

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 8. No. 11.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 23, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

THE BIG IDEA (XVIII)

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

Finally, we come to the question of technique.

There are obvious reasons, more particularly at the present time, which are a valid argument against "plans of campaign," just as against "planning." But certain considerations may be emphasised.

Every prohibition of individual initiative is a victory for the enemy to exactly the extent that it is effective. Not only does it, in itself, represent one more step towards the Slave World, but, except under certain conditions, it sets up a habit of apathetic acquiescence which is exactly what is desired. One of the Planners "hoped to keep the war going" for exactly this purpose; those conditions, however, are not unduly difficult to create.

The first strategy has many times been emphasised—it is to insist that Members of Parliament are representatives, not delegates. I am still of the opinion that as long as Parliamentary institutions subsist, which may not be much longer, this line of action is vital.

But the same principle can be carried into every official quarter. Once get the mental attitude well established in oneself that institutions exist only legitimately to serve individuals, and it is possible to make demands of Government Departments with which their organisation cannot deal, but are yet entirely reasonable. It is not necessary and not desirable, to organise this kind of action. The underlying idea is to call the bluff of institutionalism, and to make it either deliver the goods or expose the fact that it can't.

It is necessary to face up to the fact of institutionalised Judaeo-Christianity, the official philosophy of England, Scotland, and Wales, which is simply Liberal Judaism. I may perhaps repeat my belief, not only that Christianity has not failed because it has not been tried, but that it has not been tried mainly because Judaeo-Christianity has taken care that it should not be tried.

At the present time, ecclesiastics of the Churches of England and Scotland, are making every effort in their power to identify the Kingdom of God upon Earth with Jewish Socialism (which is State Capitalism with monopoly control by Finance), and, in many cases, doing it from what, in a restricted sense, might be called the highest motives—derived from assuming as axiomatic, the tenets of a philosophy systematically inculcated almost from birth. Against this hypnotic obsession, argument is useless—dehypnotisation is essential.

It is of the essence of Social Credit ideas that there is an

organic connection between peoples, races, and individuals, and the soils of particular portions of the earth's surface which are individualistic. The Russians are fighting, not for internationalism, but for nationalism.

It is important to enquire into, and to pillory, the fact that the Socialist Party, while demanding the evacuation of India by the British (which, in a proper, dignified, and far from apologetic manner, is ultimately desirable) insist on the admission and retention at their pleasure of the most undesirable Oriental the world has produced—the Jew.

The Jew and his philosophy, which is epitomised in the one-way street—must be provided with a country after the war, and returned to it. I cannot imagine a more distasteful fate for him.

Uninfluenced by alien intrigue, and inoculated, as he will be by the harsh realism of war, against windy abstractions, the native of these islands can be trusted to hammer out his best destiny. He will not be assisted by Secret Societies.

And the root of the matter is—mind your own business, and allow no man to make a business of minding you. Listen, in reason, to what advice seems to be backed by proper experience and ability, and pay no attention to windy idealism. And then—mind your own business. It is in sore need of your attention.

(Concluded)

(All rights reserved)

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

FEDERAL UNION IN BRIEF:

U. S.: Ham

Once-Great Britain: Spam

“... nor could the incomprehensible Arab-Jewish witticisms of the Orient compete for his [Edward, afterwards Edward VII] approval with the robust German-Jewish Stock-Exchange jokes that the Rothschilds collected for him so assiduously and so expensively (sometimes, even, by cable).”—*The Sassoon Dynasty* by CECIL ROTH.

“Queen Isabella, a most intelligent woman, once said ‘You never know about Russians, the Russian is like a cat, you never know where he will jump’... ”

On the other hand, Soviet Russians say all that is ancient history, that they are different Russians, and can fight to the death, and will. But a cat is always a cat, although I do like Russians... and also cats.”

—*The Kremlin and the People* by DURANTY.

"I should like to mention here, *en passant*, that all workers and employees of the Soviet Union nowadays receive regular wages with extra for overtime, and bonuses, etc., for good work, just as in a Capitalist country. In fact the system might more accurately be described as *State Capitalism, rather than socialism*. [Our italics. —Editor.]

"Everyone can spend money as he or she pleases, except that there is a great shortage of goods..."

— *The Kremlin and the People* by DURANTY.

In reply to the Debate on the Central Bank Bill in the Irish Dail, Mr. De Valera said that he had asked several economists to give him a memorandum substantiating their assertion that Douglas's A + B theorem was not true. "Over a long period of years," he said, "he had not got anything which he would regard as a satisfactory demonstration as to where that proposition was not true." (Mr. De Valera is a mathematician of considerable ability. —Editor.)

So what?

Nowadays, we do everything in a Big Way. The World's Greatest General has settled down the World's Greatest Distance from the World's Greatest War.

"I had no misgivings about the Kremlin. It had been expecting this war and preparing for it since 1933."

— *The Kremlin and the People* by DURANTY.

Oh, what a surprise!

British re-armament, such as it was, began in 1935.

In deference to the cries of the Hampstead Th'cots the Secretary of State for Scotland's department stocked 44,000 acres of one-time deer-forest with 6,620 sheep, one sixth of which died.

The Forestry Commission meanwhile pursues its policy of closing down for afforestation hill sheep-farms comprising thousands of acres of land in working trim.

You're right, Clarence, it is hard luck on the sheep!

The *Sunday Post* of May 10 remarks of the Free GERMAN Youth Movement, "In Britain there are 500 members of the movement. Most of them are Jews who fled from Hitler." The dream of one of them, adds the paper, is a German invasion of Germany:—optimistic, on 500 members!

EXERCISE

Materials required:—One sheet of paper, a pair of compasses and a lead pencil.

Game (it is a game!): With pencil provided, the player places any number of dots, each marked with the letter "C" on the piece of paper provided. He (or she) then adds one more dot, and marks this dot with his (or her) initials. "Player", armed with sufficient knowledge of elementary geometry, now proceeds to draw a circle containing (and only just containing) all the dots. (Later the same evening "player" reads the *New York monetary reformist newspaper*, "Money":

"If your critics cannot draw a circle big enough to include you, then you should draw a circle big enough to include them."—in other words: when your critics cannot do what they want to do to you, do it for them.

Points from Parliament

MAY 7.

Oral Answers to Questions

NOMINEE SHAREHOLDINGS (IDENTITY)

Sir J. Lucas asked the Home Secretary whether, in the public interest, he will now exercise his powers and disclose the identity of bankers' nominee holders of blocks of 10,000 shares or over in the *Daily Mirror* as on February 27 last; and the approximate number of nominees' shares held in blocks smaller than 10,000?

Mr. H. Morrison: As he indicated in reply to a Question by my hon. and gallant Friend on April 28, my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade is in consultation with me on the question whether it is necessary or expedient to impose any general requirement of disclosure of the beneficial ownership of shares in newspaper companies. Pending a decision on this question, I do not think that I should be justified in singling out this particular newspaper for the exercise of the special powers given to me by Defence Regulation 80A for obtaining information which it is necessary or expedient to obtain in the interests of the public safety, the defence of the realm or the efficient prosecution of the war. I understand that 201,571 ordinary shares in this newspaper are held by nominees in blocks of less than 10,000.

Sir J. Lucas: Is the Minister aware that this is purely a question of principle and not an attack upon a newspaper? If I put a Question down in about a month's time, will he then be able to give an answer?

Mr. Morrison: I will do my best in that time.

Mr. Garro Jones: Is my right hon. Friend aware that merely to compel disclosure by the bankers' nominees will not meet the situation in full, as many shareholders who apparently hold shares in beneficial ownership may be nominees without any apparent indication of that fact on the share register?

Mr. Morrison: That may be so, and if it is so, I am not quite clear what I can do about that.

Sir Percy Harris: Is it not only fair that if this is done in regard to one newspaper, it should be done for all newspapers?

Mr. Morrison: If my right hon. Friend reads my Reply, he will find that that is exactly what I said.

DIRECT AND INDIRECT TAXATION

Mr. Glenville Hall asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the amounts and percentages of direct and indirect taxation for the financial years 1939-40 to 1941-42, respectively; and the estimated figures under the 1942 Budget?

Sir K. Wood: The following are the figures:

		Direct	
		£	Percentage.
1939-40	...	623,980,000	... 61.20
1940-41	...	843,797,000	... 61.55
1941-42*	...	1,267,563,000	... 64.47
1942-43†	...	1,560,760,000	... 66.11

		Indirect	
		£	Percentage.
1939-40	...	395,538,000	... 38.80
1940-41	...	527,174,000	... 38.45
1941-42*	...	698,581,000	... 35.53
1942-43†	...	800,240,000	... 33.89

*Approximate net receipts. †Budget Estimate.

RUBBER PRODUCTION (AFRICA MALAYA STAFFS)

Captain Peter Macdonald asked the Under-secretary of State for the Colonies what steps have been taken to trace and utilise the services of qualified rubber planters who were able to escape from Malaya?

Mr. Harold Macmillan: The members of the Rubber Growers' Association have very kindly furnished the names and whereabouts of those of their Malayan staffs who are known to have escaped. Staff requirements for rubber production in West Africa have been almost completely met; this, among other problems of production in East Africa, is now receiving urgent attention.

MAY 12.

Oral Answers to Questions

TRADE AND COMMERCE

Mr. De la Bère asked the President of the Board of Trade whether, arising out of the Second Interim Report of the Board of Trade Retail Trade Committee, he is now able to make a statement regarding the attitude which is being adopted by the small traders throughout the country as regards the alternative courses of holding on, temporary amalgamation or closing down?

Mr. Dalton: The Retail Trade Committee are preparing their Report with all possible speed, and I hope it will soon be completed. It would not be proper for me to make any statement of policy or comment on the attitude of traders before I have been able to study the Report.

Mr. De la Bère: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the detailed Reports from the Committee lead nowhere; that there must be a plan to deal with the situation; that it must entail protective legislation, otherwise the small shopkeepers will be squeezed out and only the big firms will be left; and that it is very serious and very urgent?

Mr. Dalton: I am anxious that there should not be any undue delay, but it is a very representative Committee, representing all sections who have special knowledge, and it would be wrong, after this Committee had been appointed and had been working very hard over a series of months, for me, in advance of receiving their Report, to make any statement of policy they are advising me upon.

Mr. De la Bère: Is not the matter very urgent?

(continued on page seven)

The "B".B.C. as Partisan

By B. M. PALMER

Probably the "B".B.C. has never sunk lower than when, following the Prime Minister's speech on May 8, they broadcast *The Debate Continues*, advertised as a dramatic reminder that the mother of Parliaments is the protector and protagonist of freedom. The programme began with a complete travesty of the causes which led to the Civil War. Charles I was shewn as a weak and obstinate tyrant, with no policy at all except the suppression of the House, which was, according to the "B".B.C., said to be representative of the people. In reality it was merely representative of the landed proprietors, who already shewed signs of corruption by Whiggism. This broadcast sent me back to *The Policy of a Philosophy** and its masterly exposition of the cause of strife between Cavaliers and Roundheads. Every social

crediter needs this speech for constant reference, and if a copy cannot be bought he should not rest till he has borrowed it and made the gist of it his own.

Now the net result of the struggle between King and Parliament was that under the plea for so-called 'freedom of conscience', the philosophies in the minds of the people of this country became completely chaotic, and in Douglas's words, "left the way open to the dominance of a philosophy which was not any one of them." People thought they were Christian, but from henceforth the actions to which they were forced by the penal and industrial system had no relationship whatever to Christianity.

When we find that a deliberate attempt is being made by the "B".B.C. to misrepresent this important turning point in the history of our country—and it must be deliberate, because, though of course they would not agree with *The Policy of a Philosophy*, they can scarcely be ignorant of the important contributions to the historical research of that period made by Hilaire Belloc (to name one only of the distinguished scholars who are not Whigs) covering almost the entire Stuart period—facts which cannot be set aside, and the denial of which brands the "B".B.C. as deliberately partisan.

If partisan, then partisan for what?

For Whiggism, Abstractionism, Puritanism.

Puritanism is an even stronger force to-day than we realise.

Insofar as it is identifiable with abstractionism and whiggism it stands for negation of religion, and most certainly the negation of Christianity.

"Religion is any sort of doctrine which is based on an attempt to relate action to some conception of reality. It does not necessarily mean, for instance, that your conception of reality is a correct one, but it does mean that you are postulating that there is something to which we refer as real, and you are basing your policy upon that reality."

The attempt made by the Press and the "B".B.C. to force people to take a detached interest in "freedom", when as a matter of fact they are in firmer chains than at any other period of English history, is the purest abstractionism, and has less chance of success than a universal return to the flat earth theory.

"Freedom does not interest people as soon as they realise that it does not mean being free."

The vast majority of people in this country believe that when the war is over there will be a gradual relaxation of control and a disappearance of coupons, rationing, conscription of labour and so forth.

But their Parliament asked for no *guarantee* that this would be so, to safeguard their electors.

And this is the House extolled as "free" in last Sunday's broadcast!

Let those who remember how impossible it seemed to kill "Dora" after the last armistice ask themselves what purpose the "B".B.C. has in filling the minds of the people with a complete chaos of philosophies, under the pretence that "freedom" and "freedom of conscience" are entirely identical and interchangeable.

*Speech given by Major Douglas on June 26, 1937, and reprinted in *The Social Crediter* of June 22, 1940.

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. 8. No. 11.

Saturday, May 23, 1942.

TROUBLED WATERS

To take the temperature of some water with a thermometer, it is not necessary to have a large quantity of water. All the water required is enough to cover the bulb of the thermometer. True that the water loses heat to the thermometer, if the thermometer is warmer than the water, or gains heat from the thermometer if that is the warmer. All the same, it is not necessary to have an Atlantic ocean of water before you tell its temperature.

It used to be said that when the opposition (ours) wanted to 'try out a new one,' they did not always fly a kite in *The Times*, or even in *The Echo*. They frequently resorted to a newspaper bought by small boys because they understood it to be 'funny.'

The suggestion recurs to us after noticing *The Economist's* article on Party Government, the appearance of which, prompted apparently by Mr. W. J. Brown's threat to 'go straight off to London and, when he gets there, start an organisation.' "That organisation," said *The Economist* on May 9, "will start committees. Those committees will start machines. And those machines will run candidates at by-elections. So an argument which opens with a denunciation of parties and machines ends with the announcement of a new party and a new machine straight from the makers." The last four words may have been introduced by the profound respect which *The Economist* sometimes shows for the refinements (now almost forgotten) of English prose. It is 'rhythmical,' and rhythm is 'a principle of proportion introduced into language.' 'Straight from the retailers' would have sounded less well: it has too many syllables. *The Economist's* notion that the politically-minded public has a large choice of dragon-breeders likewise must belong to the 'picturesque,' viz., "St. George first kills the dragon, then pops round to the nearest breeder and buys a sitting of dragon's eggs, claps them under a broody hen and hatches them out."

A week later, 'the makers'' scheme was published briefly in the popular dailies, and, whatever may be the attitude of *The Economist* towards Mr. Brown, the newspaper's antagonism to his ideas and the ideas themselves are seen to be complementary.

As for *The Economist*, its axioms are:—

- (1) Ideas can have no influence upon policy unless those who accept them form a party.
- (2) Ideas are not of equal 'worth,' and there are more of them than there can conveniently be of parties.
- (3) Some ideas are 'entitled to expression,' and those who hold these must "line themselves into parties so as to express honestly the differing theories of government which are entitled to expression."

(4) If the 'rules' are not observed, "democracy and party will go down together."

The *Daily Mail* does not, but the *Liverpool Echo* does give the 'three' main objectives of Mr. Brown's party, in which he is supported by 'Captain Cunningham-Reid, Mr. Edgar Granville and 'a number of private citizens.' The new party is to be called "The People" (so that every one shall have an opportunity of supporting those whose opinions are entitled to expression?), and the machinery will be through "people's constituency committees."

The three stated objectives are:—

- (1) To stop the stream of inefficiency at the source in the other party caucuses.
- (2) To punish those in high places in politics, industry and the services when they deserve it.
- (3) To encourage M.P.s and candidates who agree to (1) and (2) and to fight those who do not.

Mr. Brown seems to be quite of the same mind as *The Economist* concerning the axioms of representative government. Even on 'the brink of ruin' they cannot see either that their axioms are not axiomatic or that there can be a 'specification' for a smoothly-working political system. The similarity at least in form of words between the People's Constituency Committees and the Voters' Policy Associations advocated in *The Social Crediter* will attract attention, and it may be surmised that Mr. Brown is going to thrust his thermometer into what trickle of electoral water can run through the filter of A.R.P., overtime in factories, Fire-watching, Home-guarding, etc., etc. 'The Makers' may think that, if the temperature recorded is unduly high there may be plenty of time before the war ends to scrap an 'outworn parliamentary system' as well as an 'outworn financial system' ("Financial Mysticism," vide P.E.P., May 12, 1942.), in favour of rationing of ideas ('entitled to expression') as well as goods, freedom and leisure (entitled to live).

One thing is fairly clear: that the 'makers' have now reached so low a level of salesmanship that unless they go in for the manufacture of mere noise any voice with something sensible to say about politics (which by the bye is concerned with the materialisation (in the broadest sense) of *policy*, the ends envisaged) is bound to be heard and listened to with close attention.

Wherever the 'People's Constituency Committees' appear, someone should see that it is thoroughly understood by all concerned, including 'the Makers', that they are the people's, not the makers'. That summarises the situation in a single axiom.

MUSTARD

Why buy this, when you can grow it in your garden? The stuff you buy is half drugs, and is injurious to health. A yard square of ground, sown with common Mustard, the crop of which you would grind for use, in a little mustard-mill, as you wanted it, would save you some money, and probably save you your life. Your mustard would look brown instead of yellow; but the former colour is as good as the latter; and, as to taste, the real mustard has certainly a much better taste than that of the drugs and flour which go under the name of mustard. Let anyone try it, and I am sure he will never use the drugs again. The drugs, if you take them freely, leave a burning at the pit of the stomach, which the real mustard does not.

—WILLIAM COBBETT in *Cottage Economy*.

LORD ELTON'S ALTAR

Less than six months ago, it was reported that Douglas had said that before long we should all be Social Crediters, and it would then be more important than ever to know what was a Social Crediter. Major Douglas had gone on to say that our formula (*i.e.*, the formula for a Social Crediter) was an absolute, like the formula for sulphuric acid. (There is a formula for sulphuric acid—whatever it is. If it is H_2SO_4 , that's it. If H_2SO_4 is not the formula, then some other arrangement of symbols is the formula. Sulphuric acid has a formula. HCN is not the formula for sulphuric acid. It is said to be the formula for prussic acid. Prussic acid is not sulphuric acid. The difference between the two acids is an absolute difference. It is a difference which never ceases to be the *same* difference.)

If we are not yet *all* Social Crediters, the prophesy has been already fulfilled at least to the extent that it is beginning to be difficult for some Social Crediters to distinguish between themselves and persons variously occupied in the community, who, without in the least claiming to be Social Crediters, seem, to those whose eye they catch, to be acting (but more often talking) rather like Social Crediters. The problem thus set would be purely academic if it were not that our difficulties in face of our present discontents (the world's) are not intellectual. They are 'military'. To see a soldier running is no proof that 'the enemy is on the run'. To see a lot of soldiers running is no proof that they are running away. Nor is it a proof that they are running to your assistance. To see a lot of soldiers running and to know that they are running away is no proof that you are overtaking them. Up to the present, the retreat of the opponents of decentralisation of policy in society has been a perpetual retreat. A perpetual retreat is really a kind of victory, and to ensure it all that is necessary is superiority of transport facilities. The metaphor does not hold completely, because the terrain to be traversed, politically, changes, and the perpetual retreat assumes that it remains, at least relatively, the same for pursuer and pursued. There is an absolute difference between trying to do the inherently impossible and trying to do the possible. Social Crediters believe that the Grand Judaeo-masonic plan for 'total' centralisation of policy (Totalitarianism, whether National-socialist totalitarianism or International-socialist totalitarianism) is inherently unworkable—*ultimately*. But ultimately is at the end, and most men and women want a chance before the end comes. If, however, the end is very near, they may have a better chance than if it is very far away. Many of them have arrived quite near to 'the end,' with fairly clear heads and healthy wills. There is thus reason to believe that what we are trying to do is the possible. Is it necessary to know pursuer from pursued in the Great Retreat to which we are trying to set a limit? Do we need to know a Social Crediter: to know whether the 'absolute formula' is represented? Douglas says 'yes.'

Very well: let us take Lord Elton. Lord Elton has written a book, prominently displayed for sale in these times of paper shortage, in which there are some 'promising pages'.* The book is being widely read by the kind of person who, with much less inducement from shop-window displays, might be reading *The Big Idea*, or *His Service is Perfect Freedom*, if not *The Monopoly of Credit*—and acting

on it in many cases.

In a brief foreword, Lord Elton tells us a little, but not much about himself. He says that some readers of his second chapter will at once write him down 'an inveterate opponent of progress; while others, if they reach the sixth, may choose to class him as a Socialist.' He pleads guilty to only two 'prejudices.' He believes that change, however sweeping, should have its roots in the past; and he is a Christian. The first of these 'prejudices' Lord Elton shares with all of us who do not entertain wholly unconventional notions concerning the nature of Time. Change consists in 'passing from one state to another,' the time of the initial state being past relatively to the time of the final state. But doubtless, Lord Elton means to imply that, in regard to social change, he would 'conserve' more things (unspecified) than certain other people, of whom he is thinking, would 'conserve.' Concerning his second 'prejudice,' it is well-known that people holding quite different philosophies claim to be Christians, a contingency foreseen in the New Testament, which consequently recommends an 'acid' test by which individuals may be known: 'by their fruits.'

On beginning to read Lord Elton's book itself, it is immediately apparent that he is addressing himself to readers who are assumed to be sympathetic towards, or likely to be persuaded easily into sympathy with, ideas not supposed to be widely current outside of the relatively small circle of people who read *The Social Crediter*. They are current, and it is we who have made them so. He says that few statesmen would be willing to prophesy how their own countries, or the world itself, will be governed in five years' time, save those who do so for the sake of propaganda. "Our civilisation is in dissolution." He says it is doubtful whether Hitler (or Hitler's 'era') cannot hold down the reluctant nations by force for ever. Without using Douglas's words, he seems to see the truth of the statement that 'Probably the future of humanity turns on the answer to a single question: "Does Social Power proceed from within, or does it reside in guns, tanks and aeroplanes?"' He says there will never be a perpetual peace unless we organise perpetual change. We should not have said 'organise' here. We might more gracefully have said 'respect', or (with reservations) 'permit', and in that case we might have said, not the same thing as Lord Elton, but the opposite. Obeying God is the opposite of trying to 'run' God for a vested interest, even if the interest is vested in a private view of goodness. Although subtly attached to what we would consider a wrong idea, the idea of the necessity of 'international' control, Lord Elton says that a 'power' in possession of overwhelming strength "whether it is a paramount German Herrenvolk or an International Police Force which exercises it," will be "seeking to stifle the most powerful force in nature." He recognises that this force is Life. In a contest between nations, there is 'no speck of rottenness' which may not have its influence upon the outcome. The 'invisible forces of righteousness' will not do the fighting for us. "I believe that it is true that all evil is ultimately self-destructive. . . . But it may be a very long run indeed." "Progress is neither inevitable nor continuous." "Nothing in history or theology suggests that, because Nazi rule is evil, it is impossible that the world should now be plunged into a thousand years of slavery." The meaning of every crisis in history is that it is a choice. "The fortieth century will be as free as the twentieth to revert to the law of the jungle, or the morals of the farmyard, and call it Progress." "Crisis is

a Greek word, signifying judgement, or decision." "Our war aim cannot now be this reform or that, not 'social justice' or the restoration of Czechoslovakia or a new paper League of Nations, but rather to prove that it is tyranny which is obsolete, and not the British Commonwealth."

There is a tilt at "the culture of paper constitutions", whose "planners counted on solving all the problems of the new world by the speedy enforcement of systems which they, and others, have been persistently advocating, and the electorate as persistently rejecting [omnipotent and responsible electorate!], for the last fifty years,"—a "peculiar form of war profiteering." The new age will be a *new* age, and the isms will be outmoded and 'date' irremediably. This country never has cared for the *a priori* plans of experts and cranks; but "has preferred to proceed empirically from problem to problem, tackling them successively by the compass-bearing, so to speak, of a long-descended instinct for self-government." But this only means that the planner "has to go to work within that framework with which empiricism and instinct will have already presented him"! Empiricism and instinct have, of course, received no assistance from planners. They are alone responsible for the "set".

Lord Elton proceeds to an attack upon the attack upon morale. Having fought unsuccessfully the Thornbury Division of Gloucestershire twice (1924, 1929), and having been expelled from the Labour Party in 1931 as a supporter of Ramsay Macdonald, a pacifist, the peer created in 1934 castigates the pacifists. Those who survived the last war were the physically or morally less well qualified, "who, for one reason or another preferred to control margarine, or to drive ambulances behind the lines, or... were too conscientious to fight at all." Now, however, Lord Elton can see something curious in the fact that 'ostensibly' Conservative newspapers with large circulations 'unostentatiously surrendered' their literary columns to those who subscribed to the prevalent conventions, "and nobody thought it odd that for years the chief fiction reviewer on the *Conservative Observer* should have been a lifelong socialist." He attributes this to 'timidity'! Lord Elton has discovered that "any one who will take the trouble to look back over the opinions invented for the egregious Blimp by his distinguished creator, will discover how often... it is not Low but Blimp who was right." He quotes Mr. G.D.H.Cole: "Punctuality, regularity, discipline, industry are a set of slave virtues."

Lord Elton claims to have argued for 'an hour on end with intellectuals about intellectuals, and at the end of it all' he has found them "not, I think entirely owing to my fault, still apparently under the impression that I was attacking intellect."

The more intellect the better, says Lord Elton. "No community can prosper if it lacks powerful intelligences. Only, if the community is indeed to prosper, they must be wedded to character and experience." The character and experience of the Readings? Strakosches? Normans? Sieffs? Macdonalds? "Who has not encountered by now the zealous ideologue who cannot keep his own shoelaces tied up or find his razor in the morning, who can neither live happily with his wife nor pay his tailor, whose private life in fact has been laid waste by timidity, selfishness or incompetence, but who is confidently prepared to organise British industry or plan world federation?" Most seemingly courageous of all, Lord Elton goes for the most absurdly flattered of all

the present symptoms of social disease, the secluded young, whose 'education' may be "to wear blinkers for too long". He cites Aristotle for the opinion: "The young are not fit to be students of politics, for they have no experience of life and conduct, and it is these that supply the premises and subject matter of this branch of thought."

"We have created," says Lord Elton, "a civilisation rich in means, but almost destitute of Ends." Writing on the topic of party government (*'Mechanism of Democracy'*) he remarks interestingly that "In 1938 a well-known member of the 'Red' Clyde group once led by Messrs. Wheatley and Maxton, assured me that no important issues now divided the political parties. All, in short, was as, more or less, it had ever been." The "business of Christians, as *Christians*, is to denounce the social evil, and to insist that the politicians must get rid of it—not to commit themselves in detail to one particular remedy." Why 'in detail'?

As distorted echoes of what may be called 'correctitude' these citations are remarkable, and make a remarkable list. But how is it that the author who on page 9 can say that we may not know certainly what was the meaning of the war until long after it is over, although "it must have a meaning," can, four pages from the end of his book, assert: "This is the inmost meaning of the war; the opportunity of that victory over ourselves without which we shall not be worthy to survive, or shape a new age. This is the hardest of all our tasks, for it is not the reform of others, but of ourselves; not the suppression of other people's privileges, but the surrender of our own...?" It is "we" who are wrong, and there ain't no Schiffs and Warburgs! Why did not Lord Elton pause a little longer before he slid so easily from a fact to a theory here and there? The *assault* upon morale!—who made it? The weeklies and the great newspapers were 'intimidated'—who intimidated them? A chapter heading is, "Production and Distribution—For What?" Well, why does he not tell us 'for what'? Lord Elton advocates the surrender of privileges. He is advertised as a well-known broadcaster. If he has no other privilege, why not let him forego this one, in the interest of self-consistency? How is it that for those who seem least capable of turning anything but a blind eye upon the really dark (hidden) forces at work in the world, 'ourselves' invariably means '*yourselves*'?

Our friends do not say right things about wrong topics, or wrong things about right topics. The formula for a Social Crediter is the elaboration of the *connection* between a policy and a philosophy. Words do not matter. They may be merely portentous, as, we believe, this book is portentous. What matters is the connection. Lord Elton asks for 'Ends as well as means.' What is wanted is the laying bare of the means which have led to the ends we have (unfortunately) got; and the laying open for human use of the means to ends chosen by men, for their (own) ends. Moloch was a Phoenician god, partial to human sacrifices. He has been well fed; and is still eating. While he has waiters, he will go on eating. But a *Christian* waiter! Ye lambs! Our Lord said: 'Feed them'—not sacrifice them!

T. J.

PARTY POLITICS

The best party is but a conspiracy against the rest of the nation.
—LORD HALIFAX.

POINTS FROM PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page three)

Mr. Doland: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that it is over 12 months since this Committee was set up and that many small shopkeepers have been swept away in the meantime?

Mr. Dalton: The Committee have already made two Interim Reports.

Sir L. Lyle: Are not the small traders the very backbone of the country?

Mr. Dalton: The very backbone.

Mr. De la Bère: The Government ought to do something now.

SUPPLY: SCOTTISH INDUSTRY

Mr. Neal Maclean (Glasgow, Govan) . . . I now wish to refer to the Forestry Commission, which the Minister did not mention. The Forestry Commission is not playing fair in Scotland. I hold to that view very definitely. It is closing down hill farms which have been providing good sheep for the market and is allowing to go waste large tracts of country amounting to several thousands of acres which ought to be utilised for the benefit of the community not only in Scotland, but here in England. I put this forward as a protest. There are two Members of Parliament on the Forestry Commission, one an English Member representing the Forestry Commission in the House of Commons, and the other a Welsh Member, but there is no Scottish Member upon that Commission. There are two Scotsmen upon it, but one never hears anything about them. The Forestry Commission, apart from the ordinary report that it makes, is not getting the criticism that it deserves for the manner in which it is handling the afforestation which is going on in Scotland at the present time.

I conclude by asking whether there is to be not a drift of North industries, but a re-opening of industries in which Scotsmen and Scotswomen and Scottish lads and girls are capable of working. These industries can be re-opened, and once they are flourishing again and Scottish and other labour is induced to enter the factories, I hope that legislation will be provided so that huge combines cannot come along and buy up these factories and close them down and transfer the machinery to England, leaving the buildings standing, and men and women who had worked in the factories unemployed and starving, while they start new factories with old machinery in England and employ English labour in order to be near Whitehall, where, on Government contracts, the same freightage has not to be paid and entered into the cost of production as if the work had been done in Scotland.

Mr. Wedderburn (Renfrew, Western): . . . Since the war began, the Secretary of State has been responsible to Parliament for the administration of a great number of the emergency powers which have been conferred upon the Government for the prosecution of the war, and he can do almost anything by Order in Council. Last year, Scotland was divorced, or at least partially separated, from the Ministry of Works and Planning. When that decision was made a great many English Members congratulated me on our deliverance. They asked me how it was that Scotland had managed to escape from the "octopus." I have forgotten which Minister of Works and Planning was in office at that moment. I am sure the phrase had no personal significance.

But the new powers which the present Secretary of State has been quietly and unostentatiously accumulating into his own hands are now very considerable. To advise him in the exercise of those powers he has set up the Scottish Council on Industry and, above that, a still more exalted authority, consisting of the Secretary of State for Air, the Minister of Health and my right hon. and gallant Friends the Members for Kelvingrove (Lieut.-Colonel Elliott) and North Midlothian (Colonel Colville) who are known as the Secretary of State's Council of ex-Secretaries of State. For the sake of brevity, I always call them the junta. Acting on the advice of those bodies, or after listening to the advice of those bodies, the Secretary of State is now the Minister primarily responsible in Parliament for the reconstruction of Scotland at the end of the war. . . .

MAY 13.

Oral Answers to Questions

PRODUCTION: INDUSTRIAL PANEL

Mr. Ellis Smith asked the Minister of Production the names and qualifications of the panel that is to work under his direction; how it is intended they shall operate; and will they be given executive power to act in the national interests?

Mr. Lyttelton: With the hon. Member's permission I will circulate in the OFFICIAL REPORT a list of those members who have accepted my invitation to serve on the Industrial Panel. As regards the manner in which the members of this Panel will operate, I would refer the hon. Member to the statement which I made in the House on April 22. . . .

Mr. Buchanan: How was the personnel of the panel chosen?

Mr. Lyttelton: I suggest that the hon. Member should wait for the list of names and then the question will answer itself.

Following is the list:

Mr. G. E. Bailey, C.B.E., M.I.M.E., M.I.P.E.; Mr. E. W. Bussey; Mr. A. Dalgliesh; Mr. W. Gunn; Sir Ernest Lemon, O.B.E., M.I.M.E.; Mr. G. S. Maginness; Mr. G. Martin; Mr. A. McKinstry, M.I.E.E., M.I.M.E.; Mr. F. Parkinson; Mr. W. Puckey; Mr. T. G. Spencer; Mr. J. Tanner; The Hon. J. K. Weir.

OPENED POSTAL PACKETS (INQUIRY)

Mr. A. Bevan (by Private Notice) asked the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that certain letters addressed to writers to the weekly journal named *The Tribune* have been opened before delivery; whether this was done with his knowledge or by his instructions, and what explanation he can give for this behaviour.

Mr. W. S. Morrison: The answer to the first two parts of the Question is in the negative. If the hon. Member will be so good as to arrange to let me have the covers of the letters referred to, I shall be happy to have full inquiry made in the matter.

Mr. Bevan: May I ask what is the purpose of providing the right hon. Gentleman with the envelope? The envelope would have been opened in any case, and how can he tell by looking at opened envelopes whether they were opened by the recipients or before their delivery? Further, will the right hon. Gentleman see witnesses who will be able to say that these envelopes had been opened before delivery? I shall be glad to bring the witnesses to him or to anybody whom he may suggest?

Mr. Morrison: The purpose of asking for the envelopes is this: the hon. Member's Question as it stands does not

give me the names or addresses of the persons concerned nor does it state the date on which the letters were supposed to have been sent. It is clear that without that information I can make no useful enquiry into the matter. If I have the covers, they will provide, besides the particulars I have mentioned, information as to the offices through which the letters have passed and will in that way narrow the scope of the inquiries.

Mr. Bevan: I am perfectly prepared to provide all the evidence which the right hon. Gentleman wishes, and had he asked for it earlier I would have supplied it.

Mr. Bellenger: Can the House be assured that there can be no tampering with the mails without the knowledge and authority of the Postmaster-General?

Mr. Morrison: It is a criminal offence for any officer of the Post Office to tamper with or open any postal packet in course of transmission, except that in cases where the address is indecipherable the letter may be opened to ascertain the address of the sender. All these matters are provided for in Section 56 of the Post Office Act, 1908, and it is in accordance with that Statute that the Post Office acts.

Mr. Stokes: Would the right hon. Gentleman be advised if some official of some other Ministry had received instructions from the War Cabinet or other people to inspect certain letters?

Mr. Morrison: I think I should. If the hon. Member will look at the Act, he will see the circumstances in which letters can be opened. The whole matter was discussed in Parliament at that time and there has since been no change in the position. If hon. Members interested will consult the Statute they will find the position fully described.

Mr. Shinwell: May we have a definite assurance that in no circumstances are letters addressed to those who contribute to British newspapers and periodicals tampered with?

Mr. Morrison: No distinction is made in the Post Office between people who contribute to journals and any other section of the public. As I say, the Post Office acts in accordance with the Statute I have mentioned.

Mr. Stokes: Has the Postmaster-General received instructions that, not his officials but other officials, are to tamper with some correspondence? That is the point.

Mr. Morrison: To this extent: There is a censorship in existence in certain areas. My duty is to hand letters over to the censor and, when I get them back, to deliver them to members of the public.

Mr. Shinwell: Though the Post Office Act stipulates that there must be no tampering with internal communications, yet, at the same time, if, in the opinion of a Post Office official, a letter calls for examination—a letter addressed, say, to somebody who contributes to the British Press—he may turn it over to the censor for opening and investigation. Are we to understand that that is done? If so, under whose direction?

Mr. Morrison: No, Sir, that is not done. Officers of the Post Office have no discretion whatever to deal with letters in the manner suggested. They can only hand over letters to the censor in certain areas when those areas have been specified. There is no power in any officer of the Post Office to exercise any discretion as between letters of that character.

Mr. Sorenson: How does the Department know which letters to hand over?

Mr. Morrison: There are certain prohibited areas where censorship is imposed, like the North of Scotland and around

certain naval centres, and the Post Office knows that letters from or directed towards such areas must be handed over.

Mr. Bevan: My allegation is not that the letters are opened by the censor at all. Usually they are marked, if they are so opened. I take it I have to establish my case to the right hon. Gentleman, and when I have done so the matter may be raised again?

Mr. Morrison: Yes, Sir. If letters have been opened by an officer of the Post Office in excess of his duty, an offence has been committed, and I shall be very glad to look into it.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Warning Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
The Use of Money	6d.
"This 'American' Business"	3d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.

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.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	2d.

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.

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.
 BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 73 Manor Rd., Blackpool.
 BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
 CARDIFF S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 8, Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
 DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.
 LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.
 LONDON D.S.C. 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 June 4.
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.
 SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.