

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 2.

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

INDIA: THE REASON WHY

By GUY N. ANDREWS

(The following article, written in 1934, is published here because of its interest as an individual expression of opinion by an observer for many years a member of the European community in India in close touch with the chief actors, official and unofficial, in Indian affairs. The writer's opinion, that the Jews might be enlisted in a world-wide movement to destroy the power of the Kahal is the only one of a general nature from which those entrusted with the direction of this paper would dissent, relatively small matters of emphasis apart. A considerable mass of evidence in support of statements concerning the course of events in India up to the time the article was written has been made available to us by Mr. Andrews.)

No unbiased person knowing India could or would object to the country being ruled by Indians trained in the art of administration and of proved loyalty, ability and integrity. Indeed there are Indians who would make far better Governors or even Viceroys than the political schemers, dreamers and figure-heads who have helped to misgovern the land during the last twenty five years.

What the overwhelming majority of educated, intelligent persons, both European and Indian are opposed to is the Parliamentary system, a system that even an old stager like Mr. Churchill has described as "inefficiency, nepotism and corruption" and under which the welfare of the country will pass into the hands of incompetent men and others who are admittedly out to destroy our Indian Empire.

To even a casual observer it will be obvious that under the Parliamentary system the only requisite qualifications for a Minister besides the ability to speak in public are that he must be plausible and utterly unscrupulous. No knowledge is necessary of the subject he is called upon to handle. If the electorate were to have pointed out to them the absurdity of this form of government whereby these Ministers supported by human voting machines masquerade as the country's rulers the constitution would break down even in Great Britain because no one but the Liberal Jew or a lunatic would go to the Poll and this would soon be noticed and forcibly stopped.

With regard to the Jews. I am one of those who consider the Jews more "sinned against than sinning:" nevertheless it is obvious that they must be strongly opposed both on religious and racial grounds. Religious, because in the Talmud we have a criminal anti-Christian doctrine in which every Jew is well grounded. Racial, because religion is the basis of racial character, racial unity and ultimately, race itself. In my opinion an internationally assimilated Jewry purged of the Talmud and freed from the diabolical control of the Kahal would be an incalculable power for good and

the best safe-guard for the future peace and prosperity of the world that we could possibly have. Incidentally I am convinced that the majority of those aliens of international and uncertain origin who keep our criminal Courts busy and who are responsible for the deterioration of our National life in the social, political and economic sphere have no right to call themselves Jews.

The primary objective of this article is to rouse the alarm and secure the intervention of the members of the Royal Family and Court since the occult forces now dictating our India policy and which nothing short of annihilation can turn aside are identical with those which achieved the downfall of the Russian Empire and the murder of the Russian Royal Family. Their ultimate triumph 'as will be noted involves the destruction of every Monarchy in Europe as well as Western (Christian) civilisation itself.

Anyone interested in politics whether they know India or not is by now thoroughly mystified and confused by the situation: On the one hand we have the India Defence League and a section of the Press stating the true, plain facts, while pitted against them is another equally representative organisation (U.B.I.*) and an even more powerful section of the Press voicing half-truths or deliberate mis-statements. The B.B.C. whilst withholding the same facilities to experienced members of the India Defence League permit a clergyman of the Church of England to broadcast his views, not as a disciple of Christ having the welfare of the masses at heart but on his own admission as an ally of seditionists and revolutionaries. Through the same medium we are permitted to listen to M.P.s such as Messrs. Isaac Foot and Lansbury, whose ignorance would be comic were it not so tragic, while in between times Government spokesmen betray their insincerity and the Conservative party threatens to be completely disrupted.

What is one to make of it all? What is the cause of this dissension? The answer can be summed up in five words, Fabianism alias Zionism alias Bolshevism!

If instead of a political controversy the India question were to be made a legal issue and the case for and against democracy, sifted and argued by eminent counsel in a Court of Law before an average British jury there is no doubt whatever that the Government and their supporters would lose their case.

Lord Reading and Sir John Simon if consulted in their legal capacity would be compelled to uphold this assertion. Why then, readers will ask, are they supporting or even sponsoring these proposals for a democratic form of Constitution? The answer again is the same *viz.*, Zionism and

*"Union of Britain and India" Association.

its subsidiaries.

Indeed before we go any further it may be stated frankly that were the whole story to be related of Zionist intrigue and treachery, with all its deplorable effects on the welfare of the Indian and British peoples, some of our leading statesmen, might find themselves the victims of mob law.

In 1930 I suppose I was typical of the average business man nearing the end of his residence in India. During my twenty-five years service I had become acquainted with almost every district throughout the country both before and after the War and could not help but notice the growth of unrest, and the deterioration in the government and public services as well as the increased taxation that had taken and was still taking place as a result of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms and premature Indianisation. Nevertheless I re-regarded it as none of my concern. I had my work to do and politics was a dirty business anyway, also I should soon be out of the country. If the government were bent on making fools of themselves who was to stop them? The country was certainly drifting into a state of anarchy and chaos under the rule of Lord Irwin but we British, in Calcutta at any rate, were, because of our numbers, quite safe.

This then was my attitude, the attitude I venture to say of all but a minute percentage of the unofficial Britons in India at the present time. It never for an instant occurred to me that there might be an evil power at work guiding our disastrous policy until one day I made a discovery.

This discovery was that the European Association, a political organisation to which I belonged as a matter of form, were on their own responsibility going to support the Simon Commission's recommendations for an extension of "democracy."

These recommendations by general consent were so at variance with genuine British opinion and so opposed to common sense that I then and there decided to stage a protest movement.

Without going into details which can be gleaned from the back files of the Indian newspapers I may mention that in less than a fortnight a small group with which I became associated roused the greatest political enthusiasm that according to the Press reports had been shown in India since the Ilbert Bill. This culminated in three crowded enthusiastic meetings, the first one independent, when views on the subject of democracy for India were freely ventilated; the other two held under the auspices of the European Association when the same views were cunningly side-tracked by the political machine. I began to think then that if misrepresentation could be achieved so easily on a small scale it could be accomplished in the Mother of Parliaments as well and that under the circumstances "self-determination" and "the will of the people" were simply a myth.

After these meetings and as a result of a number of sinister occurrences I came to the conclusion that there were hidden forces at work that were determined to stifle or misrepresent genuine views at all costs and that the influence was unquestionably Jewish.

At the first opportunity therefore I expressed this opinion in public. The effect was rather like that of overturning a bee-hive and I realised that not only had I scored a bull's eye (confirmed shortly after by Lord Reading's *volte face* at the Round Table Conference) but that, politically-speaking, I was finished.

Nevertheless being by this time thoroughly intrigued I

decided to find out more about these forces and their motive in regard to India with a view to exposing and if possible defeating them.

The relation of my intensive efforts and investigations would fill a book and there is no space to set them down here. I will only state that whenever and wherever I dipped down deep enough I always discovered the same influences and usually Lord Reading.

It is now of course common knowledge amongst the well-informed that he is responsible for the present proposals concerning India although one may search in vain through the columns of the daily press for any notification of this.

What most people are in ignorance of is the motive for these extraordinary proposals and this is where my investigations are of interest and I trust, of value.

There appear to be two motives one of which has been cunningly suggested to pave the way to the achievement of the other. First there is a scheme to gain control of the country through the Legislatures by an alliance of Indian and International financial interests with some of the leading Princes whereby the latter as well as certain captains of industry have been hoodwinked. This is the only intelligent explanation for the grotesque Communal Award and fantastic extension of the franchise which will effectually place electioneering beyond the means of anyone not financially assisted. Behind this motive is the plan of the Zionists to achieve our destruction and their historic hope of World Empire by the severing through Congress of the Indo-British connection, and the occupation of India, China, etc., by Soviet Russia whose ideals be it remembered have the warmest support of our present Prime Minister (to mention only one member of the Cabinet) as well as several members of both Houses of Parliament.

To appreciate Lord Reading's (*i.e.*, the Government's) destructive proposals it is necessary to turn to the map for a moment. If we take a line from Aden through India to Singapore we have what is actually the strategic base of our Empire. Aden covers the Red Sea and the Suez Canal; India the advanced bases of the Persian Gulf and Burma; Singapore covers Australia. It is common knowledge that our Navy is largely dependent on foreign oil. With the loss of the Persian oil-fields and a hostile Russia it would be difficult to find enough fuel to enable our fleet to put to sea. Without adequate protection by our Navy our food supplies would diminish and eventually we should either have to cave in or starve.

But, readers will ask, even admitting Zionist Jews control Russia and exercise considerable influence over our own Government why should they want to smash us up? To answer this question it is necessary to give a short description of the medium through which Lord Reading wields his power. I refer to the Jewish organisation known as the Kahal, the central governing authority of Judea, of which he is the principal agent in Great Britain.

This, the secret organisation of the most formidable sect in the world, appears to date back to the dawn of history. It was possibly introduced originally to enable the nomadic Israelites principally through the medium of Usury and Self-Governing institutions to establish control over and destroy if desired, those nations with which they came in contact during their wanderings, Egypt probably being the first victim. Subsequently it has been utilised for the purpose of world conquest.

Although its ramifications are of necessity world wide

and stupendous the central directorate or governing body, presided over by a supreme chief, consists of probably not more than 24 members or Elders (the elect of Israel or "Builders," hence Masonry), on whom the onus falls for the effective carrying on of a (believed) Divinely appointed mission. Every member of the Kahal is bound by the most solemn and sacred oath to persist with this mission and to ensure that positions once gained are never abandoned under the direst penalty. The headquarters are situated in America.

The motive governing the policy and actions of the Kahal is the attempted fulfilment of Scriptural prophecy based on the age-old Jewish belief that the Messiah or Messianic conditions will not be established until the Jews have obtained material domination over the whole world (*vide Genesis xlix v. 10*).

The scheme of this sect for world-domination and their machinations which they are now making little effort to conceal may be ascertained from a publication entitled *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (Britons Publishing Society, 40, Great Ormond Street, London, W.C.). There has been considerable litigation and dispute concerning the origin and authenticity of the Protocols and publication has been suppressed in America by Jewish influence but I do not propose to discuss the arguments of the disputants here. All that I am concerned with is the contents of the publication mentioned above which are mainly the translation of a book published in Russia in 1905 a copy of which was lodged with the British Museum on August 10, 1906.

These contents are of vital importance since not only do they include a ruthless exposure and scathing indictment of our Parliamentary rule and financial system but reflect and explain present day happenings as well as Lord Reading's sinister actions and proposals in regard to India. They also disclose the final objective for which the sect are working.

The main unchallengeable theses of the Zionist Elders are:—

- (1) For the successful administration of a nation there must be a supreme ruler skilled and trained in the art of administration.
- (2) The control of the money of a country means the control of the entire nation collectively and individually.
- (3) The control of publicity means the governing of opinion, national passions and votes.
- (4) That under the Parliamentary system they can by the aid of (2) and (3) always select men who will wittingly or unwittingly do their bidding.

Once control has been established on these lines nations can be rendered strong, weak or destroyed and through the medium of Pacts or Treaties wars between them generated at will.

A close study of genuine world history would no doubt indicate that all the great nations and empires of the past have met their fates at the hands of the Kahal and the destiny of Britain and her Empire is inevitably sealed unless effective action is taken to destroy this power.

Effective action would involve the recognition and adoption of truly interpreted Christian principles in respect to our social, political and economic life. This however necessitates publicity which to-day is completely in the hands of the Jews. The only remedy therefore is to enlighten the Jews, the majority of whom even including Zionists are I am convinced, as ignorant of the true situation as the average Gentile, and with their aid form a world anti-Zionist movement which will effectually destroy the power of the Kahal. Only in this way can India and our Empire be saved and impending catastrophe averted.

INDIA

There seems no reason to doubt the accuracy of the following facts and estimations concerning India. They are taken from the monthly review of world affairs issued under the auspices of the Imperial Policy Group:—

Area 1,809,000 square miles.

POPULATION (approximately) 389,000,000 (1941) = three quarters of the British Empire. The Indian population increased by 36 millions in the decade ending 1941, and contains:—

Moslems, 95,000,000,

Depressed classes, 40,000,000,

Languages (apart from dialects) 225,

Engaged in agriculture and rural pursuits 65 per cent. of the population.

Literacy, 156 males per thousand; 29 females per thousand can read or write.

GOVERNMENT: The Congress Party formed majority ministries in the following provinces before 1939, when all the Congress Ministries resigned:—

Madras, United Provinces, Central Provinces, Bihar, Orissa, and Bombay.

Minority Ministries were formed in:—

The North-West Frontier Province and Assam.

Non-Congress ministries were formed in:—

Bengal, The Punjab and Sind.

Since 1939, governors have administered Madras, United Provinces, Central Provinces, Bihar, Bombay and The North-West Frontier Provinces.

Orissa was so administered until the end of 1941, when a non-Congress ministry was formed. The three non-Congress ministries of Bengal, the Punjab and Sind are still in existence and one was formed in Assam but this broke down in 1941. In every Congress-governed province there was a decline in administrative efficiency, least in Madras.



"Of the British *achievement* and American *interests* there is widespread ignorance" (in India). The Imperial Policy Group will forgive us for underlining so important a distinction.

Mr. Churchill's Brow

The distinct elevation arising from the left side of the Prime Minister's forehead, in the *Daily Telegraph's* photograph of Mr. Churchill and M. Stalin, on August 24, has been variously interpreted. The view that Mr. Churchill is developing the *petasos* of Hermes, which the learned Dr. Smith says was "a travelling hat with a broad brim, in later times adorned with two small wings" is contradicted by the total absence of a hat.

The Goods Standard

Sir,

I wish to correct, at the earliest moment, a statement I made in connection with my letter to the *Scotsman* of August 6, that it was sent to that paper, but was not published. It was, in fact, published *in extenso* in the *Scotsman* of August 8. I am quite at a loss to understand how it was missed in reading the paper of that date.

I am, etc.,

C. H. DOUGLAS.

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. 2.

Saturday, September 19, 1942.

HELP YOUR M.P.

"Totalitarianism in one or other of its forms." The appearance of this almost diagnostic phrase in an illustrated Sunday paper, with the suggestion that it is a disgusting but possible outcome of the war, goes with "The attack on all forms of liberty increases in intensity under cover of war needs [note: *under cover*], for there is a determined group of theorists at work." This admirably concise expression is *The National Review's*.

A lot of water has flowed under the bridges since October, 1936.

In that month Douglas delivered, at Liverpool, one of the last of the series of great addresses which brought us within hearing of the War.* It was a time when a supreme effort in response to the organisers of the Electoral Campaign *could* have directed the mighty forces now at work for the destruction of many centuries of effort into different channels from those which they now flood in spate.

The first Electoral Campaign came within measurable distance of success, and beyond question demonstrated both the soundness of the conception which underlay it and the feasibility of putting it into execution. Many honest Englishmen who now find themselves enmeshed in the network of corruption and intrigue elaborated to prevent our parliamentary and representative institutions from functioning in a way which the elector might justifiably call successful do not know what the Electoral Campaign was or that there has been such a thing. It was an opportunity for electors, irrespective of party and independent of individual opinion concerning technical methods, to bind members of parliament to a democratically chosen policy, which an overwhelming majority of electors regarded as a possible policy. In every area in which the campaign was properly tried out, the hopelessness and incredulity of the electorate about making the political machinery of the country work with satisfaction to themselves was turned, in a few months, to warm co-operation in a measure rapidly revitalising politics. Lord Strabolgi's emphatic commendation of it was not the only, or the most significant, welcome. Before the campaign was overborne, lorry drivers on long night journeys were leaving 'word at home' that an opportunity must be found for them to 'sign the pledge.' Parties, collected in constituencies where the campaign was being worked, lingered to ask when the canvassers were coming over to their constituencies, and 'couldn't they sign now?' They did (though not, of course, in Bloomsbury). The Press took a sudden interest in Social Credit. Wherever a meeting was announced (most meetings were superfluous) to encourage and advise workers in the

Campaign, the Chief Reporter came along, and half a column, a column, two columns appeared in the newspaper. The words "Social Credit" invariably appeared in the headlines, and there was rarely more than an oblique reference to the Electoral Campaign. The House of Commons knew all about it. The Party Caucuses knew all about it. M.P.s were on tip-toe. One was driven from his constituency during the life of Parliament. His successor got in by giving an ambiguous undertaking to carry out the wishes of his constituents, which was unfortunately and quite unnecessarily accepted by the campaign workers, who then, again quite unnecessarily, died, figuratively, as Judas did. M.P.s don't do that! The successful working of the campaign was carried into municipal politics and councillors with large majorities unseated.

What defeated the Campaign? It hasn't been defeated. In one form or another it is the only political weapon which is indestructible in the hands of the people. The first use of it was made ineffectual by "the determined opposition of the oligarchy which rules us to any effective financial reform." They made war inevitable and rearmament imperative, and, to ensure the length and severity of the first let us down on the second. They had an ally, Time. Now Time is on our side, possibly a bad Time too.

The only significant *forces* in politics are now outside Parliament—constructively significant forces. It is outside Parliament that ignorance of the Electoral Campaign is greatest. Even so, members of parliament are not all fools; nor are they all corrupt. That they are members of parliament at all may indicate that they have poor minds. To the poorest mind there may be, and doubtless are, a variety of paths. The trouble is that none of them stands up to heavy traffic. But the House of Commons, and to a still greater extent, the House of Lords, is displaying an unwonted aspect of wishing to do something beyond its competency, not beyond its legal competency, but beyond its collective executive competency. It is displaying, (though not in all quarters) ineptitude in the discharge of its consciously-apprehended function. It wants to control the Agenda, and it can't find out how to do it. Control of the Agenda is the first step to democratic representation: it isn't for themselves as M.P.s that some members of Parliament now want to control the Agenda. It is for what they call 'the country,' and they are not very far from realising that that means the people, not the trees. If they had learnt anything from the Electoral Campaign besides learning to fear it; they would not stand in any need of coaching.

"The fact is that it is the simplest matters that always form the subject of the most profound misunderstanding, and in regard to which the average individual is the most difficult to convince of any error in his belief." As between the discredited forces within Parliament and the growing force outside, one lacks one element in the trinity of ideas which organisation involves; the other another. Policy: Administrations: Sanctions. The Members of Parliament have sanctions, but do not know it; and would be afraid to use them if they did (the mark of the poor mind). The superior forces without have no sanctions and, from habit long ingrained, do not know how to embody a sanction. Their quality will be revealed by their demonstration of their power to learn. Upon both it should be pressed, in and out of season, that:—

"Although the idea may be repulsive to many who have not faced the realities of life, physical force is the

**The Tragedy of Human Effort.*

ultimate sanction of the physical world. Moral, intellectual, and emotional considerations unquestionably go to the determination of the use and direction of physical force, but, in the last resort, the last squadron of bombing aeroplanes will have its way when all the navies, armies, and aerial fleets of the world are destroyed, and in the last event the problem of sanctions is to obtain control of that last squadron.

"So far as the present* situation is concerned, the regular forces of the realm are the last sanctions of law and order within the realm, and law and order can be identified with the operation of the financial system as it exists at the present time. There is no serious financial reform which can be inaugurated within the framework of the present legal system, except by those in control of the existing financial system. There is no intention whatever on the part of those in control of the existing financial system to change that system to their disadvantage, and there is no effective change in the financial system which can be made without depriving its present controllers of their absolute power. I believe the foregoing statements to be axiomatic, and any form of strategy or argument which traverses any of them would certainly seem to me to be lacking in realism." T.J.

Social Credit Expansion Fund

The Social Credit Expansion Fund was instituted late in 1937 for the purpose which its name implies.

Expansion, apart from the steady growth which is the profit earned by the day to day service of all those in association with the Social Credit Secretariat, is a contingency towards the opportunity for which every Social Crediter looks forward with expectation and hope. No major opportunity for expansion has occurred since the institution of the Fund. Nor at any time since its inception would the Fund have provided the considerable necessary means for an operation of a truly expansive character. The requirement which it is desired to satisfy is availability, instantly, of means to meet a situation the details of which are unpredictable, as well as to provide for relatively small needs, expansive in direction, not a proper charge against the Social Credit Secretariat, which is, and is meant to be, self-supporting.

We should be ready for Expansion at all times, and more ready as the time for it approaches. A form for subscription is printed in this issue of *The Social Crediter*, and will be repeated at intervals. The Fund is "expended by the Administrators at the sole discretion of Major C. H. Douglas."

JEWISH BOARD OF DEPUTIES

D. I. Sandelson, a member of the Jewish Board of Deputies, writing in the *Jewish Chronicle*, exhorts members of the Board to rally to its support at its next meeting on September 15. "The T.A.C." (Trade Advisory Council) "succeeded in bringing dire misfortune on the Community. . . The present position of Anglo-Jewry must cause responsible Jews serious anxiety. . . How. . . are we to. . . ensure a unified policy which will represent the carefully thought-out and clearly expressed view of our people?" The writer complains of a "vast number" of "promiscuous organisations" among Anglo-Jewry, claiming to express views on policy, issue manifestoes and "not infrequently to make direct approaches to Government Departments"

*C. H. D., October, 1936.

The Untouched World of Reality

By B. M. PALMER

"Beyond the hideous fantastic world of compulsion built up by these power maniacs, still lies untouched the world of reality.

"In this real world, if man make the right associations, satisfactory results will flow to him."

Some years ago we said to one another, "Of course, in the Social Credit era, such and such abuses would not be tolerated," or even, "When Social Credit comes we shall do so and so," and thereafter we were mightily cheered and went home to a sound night's sleep.

It has occasioned some surprise in certain quarters that social crediters with any claim to the name no longer speak thus. As distinct from pure intellectualists and planners, they have come to realise that no one can live or work in the future, of which only the roots exist. Of these we can know something for they are to be found in ourselves, and in our fellows.

Closely connected with this is the realisation, also apparently confined to Social Crediters, that men do not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles. This is twofold, a grasp of the nature of the roots that are developing in the society of which we form a part, and at the same time a certain amount of concentration on grapes and figs. But whereas the power maniacs and intellectualists offer us intangible fruits of an imaginary future, fruits which have not yet existed and which they ask us to believe may be developed (a propertyless society, for instance), instead of bandying words it would be as well for us to concentrate even more intently on grapes and figs, in a really literal sense. We are the custodians of a way of life. If we can help to retain the British criterion during this maelstrom, it will be something. We can at least see that we as individuals hold our heads high. The story of the man who wore evening dress for dinner in the jungle is pathetically ridiculous to all who do not see the somewhat subtle point that he was determined not to forget the *taste* of grapes and figs. From this point of view the story has always seemed to me highly significant, and perhaps only a born Anglo-Saxon can grasp its full meaning.

After which little parable (which I define as a heavenly story with an earthly meaning), I think it will be appropriate to publish two Christmas recipes which I enjoyed in, I believe, 1910. These cakes were made by an old lady of seventy, a countrywoman of Oxfordshire, as part of her regular Christmas preparations:

CHRISTMAS CAKE

1 lb. butter.	
1 lb. brown sugar.	$\frac{1}{4}$ lb. almonds.
1 lb. flour.	$\frac{1}{4}$ lb. mixed peel.
$\frac{3}{4}$ lb. sultanas.	$\frac{1}{4}$ pint wine.
2 lbs. currants.	8 eggs.

ALMOND PASTE

4 lbs. icing sugar.	4 lbs. ground almonds.
4 lbs. castor sugar.	1 pint of egg yolks.

I will not trouble you with the method. We should all know what to do with these things if we had them. Don't you appreciate the lavish scale of hospitality?

I commend those two recipes to Lord Horder, a truly sensible man, who I believe, has made at least two wise

remarks during the course of his life. This gives him some claim to our attention. He said,

(a) That experts who do not produce the results required should be fired.

(b) That we should try to make life happier rather than longer.

It would be as well if all those, amongst them Lord Horder, who contributed the enormous reams of matter, about it and about, on the subject of nutrition in *The Times* should sit down and consider, as calmly as possible, the fact that, less than forty years ago, it was *not* impossible to take a pint of egg yolks, and that even if the result was indigestible to some people that was entirely their own business. (The old lady's husband lived to be eighty, anyway). Excellent as nutrition councils may be in time of war, for heaven's sake let us remember that their whole basis and composition is part of the hideous fantastic world of compulsion and scarcity, the world of the power maniacs.

By all means let us have experts on the subject of nutrition provided they start off with the realistic assumption that there is no earthly reason why a quart of egg yolks should not be available after the war to anyone wanting them. But a nutrition council built up in an atmosphere of dehydrated meats, and nightblindness caused by lack of carrots can have no possible place in an age of plenty, unless the plenty is to be distributed on a system of rewards and punishments. This is not the way to make life happier. The subtle dangers we shall encounter if we leave these experts to run wild in a world in which almost anything may be synthetic doesn't bear thinking of. Ponder over the last sentence of *The Times's* article on *Food and Food Values* (August 28): "And when war and war's immediate effects are past it [the Nutrition Council] might help, as part of an international nutrition council, towards the complete abolition of the most shameful fact in our peace-time civilisation: malnutrition in the presence of plenty."

The whole point is that three years of war conditions cannot possibly provide a realistic basis for experiment. Bees prefer blue flowers. No one knows why. When I hear Professor Drummond broadcast that there is no essential difference between honey and glucose, I wonder why 999 people out of 1,000 prefer honey, and should say that fact alone would wipe out the necessity for chemical analysis in a world of reality.

The untouched world of reality. It was those words which caught my imagination, and I thought, not until we are able to distinguish at once, throughout the whole of our personal experience, between the real and the unreal can our lives be free from friction. Let us concentrate on the grapes. Sometimes, in a moment of intense emotion the personal policy of our lives is revealed to us. Sometimes we have to find it. If we have the strength to go on from there, things become easier. We become persons of integrity. This, as Major Douglas has pointed out, has nothing to do with morality. But it has much to do with happiness.

If I remember rightly, Major Douglas once said that the future of civilisation might well rest with the small number of people to whom he was then speaking. That number has only slightly increased. No one can do more than is humanly possible, and we have only available that part of our lives which is free from the machinery of compulsion. How to use this to the best advantage? It seems only a

small fraction of our lives, yet this is the reality, our own little untouched world which lies behind the hideous fantasy of the power maniacs. It is in the present, and it is our own. Possibly neither "leisure" nor "escape" nor "recreation" is the correct term for this, the only reality we are ever likely to know in this life.

It seems to me first essential to consider it in the smallest time sections possible in order, if may be, to avoid time as measured by timetables, which is only another form of compulsion. Each moment is a world in itself, which we may try to live to the full.

In proportion as we throw off the bonds of the past and future we can concentrate on the present. Inhibitions are of the past, and bye-products are of the future. We can be free from the fear of both, if we take life easily, for neither of these nightmares exist in the present.

On another occasion I understood Major Douglas to say that in any course of action or inaction the motive of fear should be consistently disregarded. In our little world of reality we can at least make some progress towards this equanimity. Our success will be proportionate to our application of the social credit principles to ourselves. We know what the principles of association are. We can begin by minding our own business. True, this involves some understanding of what our business is, but it can be done. We have had plenty of help in this direction. Our business is our own world of reality, the grapes and figs.

Points from Parliament

SEPTEMBER 8.

SUPPLY: COMMITTEE—WAR SITUATION

After Mr. Churchill's address on this subject, which was reported in the daily press, Mr. Arthur Greenwood spoke shortly. Mr. Churchill left the House towards the end of Mr. Greenwood's speech, and after two more speakers had addressed the House the debate was brought to a close, no member present wishing to speak. The House proceeded to Business of the House:—

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. A. Edwards (Middlesbrough East): Can the Lord Privy Seal say on what grounds he was led to arrange for two days to be devoted to this Debate, in view of the fact that, after we had heard the speech of the Prime Minister, who did not sit long enough to listen to the end of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, the latter spoke to an almost empty House? There were four Members on the other side and four on duty on the Front Bench, and six on this side and two on duty on the Front Bench. It would seem that we are reducing Parliamentary procedure to a complete farce, if we are to have Debates arranged which we are led to believe will be important Debates on the developments of the war. We are treating the Prime Minister, with these frequent exhibitions, as a kind of prima donna. Did we come here to discuss the progress of the war or not? About 300 Members of Parliament are in the precincts of this House, and yet not more than 20 were willing to stay even to hear a second speech. Was it necessary to devote two days to this subject and ask Members to remain in town

an extra day this week?

Sir S. Cripps: The matter was arranged through the ordinary channels, and the expectation was that a sufficient number of Members would be interested in the matter to take their turn in the Debate for two days. I am as surprised as my hon. Friend that Members have not wished to speak upon the subject matter. Apparently the Prime Minister's speech leaves nothing for discussion, but I am bound to say that it does cause me, as Leader of the House, very seriously to think when Members cannot wait even, as my hon. Friend said, to hear the first two leading speeches in the Debate. I think it is a most unfortunate thing that such disrespect should be paid to the Leader of the Opposition or that Members should go out in the middle of the Prime Minister's speech, as a number of Members did. I do not think that we can conduct our proceedings here with the dignity and the weight with which we should conduct them unless Members are prepared to pay greater attention to their duties in this House, which are just as great as the duties of men in the trenches at the front.

Mr. A. Edwards: Further to that, may I ask the Leader of the House whether he has been led to suppose from what is so frequently referred to in this House as "the usual channels" that there would be a House which really wanted two days' Debate? I have never seen such a disgraceful thing happen as has happened here to-day. The whole Press was full of statements last week that the House was on its toes, and it seems that the Government have been led to suppose that two days must be devoted to the Debate, necessitating, thereby, a change in our programme. Does not my right hon. and learned Friend think that this sort of thing is inviting the suspension of Parliamentary Privilege if hundreds of Members treat the House with the disrespect that they have shown to-day?

Sir S. Cripps: I have already stated my views upon the attendances of Members of the House, which during the last series of sittings were very poor indeed, much to my regret. If I may answer the Noble Lord opposite now, the Chancellor of the Exchequer will proceed with the Business of the Vote of Credit on our next Sitting Day.

Earl Winterton: Are we to have a chance of debating the Prime Minister's statement?

Sir S. Cripps: I will see if consideration can be given to that, but arrangements cannot be made for it to be done on our next Sitting Day. The Chancellor, instead of making his statement on the last of our series of Sitting Days this week, will make a statement on our next Sitting Day and the Debate on the financial side of this Vote of Credit can only proceed then.

Miss Rathbone: Are we to understand that the Debate on our next Sitting Day will not be on the conduct of the war but on the Chancellor's statement? I think that what has really happened is that a good many Members who want to speak on our next Sitting Day want time to think over the Prime Minister's statement first. There will be considerable dismay when they will find that they have lost their chance.

Sir S. Cripps: I am afraid that if Members cannot attend in the House, they must lose their opportunity of speaking. It is the intention to proceed with the financial side of the Vote of Credit on our next Sitting Day. . . .

SEPTEMBER 9.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Shinwell: By what right did the right hon. and learned Gentleman rebuke hon. Members yesterday? Is that in accordance with the traditions of the House? He is well aware of the practice of this House, particularly since we entered upon the new arrangements for meeting, by which Members go out to the dining rooms for meals and, although he may not be very much concerned about meals himself, other Members do not feel that way. Apart from that, is it his duty, as Leader of the House, to rebuke hon. Members for not attacking the Government, when so frequently right hon. Gentlemen on that bench attack hon. Members for daring to criticise them?

Sir S. Cripps: The right by which I made the remarks that I made yesterday was the right which every Member of this House has of saying frankly what he believes. I do not withdraw any of the statements I made yesterday.

Mr. Shinwell: If the Leader of the House is entitled to say what he thinks on matters that do not come within his province—because he, as Leader of the House, is responsible for the conduct of Business to a large extent, apart from the Speaker's prerogative, which is understood—and if he goes outside his province, are we not entitled to object? If he says what he feels about Members, why should not Members say what they feel about the Government?

Sir S. Cripps: I have no objection whatever to the hon. Member saying what he feels about the Government, or about me. He is well within his rights in doing it. The hon. Member says that I am concerned with the Business of the House. The Business of the House cannot be carried on if Members are not present.

Mr. Maxton: Who were the parties in the House who informed the Government that two days were necessary for this particular Debate? With reference to the caning which the right hon. and learned Gentlemen gave the House yesterday, he seemed to suggest that it was a particular crime to go out when a person whom he described as the Leader of the Opposition was speaking. I want to know whether that designation has been attached to the right hon. Gentleman above the gangway. If it is attached to the right hon. Gentleman, is there some special onus on the House to be present on such occasions?

Sir S. Cripps: The answer to the last part of the Question is "No," but in order to carry on the Business of the House, it is necessary to have a quorum of 40 Members present, and yesterday there was a count in order to get an audience of 40 Members.

Mr. Maxton: Is not the onus upon the right hon. and learned Gentleman himself and his friends to see that they are present?

Sir S. Cripps: The onus, I should think, is upon the Members of the House.

Mr. Maxton: No.

Sir S. Cripps: I take a different view from that of the hon. Gentlemen. As far as the question of the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, I was no doubt wrong in using that as a technical phrase; I should have referred to the Leader of the Labour Party. -

Colonel Sir Charles MacAndrew: Will the Lord Privy

Seal take into consideration whether, in view of the fact that we now sit at a different hour, it would not be worth considering having no count at meal times, as we did in ordinary times?

Sir William Davison: Assuming that the Government were correct in thinking that a large number of Members wished to raise points on the war, may it not very well be that they were satisfied with the statement made by the Prime Minister and that therefore they did not want to debate points which they would otherwise like to have debated; and why should they be censured for not carrying on the Debate?

Sir S. Cripps: I made that point yesterday.

Sir W. Davison: Are not ill-informed criticisms of this House likely to have a bad effect on the country?

Sir H. Williams: May I put a Question which has not yet been answered by the Leader of the House, namely, at whose request was the two days' Debate fixed?

Sir S. Cripps: The soundings were taken in the ordinary way.

Hon Members: Through whom?

Sir S. Cripps: Through the usual channel, which is a perfectly well-known expression, and as a result of that, it was estimated that the House would want two days.

Mr. Charles Williams: May I ask the right hon. and learned Gentlemen whether he thinks that it is in keeping with the dignity of the House that he, as Leader, should fling this sort of accusation about?

SUPPLY: COMMITTEE—VOTE OF CREDIT

[A good deal of criticism of Mr. Churchill was expressed in this debate. Mr. A. Bevan's speech was the most striking:—]

... if the Debate yesterday came to so untimely an end, part of the responsibility must rest upon those who have the presumption to call themselves Front Benchers. The rest of the responsibility for the early collapse of the Debate must, of course, rest with the Prime Minister himself, because his speech was unable to compete in attractiveness with the House of Commons meals, and everybody here knows what that means....

I shall take advantage of the opportunity to say one or two forthright things about the Prime Minister. I have already given him notice that I propose to say them, but, of course, I understand that it might not be possible for him to be present....

The Prime Minister... invited the representatives of the Press to meet him the day before we had our Secret Session on shipping. I understand from my informants, and I have checked this on several occasions from different people who were present, that the Prime Minister was dressed in some uniform of some sort or other. I wish he would recognise that he is the civilian head of a civilian Government, and not go parading around in ridiculous uniforms. It would be very much more dignified if he just went around in ordinary fustian. He addressed these 50 or 60 representatives of the Press and told them everything which we were told the following day in Secret Session. About that I do not make too much complaint, except that it is a very difficult situation for hon. Members of this House if the secrets which are reposed in us are shared by so very many people over whom we have no direct control. I should not be answered in this

matter if it were suggested that the Prime Minister was following the example of President Roosevelt, because President Roosevelt does not sit in the Senate or in the House of Representatives. Therefore, when he has to speak to the world he must use a Press Conference through which to do it.

But the Prime Minister is a Member of the House of Commons, and if he has anything to say, he should say it here and not make use of secret meetings of that sort. But he did far more than that. That is why I refer to the fact that he has now recovered his sense of humour, because at this meeting, using the language of my informant, he railed at the representatives of the Press for giving his critics so much space in the newspapers. I want the House of Commons to realise the seriousness of this. Here is a Prime Minister who is the leader of a political party, the head of a National Government. That Prime Minister and that Government have enormous powers over the Press which they have used on several occasions. That Prime Minister, armed with those powers, meets the representatives of the Press and accuses them of giving his critics, who are Members in the House of Commons, too much space in the Press. I say that this amounts to political intimidation without any precedent in the history of this country and is evidence of the increasing paranoia of the Prime Minister's psychology for which the docility of the House of Commons is responsible. The time has come when we should make this man realise that the House of Commons is his master, and that he must not abuse the patience and tolerance and good will of the House in the way in which he has been doing it. I am very sorry, as I have already said, that he is not here, but I ask the House of Commons to agree with me when I say that it is irregular, to say the least of it, for a Prime Minister to try to use his authority in order to prevent his critics from having any public notice....

[Mr. Bevan went on to criticise Mr. Churchill's conduct of the war, to advocate an immediate second front and to deplore the fuel situation.]

The Social Order: Its Reconstruction and Perfection by His Holiness Pope Pius XI (the Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*) is now available from K.R.P. Publications, price 2d.

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer,
Social Credit Expansion Fund,
c/o The Social Credit Secretariat,
49, Prince Alfred Road,
Liverpool, 15.

I enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas

Name

Address

Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to the Social Credit Expansion Fund and crossed "& Co. account payee only."

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