

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 18. No. 1.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Viscount Samuel tells us that the cause of human liberty did not lose the war but won it. So long as it is clear that the British didn't win it, we don't mind. We British just play for, the sake of the game.

It is generally possible to surmise who won a war by noting who is satisfied with the result, and is given the widest facilities to say so. But perhaps Lord Samuel was referring to the Statue of Liberty, and the predominant race in the adjacent city.

There is always the possibility that a *soi-disant* "Conservative" element may be introduced into the Financier-Socialist Administration to suggest a Government of all the talents. The following Members should be kept out of Office by all legitimate means: Mr. WALTER ELLIOT, Mr. W. S. MORRISON, Mr. Anthony EDEN, Mr. Oliver STANLEY, Mr. Leslie HORE-BELISHA. Mr. Churchill is a danger to the country except in time of military war.

Mr. Ernest Bevin, for whom, as an honest buccaneer with a single eye to Mr. Ernest Bevin, we have some respect, is, with a trainload of fellow-travellers, going to Moscow for Food Talks (twenty-three courses, six wines, brandy, whisky, and vodka). His anxieties, which are heavy, are much lightened by the fact that Mr. Herbert Morrison is in the doctor's hands.

What we like so much about Socialism and Communism is its Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, or Brotherly Love.

In view of the preference of the Amurricans for shortened forms of geographical names, such as 'Britain,' we suggest that their country should be generally known as '... States.' The pause before the single word enables an adjective to be affixed *sotto voce*.

The fulsome adulation of the Cabinet, headed or tailed by our (save the mark!) Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, for miners and other Trades Unionists who have been acquiring enormous sums, by doing their legitimate work in bad weather, must revolt the millions who bore the brunt of war conditions on token pay or none at all, and were barely thanked for it. It is becoming clear that the *morale* of the country is going from bad to worse; either these incredible London-School-of-Economics-cum-Trades-Union-Council nominees do not care what happens so long as the failure (for us) of their P.E.P. plans is not too blatantly exposed, or, as was undoubtedly the case with the New Deal gang in America, (their blood-brothers) in 1938-39, are determined that the failure (which is their success) shall be cloaked in another world war. It

should be remembered that the "Germans" both in 1918 and 1944 said that if they were beaten militarily, they would bring down the world in ruins. The real Germans were the dupes of the Sanhedrin in New York, just as we were when, at all costs, having seen what kind of a victory we were allowed to have in 1918, we did not avoid the game a second time. We had ample opportunity to see the marked cards. If chaos is to be avoided, a wage policy must be instituted at once and retained for a period of at least five years, and even then only reviewed on a cost-accountancy basis and not on Judaic Black-Market methods of the kind now universal in "Labour" and "Government" circles. The production of the country must, wherever possible, be switched over to consumer goods at falling prices, and the producer compensated to give him a specified profit *on turnover*. All export sales must be for pegged credits only granted to countries willing and capable of supplying those materials we cannot grow or produce ourselves. We know exactly what treatment we always receive from the '... States': Canada is apparently unable to rid herself of Mr. Mackenzie King, who is committing her to be the Belgium of the next war; and France is riddled with Communism and Grand Orient Freemasonry, almost with the primary purpose of preventing her from being an effective partner. The Scandinavian countries are naturally friendly; there is a large latent ally in the people of South Germany; and we can find friends all over South America if we crush the alien influences which are, and have for many years been intent on our ruin. But there is not much time. Drake's Drum is sounding.

Inside the Law?

"In 1926, at the time of the General Strike, strikers were much disturbed when Sir John Simon told them that their strike was illegal, and that they would be personally liable for the losses caused by their breach of contract. The trade unions, like the rest of England, have a keen sense that they must keep inside the law. It was because they thought they had the law on their side that in a number of cases they refused to encourage periodicals which would otherwise have come out, being produced by hand, but then needing, of course, the services of the distributors. The whole question of whether what Mr. Shinwell did was illegal or legal is thus of great practical importance. Assuming that it was legal, not merely in cutting off fuel and power, but in banning any substitute productions, the trade unions supported the Government, thinking they could not possibly be charged with breach of contract. Whether any cases will, in fact, come before the courts, it is too early to say, but it is widely believed in London that the announcement that the periodicals are to resume is a concession Mr. Shinwell would not have made if his own actions in this part of the crisis were not so vulnerable."—"The Tablet" in "The Standard," February 28.

PARLIAMENT

Extracts from House of Commons speeches since January 28 were marked for inclusion in *The Social Crediter* and have not been published owing to the curtailment of the issues for February 15 and 22. Among them were:—

February 3: Mr. R. S. Hudson (Southport) and Lieut. Colonel Sir Thomas Moore (Ayr Burghs) on the Electricity Bill; February 13: Mr. Oliver Lyttleton (Aldershot) and Mr. David Eccles (Chippenham) on the Industrial Organisation Bill; February 19: Mr. Quintin Hogg (Oxford) and Mr. Christopher Hollis (Devizes) on Broadcasting; and February 21: Sir Basil Neven-Spence (Orkney and Shetland), Mr. Snadden (Perth and Kinross Western) and Mr. Boyd-Carpenter (Kingston-upon-Thames) on Oatmeal Points Rationing.

House of Commons: February 17, 1947.

Weekly Periodicals (Suspended Publication)

Mr. Driberg: asked the Prime Minister if he will consider moving for the appointment of a small Select Committee to draw up a list of weekly periodicals, generally recognised as leading organs of political comment, which should, in the national interest, be exempted from the forthcoming suspension of publication.

Lord Privy Seal (Mr. Arthur Greenwood): I have been asked to reply. No Sir. The sacrifice voluntarily accepted by the periodicals is of a severity unprecedented in their history and I would not think it fair that the hardship should be other than equally shared.

Mr. Driberg: Can my right hon. Friend say whether, when the agreement was made, the distinction between commercial and non-commercial periodicals was borne in mind? Is he aware that such papers as the "Spectator" and the "Economist" would gladly appear without any advertisements at all, in greatly attenuated form?

Mr. Greenwood: I understand that is so, but the association concerned, the Periodical Proprietors Association and the Newsprint Supply Association in the discussions, did come to the conclusion that they should suspend publication as from today for the fortnight, with the exception of daily and Sunday papers, and so on. I was not present at the discussion but I gather that the organisation which represents all these periodicals agreed in a very public spirited manner to the suspension of issue for the time being. Quite clearly they were of opinion—an opinion which I share—that if some had to do it, all had to do it. [HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear"] I do not see how we can depart from that. It may well be that some of these newspapers might have said voluntarily, "Well, we could do a short truncated edition," but clearly this must apply to all of them.

Mr. Skeffington-Lodge: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that discrimination in favour of certain publications at the expense of other types of journal, which is sought by various hon. Members of this House, is wholly deplorable?

Mr. Hopkin Morris: Does the Minister realise that what he has described as an "unprecedented hardship" is an unprecedented blow at the formation of serious and enlightened opinion in this country?

Mr. Greenwood: I would not have thought that serious and enlightened opinion would suffer by having a fortnight in which to think for itself.

Mr. Henry Strauss: When the right hon. Gentleman says that this agreement was made on behalf of all these papers, is he aware that the "Economist" was not a party to this agreement in any shape or form?

Mr. Greenwood: I was not aware of that. I thought it was a generally understood acceptance of a proposal which had been put by the Government and I gathered that the association concerned was widely representative of all periodicals.

Odlum v. Stratton (Costs)

Sir E. Graham-Little asked the Minister of Agriculture if he will now reveal the amount of costs in *Odlum v. Stratton* paid to Mr. Odlum's solicitors; whether these were a full indemnity to Mr. Odlum; what amount of the costs of the action was charged to his Department; what other cost were paid under the indemnity; whether those are the full indemnity costs; and what precautions he proposes to take to avoid similar incidents in future.

Mr. T. Williams: In answer to the first part of the Question, the costs, which have now been taxed and will shortly be paid, amounted to £4,965 6s. 11d. No indemnity was given to Mr. Odlum. The whole of the costs of the action will be charged to my Department. The costs were taxed in accordance with usual practice on a party and party basis, and consequently, as in all actions, they do not necessarily amount to a full indemnity. In answer to the last part of the Question, committees are, of course, aware that statements should not be made which can be construed as libellous and no doubt the result of this case will make them more careful in future.

House of Commons: February 26, 1947.

Fuel Emergency

Mr. Frank Byers (Dorset, Northern) . . . It appears that an arrangement was arrived at with a trade association, namely, the Press Periodicals Association, whereby all periodicals were to be suppressed for a period of a fortnight. The question I wish to put to the Minister of Fuel and Power, which is of constitutional importance, is this: Was there any statutory authority for that order? The only thing which has been issued from the Ministry of Fuel and Power has been a Press release. I would not have introduced this subject, in a Debate of this kind but for these reasons: An emergency arose, and the Minister took it upon himself to suppress free organs of the Press for a given time, without any statutory authority whatsoever, by coming to an agreement with a trade association, which represents only 60 per cent. of the journals involved. Is it the case that he can control the publication of these periodicals merely by a piece of bluff or a piece of sharp practice, and I say that advisedly. In the next crisis which may arise, it may well be that an order will be issued from the Public Relations Department of the Board of Trade that all shops are to close for a fortnight, without any debate in Parliament, and with no statutory authority. There is no legal authority for this at all, and therefore this is a matter which should have the attention of the House. It cannot be laughed off by hon. Members on the other side, who claim to believe in Parliamentary democracy. I say frankly, as far as Liberal publications are concerned, they will still appear, because there is no statutory authority whatever for putting on this ban. I should also like to ask what right has the Minister of Fuel and Power in this crisis or any crisis to decree that duplicated copies, which do not involve the use of power in their production, shall also not appear. The Minister, to my mind, is responsible for the

control of power, and not for the control of publications. I feel it my duty to draw the attention of the House to this very grave inroad upon its privileges as a legislative body. . . . I ask whether a Bill of indemnity is to be brought in, and if not, whether these people who had a duty to publish these papers and who by not publishing them have suffered losses, have a claim against the Crown for action taken by a Minister without statutory authority. I should like to have an answer from the Minister on that matter

The Minister of Fuel and Power (Mr. Shinwell): . . . The hon. Member for North Dorset (Mr. Byers) asked whether there was any statutory provision for the action taken in the suppression, temporarily, of periodicals. The answer is that there is, of course, no statutory provision, but it was possible to gain the consent of those who represent, for the most part, the weekly periodicals.

Mr. Byers: Sixty per cent.

Mr. Shinwell: That is true, but there was a majority. Actually there was some discontent about the decision, but the action had to be taken, having regard to all the circumstances. I think the action taken by those responsible for conducting the publications was, on the whole, quite satisfactory.

Mr. Byers: Will the right hon. Gentleman say why his Order said that the publications "are not permitted"—those very words "are not permitted"?

Mr. Shinwell: We had to rely for the most part on voluntary co-operation, but an instruction of some sort had to be given. The parties concerned naturally sought guidance, but the matter will be disposed of very shortly, as already some arrangement has been made for the resumption of those periodicals.

Mr. Byers: In other words, it was a bluff.

[*Mr. Shinwell* did not comment on this remark.]

Paper Quota (Personal Case)

Sir E. Grahame-Little asked the President of the Board of Trade why his Department has refused to Mr. Douglas Reed the small quota of paper granted to ex-Servicemen to start a publishing business, in view of his Department's ruling that this small quota could be granted to ex-Servicemen who have sound experience of book publishing and wish to start a bona fide publishing business and of the fact that Mr. Douglas Reed saw service at the front in both wars; and if he will reconsider this decision.

Sir S. Cripps: I understand that Mr. Douglas Reed was a war correspondent in the last war and not a member of the Armed Forces. In the circumstances, however, it has been decided to grant his application for a paper quota.

House of Commons: February 27, 1947.

Supply: Committee—Foreign Affairs

Mr. Hollis (Devizes): . . . One thing has been clearly proved by the serious developments of the last 18 months. It is that those people were a great deal too simple minded who said—indeed, people sometimes still say it—that the international pacification of the world would be automatically solved merely by putting Socialist Governments into power. I would ask the Committee to consider, as passionlessly as possible, what is the difficulty of the Russian point of view.

I remember that before the last war I used to have conversations with a Russian diplomat and he used to explain to me, "It is not fair to say that we Communists want to make revolutions in other countries. You misunderstand us if you say that. The way we are compelled to look at it as Marxians is that we think that all non-Communist societies are coming to an end anyway. There are these inherent contradictions in non-Communist economies which mean that they are inevitably riding for a fall. Therefore, the problem, as we see it, is not that we want to create disturbances in those countries but that they are coming to an end anyway and the only question is whether we shall allow them to collapse into chaos, or take such steps as are open to us to guide them on to the next logical point in their route towards the Communist state."

Granted the Marxian premises, that is an entirely coherent and, indeed, irresistible argument, and I am sure that one must understand that the Russians today, do honestly believe that all these bourgeois Governments of Western Europe are coming to an end. And whether hon. Members opposite like it or not—indeed, whether it be fair or not—when the Russians think of bourgeois Governments they include the Government opposite. There are many people who think that the Bolsheviks came into power by overthrowing the Tsarist regime. In fact, they did nothing of the sort: they obtained power by overthrowing the Parliamentary Socialists. If we read the extremely interesting letters of Lenin we discover that he believed, as all Bolsheviks believed when the revolution took place in Russia, that at the end of the 1914-18 war when Germany collapsed it would be possible to move Communism to Berlin and thence into Europe. That was their expectation. They expected Communist revolutions after the 1914-18 war. There is very little doubt that we shall find that they had the same expectation of revolutions after the end of this war. They thought there would be a war between Great Britain and Germany—in which they were right—they thought that Russia would be able to keep out of that war—in which they were wrong—and they thought that when it came to an end, Communist regimes would establish themselves in Europe. All the logic of Marxism compelled them to believe that.

That is what they thought. What happened? In the closing months of the war the Russian Communist forces were able to advance themselves to the line Stettin to Trieste, and behind that curtain, as it is fashionable to call it, there are now either Communist or near-Communist régimes. Sometimes we have a pure Communist régime, sometimes a Coalition government. A Coalition government in such a country means the sort of government in which the hon. Member for Mile End (Mr. Piratin) might be Prime Minister, and to show that it was not a one-party régime the hon. Member for Hornchurch (Mr. Bing) might be included as Chancellor of the Exchequer. On the one hand, over half of Europe there has been this very strong advance. On the other hand, over the rest of Europe something quite different has happened. It is important that people should understand what has happened. What has happened is that wherever there have been free elections—in Austria, Hungary, Greece, Italy, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Norway—wherever the people have had the opportunity of expressing their opinions, they have expressed opinions very decidedly against Communist régimes. They have turned against

(continued on page 8)

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: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 18. No. 1.

Saturday, March, 8, 1947.

Notes on the Lock Out

The consequences of the recent edicts of the Ministry of Less Fuel and Power have hardly begun to be reaped. Privation is being borne angrily by millions, for many of whom the results will be grave. Trade and commerce is dislocated. The stage is set for major conflicts. If not the 1947 model of the General Strike of 1926, the initial or preparatory stages are developing.

It is too early, as these lines are written, to assess the reaction of the "banned" weeklies to the lessons they should have learned. Their instruction in real politics is not likely to have been complete, or, indeed, sufficiently advanced to carry them far without powerful assistance. It is the lines of such assistance which are therefore of paramount interest at the moment.

To Social Crediters those lines will be, or ought to be, clear. Briefly they are the demonstration of the necessity of uniting power and responsibility—decentralisation of policy, of initiative, is the key. Until they are armed with a clear understanding of the real nature of the mischief they are presumed to be tackling those editors who are contemplating the setting up of group machinery constitute a potential danger to freedom rather than the reverse. A negotiating committee was the major, if not the sole cause of the loss of the doctors' fight for freedom; and a negotiating committee was the first resort of bureaucracy during the suppression just effected. The first step to the restoration of rights to the individual is the repudiation by the individual of usurpers everywhere of the power of representation.

We shall watch the early development of the discussion with attention, but not with absorption. We wonder what percentage of sheer ineptitude and how much camouflage of solid devilry underlie the recent manoeuvres. What have "they" done, besides turning industry and domestic life upside down, irritating (but, curiously, scarcely frightening) everybody, demonstrating a point or two of social psychology, etc., etc., Have we missed some dark deed, quietly effected? Then there is all the more reason to get busy on the Trojan Horse of Communism and Treason within the parties—a useful list of names will be found in "From Week to Week."

Without Prejudice

(1) The following is the text of a letter received by the publishers of *The Social Crediter* on February 22, on stationery headed:—

W. H. SMITH & SON, LTD., NEWSAGENTS BOOK-SELLERS, STATIONERS, LIBRARIANS, BOOK-BINDERS, PRINTERS AND ADVERTISING AGENTS,

STRAND HOUSE, PORTUGAL STREET, LONDON, W.C.2, and dated February 21:—

"The Publisher, 'Social Crediter,' [sic]

"Dear Sir,

"We have received a supply of duplicated copies of the 'Social Crediter' [sic] dated week-ending February 22nd.

"According to Government announcements, as you will know, publication of all weeklies and periodicals have been suspended for the weeks February 22nd and March 1st.

"Clause 6 of the Ministry of Fuel and Power Pronouncement states 'Duplicated substitutes for suspended publications are not permissible.' You will gather from this that we are unable to distribute these copies, and would like you to let us know if this issue is to be distributed when the release order is given by the Government.

"Yours faithfully

"C. Bartle

"W. H. Smith & Son, Ltd."

(2) The reply sent by Messrs. K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., to Messrs. W. H. Smith & Son, Ltd., was as follows:—
 "Gentlemen,

"We note from your letter of the 21st inst. under reference C/N/CB that you will not distribute the copies of *The Social Crediter* supplied to your order, and that you await our instructions. Please return the copies to us."

(3) Messrs. W. H. Smith & Son, Ltd., are customers of Messrs. K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., for supplies of *The Social Crediter* to sell to customers. They are agents, if at all, of readers not of the publishers (in this case).

(4) We print the above correspondence chiefly for its evidential value to (1) Readers and (2) Proprietors and Editors.

Mr. W. E. Hall and THE TIMES

Under the heading "Freedom to Print," and with the assistance of *The Times*, February 26, Mr. W. E. Hall, 14, Park Hill Road, Birmingham, 14, launches the accusation: "None of the objecting editors have stood by their declared principles and challenged the Minister by producing a 'duplicated substitute,' without using electricity. The freedom of the Press, of which these gentlemen are the inheritors, was not won in the past by such cautious methods."

The Editor of *The Social Crediter* has written to *The Times* contradicting Mr. Hall's statement. We may now see how general is the "Freedom to Vindicate."

The Social Credit movement is not an
 "underground" movement.

THE PROPER HABIT OF GROWING PLANTS IS ROOTED IN THE GROUND; LEAF AND FRUIT ABOVE GROUND. BEARING THIS IN MIND, WE SHOULD BE GLAD TO HEAR IF ANY READER HAS IDEAS FOR THE SUPERSEDEMENT OF THE ART OF PRINTING FOR THE GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF INTELLIGENCES.

Who ARE the Poor?

By ELIZABETH DOBBS.

Who are the Poor? The question raised by Mrs. Best's article in *The Social Crediter* of December 21, 1946 and revived by Mr. Laurence in the issue of January 25, 1947, sets the curious a deeper problem as to the limits within which each is right.

Do you remember Bob Cratchit in Dickens's *Christmas Carol*? He had 15 shillings a week, and a long, long muffler instead of an overcoat. He had a wife and six children, and what did they all eat for their Christmas dinner? Poor young Cratchits! Their father could only manage a roast goose*; they merely had a Christmas pudding round as a cannon ball, aflame with a pint of brandy; and afterwards, as they ate their apples and oranges and put a shovelful of chestnuts on the fire to roast, they had to make do with a jugful of something compounded from gin and lemons.

Bob Cratchit was exceedingly poor. In fact he *was* "The Poor" of the Victorian Age—Dickens's Type of Poverty (and Dickens was not given to understatement) in a morality tale where all the figures are symbols rather than characters. He was poignantly poor,—but what riches, today!

Mrs. Gaskell, describing Keighley (I think), through which she passed on her way to visit Charlotte Bronte, noted particularly the two heaps flanking every doorway in the rows of poor men's cottages: a heap of coal on one side, and on the other a pile of vessels for brewing beer.

What poverty then! And what riches now!

Since those passages were written, we have harnessed power enough to make every man a nabob, but we have only succeeded in delivering most men into a state in which geese and brandy and *round*† plum-puddings and gin and lemons and chestnuts, not to mention coal and beer (let alone home-brewed beer) are fables.

The poor and the rich are, in fact, comparative terms. They are not absolutes: and Christ's words at Bethany, "The poor always ye have with you," referred to in an anecdote at the opening of Mrs. Best's article, are merely a plain statement of fact, the simple fact that poverty, and also wealth, is an economic relationship. Not only have there been poor and rich from that day until this; but the only conceivable alternative is equality of wealth, a conception quite at variance with the nature of man and, indeed, of any form of life. As we are now beginning to find; the attempt to realise such equality evokes more starkly still the differences that are in the very pith of men's nature: but it evokes them as the factors of tragedy, never as the elements of the life more abundant.

I shall return later to another stratum of truth to which these words refer, for they and the incident that gave rise to them are truly at the core of Mrs. Best's problem.

But is she not confused about her problem? It seems to me that she incorporates into her pattern without distinction factors from several quite different frames of reference, with the result that her design is at once too simple and too sweeping; and while what she concludes is true enough within certain limits, to examine the nature of the limiting factors is at least as important as to trace the case they envelop.

*"Such a bustle ensued that you might have thought a goose the rarest of all birds." Dickens: *A Christmas Carol*. Stave 3.

†You cannot buy spherical plum-puddings ready made.

As both Mr. Laurence and Mrs. Best point out, The Poor are a very mixed lot, and not standard units of destitution as like each other as billiard balls. But what follows from this? Who *are* the poor? There are the unwilling destitute who cannot get enough money to sustain themselves even with thrift; there are also the extravagant poor who make a good deal of money and spend it all and continue to be slum dwellers. There is the aristocracy with land but no money to maintain it; there is the peasant, with food, but little money. There are the clergy, with large families, large houses and small stipends; the professional people who won't sell their souls; their retired relatives living respectably on minute and collapsing dividends; the pensioners; the sick and those with some deficiency, either of mind or body; the idle poor; the artists who starved for their conception of art (can they still?); the tramps, who choose the road, and cannot abide steady work; the religious poor who *choose* the life of poverty; and even the temporary poor—campers, mountaineers, etc., who choose a temporary poverty as an adventure.

Although it is difficult to generalise about such a collection, it is clear that there are at least two sorts of poverty, not necessarily coincident—monetary poverty and poverty in real things.

And one can also see three classes of reasons for being poor. The first of them comprises involuntary and non-immanent factors, of which by far the greatest was (until direct suppression of wealth began to surpass it) a monetary policy that ensures that incomes in total can never meet costs: but this affects every economic class in proportion to its income, and the poor mathematically least, although that 'least' may perhaps in human terms rank highest. The second kind of reason for poverty includes inherent and real abnormalities of mind, body or will, such as lunacy, sickness or idleness. And thirdly there is free choice; and, though neither Mr. Laurence nor Mrs. Best are concerned with willing poverty, it is important to remember that it exists.

Most people who are poor are so for a mixture of the first two reasons, and their poverty may be of money or real goods in quite different degrees. The poorest in money have often a great deal to lose which cannot be lost through money directly: apart from houses and lands and such things, they have their children and their friends; and they have also that pattern of thinking and behaviour which preserves to them their self-respect and independence, within whatever limits are allowed. One side of it is called culture: another is called morale; and it is the basis of personal credit.* It is something that in the past has been so taken for granted as the condition of tolerable existence that no famous legends illustrate it; but it is within everyone's experience. To take only one example, most people know some desperately poor elderly lady who stubbornly subsists on next to nothing in independence and her own traditions (*Cranford* is a good, though old-fashioned, guide-book on this subject). This persistence in cultural traditions shows how much is attributed to them. It is recorded that Austrian aristocrats impoverished after the last war have maintained and transmitted their proper culture while working as poor men in the factories, so that, though manual workers and poor men they are still the 'class-enemies' of the much wealthier and more powerful communists. It seems to be the breaking of this sort of integrity which creates a proletariat.

*"Real credit is a well-founded, that is to say, correct belief or estimate of the capacity of a person or community to materialise its desires." C. H. Douglas: *Warning Democracy*, p. 26.

Now State Benefits—and in this we include all paternalistic legislation by the State, including National Insurance, Family Allowances and so on—and also Centralised-Organised “Charity” so far as it imposes bureaucratic conditions on abstract “cases”, are expedients for relieving politically imposed monetary poverty at the price to the individual of this intangible heritage on which his whole personal credit is based. The results of this process are observed even by the most confirmed “do-gooders,” who complain of the decline in responsibility and initiative on the part of those for whom the State does so much. We may expect it to extend with the widening incidence of Government by regulation.

There is not much more to choose between Centralised-Organised-“Charity” and State Benefits than between cartelised Big Business and monopolist nationalisation. The difference, however, is a matter of dealing with men of goodwill rather than men of badwill: though the State stands between the poor man and the unwilling taxpayer by ordaining that as the gift is unwilling there is no reason for gratitude—which is a relief!

On the other hand, Social Credit literally capitalises the heritage which Centralised-Organised-“Charity” and State Benefits take steps to destroy—the effective good will of mankind—and by enabling it to operate in the practical production of whatever the owner considers to be of most value and importance, at once augments real wealth to the extent that people consider desirable (limited only by natural resources and by techniques) and sees to its equitable distribution. It would certainly abolish imposed poverty with the National Dividend (itself a mode of interdependence, of course), but despite the immense improvement that this would bring about, social *credit*, being what it is, cannot remedy poverty that is a reflection of reality, *i.e.*, that due to the second class of reasons referred to above. The thing that Social Credit will cure is not the existence of rich and poor, but the inability of all classes of income to meet costs, and thus it will restore the satisfaction of all with the income they enjoy (at the moment no-one *enjoys* an income—least of all the ‘higher income brackets’). In fact, it will restore meaning to the verse in the hymn we were all brought up on, which must infuriate officials of the Ministry of Education, and which, I understand, like the second verse of the National Anthem, has been cut out of the latest hymnals! I mean:

The rich man in his castle,
The poor man at his gate,*
God made them high and lowly,
And ordered their estate.

Each person would strike his own level of income, the outcome of his peculiar blend of will, energy, efficiency, intelligence and disposition, added to his share of the national heritage in the shape of the national dividend. But there would still be rich and poor, and the poor (apart from those who chose it) would be the *incapable*.

Now if we allow to proceed much further the ‘dole’ method of discouraging production by fining those engaged in it for the support of the growing body of those who are not, we may soon find that real credit† has sunk so low that a National Dividend, if introduced, would be quite inadequate

*How many of us have even our own gates, these days?

†See footnote on page 5. Also, “Credit, convertible into money, is a correct estimate of the capacity of society with its plant, culture, organisation, and moral, to deliver goods and services desired by individuals.”—C. H. Douglas: *Credit Power and Democracy*, p. 126.

to relieve the destitute. Yet the further we go towards such a position the more urgent becomes the reversal of policy represented by Social Credit, which offers the only hope of a return to plenty. A policy of destroying all motive for production must of course lead to destitution—that cannot be avoided; to re-create that motive and the real credit to which it gives rise, is vital, and the only way of sharing the scarcity without impairing the motive for curing it is the voluntary method. If the Dividend is too small to do away with it, real poverty, such as that due to sickness or incapacity, must be left to real (that is willing and personal) charity.

Let us suppose, however, an increasing dividend which progressively becomes more adequate. At what stage do the helpless cease to be in need of true charity? Even money charity will be needed until the dividend has reached a considerable magnitude. Money charity, which through the perversion of money now appears the most important expression of charity, is really among the lesser forms and obscures those which are more vital. It seems probable that as the dividend increases and progressively displaces the wage the monetary profit motive will be increasingly modified. It will be increasingly difficult to hire people to perform the more arduous or unattractive duties unless they want to do them. In that case they will not want money for them, and such duties as the care of the sick, which is essentially an expression of charity, will depend completely on charity.

They will depend on true charity: not the ordinance referred to in the dreadful phrase, “as cold as charity,” nor the coercive institutionalism so called by many others besides Mrs. Best, but the charity of which St. Paul wrote before the word was outraged and which has been defined as “the love of God above all things for His own sake, and the love of ourself and our neighbour for the sake of God.”*

Mr. Bevan has declared his intention of doing away with charity altogether in relation to illness (where it is perhaps most needed) and while his words are no doubt aimed at the perversion, under this pretext the steps for which he and Mr. Griffiths are responsible are making goodwill, charity and concern for others increasingly difficult. To the extent that they succeed they will eliminate social credit—people already have only a diminishing faith that in association they will be *allowed* to get what they want.

“For the poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always” was Christ’s comment on a most significant incident.

Mary had anointed him with ointment of spikenard, “very costly”; St. Mark continues, “And there were some that had indignation within themselves, and said, Why was this waste of ointment made? For it might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and have been given to the poor. And they murmured against her.” But St. John, who was there, says that it was *Judas Iscariot* who made this suggestion, and more.

“This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he had the bag, and bare what was put therein.” Gore’s *Commentary* adds that the form of the word translated by ‘bare’ indicates that Judas was *in the habit* of taking from the bag!† Judas, in fact, had the makings of a first-rate Min-

*M. Shechan: *Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine*, II p. 222.

†The Revised Version has, “having the bag took away what was put therein” and Father Ronald Knox, in his recent translation, “he kept the common purse, and took what was put into it.”

ister of State Insurance, in that he wanted to exact contributions so that he could extract a generous salary in return for graciously dispensing the rest (though we doubt he got £5,000 a year out of it).

There remain the third sort of poor, those who choose to be so. Jesus himself was poor—incidentally. St. Francis was poor—heroically. Christianity was founded by men who were either poor, or who esteemed some things more highly than wealth. On their case, too, the incident at Bethany has a bearing. "The poor always ye have with you," John puts it without qualification. We are told that the disciples simply forsook their ordinary way of life and followed Christ. They chose poverty. They were always there. They were absolutely dependent on the charity of their neighbours, because that goodwill was one of the things that they believed in and made actual. Conversely, there was the advice given to the rich young man who had kept the Old Law scrupulously:

"If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me."

"But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful; for he had great possessions." (My emphasis).

Christ did not give this advice to everyone; it does not seem to have been the actual poverty in which he was interested (for it would have made the young man poor, and The Poor less poor) but in a kind of release, and a discipline, it would give to certain of those in whom he saw the seeds of understanding. It was probably bound up with the price to the individual of riches: "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" A few years ago we could put the price of a man's soul at something over £1,500 a year. Up to that level it was still possible to earn a living without pawning your policy—above it, question might arise. The level has fallen, and is falling.

It is as if those who maintain the deficiency in the price system are determined to justify it by creating a parallel flaw in prices expressed in real terms. The legitimate price of wealth in real terms should be the exercise of those qualities and efforts equivalent to the production of it: but nowadays in addition to this, something else is demanded—'key-money' in the current jargon of house-hunting—and at all levels this is a policy factor. We have seen that the price of a pittance for the unemployed is still the disintegration of initiative and responsibility which are the basis of personal credit. The price of souls is going down; as in a tale Hilaire Belloc once told of the Devil, politely embarrassed because he had to refuse the soul of an eminent politician, explaining that he no longer dealt in political souls singly—but if the politician could make up a *gross*...! So now, the biggest incomes are earned by those who trade the credit of millions: by those who pervert its sources (crooners, for instance, and film-stars) or divert its stream (bankers and politicians). The middle class man gets his opportunity in a smaller way as a bureaucrat—but he must also submit to the alienation of his personal credit hitherto only suffered by the destitute.

This is the corrupt system of the day. But even in a sane economy where policy had been freed, there would still be a price for riches—bounded on the one hand by the limit of one's capacity to extend real credit, and on the other by the attention engaged by and the responsibility of looking

after, the *things* that will comprise riches. This has always been an onerous duty, and might well obscure from the individual his true bourne, just as a wrong policy will misdirect him. Not everyone will desire riches on such conditions, and those whose capacities lie in other directions will (on such riches as they are willing to make and maintain) explore other motives and other ends than the elaboration of material gadgets which has obsessed and confused the Western world in the past two hundred years. From such as these we may expect developments which may modify the whole course of this civilisation.

Inevitably we depend on each other if we live in a community at all. There are two ways of doing so. We can rely on the controllability of our fellow men through fear and mass hypnosis for the necessary production and for the payment of taxes. It is no use denying that this is a very real basis of credit: it works, after its fashion. For instance no one doubts that practically everyone will pay the enforced insurance contributions.

The alternative is of course to rely on the voluntary spirit both for money and production, which Social Credit would implement in a society that believed in it. As regards the provision of wealth the National Dividend is an expression of surplus credit at large in the community, while charity is an expression of private credit. All credit of course is private in origin, but as soon as it becomes surplus it becomes social.* "They" have appropriated most of our surplus credit; but they have to leave us some, or the system breaks down (if no one is allowed to produce wealth surplus to his own requirements obviously society ceases to exist); and apart from surplus, everyone who is allowed to survive must be allowed some credit.† Now charity is the outward expression of one's personal credit, or, to put it another way, the personal direction of one's social credit; it includes all such things as hospitality, and neighbourliness and is by no means shown only towards the poor, but neither is there any reason why the poor or otherwise needy should be excluded from it. The credit attached to the exercise of charity is obvious—how else can one explain the rush of would-be 'philanthropists' to grab it, and the perversion of the word as well as the thing itself, until it stinks so much that even 'Beveridgism' is preferred? At its best it is used to help an individual to retain his policy under a pressure too great for him to withstand with his own resources. It is directed, that is, to a freeing of policy in individual cases.

Charity is thus the core and ultimate residue of the thing which if allowed to grow develops into social credit at large. That is why Mr. Bevan and Planners generally want to get rid of it. But this they can never do, because it is based on what they exist to steal; so their aim is to abolish all surplus credit from the vast majority. But credit is surplus only relative to needs; and needs can, if necessary, be reduced so as still to yield a surplus to provide the only possible basis for improvement. This means sacrifice, a

*This was recognised by the Christian "economic theory" of the Middle Ages; e.g. St. Thomas Aquinas makes it clear that while the rich man's rights in his property were absolute as regards administration any product from it surplus to his needs was to be given to the poor not as a meritorious act but as part of his function in the economic cycle.

†Even a bureaucrat has some real credit out of office hours—though during his employment his credit is negative, as it must be measured in productive activity suppressed and diverted.

tactic imposed by the Enemy, the essence of which is the surrender of the inessential to save the essential—the pottage rather than the birthright.

And, as the ultimate residue of social credit, charity is in fact an invincible fortress, the strongest possible expression of the voluntary principle because far from being forced, all the forces except that one force which it is against it.

It will be apparent from the foregoing that far from doubting whether the relative merits of public and private charity are a subject worth "serious consideration to-day, and one having any bearing on reality," there is surely implicit in it the whole germ as well as the burden of social credit.

The poverty with which Mrs. Best's thesis is concerned is that characterised above as the 'imposed' element in actual poverty, and of course, she supplies the reason for its imposition: the "scourge of poverty" is to enforce dependence on central control and thrust us into the World State of well fed (?) slavery. But it is difficult to believe that those who are ruthless now in using poverty as a weapon to gain their ends will not retain it for use as a threat with which to keep their power: probably it has a greater potency as a threat than as a fact.

For there are two phases in the offensive use of poverty in this way. There is poverty itself, which although partly natural is, of course, appallingly intensified by financial policy and heaped, particularly, on all who jib at the conditions for relief. Here we agree with Mrs. Best that the destitute obviously cannot be 'ruined' in the restricted financial sense in which, as the melodramas say of the well-to-do, "Ruin stares them in the face"; but by accepting State conditioning (or other controller—"Charity" which interferes with the very structure of their lives, rather than Charity, which leaves them free, the Poor subject themselves to an enormous pressure too great for all but a few, tending towards that personal ruin (pauperism) of mind and character which is the end-product of the debt-system.

Secondly there is the *threat* of financial poverty: this is a political method of keeping those who still have money (and thus escape some of the direct conditioning) dependent on central control. It is made universal by the income-cost ratio (A + B) and in particular by taxation, as Mr. Laurence has pointed out. And it works by securing at a deep and probably unconscious level, the complicity of the will of the person concerned; e.g., Fabian-P.E.P.ism, etc.; the dislocation of character thus caused is equally obvious and more damaging to the right direction of credit.

So that the oppression noted by Mrs. Best, and the taxation analysed by Mr. Laurence, are supplementary and not in antithesis.

For the poor (and their sympathisers) by welcoming 'Beveridgism' increase the power of the weapon (threat of poverty) used against *everyone* except the utterly destitute. The non-destitute, by submitting to the pressure represented by taxation and A + B, increase the sum total of destitution. The only possible solution there is, or ever can be, is charity; not only of the less poor to the poor, but also, which perhaps is more difficult, of the more poor to the less poor.

Read:

C. H. DOUGLAS: *The Brief for the Prosecution.*

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3)

Communism—and to whom? The Attorney-General wrote a letter to "The Times"—...

Mrs. Leah Manning (Epping): ... does the hon. Gentleman know the exact number of Communist Members in the French Parliament?

Mr. Hollis: I will tell the hon. Lady the exact number. I happen to have it here. It is 169—

Mrs. Manning: Does the hon. Member know that it is the biggest party?

Mr. Hollis: I am perfectly well aware it is the biggest party, and I am also aware that it is not in the majority. Perhaps the hon. Lady will allow me to continue. The Attorney-General said, very truly, that Europe was not turning to the Conservatives. I entirely agree if, by "Conservatives" is meant the old Right Wing prewar parties, that Europe is not returning to them. On the other hand, the Attorney-General drew from the lesson that if the issue was not between the Conservatives and the Communists, then it must be between the Socialists and the Communists. In that he was completely misinformed, and the hon. Member for Gateshead (Mr. Zilliacus)—it is not often that I have the opportunity of agreeing with him—in his controversy in "The Times" with the Attorney-General, was completely right. The last thing they are turning to is the Socialists.

Some hon. Members opposite have put down a Motion asking the country to co-operate with the Socialist countries of Europe. The difficulty about that Motion is that there do not happen to be any Socialist countries in Europe, with the exception of Norway. It is a policy of co-operating with a ghost. It is perfectly true that the policy of parliamentary Socialism may stagger on for a few ineffectual years or perhaps months in this country, but one thing which is perfectly clear, for better or worse—I like antiques and sometimes regret it—is that Parliamentary Socialism in the world at large is a creed of the past and that the world has passed beyond it. Hon. Members opposite are museum relics. We must face those facts.

It is most important to understand who have been the new parties gaining in the elections on the continent of Europe. There has emerged a series of new parties with different names—such as M.R.P. or Christian Democrats—but all of the same nature, parties which are not in the least Conservative in the old sense of the word and not in the least Socialist. There are parties which the hon. Member for Gateshead referred to in his letter as Catholic Conservative parties, but of those parties on the Continent there is only one which in any ordinary sense one can call a Conservative Party. That is the Populist Party in Greece, and that one excludes Catholics from its membership so that the hon. Member's description was not entirely accurate.

(Further passages from Mr. Hollis's speech will be given next week.)

GLASGOW (SOUTHERN) D.S.C. SOCIETY.

Current Affairs Section.

A PUBLIC MEETING

will be held in R.I. Rooms, 200 Buchanan Street,
on TUESDAY, MARCH 18, at 8 p.m.

Subject:—THE SECOND WORLD PEACE.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.