THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 17. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, JANUARY 2, 1943. 6d. Weekly.

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

by C. H. DOUGLAS

The "owner" of minerals had no choice whether they should or should not be worked. He was obliged to grant a lease to a Colliery, on demand and at practically its price, but the Colliery had complete freedom as to whether or not it would work them. It is true that in many cases the Lease contained a "minimum rent" clause, usually about £1 per acre, but this so-called "rent" was afterwards deducted from the royalties together with all bad coal, "faults," *etc.* In effect, for about twopence per ton, the colliery got control of all the coal without buying the surface and with the whole of the political responsibility and abuse directed against the "owner."

Now let us see what happens to the surface. In the first place, it becomes for a lengthy period unsaleable for building purposes, because of the danger of settlement, and this unsaleability causes a money loss probably greater than the total sums received, nett, for the royalties. In the second place, miners, very good fellows as they are, are not regarded with enthusiasm by farmers.

They are inveterate trespassers and poachers; destroy fences, leave open gates, and produce an easily recognisable "ragged" air to the countryside which is accentuated by the "planned" neatness of many modern colliery villages. The sulphur smoke from the pit chimneys hurts the crops. And of course, by the almost inevitable destruction of the amenities of the district, its general residential value becomes restricted to those connected with the working of minerals.

Notice that the "owner" has nothing whatever to do with this state of affairs. He merely pays the taxes, is pilloried by the miner as battening on the virtuous worker "who produces all wealth" and hasn't sufficient experience to realise that the "wealth" he produces goes mostly, as an American manufacturer recently put it, to provide a quart of milk a day for Hottentots. That is to say, it is exported practically free, and goes to swell the thousands of millions of pounds of capital which have been lost in the last fifty years.

Anyone who will give a little unbiassed consideration to the facts of Land Taxation and Legislation since, to go no further back, Mr. Lloyd George's Budget of 1908 must be driven to the conclusion that it has not been intended that "the Land" should prosper, *neither has it been intended that the land should be "nationalised."* Politically, it could have been, any time this past thirty years. While destroying every real right of property-rights without which the proper administration of land is impossible, the titular "ownership" has been left in private hands so that the international bondholders might extract in taxation all the money possible, while the results of draining the countryside of liquid capital might be used to discredit the whole system of private property. A very pretty scheme.

While fundamentally, of course, the financial aspect of the matter ceases to be of importance with the sabotage of private "ownership," it may be noted in passing that International Bondholding is doomed on the day that "ownership" passes to the State and the State itself would hardly survive. The rent and maintenance charges which would have to be collected to pay the Bondholders, of whom individual War Loan holders form a small part, would then be so impossible that, the private "owner" having disappeared, the real malefactors would be easily recognisable—to quote that professional maker of phrases, Lord Baldwin, during the past half century, the Government, whatever we may mean by that, has "realised the ambition of the harlot throughout the ages—power without responsibility."

There is no room at all for difference of opinion as to the relative excellence of management by private ownership or by the bureaucracy by which it is being replaced. Leaving out of comparison such outstanding instances as the Buccleuch or Stanley Estates, there are still hundreds of small properties in which ownership is maintained by extraneous funds, which are immeasurably superior to the properties of Government Departments disposing of practically unlimited funds.

Was there then, no room for complaint about the system? I think that there was. And, for the moment, there is every evidence that, so far from its defects being rectified by State Management, they will be greatly magnified.

 To be continued.

Concentration and the Paint Industry

On December 3 there was held in London a Mass Meeting of Members of Small Paint Firms which the Government wish to concentrate in the "National interest." Social Crediters will know the arguments and feel sceptical, consequently the following excerpts from an address given by Major H. A. Proctor, M.P. for Accrington, who has been a tower of strength in helping the cause of the "small man" both inside and outside Parliament, will be an encouragement to all who know the real aims.

He begs *members of any trade* who are being imposed on by this Policy of Concentration to write to their M.P.'s and place the facts before them. They would also help if they sent a copy to the Secretary of a new organisation that is in the course of formation, provisionally known as the "Manufacturers and Traders Association," c/o C. R. Averill Limited, 22, Duchy Street, Stamford Street, London, S.E.1, when it will receive careful attention. The Secretary is in direct and constant touch with Major Proctor who

wants all the relevant information he can get.

Here are the excerpts:—

"I congratulate you on the great meeting which you have organised, showing that you protest against the paralysing hand of Government officials taking away your means of life; and not only your livelihood but the livelihood of the men who work for you.... For this reason, when one of my constituent's works was attacked... I decided I would put on the war paint and co-operate, as far as possible, and direct, as far as possible, from my Parliamentary experience, how, at least, we could arrest what had already been decided on. No one can touch my constituency without touching me."

"It did not need extensive consideration to realise that after all this was a national issue. There were fundamental principles at stake. I have seen first of all the attack made on the small trader, and I am glad to say that we scotched the Craig-Henderson report.... The next attack came on the amalgamation of the small police forces into the larger areas, which was putting into the hand of one member of the Executive the powers that might be usurped by a future Dictator to get anything he wished."

"I can see here all these concentrations, all these regulations and controls of industry under the name of war, and I do not hesitate to say there is no man here, no small manufacturer or small trader, but what would willingly sacrifice his business to win the war, provided that the big men also should make the same sacrifice. (hear, hear.) That is justice."

"I am not criticising concentration, or anything else necessary for the war, but what I am criticising is the way in which concentration is being done. When Government officials and bureaucrats start into business it is like children playing the piano with a sledge hammer. They have a different type of mind; they always want to pass the buck.... The commercial success of this little island has been built on small men taking risks, and we cannot afford for this characteristic of our moral fibre to be destroyed, so we are carrying this fight, which was started here, a step farther. I am trying to get a debate on the Floor of the House on the whole question of concentration, controls, and regulations. I have already got the promise that on the first free day I shall have the opportunity of dealing with the larger issue of concentration, and I hope that I shall use the paint trade as an illustration...."

THE CHRISTIAN TOUCH

"As far as I can gather from them" (the planners) "their idea of a revolution is simply.... exchanging the tyranny of wealth which exists at the present moment, for the tyranny of the frozen hell of Socialism."

—MR. AUSTIN HOPKINSON (M.P. for Mossley).

Mr. Hopkinson's speech in the Debate to the Address, quoted in *The Social Crediter* for December 5, is worth reading very carefully. Not only as an example of the phenomena which these little "once-great" Islands can still produce, but also as a useful object lesson. Its outstanding characteristic is Mr. Hopkinson's courage—saying things that as he admits are difficult to say. One hopes he receives some encouraging response inside the House; enough at least to induce him to persist. Certainly the daily press is too busy giving publicity to the Archbishop of Canterbury's secular programmes to report such sincerity. Mr. Hopkinson represents something fundamentally big, striving to express itself. Attempting to find a voice for his innate, and essentially British feelings about men and things, he just fails (though with immense credit to himself) to be articulate. Would it be taken amiss if one tried by analysis to discover the reason?

Here is a Christian man, in the real, biological sense of the word rather than its official significance, who is not particularly interested in his party or his reputation; nor is he concerned to shout the current jargon, whatever it may be, louder than his aspiring neighbours, in the present competition of stridency and assertion that is so very un-English, to say the least of it. Instead he attempts to keep his ear to the ground; to the body of "This England" that the publicity boys find so handy for pep radio talks, to catch if he may through the racket the real voice of its people. This is without doubt a very proper position for a "representative," however little appeal it may have to episcopal planners. In the almost overwhelming spate of the "materialistic" propaganda that goes out as public opinion to-day, he is concerned to find expression for an alternative formula, both for himself and all the unfortunate to-be-planned—especially the rising generation that has to carry the lion's share of the present fighting. He sees truly that all these millions of average, British people are dimly conscious that they are being "got at"; but that they are altogether too confused (as it is intended they should be) by the stridency and noise of the unabashed publicity stunt now being conducted for Socialism and all its frost-bitten enticements, to put up an articulate resistance.

The practical difficulty of countering all this blatancy and drum-banging and of getting any hearing at all for an alternative, arises from the fact that the Christian role is an essentially humble one—at best "wood-wind," while all the "brass," both of orchestration and "neck," is to the Opposition. In short, it is the role of the Shower, rather than that of the "Announcer." Through all Mr. Hopkinson says one can sense that genuine, Christian desire to learn what "the other man" wants, not from any sycophancy, but because it is just that that is interesting; is knowledge; is, in fact, what is meant by the Voice of God, in contradistinction to "London (City) Calling," to the accompaniment of a £2,000 cinema organ.

But, as an engineer, Mr. Hopkinson is bound to know that there *is* a correct technique for everything that has to be done. That he has not yet discovered what he is looking for in the present instance is possibly due to the fact that, though he is generally aware of the nature of the forces arrayed against him, he has not yet brought himself to the point where he is able completely to objectivise them, or to identify the technique of those who follow the Black Arts as applied directly to himself.

Before touching on this matter of hypnotism it is necessary to be reminded that its employment is not only an acquired art, but an instinctive one as well. In other words, there are the conscious adepts, "the few," who use it to tempt and influence "the many" to practise it. Now the principal strategy employed by the hypnotist, who in the final analysis is just one that wants to get control of someone else's violition and is out to make *you* do what *he* wants you to do, is to obliterate, as far as possible, all traces or suggestions of any alternative course of action to that which he wishes you to take. In the absence of unbiassed discussion, and by reitera-

tion through all the channels of publicity, an arbitrary and entirely artificial plan is made to assume a character both of inevitability and "naturalness." In fact, the victim can be made to evolve its detail himself—by "voluntary compulsion." (See Board of Trade).

The voice of the hypnotist, issuing from Broadcasting House, and the Press, and a hundred and one semi-endowed organisations, all "inspired" from the same centre, becomes for the hypnotised indistinguishable from what is understood as the Voice of God—so much so that even Archbishops jump to it!

The propagandist's avowed philosophy of life lays him open to the severest censure to be found in the New Testament, and that is no watery brand! To attempt to control the will of another for one's own ends, no matter how well-intentioned, is to be guilty of "the sin against the Holy Ghost." It is obstruction of the "natural" course of events, whatever they may be. What has happened in Mr. Hopkinson's case, and it happens to all of us who are not forewarned, and so fore-armed to resist, is that his "associations" (to borrow a term from the embryo science of Semantics) are being tampered with. A study of Mr. Stuart Chase's book, *The Tyranny of Words*, on this subject, would help him enormously to an appreciation of the unfailing recipe employed by the Black Artists who deal in these mysteries. Their method is to attach what they want (mentally, that is, by suggestion) to something else which for you is a "natural" necessity. This might be termed the art of quid-pro-quo, carried to the *n*th degree, and it is by this means that the individual is robbed of his elementary Christian right of "freedom to choose or refuse one thing at a time."

If you study Mr. Hopkinson's speeches carefully (and they are worth study for their own sake), you will see that with him it goes something like this. Because in the "frozen hell of Socialism," all the emphasis is on security, safety and plenty *at any price*,—"any price" being the Socialist terms of the Slave State; and since by the employment of propaganda and word-manipulation these two things (the abundant life and Socialism) have been identified and made to appear inseparable, Mr. Hopkinson, though like all decent men he repudiates the terms, not being as yet entirely free from the hypnotic influence, is forced to accept (as it was intended he should) this picture of Socialism at its face value. He has been duped (there is no other word for it) into confusing (identifying) Socialism, or Dialectical Materialism, to give it its ugly but comprehensive title, with a high standard of living, since he is not sufficiently familiar with the hypnotist's tricks: the art of associating naturally quite unconnected facts, by means of words (symbols), for purposes of his own which are entirely distinct from any truth or reality inherent in them. In-so-far as he has not seen this he has swallowed the hypnotist's bait, and is therefore mentally compelled to see Materialism's opposite, which he correctly identifies as the Christianity he is seeking to define, as an association of the *opposite* facts; as a low standard of living, even insecurity and danger and want (the things we all naturally dislike), to be embraced as the only visible terms on which the frozen hell of the Planners may be avoided—though he knows quite well that the Christian formula is that "man does not live by bread *alone*," with the emphasis on the last word.

In short, Mr. Hopkinson's opponents have got him where they wanted—playing with the sun in his eyes. He is at such a disadvantage that he can be made to appear as the enemy of a decent standard of comfort for everybody except himself and his classmates, by those who don't possess a fraction of his humanity and compassion. Without a shadow of doubt low living, even insecurity, is better than slavery. But who has made low living and Christianity interdependent? Is there a "natural" affinity between them, or only one created by Black Magic, by word-juggling and suggestion? Mr. Hopkinson, as an old Parliamentarian, can appreciate the fact that he has been handed a banner incapable of rallying anything but a party of dyspeptic misanthropes.

As those who have benefitted by the study of Social Credit text-books know (and this is a privilege open to *everyone*!) the truth about Socialism is just exactly *not* what Mr. Hopkinson has been forced to accept about it. It has no essential connection with the world of good houses, and trim gardens and bright fires that he finds himself almost in the position of having to condemn—all things that healthy mortals want immensely, if the price is not too high. Separated out (dis-associated) from the Gestapo-Ogpu-Snooper "conditions" of Socialism, which so properly shock him and are beginning to shock all decent Britons of *every* class, to which propaganda has so artfully attached them, the promised good standard of living for all is the only respectable part of the Socialist programme—*if it was realisable by that means*. But there is no natural, inevitable connection between the two, as Britain will prove to her great discomfort if she succumbs to all the prevalent "suggestions." On the contrary, Economic Democracy discloses the simple, technical fact that Socialism *can't* do it; not even in its own, mean-spirited, rabbit-warren terms.

The reality of Socialism, if Socialism *is* anything, if it can be *located* in anything, is just Fear—doubt, dis-belief, lack of confidence. It consists, if at all, in the abject timidity of the spirit that animates it—a spirit much too fearful to adopt any method capable of achieving "the abundant life" in *any* direction. If Mr. Hopkinson could see Socialism like that, it would surely help him to a clearer picture of Christianity—its opposite "number." Not a "low standard of living," then, opposed (at what a disadvantage!) to a "high standard"; but just, *not Fear*,—in short courage, confidence in "nature." Belief in one's own and one's neighbour's ability, when it is not being monkeyed with by propagandists, and interfered with by planners, and regulated by Government officials, voluntarily to produce and consume as much as is wanted. What we call Social Credit, in fact!

How long, one wonders, will it be before a sufficient body of experienced men of Mr. Hopkinson's calibre and character, of which the British Empire must have plenty in *every* grade of society; straightforward, and possessing what might be called "the Christian touch," reach his point of mental freedom from the mass hypnotism that paralyses the world to-day, and begin to "feel after" the truth that what we term Christianity is not just a moral code; a theory that it gives every Britisher a pain in his vitals to mention in public, but (with all deference to the Archbishop of Canterbury) the most perfect social technique ever devised; and surprisingly modern and Anglo-Saxon in spirit, even though it was propounded nearly two thousand years ago, and in Palestine.

N.F.W.

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. 17. *Saturday, January* 2, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Yes, Clarence we were wont to dabble in monetary reform, but after reading *A Twentieth Century Economic System* as expounded by *The Times,* we realise that "Our pleasant vices are now the whips wherewith to scourge us."

We cower under the threatened final insult that "*Social Credit has come.*"

• • •

The Nineteenth Century Economic System was never able to prevent the individual getting slight and accidental shares in the increment of association by means of lower prices. But Lord Sempill and his merry concert party have found a scheme. Every time you think you see a bit coming your way—presto! it's gone into slum clearance. And *what* a lot of slums the Ministry of Works and Planning are Planning.

Twopence-halfpenny stamps for ever. You lose three-quarters of your income in taxes to pay the last American War Debt, and seven-eighths of the rest in insuring that while prices can go up they can never come down.

If Lord Sempill isn't made a Duke, it won't be because Israel Moses Sieff wouldn't do all he could to help.

• • •

It is becoming more certain daily that "monetary reform" is one of the most dangerous threats that face the hag-ridden Briton. As a mechanism for enthroning in something close to impregnability an omnipotent Financial Bureaucracy, "Lord Sempill's" Scheme deserves high marks. We have very little doubt that its ancestry runs straight back to the first Lord Melchett, Ludwig Mond and Rufus Isaacs, Marquis of Reading, with a little varnish from the Economic Reform Club.

• • •

"The German attack upon Russia, which had begun on May 1, 1915, continued all this year well into September, by which date the Russians had been driven out of Poland, Courland, and the best part of Galicia. The Russians fought gloriously, often almost without arms, but were overwhelmed by the superior leading, organisation and armament of the enemy."

— GENERAL REPINGTON: *The First World War,* 1914-1918.

Major Douglas on Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Report

(From the "Scotsman," December 19.)

The following letter appeared in the *Scotsman* of December 19:—

"Sir,

"It is not necessary to analyse in detail the report on this subject which has just been issued and which Mr. Thomas Johnston states is accepted 'in its general conclusions by the Government,' to recognise that 'the Government' has learnt nothing, and forgotten nothing.

"By way of bringing into relief the real issue—perhaps the main issue before the world—perhaps I may quote:

" 'In the year 1859, three events took place which were to be the crystallisation of our own century's beliefs. Darwin's MS *The Origin of Species* was accepted by a London publisher. Karl Marx published *The Critique of Political Economy.* Richard Wagner completed *Tristan and Isolde.* On three fronts, this trinity of remarkable men presented the idea of mechanical materialism which prevails in our thinking, to-day. The Darwinian, Marxian, and Wagnerian world which resulted from this doctrine was alien, cold and uncomfortable. The individual had no value in the scheme of things. His feelings were illusory, his will was powerless. Everything in the Universe was reduced to material fact.' — M. JACQUES BARZUN.

"Under a thin veneer of park-preservation, the report exhibits the implacable determination of the international 'Capitalist' (the 'Big Idea') to press forward the industrialised structure of the world in the teeth of any or all opposition. 'No vested interests will be allowed to intervene to delay'—this vested interest. That is a clear challenge. Is there anyone in Scotland who will answer it?—I am, &c.

— C. H. DOUGLAS."

The "Glasgow Herald" and Mr. McKenna

The following letter was sent to the *Glasgow Herald* in reference to a letter which might be construed as meaning that Mr. McKenna refuted some of the arguments submitted by Major Douglas to the Macmillan Committee.

It was not published:—

Sir,

My attention has just be drawn to a letter in your issue of December 1 in the course of which the writer, Mr. George Blatch, remarks "every loan made by a bank is a loan of cash, as was made clear by Mr. McKenna in his cross-examination of Major Douglas before the Macmillan Committee. . . . ."

I am still a little puzzled to understand why anyone takes the trouble to argue on this subject—there is no difference of opinion in responsible circles about it. The matter is put in perhaps its shortest form in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* in the words "Banks create the means of payment out of nothing."

All Mr. McKenna did in the passage referred to by your correspondent was to insist that these credits created out of nothing should be called "cash." A good deal of his argument seemed, not only to me but to members of the Committee, to traverse his own speeches, in which he repeatedly used the phrase "Every loan *creates* a deposit, and the repayment of every loan *destroys* a deposit." I might refer anyone who has any doubts on the matter to the very simple mathematical proof in Section 13 of my Argument. This is followed by the remark, "It would, perhaps, be misleading to describe this ingenious process as wholesale counterfeiting, as since the Bank Act of 1928, the State has resigned its sovereign rights over Finance in favour of the international private organisation known as the Bank of England."

If by "cash" your correspondent means "legal tender" then his statement is certainly incorrect.

I am, etc.,

C. H. DOUGLAS.

TALMUD

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.*

At a time when Chinese thought had for centuries been safely chained to the Doctrine of Social Status the Jews were settling in small, closely knit communities along the Mediterranean round which were built what later became the chief cities of the Roman Empire. The Diaspora, the dispersal of the seed of Judah, had begun in earnest and the Roman Empire appears to have initiated in the West that system of government by Law and Finance which is associated with cities, secrecy and Jews. The numerous Jews, of whom Josephus is perhaps the best known to posterity (although the category might include the Jewish mistresses of Roman Emperors and Generals), occupying key positions in the administration of Roman Law, and, which is far more important, the similarities between the 'books of rules' according to which the Jewish, and the Roman populations were governed, afford evidence of such an assumption. The close connection between Talmudic, Syrian and Roman Law, the last of which is still officially considered the parent of European Law, has been shown by Mr. S. Rubin*; and Mr. Roth, the historian, is of opinion† that "it is indisputable that the parallels between European and Talmudic law go beyond a few vague general principles." Let us first examine some of the general principles of Talmudic law.

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which is edited in Chicago, and ought to know, informs us that "the Talmud is still the authoritative and practical guide of the great masses of the Jews," a statement which is all the more interesting when one considers that the mass of the Jewish people are led by 'guides' who deem it necessary "that the Rabbinical ruling should be authenticated by its association with older authority.... [with the result that] anonymous writings were attributed to famous names, and traditions were judged—as in Islam—not so much upon their merits as by the chain of authorities which traced them back to their sources."‡

While the scientific value of the chain-of-authority method is questionable, any intelligent graduate of Law, Economics, History, *etc.*, of any University anywhere will acknowledge its usefulness in keeping questioning minds from losing themselves along slippery by-paths of giddy exploration, and the bias which is often noticeable in minds so trained is amply counterbalanced by a feeling of aloof superiority which is an indispensable asset for people who want to get on in a world of ever increasing demand for diplomas and licences. We recall Lord Haldane's remark that Sir Ernest Cassel financed the London School of Economics to "train the bureaucrats of the future Socialist State."

The effect on the Jewish people of the legislation framed by the chain of legal authorities from Moses to Ezra would appear to have been much the same. In the foreword to his *Everyman's Talmud* the Rev. Dr. Abraham Cohen writes that the policy of Ezra was to keep the Jew distinct "not merely by a creed, but by a mode of living.... even in the common acts of daily life there would be distinguishing features which would constantly recall his Jewishness. His life in every detail was to be controlled by the Torah."

At the opening of our Era there were two schools of legal thought, or 'parties,' contending for supremacy among the Jews: the Sadducees, adhering strictly, and contentedly, to the Mosaic Law can be likened to our Conservatives, while the Pharisees, who pretended to be modern and interpreted the law to suit their needs with the result that their interpretations produced still more 'law,' can be compared to our Socialists. They were of course directed from the same source, and furthered identical policies. Jesus made no distinction between them. Mr. Lionel Curtis, a lifelong supporter of 'Federalism,' in describing Jesus's conflict with Judaism writes:

"Unlike Paul thirty years later, he refrained from any attempt to conciliate the Pharisees or enlist their support in his struggle with the priests. Their blind attachment to the principle of authority and the rigid legalism of their scribes was a worse, because less obvious, evil than the greed and corruption of the hierarchy".... "The Sadduccees at any rate were content with those [rules] embodied in the law which Moses was held to have received from God. But the Pharisee scribes had deduced from the written code a body of minute and trivial rules, which people were taught to regard as their necessary guide in every detail of life. The system is one which destroys all power of initiative and capacity for accepting responsibility in those who live under it."

Dr. Cohen, on the other hand, feels that the Sadducean method of interpreting the original Mosaic injunctions to fit a present case has "served a vital purpose, which was to make the Torah a practical guide of life of everlasting validity. The Torah could never grow old as long as it was capable of *re-interpretation to comply with new contingencies.*"

His chapters on Jurisprudence show that there was no contingency in the daily life of the Jew to which the Talmud did not provide a card-index answer. It has been pointed out that the Talmud contains everything *except* an index, and as the original consisted of some 12 volumes it is clear that what we would call a 'higher' education was necessary to train the men who were to have all the answers at their fingers' end. From the welter of Rabbinical dicta I shall only cite one which will indicate the policy served by the mechanism of Talmudic prescriptions:

"He who is good towards God and his fellow-men is the righteous man who is good. He who is good towards God and evil towards his fellow-men is a righteous man who is not good."

The policy is obviously one of division and points straight to the central doctrine of Judaism: the Unity of God. For a definition of Judaism let us turn to the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*:

"Judaism is above all the religion of pure monotheism .... Judaism protested at all times against any infringement of its pure monotheistic doctrine".... "Indeed every contact

Das Talmudische Recht, published 1936 or 1937 in Germany. For reference to this work see the *University of Toronto Law Journal,* Lent 1941.

†CECIL ROTH: *Jewish Contribution to Civilisation.*

‡*Encyclopaedia Britannica*: 'Talmud.'

with other systems of thought or belief served only to put Judaism on its guard lest the spirituality of God be marred by ascribing to him human forms."

We have already touched upon the division between man (material) and God (spiritual). Quite easily the idea of the One-ness of God, which Louis Golding in his fevered apologia* calls the great contribution of the Jews to Mankind, leads to the 'separateness' of God. God is as high above, and separate from man, as God's Chosen people is superior to, and separate from, the rest of the world. The *Jewish Encyclopaedia* says: "God is one, and so should Israel of all nations be the one vouching for his pure worship .... as soon as the Jewish people were scattered among the nations and thereby found opportunity of drawing comparisons between other beliefs and their own, it was inevitable that they should be so impressed with the superiority of their own faith as to look forward with perfect confidence to its ultimate triumph, like Abraham, conscious of their mission to proclaim the only God everywhere."†

From monotheism to monarchy, in the sense of centralised government, there is but a step. The 'God' who demanded that his word, the Law, be promulgated by means of the sword (war being compulsory against certain neighbouring tribes) quite naturally delegated his power to a leading swordsman, his Anointed One, the Monarch to whom all had to bow down.

The worship of the one and only God resulted in a "rigid intolerance toward every form or snare of idolatry" which became "the characteristic feature of the rabbinical law"‡ and endless persecutions were the result. Moses's whole-sale slaughter of the dissenting clique who preferred to dance round the Golden Bull, encouraged, so it seems, by the brother of the prophet, to dancing to the pipe of Moses, whether it is considered to be a historical fact or a myth, is at least highly indicative of the methods and temper of the hierarchy. At the same time the blind obedience to the 'Leader' which is stressed time and again in the Talmud involved the Jews, as all other people who have rendered up their destiny unconditionally to an outside authority, in constant warfare. All of which provided the necessary atmosphere in which people would accept the sacrifice of freedom and leisure and privacy: "The more we are together the sooner we shall win." The next thing to aim at is, as we know, to make this barracks-existence appear so attractive as to transform it into a 'peace-aim.' Dr. Cohen maintains that the desirability of companionship is constantly stressed in the Talmud, and quotes the text:

"Hence it is declared: a man should acquire a friend for himself, to study the Mishna with him, eat with him, drink with him, and disclose his secrets to him (*Sifre Deut.* para. 305)," and "Either companionship, or death (*Taan* 23a)."

I have written that a belief in one God, and One Monarch, results in mass-life; but at the same time one might say that mass-life is necessary for a continued belief in the absolute ruler, the philosophy (Judaism) and the policy (Slave-state) inter-acting upon each other. In the mass-life of large cities each 'unit of the mass' feels small and helpless* and they naturally feel that if anybody is to rule effectively he must be a really big guy and be given really big powers. It is invariably the majority of the masses of big cities who vote absolute leaders into powers. "Majority is only a specialised and deceptive word for the *Fuehrerprinzip*."†

Mass-life further conditions people to accept a mass, or collectivist faith, just as a collectivist faith, like Judaism, helps people to be content with life in the mass. All the main temples of Judaism are built in, or near, the centres of large cities. Any reference book on Jewish theology contains innumerable statements to the effect that Judaism conceives of Israel as being more important than the individual Israelite. The *Jewish Chronicle* has written:—

"Judaism just in this respect so different from Christianity, has always paid less regard for the individual than for the congregation, less for an individual soul than for the soul of all our people."‡

The leaders of the synagogue saw to it that there should always be ample opportunity for their co-religionists to 'descend to meet' and in this they were greatly helped by the all-important doctrine of the Sanctity of Labour. When we are not at *war together*, we can at least *work in common*. In modern prolonged 'states of war' we call it *war-work*. Even the Quakers will do it.

Throughout Talmudic literature the Rabbis stress the virtue of Labour with a capital L. "Great is work, for it honours the workmen" (*Ned.* 49b), and upon this theme a good many love-work homilies are preached. There are no lack of practical hints for the cure of unemployment. We meet the Rabbinical admonitions in the letters of Saul, their disciple: "If a man does not work...." which again paved the way for the common belief that the curse of Genesis "In the sweat of thy brow—" is to be regarded as a blessing in disguise. Note the chronology: Talmud, Epistles, 'Old' Testament, which I think is correct when it is remembered first that there is no manuscript of the 'Old' Testament before the tenth century (the Talmud of Jerusalem is said to have been completed about 350 A.D.) and, what is more to our purpose, that the effects of Paul's 'Christianity' were widely felt one thousand years before Christendom at large became acquainted with the contents of the Jewish Bible through the kind services of the Reformers, all of whom shared a predeliction for the Epistles of Paul. Many of the Reformers took lessons in Hebrew with famous Rabbis from whom they may also have learnt the art of keeping their 'flocks' busy and safe from sin:

"The Happy Medium advocated for the ordinary man was: 'If a man learns two paragraphs of the Law in the morning, and two in the evening and is engaged in his work all day, it is ascribed to him as though he had fulfilled the Torah in its entirety.'" (*Tanchum Bashallach* para. 20).

If for the Torah you read the Daily Press, whose preoccupation with bombs, murders, rapes and monetary double-dealings vividly brings back the atmosphere of the Talmud, it will be seen to what an extent the Masters of the Cabbala have succeeded in making the Gentile world conform to that

*LOUIS GOLDING: *The Jewish Problem*, Penguin books, 6d.
†The article on Judaism also contains this passage: "Judaism at the very outset was a declaration of war against all other Gods: 'Against all the Gods of Egypt I will execute judgement: I am the Lord.'"
‡*Jewish Encyclopaedia.*

*"We are so small, we cannot do anything," said the Germans who do not like Hitler but felt powerless to act. *Vide. Into the Darkness* by LOTHROP STODDARD.
†C. H. DOUGLAS: *The Big Idea.*
‡Quoted by WARREN WESTON in *Father of Lies*, p. 169.

'happy medium' which, judging by results, seems a most effective means of keeping men and women 'ordinary.'

The relationship between master and workman were regulated by such a wealth of Rabbinical rules and regulations that masters as well as men would continually come running to the Rabbis for advice and decision about controversial points. The standing question was ever "Is that the Law?" and the Rabbis would settle the point by answering, "It is written—." We hear this same question re-echoing down the centuries in the civil courts of Europe (Shylock: "Is that in the Bond?"); we hear it in the 'independent' courts of the Medieval Guilds and in our 'modern' masters-*versus*-men squabbles, which have done so much to embitter both parties, sabotage production, and obscure the identity of the real mischief-makers. We have noticed that there are Jews among the secretaries of Labour lodges and in other key positions in the administration of the political machinery of 'Labour.' Marx was the descendant of a long line of Rabbis, and the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* points out that his economic theories "suggest by their subtle analysis an inherited Talmudic bent."

The Talmud is a vast collection of Rabbinical interpretations of the Mosaic Code, which, as Mr. Alfred Nossig points out in his *Integral Judaism*, is the original programme of restriction and sabotage on which the Socialists model their legislation: "Socialism and the Mosaic code are programmes which are not at all in opposition. Between the fundamental ideas of the two doctrines there is, on the contrary, a striking agreement".... "The two parallel ideas will be realised by following the same road."

Mr. Hyndman, who was a Jew and looked like a Rabbi, was the founder of the first political organisation in England that followed the Mosaic 'thou-shalt-not' road of restriction by law. Mr. Ernest Bevin, an unskilled worker and Trade Union official, who has had the 'once over' by Wall Street before becoming British Minister of Labour, is undisguisedly irritated by people who prevent him from 'putting his social philosophy' in practice. He is the declared enemy of the rentier class ('leisure') and personal initiative. Thanks to the spade work done by Mr. Bevin and other legalists of the trade-union hierarchy, 'New York,' as represented by Mr. Winant of the International Labour Office, can congratulate themselves on having got the British working men as completely and helplessly at the mercy of the 'law' as were their medieval forebears of the Guild trusts, or the Jewish labourers of the Talmudic community in which Paul, the Patron Saint of Bureaucratic Socialism, was born and bred.

Centralising Power in Australia

On December 2 the Constitutional Convention in Australia adopted a Bill recommended unanimously by the drafting committee, for the centralisation of 14 specific powers.

The Bill provides that the State shall transfer to the Commonwealth the powers to legislate for the purposes of post-war reconstruction for five years after the cessation of hostilities respecting the conditions of service men and the dependents of those who are killed or disabled; employment and unemployment; the organised marketing of commodities; the codifying of company law and the law regulating trusts, combines and monopolies profiteering and prices (exclusive of prices or rates charged by the State of semi-Governmental or local governing authorities for goods and services); production (other than primary) and the distribution of goods with the consent of the State Executive Council; primary production (provided no legislation under this paragraph shall discriminate between the States); control of overseas exchange; overseas investments and the regulation of the raising of money in accordance with such plans as the Australian Loan Council approves; air transport; the uniformity of railway gauges; national works (provided that the consent of the State Executive Council shall be obtained before each work is undertaken and that it is carried out in cooperation with the State) national health in cooperation with the State; family allowances; and people belonging to the aboriginal race.

The Bill stipulates that it may be repealed or amended only with the approval of the electors of the State Legislative Assembly. It is provided that in the execution of legislation under the transferred powers the Commonwealth shall, so far as is reasonably practicable, invoke the assistance of State officers and authorities.

The Bill will not go into operation until it is passed by all the State Parliaments, where the respective Premiers have agreed to introduce it before the end of January. There has been considerable opposition in the States to the ceding of such powers to the Commonwealth.

A correspondent writes: —

"A few weeks ago the Australian Newsletter—a cyclostyled paper issued to the Forces over here—contained the following: '....Some of the delegates to the conference objected to the proposed grant of power as being too vague, but Dr. Evatt said it followed closely the language of the Atlantic Charter, which not only Britain and the United States, but also Australia, were bound to carry into effect.'

"The conference was one of State Premiers *etc.*, considering the proposal that the Federal Government should retain certain of its war-time powers after the war. In the first place the proposal was to hold a referendum on the matter, but the Federal Government wants to avoid this, and hopes to do so by getting the States to pass the necessary legislation giving up their powers. Some of the powers proposed are those that have already been refused to the Federal Government in previous referenda.

"The Labour Party, the Opposition at the beginning of the war, was most alarmed by the 'Fascist-like' powers that the then Government wanted for the conduct of the war, and it succeeded in reducing the post-war terms of those powers from, I think, one year to six months. Having since then become the Government, the Labour Party has inherited those powers. 'Power corrupts....'

"Incidentally, the attack which Curtin launched on Britain, when he wanted to 'cut the strings' and re-tie them to America has been a plank in the Labour Party for very many years."

Easier to become a "Briton"?

Under the existing law a man may be a British subject either because he was born such or because he has acquired a certificate of naturalisation, in which case he has the same

full rights of a natural-born British subject. Broadly, we base British nationality on a territorial test rather than on a test of descent: if a man was born within the areas governed by the British Crown he is a British subject at birth. The full operation of this rule is modified in some cases: for instance there is a statutory provision that even if an individual was born abroad, if his father was born on British soil he also is a British subject.

The British Nationality and Status of Aliens Bill, which received its second reading in the House of Lords on December 8, modifies the existing law in several not unimportant directions.

In 1922 it was provided that by registration of his birth at the appropriate Consulate a child, though born abroad, if of a British father, could acquire British nationality. The precise conditions of time and place laid down in this Act were found in practice to be unduly severe, and Clause 1 of the new Bill gives more latitude for such registration.

Clause 2 of the Bill secures that the child born to a British father in the British Protectorates, which are not in the fullest sense British territory, shall be in the same position as a child born in a British colony.

Clause 3 amends the wording of the existing law so that the meaning is clearer.

Under the general law, in normal cases, certificates of naturalisation are only granted to suitable applicants if they have spent five years out of the last eight in British territory and have resided for the last twelve months in the United Kingdom. Service under the Crown abroad, whether in a military or a civil capacity, is treated as though it were, for this purpose, residence in the United Kingdom. Analagous regulations apply to naturalisation of applicants to the different Colonies. Now Clause 4 of the new Bill provides a special power to grant certificates of naturalisation to French nationals, if they desire it, if they are serving in His Majesty's Forces, without these conditions of residence *etc.* It applies only to French citizens serving in the British Forces, and they must satisfy the usual conditions with regard to character and so on. In introducing the Bill the Lord Chancellor commented that this clause was the fulfilment of a promise made by the Prime Minister on July 4, 1940, soon after the French collapse. It concerned about 500 people and would not, of course, affect the position of the Frenchmen who are fighting in French units.

Clause 5 provides that certificates of naturalisation granted under laws of the Dominions in consideration of services rendered at any time during the present war period in connection with the prosecution of the war shall be treated in this country as equivalent to the grant of a certificate of naturalisation in this country.

There was little discussion of the Bill (which has not yet been to the Commons) at the second reading, but Lord Wedgwood rose to remark on its omissions. He thought that as well as French citizens all Jews of foreign countries should be included under Clause 4. Lord Strabolgi wanted to know how Clause 2 would affect the position of Palestinians. The Lord Chancellor replied that it did not affect Palestinians as such, but it would apply to the children born in Palestine of British subjects.

132

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: December 16, 1942.

ADJOURNMENT: WAR FINANCE AND BORROWING POLICY

Referring to the Debate on War Finance and Borrowing Policy two days before it took place, a provincial paper stated that some M.P.s "are inclined to some of the ideas of Douglas Social Credit." During the debate a good many points of monetary reform were conceded, but the following series of extracts on subjects of policy not directly connected with finance show how unimportant to the final issue such concessions are:—

Mr. Pethick-Lawrence (Edinburgh, East): ....If we can avoid both these extremes of inflation and deflation, then, with the power of production freed from the constricting Bed of Procrustes imposed upon it in days past by the gold standard, and with a wise national policy in foreign imperial and domestic affairs, we shall be able to have full employment and use to the utmost the knowledge and technique which have been acquired during the twentieth century....

Mr. Woodburn (Stirling and Clackmannan, Eastern): ....What is to be the solution? It is that we must expand public enterprise to take up the lead. If we leave men and women standing and wasting their lives, that is wasting something which can never be recovered. The purpose of the financial policy of this country after the war should be to direct the labour of those employable men and women into channels that will produce the things that this country and its people need....

Mr. Graham White (Birkenhead): ....I am not one of those who take a pessimistic view with regard to post-war problems, but it depends entirely on seeing our problems as a whole and upon our abandoning the idea that everything that can be done is done without very hard work. Members have made reference to the Beveridge Report and to various other aspects of reconstruction.... measures of international co-operation and a policy of full employment....

Mr. Craven Ellis (Southampton): ....I feel strongly that the future prosperity of the country and the basis of full employment of the people is dependent upon some reform of our monetary and financial systems....

Mr. Hely-Hutchinson (Hastings): ....Broadly speaking the Government deserve the greatest credit for their financial policy up to the present time. Their measures should be judged as a whole, and upon the success of the physical controls, rather than solely upon immediate financial results.

Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne (Kidderminster): ....It is men and women, with their power to consume as well as to produce, who can give us real prosperity. That is why I am all in favour of these social schemes provided that there is a proper financial policy capable of dealing with them. But it is no use giving the people in this country an idea that these proposals can be put into operation until we have decided, in consultation with others, what our policy is to be....

"Carthorse Conditions for All"

Some copies of *The Social Crediter* for December 19, the issue devoted to the Beveridge report, are still available at reduced prices.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.