

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 10. No. 8.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 1, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

## Programme For the Third World War (IV)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

A deceased diplomat, whose superb self-confidence adorned an almost invincible stupidity, explained the ideals of what, for brevity, we may term the Chatham House Gang.

Speaking at a dinner in New York just before the war, he remarked, "Peace comes from there being overwhelming power behind Law." The capital letter was, I think, in the original report. The speaker did not explain whose Law, or whose power.

Apart from the fairly obvious fact that more elaboration would appear to be required on these two matters, I feel that a little de-bunking of Law with a capital letter is both necessary and desirable at this time. Both the word and the thing are becoming overworked.

In parenthesis, the kind of Law in the abstract to which reference is made in the speech just recalled has many characteristics which distinguish it from natural law. For the moment, it is only necessary to refer to one. It is almost invariably negative—"Thou shalt not —." It is an interesting indication of the origins of the Law, that nine out of ten of the Commandments of the so-called Mosaic Law are negative, while the sole Commandment of the New Testament is positive.

I think that the important point to recognise is not merely the minus sign of the Law (because there is room for a good deal of elaboration on that point) but that negative direction is almost invariably a sign of immaturity *when taken by itself*. All children love to order people *not* to do things. Beginning with "naughty dolly," they work up to a point, usually reaching a maximum at about the age of eighteen, in which almost everything is coded—it is either "done" or "not done." Quite a lot of people never get past that stage, particularly if their life is spent in office work.

The perfect comment on this kind of Law is that of William Blake, the poet and mystic, who said that, "One Law for the lion and the lamb, is oppression."

While, in the last analysis, I think this goes to the root of the matter, it would be absurd to suggest that enforceable law has not a quite limited use. The Common Law of England worked on the whole to the general benefit, largely because it always had regard for the fundamental maxim *De minimis non curat lex*—the law is not concerned with trivial matters. And it is small matters which make up the essential life. The principle has only to be stated for us to see how far we have departed from it, and how fantastic it is to have an organisation which is forever

grinding out new laws. But that is something else again.

While this place for law in its proper place, and stripped of the nonsense of majesty and sanctity, may be admitted, it is yet possible to say, I think without any effective reply, that *Law becomes more irrational, oppressive, and ultimately intolerable as the number of persons affected by it increases*. So far from the ideals of the Chatham House Gang having any basis in inductive experience, only "intellectuals" encouraged by gangsters could fail to see that Home Rule movements are an affirmation of the healthy reaction against the World State. "Equality under the Law" is primarily intended to benefit the lawyers and their friends. So far from peace proceeding from it, there is not a country in Europe which is not seething because of it. Of course, it is open to anyone to say, as in the case of Dr. Temple, that "we need supremely the control of human purpose" and to defer the explanation of what you mean by human purpose and who "we" are.

For my own part, I am satisfied that this reaction against legislation is easily the most hopeful outcome of the war so far. No people ever became great by passing laws, and the combined tendency to regard law as a substitute for action, while abandoning industry for bureaucracy, is one of the most dangerous symptoms of racial degeneracy.

I am personally familiar, from a position of comparative detachment, with the working of two Government "spending" Departments.

The human material in them is usually good, but deteriorates rapidly. One of these Departments, the first example of nationalised industry, the Post Office, is a proof of the greatness of this country. No country which had not immense powers of endurance could sustain an organisation such as the Post Office, and survive.

In order to reconcile this with a fair, but rapidly deteriorating postal service, it must be realised that a very high proportion of the work of the Post Office is not done by the Post Office staff. It is done by the commercial organisation of the country. Practically the whole of its material is bought; nearly all of its transportation is contracted for by "outsiders"; and a high proportion of the most troublesome collection and distribution is the work of small sub-post offices which double the job with that of the village shop. With the exception of telegraph and telephone maintenance, and the mechanical equipment of the large city post-offices, the main function of the Postmaster-General's Department is that of a pure bureaucracy, operating under a set of intricate "Laws" known as Regulations. If a commercial undertaking of comparable size had the "overheads" of the Post Office, and dealt with its problems by the same methods, it would not stay in business for six months.

The ostensible work of this swollen bureaucracy consists

in writing "Minutes" in "Files"; and the art of writing minutes consists in never by any chance committing yourself to any responsibility for anything whatsoever. But, in fact, the main employment of these huge staffs is departmental intrigue mixed to an increasing extent with OGPU-Gestapo practices. They are riddled with Freemasonry; their Class Distinctions, like those of the Communist Bureaucracy in Russia, far exceed those of so-called capitalist society, any activity requiring practical knowledge being confined to the Lower Orders.

While I am confident that before much time has passed something will have to be done with the Post Office by someone, my object in expressing a mild and limited opinion on its merits is simply that we have a working model, in it, of what a complete bureaucratic state would be like. And the almost incredible fact is that the great mass of the population outside these organisations (in the main hypnotised by the economic security attached to State employment) have no idea of the facts, which are simply that the weight of them, which grows daily, is carried by the diminishing number of people who do any useful work; and that the economic security is simply parasitism.

The Post Office is Socialism in being under the most favourable conditions. It is a monopoly; it relies on a more efficient system to do most of its hard work at low pay; it is grossly overstaffed and has much more than its fair share of Jews in key positions. It is rigid and lacking in initiative; always looking for a reason why something should not be done, rather than why it should be done. It is impossible to hold it responsible for anything, and like internal Russia its one fear is publicity.

With this picture of Socialism under the most favourable conditions in our minds, we can consider the links between the inauguration of the Socialist State, Russia and the Fascist State, Italy, the allegedly opposing system.

*All rights reserved.*

*To be continued.*

### "Unofficial Super-Cabinet" In U.S.A.

The *Daily Express* of March 8, 1943, reported:

"Five 'Assistant Presidents' have been meeting secretly at the White House as an unofficial super-Cabinet to advise Roosevelt on the high politics of warmaking. The big five are:—

"Bernard Baruch, Director of War Industries in the last great war.

"Admiral William Leahy, Military Adviser to the President, and former U.S. Ambassador to Vichy.

"Mr. Harry Hopkins, the closest personal aide to Roosevelt.

"Mr. James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilisation.

"Judge Samuel Rosenman, the behind-the-scenes friend and adviser to the President, who calls him 'Sammy the Rose.'

"The super-Cabinet has no official authority, but tremendous power because of having the President's confidence.

"Its existence was revealed when other officials were called in."

The problem now said to be engaging its attention is as to man-power. Shall the United States conscript men and women for war industry?

The five are reported to be divided, either three to two, or four to one, for conscription.

### THE MEN-OF-MUNICH RAMP

The following was submitted to but not published in *The Patriot*:—

Sir,

Following upon quite a useful list of those who are 'most vocal in pursuing and vilifying the memory of Mr. Chamberlain,' Mr. Arthur F. Loveday explains their motive as being merely an unlaudable desire to divert attention from a simple error of judgment. Without any greater respect for the characters of most of the people concerned than Mr. Loveday's, I find this theory naive, and, indeed dangerous. The phenomenon, whatever it is, has clearly great historical and social importance, and the first explanation of it which arises in the mind should not necessarily be accepted unless it covers all the facts. To regard the 'anti-appeasers' as a lot of rabbits doubling back into their burrows underestimates their significance for ourselves and the future. They are sinister not because they changed their game but because they played, and are playing, a double game. Their objective was war, and not only war but a great war, with the narrowest possible margin of 'victory' on either side. To achieve their purpose, it had to be long, destructive and cataclysmic in the opportunity it provided for remoulding the world nearer to their hearts' desire. The acceptability of this desire may be best judged in the light of the means necessary to satisfy it. By those who vilify Mr. Chamberlain and are intelligent enough to know why they prefer one politician to another, Mr. Chamberlain is hated because he endangered the plan, and may have come much nearer than anyone yet knows to wrecking it. A not inconsiderable piece of evidence in favour of this last assertion is, in my opinion, the public bearing of Mr. Chamberlain right up to his last broadcast announcement of his colleagues' preference for another Prime Minister than himself. Those more closely in touch with him than the most watchful outside observer may know better; but I doubt whether many people detected the slightest sign of defeatism in Mr. Chamberlain's bearing until he knew that he had been driven from office,—or rather the Prime Ministership.

Yours faithfully,

University of Liverpool:  
April 2, 1943.

TUDOR JONES.

MAJOR DOUGLAS'S LATEST COMPLETED  
WORK IS NOW AVAILABLE IN PAMPHLET  
FORM.

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

Price 2s. (Postage extra).

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

## Signs of the Times

On April 12, *The Times* published a special article by its Medical Correspondent designed to intimidate the medical profession back into the acquiescent apathy which had, until recent months, seemed to promise easy victory for the Plotters. But lately there has been a growing appreciation amongst members of the medical profession of the nature of the situation in which they have become involved. For many years that once most self-reliant and independent profession had been "softened" by the frustrations imposed through the Panel system and by the steady propaganda of the centralisers, until everything seemed ready and prepared for the final imposition of a State medical system. It seemed not only inevitable, but natural. Without a struggle doctors would give up their private property rights in their own knowledge; their freedom derived from the receipt of income from many sources instead of from one; their initiative and their responsibility. Nothing more was to be heard from them than a mild and innocuous discussion as to whether an extended panel system or straight-out State authoritarianism should be "chosen."

But, as the Medical Correspondent indignantly observed, "Correspondence in the medical journals and discussion among the members of the general public seems (*sic*) sometimes to take it for granted that the setting up of a comprehensive health service is still a matter of debate and that negotiations concerning this basic principle are still in progress." What he also observed, but didn't mention, was that the correspondence and discussion had hardened and clarified; despite a few diversions, in the form of correspondence in the *British Medical Journal* not "closed because of lack of space," there is more and more to be heard of freedom, and of the fact that it is freedom to serve patients to the best interests of patients and doctors which is threatened by plotting, miscalled "planning."

So the Medical Correspondent let the doctors have it. Despite what doctors might think, there is a Government plan, though what the plan is has not been "revealed." On the other hand, the "broad principles" on which it is based "have been enunciated in secrecy" (Many thousands of lives have been lost through. . .) "for the benefit of the various groups summoned" (how too, too Hitlerian) "for this purpose." Furthermore, this plotted service is to be "administered through local government machinery." "Medical bodies may continue to advocate a national corporation to control the health services." (. . . Careless Talk!)

Just in case all this is not enough, the same issue of *The Times* carries a sub-leader to drive home the points made by the Medical Correspondent. And what admissions it contains! "Matters of finance, terms of service, and the details of administration all vitally concern the doctors." Now we know.

At least the medical profession has extracted a clear statement from *The Times* of the philosophy for which it stands. "The reconciliation of administrative self-government with central planning and direction of policy, of individual initiative with collective responsibility, is a problem not peculiar to the organisation of the health services and of the medical profession." There it is: "democracy" of administration with dictatorship of policy; the Minister makes a mistake (individual initiative) and the medical

profession gets the blame (collective responsibility)—or, as Major Douglas so often has pointed out, "*Demon est Deus inversus.*"

B. W. M.

## Social Credit Secretariat

### EXAMINATION FOR THE DIPLOMA OF ASSOCIATE, MARCH, 1943.

The following candidates have satisfied the Examiners:

Mrs. Clifford.  
A. F. Edwards.  
J. H. Edwards.  
Mrs. Hyatt.  
Mrs. B. Jensen.  
Alec Kearney.  
Lt.-Col. S. R. Normand.  
Miss Clara Robson.  
J. Sanders.  
Miss Gladys M. Watts.

Judging from the answers of the majority of the candidates, the examination paper set was more severe than was required for the standard of the examination, which is elementary. Questions one and two were in most cases not well answered.

Will those whose names appear in the pass list please inform me whether they wish their full names or initials only to be entered on their certificates.

B. M. PALMER, *Director.*

### Examination Set (Great Britain) for the Diploma of Associate, March, 1943.

Examiners: Mrs. B. M. PALMER, HEWLETT EDWARDS, Esq., H. R. P., Dr. TUDOR JONES.

(Candidates are expected to answer all the questions.)

1. Apply Douglas's dictum: "There is no fundamental relation between money and value"\* to payment for 'piece-work.' 25 marks.

\**Economic Democracy*, page 108, third edition.

2. Write notes explaining what you understand by the following words and phrases:—

- (a) An ideal situation.
- (b) Individual initiative.
- (c) Sanctions.
- (d) Political Economy. 25 marks.

3. A director of a trading bank, whose name is unfamiliar to you, is reported in the Press as having stated that, in his opinion, the adoption of some form of consumer credit will be inevitable after the war. What would you do about it? If your answer involves the writing of a letter, either to the banker or to some one else, write the letter. 25 marks.

(N.B.—The above question is set to give you an opportunity of showing competency in handling an opening of the kind suggested.)

4. What characteristics distinguish "optimum"-scale from unduly large-scale and unduly small-scale production to your mind? 25 marks.

## 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. 10. No. 8.

Saturday, May 1, 1943.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It will be noticed that in every case in which a Commonwealth Candidate has contested a bye-election an "independent" candidate has been put up to split the anti-Commonwealth vote. This is one of the most effective methods of securing the election of a minority candidate, but it is very expensive, and requires an extensive and underground organisation. Where is the money coming from, and what is the underground organisation? Precisely the same trick is being run in Canada, where the so-called Progressive Conservative Party is being "steered" by the late "Liberal" Premier of Manitoba, John Bracken, whose valuable service to the bankers in side-tracking the Manitoba Social Credit movement is now being rewarded. The Progressive-Conservative Party—"Tory"!—combines with the Communist C.C.F. (Commonwealth) Party to split any anti-banker vote wherever found. Money no object.

#### UNSOLICITED ADVERTISEMENT:

*Last Train from Berlin* by the American, Howard Smith, which devotes its early pages to ridiculing everything British except the Oxford Labour Club "which is less a part of the University than a competitor of it" and is addressed by "men of the calibre of G. D. H. Cole, Sir Arthur Salter, R. H. S. Crossman, A. D. Lindsay" and "Sir Stafford Cripps, Harold Nicholson, Professor Laski," etc., is published by the Cresset Press, and printed by the *Shenval* Press. Mr. Smith, who would appear to have acquired a Rhodes Scholarship by whatever method American Rhodes Scholarships are acquired, spent his first night at Oxford dead drunk, and proposed to, but unfortunately didn't, leave next day.

"O come, O come, Emmanuel."

Mr. John G. Winant, the millionaire World Planner,

who moved in at the beginning of the war to the post of Ambassador from the U.S. to once-great Britain, is not returning, according to a Canadian contemporary.

Liquidation of the British Empire postponed?

The Town and Country (Interim Development) Bill, which has just been introduced to Parliament, is a flagrant attempt to move towards the Totalitarian State we are supposed to be fighting against. It has nothing whatever to do with the winning of the war, and everything to do with losing the peace (if ever).

Write to your M.P. and instruct him to vote against it at every stage *and see that he does.*

From *Webster's Dictionary*:

**BUREAUCRACY:** A system of carrying on the business of government by means of bureaux or departments, each controlled by a chief who is apt to place special emphasis on routine; officialism; also government conducted on this system. Hence, in general, a system which has become narrow, rigid and formal, depends on precedent and lacks initiative and resourcefulness.

(2) Similarly, a system of government by bureau heads responsible only to administrative officers above them, having complete power over subordinates, and in official duties generally not subject to the law of the land.

**BUREAUCRAT:** An official of a bureau, especially an official concerned in a narrow and arbitrary routine or established with great authority in his own department.

UNDER DISTINGUISHED PATRONAGE. OPENING OF THE MONETARY REFORM SEASON.

Jake Kanes, the Treasury Pet, meets Halfpenny Morningthaw, the Yiddish Wonder.

Catch weights. No holds barred. All fouls legal.  
 Come and get all stoked up, folks.

"Nationalisation? We welcome it."

The *Share Control* of the Bank of Canada rests, in theory, with the Canadian Government. This capital is £1,000,000 (Five million dollars).

The effect of the working of the Bank is to transfer from individuals to the "State" purchasing power represented by the sum of the last four columns.

It's quite a young little Central Bank, but it shows promise:

#### PROGRESS OF THE BANK OF CANADA

Year	Annual Net profits* Total	% on capital	Transferred to Receiver General	Investment in Dom. & Prov. Securities	Total at end of year	
					Rest Fund (unappropriated) Profits	Notes in Circulation
1939	\$1,864,000	37	\$1,639,000	\$ 231,773,000	\$2,450,000	\$232,779,000
1940	4,044,000	81	2,546,000	575,763,000	3,723,000	359,949,000
1941	5,813,000	116	3,726,000	608,472,000	5,586,000	495,956,000
1942	9,097,000	182	7,985,000	1,016,401,000	6,473,000	693,618,000
Increase in 4 years				\$ 784,628,000	\$4,023,000	\$460,839,000
Per cent increase in 4 years				340%	164%	200%

\*After allowance for contingencies and reserves.

## On Social Security

*A speech of Mr. Norman Jaques in the Canadian House of Commons on March 5, 1943.*

*Mr. Norman Jaques (Wetaskiwin):* Mr. Speaker, it is a long time since I last addressed the house, and on this occasion I do not intend to make a speech. I shall try rather to make only a few random remarks.

First of all I should like to pay humble tribute to all those who have made and are making their contribution to Canada's great and splendid war effort—the armed forces, the merchant marine, their mothers, wives and sweethearts, the fishermen, the war workers in industry, and, last but not least, the farmers of Canada, to whose natural hazards have been added the handicap of shortages of labour and materials. Theirs was a voluntary effort. With the rest of the empire Canada did not wait for the invader's boot, because it did not need the spur of invasion.

The other day an hon. member sitting opposite said in the course of his remarks that he could understand what the Conservatives and the Progressive Conservatives were talking about; he could understand what the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation were talking about; he could understand what hon. members to my left were talking about, but he utterly failed to understand what members of this group mean, and what they discuss. I am not going to say that that hon. member was speaking for all members of his party; I happen to know he does not. I believe however that there is a large element of truth in what he said, and to me the reason is fairly obvious, because all other parties believe more or less in the same thing, and, I may say, their objectives are more or less the same. For instance I believe most members of other groups in the house, except this one, would agree that they believe in the creation of employment for all. They would agree on a planned production. I have heard several hon. members sitting opposite speak favourably of internationalism, an international bank and an international police force. I think most hon. members, with the exception of those in this group, are in favour of more and more taxation, and most of them seem to believe in the removal of tariffs.

I think that situation is more or less crystallised in Alberta; for in that province you see two parties to-day, namely the Social Credit party and the so-called Independents. The Independents are made up of Liberals, Conservatives—that is, Progressive and otherwise—and Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

*Mr. MacInnis:* No.

*Mr. Jaques:* They sit in opposition.

*Mr. MacInnis:* You are in opposition but you are not in the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation.

*Mr. Jaques:* They are in agreement in their criticism.

*Mr. MacInnis:* Oh, no, they are not.

*Mr. Jaques:* The leader of the Independents was a former Cooperative Commonwealth Federation member of this house.

*Mr. MacInnis:* He is no longer the leader.

*Mr. Jaques:* He was. Instead of the creation of employment, we believe in the creation of leisure. We believe in

a planned consumption rather than a planned production. We believe in decentralisation. We believe in nationalism rather than in internationalism. We believe in the abolition of taxation. We believe that the fundamental remedy which will have to be applied is the distribution internally of the purchasing power necessary to consume the whole of our production so that we may consume all imports which are exchanged for our exports.

Finally, I think the majority of the members of all the other groups in the house agree with the Beveridge plan, but this group does not and I think I can say that social crediters all over the world do not agree with it. They agree with the idea of security, but they do not agree with this method of obtaining security.

The first I heard of the Beveridge plan was over the radio, over the red network, or perhaps I should say the C.B.C. The announcer told us that the author of this plan, Sir William Beveridge, admitted that it would involve a trip half-way to Moscow. Therefore I was not surprised when I received the book to find that its cover was mostly red. After skimming through the contents I came to the conclusion that the red cover was the only novelty. It is simply an old scheme of national insurance; in fact it was adopted in England long before the last war when it was copied from Germany. The Germans initiated it, and possibly that is what Sir William meant when he said he was going half-way to Moscow to find the solution. I have been down below in the storeroom looking at the old government handbooks dating back almost to the times of confederation and the only colour I could see was blue. I have heard of blue books and white papers, and we now have a red book, or at least half red. As the author says, it is half-way to Moscow.

I should like to say a few words about the birthplace of this idea, the London school of economics. This school was founded by a Fabian socialist before the last war and was financed by Sir Ernest Cassel, a German Jew international financier, who I believe endowed it with a million pounds sterling. The admitted purpose of the school was to train a bureaucracy for the future world socialist state. Sir William Beveridge, I understand, is a director of the London school of economics. Another member of its alumni is our own chairman of the post-war reconstruction committee, Doctor James. Doctor James believes in and is working for the establishment of the gold standard. The other day, while addressing the Montreal chamber of commerce, he said this:

We realise—

I am not sure who "we" is.

...that the world of to-morrow will not be identical with the pleasant and familiar scene which lay before our eyes in 1939.

I infer from this that he looks to see a world considerably different, a less pleasant place after the war than it was before. I remember during the last war they said that all we had to do was to hang the kaiser and we would have a world fit for heroes to live in. They did not actually hang the kaiser, but they put him out of business and all I can say is that the world was a much less happy place without the kaiser than it had been with him. According to Doctor James, the world is going to be a less pleasant place without Herr Hitler than it was with him. Those are the words of Doctor James, not mine.

According to his book, Sir William proposes to give £4

or \$20 for a birth, and £20 for a funeral. Apparently a person will be worth more dead than he is alive. Then Sir William says:

Freedom from idleness is far more important than freedom from want.

It will be seen that he has added a fifth freedom to the four freedoms, namely, a freedom from idleness. Another distinguished member of the London school of economics is Professor Laski, who is professor of political history at the school. He is internationally known as a communist, and a few years ago he published an essay in the United States entitled *Recovery through Revolution*, from which I quote as follows:

The Communist hypothesis... insists that no Socialist Government can attempt seriously to put its principles into practice without encountering determined resistance which will issue in civil war. To maintain Socialist principles, in short, Socialists will be driven to become Communists or to betray their Socialism. If they become Communists they will find themselves involved in the grim logic of Leninism—the dictatorship of the proletariat, the drastic suppression of counter-revolution, the confiscation of the essential instruments of production, the building of the State, in a word, upon the principles of martial law until the security of the new order is firmly established. The transformation of capitalism into Socialism means revolution, and that implies an experience akin to that through which Russia has passed.

Well, we are going half-way to Russia.

The fundamental idea of social insurance is really nothing but compulsory saving. And is not compulsory saving the very remedy adopted by the government at the present time to kill effective demand, or, in other words, to kill prosperity? I am not complaining of that. I believe that the present government is making a very successful and praiseworthy effort in preventing any kind of inflation and in keeping prices down. But my point is this, that one of the main ways of doing it is through compulsory saving. Taxation is, of course, really compulsory saving. The main idea that underlies the Beveridge report is compulsory saving, and does it not stand to reason that it will have the same effect after the war that compulsory saving has during the war, namely, to kill prosperity?

Again, the Beveridge scheme, as I understand it, does not come into full effect for twenty-five years. If there is any merit in the scheme, why wait for twenty-five years? What are they waiting for? I understand that they have to wait until they have accumulated a sufficient fund before they can say: Now we can pay it out to one another. In reality they do not propose to save anything. They do not save any food, they do not save any clothes or anything of that kind. They are simply saving figures. You cannot eat figures; you cannot wear them. Suppose that when the war started this government had said, Sure, we must provide so many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of munitions of all kinds, but we cannot go to work on that yet because it will take us twenty-five years to accumulate the necessary funds, the figures. The same argument holds. If it is a good idea, why should we wait twenty-five years to put it into effect? Why not put it into effect immediately? Why not give assistance at once to those who are unemployed and those who are sick and need pensions or relief of any kind? If we did that, it would provide a great deal of employment for those who will need it.

At the present time, as one of my colleagues reminds me, we are paying the Germans every year a dividend of so many billions of dollars, amounting to well over half our national production, and we do not get anything in exchange

for it. In fact, that is the last thing we want. We make a present of the whole thing to the enemy. I remember when members of the house and people outside used to laugh at the social credit idea of paying ourselves a dividend. The thing appeared fantastic to them. Where would you get the money, they asked? It would be impossible, they said. But now we are doing it; only we are paying the dividend to the axis powers, a dividend that amounts to billions of dollars a year, and it seems to me that we are extremely prosperous while we are doing it. We are so prosperous that I imagine the main headache of the government is to kill that prosperity. Can one imagine what our prosperity would have been if, instead of making a present of all this wealth to the enemy, we had turned around and paid it to ourselves? Is there any limit to the prosperity we might have had? There would be no unemployment except of those who were incapacitated.

... Whether or not we wait for twenty-five years to implement the Beveridge report or something similar... certainly we should not wait for one day to augment the pensions that we are paying to the aged and the infirm and the war widows...

### CORRESPONDENCE

#### **Bristol Voters' Policy Association**

Sir,

It may interest your readers to know that the Hon. Secretary of the Bristol Ratepayers' Representative League recently resigned from office in order to carry the successful policy of the League into a wider field by forming a Voters' Policy Association. The League, meanwhile, as stated recently in the press by the Chairman, will continue to implement its policy unchanged in local affairs.

The aims of the associates of the Bristol V.P.A. are as follows:—

To obtain by study and practice an understanding of the nature of Democracy (government which delivers the results wanted by the governed) with a view to ensuring that the voters' policy, rather than that of any party, or independent representative, or anonymous controller of policy, shall prevail increasingly in the affairs of the country.

Under present circumstances any resident in the Bristol area over 17 years of age is invited to associate by accepting the above aims, taking part in the activities of the Association, and agreeing to act upon the advice given so far as he or she is able. Any Associate will resign when no longer in agreement with the policy of the Association, or when asked to do so by the Director.

The Association is prepared to give technical advice to any policy group (*i.e.*, group of people united on what they want) on how to organise to obtain their objective, and is prepared to be judged by the results of such advice when carried out.

Activities are already in full swing, and it is confidently expected that some results will shortly be forthcoming.

N. CORRADINE, *Director*,

C. G. DOBBS, *Adviser*,

*Bristol Voters' Policy Association, "Windermere,"  
Barleycroft, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol; April 20, 1943.*

## Points from Parliament

House of Commons: April 8, 1943.

### SUPPLY: CIVIL ESTIMATES — B.B.C. (PROPAGANDA)

*Mr. Pickthorn* (Cambridge University): . . . No process ever arrives at its terminus, except in the grave, and what has tended to happen is that the more machinery for discussion has been elaborated and modernised the more has the temptation been upon Governmental persons to see that a question does not emerge above the surface so far as to be open to discussion until things are already so arranged that only one answer to the question is possible. That is the modern temptation. It is the modern temptation of all countries under all sorts of democracies; whether you have the plebiscitary gangster kind of democracy, the sort of democracy of Hitlerism, or any other, there is a temptation to try to do the thing that way.

I beg hon. Members to believe that if I am now going to talk about the Beveridge Report it is not with any wish to criticise the Beveridge Report. . . My argument has nothing whatever to do with the merits of the Report. There is perhaps another preliminary remark which I ought to make, and that is that the Minister of Information must, I think, to some extent take responsibility for knowing the newspapers. The B.B.C. and the Ministry of Information are really indistinguishable. If anybody challenges that view I shall have to waste the time of the House by reading a long chain of quotations from Ministers. Everything that comes to us over the ether comes upon the responsibility of my right hon. Friend the Minister who ought to be on the front bench. The B.B.C. and the Ministry of Information are responsible not only for what is emitted by this machinery but equally, though it may not be quite so obvious, for what is not emitted by it, and though they are not responsible for editing newspapers they are responsible for knowing what the newspapers do. I do not say they are responsible for trying to print everything the newspapers do not print and for not printing anything that the newspapers do print, but they are responsible for trying to see that what goes out on the air shall enable the man who reads one or two newspapers, in conjunction with what he has heard on the air, to be able to make up a fair picture for himself. . .

There was not a great deal of preliminary boosting of the Beveridge Report on the wireless, although there was some—and this is queer, and is one of the things for which I regret my right hon. Friend's absence from the House—which included a statement by Sir William Beveridge on November 21—I am awfully sorry, but I have lost the exact words. Oh, I have them now—that if all ex-Service men and workers knew that the Government had good plans for maintaining employment after the war, that would be a major contribution to victory. That was not the line taken by the Minister yesterday in answer to a question by the hon. Member for Barnstable (Sir R. Acland). The Minister did not think it was flattering to our Forces to suggest that they would fight better because of political promises about the post-war future. I am bound to say that I do not. I think that if that were necessary, it would take us even longer to win this war than it is going to take, and we should be quite certain to lose the next one. . .

There was a certain amount of preliminary stuff on the wireless, and a great deal on the day which the Report was

printed. There were Questions answered in this House about how it was being published. I venture to ask the Leader of the House whether we could have an assurance that this Report would not be expounded on the air by those who had the advantage of reading it before the rest of us had had a chance of reading it, and the Leader of the House said that that would be considered. I do not know how much consideration there was, but it did not have much effect. In fact, that evening there was a long summary of the thing, telling us all about it and, I think, although I have mislaid a note and am not quite sure, there was an interview with Sir William Beveridge. The next evening there was a long talk by Sir William Beveridge and a few days later there was a conversation between Sir William Beveridge and the Editor of the *Daily Herald*. There was nothing of a critical nature at all.

I cannot say I have seen all the scripts, and I may be unfair about this. I have not secretaries to file and cross-index and arrange things and so on. I may put something wrongly or misleadingly, but I will try not to. Certainly my impression is—I send for the scripts pretty often, and I have read almost all of them—that there was practically not at all, all the way through, on the Home Service or the Foreign Services, anything in the way of criticism. There was one conversation in which an American journalist, called Ed. Murrow, took part—there were half a dozen of them altogether, but I happen to remember his name—with a couple of people who said something of a mildly critical kind. On the whole, this thing was put across in such a way that practically everyone was bound to take it. It was like the exercise of skill when the conjurer offers you a card. I do not know how it is done, but with a really good conjurer you always take the card he is trying to offer you. Anyone listening to those broadcasts was bound to get the impression that this was the card they were to take and that the thing was to be swallowed whole, and not to be looked at or criticised. . .

I have envelopes full of these broadcasts, and I obviously cannot read them all to the House. Perhaps it is hardly fair to expect the House to take my word for it, but I assure hon. Members, that for the first six weeks or more, so far as I can say, there was no attempt at anything in the nature of criticism or question in what was addressed to overseas audiences. It is true that there was put into broadcasts now and then phrases like, "Of course, this is only a proposal," but it was done in a rather perfunctory way. My right hon. Friend is too good a propagandist—it is his business to be—not to know very well the importance of the mood in which you say things, whether you say them in plain indicative mood—"this is," or "this will be"—or whether you state them in a more conditional way. We started off on December 1, when the nine main proposals were explained to the world, although nothing was said about the rate of contribution. On the same way, Mr. Gordon Walker told Europe that want could be abolished. . .

When the Report was issued it was clear that the phrase was to be the slogan or the *leitmotiv* of the whole thing; it was to be tied up with the Atlantic Charter and with the Prime Minister's lifelong devotion to social reform: these things were quite obviously the *mot d'ordre*, the word imposed. Those phrases were repeated in broadcast after broadcast day after day in every sort of language. On December 1, Mr. Gordon Walker said that the scheme had

the support in Britain of the vast mass of our people who were fighting and working. I do not know whether Mr. Walker had then read the Report, and how he found out that the vast mass of our soldiers approved of it I cannot guess. On the next day, Sir William Beveridge spoke. I will only quote from one paragraph of the speech and will leave out all the words except those which illustrate the indicative nature of the language. The quotations are:

"The main feature is . . . the scheme applies . . . it does not apply . . . everyone will be insured . . . the benefit will be the same . . . it will last . . . the one exception is . . . the schemes provides . . ."

and so on. You see what I mean. I might slip into that sort of language by mere inadvertence, but not the Minister, and not anybody acting under his *aegis* or guidance, and not anyone whose script had been vetted by the B.B.C. Those are the nuances, the fine shades, by which the thing is done, by which the pup is sold. Either the Minister and his advisers know nothing about propaganda or they know all about this technique. . . .

Sir William Beveridge is a unique creature. He was Chairman of a Committee, but he was Chairman without a Committee. He was suspended, like Mahomet. Has there been any previous case where the Chairman of a Committee has given views to the Press beforehand of the sort which were broadcast on November 19? Has there ever been any previous case of a B.B.C. broadcast of the views of a Chairman as to the good work his Committee were going to do? Has there been any previous case in which the B.B.C. allowed, or invited on their own, a Chairman to explain his own stuff on the day before his Report came out, or on the day after? Is that the ordinary practice of the B.B.C.? If it is not the ordinary practice, did they venture upon this startling innovation—I am sorry that there is only one Governor of the B.B.C. left in the House—entirely by the initiative of the Governors, whose pent-up energy had for years wanted to do something and at last broke all bounds? Or how did it happen? . . .

We are all very apt to assume that all Continentals always like us best when we are standing on our left foot. It is not true. . . and in war-time particularly it is a mistaken view to suppose that everybody on the Continent likes us better when we say we are more interested, or even as much interested, in social questions as in national, strategic and frontier questions; because it is national, strategic and frontier questions that interest you when you are defeated, occupied, make no mistake about that. . . .

. . . Was the Foreign Secretary really consulted? Was he clear before the ether was mainly used, as it was for weeks, for persuading the world of our interest in social reform? Our wireless boasted something to this effect, "To-day even Tunisia and Stalingrad have been knocked off the headlines by Beveridge." That was what Europe was told. . . .

I should not have said that the ether was monopolised. There were also more or less anodyne talks—there was news, but I will undertake to say this; that the main argumentative message to foreigners for weeks after December 1 was Beveridge. . . . There are two parties to communication; there are two parties to propaganda, and this House ought to know just what we are saying to foreigners, and also which foreigners are listening to what we are saying and what effect it is having on their minds. It is difficult in this war, more difficult than in the last war. . . .

*Jesus Meets Paul (A Duologue in Paradise)* by Dr. Alexander Paterson, for thirty years medical missionary in Hebron, Palestine, is now available from K.R.P. Publications Limited, Price 2s.

When the limited stock of this work held by K.R.P. Publications is sold this book will be out of print.

### SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

Owing to the absence of the Librarian this week there will be a short delay in the Library Service. Readers now waiting may expect books by next Thursday or Friday (May 6-7).

### MISCELLANEOUS

**FOUND** after the London Douglas Social Credit Group meeting at the Waldorf Hotel: a Man's Leather Glove. Apply to the Librarian, 21 Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.

**WANTED:** Copies of *What Katy Did at School* or other books suitable for a Schoolgirls' Library. Willing to purchase. Please write to Miss Doris Murray (Librarian), Bermondsey Central School, at The Aylwin, 55 Southwark Park Road, London, S.E.16.

### BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

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

#### ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold . . . . .	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson . . . . .	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne . . . . .	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance . . . . .	4d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee . . . . .	9d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt . . . . .	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus . . . . .	3d.

#### Leaflets

The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell . . . . .	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
Carthorse Conditions for All (the Beveridge Report issue of <i>The Social Crediter</i> ) . . . . .	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.
The Job of a Representative . . . . .	½d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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