FROM WEEK TO WEEK

ANOTHER IMPENDING APOLOGY: "In a Munich Nazi Court, a schoolboy was alleged to have thrown a sponge at a circus elephant. Nothing quite like this has happened since Italy declared war on America." — Punch.

"There was a time when Americans could afford to follow the foreign policy summarised by Tyler Dennett in the epigram 'When we are asked to put up or shut up, we do neither.' The time is now rapidly approaching when we Americans will have to put up or shut up."

— Demaree Bess in The Saturday Evening Post.

You said it.

If there is one cause which can be stated with certainty to have made the rise to power in Germany of Hitler, or someone like him, inevitable, it is the conscious policy of fantastic and real inflation which delivered most of the real and personal property over to the Jews, who paid for it in billions of "wallpaper" marks, which were required by the ordinary individual for day to day living, and which they bought with a few dollars at an exchange rate of 4,200,000 million marks to the dollar (November 20, 1923). The procedure was exactly similar to that pursued in Russia, and proceeded from the same quarters.

One item in this little game of beggar-my-neighbour was overlooked. A very considerable portion of the mortgages in Germany were held by Jews and Jewish Institutions, and they were paid off in wallpaper.

Now observe: The Bank of "England" (Governor, Montagu Norman, late of Brown, Shipley affiliated to Messrs. Harriman, U.S.A., who got most of the valuable concessions when Pine Street, N.Y. financed the Bolsheviks) has confiscated all holdings in foreign, and particularly, dollar, currency, with the exception of those of its pets. So you won't be in the wallpaper game, Clarence.

And its camouflaged mortgage and loan departments, such as the Lands Improvement Company, have powers to refuse to accept the re-payment of the principal of their Mortgages.

You have been warned.

"Retired Colonel von Streber, who lived on the first floor and who had been quietly and slowly starving through all these years, suddenly seemed to wake up. He said everything would change in Germany, now, and it was about time. His voice was full of hate.

"A few days later, when I came home, Herr Lehmann was whispering to Concierge Waldman. I didn't hear much of the conversation: I just heard two words: 'The Jews.'" — Beginning of the End by Kurt Riess.

"I have been ten years in Russia, and have been in Petrograd through the whole of the Revolution... had ample opportunity of studying Bolshevik methods. It originated in German propaganda, and was, and is, being carried out by international Jews. The Germans initiated disturbances in order to reduce Russia to chaos. They printed masses of paper money to finance their schemes..."


Praoda which is an official paper, because there aren't any others, says that the relinquishment of Manila and the great naval base of Cavite, without defending them, was cowardly.

There is something about these Russians, you know.

If you will go into almost any Post Office, you will see a coloured poster advertising the Post Office Savings Bank, the Controller of which, Mr. Leon Simon, is a member of the Zionist Committee. The poster depicts a winged lion with two outstretched paws and a spiral tail. It is, in fact, a very slightly disguised edition of the Caduceus, or Staff of Hermes, a symbol of international freemasonry, which may also be seen, undisguised, on the bronze doors of the Bank of "England." The dollar sign is a camouflage of the same symbol. The poster exhorts you to "Save for Supremacy." No, Clarence, not your supremacy.

Paper is vital to the production of munitions and there is said to be a serious shortage. This is no doubt why an ever-increasing torrent of useless forms pours from every Government Department, and why no Government Department disposes of business in which it concerns itself without writing six times as many letters as would be necessary to a private undertaking doing the same work.

"Organisation" or "Planning," which nowadays mainly consists in paying people with their own money to work to their own disadvantage, has that blessed word Mesopotamia beaten at the tape. If you say you have been expecting war with the Japs and the Japs bomb Manilla, torpedo the ships in Pearl Harbour, and capture Wake Island, you don't shoot back at them if you live in the best circles. You hurriedly go as far away as possible, and organise. It then transpires that somebody else will do the shooting for you—perhaps.

Strange as it may seem, the so-called Battle of Britain was not won by "organisation," and neither was the Graf Spee sunk that way. These battles were won by men who used their personal courage and initiative, and hit their enemy as soon as they saw him, and went on hitting him, until he'd had enough.

Ninety-five per cent of the "organisation" in Great
Britain, at the present time, is directed to strangling action of any kind whatsoever. The only reason that we have not lost the war already, and the only reason that we shall win it, is that ninety-eight per cent. of the population disregards so far as possible the “organisation” on every important occasion, and uses its own native common sense. The clearing-out of the hundreds of thousands of petty bureaucrats, the lice bred by centralised “organisation,” whose only function is to get in each other’s, and every one else’s, way, and to spew forms requiring masses of information of which no use is made, is the first step to shortening the war. If it is not taken, that is clear proof that a state of war is desired for the purpose of setting up a bureaucratic New Order which will have lost us the war, whatever happens.

Major C. H. Douglas and the Social Credit Secretariat have received from the Douglas Social Credit Association of New South Wales a resolution passed at the last annual general meeting reaffirming confidence in them and appreciation of advice received from time to time, which has been conveyed throughout Australasia by the Association’s official organ The Information Sheet.

The letter concludes with the comment: “This week the new Federal budget has been issued, and the people are staggered. We can expect to be busy in the near future by being approached by numbers of people who are now beginning to awaken to the fact that this method of finance is going to ruin Australasia even if we do win the war.”

The members of the Birmingham Youth Forum who debated the subject, “That the Freedom of the Press is a Sham,” and carried the motion by 66 votes to 20 were then ticked off for this conclusion by a newspaperman present, who said that “the pages of the British Press demonstrated daily the maintenance of freedom.”

The free Birmingham Mail gave the report of the proceedings 12 lines and the newspaperman’s words 23.

An anonymous correspondent wrote to the Huddersfield Examiner of December 24, 1941:

“In your issue of the 22nd inst. there appeared a letter signed by ‘E. L. ’, headed Lessons From the War. It appears to me that this letter was a subtle effort to prepare your readers for the joys of the communal form of post-war life, about which certain groups of people are so enthusiastic at the present time. Condensed, it points out that there was malnutrition and disease during the years of peace preceding this war, and suggests that the cure for the evil is communal feeding.

“Now Lord Horder, in drawing attention to malnutrition, suggested that the cause was poverty due to unemployment and short time.

“This truth so shocked certain so-called ‘experts,’ who would have preferred, no doubt, to keep such facts dark, that steps were taken to find out the minimum amount of cheap food required to keep the individual in reasonable health at the lowest possible cost, and the answer was communal feeding centres and school meals. The latter does not attempt to point out the way to abolish poverty, or even to suggest that poverty must be abolished, and the writer does not place much value on the right of every individual to freedom of choice, even in food.

“To suggest that malnutrition is due to ignorance of parents is, except in a very small number of cases, an insult to the common sense of the British public. It cannot be stated too often that the individual is the finest ‘expert’ on what he or she requires, and, if people only insist on incomes sufficiently large to enable them to purchase the food they require to provide a maximum diet and not a minimum one, the British housewife will put on a meal for husband and children that will outclass any communal meal both in variety and excellence in cooking.

“Let ‘E. L.’ concentrate on turning the war-time expenditure of £14,000,000 per day into peace-time pursuits, thereby raising the effective income of each family of four to nearly £10 per week, and I think we can guarantee to choose the right foods and cook them in the best way without the assistance of ‘planners,’ ‘experts,’ or ‘bureaucrats’ of any kind.”

Democratic Victory or the Slave State?

By L. D. BYRNE

The substance of the address given at the Winnipeg Monetary Reform Convention of October, 1941, by the Technical Adviser to the Alberta Government.

I am sure that every one of us is very conscious of the fact that we are meeting in the shadow of an acute crisis in human history. Yet however critical we may consider the present situation—and it is desperately critical—there is every indication that it is likely to prove child’s play compared with what lies ahead. The sober truth is that a situation of terrific and, to many, terrifying proportions is developing.

That may sound like the statement of an alarmist, for are we not being told that everything is forging ahead satisfactorily and that we can look forward to the future with calm confidence if we will but put our shoulder to the wheel to lick Hitler? There can be no doubt about the need for putting forth a supreme effort in the present conflict—but anybody who tells us that we can view the future with calm confidence under existing circumstances is either a lunatic or a dangerous fool. Already we have paid a terrible price in human suffering for the criminal policy of “It’s all right, old chap, we have the situation well in hand.”

If we mean business—and it would be useless continuing with this Convention unless we do—then we have to face the stark realities of the situation. Otherwise we cannot gauge either the nature nor the size of the task before us.

Since 1914-1918

You will recall that at the conclusion of the 1914-18 war “to make the world safe for democracy,” the people of all the victorious countries were told that they could look forward to an era of unprecedented prosperity and progress. At that time Great Britain had powerful fighting forces; the country was relatively prosperous, agriculture was flourishing; industry, which had expanded under the demands of war time needs, was booming; ship-building yards were well equipped to make good the losses of war; there was practically no unemployment; and wage rates
were at a high level. Suddenly in 1922-23 the collapse came. Unemployment rose rapidly, wages fell, factories shut down, agriculture began to decline, British ships were sold as scrap metal to foreign countries and the whole nation found itself in the grip of depression.

That was the story of most countries except the U.S.A. which continued to enjoy relative prosperity for some years later. Step by step, with increasing intensity, the western world succumbed to the plague of increasing poverty and unemployment, while side by side there existed idle factories and idle resources which could have been exploited to provide the wants of the growing millions of destitute people. Instead production continued to be restricted, goods were sabotaged on a wholesale scale because markets had collapsed, and the entire situation went from bad to worse, as debts mounted to fantastic levels and increasing taxation added to the insecurity of everybody.

For a long time those in control of our national affairs, backed by economists and financiers, told us that there was really nothing to worry about; we had been struck by an economic blizzard due to various causes, including sun spots and the wickedness of people generally. All we had to do was to wait until the blizzard had blown itself out and we would find prosperity waiting around the corner.

What were the central facts of the situation? On the one hand we had the vast majority of people in want, while on the other we had industrial and material resources capable of producing abundance, unemployed workers able and anxious to man the factories, and producers able and anxious to turn out the goods which the people wanted but unable to market even their restricted production. All that stood between the people and the products which filled the stores was the lack of money to buy the goods they needed. The existence of poverty under such conditions should have made it plain to a person with any intelligence that a vast unsatisfied market existed for producers, but both production and consumption was being stifled by lack of consumer buying power. There was no problem of production, no problem of transportation—but only a problem of purchasing power. Likewise it should have been plain that the existence of similar conditions over a wide area indicated that this money problem was inherent in the operation of the monetary system.

The significant fact to bear in mind is that in spite of the evidence of conditions, and in spite of the increasing and widespread demand for monetary reform—the monetary system was preserved intact. In fact the greatest pains were taken by means of propaganda to make it plain that whatever was to blame for the ghastly deterioration it was not the monetary system.

Yet could those responsible for national affairs in all the countries concerned really have been ignorant of the fact that in every case the collapse of the national economy was due to deliberate monetary restriction and manipulation?

The Effects of 'Poverty in Plenty'

Next let us consider some of the effects of this universal condition of 'poverty amidst plenty.' Within a space of less than twenty years Great Britain's economy lay in ruins. Her mercantile marine was reduced to less than the pre-war tonnage, her ship-building yards, cotton industry and other vital productive plant was sabotaged under the super-

vision of the Bank of England; her agriculture was ruined, her fighting services cut down to a minimum and over a third of the population was existing below the poverty line, ill-nourished and ill-housed. That is one side of the picture. Concurrently small commercial and industrial concerns were forced out of business or swallowed up by huge combines; systematically control over industry passed from those engaged in production to banks and insurance companies; the quality products for which England was renowned gave place to cheap and shoddy goods; jerry built houses run up by the ten thousand fouled the landscape on every hand; and a new bureaucracy was set up in the public life of the country. Step by step all effective power—economic and political—became centralised in fewer and fewer hands.

I have told you about Great Britain for two reasons. The first will be evident to you in a few minutes; the second reason is that I have a first-hand knowledge of it. However, what is true of Great Britain is true to a greater or less degree of the entire British Empire and other countries.

Now things do not "just happen" in human affairs. Events are the result of actions by individual men and women. And when we find that, in the face of all reason and in spite of all the suffering inflicted on millions of persons, the same conditions were being imposed upon the people of Canada, the U.S.A., Britain, France, Australia—and in fact all the countries of the Western World—there is no room for doubt that a uniform policy was being pursued everywhere.

We have to be clear on the nature of that policy and

(continued on page 7)

SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND

SOCIAL CREDIT CIRCULATING
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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.
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Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.


THE BIG IDEA

Now that Haiti and Costa Rica have declared their unalterable determination to fight until V-Victory is assured, it is perhaps possible, and permissible, to consider how we may recognise it when we see it. So far, this has clearly been inadvisable. Haiti and Costa Rica, while enthusiastically applauding war as a spectacle, have shown a marked preference for ringside seats, and there is, even now, a strong feeling amongst their populations that this cutting of the ropes and mauling of the “fans,” to use the language of the latest belligerents, is not the treatment they had a right to expect, or for which they had bargained.

But it is one of those attributes of war, which make it so popular in the highest circles, that once you have the populations bombing and drowning each other, and in a fair way to famine and pestilence, it doesn’t matter what you say caused it, or what would end it except stopping fighting. No properly brought up people ever do that until they have effectively smashed up the furniture, and made it impossible to talk of “poverty amidst plenty” for a long time. “He that will not work, neither shall he eat,” is restored to that eminence from which there were dangerous signs, only a few short years ago, that it would be deposed permanently. Already, the scarcity psychology is fully re-established. Everyone has a tendency to eat too much.

Dr. Arnold Toynbee, Secretary of The Royal Institute of International Affairs (“Chatham House”), in a speech which has often been quoted, remarked that the surest sign that he and others were engaged in what could be paraphrased as treasonable activities was that they strenuously denied it. I feel sure that this technique is widespread. It was explained at some length in Spanish Arena, together with other curious matters. So that what little has been said of the goal of V-Victory is not really reliable evidence that we shall recognise the goal when we stop fighting.

I have said many times, and take pleasure in repeating, that the Germans are, and have been for generations, a godsend to warmakers, and a pest to Europe. The opinions of Lord Vansittart ad hoc, convey to me the impression of being the pronouncements of a competent, trained and experienced expert, and while he has expressly repudiated a “plan” for dealing with Germany and the Germans, I imagine that he could formulate one, and that it would be effective for some time to come—when we are in a position to put it into practice, as we were in 1918, and didn’t.

But to agree with all this, and to admit that we have been manoeuvred, or have got ourselves, into a position in which we have to fight a long devastating, and completely unnecessary war to some kind of a finish which will enable Lord Vansittart, say, to embody his views, is one thing, and to say, “It’s all that — Hitler,” or even, “those b— y Huns,” is quite another. This war is too entirely convenient to plenty of people who don’t intend to fight in it, for that to be much of an idea, although it is earnestly desired that the general public should accept it. To what extent the Germans, for their part, have allowed themselves to be manoeuvred into the position of the “goat,” is their business.

If you see a man undress on the bank of a river, and plunge in, and you are sufficiently interested to wonder why he did it, you can form three hypotheses:

(a) He wants to commit suicide
(b) He wants to get to the other side
(c) He likes swimming.

You do not say, “This is astounding. No one ever did anything like this before. I can only assume that he wants to catch the 9-15 train to his office.” Which is about the level of intelligence required to accept the theory that if it hadn’t been for Hitler, the world would be an example of Great Men serving Noble Ends.

There is perhaps no more convincing single piece of evidence in regard to the existence of conscious, evil, forces energising a continuous policy, than the strenuous and skilful endeavour to present a picture of events and of history, as purely episodic. History is crystallised Politics, not disconnected episodes. Where it is possible to indenify a continuous organisation, it is safe to postulate a continuous policy, and as every policy besides having a philosophy, has an appropriate mechanism, or form of organisation, it is also safe to conclude that similar mechanisms have similar policies and philosophies, even if one calls itself National Socialism, a second, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and a third, the New Deal.

At once, I feel sure that some reader will protest, “Are not Haiti and Costa Rica, those great New Deal countries of the West, joined with Britain (once-great) and our Russian Allies in the struggle to destroy for ever the Nazi tyranny?” To which, the answer is, in Costa Rican, “Yep.”

At this stage, it is, I think, desirable to consider the meaning which could be attached to the remark attributed to the Archbishop of Canterbury nine or ten years ago, that it might take another great war to bring about those changes which were necessary in the world.

(To be continued).

(All rights reserved).

EPISCOPAL OPINION

The National Federation of Old Age Pensions’ Associations, which is working for, “Economic Security for all at 60 years of age, through adequate pensions, and the abolition of the Means Test” by means of pressure on M.P.s to implement the will of their constituents, publishes in The Old Age Pensioner a letter addressed to all the Archbishops and Bishops in the country, along with ten of the replies received. Two replies were promising, four could only be described as ‘cool’ and another four were simple acknowledgements.
The “Future” of Music after the Present War

By KAIKHOSRU SHAPURJI SORABJI

I have purposely put “Future” between inverted commas, as I am immorally certain that as far as England is concerned, music after the present and second outbreak of “Freedom and Democracy” has none. Music, the most intimately personal, the most individual and individualistic, of the arts is not likely to be tolerated—except in the most Marks-and-Spencered, the most standardised and robotised of forms after a War whose real and concealed purpose—as distinct from its propagandised purpose—is the production of the Universal Robot under the Universal Totalitarian Tyranny, whether it be “European Federation” genre Adolf Hitler or “Federal Union” genre Streit-Kuhn-Loeb-Bank-of-International-Settlements.

In other departments of human activity the suppression of individual activities—part of the conspiracy against the integrity and security of the individual, which is anathema to the not-so-hidden-hand of the International Wirepullers of La Haute Finance—which has made such frightening inroads since 1914, I will leave others better qualified than myself to animadvert: I propose to pass in quick review here just what has happened to musical activities in England since 1914 when the asphyxiating fungus and pest of broadcasting was still in embryo.

Those of us who remember the bulk—and quality—of music in London alone during the decade preceding 1914 and contrast it with what is now left after the breath of the B.B.C. has blown over it, and the first “Freedom and Democracy” shattered it, are tempted sometimes to wonder almost whether we are living on the same planet, let alone in the same city. In those years there were in London alone four full-blown Symphony Orchestras, which between them were responsible for at least six series of Symphony Concerts a season, not to mention the Sunday afternoon series conducted one apiece by the National Sunday League and the Sunday Concert Society, which brought the total up to eight. There were three or four seasons of opera in the year at Covent Garden alone, totalling anything from twenty-eight to thirty-five weeks of opera in the year, not to mention the operatic activities of the many well-known and old-established organisations such as the Carl Rosa, the Moody-Manners, and many other companies who thought it both worth their while, and financially practical politics, to start other seasons as well, such was the public for music and opera in London in those days. The more cloistered and ascetic practice of chamber music was as prevalent: there were bodies like the Classical Concert Society, the Société des Concerts Français, the London String Quartet, the visits of such famous parties as the Rozé of Vienna, the St. Petersburg String Quartet, the Geloso of Paris and others whose names for the moment escape me, all of whom gave regular London series of concerts.

The great society hostesses vied with one another in giving the most brilliant of musical parties and receptions as well as, by their regular patronage, keeping music in a vigorous and flourishing condition both in its operatic and its purely instrumental manifestations.

When “Freedom and Democracy No. 1” had finished its dire and nefarious course, the number of orchestras left giving regular series of concerts had shrunk to two, and the opera season at Covent Garden to four or six weeks for the whole of the year and most of the great string quartet bodies vanished entirely. All this has been counterbalanced (?) by the monstrous fungoid growth of wireless which has gradually—and not so gradually either!—assumed a position of totalitarian monopolism, has in instance after instance utterly destroyed independent concert-giving and concert enterprise, has, moreover, degraded standards of performance to an extent which it would require many columns of The Social Crediter merely to enumerate, has caricatured the sound of an orchestra so that even what a musician hears—or is allowed to hear, after the control-panel-functionary has exercised his knob-twiddling fingers upon it, often bears a relationship to the score as he knows it which is only discoverable with difficulty and some perseverance, and which has such an infinitely perverting and corrupting effect upon untutored ears that has only to be stated to be hideously obvious: a state of affairs that brings it about that otherwise fairly reasonable and sane people can now be heard to say that they “like” the sound of an orchestra over the wireless better than the sound of the real thing, thus reminding one of a Devonshire family of whom one once knew who, producing everything in the way of food they—they or anyone else—might require, from vegetables to home-cured bacon, preferred to feed out of tins, as they liked the “taste” of the tinned stuff better!

As for the effect of wireless upon singing, the omnipresent yodelling wobble as of an epileptic calf in his first love-affair, is the best (and worst) indication of what it has achieved, coupled with the fact that it is often quite openly admitted that great singers—such a tiny handful of them as still remain—do not “broadcast” well: which is the equivalent of saying that bad singing is best for broadcasting. It of course occurs to no one but musicians and such-like lunatics to ask “but what about music?” From this the further interesting position is reached that we can see openly derided ridiculed and denigrated the great singing artistry of the singers of an elder, happier and wireless-free generation, and this not, mark you, in what one might suppose to be uninformed quarters, but in important daily sheets. This all serves only as additional evidence of the working of the levelling-down conspiracy and its ramifications, of which, naturally, a systematic attack upon all fine craftsmanship, great workmanship and exalted standards is part and parcel. Such things are “aristocratic” in the very truest and most essential sense of the word; that is to say, they represent the acknowledged primacy of the best, and are therefore intolerable in an egalitarian, totalitarian tyranny such as is being planned and plotted.

All these things will react and are reacting most direly upon the most important of all musical activities, around which satellite fashion all the others revolve, namely that of the creative musician, the composer, and we need not be surprised—even if we are distressed—at discovering that the only supremely vital creative musical work still being produced to-day is either the work of men well over middle age, such as Sibelius or Ernest Bloch, or that if and when the work of younger men shows any real creative vitality and drive, as opposed to a cheap-jack smart-Alec musical wise-crackery, it is the work of men creating in comparative obscurity, unknown, boycotted or both, and for one reason or another personae ingratissimae with the organised gangs, cliques, rings and institutions of music, which, along with
the Financial System, are the greatest "cess-pools of corruption" (to use a telling phrase of Mr. Pasco Langmaid) one could wish not to find.

"The Future of Music"... well? What then? If what we see is what has happened to our wretched Art after the first Free and Democratic Outburst what does anyone with any imagination suppose is likely to be its state after the end of the Second? Margaret Cooper's witty song used to tell its hearers "If you have a past... forget it!" Music and musicians had better, it strikes me forcibly, forget its and their "future" as well else more or less deliberately withdraw from the "World" in the cant-phrase, work in secrecy and silence, and, like one living creative musician at least, not only refrain from seeking public performance of their works but actually prohibiting it.

MORE SOCIALIST SCIENCE

By B. M. PALMER

Taking part in correspondence concerning "Social Science" in The Times on December 30, Messrs. H. J. Braunholtz and W. B. Fogg, president and honorary secretary of the Royal Anthropological Institute, asked for the establishment of an organisation in which the several inter-related sciences which are concerned in social research would be represented. They wrote: "In default of united action, the knowledge of social problems available to post-war statesmen and politicians is likely to be incomplete and uncoordinated, and the basis of political action will be correspondingly unstable."

It is fairly safe to predict that the criminal waste of their own powers by present day research workers will be a matter of grave concern to future generations. They will see it as a squandering of the cultural inheritance. Most aspects of this subject have already been ably dealt with by Dr. Tudor Jones and I wish merely to draw attention to the fact, apparently overlooked by the vast majority of scientists, artists and those who write books, that research or creation based on propaganda has no value at all except to the propagandists, whose aim is not an objective view of the true facts, but a biased representation thereof to suit their own purposes. Most of the literature of the social sciences, now of a vastness scarcely to be conceived a few years ago, is based on the propagandist doctrine that man should learn to adapt himself to his environment, not to control it, and that the agenda for this adaptation should be made by politicians. This is the view put forward in the letter quoted above. Thousands of young people are giving the best years of their lives to this type of research. It is one of the major tragedies of to-day. If Messrs. Braunholtz and Fogg get their way still more time and energy will be wasted; and there will be many more books based on the misinterpretation of those words, which were surely spoken in irony, if any words were so spoken—"The poor ye have always with ye."

One of these publications is the Cambridge Evacuation Survey edited by Susan Isaacs. It is one of a series of contributions to modern education under the same editorship, published by Methuen at prices from 4/- to 9/6 each. No attempt will be made to review this book in the usual sense of the word. It is a conscientious survey, within its own frame of reference, of the organisation of the removal of hundreds of Tottenham and Islington school children to Cambridge; of what the children said concerning their new life; of what the foster parents and teachers said; of successes and failures, and indication of how pitfalls can be avoided on future occasions.

The survey was completed between October, 1939 and July, 1940, and it is interesting to note that it was thought necessary to add the following footnote to the introduction:

"Since the bombing of London's East End, we have seen how this need to keep the family together and to cling to familiar home surroundings may override even the worst dangers. Among the simple and the poor where there is no wealth, no pride of status or of possessions, love for the members of one's own family and joy in their bodily presence alone make life worth living. So deeply rooted is this need that it has defied even the law of self-preservation, as well as urgent public appeals and the wishes of authority."

I wonder what the law of self-preservation is, or how it could be defined: in the last few lines of that footnote there speaks the totalitarian official, amazed at the people's challenge to non-immanent sovereignty.

From the introduction turn to the appendix where you will read, among other things the following interesting information:

"In each cell the deviation from expectation is 2.1. There are 2.1 more unhappily adjusted boys and happily adjusted girls, and 2.1 fewer happily adjusted boys and unhappily adjusted girls than there would be if there were the same proportion of happily adjusted individuals in each sex." (Page 206).

And on another page:

"If a 3 x 2 table is constructed by taking the three age groups of foster mothers and dividing the cases in the two classes (+ 2, + 1 or 0) and (—2 or —1) we find \( x^2 = .28 \) which (with two degrees of freedom) gives \( P = .2 \) approximately."

There are still people in the country who are fortunate enough to be free from these things. Their cases are not entered on graphs made by social workers, their children are not included in the 37.3 per cent. of those who could not afford to pay, and algebraical tables are not made concerning their adjustment to new conditions. They can afford to be comparatively independent. But it is from among these more fortunate ones that the majority of Social Science research workers are recruited. Slumming is no longer fashionable. In its stead we have one section of the population studying and experimenting upon another, because to do so provides stepping stones to a safer career.

If this is a desirable state of affairs, then The Cambridge Evacuation Scheme is an excellent book and well worth 8/6. If otherwise, the sooner it is forgotten the better. We have no doubt as to its ultimate fate.

HOW TO USE UP MAN-POWER

From "The Drapers' Record," November 11, 1941:

"... ignoring extras and allowing for men and women in the Services, we reckon 66 coupons each for 40 million persons, giving a grand total of 2,640,000,000, each of which can change hands three or four times by May 31 next."
DEMOCRATIC VICTORY OR SLAVE STATE?
Continued from page 3.

who, as its authors, were imposing it on all these countries.

That policy can be stated very simply. It was to divest the individual of economic security, render him subservient to domination by financial instruments such as debt, taxation, prices over which he had no control and a perpetual uncertainty regarding the future. At the same time to centralise and consolidate financial control—and through it control over every aspect of the economy.

In short, the policy was to progressively enslave entire populations to centralised financial domination. And the only persons who could impose such a policy were those who controlled the monetary systems of the countries concerned. That control, at the conclusion of the last war, was centralised on an international scale in the hands of a group of international banking houses. The men comprising this international money power were almost exclusively non-British, bearing such names as Kahn, Warburg, Schiff, Schuster and Rothschild.

To what end was the policy of this international money power directed? Obviously to the complete subjection of all people to an international financial dictatorship. Their goal is a World Slave State.

Attack Against Democracy

However, no group of persons can gain complete domination of the world without disposing of certain obstacles. For instance, so long as nations retain sovereign power, backed by armed forces to enforce "the will of the people," the position of any usurped international power—whether financial or otherwise—is precarious. Its domination can be challenged effectively and its power destroyed.

The greatest obstacle confronting the international money power in gaining its goal of world dictatorship has been and is the British Empire in particular and all democratic countries in general. Therefore we would expect to find that a deliberate and concerted effort has been made to undermine the strength of the British Empire, to discredit democracy and nationalism, and to render sovereignty ineffective, with the objective of ultimately destroying them. And that is just what has been going on.

Democracy has been represented for years as a social system under which the people had the right to vote for one party of political careerists in preference to another but always with the same result—that they uniformly got conditions imposed upon them which they did not want.

Under a functioning democracy the people do obtain the results they want from the management of their affairs. But under the pseudo-democracy which has been palmed off on us the people have always got the very opposite of the results they wanted. Instead of the maximum economic security and freedom, they have been victimised with the maximum insecurity and rapidly diminishing freedom. In other words instead of democracy have been subjected to dictatorship masquerading as democracy. And this is the technique which has been used to discredit democratic government. The whole thing is so childishly simple, it seems inconceivable that those entrusted with the leadership of the British peoples did not know what was going on.

At this point we have to turn our attention to the appearance of another menace on the pre-war scene. The thing called totalitarianism—which was, in point of fact, nothing more than open dictatorship based on force, instead of the hidden dictatorship of finance based on deceit, which was mis-termed 'democracy.'

The first totalitarian regime was that of the Bolshevik regime of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which was ushered in under the direct supervision of the international money power, with the assistance of Imperial Germany.

Next came the Fascist revolution of Italy led by the one time editor of a Socialist periodical.

It was some time later that an ex-corporal of the German army made his debut with his new cult of National Socialism—the new version of the old theme of Deutsch-land Uber Alles. Followed the Nazi revolution—and the unleashing of forces which have spread tyranny and desolation on every hand.

The first fact to be noted is that, under conditions as they exist, Lenin and Trotsky, Mussolini and Hitler, together with their respective gangs, could never have gained power without the backing of powerful interests—and certainly in the cases of Lenin and Trotsky and of Hitler we have evidence that such assistance was provided by the international money power, both directly and through channels which they controlled.

The next point to note is that in each instance these dictatorships—Bolshevik, Fascist and Nazi—lost little time in building powerful war machines. They found no difficulty in obtaining all the necessary international credits for this purpose. The financial obstacles were swept aside for them—and this could have been done only with the active assistance of the international money power.

Concurrently in Great Britain, France, the U.S.A. and other democratic countries complacent Parliaments and harassed Governments could not get money to feed and clothe their people decently, let alone to meet the growing threat of the totalitarian war machines with adequate defence measures. And that policy could have been imposed only by the hidden international money power.

In other words this alien financial power deliberately armed the totalitarian nations, and kept the democracies unwarmed and helpless, wallowing in an artificially created depression.

Thus the stage was set for the destruction of the British Empire, which became the focus of the attack—both financial and military—and for the extermination of a discredited democracy.

Enemy in the Rear

With the outbreak of war in which the British nations were to be forced to fight for their existence with their backs to the wall, a well organised campaign was launched to win support for a scheme which would divest every nation of all effective sovereign power by centralising control over finance, citizenship rights and the armed forces in an international authority. Thus at one stroke international finance would gain its objective—namely the destruction of the British Empire and of democracy, and the establishment of a dictatorship in which all effective power, including
the armed forces, would be centralised in a finance-dominated international authority.

Such was the nature of the scheme for world federation which was put forward, under a cloak of plausible publicity, as a desirable peace aim for Great Britain and the Empire supported by the U.S.A. And there is plenty of evidence pointing to the fact that the forces controlled by the International Money Power are still determined to make that the pattern of the world after the war. They call it the New Order.

By a strange coincidence the Nazis have just such a scheme for the subjugation of Europe to Nazi domination—only, unlike the Union Now proposals of Streit, Warburg and Co., it is not to be based on the gold standard but on a steel standard.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the choice which is being presented to us—tyranny under an alien financial dictatorship or submission to a swashbuckling gang of military tyrants.

There is one thing that these men have left out of their reckoning, that is the character of the British people—English, Irish, Scotch, Canadian, Australian, New Zealand—men and women who have built the greatest Empire in history.

Is there anyone here—is there a British man or woman anywhere—with red blood in their veins that is going to submit either to the megalomania of Hitler or to a gang of power drunk alien figure manipulators? I venture to say that no freedom-loving man or woman who knows what is going on will ever submit to the machinations of these would-be slave drivers of humanity.

Action Alone

But action alone will avert the disaster towards which we are being hurried. The issue is clear—we can either do nothing, only to find that when, exhausted, we emerge victorious against the threat of Nazi aggression, we are in the toils of a tyranny worse than anything the world has known; or we, on the home front, can open hostilities against that subtle enemy in the rear—the alien international money power—who seeks, under cover of war conditions, to encompass our destruction.

We have met here for the purpose of discussing this situation—and, I hope, dedicating ourselves to the task of ensuring that when our fighting forces return it will be to a free Canada from which the shackles of financial serfdom have been struck for all time—a Canada worthy of her great destiny.

However, it is of little avail to undertake this campaign unless we are clear in our minds just what action is required of us and the most effective means for carrying it out. I will do no more that indicate the broad lines along which I believe we should proceed.

Now human relationships under community life are mainly a question of organisation, and I cannot emphasise too strongly that organisation is not a haphazard affair based upon the opinions of this or that person. Organisation is a science about which we have learnt a great deal from human experience. There are certain basic principles which cannot be ignored, whether in the organisation of a factory or in the organisation of a nation.

(To be continued).