

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 14.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER, 12, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket (II)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

I do not think that it can be reiterated too often, at this time, that except as a purely legal fiction, the common ownership of the soil by 45,000,000 individuals is not a subject for debate—it is a factual impossibility. In the sense in which it is understood by the ordinary man, ownership means control. Forty-five million people never yet controlled anything. If they can't control the Post Office, or the Army, Navy, or Air Force, and can't even control their individual and collective involvement in a war they didn't want, and don't understand, how can they control sixty million acres varying from limestone rock to water-meadows?

So far as the *produce* of the land is concerned, that is available to anyone who has the money. Has anyone suggested that "the People" should have the produce of the money-making machine?

Conversely, do the agitators for common ownership yearn to pay the taxes now borne by land? Ask most of the farmers who bought their farms during and immediately after the 1914-1918 war period how they like their bargain, from the business point of view. If the older conditions of estate management were so unfair to the tenant, how was it that farmers' sons had to wait years before they could get a vacant farm, and had to be well known to be thoroughly competent farmers, or they would never get one; while nowadays there are hundreds of once-famous farms going begging, and every day good farmers are throwing in their farms in disgust at the ever rising tide of interference without responsibility?

If the farmers are worse off, the "owners" are ruined and dispossessed, "the people" are getting worse produce at higher prices, and the land itself is impoverished and "farmed out," *quis beneficet?*—who is better off?

To understand and to recognise without peradventure exactly what has caused this situation, let us consider Professor J. H. Morgan, K.C., writing in *The Quarterly Review* of January, 1929 (pp. 187-8): "When I once asked Lord Haldane why he persuaded his friend, Sir Ernest Cassel, to settle by his will large sums on... the London School of Economics, he replied 'Our object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State.'"

It will be remembered that (a) Lord Haldane said that Germany was his spiritual home, and (b) that Sir Ernest Cassel was the *alter ego* of Jacob Schiff, of Kuhn, Loeb, and Company.

Now there is no room for discussion as to what has

caused the disastrous state of British land and everyone connected with it. That cause is grinding and punitive taxation.

And this taxation has for the most part been concocted either directly or indirectly by the London School of Economics—a good deal of it by Sir William Beveridge who we are to entrust with the building of our New World, "half way to Moscow," as he puts it so engagingly. An understanding of the main principles of current taxation is indispensable to anyone who claims to hold views on the future of the soil. In the first place, it is necessary to recognise three classifications of the surface—agricultural, industrial, and residential.

The question of minerals underground is closely interwoven with the surface classification, but may be left for subsequent consideration. It is a question which, if possible, is less understood by the average land agitator than that of the surface.

Now, land taxes begin with a series of recurrent capital levies at each inheritance, thinly disguised under the names of Legacy Duty, Estate Duty, and so forth. It must be borne in mind that (in spite of nearly unworkable alternatives of recent date) these have to be paid in *money*, and land does not grow money. Generally, this money is borrowed on mortgage or otherwise. These "Duties" may range from 10 per cent. in the case of very small properties, to sixty or seventy per cent. in the case of very large ones.

In effect, these taxes are confiscatory, consequently *whatever is the state of the land at the present time, that state is the result of a change of effective "ownership."*

Subsequently to the Capital levies paid by the legatee, but not by anyone purchasing the land, Income tax at the current rate, (now 10/- in the £) is paid on the *ownership of the land, not on the return it makes, but on an arbitrary assessment which goes up if the land is improved. This assessment is generally made by the local rating authority who levy their own distinct taxes, called Rates, on it; and these go up if the land is improved. But if the owner also occupies "his own" property, he pays Schedule B as well as Schedule A and Rates, also at the current rate.* (The foregoing statements are subject to certain modifications in respect of Scotland, and to the vagaries of Derating Acts.) In effect, the owner-occupier of his "own" property pays, at the present time, more in rates and taxes than he would have paid in rates, taxes *and rent*, sixty years ago, as a tenant.

It is a sound legal, as well as common-sense axiom, that a man must be presumed to have intended the logical consequences of his actions. The logical consequences of the taxation just roughly summarised can be seen to be what they have in fact been. They have made the use of land for agriculture only precariously possible by treating as soil

income what is in fact soil capital; thus fostering overseas imports of easily grown food.

They have made the "ownership" of land, as an administrative profession, impossible by imposing what is in fact an intolerable nationalised rent. And they have made the improvement of real property an expensive form of altruistic philanthropy (many landowners have accelerated their ruin by persistence in it) by penalising every improvement either to site or buildings by an increased assessment, so that whoever doesn't get the rent, the tax or rate-collector does.

A short survey of the bearing on all this of what were called "Mineral Rights" will enable us to pass on to a consideration of why once-Great Britain is unique in its taxation, the objective of it, and who benefits. That will clear the ground for the possibilities of a reasonably sane system.

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

LAND TENURE IN ALBERTA

Mr. H. E. Tanner, Alberta Minister of Lands and Mines, discussed the system of land tenure in Alberta at a recent meeting. He said that through the operation of the provincial government's farm land tenure system, put into effect under Premier Aberhart's guidance, settlers are being assisted to put their land into production without cost.

They pay rent only on a basis of the percentage of the actual crop production. The rent amount therefore is based only on the production from the land.

The plan has been so successful in the past two years that many other provinces and parts of the United States have asked to have its workings explained to them.

Under the former system settlers were given title to any 160 acres of homestead land providing they lived on the land for certain periods each year and made certain cultivation requirements. Settlers were not given assistance in locating good producing land. When they 'filed' on the homesteads, they were required to pay taxes whether the land was of a productive nature or not. Many of the early settlers lost their homesteads, after working them for several years, because they were unable to pay the back taxes.

The present plan went into effect in 1939 and under it land is leased for usually 20 years with arrangements for renewals.

Applicants must be British subjects, 18 years or older, who do not own any other land. They sign an agreement whereby they must live on the land for at least six months each year and erect a dwelling costing at least \$200 within five years. They also must agree to meet cultivation requirements by breaking and seeding.

Rent and taxes are paid by the settler giving one-eighth of the crop. If the yield is less than five bushels per acre, no rent or tax money is collected.

Thus no arrears of rentals or taxes could ever accumulate as a result of poor crops. Since the new system went into effect, 309 leases have been given by the provincial government.

Mr. Tanner added that the plan would be of great value when the war is over and thousands of men return to take over settlements in the province.

PLANNING THE POPULATION

At a recent session of the Brains Trust, it was asked whether a method of predetermining sex had not been discovered. Sir William Beveridge who was present on the occasion is reported to have replied that there were some things concerning which he would prefer the public to be ignorant.

We do not propose to comment on these words further than to state that they recall a passage in *Hansard*, of two years ago. As we do not share this meddlesome concern for the 'public's' morality, the passage is reproduced below:—

Dr. Morgan (Rochdale): We are told that this in an international war of ideas. There are many sides to German philosophy. The hon. Member for Bridgwater (Mr. Bartlett) has stressed the need for propagating ideas in belligerent countries with a view to breaking down the power of German philosophy. With the permission of the House, I should like to stress the question of certain ideas which have been prominent in the writings of some pseudo-scientific writers in this country, and which have not, up to the present, been repudiated. It is the custom in democracy for every subject to be discussed, and that ideas, however bad, should be considered, whether amoral, revolting or Christian. There are certain men to-day to whom the Government appeal for medical advice on almost every subject like the Chinese Abacus and, therefore, when certain popular individuals are being asked to give that advice on health and scientific problems, it is as well that this House should have regard to it, and should know what is being sponsored and advocated outside. The German philosophy with regard to breeding gets us nowhere. In Poland to-day Germany is giving expression to her racial ideas by sterilisation of males. Even in Russian Poland they have not stooped to this revolting and sordid practice. I want to stress specially one particular instance—that of an ennobled and very good physician, a very popular personality, who is frequently called in by the Government to give advice. The House may not be aware that in a book called *After us*, published in 1936, this ennobled physician, with the ear to the Court, the ear to Cabinet Ministers and facilities to the microphone, sponsored certain views. I propose to read one or two extracts from this book, because in my view the ideas are the converse or the reverse side of Hitler's philosophy of perverted science. . . . Certain Labour Members have asked that this gentleman should be appointed Health Commissioner with certain compulsory powers for London.

On page 52 of this book, sponsored by this great physician—and here I wish to say that I have nothing to say against his medical knowledge; he has treated me personally with great consideration, and I am only stressing my personal views and not those of any organisation or of my employers—views are expressed upon which I feel most deeply. I think that these pseudo-scientific, bastard philosophies should be stopped as soon as possible. On page 52 it states:

"There must be allowed no matings between the sexes to result in the birth of children, except where and when such births are desirable from the racial point of view. This is a very big step in the control of human beings."

On page 54 we find:

The best way to put eugenics into practice is to make it compulsory for all male children to be sterilised soon after birth. . . . Certain male children of selected strains will be exempt from com-

pulsory sterilisation. These children will be selected carefully by a thorough scientific study of their pedigree."

Working-class people keep no account of pedigrees. The book continues:

"Their actual parents will not be so important as their ancestors for two or three generations back. One child in every 100 or 200 will be left unsterilised, and these children will become the fathers of the next generation."

On page 26 it is stated:

"Any woman desiring to have a child will have to apply to the Eugenic State Authority for the necessary permission. She will be obliged to produce the required facts relative to her own pedigree for two or three generations back. These will be verified and studied and if it is found that there is no hereditary taint, she will be granted the necessary permission. If that is satisfactory a list of suitable sires will be given her to choose from."

She will then spend a few days in hospital, where she will be artificially inseminated. This is a book written by Mr. Lockhart-Mummery. Now I should like to quote a phrase upon democracy:

"Democracy is stated to be breaking down everywhere because it is essentially wrong."

This is the same democracy for which we are fighting for our very lives in this war. My last quotation is:

"No new ideas, however beneficial, can be introduced without opposition. One so radical as the official control of child-birth would produce violent antagonism. The method of sterilisation of males, however, will not cause such a revolutionary change in human relationships as the method suggested by Haldane of an ectogenic baby, where the ovum from the ovary removed from a selected woman is impregnated artificially in the laboratory and the embryo is grown in artificial serum in an incubator till the child is developed sufficiently to be brought into the air. On the other hand, there is the method suggested by Thompson, of introducing the artificially impregnated ovum of a woman into the womb of a cow, and allowing the poor old cow to find a new phase of usefulness by acting as the mother, as well as the foster mother, of the human baby."

I hear some laughter. Ridicule and ironical laughter are the proper way to deal with such subjects; but there is the tragic side. I went into my constituency and read some of these quotations to a working-class mother. I said, "What do you think of this?" She said, "Is this a book written not by doctors for doctors but by a doctor under high sponsorship for reading by the public?" I said, "Yes." She said, "All I can say is that it is a disgusting, nauseating, revolting doctrine, and I would not have them standing on my doorstep." The House may ask, as an hon. Member asked, "What has this to do with the subject under discussion?" It is, in my view, of tremendous importance if we are fighting this war for certain spiritual values and to prevent science being perverted against the working classes. If Christians are making a fight for the things that matter, these spiritual values are worth fighting for.

Readers are asked to consider what would be the first steps needed to usher in the Age of the Science of Eugenics. Without doubt control would be the first essential, control over the individual (freedom from idleness), control over the children and the family (family allowances), control of would-be and expectant mothers (state medical services). We need not ask whether the sponsors of Eugenics will support the Beveridge Plan. It is their first step.

"Ridicule and ironical laughter are the proper way to deal with such subjects"—but the laughter must ring from one end of the land to the other and liberate the spirit of the people.

B.M.P.

Points from Parliament

HOUSE OF COMMONS: DECEMBER 1
NATIONAL FINANCE

Bank for International Settlements

Mr. Bellenger asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has taken, or will take, advantage of the visit to this country of the President of the Bank for International Settlements for the purpose of an interview regarding the interests of this country in the bank?

Sir K. Wood: Yes, Sir. I saw this gentleman when he was passing through the country on a short, private visit and had a general talk with him.

Mr. Bellenger: Was not my right hon. Friend able to discuss with the President of the Bank whether any clearing facilities had been given for the large transactions in black market visas to pass through the Bank for International Settlements, to our detriment?

Sir K. Wood: No, Sir, I do not recall that my conversation with him included that. It was a general confirmation of the statement which my hon. Friend will remember that I made.

Mr. Stokes: Does the right hon. Gentleman not think it would be now desirable that Mr. McKittrick, the President of the Bank, should have a talk to Members here so that we may learn some of the facts which the Chancellor never seems able to give?

Sir K. Wood: No, Sir.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS

The ninth day of the Debate on the Address was devoted to a discussion of Post-war Reconstruction. Earlier in the day Mr. Eden, Leader of the House, had been subjected to a spirited catechism as to why the Beveridge Report which had reached the Press the previous night, was not to be available to Members until that afternoon, too late for use in the debate. The discussion was not distinguished by a realistic approach to the subject on the part of speakers, but the attitudes of some of the speakers have been characterised briefly below, as it is thought that constituents may wish for some indication of the reactions of their members to this subject.

Mr. Arthur Greenwood (Wakefield) took as his plaything the whole world: "What, in my view, the world must face is the establishment of what I would call an International Development Board, with a parallel Finance Board, to assist in the economic reorganisation and development of the war-stricken, impoverished and under-developed countries." Major Sir Edward Cadogan (Bolton), while confining his observations to "a criticism of the policy of planning rather than to its technique," was contrary-wise, "not going to have it said that I am against planning because I criticise the methods of planners. I am just as anxious as anyone else that we should plan for the post-war period." Sir Geoffrey Shakespeare (Norwich) gave a detailed criticism of the Uthwatt Report. He warned the Paymaster General that if he must have planners he should have them on an Advisory Council and advised him "to choose a few good economists who can add a little freezing mixture into those boiling solutions which have been concocted by the planners."

Continued on page 7

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. 9. No. 14. *Saturday, December 12, 1942.*

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Yes, Clarence, Eisenhower the Stupendous ("Ikey" to you) has broken through to the Hotel St. George, at Algiers, under the guns of the (ssh—British) Fleet. This hostelry is famous throughout North Africa for its cuisine and wines. (Unsolicited advt.) The only serious accident was that a small number of American soldiers, used to driving on the wrong side of the road, became confused and headed for the battle line in Tunisia five hundred miles away.

This mistake, which might have had serious consequences, has now been rectified, and General Eisenhower, with a brilliant staff and Admiral Darlan, is now fighting the Germans with the First (ssh—British) Army, by remote control. You doubtless heard that the United States had invaded North Africa. (Ssh—ain't they good pickers?)

The modern Russian Capital:

"A week after we arrived in Kibyshev our secretaries followed. We hadn't been allowed to bring them on the train with us. . . . The filth of the streets, the horrible sanitary conditions in the Grand [hotel] and the lack of fresh vegetables, soon began to have their effect on us. All of us had dysentery, the very worst thing we could catch, conditions in the Grand being what they were. Our lives soon began to be bound up with what for the sake of delicacy I will call 'bathrooms.' There were two 'bathrooms' to take care of over a hundred guests."

—QUENTIN REYNOLDS in *Only the Stars are Neutral*.

In November 1919 a very hush-hush meeting of high-ranking Freemasons was held at the Hotel St. George, Mustapha Superieure, the expensive suburb of Algiers, to consider the Next Step. No doubt we are living through it.

At this conference, largely American and Anglo-American millionaire in make-up, Rudyard Kipling was present, no doubt to elaborate the ideas contained in *As Easy as A.B.C.* He travelled specially from England with his secretary, and returned at the close of the conference.

The Hotel St. George is a cluster of white buildings nearly covered with masses of purple bougainvillea. It is surrounded by a large garden, in which, at separate tables placed under the trees, lunch is eaten all through the winter. Gazelles, about the size of large greyhounds, but with longer necks, wander about the tables and nudge the elbows of the lunchers in order to be fed.

The winter climate of Algiers is delightful in the day-time, but becomes cold as the sun sets.

"They have this idea of the suppression of the individual

citizen, man and woman, to be a mere chattel of a State Machine." Mr. Churchill made it clear he was not referring to

Sir William Beveridge
 Luton and the Board of Trade
 The paint industry.

Social Crediters do not need to be reminded that once there is movement *in the right direction* whoever initiates it, the relatively smaller force necessary to maintain it must be exerted. Write to your M.P. about it!

No instance of concentration in industry or centralisation of policy or concentration of power should be allowed to pass scrutiny; and where appropriate the strong resistance of representatives should be demanded by the elector, and where it occurs should be upheld. Sight must not be lost of the fact that concentration *may* result in greater efficiency in prosecution of the war effort. *This is the plea advanced to justify bureaucratic interference even when sabotage of the war effort is the result actually gained in experience.* Here, therefore, the vigilant elector is thrown back upon his unverified opinion; and it is *policy, not opinion*, which the representative should at all times represent. The elector should hold his representative to electoral policy, therefore, all the time, making it clear that he will be held responsible for both its positive and its negative aspects: *i.e.* the raising of the war effort to its highest power *and* the avoidance of means which sabotage morale by making us fight *for* what we are fighting *against*. In all cases, the concrete situation must guide the elector. Concentration of the preparation and use of highly inflammable materials, as in the paint industry, is, apparently, Fifth Column work, whatever Department is responsible. But the elector must protect himself against cunning presentation of one thing as its opposite, and *only concentration upon policy can achieve this.*

Sir Richard Gregory (Baronet, 1931: P.M. J. R. Macdonald) President, British Association; Editor of *Nature*; Chairman of the British Science Guild which invited Dr. Sprague (see histories of the fall of the last Labour Government) to 'assess' the opinions of British scientists at a colloquium on Oil *versus* Coal for the British Navy, has said he could not name six scientists who would do national service as members of the Cabinet.

Well, if he really couldn't we've been thinking things were worse than they are.

He thinks things are "changing," a result which he attributes gratefully to the Deity. But *which* Deity? By the bye, Dr. Sprague's "assessment" didn't come off. At the appointed hour this "economic adviser to the Bank of 'England'" was speeding across the Atlantic to continue his work at Mr. Roosevelt's side. There are similar *contretemps* in the offing.

When H. M. King Edward VIII was marked down for abdication, a noticeable feature of the early stages of the lightning campaign conducted among the public was the high proportion of Freemasons who gave expression to ready-made opinions (adverse to the King). "What do you think of the Beveridge Report?" — "Are you a Mason?"

Control and Exploitation in China

By BORGE JENSEN

"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."

— C. H. DOUGLAS in *The Big Idea*.

Douglas has defined the word 'religion' as any sort of doctrine which is based on an attempt to relate, or bind back, action to some conception of reality. As there is a striking similarity between the essential doctrines set forth by the founders of the world's religions, it seems possible that men like Lao-Tse, Buddha, and Jesus had all caught a glimpse of the true working of the universe, and that they were, in varying degrees, realists.

Douglas has further defined the word 'policy' as "governmental action taken towards a recognised and conscious objective." The word is allied to 'police' and is derived from Greek *politeia*: citizenship, the root word being *polis*: city. Etymologically, the word 'policy' therefore means action taken towards a recognised and conscious objective by the men of the city, while 'politics,' in the same way, is the art and science of city government.

Broadly speaking, the net result of governmental action to date has been as complete a citification of the world as is compatible with the survival of our species. (I am at the moment purposely avoiding the usual word, civilisation, derived from Latin *civitas*, town, as it has come to signify both the policy we are about to discuss and that culture which it invariably destroys.)

The conscious objective which the citification, or ghettoisation, of the world is meant to achieve is what the Elders of Zion called "the magnificent absolutism of our Prince of Judah" while those who have openly contributed to the realisation of this ideal state of affairs have referred to it variously as 'The Universal Republic' (Clootz), 'Civitas Dei' (Curtis) and, latterly, 'Federal Union' (James Warburg, Streit, Henry Ford, etc.), while Social Crediters correctly use the term 'World Police State.'

It is significant that the long series of social upheavals from the Crusades over the Reformations to the Revolutions has been launched and directed by 'city-politicians' who were as often as not members of a race whose perception of reality has been seriously impaired by centuries of city life.

The 'city-politicians' had probably never in their long experience met with anything more fatal to the realisation of their ideal than the straight-forward individualist teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. Nothing could be more repugnant to them than the Doctrine of the Incarnation ("the father and I are one") and their subtle and tenacious attempt to organise out of existence the vital teaching of the Nazarene forms perhaps one of the most interesting chapters in the history of the citification of the world.

The very facts that any fundamental perversion of Christian teaching was brought about during the first centuries, and that by the fourth the 'Reigning House' had to some extent neutralised the most dangerous elements of Christianity, appear to have escaped the majority of 'Christian' writers. It is, therefore, all the more remarkable that an 'outsider' like the Chinese author Lin Yutang should have noticed that "many theological complications arose in the

first, second and third centuries and turned the simple truths of the Sermon of the Mount into a rigid, self-contained structure to support a priestcraft as an endowment institution,"* and that as a consequence there grew up "a tendency to emphasise the after-life." In a later book, *My Country and My People*, he goes a step further and states:

"To the West, it seems hardly imaginable that the relationship between man and man (which is morality) could be maintained without reference to a Supreme Being, while to the Chinese it is equally amazing that men should not, or could not, behave to one another as decent beings without thinking of their indirect relationship through a third party . . . I have wondered what the development of European ethics would have been if it had not been overshadowed by Pauline ethics."

Paul, or Saul (or whatever influences wrought their sinister will through the instrumentality of his frail, epileptic body), was the first of a long series of 'converted,' 'anti-semitic' Jews who, consciously or otherwise, laboured to drive a wedge between the 'Father' and the 'Son,' between a man's actions and his inmost desires. Their chief method was what can be loosely termed 'abstractionism': there is first the subtle change of name: the Father becomes the Lord, the Sovereign, the Son is changed into the, or a, subject; and just as the terrestrial Sovereign is all-powerful so the celestial Lord is as infinitely good, 'spiritual,' as Man is infinitely evil, 'material.' The split between Man and God leads to the strife between nation and nation, the first Grand Abstraction, the Separatist Godhead, preparing the way for a host of others: The Nation, Race, or Tribe (specially Chosen by the Lord God); The Law, Church, State (the instruments through which the Lord God curbs the evil leanings of the Chosen Ones, and through them, the wickedness of the world in general); and lastly, often after centuries of conditioning, 'Justice,' 'Public Morality' *alias* the 'Common Good' *alias* the 'National Interest.'

Let us for a moment consider to what an extent Lin Yutang's countrymen, the Chinese, are immune from the virus of abstractionist philosophy.

According to the Jewish writer Arthur Waley,† ancient or traditional China (which in many respects lasted until the Jew-contrived 'Republican' revolution in the present century knocked the Son of Heaven off his Pea-cock Throne) was dominated by three distinct schools of thought, the first of which was Tao-ism. From Lao-Tse's rebuff to Confucius: "All this talk of Goodness and Duty, these perpetual pin-pricks, unnerve and irritate the hearer; nothing indeed could be more destructive to his inner tranquillity," we may conclude that Tao-ism is at least as impatient of the high-flown abstractions which mark the last stage of decline in the power of individual thinking as is true Christianity. From Mr. Yutang's works we gather that the majority of Chinese gentlemen have as little use for Duty *in vacuo* as the Tao-ists, but they are, nevertheless, largely products of the second school of thought, which bears the name of the gentleman whose abstractionist talk irritated Lao-Tse:

"The Doctrine of Social Status, as Confucianism has been popularly called, is the social philosophy behind the family system. . . ." "The principal idea is status, *ming-fen*, which gives every man and woman a definite place in society. *Ming* means 'name,' and *fen* means 'duty.' Confucianism is

*LIN YUTANG: *The Importance of Living*.

†ARTHUR WALEY: *Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China*.

actually known as . . . the religion of names. A name is a title that gives a man his definite status in society and defines his relationship with others. Without a name or a relationship a man would not know his *fen* or duties in that relationship, and hence would not know how to behave." (My italics.)

While the Chinese thus appears indifferent to Duty with a capital D, he has nevertheless submitted to having his duties to his neighbour dictated to him by a set of rigid social conventions. Mr. Yutang shows how the constant pre-occupation with the dowries of the female members of the clan will often make a weary civil servant postpone his retirement and his realisation of a lotus-eating old age in a mountain-retreat, and the younger man from taking up the career of his heart. Admitting the essentially restrictive nature of the family system Mr. Yutang, who is brought up in the Confucian tradition, is nevertheless eager to point out that it was never Confucius's intention that the family-system should develop into a 'magnified selfishness' and universal corruption of official life, on the one hand, and the seclusion of women and the mutilation of their feet, on the other.

It is interesting to note Mr. Yutang's remark that the small colony of Jews who lived at Honan (Jews have never settled in China in any great numbers) were thoroughly "sinolised. . . the race-consciousness of the Jews can be shamed into oblivion only by the greater race-consciousness of the family-minded Chinese."

In other words, the Mosaic injunction to honour your parents has been obeyed so thoroughly by the Chinese for centuries that the 'city politicians' found it unnecessary to include the Heavenly Empire among the fields of their missionary efforts until quite recently. One cannot help wondering whether, if (to use Mr. Yutang's phrase) Chinese social life had not been overshadowed by Confucian ethics, the 'Western Powers' would have found it so easy, when they finally decided to break a hole in the Chinese wall (masonic symbol of the complex of social rules which hedges round every Chinese family, making it a small state within the state), to split China up into 'spheres of interest'* taking over fiscal rights in exchange for loans, with the result that the people of Szechuen to-day pay tax thirty years ahead and farmers pay 25 to 31 times the regular farm-tax while those who have failed to plant opium are liable to a *laziness* tax; to have precipitated a 'republican' revolution; involved China—invitation from *Washington*—in the first World War; and flooded the country with Communist agitators directed from Moscow. All this has been accomplished in the course of a generation.

That Confucianism contained within itself the seeds of its own final destruction can be seen from the part played in modern politics by the Soong family. The Soongs represent, according to Mr. John Gunther, "what is beyond doubt one of the most striking agglutinations of personal power."† It is perhaps not without significance that the Confucianism of the Soongs has been "finished abroad" so to speak, Soong père having become a member, in the United States, of that Calvin-influenced Methodist Church of which the late Lord Stamp was one of the chief pillars.

The youngest of the Soong sisters married the hero of

*Schiff to Max Warburg: "Goodness knows there is enough space and there are enough people in the Chinese Empire to require many different kinds of financing for years to come."

—CYRUS ADLER: *Jacob Schiff*.

†JOHN GUNTHER: *Inside Asia*.

the New Republic, the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who, according to the former Netherlands Minister in Russia, M. Oudendyk† was greatly influenced by Adolf Joffe, a Jew, and Soviet Ambassador to Germany and Agent to China. Dr. Sun Yat-sen had repudiated his first wife to marry Miss Soong. Sun Fo, his son of his first marriage, was for many years Minister of Railways. The second Soong sister married General Chiang Kai-shek, present Chairman of the Republic, after he, also, had repudiated his wife. The eldest sister is married to H. K. Kung, the present Prime Minister of China.

Mr. T. V. Soong, their brother, is a graduate of Harvard and Columbia, a brilliant Ph.D. in Economics. He was Chinese Finance Minister for nine years, introduced the budget system, unified the currency and established a Central Bank of China. His taxation policies prevented China from re-arming on a large scale. He is at present Chinese foreign secretary with permanent residence in Washington. The Government of China is therefore strictly 'a family affair,' as M. Oudendyk puts it.

The replacement of the Traditional China of the Emperors which was governed largely by 'morality,' or social sanction, by the growing Totalitarianism of 'Republican' China of to-day which is essentially governed by Law backed by overwhelming force, is, fundamentally, the triumph of the third of the Ancient philosophies described by Mr. Waley, i.e., the Fa Chia, or Law school of thought.

The legal mind is the static mind and worshippers of the Rule of Law would not appear to have changed their methods or arguments very much during the last couple of thousand years.

It is not without interest that these principles should appear so familiar and natural to Mr. Waley that he finds the name 'Realism' more suitable to this school of thought than that of 'Law.' In the view of these 'realists' the sole aim of the State is to maintain and if possible to expand its frontiers' and, interiorly, to eliminate hereditary privileges and distinctive classes generally. Almost the whole of 'Realist' literature takes the form of advice to a ruler.

"It is assumed that the object of every ruler is to become a 'hegemon,' that is to say to make his state paramount over all states, or at the best, to become ruler of all China. . . . This can only be achieved if Law is substituted for morality and the whole energy of the State concentrated upon war and agriculture. . . ." "But the creation of this State requires the observance by the ruler of certain secret methods and precautions, called his 'art' (*shu*)."

Espionage and collective punishment were the two outstanding features of this Ideal State: the people were to be organised in groups "who were mutually responsible for each other and were obliged to denounce each others crimes." One might as Mr. Waley says almost be reading an extract from the Daily Press of to-day, for the inverted Golden Rule: 'Do your neighbour before he does you' which is the guiding principle of Jewish fraternities and secret societies everywhere, has indeed reduced the larger part of the world to a state of perpetual Collective Insecurity. It is interesting to note in the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (VII, 6): "If we allow the possibility of a general rising against us, we shall respond with the guns of America or China or Japan."

†W. J. OUDENDYK: *Highways and Byways of Diplomacy*.

POINTS FROM PARLIAMENT

Continued from page 3

"We must plan for a socialist and not for a capitalist objective," said Mr. Ridley (Clay Cross) after expressing solicitude at the poverty in plenty which characterised the period between the wars.

Sir William Jowitt, the Paymaster General, brought out Advisory Committees, like rabbits from a hat, as replies to the criticisms offered, and in the course of his speech announcing the future formation of a new Ministry of Town and Country Planning, said: "I have always felt that war has this advantage over peace: In war you have a perfectly simple direct objective, the defeat of the enemy, and everything which stands in the way of that objective is put ruthlessly on one side, but in peace-time the objectives are so diverse, so different, one does not know which to aim at. I myself suggest that the objective we ought to aim at is the maximum employment of our people, and that to that end all our policies should be subordinated. We should allow nothing to stand in the way of our success in the fight against unemployment. The more efficient our industry becomes the more likely we are to succeed in that fight. If we can produce adequately we can consume adequately, and if we consume adequately we can produce adequately.

"The difficulties that have arisen in the past are not difficulties of production but of distribution...."

HOUSE OF COMMONS: DECEMBER 2

Debate on the Address—Reconstruction

Major Petherick (Penryn and Falmouth): I think it will be very difficult to attain complete unity on the subject of war aims, that is to say, in the main what we are fighting for; ... many Members might feel that one of our objects was to try to introduce some form of Socialism into Europe. I am not so foolish as to think that one of our war aims is to try to introduce any form of Conservatism into Europe, although I should prefer a more conservative Europe than would some Members of the Labour Party. It would be extremely difficult to get common agreement on what we are fighting for, but we are completely agreed on what we are fighting against....

Mr. Mander (Wolverhampton, East): I agree with my right hon. and learned Friend that many of our controls will have to be kept in operation for a considerable period after the war. Some, I think, will have to be continued permanently. We shall have to go in for more planning. I do not mean planning for land development, but wider economic planning....

The vital thing in the future is that we should know that military power in overwhelming force can be operated the moment an aggressor starts, or even makes preparations to start, and we cannot very well do that unless we have in on it the people who really count and are determined to work together for that purpose....

Mr. Daggan (Abertillery): Whatever is done by the Government, whatever planning is done and whatever proposal is submitted for discussion by this House, you cannot efficiently plan the property of other people. You must have control. Those who own property now will agree with that....

Mr. Summers (Northampton): do not let us spend all our time thinking of what shall be the system in which

people live; let us pay some attention to the development of the characters of the people who are to live in it and make use of it....

Mr. McLaren (Burslem): ... I, for one... am determined that, when the war shows signs of ending... the land of this country shall, by declaration of this House, be made the property of the State. There shall not be any private interests or private body to stand between willing hands and the natural opportunities within this country for employment....

Sir George Schuster (Walsall): If we look forward to the future and the conditions in which our economic policy will have to be carried on, I think it is perfectly obvious there will have to be a closer link-up between Government direction and the working of industry than there has been in the past....

Mr. Boothby (Aberdeen and Kincardine, Eastern): there is only one institution in this country powerful enough to stand up against them [the monopolists of big business], and it is the House of Commons. Nothing else can do it. We shall have to do it. We are not, after all, fighting this war to make the country safe for Imperial Chemical Industries....

One thing alone is certain. Planning of some kind there will have to be, because the alternative is chaos. The question simply is: who is to do the planning, and with what object?....

Whether we like it or not, we have to start planning the framework of the new world now. We must do it, or we shall be too late. And we cannot do it alone. Nothing short of a Supreme Allied Council can have the authority to make the *ad hoc* political decisions which will be called for increasingly in the months that lie immediately ahead, and lay the foundations of that new Europe which must emerge if once again victory is not to be turned to dust and ashes.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Eden):

.... I have spoken of four great Powers, ourselves, Russia, the United States of America and China, but I must make it plain that I do not visualise a world in which those four Powers try to clamp down some form of big-Power dictatorship over everybody else. What will happen when the fighting is over is that these great Powers, and particularly ourselves, the United States and Russia, will have a virtual monopoly of armed strength, and that armed strength must be used in the name of the United Nations to prevent a repetition of aggression. But other Powers, be they great, be they small, provided they are willing to play their part, will, I trust, be secured in the enjoyment of that independence for which they have fought and suffered so long. Indeed, it is essential that the independence of these other countries should be restored if we are to create a free international society in Europe. And so I say that in any world system that is to operate all States will have to play their part....

Somebody may say, "How is all this to be done? What is the machinery to give effect to it?" I would reply that, although the machinery is important, it is, unfortunately, less important than certain other ingredients which are essential to the maintenance of peace. The old League of Nations failed, not because its machinery was faulty but because there was not the representation or the force or the drive behind it.

To my mind, there are three indispensable attributes—

and I think these come near the definition which my hon. Friend gave early in the Debate—for any international organisation if it is to have a chance to achieve its purpose. First, it must be fully representative of the powers that mean to keep the peace. The old League was not. Secondly, the Powers themselves must have the unity and the determination to arrive at agreed and positive decisions. And the third, and perhaps the most important of all, is that they should have the force behind them to give effect to their decisions. . . .

HOUSE OF COMMONS: DECEMBER 3

Debate on the Address—World-peace

Mr. Pickthorn (Cambridge University): . . . it is going to be very much more difficult to do this business [reconstruction] if it is to be done wholly upon the old League of Nations Union basis of all joining in all wars. If it is to be done upon that old basis, at any rate let that be after full discussion in this House and the country, to let us know where we are. The old League of Nations, said the Leader of the House, failed not because its machinery was faulty but because there was not the force or the drive. . . .

He then went on to explain exactly what would be necessary in the new organisation. . . . He said that the new organisation must be fully representative of the Powers that mean to keep the peace. How do you know which Powers mean to keep the peace? Does that mean that the Powers which in the past have not kept the peace are to be excluded? Is it to be a permanent league of the victors to-day? He said the matter was simple as long as we had three conditions. That was the first. The second condition was that the Powers—he did not explain whether “the Powers” meant all the Powers or the Powers which won—must have the unity and the determination to arrive at agreed and positive decisions. What an invention. There are a great many people who disagree on a great many objects, and it is suspected that some of them may be willing to raise forces to maintain their side of the case, and we are told it would be easy to prevent that happening if only we could have an organisation in which those people themselves had unity and the determination to arrive at agreed and positive decisions. Of course it is perfectly true that if you get a collection of Powers positively determined that they would agree there would be quite a chance that in fact the result would not be war.

“The third condition, and perhaps the most important of all, is that they shall have the force behind them to give effect to their decisions.”

. . . . It may be true, as the Foreign Secretary rather indicated yesterday, that it would be necessary to say that wherever there was a war it is our war, that peace is indivisible, and that we are to go into every war. It may be that is the right way, though I am not yet persuaded; but even suppose that is the right way, the force and strategy necessary for your policy must be thought out first, and must be the first charge upon our Income Tax. It must come before the Beveridge proposals as a charge upon our Income Tax—inevitably it must come first, otherwise make no mistake, next time the interval may not be 20 years but 10 years, when some foreigner will come and try to take away the whole of what you have—Income Tax and Beveridge and all. . . .

If we are going to try to wind up this war and put off the next war on the basis of personal likes and dislikes or

of spiritual and moral superiorities and of using force in order to make foreigners better; if we are to start over again trying to do that kind of thing then the whole wheel is going round, and probably faster this time than the last, and it will be back again before I have had the luck to die of old age. If we are going to be fools enough to try and conduct foreign policy in that way, France must be the key to our policy. . . . we have somehow to make France as great a Power as we can and to be on the side of France, because otherwise we shall not get even that first 10 months without which in this war who dare say where we should now be?

CHRISTMAS GIFTS

Why not a subscription to *The Social Crediter*

RATES: *One year*, 30/-; *Six months*, 15/-;

Three months, 7/6d; *One month*, 2/6d.

Or a book by C. H. DOUGLAS?

The Big Idea.....2/6

Social Credit.....3/6

The Tragedy of Human Effort.....7d.

The Policy of a Philosophy.....7d.

Send your orders now so that they may be despatched by Christmas.

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.

BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 73 Manor Rd., Blackpool.

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

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 December 17.

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.