fellow Men in Peace. They must also be quite sure that they agree that these two results cannot be achieved while the share certificates and other documents of title into which the *great* resources of this community are divided remain the objects of legal private ownership. They must in fact agree that these great resources shall be owned in common. And their actions must show that they are resolutely determined to proclaim their belief in these things by every means within their power."

How they can be 'quite sure' in the absence of trial or practical proof is not disclosed: such a demand for dogmatic theory can only result in the self selection of quack-minded parrots, who, like the Queen in *Alice in Wonderland,* have one cure to meet any emergency: "Off with his head!"

Habeas Corpus

LORD ATKIN'S DISSENTING SPEECH

The House of Lords, by a majority of four judgments to one, decided in a recent case that in administering Regulation 18B it is not necessary for the Home Secretary to justify himself by proving that the suspicions on which he has acted are those which would be entertained by the 'reasonable man' of legal hypothesis: his decision is not subject to judicial review.

Lord Atkin, in the course of his dissenting speech, said that the material words were simple and, in his opinion, obviously gave only a conditional authority to the Minister to detain any person without trial, the condition being that he had reasonable cause for the belief which led to the detention order. The meaning, however, which appeared to have found favour with some of their Lordships was that there was no condition; for the words "if the Secretary of State has reasonable cause" merely meant if the Secretary of State thought that he had reasonable cause. The result was that the only implied condition was that the Secretary of State acted in good faith. If he did that the Minister had been given complete discretion whether he should detain a subject or not. It was an absolute power which had never been given before to the Executive, and he (his Lordship) would demonstrate that no such power was in fact given to the Minister by the words in question.

It was surely incapable of dispute that the words "If A has X" constituted a condition the essence of which was the existence of X and the having of it by A. The words did not and could not mean "If A thinks that he has." "Reasonable cause" for an action or a belief was just as much a positive fact capable of detemination by a third party as a broken ankle or a legal right. That meaning of the words had been accepted in innumerable legal decisions for many generations; "reasonable cause" for a belief when the subject of legal dispute had been always treated as an objective fact to be proved by one or other party and to be determined by the appropriate tribunal.

In the Defence Regulations themselves the persons responsible for the framing of them had shown themselves to be fully aware of the true meaning of the words, and had obviously used the words "reasonable cause" to indicate that mere honest belief was not enough, using different words where it was intended that the Executive officer should have unqualified discretion.

Having considered the various Defence Regulations as supporting that view, his Lordship considered the wording of Regulation 18B, and said that organisations were impugned if the Secretary of State was satisfied as to their nature, but the person was not to be detained unless the Secretary of State had reasonable cause to believe that he was a member. Why the two different expressions should be used if they had the same "subjective" meaning no one had been able to explain. He suggested that the obvious intention was to give a safeguard to the individual against arbitrary imprisonment.

It was argued that it could never have been intended to substitute the decision of Judges for that of the Minister. But no one proposed either a substitution or an appeal. A Judge had the duty to say whether the conditions of the power of detentions were fulfilled. If they were reasonable grounds, the Judge had no further duty of deciding whether he would have formed the same belief, any more than, if there was reasonable evidence to go to a jury, the Judge was concerned with whether he would have come to the same verdict. It was further argued that the grounds of belief might be confidential matters of public importance, and that it was impossible to suppose that the Secretary of State was intended to disclose either his grounds or his information to the Court. The objection was answered by the very terms of the regulation itself, in its provisions that the detained person had the right to make objections to an advisory committee, and that the chairman must inform the objector of the grounds on which the order had been made against him.

The only argument as to expediency put forward by the defendants which had any weight was that it could not have been intended that the accumulated experience, instinct, knowledge of the Minister in coming to a decision on this matter could be replaced by a judgment of a Court of law. But before that decision was made there had to be a valid belief that the subject was of hostile origin, association, &c. Once that was established it was very unlikely that a Court would not in most cases accept as reasonable the Home Secretary's decision to detain.

He (Lord Atkin) viewed with apprehension the attitude of Judges who on a mere question of construction, when face to face with claims involving the liberty of the subject, showed themselves more Executive minded than the Executive. Their function was to give words their natural meaning, although not perhaps in war-time leaning towards liberty. In this country amid the clash of arms the laws were not silent. They might be changed, but they spoke the same language in war as in peace. It had always been one of the pillars of freedom, one of the principles of liberty for which on recent authority this country was now fighting, that the Judges were no respecters of persons, and stood between the subject and any attempted encroachments on his liberty by the Executive, alert to see that any coercive action was justified in law. In this case he (his Lordship) had listened to arguments which might have been addressed acceptably to the Court of King's Bench in the time of Charles I.

He protested, even if he did it alone, against a strained construction put on words with the effect of giving an uncontrolled power of imprisonment to the Minister. The words had only one meaning; they were used with that meaning in statements of the common law and in statutes. They had never been used in the sense now imputed to them; they were used in the Defence Regulations in the natural meaning.

He knew of only one authority which might justify the suggested method of construction. "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty had said in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less." "The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean different things." "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master—that's all." (Looking Glass, c. vi.) After all the long discussion in that House the question was whether the words "If a man has" could mean "If a man thinks he has." He was of opinion that they could not, and that the case should be decided accordingly.

The plaintiff's right to particulars, however, was based on a principle which, again, was one of the pillars of liberty, in that in English law every imprisonment was *prima facie*

unlawful, and that it was for a person directing imprisonment to justify his act.

Lord Maugham, who presided over the hearing, wrote to *The Times* to say that according to the traditions of the Bar, counsel could not reply "even to so grave an animadversion" as Lord Atkin's statement that he had listened "to arguments which might have been addressed acceptably to the Court of King's Bench in the time of Charles I." Lord Maugham did not hear from counsel or from anyone else "anything which could justify such a remark."

A rejoinder from Mr. Gerald Gardiner the next day contains two interesting points:—

"It may be presumptuous for an ordinary lawyer to express a view upon the decision of the House of Lords, but as so distinguished a lawyer as Lord Maugham has thought your columns an appropriate place in which to comment upon part of the speech of another member of the tribunal, it may be permissible for a humble member of the Bar to follow his example and to say that in places where lawyers meet the view being yesterday expressed by lawyers of all shades of opinion was one of admiration for, and gratitude to, Lord Atkin for his dissenting speech, the contents of which appear to some ordinary lawyers to be unanswerable."

Mr. Gardiner, who wrote from 3, Hare Court, Temple, also pointed out:—

"The original Regulation 18B conferred on the Home Secretary an absolute discretion to detain persons if he was 'satisfied' of certain things. On October 31, 1939, upon a motion in the House of Commons to annul the regulations, grave dissatisfaction with this regulation was expressed in the House on the ground that the regulation left the liberty of the subject to the sole discretion of the Home Secretary. The Government thereupon withdrew the regulations and agreed to amend them to meet this and other objections, and, on November 23, 1939, the amended regulations were made, the new Regulation 18B providing that the Home Secretary could only detain if he 'has reasonable cause to believe' those things of which previously he had only to be 'satisfied.' What is one to think of an Executive whose law officers now argue that the amended regulation means, and must have been intended to mean, precisely the same as the regulation which was withdrawn?"

This Jewish Business

By H. R. P.

No periodical, certainly not *The Social Crediter* is exempt from criticism by its subscribers. Much of that criticism, if constructive and put forward in reasonable fashion, is very helpful. Some is not.

It is proposed, here to deal with only one particular, but apparently frequent criticism. It goes somewhat like this: "I read the paper because I feel I should, but I can't follow this Jew business." On the face of it such a critic has failed to grasp not only the reasoning in many published articles, but the implication of the bare facts put before the readers. In other words, each issue is in itself an answer to this criticism which persists merely because the critic has not thought the matter right through. These lines are intended to assist him to do so.

To begin with, *The Social Crediter* is hostile only to certain Jews and certain Gentiles, who have been and still are guilty of plotting the submergence of democratic thought and a typically British mode of life.

The attack on these Jews and their Gentile collaborators goes deeper. There are still many people who think that what we are attacking and what we should exclusively criticise is a system. Such an approach is a compromise with the devil and a few years ago may—or may not—have been psychologically sound. To-day such an approach, lacking as it does a background of reality, is undoubtedly misleading and therefore wrong. A system may be inefficient or faulty, *i.e.*, it does not perform its agreed function with the least possible degree of friction, or it may not show the results pragmatically possible. But all systems are capable of alteration and adjustment. It only requires some person to point out the failings in the system and it *can* be put right. So far as our financial system is concerned, attention was drawn to its faults in 1918. However, it has not been altered for the benefit of the individuals comprising this or any other country.

A system does not run itself. It is run by individuals. When these put up a very determined and active opposition to changing the system for the better, then the only remedy open to the people is to remove them from their positions of power and put in their place men who will carry out the people's policy. Opposition to the improvement of the financial system suggests another system, one of secret government, of which the financial system is only a part, albeit an important one.

The argument that the system should be attacked and not the men by whom and for whom that system is run, is superficially plausible and rather subtle. It is, however, a matter for amazement that people, who in other respects have proved their capacity to recognise reality, should fall for it. A centre forward plays the individuals, singly or in combination, of the opposing team, he does not play "the team" and most certainly he does not play the rules of the F.A. Just so are we pitted not against a system but against the men who have proved over and over again that they are prepared to see all life on this planet extinguished rather than relinquish the power the system gives them.

On the whole their activities are subtle and hidden, but on several occasions they have been forced out into the open and have not shrunk from the crudest action. We have seen them at work in this way in Austria, Bavaria, Australia, Alberta and elsewhere. It happens to be a fact that a large number of these men who form the secret world government, not yet—thank God!—in complete control, are Jews. Not only that, but the philosophy underlying the policy they pursue, the policy of this secret government, is identical with the Judaic philosophy. Its centralisation of policy, its deification of abstractions, its denial of the rights of the individual human being, have been shown in these pages frequently enough not to require repetition. Hitler's policy, which incorporates all these features, must derive from a similar philosophy.

It is this Judaic philosophic conception of life that is so abhorrent to the British mind. It follows that our enemies are those men who are so ruthlessly, by blood and sword, by death and falsehood, somehow, anyhow trying to clamp down, on a largely unsuspecting people, eternal slavery. Although many of their instruments are Gentiles, those men are mainly Jews. So long as the bulk of the Jewish people actively assist these men, they must be our enemies too, whether they know to what ends they are being used or not. Hence this "Jew business"!

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: (*Editorial*) 4, ACREFIELD ROAD, WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL, *Telephone*: *Gateacre* 1561; (*Business*) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, *Telephone*: *Wavertree* 435.

Vol. 7. *No.* 10. *Saturday, November* 15, 1941.

'Root Causes' of Hitler

The Times announces an advance in economic opinion. Apparently the advance has been accomplished simultaneously in Washington and New York. Whether this step has been taken to catch up with Social Crediters (who are more than one short step ahead) or to induce *The Times* to catch up with Wall Street is not clear.

Russia seems to have been the unconscious instrument of enlightenment. Russia is 'anxious' to pay for everything she receives. We have no objection. It would hardly be our business to object to 'Russia's' paying for what she didn't receive, or to object to her paying for what she received to someone she didn't receive it from. But these are matters for the consideration primarily of Russian citizens and American munition workers. The credit necessary to finance supplies to Russia, is not to be a 'debt-free' payment, like the credits the Australians have been asking for. It will be merely an 'interest-free' payment postponed until five years after the war, and then payable in kind over a period of ten years. £250,000,000 distributed in this way may not have appreciable results; but where American manufacturers are to get the money to 'buy' the raw materials which will form part of the payment, and American consumers the money to buy the commodities which will form another part are, alike, matters for Americans to consider. Somehow or other *The Times* seems to think that the procedure suggested avoids the creation of international debts and credits, and shows 'a great advance towards the realistic treatment of war finance.' The return of goods for goods is, of course, realistic. But what this has to do with financing *per se* is not by any means clear. American unemployed, unless some illumination dawns concerning the inadequacy of the wage system to distribute goods, will have the opportunity of complaining to their union bosses about 'Russian dumping' instead of being justified in complaining in the same heedless quarters about high prices—*i.e.* prices their wages cannot cancel over the counter.

Whether this illumination is likely to constitute a further 'advance of opinion' in America or not, it seems to be still far from *The Times*. However 'determined' the American administration may be 'to avoid the mistakes made after the last war' the mistake of making work for 'free' people does not seem down for avoidance. By undertaking to provide a decent standard of life for the world's millions, at least every American man and woman who wants work will get work (to provide a decent standard for someone else!). This is said to be getting 'at the root causes of the economic evils which prepared the way *for Hitler*.' It is, on the contrary, the continuation of root causes which will pave the way towards somebody's having to get rid of a super-Hitler. That Hitler had 'root causes' in economics must not be taken to be *The Times's* way of saying that he is the child of the Devil. It is however, an advance. T. J.

Brandeis

The late Louis D. Brandeis and the late Menahem Ussishkin have been memorialised at Tel-Aviv and in the Emek, and the first named in London as well. Both were Jews almost unknown to the great public, so that what is now said about them and who knew enough of them to say it is of interest.

Besides Mr. Winant and Lord Snell, representatives of the Foreign Office and Colonial Office attended the London meeting, according to *The Jewish Chronicle*.

Lord Snell said Brandeis was "more than a leader of his own people—a leader and counsellor of mankind." The American Ambassador said that "more than any other American jurist, he had related economics to law." Dr. Chaim Weizmann said Brandeis was "the greatest Jew the American community had so far produced. President Wilson consulted him with regard to the drafting of the Balfour Declaration in 1917." The Leeds professor, Dr. Brodetsky said that "at the end of the war it would be *largely the Jews of the U.S.A. who would lead in the problems of the resettlement; and unfortunately they would be without the guidance of Justice Brandeis*." At Tel-Aviv, Julius Simon, Treasurer of the Palestine Economic Corporation, said: "Brandeis was a synthesis of Herzl and Achad Ha'am: he believed in Herzl's political conception and also in the principle of Achad Ha'am that quality is more important than quantity." At the first municipal meeting of the Jewish New Year, the mayor of Tel-Aviv, Israel Rokach said: "Ussishkin, who was wrapped in Jewish tradition, taught us to love our fatherland; Brandeis, who was far from tradition, but *close to his people, from his high position in a free country remembered his nation, his second homeland, and fought for it*." 'His nation' is obviously the Jewish *nation*, and 'his *second* home' not the place (America) where he lived.

A correspondent writes:—I believe I am right in saying that it was at an interview arranged with remarkable celerity as Douglas was waiting to embark at New York that Douglas, who had not previously heard of Brandeis, first fully appreciated that those operating the financial system knew exactly how it worked and were not in the least interested in getting it to work any better. "I described to him," said Douglas, "the details of the financial system and the results which ensued. He listened with close attention and without raising the slightest objection, and at the close sat back, put the finger-tips of his two hands together and said: 'Very well; and NOW what are you going to do about it?' "

Winant's remark quoted above is an answer to those who innocently remark that Brandeis was a lawyer not a banker.

• • •

The unpardonable sin of the supreme power is that it is supreme. —G. K. CHESTERTON.

THE MEDICINE MAN

Alexis Carrel wrote a book called *Man, The Unknown,* and published it in 1935. Carrel was born at Sainte Foy les Lyon in 1873, the son of Alexis and Anna (Ricard) Carrel. In the preface to his book, Carrel says he has spent most of his time in the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in America. There he 'contemplated the phenomena of life while they were analysed by incomparable experts such as Meltzer, Jacques Loeb, Noguchi and many others.' That the study of living things has been undertaken at the Rockefeller Institute 'with a broadness of vision so far unequalled' Carrel attributes to 'the genius of Flexner.' Presumably he means Simon Flexner, a Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. There are three Flexners. Abraham, described by *Who's Who in America* as an 'educator.' He has written about medical education in Europe and in America and about prostitution in Europe. Bernard was Counsel to the Zionist delegation to the Peace Conference in 1918. The three are brothers, sons of Moses and Esther (Abraham) Flexner.

Loeb is probably as well-known as any of the others. He is a mechanistic physiologist who deems consciousness to be 'an illusion' of sensation. But the purpose of this article is not to assess the importance of these personalities. It is not even to analyse the process or the results of centralisation of 'scientific' enquiry in conjunction with the development of 'big-business' policy, or any other policy. It is merely to draw attention, in the setting in which it occurs, to something curious, almost inexplicable.

"Human beings," says Carrel, "are not found anywhere in nature. There are only individuals. The individual differs from the human being because he is a concrete event. He is the only one who acts, loves, suffers, fights, and dies. On the contrary, the human being is a Platonic Idea living in our minds and in our books. He consists of the abstractions studied by physiologists, psychologists, and sociologists. His characteristics are expressed by Universals. To-day we are again facing a problem which engrossed the philosophical minds of the Middle Ages, the problem of the reality of general ideas." He goes on to say that we live in two different worlds—the world of facts and that of their symbols. Carrel was awarded the Nobel prize (he is primarily a surgeon) for his work in transplanting tissues from one animal to another. It is not, however, a common trait in the character of surgeons to want to make the best of two worlds. Usually they strive to make the best of one of them. Carrel won't have the division between 'the realists who believed in the existence of Universals and the nominalists who did not believe in it.' (Anslem v. Abélard.) They "were equally right." "Scientists accustomed to the techniques of mechanics, chemistry, physics, and physiology, and unfamiliar with philosophy and intellectual culture, are liable to mingle the concepts of the different disciplines. . . . . Education, medicine and sociology are concerned with the individual. They are guilty of a disastrous error when they look upon him only as a symbol . . . individuality is fundamental in man. . . . Each individual is conscious of being unique. . . . We are not even capable of discovering the essential characteristics of a given man. And still less his potentialities. . . . Most of us are unaware of our own aptitudes. The tests applied to school children and students by inexperienced psychologists have no great significance. They give an illusory confidence to those unacquainted with psychology. In fact, they should be accorded less importance. Psychology is not yet a science. . . . Physicians. . . . are asked to realise the impossible feat of building up a science of the particular. . . ."

Carrel has now made the best he can of World No. 1. "Each of us is certainly far larger and more diffuse than his own body. . . . Love and hatred are realities. . . . If we could visualise. . . . immaterial links, human beings [not individuals?] would assume new and strange aspects. Some would hardly extend beyond their anatomical limits [although 'we are not even capable of discovering the essential characteristics of a given man']. Others would stretch out as far as a safe in a bank. . . . Others would appear immense. They would expand in long tentacles. . . . Leaders of nations, great philanthropists, saints, would look like fairy-tale giants, spreading their multiple arms over a country, a continent, the entire world. . . . Caesar, Napoleon, Mussolini, all great leaders of nations, grow beyond human stature. . . . Between certain individuals and nature there are subtle and obscure relations. . . . Each man is bound to those who precede and follow him. . . . Individuality is doubtless [sic!] real. But it is much less definite than we believe. And the independence of each individual from the others and from the cosmos is an illusion. . . . Modern society ignores the individual."

From the point of recognising the relativity of individuals, which is a biological as well as a social fact, Carrel proceeds to stress the damage done to individuals by standardisation and our ignorance of 'the constitution of the human being.' It is to be noticed that the damage has been done to the real thing; but emphasis is now to be transferred to the abstraction, the human being. Carrel has already defined the province of science—'the abstractions studied by' scientists. Carrel is a scientist. (There's nothing like leather). "The democratic principle [what is that?] has contributed to the collapse of civilisation in opposing the development of an élite. . . . The standardisation of men by the democratic ideal has already determined the predominance of the weak. . . . Like the invalid, the criminal, and the insane, [the weak] attract the sympathy of the public. The myth of equality, the love of the symbol, the contempt for the concrete fact, are, in a large measure, guilty of the collapse of the individual. . . . We know that he cannot adapt himself to the environment created by technology, that such environment brings about his degradation." Technology is an omnibus abstraction; and things are not created by abstractions; but let this pass. "Science and machines are not responsible for his present state. We [who?] alone are guilty. We have not been capable of distinguishing the prohibited from the lawful. We have infringed natural laws. . . . Life always gives an identical answer when asked to trespass on forbidden ground. It weakens and civilisations collapse."

Unconsciously, Carrel has been writing 'science.' He has described what the individual has *become* in terms of his abstractions. He is determined to effect the remaking of man by carrying his abstractions a stage further: to make the best of Word No. 2. He *says*: "As long as the hereditary qualities of the race remain present, the strength and audacity of his forefathers can be resurrected in modern man by his own will. But is he still capable of such an effort?"

Grammatically, 'his' will here is the individual's.

Carrel must be ignorant of the notion:—

> The pyramidal structure of society gives environment the maximum control over individuality. The correct objective of any change is to give individuality maximum control over environment.

These words appeared in the first edition of *Economic Democracy*.

Whether 'he' (the individual) is capable of an effort or not, Carrel, apparently is! And this is the form, apparently, which his effort is to take:—

"Medicine [at the Rockefeller Institute] is the most comprehensive of all the sciences concerning man, from anatomy to political economy.... Can any individual master anatomy, physiology, biological chemistry, psychology, metaphysics, pathology, medicine, and also have a thorough acquaintance with genetics, nutrition, development, pedagogy, esthetics, morals, religion, sociology, and economics? It seems that such an accomplishment is not impossible. In about twenty-five years of uninterrupted study, one could learn these sciences. At the age of fifty, those who have submitted themselves to this discipline could effectively direct the construction of the human being and of a civilisation based on his true nature. Indeed, the few gifted individuals who dedicate themselves to this work will have to renounce the common modes of existence. They will not be able to play golf and bridge, to go to cinemas, to listen to radios, to make speeches at banquets, to serve on committees, to attend meetings of scientific societies, political conventions, and academies, or to cross the ocean and take part in international congresses. They must live like...." Well, never mind: the chief point is that they will still live in the shadow of the genius of Flexner! "Why," asks Carrel, "should not some individuals sacrifice their lives to acquire the science indispensible to the making of man and his environment..... There is no more beautiful and dangerous adventure than the renovation of modern man." Dangerous, yes, and not only to the sacrificialists; but the answer to this question is, briefly, that some individuals may do what they like, provided they do not merely make a corner in indivuality, and are not merely obtaining maximum control for *their* individuality. But that, otherwise, so fatuous a proposal is both useless and unnecessary. Even at the Rockefeller Institute doctors differ. Is it not curious that men can know so much and understand so little? To take up an excellent point which Carrel makes himself, is it *natural*, that men should have to sacrifice their lives for an abstraction, and isn't the renovation of modern man an abstraction? Would it not be more 'natural' if some of our abstractionists sacrificed a few of their abstractions in favour of the real individual, whose 'essential characteristics' they are not 'capable of discovering'? The opinion is Carrel's own.

T. J.

No Debate on Chain Stores

Sir John Anderson told Mr. de la Bere, M. P. for Evesham, in answer to a question in Parliament that time could not be found for a debate on limitation of chain stores. He said the importance of the small shopkeeper in our economy and social structure was "pretty well recognised."

Mr. de la Bere had said that the livelihood of more than a million small shopkeepers was at stake.

On Adaptation

By N. F. W.

One can be brought up very sharply by the question: What is Social Credit?

There are several ways of reacting to such a query. Time was when it led almost directly to an explanation of the gap in prices and to argument, as it still can. And then later it was to a definition of what the two words Social Credit mean. But in neither instance did the answers really deal with what was probably most in the mind of the questioner, seeking for some visible, tangible evidence of what is called Social Credit, something active and dynamic, comprehending the Movement.

To attempt in any exact sense to define Social Credit in a single aspect, either as a Movement, or a philosophy, or a criticism, or a proposal, is likely to result in obscuring more than it reveals. In all likelihood it can be more usefully hinted at than defined.

A living organism has a policy which we may call Life. And it has a strategy and a tactic which combined make up its method of procedure and its adaptation to circumstances. Policy remains fixed, but conditions are forever altering and with that alteration an organism—a Movement, if it is dynamic—must change its strategy and tactics. This is the test of a Movement, and of whether it is organic or merely organised. The Labour Party affords an example of an association whose strategy and structure remain rigidly "put" in a top-heavy Party Organisation, pegged down to Internationalism, while its policy, so-called, reacts from Pacifism to War-fever, and from disarmament to total mobilisation.

In so far as Social Credit is a real Movement it is the exact opposite to that; neither pacifist nor bellicose in any political sense, because neither represents its policy. It is adaptive. And the correct answer to the question, "What is Social Credit?" would not be the same in 1941 as it would be in 1931, or again in 1921; for the very appearance of an organism undergoes change according to circumstances —almost one might say, in proportion to its fixity of policy.

It is the height of practical wisdom to cultivate fixity of purpose and principle, and to hold on to it; to be ready, if necessary, to let most else, and especially yesterday's strategy, slide. For the strategy that was correct twelve months ago, is not necessarily or even probably correct for to-day. A principle, on the other hand, if it was ever correct is always so. To keep tight hold on policy then, and remain free to meet each shift and change of events is both the evidence of organic life and the surest way of promoting it.

So that at any rate one correct answer to the question is that Social Credit is quite literally a Movement, but without party or plan or organisation. That it possesses no definable numerical strength, nor headquarters worth mentioning, nor tangible assets on which Finance can get a lien. It is, in fact, remarkably like the Kingdom of God, of which it is stated that no one can say— "Lo here! or, Lo there! For behold the Kingdom of God is within you."

Social Credit attends on "events." And for that reason there is no status nor comforting membership button for Social Crediters; but only ceaseless adaptation of strategy directed towards a constant organic policy, which after all is the only thing that can make life really worth living.

Centralisation and Country Life

By B. M. PALMER

I have spent a weekend in one of the Home Counties where life is still almost completely rural—the train service is too poor to allow of daily travel to London and most of the villages are without main water, gas and electricity—conditions which cannot be taken as typical of country life everywhere; but I do not know that anything is gained by an attempt to generalise. There are no new factories in this area, it is considered too dangerous. But every condemned cottage, every spare bedroom has long been occupied by refugees from London or coastal districts, some of them living under conditions not only of complete discomfort, but of boredom.

This summer there were two main problems, to accommodate the refugees and make the best use of all products which were not directly marketable through the usual trade channels. This was mainly fruit and vegetables from private gardens.

From the very beginning the evils of centralisation made things doubly difficult. With the best will in the world it was impossible to cope with the extra cooking in the small crowded cottages. Yet though there was labour available and no physical reason why the vegetables and milk produced locally should not be used to provide a hot mid-day meal for the school children, it was weeks before the arrangements could be made.

Refugees crowding into the villages needed milk, but they could not get it. This was not because no supply was available, but because some of the farmers had not been able to build cowsheds to conform to the requirements of the Milk Marketing Board. Their milk could not therefore be sold.

One farmer gave a supply of skimmed milk to be distributed among the school children, having discovered there was no law to forbid this: There followed a fine scandal—"How dreadful that the poor children are being fed on skimmed milk!" The medical officer of health from the county town looked into the matter, said that the skimmed milk provided was of better quality than what passed for whole milk in most districts, in spite of the unorthodox cowsheds, and cut through the red tape on his own responsibility. But not all officials have either the character or power to defy the great lumbering machine at Whitehall.

Meanwhile the local officer of the Ministry of Food has resigned. This is his second experience of rationing in wartime, and the amount of office work is now more than he can cope with. Every week there are more forms to fill in, and as his staff is recruited from young women who are not wanted in the A.T.S., W.A.A.F., or W.R.N.S. his work is progressively in arrears.

What will happen when there are more forms to fill in than officials can deal with? This point has almost been reached. Shall we lose the war?

The complete disappearance of tinned foods meant that cottage women needed help with preserving fruit and drying vegetables. Even in a bad season there is often a small local glut which has to be dealt with at once. Little provision had been made by the Ministry of Agriculture—they were fully occupied with the jam scheme and said they were too busy even to provide instruction to help the refugees with their new allotments.

The villagers did not like the jam scheme. They felt it was a cheap and easy method to provide the towns with jam at the expense of the winter needs of the villages. In this district there was a woman who had been well-known for some time as an expert in fruit-bottling. She had lectured at the various Women's Institutes on modern methods of bottling without sugar, and drying. There was a public demand for her services, and finally she was appointed by the county as a technical expert. So far as I am aware she is the only expert in the area who is directly responsible to the public.

The opinion was expressed to me that the organisation of jam-making on a national scale from a centralised headquarters was both wasteful and against the true interests of local people. Why could not surburban housewives be supplied with the fruit and sugar and told to use it as they thought best? But for some reason the Ministry had decided that jam is good for us, and therefore we were to eat jam tarts next winter instead of our own bottled fruit. And the work was to be done by the already over-worked village women, many of whom toil in the fields, although suburban

To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

Affiliation to the Social Credit Secretariat, which has been accorded to Groups of Social Crediters, will be replaced by a new relationship and all existing affiliations will be terminated as from January 1, 1942. This new relationship is expressed in the following Form which Associations* desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members of Association .....

.....

.....

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat†.

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy to every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... *Signature*.....

A brief statement is also requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,
Director of Organisation
and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

housewives have far more time, even if they have children. Generally they also have more conveniences for cookery, and often welcome the opportunity for experiment.

One last point: although the county concerned was fully supplied with technical experts and lecturers, a *second* set was provided by the Ministry of Health, largely recruited from young girls with domestic science degrees who before the war had been demonstrators for various gas and electricity undertakings. These girls were completely at sea in rural conditions, and had everything to learn before they could be of the slightest use.

They quickly lost face with the villagers, who soon tired of receiving incorrect or inadequate information.

Even with the best will in the world it would be impossible for these three ministries—of health, of food and of agriculture—to organise so gigantic a task from Whitehall without unlimited waste and overlapping. But when interested parties are waiting to turn mistakes of the Ministries to their own account, it is of vital importance for as many people as possible to realise how much of this chaos is due to centralisation. And they *are* learning. They are still pondering over the egg scheme: one of the villagers said, "You know, I think there must be something behind the egg scheme." May they go on pondering until they identify it.

Licensing Banks in Australia

The Times reports that representatives of the trading banks have conferred with Mr. Curtin, the Australian Commonwealth Prime Minister, Mr. Chifley, the Treasurer and Dr. Evatt, the Attorney-General, on the Government's proposals to control them by licence under the National Security Regulations.

"While the banks recognise that some form of supervision is inherent in the Labour policy, they argued that what the Government proposed to do by regulation could better be achieved by a 'gentleman's agreement,' as under Mr. Fadden's Budget, which had a similar objective to that of the Labour Government. One probable outcome of the conference is that while a fundamental alteration of the Government's proposals is unlikely, there will be some broadening of the machinery of the proposed licensing system."

A statement in the *Daily Telegraph* adds that the banks decided to accept the Government's proposed regulations without public protest, but the acceptance does not imply their approval of the principles of the regulations.

• • •

"Labourites, whose socialistic philosophy prevents them from taking the initiative in attacking the communists on matters affecting the democratic government of our country, are always ready and willing to support any sort of attack upon communistic action." (Extract from letter from New South Wales).

Hamstrung but still able to hop—in Australia.

• • •

It was stated in court that Ernest Heath, a Glasgow seaman, refused to work because the captain would not let him steer.

Ernest is 18 years old.

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

Information about Social Credit activities in different regions may be had by writing to the following addresses:

BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.

BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.

BLACKBURN S.C. Association: 168 Shear Brow, Blackburn.

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

DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.

LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.

LONDON Liaison Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
Lunch hour re-unions on the first and third Thursdays of the month at 12-30 p.m., at The Plane Tree Restaurant, Great Russell Street, W. C. 1. Next meeting November 20.

MIDLAND D.S.C. Group: see Birmingham.

NEWCASTLE and Gateshead S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

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

SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton. Liverpool.