

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 20.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 22, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

The Brief for the Prosecution

By C. H. DOUGLAS

CHAPTER XII*

On the declaration of war in September, 1939, and more especially, on the entry of the Labour Party into the Government in May, 1940, it was clear that the carefully prepared Socialist State for Great Britain was about to be inaugurated. The ordinary law was abrogated; by Regulation 18B the mere opinion of the Home Secretary was sufficient to procure the arrest and indefinite incarceration of a British subject, a power which was almost exclusively exercised against the political opponents of the Labour Party and its shadowy allies. A savage attack on private property and privacy itself was inaugurated by the evacuation and billeting regulations whose horrors were only equalled by their complete collapse—a collapse which did not occur without many terrible and completely unnecessary tragedies. It is safe to say that the ordinary citizen, during 1940 and 1941, came to dislike his own Government only less than that of Hitler.

It would be absurd to deny that the immanence of modern three dimensional, mechanised warfare renders drastic inroads upon civilian comfort inevitable. But the legislation which was imposed upon the country under the threat of war was precisely that referred to in the P.E.P. statement that no British Government would accept it under conditions less compelling. Perhaps, amongst many, the provisions of the Agriculture (Miscellaneous War Provisions) Act, 1940, form an example of the combination of measures clearly justified by a state of war, and measures intended to alienate property rights, and powerless to assist in a victorious outcome of the conflict.

To understand the situation it must be realised that both landowning and agriculture had been penalised in every possible way in the armistice years, both to enable payment for overseas investment to be made and to destroy the political power of agriculture. Thoroughly experienced and capable farmers stated openly that high production was ruinous. Tenant farmers, unless rigidly supervised, had "farmed out" their land and then sold out, leaving the soil exhausted and nearly useless without fallowing. In addition, the substitution of artificial fertilisers for humus had brought in its train a state of organic unbalance.

*The extracts now being published in *The Social Crediter* from Major Douglas's forthcoming *The Brief for the Prosecution*, of which the first appeared on May 13, 1944, are published with a view to the existing situation, and not in the sequence or detail in which they will appear later.

The submarine blockade made it obvious and vital that this situation should be rectified as soon and as far as possible, and the War Agricultural Committees which were set up were given the powers of a totalitarian state. The mere statement by an Executive Committee was sufficient to expropriate either a landlord or a tenant on the ground that land was not "at that time" being cultivated in accordance with the rules of good husbandry. That is to say, a condition which had been largely induced by Government policy in peace time, if in the opinion of a body obviously required to justify itself by action it existed, was a ground for expropriation under conditions which made, for the first time for many years, high cultivation profitable.

Assuming without examination that better results were obtained by this process, the inequity of it was explained by paramount necessity, although clearly providing grounds for generous compensation.

But paramount necessity cannot be invoked in respect of Part IV of this Act, which provides, *inter alia*, that "The Minister . . . may, after and notwithstanding the expiry of the said Act, continue in possession of the said land, either by himself . . . or by any person with whom a contract has been made under the following provisions of this section, for any period not exceeding three years from the end of the war period." That is to say, although no law may exist to justify possession, possession may be retained or delegated until it becomes unprofitable again, and this possession is dependent on something notoriously difficult to define, "the war period."

But the injustice goes much further. "The Minister" may spend indefinite sums of money for his own purposes, and when the land is given back, the owner, who has not been consulted, and whose opportunity to benefit by the expenditure has passed, is called upon to repay these sums. And for this purpose "The Minister" is placed by statute in the position of a mortgagee, so that he advances money to himself as tenant without effective check, on the security and credit not of the tenant but of the owner who cannot control him. Clearly, that is not a war measure—it is a political manoeuvre of a far-reaching nature, involving a complete body of powers expressly repugnant to English Common Law, as well as equity.

That the policy pursued is not a war-time necessity, but is an instance of the use of a public emergency to abrogate the principles of the Constitution in the knowledge that Parliamentary powers could not be obtained for the measures desired, is proved by the use made of "delegated legislation," against which so masterly a protest was made by the Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart, in his book *The New Despotism* published some years before the declaration of war in 1939. The technique, described by

Lord Hewart as "administrative lawlessness" is to pass an Enabling Bill so widely drawn that it will include practically anything, while at the same time giving no information to the Parliamentary representatives of the people affected; and subsequently, to issue Orders in Council, having the effect of law, which are not debated in Parliament; *i.e.*, the anonymous civil servant in the background, who is immune from responsibility, becomes at once the lawmaker, the judge, and the executioner.

More than two thousand of these Orders in Council were issued in the first three years from the resumption of hostilities. Many of them created new crimes with ferocious penalties, many of them were contradictory and quite a large number were unintelligible.

The body of legislation proposed or enacted under the general cliché of "social security" is even more obviously inspired by revolutionary rather than military activities. The much advertised Beveridge Plan, to which is ancillary the proposal to nationalise the medical profession so that the medical certificate can be "controlled," is a lineal descendant of Bismarckian Germany.

The comment on the evolution of German mentality under Bismarck "He instituted for the working classes a model system of social insurance, but at the same time deprived them of... all right to liberal or revolutionary opinions or activities" (*The Germans and the Jews*, p. 196) is directly applicable to the Beveridge Plan, an instance of the use of socialistic doctrines to entrap the dupes of it into an irretrievable position. That this criticism is not unduly harsh, may be verified by anyone who will take the trouble to observe the omissions in the abridged explanation of the Plan officially issued, or who listened to the broadcast recommendations of it as a novel and notable advance in civilised organisation.

It is perhaps unnecessary to recall that Sir William Beveridge was from 1919-1937—the dates are significant—Director of the London School of Economics, the institution endowed by Sir Ernest Cassel, the German Jew, "to train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State," and a member of the Royal Commission on Coal to which reference has been made.

(Copyright)

(All rights reserved)

"THE AIMS OF EDUCATION"

The extrication of life and thought from propaganda, even as a hypothesis, is only beginning. Its preparation has been the work of Douglas and the movement which follows him, and may later be seen to be their first positive accomplishment. Whatever allies and assistants come forward, the next steps in this liberation will be a task laid upon the Social Credit Movement, which is a cultural movement, in the first instance. To indicate our conscious acceptance of the implied responsibility, and not to depart in any way from the accepted definition of the field within which the Secretariat claims special technical competency, *The Social Crediter* has accepted for publication a series of five articles on *The Aims of Education* from the pen of Dr. Bryan W. Monahan. The first of these will appear next week.

MR. MAXTON AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

Major Douglas has addressed the following letter to Mr. James Maxton, M.P., at the House of Commons:—

Dear Sir,

I have read with appreciation and a large measure of agreement your speech in the House of Commons on June 22.

Possibly for tactical reasons, you suggest the common misapprehension that somebody gets the whole of the interest on the National Debt, and that, if that interest is met by taxation, the internal debt is merely a re-distribution. This is not the case. A typical instance, only one of many types, may demonstrate this.

Suppose Messrs. John Smith to have an overdraft with the Mudchester Bank—a normal situation. They may also have invested in War Loan, possibly on money borrowed from the bank at $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. less than the Loan rate. In any case, the Bank will hold the Bonds "for Safe Keeping" and collect the interest. This interest goes to the reduction of the overdraft and *both the interest and an equivalent amount of the overdraft disappear*. If you want a mathematical proof of this, you will find it in my evidence before the Macmillan Committee.

The Socialist emphasis on interest and dividends as being that part of the money-value of production which the "workers" don't get, has been the greatest godsend to the international financier, who is delighted to reduce both interest and dividends, and has done so. He merely gets control of everything produced on bank loans, and takes it when he wants it by calling in the loan.

Yours etc.,

C. H. DOUGLAS.

THE BROADCASTING MONOPOLY

Widely advertised as a 'model' public 'utility,' the real character of the British Broadcasting Corporation as a Socialist-Cartelist monopoly is becoming rapidly more widely apprehended. A start has been made in Canada to break the mischievous monopoly of broadcasting there. The monopoly exercised by the British Broadcasting Corporation is even more mischievous and is scarcely assailed. It must be broken. Volunteers willing to assist this purpose are invited to write to the Social Credit Secretariat, marking their envelopes "B.B.C."

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

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

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

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

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

ROOSEVELDT'S BIG IDEA: Let the British own and police anything they like, and we'll lease the strategic bits and control all the business.

"I have often wished it were possible to discuss great public questions in the abstract, and absolutely without reference to the person or persons by whom they are espoused; but history, observation, and experience illustrate the innocuity of principles in the abstract. They are relatively impotent until incarnated in a personality."

—DR. T. T. SHIELDS, Toronto, May 18.

We have often marvelled at, and regretted, the apparent inability of Sir Ernest Benn to see the logical implication of his own expressed views. But, having resigned ourselves to the fact, we are able to derive continuous pleasure from his sanity of expression and his grasp of the realities of present-day tendencies. These qualities reach high-water mark in an article in *Truth* of July 7 entitled *The Bourgeoisie*. There is no part of it with which we should disagree, but we should like to stress one point made by him, which is not much noticed; the intellectual arrogance of the present-day First Division Civil Servant, in conjunction with the marked lowering of standards of the remainder. There is the closest connection, which may be purely co-incidental, between Sir Ernest's criticism, and an article in the same issue entitled *Wanted—A Governing Class*.

It is the habit of the clever young men of the Fabian Society and elsewhere, many of whom are First Division Civil Servants, and very satisfied with their position, to shrug their shoulders and murmur the Russian or Yiddish equivalent of "*laudator temporis acti*" to any suggestion that their predecessors had certain virtues which have mainly disappeared. But the fact is that the First Division Civil Service of the latter half of the nineteenth century derived its unique qualities from the triumph of matter over mind. It is true that it was recruited by the most severely competitive examination in the world. But the examination was "unfairly" weighted in such a manner that it recruited the most pragmatically desirable candidates, not the best examination-passers. The subject is one of the highest importance, and we shall return to it. "They rule by the smiling terror of an ancient secret. They smile and smile, but they have forgotten the secret."

The New Christianity: Archbishop of Canterbury Model. A permanent income tax of 7/6 in the pound, and the giving-up of personal freedom.

—Canterbury Diocesan Conference, June 10, 1944.

"Democracy demands that no one shall have special privileges."

—BERTRAND RUSSELL, in *The Saturday Evening Post*.

So let's build all our railway carriages oval, and blow the expense, so that no one can have a corner seat. In the meantime, don't let anyone sit in the corners.

We should estimate the "weighting" of the News Bulletin

of the "B".B.C. on the Forces and Eastern Programme, which is received in India, to be 75-25 in favour of the American Army, as compared with the British Army. We gather that the R.A.F. occasionally flies, but only on the easy bits. Tune in at 5 p.m. and listen for yourself.

"Rome succeeded with its legions in organising a universal government and preventing serious wars for over a century throughout the Mediterranean Basin and Western Europe, but it became both tyrannical and corrupt at the centre; it proved unable to adapt itself to changing conditions, and the Eternal Empire passed away, the victim of over-centralisation."

No, Clarence, that is not a quotation from a Social Credit publication. It is an extract from a Report of the Carnegie Commission, an organisation whose objects appear to run parallel to, and to supplement, the activities of the International Money Trust and World Cartel.

"The end cannot justify the means, for the simple and obvious reason that the means employed determine the nature of the ends produced."

—ALDOUS HUXLEY, in *Ends and Means*.

That seems to dispose of the World State in the minimum number of words.

The killing of Georges Mandel-Rothschild ought to be a reminder that up to now, this war has settled nothing. Broadly generalised, the cleavage which ruined France was that between the corruption of the Grand Orient-controlled Comité des Forges with its infected and putrefying mass of journalists, lawyers, and bureaucrats, on the one hand, and the traditional Catholic France (in the sociological even more than the religious sense) of the landowning peasants, the remnants of the aristocracy and, more formidable, the Breton naval officers and their opposite numbers in the officer-graduates of the St. Cyr, on the other.

At bottom, it is the conflict between the proletariat and the peasant, the countryman and the factory hand. It cannot have escaped notice that a "land-question" is manufactured everywhere at a time when calm judgment has been suspended "in war, or under threat of war," and that those who are most vociferous for changes in rural conditions are those who live in towns.

Modern war is an exposition of the factory system, and the influences behind the factory system are primarily concerned to reduce their eternal opponent, the agriculturalist, to a subordinate place in the system by transforming the farm into a factory. The contrast between the conceptions of chivalry in war, and the battle of doodle-bugs, is simply the externalisation of this central conception.

"Anti-Trust suits by the American Government against four major chemical companies have been dropped until after the war at the request of the Armed Forces, it was announced to-day."

—U.S. Newsfront in *The Daily Express*, July 15.

The Armed Forces? Just aren't they!

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 12. No. 20.

Saturday, July 22, 1944.

THE B.M.A. IN THE TOILS

The turns and twists of the style, the skilful evasions and confusions, the familiar words and phrases, suggest that there is at least a common factor to the groups responsible first for the *Interim Report* of the now defunct Medical Planning Commission, next the White Paper on "A National Health Service," and now the supercilious PEP Broadsheet on the latter. *Planning* dated June 30, 1944, entitled *Medical Care for Citizens*, consists of fifty-five pages designed to convince all concerned, which is all of us, that a State Medical Service is a *fait accompli*.

There are a few faint signs that a few members of the B.M.A. Council are beginning to realise and regret the pass to which their amateur excursions into High Politics have brought them and their profession. They have been not only out-manceuvred, but double-crossed—the now familiar technique of totalitarian politics.

"*Technocracy or Democracy?*—For these reasons [they are irrelevant] many doctors seek largely or wholly to exclude local authorities or the Ministry of Health, or both, from the control of medical services, or at least of general practitioners, so as to ensure that 'experts, not politicians,' shall run them. A variety of syndicalist or technocratic alternatives to the Ministry of Health have been suggested, the most important being the B.M.A.'s demand of September, 1943, that 'the central administrative structure should be a corporate body.' The precise nature of this 'corporate body' has never been defined, but it appears to be regarded either as a 'guild' or as a public corporation not answerable to Parliament in any normal sense, but acting on behalf of doctors as a kind of public contractor for their services. . . . A guild or corporation which raises its own funds by charging the public for medical services rendered—a kind of doctors' co-operative agency for selling medical care—is just conceivable, though it would leave the problem of financial barriers unsolved; a similar organisation deriving the bulk of its funds from Parliament but beyond normal Parliamentary control would be grotesque." (Page 13).

Granted the philosophic collectivist assumptions, this criticism is just enough. The opinions of the B.M.A. on administration, especially public administration, are worth quite as little as the bureaucrats' on clinical medical matters. Yet they express them as pompously as does PEP. The difference is that PEP is taken seriously, and if the B.M.A. doesn't know why, it is time it found out. There is

cheerless reading in *The British Medical Journal* of July 8—and in most issues—for those who look to the B.M.A. to protect the rights not only of doctors, as is its function, but of patients, as it claims to do. As the body corporate of the medical profession it should, in fact, protect the patients' corporate interest, which can be deduced quite unequivocally from the terms of the Hippocratic Oath.

So concerned in administration is the B.M.A. that it overlooks, in its editorial answer to *Planning*, the answer which *Planning* inadvertently (or ironically?) gives, immediately following the passage quoted above: "In so vital a public service, which men, women and children daily expect to save them from death [excuse our emotion], the consumer's [not consumers'] supremacy 'in all business arrangements' cannot be challenged." Except, of course, by the planners.

There is only one way in which the consumer can be supreme, and it is, in fact, by controlling personally his side of the business arrangements that concern himself. If the B.M.A. wished to save the situation (which it doesn't: it wants to be a planner in its own right), it would take its stand precisely there. It would insist that the arrangements made by each consumer with his doctor are his own business; and that he wants neither Ministry of Health, corporate body, local authority, or any other claimant to mind his business for him. What patients are entitled to have is privacy and personal responsibility of the doctors they employ directly and only to themselves; and this means access to the money to enable them to "mind their own business."

The idea that the consumer has better control over the services he demands by handing his purchasing power over to an authority to spend at the discretion of Parliament than he has by paying directly for what he wants is so fantastic that its acceptance by the B.M.A. can only be due to collusion with the plotters. We happen to know that the alternative—ignorance—is not the explanation. The position is really quite simple; either doctors and patients will mind their own business, or some central authority will make a business of minding both doctor and patient. There are, of course, many claimants to the exercise of the proposed authority. But if Drs. Dain, Rogers, Hill and the rest of the inner Tavistock House group imagined that any consideration would be given to their claims, perhaps PEP has disillusioned them. History is simply the record of struggles of claimants to the exercise of centralised power; the power is often enough transferred, but never given away. The corporate B.M.A. is merely another claimant in the field of Big Business, and doctors are notoriously bad businessmen. They don't understand, let alone make, the rules by which the game is played. The "leaders" have done their job; they have got the doctors well entangled in what *The Tablet* calls "the confusion and the undergrowth in which Mr. Willink is engaging them;" the best they can hope for is that some of them will disappear into the obscurity of the neo-aristocracy.

"The people should be very chary of granting the power of 'direction' even if to be applied to only a small number of citizens. . . 'Suffer not the old King under any name!' Let the people beware; they cannot arrange a rendezvous at Runnymede with the Civil Service."

—SIR ALFRED WEBB-JOHNSON in *The Times*.

ENEMY-OCCUPIED COUNTRIES (BROADCASTS)

House of Commons: July 7, 1944.

On the adjournment *Flight-Lieutenant Teeling* (Brighton) said: ... I sometimes feel that this House does not realise how much is being said on behalf of this country to those occupied territories. The people in them do not always know exactly what is the position in this country, and have to listen under very difficult circumstances. They look on the B.B.C. as the mouthpiece of our Government, and often things are said of which, if Members of Parliament realised them, I do not think they would entirely approve. It is not as if there were several broadcasting systems from Great Britain, there is only the one. People occasionally talk of *The Times* as being the mouthpiece of our Government and of this country. I do not think that is true. But still more might it be claimed of the B.B.C., because it is the only means, very often, of communication with these occupied countries. The Foreign Office may take the greatest care in making a pronouncement in this House, and the Prime Minister may take the very greatest care in weighing his words here, but very few of us know exactly what the B.B.C. says about them in the evening when they are talking to the countries most interested.

I would take as a particular example, Yugoslavia. Some weeks ago the Prime Minister, in opening the last Foreign Affairs Debate, made what I considered a very weighty statement about Yugoslavia. He had obviously very carefully weighed his words in everything he said, but the broadcast that was made that evening to Yugoslavia left out a very large part of what the Prime Minister had said and put in one piece, together with a quotation from an evening newspaper in this country. I raised a Question about it a few days afterwards, and I am afraid that the Minister of Information jumped right down my throat—

The Minister of Information (Mr. Brendan Bracken): Oh, no.

Flight-Lieutenant Teeling: Much hurt, I therefore asked if I might bring it up again to-day. The actual statement, as well as I remember it, of the Prime Minister was that he had received a message that King Peter had dismissed or received the resignation of his Government. In actual fact that Government did not cease to exist, and was not dismissed by King Peter, until midday one week later. Therefore, the Prime Minister must have been misinformed by whoever gave him that message. However, that evening the B.B.C. broadcast to Yugoslavia the statement that King Peter had dismissed his Prime Minister and his Government. Practically all the rest of the Prime Minister's very weighty statement about Yugoslavia was left out. As I say, bits of an article from an evening paper, which rather inferred that King Peter had been forced to do this, were put in.

Now, I think we ought to realise—especially at a time, as it was then, when this country had to cut diplomats off from direct communication with their own people by cipher—that the B.B.C. was the only means whereby that country could hear how their King had got rid, or had not got rid of, his Government. Was it fair that they should quote only from our Prime Minister's speech? After all, the King and his Government were in London, and surely they could have got some statement from

them to issue to that country. What actually happened was that a week later, on June 1, the King did dismiss his Government and on that day an announcement was made by the B.B.C. to Yugoslavia, giving the King's message to the country. It is of interest that that message was in English, and not in any Serb or Yugoslav language. The message was handed to the B.B.C., and they had to telephone the people who had been dismissed earlier in the day in order to know what exactly would be the right phraseology to use in broadcasting the King's own message to his country. Surely we should think out a little bit what we are to do—

Mr. Bracken: My hon. and gallant Friend is making a statement of some importance. Who are the people who were rung up by the B.B.C. and asked what phrases should be used in their broadcast to Yugoslavia of the King's announcement of the resignation of his Government?

Flight-Lieutenant Teeling: The person rung up was the then head of the public relations side of the Yugoslav Government in London. He is willing to give his name, and tell the Minister all about it if necessary. When that was done this statement was broadcast on June 1. When I asked the Ministry of Information if they would answer in this Adjournment Debate the Minister wrote me stating that the Foreign Office had a great deal to say in this matter. The Foreign Office told me that the Ministry of Information had also a great deal to say, and between the two I have the impression—I may be wrong—that no one is absolutely certain which of these two Ministries is really responsible for our broadcasts to Yugoslavia. What I mean by our broadcasts to that country is: what is our national policy? No doubt they probably both consult, but who is ultimately responsible? It makes the representative of the Foreign Office at the B.B.C. find himself, sometimes, in an extremely difficult position not only with regard to Yugoslavia but many other countries. These broadcasts very often use words which are much more loose than the words used by, probably, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in a statement which he would make to this House, and on more than one occasion newspapers, which are certainly more irresponsible, have been brought in and quoted. There is a monthly, which some of us know, called *The Nineteenth Century and After*. I strongly recommend people to read this month's number, where they will see statements which certainly ought to be contradicted by the B.B.C. if they are not true.

Mr. Driberg (Maldon): It's a pure Quisling review.

Flight-Lieutenant Teeling: That does not matter; they are statements, which ought to be answered, I think, by the B.B.C. in the August number. However, there are other countries to deal with besides Yugoslavia. Take the question of Finland for example. Recently the Russians have put various suggestions to Finland with regard to peace terms, and Finland has not agreed to them. We in our broadcasts to Finland have very definitely advised Finland to agree, and quite rightly so, but I think this House ought to know exactly what it is that we advise other countries to do, because, supposing one day in the years to come something went wrong with the terms of agreement made with these countries, which our B.B.C. has told the people they ought to accept, how far are we actually morally responsible as a country for what the B.B.C. asks them to do? You may

say the Foreign Secretary never said this, that or the other, but to these people the B.B.C. means this country, and that is what I am most anxious that we should get some clear definition about.

Who is really responsible for what is issued by the B.B.C. especially in quotations from the Press and decisions as to what is to be quoted from the Press? Furthermore, is it possible for us to have in the Library, just as we get the monitoring reports of what other people broadcast to this country, translations in English of what we state as regular news items and as statements of fact? It affects all countries, not only Left but Right as well. If we could have that we should know where we are. . . . I should like to have some description of exactly how the people are chosen who are in control of these broadcasts. I understand, for instance, that in charge of the Rumanian section there is a very admirable lady but she has only once been to Rumania, going through on the train to Turkey. That may not be so, but it is what Rumanians in London say, and the Rumanians are worried about it because they feel that, though the broadcasts to Rumania are excellent with regard to military affairs, they are hopeless as regards political guidance, because they do not seem to understand what is going on out there.

Now may I switch over to another side that interests me immensely, the Far East—Japan, Malaya and all those areas? I am in complete ignorance of what we are doing about those countries, and I should like the Minister to give us some slight description of how we are broadcasting to Japan, or whether we are able to get into touch with Malaya, Indo-China, Burma and so on. There are so many interesting things which have been happening there with regard to the Japanese. We hear all day long of German officers and men surrendering in Normandy, Russia and Italy, but until two months ago not a solitary Japanese officer had surrendered in two years. It is only recently that 400 or 500 Japanese soldiers and a few officers had surrendered. That fact ought to be broadcast to Japan, and it ought to be very much pushed down the throats of everyone connected with Japan. Interesting, too, is the fact that these Japanese, when captured, have asked to know what settlement arrangements are made for them in Australia, as there is no possibility of their ever going back to Japan. The Australians are alarmed at the prospect of hundreds of thousands surrendering in this way and refusing to go back to Japan. It would be of great interest if we could know whether we or the Americans are in control, or whether London is in control on our side. I would like to stress the fact that it seems vitally important that we should have further guidance on exactly who is responsible for this broadcasting. . . .

The Minister of Information (Mr. Brendan Bracken): My hon. and gallant Friend says that on the occasion he raised this issue of our broadcasting to Yugoslavia, I jumped down his throat. I do not really believe he could seriously have formed that impression. . . . My hon. and gallant Friend seems to believe that the Ministry of Information and the Political Warfare Executive are rivals of the Foreign Office. If his beliefs were well-founded, the House of Commons would have every reason to be perturbed, because I can imagine nothing more injurious to the public interest than the existence of two Departments dealing with foreign affairs. The relationship between the Ministry of Information, the

Political Warfare Executive and the Foreign Office can be summarised in a sentence. The Departments for which I am responsible to Parliament do not create foreign policy. They express to the world the British Government's views on foreign affairs and on many other affairs. In matters of foreign policy, we are the instrument, not the rival, of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. There is the closest co-operation, and the most complete co-ordination between our respective Departments. Some people may think it is almost impossible for two Ministers to have joint responsibility and that it is bound to lead to conflict and controversy. As I was the pious founder of the Political Warfare Executive and it has existed for nearly three years, I can tell the House that it has worked wholly successfully. My right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary and I are on closer terms than Siamese twins, and we have never had a controversy of any kind. The Foreign Secretary is responsible under the War Cabinet for the policy of the Political Warfare Executive, and I am responsible for its administration. It is a thoroughly well-managed Government Department and shows that even within Governments it is possible to get full co-operation.

With regard to the B.B.C.'s Yugoslavian broadcast, about which my hon. and gallant Friend complained, he asked who was the B.B.C.'s authority in making the statement which he read out. It was the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister does not know what is happening within the Yugoslavian Government—and he has spent a great deal of time in trying to compose the differences between the various parties—I doubt whether there is anybody else in the country who is a better authority. If the Prime Minister was wrong in announcing that the King had accepted the former Premier's resignation on a certain day, whereas the event took place a week later, then there must have been some reason for it, but I can take no responsibility for the deferment of the resignation of the then Yugoslavian Government. The B.B.C. European service which, I may remind the House, is entirely a Government service, cannot take a better authority in these matters than the Prime Minister.

My hon. and gallant Friend fell into a slight error when he suggested that the B.B.C.'s European service should answer the remarks in *The Nineteenth Century*. It is well named. Its views are the worst kind of reactionary opinion. It is the favourite paper of Lord Haw-Haw. If the B.B.C. gave up one minute to answering it, I should do my best to call the attention of the governors to the fact that we have a big war on and cannot really deal with the antiquated prejudices of that paper, with its wholly unfair statements about British foreign policy and its great desire to create the maximum amount of mischief among the United Nations. I can assure hon. Members that there is no possibility whatsoever of our answering that paper, and I am sorry that this Debate even advertises it. . . .

My hon. and gallant Friend has served a useful purpose in raising one question to-day. He wrote and warned me about it and I made a note about it. He asked me to give him a description, roughly, of our policy about broadcasting. I will tell him in a very short space of time. Our broadcasters are not Foreign Office officials. The latter are not required to make public announcements in their own name. They merely give anonymous advice to the Foreign Secretary. Secondly, we address our broadcasts, not to foreign Gov-

ernments but to the people. I think that is a very good idea. Many shades of opinion are expressed by different broadcasters. The only essential is that the trend of the broadcasts should be in line with Foreign Office policy.

Consequently, it is no use quoting isolated sentences or even scripts. They must be read in conjunction with the whole output. I am satisfied that, as regards Finland, Rumania and Yugoslavia, our output has followed the general directive, drawn up by the Political Warfare Executive and approved by the Foreign Office. It is a mistake to think that our broadcasts are, or should be, in the nature of Foreign Office pronouncements. If they had been, the B.B.C. would not possess in Europe the enormous audiences which it now has. We have built up those audiences and achieved our results—and very good results they are—by a policy of truthful news, supplemented by sincere and lively comment. If the House has the leisure and the inclination to read the B.B.C.'s European output, there will be no difficulty in arranging this, but hon. Members should be warned—

Miss Ward: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bracken: The hon. Lady should not say "hear, hear" before she knows what I am going to say which is that this question of reading the scripts involves a total of about 300,000 words a day.

Miss Ward: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bracken: I admire the industry of my hon. Friend opposite and I look forward to the day when she has her 300,000 words to peruse. I think she will find it will seriously interfere with the admirable public work she does. It is not within possibility for anyone to read the daily output of the B.B.C.

Miss Ward: If my right hon. Friend will give way for one minute I should like to tell him that I am not suggesting that we should read everything but that it should be there, in the same way as *Hansard*. It would be very useful if it was there to read, if one wanted to look up a particular point. Everything should be available to the student to get the best results. . . .

Mr. Bracken: Let me turn to the important point raised by my hon. and gallant Friend about broadcasts to Japan and Japanese-occupied territories. These broadcasts are made both by the B.B.C. in London and the Far Eastern Bureau of the B.B.C. in New Delhi. The policy directives are drawn up in London in the same way as is done for the European service of the B.B.C. There is also close co-operation and consultation with the American authorities. The Far Eastern Bureau at New Delhi is responsible to the Ministry of Information. The conduct of propaganda to Japan was never put directly under the Political Warfare Executive, because the Minister of Information had staff available in the Far East, whereas the Political Warfare Executive had not, but the Political Warfare Executive, as well as the Foreign Office, have a full say in the policy to be followed. . . .

To raise the moral standing of the mother of a large family, the Soviet Government, says *The Economist*, has instituted an "Order of the Heroic Mother." This will exempt her from queueing for rations in "the classic country of interminable queues." "Recalcitrant citizens, who prefer small families" are to be penalised.

House of Commons: July 11, 1944.

A.B.C.A. BULLETIN ("WORK FOR ALL")

Mr. Hugh Lawson questioned the Secretary of State for War about A.B.C.A. Leaflet, No. 71, dated June 17, and entitled "Work for All." . . .

Sir J. Grigg: The A.B.C.A. Bulletin on "Work for All" was designed to provide a background of simple economic theory against which the Army could discuss the Government White Paper on full employment. Views advocated by any political party as such were not included in this background material. As far as I am aware the bulletin is fulfilling its purpose and it is not intended to issue a further bulletin on this subject. . . .

I read the bulletin myself before it was published, and I think that the description of it as consisting entirely of the economic views of people on this side of the House is completely inaccurate.

Mr. Stokes: Can the right hon. Gentleman say why all discussion on monetary reform was specifically excluded by instruction, and that there was no discussion about money despite the "Salute the Soldier" week?

Hon. Members: Can we see the bulletin?

Sir J. Grigg: They are all automatically placed in the Library.

• • •

Major-General Sir Alfred Knox: Is it not the primary duty of the Army to fight and learn to fight?

Sir J. Grigg: They are also extremely interested in what is to happen to them after the war.

Mr. Sorensen: If this new economic theory is not related to any existing party, is it suggested that it should provide the basis for a new party?

PILOTLESS PLANES (continued from page 8.)

hope whatever of a way out of power-politics except the power to contract out.

The secret war waged for so long against the launching grounds and experimental stations, while the nation, unaware, waited for the "opening of the second front" assumes the aspect of a saga. There seems no reason to doubt it. Sites for the barrage balloons were prepared months ago; and there was much speculation as to their use. It seems that hundreds of people can keep a secret, for is there the slightest doubt that if an inkling had reached our pink intellectuals, they could have resisted the temptation to hold a committee meeting about it? They have been presented with the concrete facts of a realistic situation; and have been curiously silent in regard to it. For once they have not been able to say:—"If so-and-so had been done or were to be done now," etc., etc. There is only one thing to do—leave it to the expert; every one knows who the expert is, and his success or failure will be brought home to him and to nobody else. To me that is the great interest of the situation, and the heart of the crisis; it may well be that our whole future depends on Churchill's handling of the next few months—on what he does before November. He should have complete support and complete responsibility. And be made to feel it.

PILOTLESS PLANES

By B. M. PALMER.

In Southern England the barrage cables stand, but straining at a sharp angle away from the strong sou'wester, and lost most of the time in heavy clouds. What are the chances of a straight flight from the coast? Not so high it would seem, as some of the country people know to their cost. What is a "safe area"?

In this, probably the most difficult period of the war for many people to live through, Winston Churchill shows himself as always, master of the moment. Any one who seriously considers the mood of the people, must be struck with the severity of the psychic strain that is affecting all alike. A point too often overlooked is the strength of the natural instincts, and conscious and unconscious desires. Do violence to them for five years, or longer (for when did this war begin?) and you'll have the devil to pay. The consequence is that even a hardened billeting officer, when treated as a human being, throws down all his defences, admits he detests his job, says he hates walking around while "they" are about, and asks what is the use of it all? Others, who did not flinch in 1940, seem depressed by this present demonstration of the possibilities of "absentee management." I feel quite convinced that the fact that the planes are pilotless has seized on the imagination of the English, not so devoid of insight as has been sometimes said. I do not think this people will either bend or break so far as their determination on victory is concerned; but I *do* think that Churchill's "grim and gay" mood has entirely disappeared, and is not likely to return, and he, like the genius he is, knows it. It is quite likely that the re-election or otherwise of the "national government" at the first opportunity after the war, not to be long delayed now, depends almost entirely on the handling of the present crisis, for crisis it is, and one of the biggest we have had, the more so that it is developing in silence: and let Churchill but handle it rightly and none of his opponents on the plane in which present political events have their being will dare to oppose him. To a "southern England"-er, he set exactly the right note in his speech on June 29: and the promise among others that the planes would not be countered by similar means was right from every point of view. One does not fight submarines with submarines. And this is but a metaphor for something deeper.

All this, of course, is assuming that Churchill meant what he said concerning his determination not to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire. Does he mean it, or can he be made to mean it? Amid all the welter of lunatic argument, can we hope that the will of the people will be focussed on the sovereignty of the Empire and the complete decentralisation of the Reich? Those are the first steps: and though many difficult ones will follow they cannot be taken unless these be taken first.

Sovereignty is the core of the problem. There is no
(Continued on page 7)

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

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

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...8d.	
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet)	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.)	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	1d.
The Representative's Job	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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

Recent Publications

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR By C. H. DOUGLAS.....	2/-
THE PROBLEM OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION By B. W. M.....	1/-
BRITISH MEDICINE AND ALIEN PLANS By ANDREW RUGG-GUNN, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-

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