

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 8. No. 13.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

SOCIAL CREDIT AND COAL

In an avalanche of details, each potent to strike, if not to bury, the unwary traveller through this vale of tears, two items of the past week's 'news' claim attention. One is the discovery by *The Economist* that the chairman of Lloyds Bank may have been speaking with his tongue in his cheek when, last January, in announcing the inception of 'coupon banking,' he said that of course overdrafts would not be permitted on these accounts. The possibility of extending points rationing to cover "every mortal thing" seems to *The Economist* to open up the prospect of a 'planner's paradise.' Unquestionably it does. It is what we have been saying in these pages. When the prospect of that 'planner's paradise' is well in view, the war will have been 'won,' and the planners, or stakeholders will have won it. To win it is the reason for the war. The characteristic flippancy with which *The Economist* discusses this prospect must surely be, to anyone who has the slightest understanding of the 'prospect' which the newspaper is discussing, about as offensive as anything that appears nowadays in print. Perhaps Mr. Laski will drop a word to Sir Henry Strakosch about it. Possibly there is something more (or less) than flippant in the suggestion that we may yet hear the cry 'back to money' in place of the familiar 'back to gold.'

The other matter is the resumption, which was expected, of agitation for the setting up of a National Coal Board, which, in the opinion of *The Times*, would "clearly supersede private enterprise." The National Council of Labour is of the same opinion, expressed in slightly different words, the plan "would go far to remove the distrust of private ownership which is so widespread among the miners." Since the situation which gives a distant appearance of excuse for the plan has arisen directly, as the public well understands, from the ineptitude of planners, it is not too much to suggest that the production of results appreciable as such, and of the right kind, by the public has now definitely ceased to be the objective, or even one of the objectives of the planners. Planners are now concerned solely with the production of a paradise for planners—and only for planners. The *Sunday Times* pleads with its readers to make the saving of fuel a 'matter of conscience' while admitting that "there ought to have been no necessity for the appeal."

Following upon Mr. Lee's rebuke to *The Economist* on the score of its 'misleading' and 'incorrect' statements, Mr. Arthur Colegate, M.P., has written to *The Times* expressing surprise (it is, by the bye, as much the duty of a legislator to avoid being taken by surprise as it is a sentry's, or any other defender of the realm) expressing surprise that *The Times* omits reference from its articles to the effect on

output of Government control on a previous occasion. The Government took control, he says, in South Wales on December 1, 1916, and in other coalfields on February 1, 1917.

"The immediate effect was a substantial reduction in output of coal per person employed...."

"Ah, yes," says the 'worker,' "the Cap-pitalists were getting a taste of public ownership, and the 'workers' a fair deal!"

.... "and a very large increase in the number of days lost in dispute."

Here are Mr. Colegate's figures:—

	Production per person per annum.	Output of saleable coal per person per shift.
	Tons	Cwts.
1914	253	20.32
1915	271	20.45
1916	261	19.41
1917	248	19.08
1918	230	17.23
1919	196	14.96
1920	187	14.36

He says that in each of the two war years of control, 1917 and 1918, more than a million days work was lost by disputes as compared with 310,000 in 1916, before control, and claims that, notwithstanding the introduction of the seven-hour day, the industry under private management had restored output per person per shift to 18 cwt. [control lasted four years].

In Mr. Colegate's opinion, avoidable absenteeism occurs among a minority of irresponsibles. If it were only a minority of irresponsibles among the products of the London School of Economics who were busy creating the conditions necessary for the inception of the 'planners' paradise' we should be nearer winning the war, and England might soon be a free and happy country with a prosperous (unrationed) and a contented people.

It is clear that there is ground for 'surprise' among men familiar with the industry, who, like Mr. Colegate, are 'personally very sympathetic to the miners' present wage claim,' at the suggestion that still more 'planning' is likely to result in anything remotely bearing upon the realities of the present situation, the essence of which is "more coal with less trouble all round." Government control during the last war meant less coal with more trouble all round.

Social crediters are not unfamiliar with the question (usually timorous, as befits a shaken, if not a shattered confidence in fantastic courses), "Well, what would you do?"

It is not this question so often as the answer given to it which is improper. The right answer to each questioner

must be 'according to his folly'—which may not always be very foolish. There is, indeed, nothing foolish in a request for advice. Every member of the community has a duty in this matter, if it is only a duty to himself. But all do not share the same opportunity to weigh the wisdom of advice. Nor do they share the same opportunity to carry the advice into action if it seems to them wise. "Self-expression of the individual is not only the certain eventual outcome of these present discontents—it is the only outcome which will make possible a perfect voluntary discipline in execution based on a faith amounting to knowledge that thereby each private in the human army is fighting the fight which concerns every man—freedom of judgement, movement, influence, and work."*

If Mr. Colegate wants to know what he might do to avert the sabotage of a great industry and the degradation of a large body of experts (for to subordinate first-class experts to second and third rate experts, or to busybodies who know only how to 'muck up the job,' *in regard to methods*, is to degrade, and to subordinate them, *in regard to policy*, to anyone at all but the people whose existence gives all the meaning there is in production, is still further to degrade); if Mr. Colegate wants to know what he might do, the Social Credit Secretariat is at his service. But we too greatly fear the effects of inadvertently putting what Mr. Colegate might do into less competent hands than his to broadcast such advice as might be given

After all, the association between Social Credit and the Coal Question is not new. In 1920, when the Mining Industry was "*in extremis* and getting worse," *A practical Scheme for the Establishment of Economic and Industrial Democracy* was published by Major Douglas, after private circulation among those prominently interested in mining coal. It was an "exemplary scheme, drawn up for special application to the Mining Industry, . . . designed to enable a transition to be effected from the present state of industrial chaos to a state of economic democracy, with the minimum amount of friction and the maximum results in the general well-being." A Committee of the Labour Party 'sat' on it for nearly sixteen months, during which time they had the 'assistance' of an 'expert' in banking (since known to have been Mr. Emil Davies). They then declared, with a degree of truth now beginning to be appreciated (but only beginning) by their disgruntled rank and file, that the scheme was "fundamentally opposed to the principles for which the Labour Party stands." It is. But, just as the impact of war (plus 'planning') has recently revealed an Englishman beneath the mask of the Labourite, so further experience may reveal the Englishman's policy at variance with the secret policy of his 'representatives.' It is not without significance that the industry which 'gave' one of the first two Labour members to the House of Commons and whose 'workers' now have no fewer than 34 members to advance their cause is the first of the great industries to be brought low, so low that it cannot pay its way, or pay its men, or deliver the goods even in time of war.

T. J.

"If your morals make you dreary, depend upon it they are wrong. There is no duty we so much underrate as the duty of being happy."
—R. L. STEVENSON.

*C. H. DOUGLAS: *Credit-Power and Democracy*.

Alberta Social Credit Board Report for 1941

The Annual Report of the Social Credit Board of Alberta for the year ending December 31, 1941, signed by Messrs. A. J. HOOKE (Chairman of the Board), N. B. JAMES (Secretary) and Messrs. R. E. ANSLEY, F. M. BAKER and A. V. BOURCIER (Members of the Board), has been published in "Today and Tomorrow." The following extracts are taken from the full text:—

Following the Ordinary Session of the Legislative Assembly, 1941, the Lieutenant Governor in Council considered it advisable and in the public interest to reorganise the Social Credit Board. Your Board, being therefore composed in part, of members who had not previously served in this capacity, devoted some time to planning its internal organisation to obtain the maximum of efficiency.

Your Board also gave careful consideration to the provincial situation in the light of existing national and world conditions in order to determine the most effective means of exercising the powers conferred on it by the Legislature.

[*The following section of the Report gives a brief analysis of the world situation in terms of economic, banking and monetary policy. The Report then describes the activities of the Board during the year:—*]

An Information Service

Therefore, if our people are to avoid a repetition of the past history of needless human suffering and torture; if they are to emerge triumphant from the present world struggle and the consequent aftermath of endless disaster, then they must be informed of the true facts of the colossal hoax perpetrated upon mankind. With every moment of delay, the danger grows greater. Realising the urgency of the need, your Board carefully prepared an educational programme. A series of public addresses illustrated by lantern slides were delivered in various parts of the Province. In conjunction with this method of disseminating information the Board also prepared and distributed educational literature.

Popular demand for the continuation of the motion picture lectures depicting the development of Alberta industries induced your Board to continue this service. . . .

The far-reaching results of this type of educational work cannot be over-emphasised, especially at a time when this nation is at war. Increased production of Alberta-made products to take care of the needs of our armed forces as well as those on the home front, relieves the nation, to a considerable extent, of the necessity to import goods that can be manufactured just as well within our boundaries. Hence purchasing power is released for the purpose of importing much needed war materials not available in Canada. Further development of Alberta industry will also cushion the shock which must follow the termination of hostilities providing employment and incomes to many who are now in the armed forces or engaged in war industries.

All information services provided by the Board were planned to be in harmony with the following objectives:—

(a) To lead to a true understanding of the real nature of the present desperate world conflict, and recognition of the need for an all-out war effort.

(b) To lead to an understanding of the most effective financial policy that could be employed to assure an early victory.

(c) To show the urgency of immediately correcting the evils which exist in the economic system that are the primary causes of wars, and the cause of needless human suffering in times of so-called peace.

(d) To demonstrate the fact that Monetary Reform is essential to Victory and to the establishment of permanent security and Freedom for all people when the war is over.

As the public meetings, addressed by Board members, progressed, public reaction revealed an intense interest in the topics discussed, while increased demands for public meetings of this nature showed a keen desire for this type of timely information. An ever-increasing volume of mail requesting literature and further information was another certain indication of public interest.

[The subject matter of the addresses referred to is then outlined: it includes the condition of poverty in plenty, the money system, the present policy of the banks and the economic causes of war.]

Questions that Must be Answered

There are certain questions which are of grave concern to our people during this time of world confusion. Through its contact with the people in every walk of life and also in all parts of the Province, your Board has been in a position to determine what questions are uppermost in the minds of our people,—questions that must be answered to their satisfaction if we are to achieve a degree of national unity so essential to the effective prosecution of the war and to the establishment of permanent peace. A few of the most outstanding of these questions are listed without comment:

1. Why is it that since we can find billions of dollars for the prosecution of war, we could not find the millions of dollars necessary to relieve needless destitution before war broke out?

2. How will the principal as well as the interest on huge National Debt be paid after the cessation of hostilities?

3. Will those who are now in the armed forces ready to sacrifice their lives for their country, be expected to return after the conflict and spend the rest of their lives slaving to pay the war debt?

4. When this war is over, will our young people and the boys in our armed forces, again be compelled to ride the box-cars seeking work, or join the long bread-lines when their resources are exhausted?

5. Will we be as unprepared to meet the tremendous problems sure to arise when peace is declared as we were unprepared for war?

6. Is there not a serious danger, that, while fighting totalitarianism, the increased regimentation required under war conditions might push us into totalitarianism?

7. What is the "new order" so many leaders are talking about, and are we to be consulted to determine if it is what we want or will it be merely imposed on us?

8. Why is there so much reluctance to introduce any measure of social security in spite of all the talk of a new order after the war?

9. What assurance have we that the promises being

made regarding what we can expect after the war, are not going to be treated in the same manner as promises made during the last war?

10. If the Bank of Canada is a government owned and controlled institution, why must the government go to private banks to borrow huge sums of money for war financing purposes?

It has been the policy of your Board during the past year to concentrate its energies to the building of an information service that would arm our people with that knowledge which is the strongest bulwark against the onslaughts now being launched against Truth, Democracy and our most cherished Liberties. The trend of public opinion is moving rapidly in channels of progress. The public is very much awake to the fact that a continuance of the present economic system spells catastrophe. At the same time many do not know what must be done to stave off disaster.

The insidious philosophy of the centralisers is being very subtly introduced into the addresses and writings of columnists, authors, and politicians, in an attempt to turn people's minds towards what they deem to be a benevolent totalitarianism. For example, the advocates of the poisonous pill of Federal Union are sugar coating it with the promise of Free Trade. They disguise the dangerous and treasonable nature of their plans with the cloak of war and democratic terminology. Such propaganda is dangerous in the extreme and must be counteracted by the dissemination of the actual truth. Time is an important factor in this work. Action is necessary if we are to prevent the penetration of the poison too deeply into the minds of our people.

Your Board feels that it can play an important part in this work. Truth alone will release the forces that can overthrow the Money Power. The people's victory over the money power is the victory that will make doubly sure the Victory in the military conflict. Your Board hopes to exert all its energies to further extend its work to promote monetary reform, an all-out war effort and the establishment of a post-war era of permanent peace, security and democratic freedom for all people.

THE AUSTERITY BUREAUCRAT

The following is from LANE-NORCOTT'S column in the "Daily Mail" of May 20:—

"Although the number of persons at work in Great Britain to-day constitutes a record, there are still some 800,000 men unemployed, and probably unemployable." —News item.

How about making them bureaucrats? It is not generally realised that some 800,000 unemployed, and probably unemployable, men can easily be turned into a large and imposing army of highly paid officials.

All that is necessary is to commandeer a number of hotels and engage a staff of typists. One typist to each man would be sufficient—or even one typist to *two* men if she brought her own tea service.

Think of it; 800,000 happy tea-sodden men, each one a contented square peg in a safe round hole, split up into, say, 12,526 eager boards and 3,971 energetic committees, all actively engaged in registering bees, granting and refusing licenses for storing goats, preparing lists of broken bicycles, measuring kerbstones, filing details, and controlling sawdust.

And the keynote to it all is austerity.

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. 13.

Saturday, June 6, 1942.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Have you noticed the steady conversion of this country into a Police State? Of course, we don't have the Gestapo or the Ogpu here—dear me, no Clarence. We have “well known Inspectors from Scotland Yard to deal with the Black Market.” You see the idea. You make a law which creates a batch of new crimes, and then you install the Og—I mean, the Well Known Inspector.

For the last forty years, the public has been fed on detective stories to “condition” it for “snooping.”

The existence of a “black market” indicates that there is more available for distribution than the bureaucrats wish you to obtain. Its organisation provides the necessary “agents provocateur.” Have you noticed their race?

You see, we're not fighting the dear Germans, it's the system we're fighting. You have to fight the devil with fire, you know, Clarence. Hence the Gestapo—I mean the Og—tut, tut, the well-known Inspector from Scotland Yard.

“The intensification of armaments, the increase of police forces—are all essential for the completion of the aforementioned plans. What we have got to get at is that there should be in all the States of the world, besides ourselves, only the masses of the proletariat, a few millionaires devoted to our interests, police, and soldiers.”

—*Protocols of Zion, No. 7*

General Ludendorff, the outstanding strategic and political brain of Imperial Germany, refers to those persons who cannot recognise the existence of long-standing plans for the domination of the world, as “mayflies.” Till his death, he was a bitter opponent of Hitler and National—and International—Socialism, and described with startling clarity its intention of plunging Europe in war.

The destruction of historic buildings in Bath and York, and the threat that other Gothic and Tudor buildings will be attacked, although they have no military significance whatever, is further proof, if any were needed, that “Hitler's policy is a Jewish Policy.” The raids are an attack on monuments of a culture which it is desired to obliterate from memory.

“There is another reason also why they will close their eyes: for we shall keep promising them to give back all the liberties we have taken away as soon as we have quelled the

enemies of peace and tamed all parties. It is not worth while to say anything about how long they will be kept waiting for the return of their liberties.”

—*Protocols of Zion, No. II.*

Our valued contemporary *Truth* refers to “the home front (on which a secret battle between the English and the Planners is being fought).”

We could not have put it better, ourselves.

“Soviet Russia has demanded specific territorial concessions in Eastern Europe, and has asked her allies to endorse these demands in advance. . . . The Russian dictator, according to Sir Stafford [Cripps] intends to keep everything he got by his pact with Hitler in 1939. This means portions of Finland, Poland and Rumania, and all of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, which were independent states. Everything in Eastern Europe is now settled, according to Sir Stafford, with the possible exception of the Polish frontier.”

—*Saturday Evening Post, U.S.A.*

You didn't know all that, did you, Clarence? But its all been published in America long ago.

“Chaplin [Charlie Chaplin] rumbled his snow-white hair.

“‘People,’ he said, ‘ask, will Communism sweep the world after the war? My answer is, So what?’

“‘Undoubtedly we are in the era of collectivism.’”

—*News Chronicle, May 20, 1942.*

Congratulations to Charlie on his amplification of the technically correct retort (*vide* The Pictures), “So nuffin!”

Dealing with post-war problems, in a recent speech, Mr. Sumner Welles, United States Under-Secretary of States, said:

“It will be the wish of the people who will die in this war to insist that the United Nations undertake the maintenance of an international police power in the years after the war to ensure freedom from fear to peace-loving peoples until there is established the permanent system of general security promised in the Atlantic Charter.”

And just think, Mr. Welles, even if they should wish otherwise—they will be dead.

The *Sevenoaks News* of May 7 reported that in April Sir John D. Laurie, Lord Mayor of London, was in Masonic circles promoted to Past Grand Warden of England, and at a subsequent meeting of the Grand Lodge of London was invested by H.R.H. the Duke of Kent.

In its gossip columns the *Manchester Guardian* writes: “When it was announced that a fine collection of London books. . . has been presented to the Ministry of Works and Buildings, which is to be entrusted with the planning of London and the rest of the country, gossip associated. . . .” etc.

Just like that, between commas.

STRAWS IN THE WIND

By N. F. W.

"... Judaism and Christianity have come out of the Synagogues and Churches into the Banks and Masonic Lodges and Cabinets and workshops..."

—C. H. DOUGLAS: *The Big Idea* (II).

It will be generally allowed that what more than anything else confounds Christian civilisation to-day is the contradiction and baselessness and complexity of human opinion. What we search for—and quite vainly outside the narrow limits of physical science—is just exactly *authority*. That is what is always looked for from those in leading positions, and if it is entirely wanting, the prospect is dark indeed.

For this reason, therefore, and notwithstanding small expectations on the part of the reviewer, based on previous pronouncements of Dr. Temple's, it comes as something of a shock to find that when the Head of the Church of England "goes on record" as to the relationship of individuals in a Christian society, as he does in this small book,* he should not do more than add another opinion to the existing babel created by all the other noisy social pamphleteers.

Christianity and Social Order was published early this year, a few months only before its author came to occupy his present historic position as Archbishop of Canterbury, and at a time when he must have known there was every likelihood of his doing so. It combines, therefore, contemporaneity with the highest derivative authority—comparable to a Papal Encyclical. As might be expected, there is plenty of evidence in the book of scholarship and wide reading; nevertheless the outstanding impression it leaves is that of a mental inconsistency.

It may be that what Dr. Temple has to say is meant for comfort, but it could reassure no one; for unlike what was remarked of the founder of his Church, the Archbishop's words are those of the scribe and quite without authority. They have no intrinsic value. What interest they possess is phenomenal, symptomatic—they are straws that show which way the wind is blowing in the higher official atmosphere, and only more worthy of attention in the general din of confused council that represents the "intellectual" world to-day, by reason of the very considerable influence vested in their author.

Do these statements, particularly in view of the position held by Dr. Temple, appear sweeping? Their justice, or otherwise, can be verified by reading the book, of course; to prove them in a short review is hardly practicable. One example, however, may be given, dealing with what to Social Crediters is something of a test question; but it should be understood that it is not brought up here in order to confute it. It is to be taken as typical merely of the confused thought that pervades the entire book.

Writing on page 15, of the need to conform to "the Natural Order in which is to be found the purpose of God," Dr. Temple says, very justly, "We are obliged to ask of every field of human activity what is the purpose of God for it. If we find that purpose, it will be the true and proper nature of that activity, and the relationship of the various activities to one another and the divine purpose will be the Natural Order of those activities. To bring them into that Order, if they have departed from it, must be

part of the task of the Church."

No reasonable person could cavil at that as a clear statement of the principle upon which we have to tackle the problems of society; or of the Church's position in respect of it. Surely it could hardly be bettered?

Turn back, however, only to page 13 and you find the results, as the Archbishop is prepared to accept them, of this principle applied to that anomalous field of human activity known as "unemployment"—for Dr. Temple must acknowledge that "unemployment" as a phenomenon is as much in the Natural Order as he puts it, as say Spring-time, though men may not as yet have discovered how to put it to the same good use.

"The only cure for unemployment" we read on page 13, "is employment—beginning where school education is complete and continuing with no longer intervals than can be appreciated as holidays, till strength begins to fail. In other words, *we are challenged to find a social order which provides employment steadily and generally*, or our conscience should be restive till we succeed." (Our emphasis).

Is that, or is it not, a false and one of the most impious statements ever made? At least by anyone with enough light to pen the following, on page 38 of this same book—"It is fundamental to the Christian position that men should have freedom even though they abuse it." Who challenges us to provide work for our fellow men from kindergarten to bath-chair? Not the purpose of God, if as the Archbishop says, it is synonymous with the Natural Order. Not certainly the founder of Christianity—at least as far as the laity have been taken into his confidence. Or did he subsequently repent of his commendation of the apparent idleness of the lilies of the field?

The clear evidence here is that the Church, in as much at least as Dr. Temple represents it, has given no thought whatsoever to discovering God's purpose, i.e. the reality behind the label "unemployment." Instead it provides us here with a glaring example of elementary unthinking reaction, away from what any child should be able to recognise as the abuse, the wilful misinterpretation of Leisure, back to its literal opposite—"the only cure for unemployment is employment." In other words, the natural fact is morally wrong. God has no purpose in "unemployment." It has no natural significance, no reality. He just made a mistake which it is our painful duty to rectify.

It is quite evident, surely, that the mind which can come to that conclusion is rapidly losing all touch with Reality.

And so in the rest of the sentence we have quoted, we get the complete statement for continuous regimentation of the individual from birth to declining strength—when, presumably, he can do no more harm. Is it out of order, one wonders, to enquire if men and women, whom Dr. Temple describes on the same page as created "with hearts and wills that cannot be coerced, but can respond," appear to him as fit only to inhabit a world run on the keep-them-occupied principle of a Borstal Institute, what he conceives to be God's purpose—the Natural Order—here? Or is man himself, like "unemployment", just another of God's mistakes to be rectified? Luckily for us, there is evidence, however slight, to suggest that the occurrence of the error is in the cerebral reactions of the Archbishop, rather than on the part of the Deity.

One is dealing here with an outstanding example of what for lack of a better word we call "abstractionism"—a

**Christianity and Social Order* by WILLIAM TEMPLE; Penguin Special, 6d.

kind of inversion of the normal mental processes. The tendency has always formed some part of the mechanism of the human mind, and in its individual aspect is familiar to the medical profession as "split personality" or two-mindedness. But to-day its increase, and its tendency to assume formidable collective and social proportions, is so universal and so marked as to suggest the approach of some cosmic crisis. In Mr. Aldous Huxley's latest book *Grey Eminence* is shown an historic and outstanding example, treated with the author's usual dry, intellectualism; but nevertheless giving a warning picture of the dire results of this mental phenomenon in action.

It is the divorce, not really between theory and practice—which would seem to be the inevitable fate of mortality—so much as between the principle and its correct mental application. The "split" occurs a stage further back than that of action, actually in the reasoning faculty itself, and results in an inability to distinguish between right and wrong—between the substance and the shadow. This state of mind undoubtedly constitutes the "field" in which subversive forces go to work. The inability to make up the mind, to decide between right and wrong, can be influenced from without, and converted to a wrong (incorrect) *decision* where the interests of the individual, which are the real interests of society as a whole, are concerned; thus rendering him powerless and socially ineffectual. Douglas states the reverse of this disintegrated state in *The Big Idea* (XVI), where he says "The most irresistible social force is Integrity."

What this pathological condition means in its collective forms may be studied best in the case of the German Reich, which, as Dr. Temple says with truth, has inverted the Christian principle of man as made in the image of God, and treats him "as having value only in so far as he serves its ends." Dr. Temple, however, goes on to exemplify in himself the same mental condition in its individual aspect when, later on, he advocates that, "Christians should vote in the Christian spirit, at least to the extent of preferring the public interest to their own."

By no possible twist of logic can the abstract term "public interest" employed here be identified with anything but the "State." And if its interest is to be preferred by the Christian voter *before* his own, what is that but Totalitarianism, which the Archbishop assures us, if indeed the assurance is necessary, represents a reversion to Paganism?

* * *

There is a significant fact to be noted regarding Dr. Temple's book, which may have a bearing, more or less direct, on his failure to apply the Christian principles he enunciates. Certainly it seems strange that in the whole of what amounts to an ethical treatise on Christian Society, and in which there are frequent references to the need to identify God's purpose with the Natural Order, there should be but one single quotation from the Gospels, and that a reproof to covetousness.

From personal experience one would feel inclined to call such an omission wilfulness in almost any writer. But when it is a case of the Head of the Church of England, and, in addition, during a world war generally, if rather vaguely, allowed to be an attack on Christian principles, the fact attains almost a glaring prominence. Even if the Archbishop, incredible as it may seem, had not felt impelled to cite his Master's teaching as his authority, one would have thought the exigencies of his official position would have induced him to make at least a show of it. But in his

obliviousness—let us call it sincerity—he has not even done that.

The more legal of the Mosaic Books are referred to quite considerably, particularly in connection with usury. And there are very numerous quotations from the Epistles of Paul, who would, in fact, never have put himself forward as a better authority on the principles of Life and society than his Master. Plato is cited a number of times, also contemporary economists, including Sir William Beveridge. But of the sayings of Jesus of Nazareth, of the parables, the majority of which have to do with the Natural Order to which Dr. Temple so frequently alludes; of Jesus's Kingdom of God on earth, not one single word from beginning to end of the book.

What is the explanation—the cause—of this strange omission?

Its effect, at least, is disastrously apparent; for instead of holding up the clear light of faith in Natural Goodness and decency, which is surely the mission of the Church, Dr. Temple gives us a programme not deriving in one single item from the Christian principles he had laid down earlier in the book—in fact, flatly contradicting them—but calculated, whether consciously or not makes no difference, to bring about the complete regimentation of the individual in the shortest possible time.

It is a programme of "socialisation" which in its enforcement—now proceeding!—is simply the Mosaic Law, or rather its Talmudic perversion, from which Christianity was to be a release, translated into a ritual of Government form-filling and detailed instruction, and administered by a bureaucratic priesthood that for numbers and power would have filled the heart of Caiaphas with a sense of wonder and complete fulfilment.

There is surely something very much amiss with a Church, when all the practical comfort its Head has for his distracted flock is to hand out, presumably as a practical application of the teaching of the Gospels, an assortment of "approved" legalistic devices, of questionable "City" parentage, for regulating and checking, at least in theory, every natural and creative impulse known to man.

"Withering Capital"—after interest on an investment amounting to the original principle has been paid, the whole to be liquidated; Government and Labour representation on the Boards of all Joint Stock Companies; Family Maintenance—allowances in the form of coupons; international machinery based on gold to determine mutual export quotas; the whole bag of "financial" tricks!

It is a dry catalogue; but potent for a lot of human misery, if it is realisable. And by some mental twist, all directed against the sizable, get-at-able, individual activities of society. It is significant of much that for the purpose of illustrating business abuses it is not the documented, dynastic facts of Percy Arnold's *Bankers of London* that the Archbishop cites, but a work of fiction, *The Crowthers of Bankdam*, true enough in substance, of course, but none-the-less, propaganda in place of evidence.

After giving a table of figures showing that in 1936, 76 per cent. of all the firms registered in Great Britain had 25, or less employees, Dr. Temple comments: "There is a sentimental value in these little firms. But they are a hindrance to the progress of the science and art of Management, and are the scene of most of the remaining bad conditions of employment. Under *our* proposals men will be less likely to 'start a little business' because it is more

'respectable' than to become a wage-earner; so much the better." (Our emphasis).

The charitable hope must be that the writer of the above, who has stated in the same book that "The primary principle of Christian ethics . . . must be respect for every person simply as a person . . . independent of all usefulness to society," is unconscious of its implications; though the satirical suggestion implied by his use of inverted commas hardly confirms it. How different is Dr. Temple's impatience with the natural desire of the individual to better his position and gain some independence of action for himself, from the tolerance of the man who cried out "Oh, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou who stonest the prophets . . . How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings . . ." But "Socialism," which must be what is meant by "the science and art of management," to the progress of which the small business is a hindrance, is fundamentally intolerant of the individual.

Following closely, and after a preliminary application of butter to "our Banking System" for its integrity and public spirit—"There would not be the proverbial phrase 'As safe as the Bank of England' if its management had not been conspicuously sound," Ahem!—comes what might be a genuine thought, that interest charges on credits created by a book-keeping entry are unethical; but how can one avoid the suspicion that the suggestion springs from the same questionable parentage as all the rest?

Reading on, one finds that ethically defensible practice would admit of $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. on Bank-created credit for administration. Coupled with this is the suggestion for the amalgamation of the Joint Stock Banks with the Bank of England in a Public Utility Corporation. Here, for some unspecified reason we have somehow strayed from the bleak domain of "withering capital," and—though this may be merely a slip—it is not expressly stated that the $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. constitutes one single payment only.

This point is not unimportant. For with the Joint Stock Banks merged in the Central Bank, which in its turn, for the purposes of the necessary "international economic control," will presumably be merged in the Bank of International Settlements, now in cold storage in conveniently neutral Basle, $\frac{2}{3}$ or even $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the total capital investment of two hemispheres would do well enough to be going on with.

Incidentally, this need for "international control" would account for the Archbishop's support of the League of Nations, upon which point, as he mentions, he and the Bishop of Gloucester, who was quoted lately in this paper, do not see eye to eye.

Thoughtful people everywhere to-day are puzzled by the fact that in a world-crisis which most of us instinctively feel to be a direct attack on Christian principles, the Christian Churches, as institutions, are able to take little or no part. The truth as to this is, of course, summed up in the quotation at the head of this review. And if confirmation of that is wanted, it will be found in this little sixpenny Penguin, from the hand of the Head of one of the great Christian Churches—the evidence of a tragic inability to accept "the Cross"—which is what it is—of consistent Christian thought.

There it is, upon almost every page, an intellectual plea for the principle, followed almost immediately by a refusal to accept its practical application. On page 35, to give one last quotation, we read "If Christianity is true, it is a truth

of universal application." And then only three lines down comes this: "Christian faith does not by itself enable its adherents to foresee how a vast number of people will be affected by particular political or economic innovations—'social credit' for example."

Except for the assumption that "social credit" to Dr. Temple represents nothing but its technical proposals, that statement is a flat contradiction of the one above. But more than that, it inevitably raises speculation in the acute mind, as to what particular "faith", other than, and presumably superior to the Christian faith, enables the Archbishop of Canterbury to foresee so clearly the beneficent results of the proposed mass-regimentation to which, through himself, he lends the whole support of the Church of England?

Points from Parliament

MAY 19.

WAR SITUATION

Mr. Martin (Southwark, Central): . . . Next winter will be the fourth winter of the war. I want to suggest to the right hon. Gentleman opposite that the time has come to make a very earnest survey of the conditions of the home front and to try and consolidate the position on the home front to meet the tension, the anxieties and difficulties. That is a peril which we shall all neglect to the great detriment of this country and of generations to come.

I wish to put, from my own experience and constituency, a few things that are bearing hard on the working-class population at the present time. There is a problem, for instance, in some great towns of houses that have been damaged by air attack and are not in as good a condition to live in and keep clean and healthy as they were a few years ago; there is the problem of people who have been compelled to go and live with relations; there is the problem of long and exhausting hours of work; there is the problem—and the great difficulties, which increase now from month to month—of transport for people to get to and from work. There was last winter a problem of fuel, which may or may not be solved by some system of rationing. Regarding the suggestions before the country I would, in passing, say to anyone present representing the Board of Trade that a cut of 12 to 15 per cent. to ordinary working class people, if involved by rationing, will be a serious problem for many people in my area at any rate. There is the problem of shopping for the housewife doing ordinary domestic duties and often having to do part-time work; there is the problem of children who are evacuated and are not happy; there are children not evacuated and for whom schools have not been ready and who, now that the schools are ready, are sometimes not as good in their attendance as they were.

Certainly there are all kinds of domestic problems of that sort. Added to them there are problems of which everyone is aware, the problems of anxiety about relatives in the various Services, the constant failure in letters and other communications, the constant strain upon the ordinary family sense of affection and responsibility throughout the country. I hope the Government will pay a great deal of attention to this home front during the next few months and try to build it up, so that we may look forward not only to carrying this war to a successful conclusion next year or the year after, or whenever the end may come, but that we may find ourselves at the end of the

war a nation fit to carry those immense responsibilities to which I have referred, a nation sufficiently united, sufficiently unexhausted, sufficiently undebilitated to be able to carry on in the face of these enormous difficulties....

[Mr. Martin went on to advocate closer co-operation with Russia and the United States for the last phase of the war and for the responsibilities of peace.]

Major Marlowe (Brighton): Both inside and outside the House one hears clamourings for what is known as a second front. I dare say in common with most other hon. Members, I receive from time to time resolutions urging that the formation of a second front is an immediate necessity. So far as I am able to form an opinion, those resolutions are usually sent in by people whose main occupation is passing resolutions rather than by those whose duty it would be to take part in such an affray....

I have received resolutions only from bodies of the sort to which I have referred, and which I describe as irresponsible in the sense that there does not lie with them the responsibility for providing the ships and armaments that would be required for such an undertaking. However, I am not concerned with any particular numbered front. I am more concerned with the home front which, to my mind, is where the war can be won or lost in the quickest time, and where joint planning is most needed....

Among more intelligent Members of this House there is probably complete agreement as to the necessity for social reforms, and probably very little disagreement as to the nature which those reforms should take. Let them, irrespective of party, get together to produce now such social legislation as would make Hitler's new order seem very old-fashioned and a worn-out creed....

Rear-Admiral Beamish: I should like to say a word about the second front. Untutored and irresponsible calls for a second front are deplorable. Of course the Prime Minister would like a second front. It is amazing that any one should imagine he would not. The hon. Member for Shettleston said, truly and bravely, that the Russians might very well consider an Eastern front. That is a very proper thing to have said. I ask the people who make these proposals on these very slender pretensions whether they realise what has happened, as I see it, from a Service standpoint since the beginning of the war. First, the Royal Air Force has multiplied over and over again—I do not know how many times. It would not be an exaggeration to say four times and it may be much more. It may be as many as six. I cannot say. The Army has multiplied many more times. These two forces have been very largely expanded. The Navy and the Mercantile Marine, however, have suffered in the cause of freedom, in saving the country, in enabling the other Services to expand and function, and over and over again in saving from complete disaster the remnants of the British Army. People seem to forget the desperate and grave losses that have come upon the Navy in doing that. Our sea power is to-day not greater in strength and numbers—I hazard that it is rather less—than it was at the beginning of the war. How can we with a depleted sea power in both Mercantile Marine and men-of-war gaily suggest sending, let us say, 300,000 men with perhaps 70,000 vehicles to a second front? Think of the ships and so on that would be required. We would have to think many times before we could spare enough shipping to bring about

a second front....

Commander Bower (Cleveland): Like all Members who have been critical of the Government, I get a very large post bag. There has been an extraordinary change lately in the letters that I have had. We know that many of these letters come from cranks and people with a grievance, but lately the majority have come from serious well-educated people, who have been taught to think. I do not think that the bulk of the people are as concerned as they ought to be, but educated people are. The country as a whole is suffering under a huge edifice of frustration built upon the foundation of disappointed hopes. I can only say that on the Front Bench sit the architects of that edifice....

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.
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 18.
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.