

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 10.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 13, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

The Brief for the Prosecution

By C. H. DOUGLAS

We are publishing extracts from Major Douglas's forthcoming book in view of the urgency of the situation with which it deals.

The chapters are abridged, and the text of the book may differ in detail from the extracts to be published in this and later issues of THE SOCIAL CREDITER.

CHAPTER I.

... Dr. Arnold Toynbee, the Secretary of the Royal Institute of International Affairs informs the harassed Briton through the medium of its Journal that "we" are working feverishly but with all "our" might, to undermine the sovereignty of "our" respective nations (which implies undermining the property rights which have been transferred from individuals to the "nation") and thus conferring it on some still more mighty, but studiously unspecified recipient. Almost before Dr. Toynbee has finished speaking, Herr Hitler undermines the sovereignty of most of the nations of Europe, and Mr. Churchill, amidst approving applause from as far away as North America, announces that "we" will fight him on the beaches and in the streets, and "we" will never give in. At the same time, Dr. Toynbee and his staff are provided with comfortable occupations in the pleasant city of Oxford, presumably to go on undermining national sovereignty at the expense of the British taxpayer. It must be admitted that all this renders the deductive or idealistic method very complex and difficult to understand.

The difficulties do not end with the contradictions between what he is told and taught to think, and what he is ordered and forced by circumstances to do. He feels that, while the idealist knows where he is going, but not for publication, he himself can't quite see where he is bound, yet is on his way. Mr. Eden assures him that although the New Order must be built through war, it will be built notwithstanding. Herr Hitler says he has built it. So far as can be seen, the New Order has a common characteristic either as sponsored by Mr. Eden, or as constructed by Herr Hitler. Millions of uncivil servants appear as though by the wave of the Wicked Fairy's wand, and "order," with, on the whole, disappointing results. General Dittmar somewhat surprisingly suggests that even in Germany, "the selfishness of governmental departments which do not look beyond their own sphere, and disregard the interest of the nation as a whole" (German Radio, January 25, 1944) must be curbed. Idealists everywhere view with alarm, the language used to describe the backbone of the Classless State, "Returns in triplicate, accompanied by the appropriate vouchers." Unregenerate yeomen have been heard to say that if half the inspectors who are paid comfortable salaries, with travelling

expenses, rendered on the prescribed Form, to hinder farmers from carrying out repairs to buildings, could be taught the elements of bricklaying, they would go far to remedy the shortage of building labour besides permitting that which is available to do a little work.

And then, there is Russia. Since the Dreyfus Case, with which Russia has, perhaps, more in common than would appear at first sight, no subject has provided so widespread an opportunity not merely for dogmatic and mutually exclusive statements on matters of fact, but for arguments which seem to close for a considerable time the enquiry as to whether mankind really is a reasoning animal.

Even taking the highest figures put forward by those concerned to support the idea that National Socialist Germany is anti-Jewish, the alleged atrocities against continental Jewry do not come within millions of those committed by the Soviet Government in one operation alone—the "collectivisation" of agriculture. But the world rings with the woes of the Chosen, while Russia is idolised by multitudes. Eugene Lyons, a Communist by conviction, a trained observer, one-time United Press correspondent in Moscow, and subsequently on the staff of Tass, the official Russian Press Agency, in his book, *Assignment in Utopia*, observes:—

"A population as large as Denmark's or Switzerland's was stripped clean of all their belongings—not alone their land and homes and cattle and tools, but often their last clothes, and food, and household utensils—and driven out of their villages. They were herded with bayonets at the railway stations, packed indiscriminately into cattle-cars and freight-cars, and dumped weeks later in the lumber regions of the frozen North, the deserts of Central Asia, wherever labour was needed, there to live or die. Some of this human wreckage was merely flung beyond the limits of their former villages, without shelter or food in these winter months, to start life anew, if they could, on land too barren to be cultivated in the past. . . . Tens of thousands died of exposure and epidemic diseases while being transported and no one dared guess at the death rate in the wilderness. . . . I saw (my emphasis) batches of the victims at provincial railroad points, under G.P.U. (Ogpu) guards, like bewildered animals staring vacantly into space. Those meek, bedraggled, work-worn creatures were hardly the kulaks of the propaganda poster."

Try reading that extract at a "Workers" meeting in any industrial town.

Mr. Max Easterman, the friend of Lenin, who spent years in Russia during its most formative period, remarks "instead of being better, Stalinism is worse than fascism, more ruthless, barbarous, unjust, immoral, anti-democratic, unredeemed by any hope or scruple... 'it' is Socialism, in the sense of being an inevitable though unforeseen political accompaniment of the nationalisation and collectivisation which he had relied upon as part of his plan for erecting a classless society" (*Stalin's Russia*, 1940, p. 82).

While Mr. F. A. Voight obligingly completes the picture by remarking in regard to Germany "Marxism has led to Fascism and National Socialism because in all essentials, it is Fascism and National Socialism" (*Unto Caesar*, 1939, p. 95).

That is to say, Socialism and Fascism stem from the same root. It is part of the purpose of this book to show that practically all forms of economic, industrial and political totalitarianism can be traced to the same root.

The idea uppermost in the minds of the working-class idolater of the Soviet system is that the rich have been abolished. In 1939, only 22 years after the Bolshevik accession to power, Trotsky (Bronstein) who ought to have known, stated "the upper 11 or 12 per cent. of the Soviet population now receives approximately 50 per cent. of the national income" (quoted in *The Managerial Revolution*, J. Burnham, 1942, p. 43).

This differentiation is sharper than in the United States, where the upper ten per cent. receive 35 per cent. of the national income.

The situation of the 88 per cent. in Russia is immeasurably worse than the similar residue in England or the United States.

Until recently, it was a commonplace of "Labour" propaganda that war is a device of the "Capitalist." If you are careful to define your terms, and associate the word "capitalist" with the favourite Socialist ideal, "internationalism," there is probably a good deal of truth in the statement. But Russia, the idol of the proletariat, is considered to have demonstrated the success of Socialism by first provoking, through a non-aggression pact with Germany, and then waging, war on an unprecedented scale. Even in this, a population of two hundred millions, embodying traditionally brave soldiers, would in all probability have been decisively and irrevocably defeated by a country, Germany, of eighty millions, unless assisted by Great Britain, a country of forty-five millions which had withstood Germany single handed for a year.

My object in traversing a somewhat familiar terrain is not so much to attack or condemn any particular body of opinion, as to bring into relief something which forms a peculiar handicap to our native talent for "dealing with situations as they arise." "Situations" present themselves to our judgment in words spoken or written. It is evident, that, to a considerable extent, words have come to mean, not merely what we want them to mean, but what we want them to mean in regard to a particular subject.

This is confusing, and an effort to resolve the confusion in respect of a few of the commoner words of political con-

trovery seems to be overdue. That this confusion is not accidental, but deliberate, is unfortunately true. Perhaps as good a key as any to the fundamental policy is provided by the remark of Lord Haldane, who, it will be remembered, claimed that his spiritual home was in Germany. He was asked why he persuaded (!) Sir Ernest Cassel, one of the richest men in the world, to settle large sums on the London School of Economics. He replied "Our object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State" (*Quarterly Review*, January, 1929).

It will be noticed that a special education, differing from that of the existing Schools was necessary. And an inspection of the teaching staff indicates that this was to be inculcated primarily by German—or Russian—speaking Jews. It is ludicrous to suppose that Sir Ernest Cassel, a German-speaking Jew, provided large sums in ignorance of their objective.

In this connection, the growing revolt against pseudo-science is significant. It has been observed in many quarters, and notably by Dr. Tudor Jones, F.R.S.E., that modern science is becoming a mass of superstitions. The tendency of modern, and even not-so-modern Universities to produce communists has been traced to the insistence of their teaching staffs on the unlimited validity of such theories as that of Darwin, largely discredited in informed quarters, but presented to immature minds as fully established.

Programme for the Third World War

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

This work, which has appeared serially in *The Social Crediter*, is now published in one cover,

Price 2/-

The Problem of the Medical Profession

A Political Primer for Patients and Doctors

by B. W. M.

1/-

British Medicine and Alien Plans

by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.

(With an Appendix by B.W.M.)

1/-

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

Beveridge the Unread

A Social Security League (Northern Ireland) has been formed "to promote the Principles of Social Security as envisaged in the Beveridge Report." The advertisement for a public meeting in Belfast stated "no one can afford to miss this meeting."

Four speakers and the Chairman were members of the Action Committee. The Chairman said frankly that he had not read the Beveridge Report, but was supporting it because of the claims made for it. The speakers all made the usual claims that the Plan would give the people "real social and economic freedom," etc.

Two Social Crediters were present, and at question time No. 1 asked a question regarding financial control, and was immediately identified by the Chairman as a Douglas Social Creditor. The Chairman then gave a short address in favour of Social Credit, but said that Douglas had been so misrepresented and boycotted that there is little hope that anything would come of his "schemes," although in the opinion of the Chairman Douglas was "absolutely sound." Another member of the League said that Social Crediters were years ahead of the Social Security League.

Social Creditor No. 2 then asked how many members of the Committee had read the full Report, as distinct from the 3d. edition and any popular versions.

There was some "stalling" by the League Chairman (one of the speakers) but on being pressed it was admitted that none of them had read the Report. When asked by what right they had called a public meeting for the furtherance of a plan which they had not read, there was no reply.

Discussion followed and Social Creditor No. 2 could not catch the Chairman's eye until an hour when most Belfast meetings close. He quoted paragraphs from the Report pertaining to the conditions for receiving benefit and to various disqualifications from benefit (from page 2 of *The Beveridge Plot*) explaining their exact meaning and the power they placed in the hands of the officials. For over twenty minutes the audience stayed while he showed by reference to the report and to the statements of the speakers how the claims which had been made were contradicted by the Report itself, and went on to censure the League for their temerity in calling the meeting for such a purpose. None of the audience left during this address, which was longer than that of any of the main speakers.

None of the speakers ventured to reply, but the Chairman of the meeting reminded the audience that he had admitted that he had not read the Report, and said that the last speaker had now confirmed his fears that the Plan was not all that it had been claimed to be. He had noted that none of the conditions or disqualifications appeared in the 3d. official edition. He was very suspicious of the whole thing. He said that he had been unable to "place" the last speaker as he had the previous one (Social Creditor No. 1), but his suggestion was that both these gentlemen (Social Crediters 1 and 2) should be asked to meet the Committee of the Social Security League and discuss the whole question. No attempt was made to pass a resolution.

When the audience dispersed, which was immediately after these remarks by the Chairman, both Social Crediters waited and met the platform party for a short time. Some

of their friends were heard telling them that they would have to be careful before they called any more meetings. One candid person said that they deserved the "telling off" that they had got. A short informal discussion took place between the platform party and their critics in a very friendly atmosphere. No arrangement to meet the Committee was made.

J. A. C.

KOSHER

A correspondent tells us that all margarine made from nuts is considered better than the other kind, and that it is all kosher and marked with the Beth Din stamp. After commenting further on the impact of other such Jewish religious practices on the rest of society, he writes:—

"As a British subject who saw the beginning of the minor Russian Revolution of 1905, I am greatly perturbed at the way people here have put the Jews in a special caste who can do no wrong.

"Two things have remained in my memory: the astonishment expressed at the way the Jews had thrown off the restraints of their Jewish faith and had adopted revolution—the more red the better; and secondly, a German saying, 'Give us Russian soldiers commanded by German officers and we shall conquer the world.'

"In 1944 the question may be, what if Germany goes communist and sides with Russia?"

"It has been said that Internationalism is the handmaid of Revolution. Have we started a glissade into Revolution plus 'Communism?'"

ALBERTA'S DEBT

THE EDMONTON BULLETIN of February 10 published the following recapitulation of the debt situation in Alberta:—

The public debt of Alberta is about \$140 million gross or \$120 million net. If refunding takes place it will mean the borrowing of \$120 million.

The legislature last year by unanimous vote favoured refunding but at NOT more than 3½ per cent. interest, with no payment for back interest at the old ruinous rates of 4 to 6 per cent.

The Bond Dealers' Association in Toronto have had this offer open to them for a year.

It is stated several offers to refund have been made to the Alberta government but at a higher interest rate than 3½ per cent.

The undercover propaganda as well as the open propaganda of the Bond Dealers' Association to try and influence the Alberta government to refund at an interest rate higher than 3½ per cent. doesn't make sense to the intelligent voter.

Private firms in Canada are to-day borrowing all the funds they require at interest rates from 2 per cent. to 3¼ per cent.

Private corporations in the United States are refunding their debts at interest rates from 1½ per cent. to 2½ per cent.

How much longer are the taxpayers going to stand for the private money monopoly gouging the public at the present unnecessary and ruinous interest rates?

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. 12. No. 10.

Saturday, May 13, 1944.

The Free-for-All Plan

It is evident that we are coming closer to the crucial matters involved in the planners' scheme to impose a totalitarian state in this country (and, of course, everywhere else).

Following the "government's" proposals for "free" regimentation of doctors and patients, the 'indicator' has been hoisted that at all events the Royal College of Physicians of London (the hoariest of the strongholds of professional privilege in medical matters) will not stand in the way of "free" regimentation of future candidates for training.

Universal serfdom is to be reached by way of a universal free-for-all: a world oligarchy through the doorway of egalitarianism.

In keeping with the general deterioration of public discussion under the prevailing conditions of censorship-by-all-the-means-there-are, the report of the Royal College's Planning Committee is undistinguished. Lord Moran signs it. Possibly the Prime Minister's physician did not write it. Its extravagant appreciation of at least one Oxford School which is a byword even at Cambridge, suggests that it cannot have been put together at Oxford, unless in the "Latin" quarter.

The report recommends that "the field from which medical students are to be selected should be widened by making *all university education free*, and by the provision of maintenance grants to those university students in need." Since the Beveridge Plan, in conjunction with the plans foreshadowed by the *volte-face* of Sir John Anderson's budget, is designed to secure the universality of need, "free" maintenance will be "free-for-all" too. It will have to be. The Royal College has had time to look about it during these hectic planning years, and "it understands that the needs of other branches of university education are similar, and it does not wish that medicine should be made a special case." Big of it, isn't it?

How can the issue be made clear? The Chancellor of the Exchequer has been trying to make it clear to the taxpayer (and how many he is now!) that having money to spend unnecessarily is a valid excuse for pinching it. The argument is familiar but unpopular. When papa has no longer to find even a third of the cost of Tommy's instruction in whatever it is that "medicine" is to consist of, though the chief item will be the rules for controlling the issue

of certificates to employed persons, the Chancellor will find a willing ear for the contention that 'inflation' (good only for the State Post-Office) can be averted only by taking away that which is no longer wanted. And the "profit motive" to which Tommy, fortified by Marxian precepts as he is, might increasingly succumb under the impact of conditions fit for Russians to live in, will be officially fortified by the reminder that since neither he nor papa has ventured anything, it is unreasonable to expect to win anything.

It is no longer impossible to reveal the motive behind planning.

T. J.

Doctors Consult Their Patients*

It sounds queer. But it happened in Scotland last week.

Dr. Ruth Monro, Invergowrie, and Dr. Hay, Liff, had a joint meeting with their patients in Invergowrie, to explain and discuss the proposed National Health Service plan.

Patients of both doctors were invited to vote on the plan. They were given papers with these questions:—

- (1) Do you wish to employ your doctor as at present?
- (2) Do you favour the proposed State Medical Service?

The doctors have now got back 600 voting papers, marked and signed. Every one is against the State plan.

In his address Dr. Hay said:—

The proposed National Health Service is a political scheme.

Family doctors to-day are employed directly by you. If you don't like us you are free to change to someone else.

The so-called "free" medical service is part of the Beveridge plan.

Sir William is not so much concerned with your health, but is decidedly concerned that you be fit for work.

Doctors are to become medical policemen to see you don't draw benefit too long or to prevent you from drawing benefit at all.

The most successful doctor under the scheme will be the man to whom regulations mean more than his patient.

Do you realise medical records cannot possibly be kept secret between you and me, because State officials must be satisfied you have taken the necessary steps to restore your capacity for work in the shortest possible time?

Doctors all over the country should follow the lead of Dr. Monro and Dr. Hay. They should tell their patients exactly what the proposed plan means.

It means more State control. More bossing from the high-ups. Less freedom for you. The disappearance of your family doctor.

The people will not stand for that—if they are warned in time.

And the decision must be made by the people. It is their affair—and theirs only.

*Reprinted from a recent issue of a Scottish newspaper.

Planning and the Power of the Dividend

By BEATRICE C. BEST

In chapter 7 of part 2 of *Social Credit* Major Douglas, after pointing out some of the major anomalies of the present money system says: "A science of finance and economics which will permit absurdities of this description to pass almost unnoticed, can hardly fail to produce chaos in the world."

One calls to mind this passage when reading recent works on Social Reconstruction. Their perusal arouses the kind of bored and academic interest such as might be felt when watching a mechanic engaged in overhauling a car, knowing all the while that, either from malice or stupidity, a spanner, that is the cause of the breakdown, will be overlooked and left in the works at the finish.

Dr. Karl Mannheim's book *Diagnosis of our Times** is, in this respect, no exception, and his argument arouses a conviction that the 'spanner' will escape detection, and form no part of the diagnosis. This follows, in general, the more familiar lines of most intelligentist leftist diagnosis and propaganda. There is the usual indictment of '*laissez faire*,' while apparently ignoring the fact that the only real '*laissez faire*' was in the hands of, and therefore exclusively operated by, the private controllers of credit. We have the attack on the 'profit motive,' and the false antitheses advanced in justification of this, *i.e.* production for use or service and not for profit, with its assumption that profit is incompatible, or irreconcilable with use or service.

We have, also, the call to sacrifice, in this case linked with the clarion call to Youth (with a capital "Y"). For instance on page 37, "... without the help of the pioneering spirit of Youth, neither the subjugated peoples of Europe nor the more dynamic masses in the U.S.A. will be ready to sacrifice everything they possess, their labour, their wealth, and their lives." We are not told, however, who will be left to benefit from this all-round sacrifice, nor why it is necessary.

Dr. Mannheim's suggested reforms for establishing a New Order also follow familiar lines. We already have, he tells us "the existing means of reform—through taxation, control of investment, through public works and the radical extension of social services..." Also: "It will, for instance, somehow be settled in advance at what speed we shall spend or invest, where we shall invest, and, by implication, decisions will be taken as to how much should be spent on social services, religion, education, art, science, and so forth."

It is unfortunate for the Democracies, or rather for those who make use of the democratic label for purposes of their own, that the Totalitarian states cashed in on the idea of Planning first. It has made it more difficult to persuade the 'democracies' that 'democratic' planning is merely for war-time purposes, and has no relationship with Totalitarianism, especially as fresh plans are being produced daily to regulate our lives in the post-war period.

Dr. Mannheim has attempted to get over this difficulty, and put our doubts at rest by trying to show us how we may plan for freedom. The phrase "Planning for Freedom" occurs so many times in the course of his treatise that one half suspects him of employing suggestion to reinforce his

argument. One happy example of this "Planning for Freedom" may be given: "If there is a man with prophetic vision," we are told, "he should be given his proper opportunity..." It is true the author hastens to add that: "In this sphere the removal of specific forces of frustration... is more important than general regulations." Nevertheless it conjures up a vision of a 'Ministry of Prophecy,' and its army of bureaucrats, complete with filing cabinets, forms, schedules, *etc.*

But it would be a waste of time to examine further, and in detail, Dr. Mannheim's proposals, for the all-embracing reason that he has undertaken an impossible task. He has therefore involved himself in the shifts and devices, the inconsistencies and absurdities, and, indeed, imbecilities, that a persistent attempt to compass the impossible must entail.

For, in fact, you cannot plan for freedom, you can only plan safely—*i.e.* without fear of an overriding dictatorship—in freedom, that is, within the framework of a society every member of which is already free. The characteristics of planning for freedom is coercion, however benevolent the intention of the planner may be, and Dr. Mannheim shows every sign of benevolence. The characteristic of planning in freedom is co-operation. Between the one and the other there exists no possibility of compromise.

There will always be planners, people with ideas, and with the necessary initiative and ability prompting them to carry out these ideas. There will also be willing to co-operate, people with the necessary judgement to appraise the ideas of the planners, and the enthusiasm necessary to help carry them out. And there will be the beneficiaries, those seeing the excellence of the plans and wishful to enjoy the fruits thereof. This is planning at its best, a trinity of co-operation from which all may derive good. Of course the roles are interchangeable, beneficiaries in one plan may be the planners or co-operators in another, as the planners may be beneficiaries and so forth.

The virtue of such free planning lies in the *willing* co-operation that makes it possible. This exercise of the will of *all concerned*, and the exercise of judgment and initiative that goes with it is precisely what is lacking in State Planning, and must be lacking in all so-called 'Planning for Freedom.' For unless the individuals for whom the plan is intended are in a position to accept or reject it, that is, are *already* free, then the will of the planners prevails, and the will of the planned is annihilated.

The sanction, therefore, upon which State Planning must rely is that of force, exercised through the police (*gestapo*, *ogpu*) and ultimately of the military. But planning within a state of free individuals requires the sanction of the willing co-operation of all concerned; perhaps one might sum it up in the word *fellowship*. This sanction is a great safeguard, for a bad plan would ultimately fail precisely for want of it. It also admits of fruitful experimentation by means of trial and error.

What then, we must enquire, is that instrument or power that will deliver us from the thralldom of the planned state, and purchase or secure for us that state within which we may be free to plan and exercise responsibility for our own lives? The answer is that the same power that has us in thrall can also be the means of setting us free. It is an absolute power, and one that can confer life or death. Therefore it will be found in the hands of those who have the monopoly control over our access to the means of subsistence.

*Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company Ltd.; London.

Since money became our access to those means, that power passed into the hands of those who obtained control over money. Meyer Rothschild made this perfectly clear when in 1790 he said: "Permit me to issue and control a nation's money and I care not who makes its laws." Such a candid declaration of how man's right to his own personal sovereignty might be filched from him could hardly have been more neatly put.

It is as well here to consider for a moment this question of right or rights, for moralists are fond of telling us from time to time (and this is one of the times) that people think too much of their rights and not enough of their duties. Hence it seems important to point out that, in fact, priority must be given to rights. The Church gives tacit acknowledgement to this assertion when she admits that it is no good preaching to a hungry man. It is true she does nothing about this, being too busy playing ball with the powers that be, but she does at least recognise this simple religious economic fact. In an essay on *Health and Holiness* Frances Thompson says: "It is felt that the body has rights; nay that the neglect of those rights may cause it to take guiltless vengeance on the soul... and impoverished blood—who knows?—may mean impoverished morals." Paradoxically then, man's duty is to assert his rights. There is no virtue in neglecting them, they are, in fact, in the nature of a trust, and to allow yourself to be deprived of them amounts to compliance in an act of theft.

In what does a man's right or rights fundamentally consist? Christ said, "I came that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly." The Christian then, at least, will be constrained to admit that man has a right to live. This he cannot do without access to the means of life. In a primitive community in which the labour of every man is necessary to produce enough for all, the right to work—that is to work for a living*—and the right to live are practically interchangeable terms, and 'Full Employment' is in harmony with economic fact. But in a community like our own, the 'cultural inheritance' of man's work, intelligence, inventions, and discoveries, going back through the ages, has culminated in our modern power production age. The result is that it is now possible to produce not merely a sufficiency, but an increasing abundance with less and less labour. Therefore the insistence on the right or duty of every man to earn a living ('Full Employment') is in direct opposition to economic fact, and the outcome of such insistence is what we should expect to find, and what we do find—confusion worse confounded leading to chaos, and war!

Three things characterise an inheritance. (1) It cannot be earned. (2) It is an inalienable right, and thus differs from the dole, or gifts of charity. (These are in the nature of a concession, and, depending on the will of the giver, can be withheld, and are therefore alienable.) (3) It lays on the inheritor the responsibility both to claim it, and to care for, and preserve it. It is, in part therefore, in the nature of a trust.

To-day this inheritance can only reasonably be distributed in the form of a 'National Dividend,' for money is the easiest and most efficient way of laying claim to it.

It may help to clarify the issue here to ask why the

*Though it should not be lost sight of that in any economy there is always the 'given' thing—the raw material. Man is not a creator.

ordinary citizen saves and invests. Not, it may be confidently asserted, because he wants to own or control the means of production, nor because he is necessarily specifically interested in the nature of the enterprise in which he does invest; but solely because investment is the only way open to him to acquire an *independent income* which will enable him at some future time *to be free to do as he likes*. It is, incidentally, a measure of the jaundiced way we have come to regard man that 'to do as you like' is so often assumed to mean to act in a selfish or antisocial way.

It is therefore to the 'cultural inheritance'—or otherwise 'the unearned increment of association'—that we must look to effect the transference of the overriding power of the few over the many—the nature of which is Satanic—to the "only true focus of power," namely the individual—the nature of which is Christian.*

It may be asked here what is to prevent the 'State,' or those who use it to exercise their lust for power, from undermining, by secret and insidious ways, this freedom, even if successfully won. Is not that happening now to the few freedoms we have won in the past? "The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance," we shall be told. This is a fatiguing and boring prospect; to have to stand forever with your foot on the neck of the enemy! But this statement must be understood as relating to the specific freedoms that man has won and lost in the past. It does not relate to freedom itself by reason of the fact that man never has been free. For man is a social being as well as an individual, and a society that is divided into bond and free is not a free society. True freedom therefore cannot be experienced within it; any more than true health can be experienced in the body if part of it be diseased. The effect therefore that true freedom would have on man is unknown: belief in its efficacy is an act of faith.

There is a fundamental difference between *having freedom* and *being free*. Recently we have lost certain hard won freedoms and also acquired the promise of four new freedoms—as a gift! A slave has freedoms. If he has an indulgent master they may be pretty considerable, and give him the illusion of freedom. But should his master die, or come to sell him, the illusion would vanish. It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose that by increasing his collection of freedoms man is, or may eventually become free, for these freedoms, held precariously, are concessions made by, or wrested from the powers that be, and depend upon such powers; they partake more of the nature of privilege. But true freedom depends on truth ("The Truth shall make you free"), and thus is in the nature of things, and is absolute and inviolable.

Lord Acton's words have an important bearing on this issue. "Power tends to corrupt," he said. But it corrupts not only the wielders or holders of power, but also those over whom the power is exercised. It is a malignant growth, and no part of the body politic can escape contamination. History, therefore, seen in the light of the struggle for freedom, is the record of man living in a state of corruption, and, in consequence, presents a picture of him and his activities seen, as it were, in a distorting mirror. This picture no more

*"All these things, and many more, have convinced me that one of the fundamentals of genuine Christianity is that the only true focus of power is the individual..." C. H. DOUGLAS in *Programme for the Third World War*.

represents the truth of man, than the portrait of a man in the grip of some terrible disease can be said to represent his real likeness. (The question as to how, why, when or where man succumbed to this baleful power, and his responsibility therefore, does not affect the argument. The picture is still distorted and unnatural. Besides there are too many innocent victims. It is notable that Jesus did not condemn but "had compassion on the multitude.") If this be accepted, it follows that all philosophy is falsified to the extent that its judgments and its teachings are based upon the assumption that this distorted picture represents the truth about man and his nature. Teaching based upon such an assumption has had far-reaching and fatal results, of which one is distrust of human nature. In consequence people are easily led to believe that innumerable laws and regulations are required to keep order, and are thus discouraged from demanding an enquiry into, and the removal of the conditions or causes that make for disorder.*

With some this distrust has led to a distrust and fear of freedom. "Freedom for what?" they ask suspiciously. The question is essentially meaningless; for, as already suggested, freedom is not a possession in the sense that it is something you *get*, to do something *with*. It is an integral part of personality and its disallowance is more in the nature of a violation than a theft. The proper answer to the above question is freedom to be, or perhaps to find myself; an answer that is met with even more suspicion than accompanied the original question.

Freedom to be yourself involves the need to be able to exercise freedom of choice, and the pre-eminence of the 'National Dividend' lies in its power to endow man with this freedom, and to deliver him from the tyranny of money, and of those who control and use it to direct man, and his thoughts and activities, into ways inimical to the human spirit.

He would be a bold man who after four years of war fought ostensibly for freedom, would dare to suggest that, after all, men were not fit to enjoy it. But there are those who, while giving lip service to the idea of freedom, have quite other ends in view,† one being contained in the statement that: "We have started from the position that only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large scale planning."‡ These people are using the war to lead, cajole, or drive the people into their planned and the servile state, and will fight tooth and nail against the power of the Dividend to deliver the people from this fate.

They will be opposed by those Christians who believe in Freedom, and are able to see in the National Dividend the embodiment of a common heritage of such ancient lineage that it may be regarded as a fitting symbol of the universal Brotherhood of man, and also, and without which the idea of Brotherhood is meaningless, a symbol of the all-embracing Fatherhood of God.

*There must, of course, be rules in a community; but these should be framed on the pattern of the "Rules of the Road"—enabling rules, arising out of the exigencies of a real situation. The simplest example is the rule that you may only drive on one side of the road, which enables you to drive where you like, and without which driving except for a single person, would be impossible. To contend that such rules are an infringement of freedom is merely perverse.

†"And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands..." PROFESSOR TOYNBEE, 1931.

‡P.E.P.'s Journal for October 4, 1938.

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: May 3, 1944.

CAUSTIC SODA (MAGNESIUM ELEKTRON, LTD.)

Mr. Ellis Smith asked the Minister of Aircraft Production (1) if he is aware that the Magnesium Elektron, Limited is pouring caustic soda into the sea; how long is the pipe-line used for that purpose; what did it cost; why, in view of the fact that his Department has assisted the expansion of this firm, this waste is permitted; and with what other firms is Magnesium Elektron, Limited, connected; (2) if his attention has been directed to the revelations in the case of Thompson, His Majesty's Inspector of Taxes, versus Magnesium Elektron, Limited, and the restrictions contained in an agreement made between the Magnesium Elektron, Limited, and I.C.I., providing that the former company should not sell caustic soda and other by-products; whether this agreement has remained in force during the war; how it has effected our total war effort; and how is the company disposing of the caustic soda produced.

The Minister of Aircraft Production (Sir Stafford Cripps): I have seen the Report to which my hon. Friend refers in Question 14. From it I gather that in 1936 I.C.I. paid Magnesium Elektron a sum of money in return for an undertaking by that company not to make liquid chlorine or caustic soda and to buy from the I.C.I. the chlorine required in the manufacture of magnesium. The agreement, however, contained provisions which permitted Magnesium Elektron to make chlorine under certain conditions. The agreement is, I understand, still in force. The arrangements made under it do not effect the supply position of caustic soda required for war purposes.

In regard to Question 12 the facts are that from a Government factory managed by Magnesium Elektra under an agency agreement, a solution containing a low percentage of caustic soda is produced as a by-product and is discharged into tidal water by means of a pipe-line. The pipe-line is about 27 miles in length, and altogether with the necessary ancillary equipment cost approximately, £86,000. The method of disposal by pipe-line was selected after carefully weighing a number of possible alternatives because it entailed a much smaller capital expenditure and could be brought into operation much more quickly. Measures to recover the caustic soda would have involved a capital expenditure of the order of £250,000, and in view of the supply position of caustic soda, the erection of such recovery plant would not have been justified. Magnesium Elektron Ltd. is a private company and information is not, therefore, available regarding other firms with which it is connected.

Mr. Smith: Is it not a fact that 10 per cent. of each gallon of liquid poured into the sea would produce one pound of caustic soda; that several products which can be produced from caustic soda are in short supply and are affecting our war effort; and seeing that the restrictive agreement is still in force, will the right hon. and learned Gentleman take steps to see that this caustic soda is used.

Sir S. Cripps: The restrictive agreement does not apply to a Government factory anywhere. I cannot confirm the figures which the hon. Gentleman has given as regards the

use of caustic soda from the effluent, but no further caustic soda is required at the present time

Mr. Shinwell: Cannot the right hon. and learned Gentleman answer the simple point? Has this firm entered into a restrictive agreement with I.C.I. which prevents it selling caustic soda.

Sir S. Cripps: I have already answered that in 1936 such an agreement was entered into between I.C.I. and this firm, but it does not relate to the factory in which the caustic soda is manufactured.

Hr. Shinwell: Does the agreement operate now.

Sir S. Cripps: I have answered that to the best of my knowledge it is in force.

Dr. Morgan: Is not a great deal of the wasted caustic soda valuable; and is it not required for many products needed now in medicine.

Mr. Woodburn: May I ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether in view of statements made in America regarding this firm, the Government propose to make any inquiry into this restrictive agreement to see whether, in other ways, it has impeded the course of the war effort.

Sir S. Cripps: No, Sir, because I am satisfied it has not impeded the course of the war effort.

Dr. Morgan: May I have an answer to my question.

House of Commons: May 4, 1944.

Teachers (Emergency Training)

Mrs. Cazalet Keir asked the President of the Board of Education whether he can give any indication in numbers of the men and women in the Services who have intimated their desire to enrol in the emergency scheme for the teaching profession; and whether he has arranged the necessary priority for their demobilisation.

Mr. Butler: Preliminary information about the scheme of emergency training for the teaching profession is being made available to the Services; but no steps have yet been taken to ascertain how many men and women will wish to apply for enrolment under the scheme; nor is it possible to make any statement now as to the arrangements which will be made for releases from the Services.

Mrs. Cazalet Keir: Is my right hon. Friend satisfied with the scheme?

Mr. Butler: Yes. Following upon the MacNair Report, published to-day, we propose to give details of the emergency training scheme, which will, I hope, meet the emergency needs of the education service.

Mr. Lipson: To whom do men and women in the Forces have to make application for enrolment as prospective teachers?

Mr. Butler: I cannot go into details at this stage.

Mr. Sorenson: What objection can there be to securing preliminary list of applications from those in the Services?

Mr. Butler: There is nothing that I can say officially, but the hon. Member will be aware that we are always on the spot and we are doing our best in difficult circumstances.

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.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Reconstruction	6d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...8d.	
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.....	4d.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet)	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.)	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	1d.
The Representative's Job	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.