

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 7. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

THE BIG IDEA (V)

Any serious endeavour to identify the origins of world unrest and war inevitably and invariably leads back to what is loosely called occultism—a word which in itself seems to be almost as widely misunderstood as the matters to which it is applied.

To the average individual, it is mixed up with ghosts, seances, and witches. But, as was pointed out in an admirable letter to *The Social Crediter* of December 20, 1941, this emphasis on the allegedly “supernatural” (itself, a suspect word), is neither justified by the dictionary, which defines “occult” as “that which is secret or hidden,” or by the nature of the idea which it expresses, which cannot be static. “Occultism,” in fact is simply the reverse of discovery. *Demon est Deus inversus.*

Now, it would appear to be fairly obvious that writing or teaching about things “kept secret or hidden,” is not occultism, whatever else it is. It is either *discovery* (disclosure) or it is deception. It is important to bear in mind that in all probability, we have to deal with both forms of publicity, because there is convincing evidence of two characteristics of every major political and social revolution and uprising of the past three hundred years at least. One of these features is the emergence of vague “esoteric” theories, generally stressing the apocalyptic nature of the times, and, in effect, the necessity for a psychic or spiritual *sauve qui peut*. The British Israel and Pyramid cults are instances. And parallel with these, the paralysis of normal Government, and the assumption of its functions by persons and organisations supported by overwhelming propaganda, whose policy can be recognised as the objective of the crisis. These shadow Governments have uniformly had two features. They derive their apparent support from the towns, not the country, and they have never attacked either the Money Power or the Jews. Cromwell rose to power by the support of the City of London and its shadowy “Dutch” friends, the French Revolution was in effect the Paris Revolution with the same shadowy backing, the American Revolution began with the Boston Tea Party and was primarily “Dutch,” and the Russian Revolution was the St. Petersburg Revolution. (The evolution of the name of the old capital of Russia is far from being without significance.)

It has been pointed out, with justice, I think, that all of these revolutions tended to the advantage of Germany, or more exactly, Prussia.

Using the word “occult” in its correct sense, it would seem clear that to say, as some of our Superior Persons contend, that occultism is all nonsense, is merely another way of repeating the famous lampoon upon the Master of Balliol:

First come I, my name is Jowett,
There's no knowledge but I know it.
I am Master of this College
What I don't know isn't knowledge.

There are probably more Forces which are occult than there are Forces which are known, but one which was incontestably “occult” in the truest sense, that those who understood it were determined to mislead the general public in regard to it, was the Money System. It is no longer occult, but its Masters are.

Mrs. Webster, whose valuable work is a model of painstaking investigation and documentation, lists five main divisions of secret or semi-secret activity as connected with world unrest and catastrophe;

- (1) Grand Orient Freemasonry.
- (2) Theosophy with its innumerable ramifications.
- (3) Nationalism of an aggressive kind—Pan-Germanism (She might have added, Pan-Americanism).
- (4) International Finance.
- (5) Social Revolution.

—*Secret Societies*, p. 351.

She then asks, “Is there indeed one power directing all subversive movements—is it one of the five here enumerated, or is it yet another power more potent and more invisible?”

“It will be noticed that . . . these subversive movements have (1) A pro-German tendency. (2) All contain a Jewish element. (3) All have a more or less decided antagonism to Christianity.”

Mrs. Webster deals at great length with Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5 but clearly does not consider herself technically competent to deal with No. 4. Had she done so, she would almost certainly have realised what is probably the most significant common factor of all of them—that they are themselves all subverted or perverted.

To go very rapidly through the list, Grand Orient Freemasonry almost certainly descends from the Knights Templars, originally a militant Christian Order ultimately accused of Satanism, sex perversion, and international usury, and expelled from England *within twenty years of the expulsion of the Jews* (1290).

Theosophy is of course a generic term, but is used mainly by Mrs. Webster to refer to the body of opinion of which Madame Blavatsky was the modern focus. Whatever may be said of that very remarkable woman, it is quite certain that she abominated both the Jews and the Talmud. But Mrs. Webster is quite correct in the suggestion that the Theosophical Movement at the present day is a very different

body to that contemplated by Madame Blavatsky.

The Imperialistic Nationalism of Pan-Germany and Pan-America is not in the least a natural development of cultural nationalism, but is merely political mercantilism. The violent reaction to it on the American Continent is sufficient proof of its artificiality.

British Social revolution has lost all resemblance to the ideas of such men as Keir Hardie, or even George Lansbury, whose primary idea was emancipation. Instead, it has become a "racket," the spiritual home of the bureaucrat, of whom Lord Passfield (Sydney Webb) is the Prophet, the London School of Economics, financed by Sir Ernest Cassel, the Staff College, and the Card Index, the Ark of the Covenant. Its creed is, "We came that ye might have life less abundantly."

And, one rung higher up the ladder, we find International Finance, of which the central idea is misdirection and perversion. It is of primary importance to an understanding of the underlying causes of world catastrophe to observe the parallelism between the hypnotic propaganda to represent an amorphous accounting or ticket system as "wealth" in itself, and collectivism, which relies on statistics as an indication of well-being. The revolt against "the numbering of the people" was a sound, intuitive, revolt.

(To be continued).

(All rights reserved).

C.S. Douglas

PARLIAMENT

FEBRUARY 3.

Oral Answers to Questions (33 columns)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS.

Mr. David Adams asked the Minister without Portfolio whether, in any steps contemplated in the structure of local government to meet the changing needs of the situation, he will assure the House that the basis of democratic election will be preserved?

Mr. Greenwood: Yes, Sir. In the consideration of any proposals that may arise out of inquiries into problems of local government after the war full regard will be paid to the maintenance of the principles of democratic election.

Mr. Adams: Do I understand that this principle will govern all the proposals concerning local government?

Mr. Greenwood: I hope so, but I do not rule out the possibility of indirect election by some authorities like the Metropolitan Water Board.

RESTORATION OF PRE-WAR TRADE PRACTICES BILL

Order for Second Reading read.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Ernest Bevin):... The purpose of the Bill is to restore after the war the trade practices departed from during the war, in accordance with the Government's pledge. The Bill itself follows a precedent which was established in 1919, but there is a significant difference in the circumstances as between the two periods. That has been brought about to a large extent by the enormous development between the two wars of joint industrial relations in the country, particularly

joint industrial councils, and the improvement both of direct relationship with employers and of what may be described as tripartite machinery between the State, the employers and the trade unions. In 1915 very little of this machinery existed, and the Government at that time were driven to conduct negotiations over a wide field of conferences with large numbers of trade unions in order to secure agreements for the relaxation of practices, and after a very prolonged effort these were embodied in a Government pledge, which was then described as the Treasury Agreement.

We had, as I say, a great advantage at the outbreak of this war, in that there had been established a National Joint Advisory Council. In addition to the establishment of joint industrial council machinery, there had grown up a responsible employers' organisation which was organised in the British Employers' Confederation. Equally, the Trades Union Congress had changed its constitution from what was purely a Parliamentary Committee to a General Council with wider powers and greater ability to speak for the unions as a whole in those matters in which the State was involved. My predecessor, before war broke out, took the very wise step of calling the parties together and establishing a national body representing the two organisations. This Bill has been drafted with the aid of and in consultation with these two organised forces in industry in this country... The establishment of this machinery enabled us to transfer from a peace-time basis of industry to a war-time footing with great facility and speed. Perhaps the most remarkable thing is that the change-over was made with scarcely a single dispute in any works in the country on the question of dilution...

... The Bill is not concerned with wages; it is concerned with rules, practices or customs with respect to the classes of persons to be or not to be employed, and the conditions of employment, hours of work, or working conditions; dilution and demarcation are the most important aspects.

The intention of the Bill is to re-establish temporarily the practices existing immediately before the war. We have not attempted in these proposals to establish a statutory code of trade practices. The Bill is intended to operate in the 18 months after the war... Clause 1 places on the employers the obligation to restore trade practices which have been departed from during the war and to maintain the restored practices for 18 months....

Mr. Henry Strauss (Norwich):... Ever since the beginning of the war, and every week with greater strength and assurance, we have been informed by writers in the Press of the Left, both daily and weekly, that the pre-war world is absolutely dead, that its death is a very good thing, and that nobody who is not a fool or a reactionary, or both, would dream of reviving it or restoring any of its customs or practices. Those assurances are also given us constantly by speakers on the wireless. We are further assured that no patriot ought ever to think of what will be the position of himself, or of the class to which he belongs, after the war, that nothing is quite so indecent as property rights, and that property rights, above all, ought to be treated with contempt, I was very much interested therefore to note that my right hon. Friend the Minister of Labour, with the applause of all the trade unionists sitting opposite, said, as the greatest reason why these practices should be restored, that they were really property rights....

Mr. Austin Hopkinson (Mossley):... It is a very grave accusation to make against the Government to suggest

that they bring forward Bills which they know are just humbug; but this Government must remember that this is not the only thing which is pure humbug in relation to these matters. For example, if a man is taken into the Fighting Services from his work, he is to be guaranteed his job on his return. Every member of the Labour party who has had experience in industry knows perfectly well that that means nothing at all in actual practice. A man is put down to be called up. He is given an extension so that another man may be trained for his job. The first man is taken away with a guaranteed job. The second man after another six months is taken away and is guaranteed the same job, and so the whole thing goes on. It is humbug pure and simple. This Bill is very much on the same lines.

FEBRUARY 4.

Oral Answers to Questions (35 columns)

ENEMY OCCUPIED COUNTRIES (ALLIES' AGREEMENTS)

Dr. Russell Thomas asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information in regard to the Agreement made between the Governments of Greece and Yugoslavia, and the Agreement made between the Governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia which, among other matters, involves a common economic policy and the proposal for a customs union?

Mr. Eden: As my hon. Friend is aware the Agreement between Greece and Yugoslavia was signed in the Foreign Office on 15th January, and I am glad to have this opportunity of welcoming an Agreement which cements the friendly relations already existing between two Allied Governments and which affords a basis for a future Balkan Confederation. The text of the Agreement has already been published, and there is nothing that I can add to it.

The text of the Polish-Czechoslovak Agreement has also been published. In reply to a Question by the hon. Member for East Wolverhampton (*Mr. Mander*) on 26th November, 1940, the Prime Minister said that His Majesty's Government warmly welcomed the original Polish-Czechoslovak Declaration of 11th November, 1940. They equally welcome this new Agreement as marking a further important stage in the development of closer relations between these two Allies.

Dr. Thomas: Without attempting to make any difficulty for my right hon. Friend, may I ask whether he will be good enough, when he has consultations with the Allied Governments, to look at the point of view that economic blocks may be a hindrance to post-war trade and possibly sow the seeds of future European trouble?

Mr. Eden: It is difficult to pursue a counsel of perfection in these matters. I am convinced that the Greek-Yugoslav Agreement is very much a step in the right direction.

Mr. Noel-Baker: Are we right in thinking that it is the intention of the Governments that honour the Agreement that it shall be open to all other Balkan countries to adhere to it as soon as they have democratic and peace-loving Governments? Is it their intention that this should be an organisation within a wider framework for the suppression of aggression and the maintenance of peace?

(continued on page 7)

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It was Socrates who likened himself to a sort of gadfly given by God to the state to fasten upon and arouse into life that great and noble steed: Mr. Shinwell and his fellow critics would do well to bear in mind that a cloud of gadflies may distract and madden the horse so that it gallops in any direction but towards its proper destination.

The futility of the use of technical argument in parliament was well-illustrated in the debate on the Restoration of Pre-war Privileges Bill. One member declared that after the war production costs (and presumably wages) must be kept low or the product could not be sold and the result would be more unemployment. A later speaker insisted that unless wages were high there would not be the market for sufficient goods to keep the people in employment (and then modified this contention with the suggestion that we might keep ourselves happily employed raising the standard of living of Indians and Chinamen).

Both views contain a large proportion of truth, and what M.P.s do not see is that the two points of view are by no means mutually exclusive. They have neglected to consider the function of one of the quantities they assume invariable—the credit system. It is not their *business* to recognise this any more than it is their business to dabble in economics—their proper business is the pressing exercise of their functions as representatives of their constituents, using first-rate experts for the necessary techniques to produce the results required by their electors. If M.P.s minded their own (that is, our) business we should be a great deal nearer victory than we are. But when they don't, isn't it odd how far from the mark they wander?

Mr. Tomlinson, Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour, observed during the debate, "If the war has taught us anything, it has taught us that we cannot do what we like with our own."

Someone should tell *Mr. Tomlinson* that most of the people of this island believe that the freedom to do what they like with their own is precisely what they are defending with their lives.

The severe snowstorms of a month ago affected the Liverpool transport system more severely than did the "blitz," and the stimulation of people's morale was very similar. Those who opine that war is a good thing because of the uplifting effect on morale and the companionable atmosphere in which everyone works together might consider whether a series of intense blizzards might not produce the same result with less painful contributory effects.

Of the 6,500 small retail shops in Birmingham before the war some 2,000 have gone, either destroyed by bombs, or hit by rationing and shortage of materials. It is estimated that 65 per cent. of Birmingham shopkeepers have other jobs to help meet the loss in trading.

The only solution proposed by the Board of Trade is that the shopkeepers who were carrying on should subsidise their rivals—an impossible suggestion in view of diminished turnover and lower profits.

The National Federation of Small Shopkeepers is pressing for a scheme of compensation by the Government.

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 and Business*) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: *Wavertree 435.*

Vol. 7. No. 23. Saturday, February 14, 1942.

THE M.P.'s JOB

According to the *Daily Sketch*, Mrs. Beatrice Rathbone, M.P. for Bodwin Division, Cornwall, has signed on with her age group for national service. She is the first woman M.P. to do so. As an M.P. she would be exempt from compulsory service, but is understood to have said, "I don't want to take advantage of this if there is work to be done which seems more important than serving my constituency."

She is a native of Boston, Massachusetts, and has two children evacuees in America.

This is a mere newspaper report, but so far as is known Mrs. Rathbone has taken no steps to have it contradicted. It must therefore be assumed that her views are similar to those of the *Daily Sketch* which states that she has found a still better means of helping Britain than looking after her constituency, and that her motto is service.

Is there, then, no service due to her constituents that she need look elsewhere?

No matter how small or unimportant the constituency, its affairs are quite momentous enough to absorb the working hours of any Member of Parliament. If they do not, the relationship between his constituents and himself is improperly adjusted. There is, of course, no doubt of this ill-adjustment, and since the outbreak of war much has been done to worsen the situation. A good deal has been made of the difficulties created by the movement of population: constituents may be scattered from Land's End to John o' Groats; but this is of comparatively small moment, and in a country properly represented could easily be overcome.

An M.P. can never be more than a great public servant. Of all the circumstances against him perhaps the practice of paying election expenses from party funds is the worst. A salary of £600 a year means that his work cannot but be a vested interest dependent on the approval of the 'Party Bosses' and not on that of the people he represents. He must submit to party discipline if he is to retain his seat and salary.

But when to this is added freedom to accept paid administrative posts under the government *without seeking re-election*, of which more than a few of the present members have availed themselves since war broke out, the position becomes grave indeed. The New Zealand paper, *Truth*, in some interesting side lights on the situation in England, states that the Labour party in this country is averse to an early election when the war is over. Of course, the longer an election is postponed the longer will be the reign of the oligarchy of administrators which the house is rapidly becoming. Shall we be confronted with a second "Long Parliament"?

As well we have the open contempt shewn by the press to the franchise and the parliamentary representative system. The heading alone of the *Daily Sketch's* article is an insult to the country:

*'Woman M.P. signs on
 "There is Work to Do."'*

The Press of to-day talks as loudly as possible about democracy while decrying the only means by which democracy can function, the compulsion laid on every member to express the policy of his constituents—a full time job.

The whole machinery of democratic government is in process of destruction. We know that it has never functioned to capacity. But while it exists it could be made to function.

Meanwhile the forerunners of what we shall endure under the oligarchy of administrators is already with us—in the New Forest communal farming scheme by which 1,000 acres in the Beaulieu forest areas have been taken over for experiment. If successful, the scheme is to be extended to 10,000 acres.

Who decided on the initial experiment, and who is to adjudicate on its success? The practicability of such a scheme can only be answered in its own frame of reference, the geographical setting of Southern England.

There is only one comment to be made. Where are the members for the New Forest area and adjacent countries and are they doing their duty? For even now a Member of Parliament with his constituents behind him is a power to be reckoned with. Though both he and his electors be held in the toils of bureaucratic socialism, the first step to freeing themselves is the establishment of the correct political relationship between them. This is the fundamental belief of Social Crediters, and must be the fundamental belief of the country if the war is not to be fought in vain. Everything we do should lead up to this end. B. M. P.

INCOME TAX

In an article on income tax in its issue of February 7 *The Economist* betrays concern that the collection of income tax from workers is reducing output. It is pointed out that tax on the income of 1941 is collected at the source of the income of 1942 in conditions where incomes are rising, so that if the system is not breaking down now it will after the war; and that the system impinges with maximum severity on the incentive to greater effort, because the extra income is taxed at the highest rate to which the man's income is subject,—in the case of joint returns of husband and wife the husband's marginal rate of taxation applies to practically all his wife's income.

The Economist, in fact, complains of many of the grievances that afflict most tax payers which are now having a secondary effect on the amount of war production. To that extent its criticisms are useful: but no remark is made on the taxpayers' main, if unexpressed, grievance—that of having to pay taxes at all—which is only reasonable in a world where these people are already 'paying' for war-production by their physical effort in producing goods.

The alternative outlined is a tax of, say, 2s. in the £ on all incomes over £78 a year collected at source at the time the income arises, with surtax beginning at £250 a year. This is not reassuring as to *The Economist's* intention to show the way to the solution of the problem of taxation, only as to its wish to rearrange matters so that dangerous criticism is not voiced.

P.E.P. Turns to the German Model

The continuity of policy, together with a strategy constantly modified to meet events, which characterises the vast and enveloping tyranny which we are fighting, and betrays the human intelligence behind it, is well-illustrated by the evolution of the various world-orders which have been suggested for the post-war world. Their multiplicity is part of their deadliness: the least unattractive is a slow, instead of a quick, poison.

Among the plans unfolded for our delectation have been a European Federation, an Anglo-American Federation, a Federation of the British Empire with America and other 'friendly' states, the incorporation of Britain into the United States, a Union of the 26 nations, a Balkan, a Danubian, a central European, and a Scandinavian Federation, as well as the Russian Federation implied in the increasing pressure to communise anything and everything. The extra-territorial governments of Poland and Czecho-Slovakia have already bound their peoples to a federation; the Belgian Prime Minister is in favour of it, the "B".B.C. "Brains" trust assures its listeners that it must be; and a section of the Canadian press tells its readers that they are fifth columnists if they don't want it.

Now among the diversities in size, shape, colour and stringency of these plans, the feature common to them all cannot be disguised: it is centralisation, the further removal from the individual of his capacity to determine his own policy—*i.e.* his freedom.

The scheme known as Federal Union, with its pronounced emphasis on political federation, which was first off the mark after the outbreak of war, is probably, with one exception, the crudest. In spite of wonderful publicity and its appeal to the "intellectual," one of its most important effects, although not the most obvious, seems to be to stimulate consideration of all the facts except the fact that the theory ignored them. From the point of view of the individual Briton, union with America, or anyone else, would mean an enormous loss of freedom.

Emphasis, while still underlining the political aspect, then shifted to the Anglo-American union, stressing the likenesses in culture, language and interests of English-speaking nations. But authorities, both in Britain and America, made it as plain as the means at their disposal allowed that the British Empire and the United States of America were built up on opposing principles: the devolution of authority and policy determination to the dominions on the one hand; the insistence of homogeneity and centralised rule on the other.

The next propositions, of which the Atlantic Charter may be regarded as an example in action, transferred the emphasis from the political to the economic aspect: with the control of the economic resources obviously goes the control of people by their food and other supplies, in which case political formations would lose their authority and importance.

The latest contribution to Utopia is that of Political and Economic Planning* which in December issued its own version of the Plan, showing further interesting modifications. P.E.P. advocates a linkage with Europe using the traditional British way of association while withholding all

the sanctions that make it possible: policing, economic control, cultural control, armaments, and so on. It is, in fact, such a complete travesty of the British idea that it approximates very closely to the Nazi idea for Europe with the British in place of the Germans. Starting off with the assumption that "With, or without, or against Britain, Europe is moving irrevocably towards unity," the most important facts observable in practice are dismissed in a couple of sentences by the way: "Time and again, in the absence of decisive leadership, the bad old habits of sovereignty, neutrality or national animosity have triumphed in face of the most urgent crises. Failing Great Power leadership those habits will continue to triumph. . . ."

After commenting that all problems of politics are at bottom problems of power, the memorandum continues:—

"Power now rests on industrial potential; on the ability to control or ensure the supply of vast quantities of raw materials from sources scattered throughout the world; on a high order of technical and administrative skill; and last but not least on the ability to command the continued and active allegiance of the increasingly individualised and politically conscious masses. These qualifications only a bare handful of the greatest Powers can command. It follows that the world is moving irrevocably towards a new international power system. . . ."

"In such conditions allegiance can only be won in the long run by an attitude of give and take, by a political theory based on respect for the rights and interests of individuals and groups, by a belief in power as a means to an end, namely, the general welfare, and not as an end in itself. To the totalitarian systems, with their contempt for all rights and their worship of power as an end in itself, these attitudes and beliefs must always remain alien."

Power, like everything else, is of no value to anyone unless it is used. "Power in itself" is no more than a delusive phrase used of the ambitions of those who pursue power in order to impose their will on the majority of others. If by "the general welfare" P.E.P. means the welfare that is considered appropriate to the individual by the few who plan for the many, then their ambitions come into exactly the same category. It is "power in itself" for P.E.P. or those whom it fancies as planners, in lieu of the Nazi regime, which itself, it will be remembered, was almost as much noted for its social welfare work as for its lack of liberty.

With such similarity in principles, it is perhaps natural that *Planning* applauds Hitler's Germany for doing the things against which we are fighting: "To Hitler, indeed, Europe will owe, as it owed to Napoleon, a number of achievements of permanent value. Above all, he has succeeded in recreating the basis of European unity, although on lines very different from his aims. Much of what he has done in building up economic and administrative unity in Europe, and in breaking down barriers, it will be neither *desirable nor possible* to undo. The issue is no longer *whether* Europe should remain united, but in what form and by what leadership." (These italics are, of course, not P.E.P.'s)

There are other remarkable likenesses between the two New Orders. P.E.P. proposes the development of a European community, as opposed to the diverse national cultures which recently composed it; so does Germany. P.E.P.'s would be policed by the allies, chiefly by the British and Americans; Germany's by Germans. P.E.P. wants control

**Britain and Europe in Planning*, December 9, 1941.

of raw materials; Germany has and still wants a good deal more than she had. Germany centralised in Berlin control of the potential war industries of the Rhineland and the Ruhr with parts of Belgium and Luxembourg: P.E.P. thanks Germany kindly and proposes to hand this control, as it is, to international regional commissions. Germany is trying to Germanise all the cultural institutions and traditions of the countries she conquers: P.E.P. proposes to internationalise them, emphasising the European rather than the national trends, whatever that may mean. Germany is trying to set up a military aristocracy of Germans; P.E.P. says, "Closely linked with the rebuilding of institutions is the gradual development of individual leaders in every sphere. In the early stages British, Dominion and American personnel are bound to play a leading part; and it is one of the most urgent tasks that a start should be made with training British personnel here and now. But a start should also be made at once to place carefully picked"—by whom?—"individuals from allied nations in this country in key administrative positions, e.g., on skeleton staffs in European Reconstruction organisations, with a view to building up a European elite."

P.E.P. goes on to suggest the formation of European commissions for food, transport, health, and civil aviation as well as industrial reconstruction, the development of poverty areas in Europe and colonial possessions, "which in the second stage of reconstruction might develop into permanent European institutions under the general direction of whatever authority is charged with the long-term planning of the European economy. At all stages they would work in close contact with the I.L.O., the world commodity controls and any other organisations which may emerge from the co-operation of the leading world powers."

With one or two omissions this is what has already been done or what it is proposed to do in Europe. In some cases, even, the methods have already been proved inefficient. Dr. Funk (according to the *Sunday Times* of February 1) said recently that "although collective forms in the matter of economic organisation are important during war, they must be gradually abolished later to allow private enterprise free play. . . . Those who think that merchants and their function in international trade can be eliminated should realise the necessity of a new apparatus, which would, however, not carry out the distribution so well."

To all this economic control and interference, the essence of Nazism, P.E.P. appends, like a footnote, a political association "based on the experience of the British Commonwealth." In fact, it would not be at all like the British Commonwealth, for, as *Planning* says, purely political organisations would become less paramount as the economic institutions, over the policy of which the people have the slenderest control, grow more effective.

It cannot seriously be credited that an "economic and administrative unity in Europe" which so scrupulously follows Germany's methods can produce different results, and any system (even the same one) administered by 'perfidious Albion' would probably be even less welcome to Europe than one administered by Germany. Certainly, whatever P.E.P. may think, the British are no more fighting for the privilege of being the bureaucrats and *bêtes noires* of Europe than they are fighting to institute a bureaucracy in this country. The man in the street believes he is fighting for freedom: not general welfare, which is state charity and

the moulding of a rich diversity of character to the statisticians' average, but individual welfare, where each man chooses what he wants.

What is wanted is a flexible system responsive in fact (and not in theory only) to the will and interests of the people as individuals, and serving them to their satisfaction. This is a task which organisation should be able to accomplish. Because the pressure of his nature causes man to seek diverse opportunities rather than standardised frustrations, no Plan, whether Allied or Axis, however well camouflaged with the passwords of the moment, will succeed until it implements this; and when it does it will no longer be a Plan.

E. S. E.

"He That is Greatest . . ."

By J. M. M.

Social Power arises in the individual. When it is left free to expand itself, it does so with a minimum degree of disturbance, and is directed by the individual towards the achievement of his personal satisfaction. But when it is gathered up and skilfully directed, social power can become the most disturbing force in the world. It is this force, which has its origin in the individual, which is now shattering the world before our eyes.

It has ever been the aim of ambitious men to gather social power into large aggregations, and to direct it towards the achievement of their own ambitions. Just as a tiny rill at the head of a watershed, when gathered together with others of its kind, yields the constituents which form a mighty river, so does the individual yield the constituent power which cleaves continents, fractures the atom, explores the deepest space.

But before the rills can form the river they must be gathered together. So must social power be gathered together before it can become the potent instrument for good or ill, which it is capable of becoming.

There are two motives which may serve to consolidate social power into a useable cohesive mass:—

(a) The desire to "Exploit." (b) The desire to "Serve."*

. . . Many of the earlier social structures were built by exploiters, using for their purpose a social cohesion based on compulsion and served by the emotion of fear.

Now this social structure had a grave defect, it was apt to disintegrate at any time of crisis; for when society encountered some other "fear," greater than the "fear" induced by the exploiter, the centripetal force of social cohesion was overcome by the centrifugal force of the "fear" arising from the crisis, and the social structure was shattered.

The social structure erected on compulsion by the exploiter, using the emotion of fear, had another grave defect. To the degree that the individual was subordinated by fear, the flow from him of social force began to dry up. So that the successful exploiter who had placed himself at the apex of a pyramid of power-yielding units, found that these units became sterile, and that the power available

*Throughout this article the notion of "Service" is used in a special sense denoting service of the agreed will of the people by the administrators of the social structure and of the people themselves.

for his direction decreased in direct ratio as his exploitation advanced.

After long and bitter experience, men learned, with some degree of thoroughness, some elementary lessons from the exploiter; and he became qualified to take part in a higher form of social structure than that built on the basis of exploitation, i.e., a social structure based on *the desire to serve*.

The most serious attempts to build on this basis of "service" have been made by the Anglo-Saxon people; "*Ich Dien*," i.e., "I Serve," is the motto of our Prince of Wales.

When the desire to "exploit" gives place to the desire to "serve," the social structure takes on an entirely different complexion.

The emotion of "fear," used for motives of "exploitation," gives place to an emotion akin to love, commonly called "loyalty," when the motive of social aggregation is service.

In such a social structure the individual flourishes; his initiative is stimulated; as a source of social power he is increased a thousand-fold.

Instead of being shattered in time of crisis, the units of the social structure, whose web and woof are service and loyalty, are drawn together in closer cohesion, and the initiative of each individual stimulated to its utmost.

This is the secret of the great cohesive strength of the British Empire.

In times of crisis it is ever greater. In the person of the Sovereign, all loyal citizens find their point of cohesion and co-ordination. In him the people find a symbol of their own sovereignty.

The objection may be raised, "But surely we British people are not free from exploitation?" It must be admitted that we are not free, but it may be urged that exploitation is not the web and woof of our social structure; it is something which has been grafted upon it; it is parasitic, and has grown to its dangerous dimensions particularly since the year 1644.

All the great legal authorities, from Dicey onwards, agree that the greatest British Institution is the Office of Sovereign.

We hear a great deal of propaganda these days, under the title of Federal Union and other aliases, endeavouring to condition us to the idea of accepting some international authority to exercise a power superior to the power of Our Sovereign.

To accept such a power is to subordinate His Majesty the King. To subordinate His Majesty the King is to deny our own sovereignty; it is to tear to tatters our web and woof of service and loyalty; it is to destroy the finest social structure which has yet been built.

No one can do a greater disservice to us than to assail the throne and the Royal House. Anyone who dares so to do, should be recognised for what he is—an implacable enemy of the British People. No matter who he is, he should be placed where he can do us no further harm.

And if our Ministers, our Servants of the Crown, are not false to their Oaths of Allegiance and loyalty to the person of His Majesty, we will not hear the air fouled and

our press soiled by policies which imply the subordination of His Majesty the King, the Chief Corner Stone upon which our British Empire is built.

Since service and loyalty are the web and woof of our social structure, what may we as individuals do to strengthen these? The Nazarene has answered this question in the injunction, "But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant." (*—St. Matthew, c. 23. v. 11.*)

This is surely a "mandate" that we are to honour and esteem those who give "service." This "mandate" may also surely be stated negatively, i.e. that we are to hold in contempt, and to spurn the exploiter, and in every way to show our disapproval of him. To the extent that we tolerate or fawn on the exploiter, to that degree we are false to the "mandate" given us; to that extent we make of ourselves fertile seedbeds, stimulating the production of exploiters; to that extent we indicate that we, ourselves, are potential exploiters.

If the exploiter were shunned as the enemy of our social structure, he and his kind would quickly disappear.

The injunction was not addressed to him "who aspired" to greatness; it was addressed to us, the common people. So long as we ourselves are potential exploiters, our social structure will be weakened by this parasitic growth. It is only we who can eliminate it and the method by which this may be achieved is set out by the Nazarene.

There is no other method: "Service" from those who would aspire to greatness, and a consequent "loyalty" to them and to Our Sovereign King.

"But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant."

(Issued under the auspices of the Director of Electoral Campaign, Sydney, New South Wales.)

PARLIAMENT

Continued from page 3

Mr. Eden: It is difficult to answer for other Governments, but what I can say for sure is that this Greek-Yugoslav Treaty is definitely to form the basis of a Balkan Confederation.

FEBRUARY 5.

OFFICES OR PLACES OF PROFIT UNDER THE CROWN

Ordered,

"That the Report from the Select Committee on Offices or Places of Profit under the Crown be now considered."—[*Sir Dennis Herbert.*]

Report considered accordingly.

Sir Dennis Herbert (Watford): I beg to move,

"That this House recommends the Report from the Select Committee on Offices or Places of Profit under the Crown to the consideration of His Majesty's Government."

... I want to go briefly through the provisions of the proposed Bill which hon. Members will find set out in heavy type in paragraph 63 on page 35 of the Report.

Clause 1, as I will describe it, is really the basis of the Bill. It provides that the holding of offices under the Crown shall disqualify for membership of the House of Commons, subject to two important exceptions. Those exceptions are

dealt with in Clauses 2 and 3. The first is a limited number of Ministers of the Crown, and the second is holders of offices which may, perhaps, for convenience, be described as harmless offices, that is offices of a non-political nature, the holding of which, I think, no one would suggest incompatible with membership of this House. Clause 4 preserves two archaic, sinecure offices which might almost be described as museum curiosities, namely, the Stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds and of the Manor of Northstead, but which are still of definite and practical use as the only convenient means by which the ordinary member can resign at his will his Membership of the House. . . .

Clause 5 is to protect Members from the possibility of being excluded from membership by the action of the Executive, by being appointed to some disqualifying office without their consent. It is a matter which is not particularly likely to happen in practice, but it may be just as well to have it in this Bill. There is one case in which it might be of practical use, and that is in the case of the office of the High Sheriff of a county in England—an office which, I believe I am right in saying, cannot be refused unless the gentleman in question is able to put forward an excuse which is regarded as good, which he does not always succeed in doing.

. . . . As regards the House of Commons Disqualification (Temporary Provisions) Act, it comes to an end on March 6, and the Committee expressly recommend . . . that any re-enactment or renewal of that Act should preserve all those limitations which are already in the existing Act, including the one which provides that the Act shall come to an end again on the expiration of another 12 months.

Sir Percy Harris (Bethnal Green, South West): Would it not be convenient for it to come under the Expiring Laws Continuation Act?

Sir D. Herbert: No, Sir. If I may say so I am very glad indeed that it was not passed recently, because I think that the question ought to be reconsidered every year, and, indeed, we have made some suggestions for its possible amendment. . . .

The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Arthur Greenwood): . . . I would say, as to Part II, that we have proceeded very far, and later we shall resume our consideration of Part I with a view to the necessary legislation to which my right hon. Friend referred. As to Part II, there, as the House now realises, legislation is necessary almost immediately—within a month. . . . We accept the suggestion that the [House of Commons Disqualification (Temporary Provisions)] Act should be continued for another year. . . .

A further proposal is that a certificate issued with regard to a Member should contain a statement that it is desirable that the Member should continue to be a Member of the House. I hope the Select Committee will not insist upon that particular provision. . . .

Lastly, there was a suggestion for limiting exemption from disqualification to some stated period of time unless extended in any particular case by Order-in-Council or by Resolution of the House. I suggest, with all respect, that that procedure might involve the Government and the House in some embarrassment. . . .

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Economic Democracy |(edition exhausted) |
| Social Credit | 3/6 |
| The Monopoly of Credit |3/6 |
| Credit Power and Democracy |(edition exhausted) |
| Warning Democracy |(edition exhausted) |
| The Use of Money |6d. |
| "This 'American' Business" | 3d. each |

ALSO

| | |
|--|---------------|
| The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold |4/6 |
| Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson |6d. |
| Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report |6d. |
| Is Britain Betrayed? by John Mitchell |2d. each |
| How Alberta is Fighting Finance |2d. each |

Leaflets

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell |9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6 |
| Taxation is Robbery |50 for 1/9; 100 for 3/- |

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

SOCIAL CREDIT REFERENCE LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* is in the course of formation. It will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon the subject, as well as standard works on banking, currency and social science.

A deposit of 15/- will be required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

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., 20 Dromara Street, 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 February 19.
 MIDLAND D.S.C. Group: see Birmingham.
 NEWCASTLE-on-Tyne Douglas Credit Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.
 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.