

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 6.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

## PARALLEL

By B. M. PALMER

Hilaire Belloc, perhaps the greatest living historian in this country, gives the following analysis of the doctrine of religious toleration, which, he says, resolves itself into two simple questions:—

(a) What are the doctrines and therefore the consequent morals, and therefore the consequent acts, which are at issue with the moral sense of the community?

(b) What measure of evil doctrine, and consequent morals and acts, may be permitted lest worse evils should follow upon their suppression than the evil of their presence? On this last point, the very word "tolerated" turns.\*

The curious way in which some people speak of "toleration" as though it were a virtue in itself is largely due to the writings of Whig historians, whose text-books still swamp the country, from elementary schools to university. Only a few weeks ago Professor Gooch stated that 1689 was the most glorious revolution in our history. He was greeted with applause.

But what was 1689 in reality? A revolution which resulted in the triumph of the money power. And how was it inaugurated? By a ten to fifteen years agitation against a *non-existent* Popish Plot. This "plot" came into being after the year 1672, when Charles II had stopped the repayment of principal of the bankers' debt, in order to devote the money to the equipment of the fleet. The origin of the "plot" is obscure but the Bankers' yes-man, Shaftesbury, did all in his power to foster it with paid agitation.

Thus, though the turmoil of those years deepened the peoples' hatred of Roman Catholicism, "it is clear, now, that what they feared was not so much religion itself, as the results which they were told by Titus Oates would follow—the subjugation of England to France, and the massacre of the King and the population at large. The murder of a magistrate at a propitious moment and the discovery of Coleman's letters clinched the whole affair.

It is interesting to note the different occasions on which the discovery of letters has led to a political crisis.

Hilaire Belloc comments:—"The Popish plot was not, as has often been said, unique in the history of England for its fury. It was parallel to more than one episode of very strong sectional feeling in the general story of England.

"When such extravagant motions have been roused, especially by war or the threat of war, the national temperament of the English lends itself to excessive nervous reactions, which are part of that strong visual imagination

distinguishing the national character."

The whole of that period of our history deserves the close study of those who understand the philosophy of Social Credit. To them the origins of what Cobbett called the THING will be clearly discernible. Not least significant is the manipulation of the masses by those who knew what they wanted.

Two hundred and seventy years have passed, and, from those who take the conventional idea of time, the trite remark may follow—"but such things can't happen in England now—in the *twentieth century*?"

Extract from Hansard, September 10, 1942:—

Viscount Cranbourne: "... I was therefore driven to the conclusion, if the noble Lord will forgive my saying so, that consciously or unconsciously he seemed to want, not that the Jews should not be discriminated against, but that they should occupy a privileged position. To that, of course the British people would never agree, and what is more, the Jews themselves would not want it, because they know perfectly well that would be the quickest and surest way of promoting Anti-Semitism."

On October the first the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, and the Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire announced that a council of Christians and Jews had been formed.

The Times reports:—

"The aims of the council are:—

(a) To check and combat religious and racial intolerance.

(b) To promote mutual understanding and good will between Christians and Jews in all sections of the community, especially in connexion with problems arising from conditions created by the war.

(c) To promote fellowship between Christian and Jewish Youth organisations in educational and cultural activities.

(d) To foster cooperation of Christians and Jews in study and service directed to post-war reconstruction.

"Further details will be announced in due course, and in the meantime inquiries should be addressed to the Hon. Secretaries, the Council of Christians and Jews, 21, Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1.

"His Eminence Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster, endorses the condemnation of anti-Semitism and has, since the composition of this statement, joined the council as a joint president as a mark of his strong protest against

\*The Last Rally, by HILAIRE BELLOC. Page 96.

all persecution of the Jewish people."

Is there any Anti-Semitism in this country? The signatories of the statement must know that there is not.

They say, "In the forefront of their efforts to create division within every community the Nazis have always placed anti-Semitism, which is repugnant to the moral principles common to Christianity and Judaism alike. We cannot afford to ignore the effects of the steady propagation of this evil throughout the world."

What was the cause of the evil\*? Was it not a deliberate fostering, on the part of the rulers of Germany, of the misunderstanding of the spirit of toleration? Did not those secret rulers allow the Judaic philosophy a privileged position within the Reich, until the results of it came to be hated? And did not they use this hatred still more unscrupulously to further their own evil ends, thus bringing to the unhappy country all the evils of Anti-Semitism?

It is the grave responsibility of those Church dignitaries concerned to clarify all that is denoted by the term "religious toleration." What is likely to be the result of an attempt to foster co-operation between Christian and Jewish youth organisations, and between Christians and Jews engaged in problems arising from the war and post-war reconstruction?

It may be stated as axiomatic that trouble always follows when a number of people, before clearly defining their policy, allow a minority among them to define a policy *in vacuo*. And this is exactly the situation which those churchmen concerned are helping to develop.

The writer of this article, accepts so far as it is clear to her, the Christian philosophy. For this reason she expressly desires to exclude the Chief Rabbi from any of the above remarks, being concerned only with those whose duty it is to guide men and women in this country who wish to be Christians.

## Points from Parliament

### HOUSE OF COMMONS: OCTOBER 1 COAL SITUATION

(Continued from last week.)

*Mr. Sloan* (South Ayrshire): . . . The name of the hon. Member for Stockport (Sir A. Gridley) is among those attached to the Motion on the Order Paper demanding the return of 30,000 miners from the Forces. The return of 30,000 or 100,000, people, without proper directions, will make no difference to the production at all. That has been demonstrated. Already 33,000 men have been returned from other industries, and after that happened production was lower than before. Men returned from the Army to the mines, and production then went lower still. It has been a progressive decline. We have now lost an output of three cwt. per man-shift since the war began: instead of having 23.4 cwt. per man-shift, we have now an average of something like 20.14 cwt. Yet without one single man being returned to the mines, if output was restored to 23 cwt. per manshift we should get all the coal that is asked for by the Minister. We must find the reason for this tragic drop in output. . . .

*Major Braithwaite* (Buckrose): . . . Unless coal production goes up we shall lose the war, and the sooner the

House of Commons and the country realise this the better it will be for them. We cannot envisage opening up a second front unless we are prepared to fuel the people of France as well as the people of this country. Here we are with a gap to fill, and yet we are talking about coal as if it were a matter of not very much urgency. This Debate is on a par with Debates in which I have taken part in ordinary times; there seems to be no urgency about the matter at all. Coal production is falling, the country is in grave danger, and I am very much alarmed. . . .

### OCTOBER 6

#### BANK FOR INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENTS

*Mr. Ellis Smith* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the number of shares held or controlled by enemy Governments or companies or subjects in the Bank for International Settlements; and whether he will consider putting the bank upon the black list?

*Sir K. Wood*: It is not possible to say what the present holdings are, but on the basis of the original subscription it may be estimated that such holdings were approximately 50 per cent. In reply to the second part of the Question, I have consulted my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade and my Noble Friend the Minister of Economic Warfare, and we are agreed that the bank should not be put on the statutory list. As I have informed the House, I am satisfied that the bank conducts its affairs on the basis of strict neutrality.

*Mr. Stokes*: Does the answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer mean that he will not say or that it is not possible to say?

*Sir K. Wood*: That it is not possible to say.

*Mr. Ellis Smith*: Is it not a fact that by Act of Parliament no industrial relationships were allowed to be retained during war-time, and if that is so should not that be applied in this case?

*Sir K. Wood*: We are carrying out the policy which has already been stated.

#### COAL SITUATION

*Mr. A. Bevan* (Ebbw Vale): . . . This is the first coal Debate after two years of discussions about coal shortage in which we are to hear someone with some direct responsibility for the situation. I hope that the Lord President will be able to explain where we are in this matter. I hope that he will give us some precise information, and not embark on a series of verbal adventures.

The difficulty that I see is this: We have managed by a skill which must arouse the admiration of the whole world, to produce a coal shortage in Great Britain. Only a divinely-inspired Administration could produce such a result. This House has no responsibility whatsoever for it, except cowardice. This was not an unpredictable situation; we were not dealing with unknown factors; there was not a single element in the coal situation in this country after the collapse of France that was not predictable with mathematical certainty. The information, at least, was somewhere in the Government offices. It was not with the Minister of Production, because there was not one: it was not with the

\*See *Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy* by BORGE JENSEN and P. R. MASSON.

Prime Minister, because he does not take much interest in these matters; but we knew that there was going to be an increase by as much as 25 per cent. in the industrial consumption of coal. At any rate, that ought to have been known, because the Government were making plans for increased industrial consumption. It was known that a certain number of men, between certain ages, were being called up for the Forces from the mines. It was, therefore, a matter of easy prediction what would have been the coal output and the average age in the pits. It was known also that there were going to be certain difficulties in regard to coal transport. If those things were not known to the Government as a consequence of their own planning, it was pointed out to them over two years ago by every authority having a point of view on this matter. The Coalowners' Association of Great Britain told them 12 months ago last March, and the Mineworkers' Federation told them 12 months ago last February. A Select Committee of the House of Commons has been saying it for over 18 months. In Debate after Debate in this House the Government have been told exactly the same facts.

The only thing that was left was for the House of Commons to behave with a sense of public responsibility, and to insist upon the Government carrying out what was the common sense of the situation. Had we got that full sense of responsibility and had a Motion been put on the Order Paper and the House divided upon it, every yellow newspaper in Great Britain would have attacked us for destroying the national unity, every hack journalist in Great Britain would have dipped his pen in bile and described the Members of the House of Commons as irresponsible, raucous-voiced critics. Yet every single fact with which we are faced to-day has been known to us for over two years. . . .

This is what the matter boils down to. There is no room for argument here; we have all known these arguments for two years. Why cannot we get those men back from the Forces now? I am not asking the Minister of Fuel and Power. It has nothing to do with him. I am putting the question to the right hon. Gentleman the Lord President of the Council, who is to reply to this Debate. . . .

It is all right for some central commander of the Army to decide that certain units in East Anglia are to get two cold-meat days in a week. They are not the men who are going to have the cold dinners. We are running into a very difficult winter and we will be faced with the very serious problem of maintaining the morale of the American soldiers in this country. Large numbers of them have been brought from warm States, with heated houses. They will not have sunny skies over them, as they have in America. If they are to be kept in cold barracks, without any social amenities, you will run into the most difficult human problem with which the country has ever been faced. To maintain warm barracks and give them warm meals every day is an essential condition for maintaining their morale.

*Viscount Castlereagh* (Down): Does the hon. Member really think they are going to get central heating when they go abroad?

*Mr. Bevan*: That is not the issue. Do not let us deal with an abstract, romantic soldier. We have to face the problem courageously. We must insist on helping the Minister of Fuel and Power by demanding that these men be brought home from the Forces immediately. Hon. Members

must not believe that they can solve the problem merely by the stoical measures which we ourselves adopt so easily at the top, but which are difficult to carry out down below, where people are suffering from a bombardment of advice day by day. One of our problems is not only to impose hardship upon people, but to get people to accept that hardship as an inevitable and natural accompaniment of the war effort. If they think it is frivolous they will resent it. . . .

. . . . The Government have to consider that it may be necessary to introduce compulsory rationing if it is only in order to convince the people that the coal available is being equitably distributed. I beg and implore the House to try to live up to some sense of its responsibility. There are over 200 Members of the House directly concerned in administration of one kind or another, either having jobs or sweating on the top line for jobs. The result is that the Executive has been allowed to make muddle after muddle and to have escape after escape, because the back-bench Private Members do not realise that they are as much responsible for carrying this war to a successful conclusion as the Government themselves. When the Private Member knows that a mistake has been made he should punish the Government fearlessly and patriotically. If men are to be

*Continued on page eight.*

## "The Tragedy of Human Effort"

By C. H. DOUGLAS

There is no more suitable Social Credit literature for wide immediate distribution than Major Douglas's Liverpool Address, *The Tragedy of Human Effort*, first printed in 1937.

The Address is strikingly apposite to the immediate situation, and has for that reason been reprinted.

In this Address, Major Douglas restated his conviction that "the first requisite of a political democracy is that its operation shall be confined to objectives, not to methods," and elaborated, in outline, the strategy to be pursued, once we had recognised that "though we do, beyond question, possess the rough machinery of political democracy, we do not use it."

The strategy to which reference is here made is the strategy of the first Electoral Campaign which fully substantiated the soundness of the principles underlying it in actual practice, wherever they were applied during the two or three years immediately preceding the War.

"Neither I nor any other individual can help you if you will not help yourselves, and neither I nor any other individual who has endeavoured to arouse you to a sense of responsibility can take that responsibility from you."

**NOW READY**

7d. from all booksellers, or from the publishers (postage 1d.)

K. R. P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED.

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

## 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. 6.

Saturday, October 17, 1942.

### THE WAR

The similarity of the restrictions placed by the Germans on building operations in e.g., occupied France to those imposed by the Ministry of Works and Planning (ex P.E.P.) afford additional proof, if any were needed, of the Central Direction of World War, as a step to Central Direction of World "Peace."

Not only is this obvious, but the main policies, both short and long term, are fairly clear. The first short term policy is to keep the war going at any cost until no action is possible by individuals other than by License. In order to do this, the standard of life must be cut down everywhere to a minimum as an end in itself. It is elementary that no amount of "economy" either in fuel or anything else, will enable a country of forty-five millions of people to "save" as much as a country of eighty millions, not to mention the occupied countries which can be drawn upon by the country of eighty millions.

As Sir Arnold Gridley points out in an able letter to *The Times* of October 6, a cut of 25 per cent. in the domestic consumption of electricity and gas only represents 38 hours of mine output per year. Yet Mr. Emmanuel Shinwell, who strenuously resisted the consideration of the Mining Scheme of Social Credit when it was put before the Scottish Miners, is determined to have coal rationed. And Sir Arnold Gridley flatly accuses *The Times*, at the other end of the Planners' scale, of bias in favour of the Beveridge Plan of Rationing.

"And in those days, no man might buy or sell, save he had on his forehead [?] the Mark of the Beast."

*The Economist* for October 10 passes the "buck" to the Bank of England (Tweedledum) and the Treasury (Tweedledee)—but not the right "buck." *The indictment* of the banking system is not that it creates credit, but that it claims ownership of goods, which it does not create. It may yet prove easier to brighten the brains of bankers than to inform economists.

From *The Economist*: "... public buildings, roads, bridges and the like. These things are necessary and desirable and they yield non-monetary dividends: but if too much of the community's savings are invested in forms that yield no money return, there will be trouble." You've said it, boss; and not only savings either!

According to *The Economist*, the "cost" of "full" employment (i.e., the difference between pre-war "boom"

unemployment and "slump" unemployment (!)), at the 1938 price level, will be the expenditure of £1,200 millions a year on capital goods after the war.

"New York, Oct. 9.—An 'Open letter to the people of England' in the current issue of the magazine *Life* demands one thing from Britain:—

"Quit fighting the war to hold the Empire together, and join with Russia and your other Allies to fight the war to win by whatever strategy is best for all of us. After victory has been won then the British people can decide what to do about the Empire—for you may be sure we don't want it—but if you cling to the Empire at the expense of the United Nations' victory you will lose the war—because you will lose us.

"Briefly, there are two wars—one we are actually fighting, and the other we must fight in order to win. The war we are actually fighting is a war to save America. Nothing else. Everyone here is prepared to fight this war to any extremes, just as everybody in England will go to any extreme to save England.

"But this kind of war of each trying to save himself is just the set-up for Hitler. If we are really going to overwhelm the Axis we must envision and fight for something bigger than either England or the United States."

— Reuter.

"The strangest plan for the 'new world' after the war comes from a Mr. Maurice Gomberg, of Philadelphia. He is selling a map in the United States depicting what the world will look under the leadership of 'the U.S.A., the democracies of Latin America, the British Commonwealth, and the U.S.S.R.'

"A copy has reached this country. It shows the U.S.A. occupying Canada, Greenland, the Islands of the Atlantic, and all the islands of the Pacific. The British Empire loses everything except Australia and New Zealand, but is to be given Madagascar and the Dutch East Indies.

"Russia extends her boundaries to the old frontiers of Germany and the Adriatic. She also absorbs Iran and Finland. Germany and Italy are 'quarantined' and the rest of Europe becomes a United States of Europe. India is to be a Federated Republic."

— *Reynold's News*, October 4, 1942.

### Dr. Julian Huxley

Sir Arthur Keith has reviewed in *The Sunday Times*, Dr. Julian Huxley's book called *Evolution: The Modern Synthesis*, which has just come out. The following paragraph ends the review:—

"The last chapter in *Evolution* is devoted to the future of the species which is now dominant in our planet—*Homo sapiens*. The process of miscegenation which has spread in recent times along the skirts of racial distribution is pictured as destined to spread until a time comes when mankind will be reduced to a uniform mongrel pattern. The ruthless and cruel methods of Natural Selection are to be replaced by a humane code of evolution devised by the Darwins, Huxleys and Haldanes of the future. I should like to see this chapter submitted to the ghost of the elder Huxley.\* If there are blue pencils and Science in Ghost-land this chapter will certainly be erased."

\*Dr. Huxley claims descent from Thomas Henry Huxley.—Ed.

## "The End of Economic Man"\*

By BEATRICE C. BEST

The author of this book claims to prove that the present system—of capitalism—has failed, and belief in it been destroyed, because it has not fulfilled its promise "to establish equality by economic freedom." "It has been proved," he says, "beyond possibility of mistake, and beyond appeal that capitalism cannot create equality." In his chapter *The Despair of the Masses* he speaks of the "masses who slowly realised that their dream of equality through economic freedom had been shattered..." And again: "The proof that the economic freedom of the individual does not automatically or dialectically lead to equality had destroyed the very concept of the nature of man on which both capitalism and socialism were based: Economic Man." Also: "The masses have realised that the exercise of free economic activity will not and cannot lead to the establishment of the free and equal society."

Now without at the moment further considering the author's argument one may say at once that he has failed to establish his claim for two reasons: (1) that 'economic freedom has never existed in capitalism, or indeed anywhere, and (2) that, given *real* freedom, it is more than doubtful if the 'masses' would care two hoots about so-called 'equality,' or even give it a thought, if for no other reason than that they would be too taken up with the novel pastime—for the first time in history—of deciding what to do with their own lives.

With regard to the nature of this 'economic freedom' which has failed to produce 'equality,' I cannot do better than quote from Mr. Geoffrey Dobbs's article in *The Social Crediter* of June 29. Speaking of the "absurdity of the idea that the tendencies of the Nineteenth Century were the product of '*laissez faire*,' 'free enterprise,' or 'individualism'..." he says: "I do not know why people still have the impertinence to use these terms to describe a state of affairs in which anyone can do what he likes *provided he has a permit from the creators of credit.*" (italics mine.)

This constrictive and controlling power, working behind and outside the system, and in no sense a natural and inevitable concomitant of it, but on the contrary constituting an "unnatural interference" (to quote again from Mr. Dobbs) is entirely ignored by Mr. Drucker; for he appears to think that the evils, or "demons," as he calls them, such as wars, depressions, trade cycles, and—for him—unemployment, *etc.*, are natural and inevitable results of the system itself—an integral part of the concept of economic man. According to Mr. Drucker, therefore, it is impossible to reform "the traditional order of Economic Man," since the economic sphere has "ceased to be valid." (Why *ceased* though is not clear if the "demons" are a natural component of it.)

In his foreword the author speaks of "halcyon days of pre-Hitler Europe when Italian fascism seemed to be just a negligible annoyance in a democratic world which was fast approaching perfection." This is an extraordinary statement. Halcyon days! Ye gods! Is the author ignorant of the existence of the obscene and foetid poverty of the slums, of distressed areas, of needless unemployment in the face of needed goods and services, of malnutrition, trade wars,

cut-throat competition, bankruptcies, suicides, and always the approaching menace of war? Seemingly not. For he speaks in his chapter entitled *The Return of the Demons* [though why *return?*], of the collapse in the belief of the system brought about by the experience of the World War and the Great Depression. He says that these catastrophes "suddenly exposed the vacuum behind the facade of society": and that—"The European masses realised...that existence in this society is governed, not by natural and sensible, but by blind, irrational and demonic forces." (Demonic, certainly, blind and irrational, no. On the contrary, far-seeing and rational in view of the end desired and aimed at by these so-called 'forces.†)

The point is the 'halcyon days' and the 'democratic world fast approaching perfection' came, according to Mr. Drucker's chronology, after these 'catastrophes.' Does he really mean that the 'masses' enjoyed 'halcyon days' and were looking forward to 'approaching perfection' *after* the World War and the Great Depression, and had therefore recovered their faith in society? Or what does he mean?

Perhaps enough has been said to justify one in suggesting that Mr. Drucker's book is another example of the desperate shifts made to account for the failures of the present system while refusing to recognise the part played by the private controllers of credit, and their manipulations of it; *not* for the efficient working of industry, or true economic progress, but for purposes of their own which serve their lust for power, and are inimical to social welfare.

Ignoring this factor, yet driven to account in some way for failure and collapse, Mr. Drucker adopts the ridiculous argument that economic progress itself produces the evils which, however, are necessary to its continuance, although damaging to the society it is supposed to serve. Therefore economic progress must be rejected, since the price man has to pay for it is too high; as likewise economic freedom because it does not lead to equality! These are the reasons why we must abandon the concept of Economic Man? As well might a motorist argue that he must give up motoring because his car was liable to breakdowns, and involved him in accidents. He would instead take it to an expert repairer to find out what was wrong.

Regarding such a remedy, however, Mr. Drucker says: "For the last hundred years economists have unsuccessfully tried to discover the causes of the business cycle."

For the last hundred years! Isn't that just too bad? Especially as the poor things, even if they had discovered them, could have done nothing about it! For Mr. Drucker will have nothing to do with reform or repair. Naturally, since he believes the evils or 'demons' that result from Economic Progress are inherent in the very nature of that progress—a kind of ineradicable 'original sin.' He refers at one point to the monetary crank who tries: "to banish by magic rites the demons which destroy the free and rational society." And elsewhere he dismisses "the magic of purchasing power theories," "spending theories," and "such like." According to him this reliance on "miracle" is "an admission of the impossibility of banishing the demons by development from, and by reform of, the traditional order of Economic Man." He speaks of "The contradiction

†"It was not accidental. It was a carefully contrived occurrence—the International Bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so that they could emerge as the rulers of us all."

—MR. LOUIS T. McFADDEN, Chairman of the U.S.A. House of Representatives Banking and Currency Committee.

\**The End of Economic Man* by PETER F. DRUCKER. Heinemann 8/6.

inherent in the attempt to maintain a society by *abolishing a consequence which follows inevitably from its very promise as depression follows from economic progress.*" (italics mine). So now we know!

Mr. Drucker is not alone, however, in his distrust of the "miracle": "—there is no short cut to a new order," he says. How often is this impressed on us by the sponsors of a "New Order," and by the Planners? It is an idea that is abhorrent to them, and must at all costs be discouraged. For the 'short cut' would allow them no time to carry out and establish their various plans and projects, ostensibly advanced for the betterment of society, but, when examined, seen to be secretly designed to inaugurate servitude. That is one reason why Social Credit is anathema, because it is the 'short cut,' the 'miracle,' and, what is more, dispenses with plans and planning.\*

It might be as well to remind Mr. Drucker that Economy means management; and Economic Man, so-called, has failed because his management has been bad in every sense of that word. But bad management can be turned into good management, and it is precisely this reformation that Social Credit would effect. *Transformation* is a better word expressing, as it does, one of the characteristics of magic or miracle, namely a quick or sudden change. And it would effect this change by the simplest and most direct method or means, the economy of which is in itself perfect, and gives to those who contemplate it the feeling of satisfaction produced by a work of art the aim of which has been achieved by a like economy of means.

It would give to the "masses" the two things that Mr. Drucker maintains are incompatible, namely economic freedom and equality. For by means of the Dividend it would secure for the individual the *independence*, and the power to *contract out*,† without which all the freedoms of the Atlantic Charter are seen to be nothing but words. Equally important, it would give to the individual the responsibility that goes with independence, to wit, with the knowledge that one has the means to direct one's own life. The Dividend would also establish the only equality with any meaning attached to reality, which lies in the fact that, when all is said, we are, everyone, creatures with common creaturely needs as food, clothing, and shelter, and subject to the same cycle of birth and death: the equality best expressed, perhaps, in the phrase that "all men are equal in the sight of God." But from that necessary starting point the individual would be able to give expression to his manifold differences and inequalities, and so vary and enrich the colour and texture of his social environment in a manner, and to an extent, hitherto made impossible.

It is interesting and profitable to reflect that Social Credit would secure for each political party its own particular objective: for the Conservative, the preservation of what is valuable in the old order: for the Liberal, a fair trial for the policy of *'laissez-faire'* safe from "unnatural interference," also the independence he so rightly prizes: for the Socialist and Communist alike the only "equality" that, as contended, makes sense for human beings, and enables them to escape the 'equality' of robots or machine-men intended by the planners. It would also

ensure the only common ownership with any intelligent meaning; namely the right of access for everyone to his or her equal share of the national inheritance, which is in truth common, because accruing from the past, over the centuries, and therefore impossible to assign to any class, or individual, whether worker or not. As for 'the classless society,' a society of individuals who are one and all inheritors, indeed heirs of all the ages,\* is, *in principle*, aristocratic. *In fact*, it is not so unless and until the inheritance is claimed, and the responsibility entailed by it acknowledged and accepted.

Seeing, however, that all political parties are united in rejecting proposals that would give them all they want, one feels justified in questioning the sincerity of their avowed wishes and intentions. But there is another and more easily verifiable reason than lack of sincerity to account for this rejection. For binding them all more closely than any difference binds them is their common resolve to cure unemployment, not *primarily* for the sake of greater efficiency, and the increase of human welfare, but as an end in itself. To this fetish they are prepared to sacrifice their true aims, or by it allow them to be corrupted.

Mr. Drucker is also in bondage to the same idea; but to do him justice he is less blind or more frank than the politicians; for he sees and admits that in this age economic progress and full employment are incompatible, and he is openly prepared to sacrifice the one to the other. Speaking of the possible advent of a "new order," and to the part the democracies should play in preparing a way for it, he says: "It must be clearly recognised that in such an attempt economic progress has to be relegated to a secondary place, and that it has to be subordinated to non-economic aims, such as *full employment.*" (italics mine). Well, here we have the gospel of work for work's sake, in all its simple and naked purity, and though, in view of Mr. Drucker's advocacy of it we would not like to place our welfare in his hands, such engaging candour is welcome. We read further: "But if it is recognised that necessary social policies must to some extent be economically harmful, they can be properly weighed as to their social benefits in relation to the economic sacrifice which they involve." Mr. Drucker, however, does not stay to tell us what "social benefits" must involve "economic sacrifices." The one example he gives, namely the sacrifice of economic progress to the social benefit of full employment would lead directly and inevitably to the work-slave state, and is damaging to his judgment of what constitutes a social benefit. If, however, by economic sacrifices Mr. Drucker should by chance mean certain sacrifices of power and privilege enjoyed by big financial combines, amalgamations, trusts, etc., encouraged and supported by the money power, he should say so; but as these happen to be a menace to economic progress and social welfare alike they would hardly fit in with his argument.

Mr. Drucker's analysis of fascism, or totalitarianism, to which he devotes a considerable portion of his book, is based, as one would expect, on his theory of the End of Economic Man. Without attempting to examine it in detail it might be useful to consider, briefly, his contention that fascism has failed to substitute the concept of Heroic Man for that of Economic Man as a means of reconciling the masses (with whose 'mind', by the way, Mr. Drucker appears to be perfectly acquainted and which, strangely, exactly reflects his own) to the idea of war, or preparation for war

\*It should also be noted in this connection that some people are affronted if you suggest their difficulties can be easily solved. This weakness is exploited to the full by our rulers and planners.

†"The power of contracting out is the first and the most deadly blow to the Supreme State." MAJOR DOUGLAS: *The Big Idea.*

\*In christian phraseology, "Heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ."

involved in a large scale programme of arms manufacture.

His reasons for this need not concern us, the point at the moment being that, as according to him war or the preparation for war is essential to the totalitarian states ("for internal social reasons" such, for example, "as a means of exorcising the demons of unemployment") it is necessary to seek an alternative incentive. This is found, Mr. Drucker says, in the invention of "enemies against whose aggressive designs they have to be prepared." Again: "The clearest expression of this necessity in the field of foreign affairs was the campaign which the Italian Government conducted against Anthony Eden as the personal symbol of all the evil forces in the world." And: "Similarly Hitler began to justify German Armaments and Germany's war-preparedness with the 'conspiracy' of Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden, as soon as the German people had shown their decisive rejection of war."

The weakness of Mr. Drucker's argument lies in the fact that the "enemy" is essential to the concept of Heroic Man, their conjunction is necessary, and there is no case for substituting one for the other. An 'enemy,' real or fabricated, must always be found for the Hero. St. George must have his Dragon to fight, and, equally important, an innocent victim to defend. Any Government, and not alone a totalitarian one, wishing to unite the nation in warfare, or preparation for war, must use these means, and point to a possible or actual enemy nation, or its politicians, and also to the object of the intended attack (this may be represented as a small defenceless nation), or to the people's own soil and country. For this purpose these last must be objectivised to preserve the character of 'victim,' and obscure the less heroic motive of mere self-defence. In short the call for sacrifice, for "blood, sweat, toil and tears," must be accompanied by some high-flown and romantic justification in order to call into being that heroic spirit which may be relied on to remain blind to the true causes of the conflict in which the people are called on to play their part.

\* \* \* \*

This question of heroic man, and the heroic appeal, is worth a slight digression. It is not examined by Mr. Drucker as he denies its efficacy, but it is important, and relevant to the subject of Government, or the State. The significant point to observe is that the idea of the Hero, and the role he is called on to play are proper to a state of adolescence, and do not belong to a state of maturity. The Hero is nearly always represented as a *young* man. Though he can be persuaded to sacrifice, his desire is rather for exploits, and is not quite the same thing as the desire for "self-immolation" referred to by Mr. John Macara in an article in *The Social Crediter* for August 29, which he calls a "true and noble instinct." This desire is less self-conscious, and belongs to a later stage of development, also it is directed, primarily, to service. The Hero, however, is not without self-consciousness, and keeps half an eye on the Laurel Wreath, or, if the worst comes to the worst, the Martyr's Crown. This is not said in derision, for the heroic role, as claimed, is proper and therefore not unbecoming to youth. It is a stage of development necessary as a corrective to the natural egoism of childhood. It is nevertheless a stage that must be outgrown, or it becomes an obstacle to mental and spiritual development. The important point, however, is that it is a stage, or attitude, *extremely useful to the 'powers that be'* owing to its sug-

gestibility, and therefore the ease with which it can be exploited. Particularly is this so when war becomes imminent, and later, actually embarked on. It is then fostered and exploited to the uttermost, and though as suggested, not pre-eminently out for sacrifice, can be worked up into a willingness to be sacrificed, and to indulge in 'austerities.'

It is therefore neither fanciful nor far-fetched to suppose that it is to the interest of the 'powers that be' to condition man's mind by popularising views that encourage the heroic attitude, *and so prevent man from growing up, and reaching a state of maturity.*

Many examples of such conditioning propaganda could be given. Perhaps the one, 'par excellence,' of the 'heroic' gesture is a statement by Mr. Bernard Shaw (who is old enough to know better) which appeared some years ago in one of a 'popular' series of articles published in the daily press. This was to the effect that he was willing to be thrown on the "scrap-heap" when the "Life-Force" had done with him. The boast is hardly worth scrutiny. 'So what?' is the only fitting retort. But such an attitude of subservience to an indifferent Life-Force, willing to use human beings for its own obscure purposes, and then consign them to a 'scrap-heap,' is ignoble, futile, and stupid. No man should be so indifferent to his fate, and it is doubtful if any sincerely is. Also, unless you single yourself out for unique unimportance (a form of conceit favoured by some people) you must be willing to admit that you accept the same fate for the rest of humanity. Such talk is clap-trap anyway, but when dressed up to look 'fine' a pure 'gift' to our would-be masters.

The proposed 'Federation of Youth' that is being advertised at the moment is, perhaps, the most sinister pointer in the direction of the State's intention to capture the nation's youth and condition it in ways that will be useful for the particular purposes of the directors of the State.

The heroic attitude is, furthermore, closely allied to what can best be described as the romanticising of evil. The subject is outside the scope of this review; but it is important and worthy of attention.

\* \* \* \*

To return to Mr. Drucker, it is not possible in the space of this review to deal with all the points raised by him, nor convey to the reader the full flavour of his romantic fantasy. In the end he leaves us rather in the lurch, for although he suggests that the concept of Economic Man must be replaced by "a new, positive non-economic concept of Free and Equal Man," he confesses that "we do not yet know which sphere will become socially constitutive in the future. . . ." It hardly matters though, because Mr. Drucker's strict adherence to the policy of full employment must inevitably lead away from any concept of Free and Equal Man, and directly towards what in the event would become Slave Man. But one must, I suppose, give Mr. Drucker the credit of believing that he is blind to this inevitable consequence, and that his desire for freedom is sincere. In which case one cannot do better than conclude by advising him to study Social Credit. He may not do so because (1) of his belief in the necessity for full employment, (2) because he has resolutely refused to consider that any solution of our troubles can profitably be sought for in the management and control of our money system.\* But it is a pity, because Social Credit

\*A note on the author says that he "joined a leading international banking house as economist."

has a wonderfully clarifying effect upon the mind, and were he to undertake the study of it he might write another book and call it, perhaps, "The End of Financial Tyranny and The Beginning of Economic Man."

This, however, always with the reminder that sound economics means good management, and that the aim of economic progress does not lie in the endless multiplication of gadgets, for trade or employment, which Major Douglas calls the "delirium of materialism." It lies in the use of our productive powers and resources so that we may be free to choose and follow pursuits other than the purely materialistic one of earning our living.

How we make use of our freedom is another matter; but as we have been called on, not to say commanded, to fight for it, clearly no doubts or misgivings can rightly be entertained on that score.

Nevertheless all the fighting in the world will get us no nearer our goal unless and until we demand the use and distribution of our economic resources according to facts, and according to reality, and *not* according to the fiat of planners acting under the rules and regulations of financial overlords. Economic Man will come into his own then, and that is the only way "Free and Equal Man," or rather the reign and sovereignty of the individual, will ever come about.

## PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page three.)

asked to sacrifice their lives in France or Libya, we ought to be able to sacrifice our chances of promotion in the House of Commons. We ought to take political risks if they take physical risks. The reason we are facing this winter with a coal shortage is that the House of Commons itself has failed to live up to the high traditions set by representative government in Great Britain.

[In the course of his reply to the debate Sir John Anderson, Lord President of the Council, said that 8,000 coal-miners had been released from the army, though none from the field army, and some 600 more had been marked for release. Of the balance of about 15,000 in the forces, some had become casualties or prisoners of war, others had gone on active service overseas and others reached such rank or occupied such key positions that they could not be considered for release; 3,000 or 4,000 were the most that it would be possible to release, even drawing upon the field army. The Cabinet had decided that the field army should not be drawn on for this purpose.]

## 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."

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Tragedy of Human Effort .....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy .....	7d.
The Use of Money .....	6d.
"This 'American' Business" .....	3d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.

Also

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold .....	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson .....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne .....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance .....	2d.
The Rulers of Russia by Rev Denis Fahey.....	1/-

### Leaflets

The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell .....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
Taxation is Robbery .....	50 for 1/9; 100 for 3/-

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED  
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

## SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is now in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.

## REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

Information about Social Credit activities in different regions may be had by writing to the following addresses:

BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.

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

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

BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.

CARDIFF S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 8, Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.

LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.

LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.

Lunch hour re-unions on the first and third Thursdays of the month at 12-30 p.m., at The Plane Tree Restaurant, Great Russell Street, W. C. 1. Next Meeting November 5.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.

SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

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