

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 5. No. 17.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1941.

6d. Weekly

THE PLANNERS---BUILDERS OR DESTROYERS ?

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

Lord Elton, one of those Labourers whose Apprenticeship was served at Rugby and Balliol, who combines mildly Left Wing affiliations with the Secretaryship of The Rhodes Trust, has been telling us, that the New Order, British Edition, is already with us, and that its main features are readily observable.

My first reaction to this interesting, but not in fact novel, statement was that of the small girl who was asked to admire her new baby brother—"I hope you got him on approval, mummy, because I don't think he'll suit." My second and perhaps more relevant thought, was that either those powers to which Disraeli (and who should know better?) referred as real governors of the world, are getting careless, or they are getting nervous.

It is reasonably certain that the immense influence which has been wielded by such organisations as international finance and Freemasonry has, in the past, depended primarily on well-concealed conspiracy. The technique of banking has never been what it pretended to be, any more than Freemasonry has as its objectives anything revealed to the great mass of its dupes.

But no ordinarily intelligent observer can fail to notice the emergence of an organised group in every country of strategic importance which announces that the New Order is upon us. In fact, most of us would be in some difficulty if asked to state precisely the war aims either of Germany or Great Britain, as proclaimed, say, by Hitler for Germany, and Mr. Anthony Eden for Great Britain, if we were not allowed to use that phrase.

Not of course, the same brand, or with the same Directors. Dear me, no. But on examination, both showing quite

remarkable maturity in preparation.

Yet I suppose that if the average Englishman or German had been asked a few years ago whether he wanted an army of officials, ostensibly paid by him, to plan a New Order for him, the reply would have been instant, and most probably profane. In substance, however, it would have amounted to an unqualified assertion that what he wanted above all other things was to be allowed to do a little planning for himself. So unmistakably was this feeling evident that Mr. Moses Israel Sieff's organisation, P.E.P. was driven to confess that, "Only in time of war, or under threat of war, can the British Government be persuaded to embark on comprehensive Planning." Similarly, the German population was persuaded to become, in effect, a gigantic edition of Port Sunlight, or the industrial colonies of Mr. Henry Ford, under threat of war.

Now numbers of people, including myself, have been at some pains to demonstrate that to separate war from the economic system, and in particular the monopolistic credit system, under which the countries of the world without exception, carry on their business, is a proceeding of the same order of intelligence as to separate the spots from the disease of measles. It is quite true that the German Broadcasting Stations have, since the outbreak of the present phase of the war, put out a good deal of incisive, telling, and reasonably accurate criticism of the international credit monopoly and its relation to war-making. But their main theme is still the gospel of work—economic work, and the consequent necessity for German *Lebensraum*, so as to make and absorb work. Lord Elton for his part explains that the New Order will provide not equality, but equality of opportunity. What for? To compete for the choice places in a Planned Econ-

omy of work. And the *Times* tells us that the New Freedom will be, not freedom from interference (from which we may deduce that there will be still more interference) but freedom to work. So far as I am aware the Slave was always free to work.

I do not suppose that it is necessary to recapitulate all the arguments of the past twenty years which can be collectively termed the Poverty amidst Plenty thesis. All of us who take an interest in such matters know quite well that conscious and persistent sabotage and misdirection of production has been the outstanding economic feature of that period, coupled with every device of grinding taxation which would assist in reducing the number of economically independent individuals, and thus force still more of them into an already overcrowded Labour Market. It is beyond discussion that the policy which has been consciously pursued is that of making employment universal not of producing wealth with a minimum of work.

The military phase of the struggle which engages us at the moment, is represented as being due to Hitler, or Mussolini, or Churchill. Does any sane person believe that the Socialism which in its main feature of the omnipotent state, is common to Germany, Italy, and Great Britain, and from its very nature flourishes best in the unlimited orgy of war production, can only throw up one Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin or Churchill?

Perhaps it may emerge from consideration of these things, that, not only was the military method of sabotage confidently anticipated, but it was desired, and is still desired as a requisite to the atmosphere of compulsion in which a New Order "of which the main outlines are already with us" could be installed

and supported by irresistible force.

Now, I can easily imagine, that in despite of the hints which are to be found in Disraeli, and in many other well-informed sources of information, the idea of mysterious and perpetual organisation, constantly working to mould the social and economic systems to suit its own purposes, is regarded as merely romantic if not weak-brained. There is one feature, at least, however, of history which can easily be verified—a feature both curious, and difficult to explain apart from the existence of this hidden force. And that is the invariable appearance of some brand, or many brands, of mysticism, as a precursor of revolution. In the case of Cromwell, it was a horde of half-crazed fanatics with their special interpretations of the more bloodthirsty and revolting portions of the Old Testament.

At the time of the French Revolution, the country was swept by the propaganda of the Age of Reason—just as mystical, and just as little understood by its dupes, as the apocalyptic ravings of Cromwell's Calvinistic preachers. The Russian tragedy of 1917 was finally consummated through the agency of the black magician Rasputin.

For years past, Great Britain has been inundated with Believers in Pyramid prophecies, Leagues of World Servers, and other shadowy Brotherhoods.

Some of these number their followers in millions, and advertise on the grand scale in newspapers of large circulation which are highly selective in their acceptance of advertisements. Others are less obtrusive. Their ostensible chief officials are generally simple and sincere believers in the doctrines which they propagate, which, however else they may differ invariably have two

factors in common. They tend to paralyse judgement by suggesting that events are inescapable. And so long as they are allowed to be popularised, they never criticise banking, Freemasonry, or the Jews. In the main the suggestion is that a body of wise persons, an Elder Brethren, is watching over us, and that they are responsible for these periodical New Orders, and we should accept them gratefully, and assist, without understanding, their aims.

Now I think that it does no harm to postulate the existence of these secret Moulders of Destiny, if only to deduce their character from their works. Cromwell's New Order (you have no doubt noticed the constant interpolation of Cromwell as a subject for admiration in the last year or so) began by vandalism of every possible kind: Anything of beauty was savagely attacked, mutilated, or destroyed. With the pathetic interregnum of the Restoration, it was followed by the Whig Economy—child labour, the Factory System, the destruction of the countryside in lovely Lancashire, Staffordshire and Cheshire. Then came the French Revolution of which the Continental Freemasons openly claim to have been the organisers. The same savage attack on beauty and culture. Whatever faults the French aristocracy may have had as a class, they were certainly, by any standard, more admirable than Danton, Robespierre, and the *sans-culottes*. They were more decorative, they had a vivid conception of the grace of life, and they died more bravely. The France which followed the Revolution was ravaged by war, and subsequently, and up to the present time, has been a by-word for every description of financial and political corruption and mis-management.

About the same period a desperate

effort was made to bring about the same state of affairs in England and thus complete the work of Cromwell. The Chartist and Peterloo Riots, and the Hungry Forties, can all be traced without any difficulty to Gold Standard Finance and those international organisations which were the repository of its Secrets. In 1848 Germany came under the same influence—an event prophesied by Disraeli in *Coningsby* long before its occurrence—and the Germany which has been, and is, the Pest of Europe, was born. Of Russia, Austria and Italy, we know the story.

What I am suggesting is two-fold. In the first place, if these Masters of Wisdom are to be judged by their works, every intervention they have made into human affairs is marked by a hatred of cultured leisure, a wholesale destruction of the best which an imperfect humanity has been able to evolve, together with a determined effort to level down so as to prevent levelling up, and an increase in the Power of Money. And in the second place, these results have been achieved by methods which I believe to be likely to compass, if persisted in, the final destruction of organised Society.

The fundamental characteristic of these methods is falsehood. "*Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*," "The interest of the individual must give way to that of the public," "A War to make the world safe for Democracy," (I refrain from the citation of the current spate).

The Great Critic of World Affairs said, "By their works, ye shall know them." I do not believe that there is any sounder test. And the characteristic of those works is that the end justifies the means, all of which are demonstrably aimed at the final enslavement of the race.

STORED FURNITURE MAY BE REQUISITIONED

In order to facilitate and speed up the task of furnishing requisitioned empty houses to provide accommodation for persons rendered homeless by enemy action the Ministry of Health have now issued an Order giving Local Authorities power to requisition furniture in unoccupied premises or in store.

At a meeting of the Paignton Council it was stated that this communication from the Ministry of Health referred to was considered a better and speedier way of dealing with the difficulties. Clerks to whom authority was delegated

would not need to be reminded of the importance of exercising a proper discretion in the use of these powers.

MAIZE AS FUEL

By a decree issued at Buenos Aires on October 4, a National Fuel Board was created consisting of the Minister of Agriculture as Chairman and representatives of the various departments concerned, as well as of the Central Bank. The principal task of the Board is the application of the measures for the utilisation of maize as fuel. The Board will co-operate closely with the National Grain Board which is conduc-

ing the purchases, for account of the Government, of the 1939/40 maize. Both fuel wholesalers and consumers will have to report to the Board the extent of their present stocks as well as the quantity of their monthly sales and their monthly consumption respectively, during the months from August 1939 to July 1940.

In a communique issued by the Ministry of Agriculture, the fuel deficit owing to import difficulties is estimated as equivalent to about 100,000 tons of coal a month which would necessitate the substitution by maize of no less than 30 per cent of their requirements by the most important consumers.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"THE ECONOMIST" AND THE AMERICAN EMBASSY

The Economist devoted its first leading article on December 21 to a discussion on who should be appointed to the American Embassy in succession to Lord Lothian. Mr. Churchill, it said, was the only person in the Empire thoroughly competent to fill the post—but he couldn't be spared!

The other names mentioned and discussed were as follows in the order given: Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Eden, Sir Archibald Sinclair, Mr. Amery, Lord Stamp (whose "qualities are almost exactly those required") and Lord Eustace Percy.

In its *Notes of the Week* on December 28, *The Economist* commenting on Lord Halifax's appointment described it as "bad." Lord Halifax's appointment was not mentioned in its previous article because he "was not considered as being among the possibilities. There seemed to be so little to recommend it," said the writer of the Notes.

The Directors of *The Economist* are Sir Henry Strakosch, Mr. Brendan Bracken (one-time editor of the *Financial News* and now one of Mr. Churchill's chief secretaries), Major Guy P. Dawnay (head of Vickers), Mr. D. E. W. Gibb and Sir Walter Layton (proprietor of the *News Chronicle*), who has just returned from a Government Mission to the U.S.A.

THE CAPACITY OF THE MACHINE

"The technical advance of modern industry and the efficiency which has sprung from its increasing unification have multiplied enormously its productivity in recent years. The difficulty is no longer to make but to find a market for the goods, which—in time of peace—are being turned out in such vast quantities. We have come near solving the problem of production, but we have scarcely begun to solve that of distribution. The picture presented by the chief industrial States is that of a fleet of high power motor cars geared to run most economically at 100 m.p.h. When they try to do so in the confined space of the world, disastrous collisions are inevitable.

"The trouble is that the capacity of the machine to raise productivity is almost unlimited. To give more territory and raw materials to Germany could not, from the nature of things, satisfy her; her industrial output, swelling to meet the wider circumstances, would soon be brimming the new limits as it brimmed the old ones. It is no mere figure of speech to talk of Germany's ambition to dominate the world. Under modern conditions the industry of the State can only run at full profit when all competitors have been removed.

"To prevent Germany from achieving this aim is one of our chief reasons for fighting this war. There is no need to underline what the results would be for the rest of the nations if she succeeded. It must be made clear, however, to Hitler's victims that we are not merely substituting ourselves as candidates for world domination. Not even Britain is a satisfied nation. We, too, are subject to the law of modern industry, that the more one has, the greater is one's capacity to expand. This law would apply even to an absolute monopoly [shades of the A + B theorem!], leaving the monopolist still unsatisfied. The truth is that world domination is a sterile ambition; it does nothing to solve the real problem, which is the lack of effective demand.

"To create effective demand and wider distribution, some way must be found of providing the consumer with cash. It is evident that this is inconsistent with the concentration of profits in a dwindling number of hands. Profits, in fact, beyond a certain point destroy themselves, since not enough customers remain out of whom they can be made. At the same time, the struggle for them plunges the world inevitably into war after war, each ghastlier than the last owing to the progress of scientific discovery.

"When Hitler calls himself 'the representative of the have-nots,' all he means is that he wants to become more of the 'have.' When he condemns the democracies for their 'dividends of 40 and 100 and 160 per cent.,' he is merely planning to usurp them. Our answer should be that we are fighting for a world in which the distinction between 'have' and 'have-not' nations becomes illusory, and in which overwhelming profits are recognised to not only a

source of endless war but also an unattainable aim. The exact programme for such a revolution of ideas cannot be developed all at once; but its outlines are beginning to take shape in the minds of responsible people throughout the country and were summarised in a highly significant article last week in *The Times*...."

The article to which *Truth* refers in this passage from the issue of December 13 and from which it proceeds to quote is the leader which appeared in *The Times* on December 5, entitled *The Two Scourges*, which smelt strongly of Freemasonry. How odd that *Truth* should go so far in its arguments towards Social Credit, and then sheer off in the opposite direction in support of Freemasonry!

"ALL YOUR GOOTS"

"Since Major-General John Churchill, son of the impoverished Royalist Winston marched 5,000 men over the Wiltshire Downs to ally himself with the invading Prince of Orange, and become Duke of Marlborough, the family name has purpled British history. Its story cries for a Goldwyn film in technicolour..."

—*News Review*, December 5, 1940.

William of Orange was financed for his descent upon England to the extent of 20,000,000 guilden by the Amsterdam Jew Isaac Lopez Suasso. When he landed at Brixham, Devon, he is reported to have said, "I haf come for goot, I haf come for all your goots."

In his train there were a number of wealthy Jewish merchants. Marlborough in particular made great use of the services of Sir Solomon de Medine, and indeed was publicly charged with taking an annual subvention from him.

JOINT AMBITIONS

"One thing we National Socialists promise you—after the victory has been won you will be able to realise all your socialistic ambitions." So says Dr. Ley to the German workers, writing in the *Völkischer Beobachter* (December 29, 1940), thus falling into line with the leaders of the Socialist National Labour Front in this country.

Alberta Renews its Request for a Bank Charter

Following the second day's sitting of the Social Credit Caucus of the Alberta Legislature, the following statement was issued to the press on November 7:—

Renewal of Alberta's application for a Bank Charter was decided by the Social Credit members of the Legislature assembled in Caucus since Tuesday morning.

This decision was reached after the Caucus had fully discussed and considered the attitude of the Banking and Commerce Committee and the House of Commons last summer. It appeared to the Caucus that both the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce and the House of Commons ignored the amendments to Alberta's Bill for a Bank Charter which were submitted to the Committee by Mr. McTavish, solicitor representing the Alberta Government.

Further more the province did not have the opportunity of answering the subtle legal technicalities raised by the Dominion's legal department. Finally the House of Commons was prorogued before having an opportunity of discussing and voting on the report of the Banking and Commerce Committee.

It was considered essential that, even though a charter within the limits of the Federal Bank Act would not permit the Province to introduce the far-reaching reforms of Social Credit, great benefit would accrue to the people from a banking institution under their undisputed ownership and control, as opposed to the privately owned and controlled institutions upon which they are entirely dependent at present. A supply of Credit could be made available to those in difficulties brought on by the disorders in economic conditions, caused by the war; further, the Government now carries the full liability for losses on loans which it guarantees at the bank, while all the profits from such loans go to the banking institutions. With a Government-owned Bank, guarantees would not be necessary, and the full profits from any liabilities incurred would accrue to the people. It is felt by the Caucus that such an important matter should not have been sidestepped. The extreme gravity of the wheat crisis was given very full and serious consideration. It was pointed out by the Caucus that the failure of the

Federal authorities to provide adequately for the proper disposition of the 1940 crop is certain to have a disastrous effect on the handling of the 1941 crop.

The Caucus felt that it was most imperative that immediate action be taken to relieve the farmers of their surplus grain thereby supplying them with the needed purchasing power to carry on, and that provision should be made for the proper handling of tough grain which forms a large percentage of the entire crop; if drying facilities are not provided, the damage to this grain will be severe.

It was urged that the farmers and all organisations should exercise their democratic right to press for Federal action, as the Federal authorities, having complete control over the marketing of wheat, alone can deal with the perilous situation which is developing owing to the lack of action and foresight on their part.

It was stressed that Canada's agriculture is essentially a key industry in the national war effort, and should receive the greatest consideration in any long range preparation for after war reconstruction. While full appreciation was given to the tremendous task and the great responsibilities resting with the Federal authorities in conducting Canada's war effort, it seemed inexcusable that the wheat situation should have been permitted to drift to the present critical state of affairs.

The members agreed that in view of the failure of Federal authorities to foresee and prepare for the present wheat storage crisis, the Federal Government be urged to take immediate steps to build adequate storage at key points in each province to meet the growing storage problem. In equity the Wheat Board should either accept delivery of farmers' wheat or, in default of being able to do so, that body should not keep farmers waiting for payment for their services to the nation.

In regard to the Sirois report the Caucus felt that it would be premature for any national political or constitutional re-organisation to be considered in advance of the economic readjustments which are so urgently needed. The widespread problem of poverty and economic insecurity and the acute wheat problem provide evidence of this. It was point-

ed out by the Caucus that the Sirois recommendations raise some controversial questions, and on this ground it seemed inadvisable that these matters should be raised at a time when it is imperative that nothing should be done to impair national unity in the dominating task of Canada's war effort.

The Caucus considered the widely discussed and much publicised proposal for a UNION of the nations of the British Commonwealth with other democracies. That the proposal should be seriously propagated in time of war when the British people are fighting the armed forces of totalitarianism in order to preserve democracy, democratic rights, and the sovereign integrity of the British Crown, has extremely grave implications which should be realised, particularly under present conditions when the attack against the forces of democracy in general and the British Empire in particular is not confined to military action.

Members noted that the central feature in this proposition of Union Now is that a central international authority would control finance, the armed forces and international relations of the nations involved. It is suggested that these nations would surrender their sovereignty over these functions. Members felt that the public should realise that the effect of this would be to render the people of this and the other countries in any such Union absolutely powerless to reform their internal economy. Any such reform must, of necessity, involve the reform of the monetary system—but under the terms of Union Now which are being propagated the people would be unable to achieve any such reform; because sovereign power over finance would be vested in the central international authority. Moreover, that authority alone would have the sanctions (armed forces) to enforce the powers conferred upon it.

The grave nature of this Union Now proposal should be evident from this central fact. It would mean the destruction of national democratic rights and national democratic institutions. It would mean that the central international authority would be supreme in all national fields because of its control of finance and the armed forces. It would constitute a super-totalitarian

authority. Democracy would cease to exist. For all practical purposes the sovereignty of the British peoples would be destroyed. The British Crown would no longer be a symbol of sovereign and free peoples.

Other important questions discussed were ways and means whereby Canada's war effort can be furthered by provincial action, and the short-sighted policy of Eastern interests which is not merely discouraging but is actively opposing industrial activity in Alberta, which is ideally equipped for industrial development. In connection with this latter question it was pointed out that development of industries here, far from curtailing the market of the West for Eastern interests would greatly increase this market for the East.

Mr. Aberhart and Mr. Lucien Maynard recently visited Ottawa about the renewal of the application for a provincial bank for Alberta.

The premier said he had approached Mr. King, the Prime Minister, and Mr. Lapointe, the Minister of Justice, on this matter and appreciated "the courtesy shown us in solving this difficulty."

The premier said that under the present economic and financial set-up it was a matter of public concern to Alberta to have a provincial bank. Owing to the "sudden dissolution of parliament and the early calling of a new session which left no time to comply with the regulations prescribed for private bills, the question of procedure required elucidation."

'As a war measure to enable Canada to put forth her maximum productive effort and distribute the cost of the war justly and fairly,' the Prime Minister, Mr. MacKenzie King, is in favour of putting into effect the recommendations of the Dominion-Provincial Relations Commission.

The Commission's report, which was published last May after a three years' survey, recommended drastic changes in the financial relationship between the Provinces and the Dominion.

Mr. MacKenzie King has written to the Premiers of the Provinces asking for a Dominion-Provincial conference in January.

In a letter he said that the war has

cast additional burdens on Government and taxpayers alike. It has inevitably increased competition between Governments to secure revenues, and has aggravated the overlapping, cumbersome, discriminatory character of much of the Canadian tax structure.

Mr. Aberhart's statement said that his present visit had nothing to do with the questions arising out of the Rowell-Sirois report on dominion-provincial relations which will be studied in January.

"I might say this, however," he said. "I find our people are greatly concerned about the centralisation of financial power which would result from the implementation of this report.

"In this connection Premier Pattullo of British Columbia hit the nail right on the head when he said that undue centralisation of any kind would be harmful. It would appear from our consideration of the report that it will be exceedingly difficult for any province to endorse the Rowell-Sirois report *in toto* unless a number of drastic changes are made in the recommendations and for this reason we propose to be on hand to advocate the need of these alterations.

"The members of the commission urge that certain financial burdens should be taken from the provinces. I would go the whole way with them if they would say these burdens should be taken from the shoulders of the people. But that is not the intention at all.

"No matter whether the dominion or provincial governments shoulder these burdens, under the recommendations of the report the people will still have to bear them."

A few days later Mr. Aberhart described the Sirois commission regarding centralisation of financial control in the federal government as "a step towards totalitarianism," adding: "All centralisation of power which removes the administration of affairs farther away from the people immediately concerned is the opposite of democracy."

"If the commission's recommendations were carried out," he said, "provincial governments would be in danger of becoming nothing more than 'glorified county councils.'"

"I would say that what our people need to-day is the application of broad fundamental reforms which will give

them lasting relief from financial burdens and a guarantee of reasonable security for the future."

WAR WEAPONS WEEK

In its recent war-weapons week Portsmouth would have fallen short of its aim of £1,000,000 had not the Corporation at the critical moment invested £100,000. This sum was from the accumulation of the Superannuation Fund which had previously been invested in the Consolidated Loans Fund of the Corporation. The Chairman of the Finance Committee explained that, "In order to release £100,000 of Superannuation Fund money the National Provincial Bank was asked to advance on overdraft this sum to the Consolidated Loans Fund."

A correspondent writes from Portsmouth:

"The £100,000 'invested' by the Portsmouth Corporation is a perfect example of the creation of money under our present financial system. It is apparent that the main purpose behind the financial propaganda which is being instilled into us all through the medium of the various 'savings' campaigns is to disguise the fact that the bulk of the money which is borrowed by the Government is costless credit created by the banks. It is in fact, camouflage of the banks, by the banks for the banks, and it would be interesting to know how much more of the £1,000,000 'invested' during the Portsmouth War Weapons Week was created in the same way.

"There is little doubt that we shall win this war in spite of our financial system, but the winning of the subsequent peace is not so certain unless we all recognise this sabotaging of our physical efforts and our individual and collective responsibility to prevent it."

GIBRALTAR

A correspondent in Gibraltar writes:

"One thing about events of the past few months, and particularly those affecting us here last September, people tell me they are sick of internationalism, and are more inclined to remain British. The action of the Vichy crowd has killed Federal Union so far as people here are concerned."

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..

Editorial Office:
4, ACREFIELD ROAD,
WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL.
Telephone: Gateacre 1561.

Business Office:
12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.
Telephone: Bank 5260.

Vol. 5. No. 17.

Saturday, January 4, 1941.

THE SCAMP AS HERO

There are various ways of reviewing a book, and among the most useful, the presentation of actual passages without comment. This serves admirably to call attention to "The Importance of Living" by Lin Yutang, published by Heinemann.

—E. J. P.

To me, spiritually, a child of the East and the West, man's dignity consists in the following facts which distinguish man from animals. First, that he has a playful curiosity and a natural genius for exploring knowledge; second, that he has dreams and a lofty idealism (often vague, or confused, or cocky, it is true, but nevertheless worthwhile); third, that he is able to correct his dreams by a robust and healthy realism; and finally, that he does not react to surroundings mechanically and uniformly as animals do, but possesses the freedom and the ability to determine his own reactions and to change surroundings at his will. This last is the same as saying that human personality is the last thing to be reduced to mechanical laws; somehow the human mind is for ever elusive, uncatchable and unpredictable and manages to wriggle out of mechanistic laws, or a materialistic dialectic that the crazy psychologists and unmarried economists are trying to impose upon him. Man is therefore, a curious, dreamy, humorous and wayward creature.

In short, my faith in human dignity consists in the belief that man is the greatest scamp on earth. Human dignity must be associated with the idea of a scamp and not with that of an obedient, disciplined and regimented soldier. The scamp is probably the most glorious type of human being, as the soldier is the lowest type, according to this conception. . . . It is my hope that the net impression of the present [book] will be that I am doing my best to glorify the scamp or vagabond. I hope I shall succeed. For things are

not so simple as they sometimes seem. In this present age of threats to democracy and individual liberty, probably only the scamp and the spirit of the scamp alone will save us from becoming lost as serially numbered units in the masses of disciplined, obedient, regimented, and uniformed coolies. The scamp will be the last and most formidable enemy of dictatorships. He will be the champion of human dignity and individual freedom, and will be the last to be conquered. All modern civilisation depends entirely upon him. . .

It seems that the scamp is being displaced by the soldier as the highest type of human being. Instead of wayward, incalculable, unpredictable, free individuals, we are going to have nationalised, disciplined, regimented and uniformed patriotic coolies, so efficiently controlled and organised that a nation of sixty millions can believe in the same creed, think the same thoughts and take the same food. . . . It should not be difficult to defend by logic the ideal of the patriotic automaton as a model citizen, useful as a means to another external goal which is the strength of the State, which exists again for another goal, the crushing of other states. . . . All idiots fall for it. Incredible as it may seem such a view is upheld in many "civilised" and "enlightened" European Countries. The ideal citizen is a soldier, the soldier who thought he was being transported to Ethiopia and found himself in Gaudeljara. . . .

Now for myself, that inner resentment, that *human recalcitrancy* is the only sign of human dignity, the only spark of hope for a restoration of human

decency in some future wise, civilised world. . . .

. . . My reason is simple: that we are descended from monkeys and not from cows, and that therefore we are better monkeys, nobler monkeys for being contrary-minded. . . . The reason I think all dictators are wrong is a biological reason. Dictators and cows go well together but dictators and monkeys don't.

Looking at the picture of Europe to-day gives one a feeling of nervousness, a nervousness which comes not so much from the mere presence of conflicts of national aims and state boundaries and colonial claims, which the spirit of reason should be amply able to deal with, but rather from the condition of mind of the men who are the rulers of Europe. It is like getting into a taxi-cab in a strange city and being suddenly overcome by distrust of the driver. It is not so bad that the driver doesn't seem to be acquainted with the map of the city and cannot take me to the destination by the proper route; it is more alarming when the passenger in the back seat hears the driver talking incoherently and begins to suspect his sobriety. That nervousness is decidedly heightened when the inebriate driver is armed with a gun and the passenger has no chance of getting out. . . .

One has reason to express a reassurance in the capacity of the human mind to believe that the human mortal mind, limited as it is, is something infinitely higher than the intellect of the reckless drivers of Europe and that eventually we shall be able to live peaceably because we shall have learned to think reasonably.

Communism and Fascism are both products of the same mind. As Albert Pauphilet says, "No type of mind is so like the extreme right as the extreme left." Characteristic of both regimes and ideologies are, firstly, the sheer belief in logical necessity, for after all Fascism as much as Communism is based on the logic of Hegel. . . .

"GENEVA IDEAS"

"The "Geneva Idea" is the idea of virtue without Christ, my boy, the modern idea, or, more correctly, the ideas of all modern "civilisation"."

—DOSTOIEVSKY in *A Raw Youth*.

LOOKING BACK OVER 1940

By JOHN MITCHELL.

It is commonly recognised that Great Britain has during the past year survived one of the severest trials she has yet been called upon to face. Apart from her Empire the only Great Power which was nominally her friend and possessed the power to aid her, was the United States of America. But in our darkest hour this Power gave only such aid as would save her face, and that we had to fetch in our own ships and pay for; whilst the same Power seized the opportunity to acquire parts of British territory (which other nations are fighting for) by bartering old ships for which she had no further use, but the refusal of which might have jeopardised our communications. Now that Great Britain has sold nearly all her assets in the United States and that Government cannot acquire any more, Mr Roosevelt's 'suggestion,' says *The Times* of December 19, is, "to cut out the 'financial nonsense' and get down to realities." *The Times* thinks that "there will be many who will hail it as the first gleam of economic sanity in a world bedevilled by finance." That is no doubt what Mr. Roosevelt and his masters want people to think. The United States of America has already got practically all the gold in the world, and after experience of trying to pay the debts of the last war and failing, the world does not believe that fresh debts will be paid. The "financial nonsense" is therefore of no further use. But it has not yet been suggested by the United States Government that help should be given unconditionally. What is the price? Federal Union?

Bearing these things in mind it is interesting to look back and find what Major Douglas wrote years before the present war started:

"It is notorious that the State Socialists of Germany, commonly known as the Majority Party, were of the greatest possible assistance to Junkerdom in carrying out its plans for a Prussian world hegemony; while in our own country the bureaucrat and the Fabian have, on the whole not failed to understand each other."

—*Economic Democracy.*

"... the real antagonism which is at the root of the upheaval with which we are faced is one which appears under different forms in every aspect of life. It is the age-long struggle between freedom and authority. . . . This antagonism does, however, appear at the present time to have reached a stage in which a definite victory for one side or the other is inevitable—it seems perfectly certain that either a pyramidal organisation, having at its apex supreme power, and at its base complete subjection, will crystallise out of the centralising process which is evident in the realms of finance and industry, equally with that of politics, or else a more complete decentralisation of initiative than this civilisation has ever known will be substituted for external authority. . . ."

—*Economic Democracy.*

"Making all due allowances for the defects in it which are only too obvious, the Anglo-Saxon character probably remains the greatest bulwark against tyranny that exists in the world to-day. That is a thesis on which a large number of volumes have been written, and it does not seem necessary

to expand it further. But if it be granted, it will be agreed that any attempt, either conscious or unconscious, to establish an effective hegemony over the whole world would be likely to concentrate on such methods as would paralyse the Anglo-Saxon."

—*Social Credit.*

"We may therefore expect to see a greater diplomacy in operation, having as its objective the psychological, political, and military isolation of Great Britain contemporaneously with the economic and industrial emasculation which is at present proceeding. By forcing a policy of deflation on Great Britain, while at the same time pursuing a policy of inflation, the powers operating through the United States Political and Financial Government have, during the years 1918-1930, succeeded in destroying, to a considerable extent, the immense increase in the productive and fighting power which existed at the time of the Armistice. A continual drain of the most skilled mechanics from this country to America has been the result of the immense disparity between the wages paid in the two countries during the same period of time. No pressure has been applied from Washington or Wall Street to secure repayment of the indebtedness of any country other than Great Britain. . . ."

—*Social Credit.*

"It seems to me that only self-destruction can blind us to the fact that given these circumstances there can be only two alternatives. One is the subjection of the rest of the world to the United States, a subjugation which must be not only commercial, political, and financial, but cultural. The alternative is conflict between the United States (no doubt allied with those forces sympathetic to her policy) and the remainder of the world which is unwilling to accept her suzerainty.

"Conspicuous among those whose policy is antipathetic is, I think, the Frenchman; and, in my opinion, Sir Austen Chamberlain, in remarking at Toronto in a recent speech that France and Great Britain held the key of the international situation, enunciated an important truth.

"The French temperament is probably the most coldly logical and realistic of any well-defined type, and the abstractions on which, for instance, the United States claim monetary repayment for munitions used by France while fighting in the absence of American troops, while such a claim ceased when the same munitions in the hands of American troops were applied to the same end, produce upon the French mind a strong feeling of irritated impatience. With France, both from sentimental and economic motives, I think we can associate Spain, and Latin America, with the possible exceptions of Brazil and Peru. In the East the sympathies of Japan are well known.

"On the other hand, Italy, and possibly Russia, under its present control, and under certain circumstances Germany, would appear to range themselves naturally upon the other side."

—*Warning Democracy.*

Even before the last war had finished Major Douglas

had stated the defects in the financial system which cause war, and which while they persist give rise automatically to waste, restriction and sabotage of production. To minimise these in their own production area producers are driven to unrelenting competition, not confined within national boundaries but extending to conflict between nation and nation.

The power possessed by those in control of the financial mechanism and the use they would make of it in centralising still further all control of initiative in matters of policy were discussed in their every aspect by Douglas in his books.

Events have endorsed the correctness of every prediction and revealed how faithful was the statement of cause and effect. But those in effective control of policy have continued their way, successfully gaining the acquiescence of a hypnotised public to be led along the road of destruction. Impudently *The Times* admitted for the first time on October 12, 1940:

“Beyond doubt one of the fundamental causes of this war has been the unrelaxing efforts of Germany since 1918 to secure wide enough foreign markets to strengthen her finances at the very time when all her competitors were forced by their own debts to adopt exactly the same course.”

But this is a cause of war, and it is too late to do anything to stop the war now. The war is doing its fell work. The war is only a means to the establishment of a World Tyranny. Does *The Times* admit the real cause of tyranny?

That in brief is the background to action taken by Social Crediters during 1940. The means to the release of the individual from economic bondage may be political action leading to financial action which will enable the unhindered production and distribution of the material requirements that he wants. What we have been witnessing during recent years has been more an offensive by the hidden forces of tyranny against the individual than the reverse; and this has emphasised the importance of cultural qualities, for it is these which sustain individual freedom. Hence the assault on Anglo-Saxon culture. Those who have contributed to *The Social Crediter* week by week have endeavoured to throw a light on current happenings to show their relation in true perspective to what has gone before and what is to come and at the same time to bring out their full significance. This has been done not only for Social Crediters in this country but also active workers in the British Dominions, in at least two of which Social Crediters are an effective political force of great importance. As all effective action is based upon an intelligent understanding of all the factors related to the achievement of its objective it is not necessary to emphasise the importance of *The Social Crediter* or of its continuance.

Despite the great difficulties which have attended action by Social Crediters in Great Britain during 1940—the uncertainties of the earlier part of the year and the blackout; the collapse of France and the threat of invasion, with the psychological reactions set up in public opinion by these events; and later the fierce air raids and the resulting preoccupations and widespread disruption—the work of Social Crediters has exerted an influence in varying degrees in millions of minds in Great Britain. Pressure campaigns

have necessarily in the circumstances been very restricted. Nevertheless, although curtailed by the events of the early summer, the Tax-Bonds campaign struck a shrewd blow in directing attention to sensible action in the financial field. The recent bent of official propaganda directed to persuading people that only social objectives (and not individual objectives) must have their support after the war serves to emphasise how important it is that people should receive a guarantee now, such as bonds in return for taxation, that they will enjoy adequate purchasing power after the war. The year 1940 has also seen widespread activity by Social Crediters to expose the real meaning of Federal Union and other moves towards centralisation. Much useful knowledge has been widely spread on this subject.

One of the most encouraging happenings of the year has been the realistic attitude towards financial matters in particular, but in connection with other subjects also, demonstrated by an increasing if still small number of M.P.s. This is partly the fruit of knowledge widely inculcated by Social Crediters in previous years, although the immediate occasion of it is the sharp impact of the realities of war upon an effete financial system. This development has been reflected outside Parliament by a similar attitude among business men, and also in quite a large number of outspoken articles which have appeared in the local papers and in Co-operative journals.

During the latter part of the year some excellent work has been done with the pamphlet *This 'American' Business*, the leaflet *Bomb Hitler and Shorten the War* and in a lesser way on the subject of Compulsory Property Insurance in spreading facts and ideas, which although only made known directly by Social Crediters to a small number of the community, have the vital characteristics of sanity and reality which ensures that they find their way, if slowly and in a modified form, into the conversation of millions.

Although 1940 has been noted for so many obstacles to carrying on the sort of action upon which we are engaged, thousands more Social Credit books have been sold than in 1939 and quite as many pamphlets. In addition various leaflets have sold in tens of thousands, and two of the most important publications produced by K.R.P. Publications Ltd. in 1940 have been republished in Canada and Australia.

There is no other people in the world who can look back and find such solid justification for what they have done as can Social Crediters. Why is this? It is of course because we recognise that all the natural phenomena (is there any other phenomenon?) are subject to natural laws, that these laws are inexorable and that human associations must conform completely to them or be disrupted. Anglo-Saxon culture has need of Social Credit to combat the perils which confront it and for its development. Thwarted so far in their worst schemes the American-German-Jew Interests are now putting forward a new Machiavellian scheme which is none other than that Britain after the war shall continue to produce armaments, not for herself but for “America” so that the American-German-Jew Interests can run the International Air Force cum Navy and Army which is to keep a disarmed world in order.

1941 will be a notable year.

EYE ON PARLIAMENT

The following passages are taken from the House of Commons Official Report (Editor, P. Cornelius), known as 'Hansard'. The date and occasion of the words are given above each section, and the speakers' names by the side. The number of columns occupied by the printed report of each section cited is also given. Lack of space imposes a severe limitation on the selection of matter for reproduction.

December 17.

Written Answers (5 columns)

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

Mr. Brooke asked the Minister of Information whether he will give a list, up to the end of November, of the books and pamphlets supplied to local information committees in the London region with the intention of building up a Ministry of Information library in each borough; and also a list of the boroughs to which this issue of literature has actually been made?

Mr. Cooper: The following is a list of publications supplied to all local information committees in the London Region:

LEAFLETS AND BOOKLETS:

Britain Acts.

The Issue.

India.

An Airman to his Mother.

German Peace.

Carrying On.

Who are the real peace lovers.

German workers under Hitler's Rule.

What is at stake.

Mightier Yet.

Keep it dark; Silently she slipped away.

What is the British Empire.

Waste collection.

Food for Thought.

Sea Power in Europe.

Stay where you are.

Let's face the facts.

Prime Minister's Speech No. 1.

Macmillan's War Pamphlets Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Commonwealth in Arms.

Speaker's Notes, Nos. 1-38 dealing with numerous points such as *Life under German occupation, Economic Resources of Britain and Germany, Food Supplies*, etc.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Schmidt.

People you Love.

They like Sheep.

Winston Churchill: Man O'War.

The Quislings.

Home from Dunkirk.

More Gems of German Propaganda.

The British Social Services.

Penguin Hansard.

The areas to which the above publications have been sent include the county boroughs of East and West Ham and Croydon, as well as the Metropolitan and Municipal boroughs of the London Region.

There is no intention of establishing, in each borough, anything in the nature of a Ministry of Information Library.

WAR DAMAGE BILL.

(63 columns).

Mr. Benson (Chesterfield): The Chancellor of the Exchequer has met with an almost unbroken chorus of approval and congratulations on this Bill, but I do not think he will be surprised that I cannot share in it. I think in strict logic there is only one really equitable basis for a Compensation Bill of this kind, and that is a recognition of the fact that war damage ought to be a national liability. As a matter of fact, the Chancellor has already recognised that to the extent of 50 per cent. in certain possible circumstances. . . .

In looking at this Bill, I am not at all certain, if we judge it either from the point of view of equity or from the point of view of expediency, that it can be seriously defended. Let us look at what exactly the proposal is. First of all, the contributions are entirely unrelated to risk. Property held in London, Birmingham, Coventry or any of the other large towns is a very bad risk. On the other hand, property in the Lake District, in Anglesey or in large stretches of Scotland runs a very remote risk of being damaged by bombing. Nevertheless, there is a flat rate of contribution, and that contribution is compulsory. The Lake District owner, the Anglesey owner, the Scottish owner, has to share the burden with the owner of property in Birmingham, Coventry, etc.

Sir K. Wood: Quite right.

Mr. Benson: I am not grumbling at that. I am merely pointing out what the Bill says. But why has that basis been chosen? Why is it that the Lake District owner, who is practically safe,

is compelled to share the burden of the Coventry owner? There is only one reason, and that is that he holds a similar type of property. There is no identity of interest. (An Hon. Member: "We are all in the war.") The only association between the two is an identity of type of property held, not identity of interest or identity of risk. To base compulsory contributions merely on the holding of property of similar type is illogical and, I think, inequitable. Let me give an example of what I mean. Let us take a property in Birmingham which is a bad risk. That property may be subject to what is known in the North as a chief rent—that is, a perpetual annual ground rent, say of £100. It may also be subject to a mortgage, the interest on which is £100 a year. In order to enable the burden of risk to be borne, the Lake District owner has to pay a very high premium, although he has an entirely different risk and has no identity of interest with the Birmingham owner. But the chief rent owner of the Birmingham property, and the mortgagee of the Birmingham property, who have a very definite identity of interest, are entirely excluded under this Bill from any contributions. Why should the chief rent owner of a property in Birmingham be entirely excluded from contribution towards the cost of insuring the property, whereas some small property owner in the wilds, who runs no risk at all, is compelled to share the burden of the Birmingham owner? If you say that we are going to take not merely identity of form but identity of interest, and spread the burden on all forms of property, then there is an unanswerable case for spreading the burden. But my point is that the burden has been spread merely according to the form of property and not according to identity of interest. Why should the chief rent owner of the Birmingham property not bear his part of the burden?

Let us take another example. Take a works in London, again a bad risk. Why should the preference shareholders and the debenture holders of a firm having factories in London be entirely excluded from carrying any part of the

burden? Why should the London works be insured partly at the expense of some property-owner in the North of England and not at the expense of the debenture and preference shareholders of the particular works?

The most glaring injustice of the Bill is in connection with the inclusion of mortgages upon domestic property. Small mortgages of £500 or £1,000, as the case may be, generally come from persons who have no great savings. Often it comes from a small trust estate; as I know from experience, having done hundreds of valuations of small domestic property for that purpose. Another source is the building society. The building society is little more than a co-operative society for investments. The vast funds in the possession of the building societies come from a very large number of small investments. In the North it is customary to use building societies as a form of savings bank. The number of mortgages effected by the building societies must run into millions; but the number of depositors, who provide the money for the societies to lend, is far in excess of the number of borrowers. The Halifax Building Society, for instance, has tens of thousands of depositors, who are lending small sums in this way. These two forms of mortgagee are compelled to share the burden; but the large trust estates, which do not want small mortgages of £500 or £600, but prefer to lend sums of £50,000 or £60,000 on commercial property, are carefully excluded from making any contribution. Why should the small man, who has put £50 or £100 into a building society, be compelled to bear some of the burden, while the great insurance societies and banks are not? I hope that in Committee we shall deal with this glaring anomaly. I have not the slightest hope that we shall recast the Bill on a wider scale, and make the general levy on all property—a general levy on all unearned income—but we can remove the glaring anomaly that the only mortgagee who is compelled to bear a share of the burden is the small man, while the big man escapes.

The Solicitor-General: I cannot conclude without just saying that chorus of approval which we have had to-day has been rather broken by the hon. Member for Chesterfield. He did not like what he described as the lack of logic in our scheme. I am not sure that he quite liked the man in the Lake District standing in with the man in

Coventry, but as far as I am concerned that is the best feature of the Bill. If I dare say so—and I am sure my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer will not mind—I think that that is a perfectly good piece of Socialism in our time.

December 19.

Oral Answers (36 columns)

CIVIL DEFENCE.

CHILDREN (EVACUATION).

Miss Cazalet asked the Minister of Health whether he will now make a statement on the compulsory evacuation of schoolchildren from London and other danger areas?

Mr. MacDonald: As the answer is rather long, I will, with permission, make a statement at the end of Questions.

Later—

Mr. MacDonald: I apologise for the length of the reply, but I think the House will expect me to make a full statement on the question of the compulsory evacuation of children from London and other danger areas. Since August, 1939, 456,000 or 84 per cent. of the school-children in the county of London and East and West Ham and 223,000 or 83 per cent. of the children under five have been removed to safer areas. There remain 80,000 schoolchildren and 38,000 children under five in the county of London and 9,500 schoolchildren and 7,500 children under five in East and West Ham. The Government have again considered whether power should be taken to evacuate compulsorily the children still remaining, and I have discussed the matter once more recently with representatives of localities which would be most affected. They represented to me the deep feeling of many parents that they will not be parted from their children in these critical times; and advised me that the attitude of these parents is such as to make undesirable and even impractical any attempt to enforce evacuation. They did not think that any difference would be made by adopting the proposal to permit contracting out, which would either not solve this difficulty, or else largely nullify a scheme of compulsion.

This conforms with the view which I expressed on behalf of the Government in the Debate on 13th June last. It is

a view which the Government still hold, and we have therefore decided not to adopt, in the present phase of the war, any general policy of compulsory evacuation. If a substantial number of children remain in London, two dangers have to be faced. The first is that if children were freed from school they would lose their education and become undisciplined. This we are seeking to meet, as hon. Members know, by enforcing attendance at school. The second danger is that, apart from the risks of bombing, children might suffer in health from the conditions of life in wartime London. I am glad to say that reports obtained by the Chief Medical Officer of the London County Council show that, while there are occasional cases of children whose health is affected, London children generally are healthy and their morale is excellent. Nevertheless, it is clearly undesirable that children should remain in London and other danger areas exposed to air attack and the risk of epidemics. While, therefore, we do not propose to make evacuation compulsory, we shall continue to advise and urge parents to send their children away.

But to the policy of voluntary evacuation there is to be one exception. There are occasional cases of children who are suffering from war conditions. I believe all hon. Members will agree that any child found to be suffering in body or mind from conditions in the danger areas should not remain in them. I am therefore taking power by a Defence Regulation to require any child to be medically examined who is thought to be suffering or to be in such a state of health as to be likely to suffer, in body or mind as a result of war conditions in an area defined by an Order to be made under the Regulation. If the examination shows that the child is suffering or likely to suffer in this way, there will be power to require the child to be sent away from the area, under the Government evacuation scheme. There will be a right of appeal against the requirement to a court of summary jurisdiction. If no appeal is made or if an appeal is made and rejected and the child is not sent away the parent will be liable to prosecution under the Defence Regulations. Such children will be cared for in hostels in the country whenever necessary. The Regulation will not apply to Scotland, where the conditions are different, and I contemplate that for the present the powers which it will confer will be applied only

to the London evacuation area.

For children who remain in London and other areas exposed to attack the chief danger to health comes from living in shelters—particularly large public shelters—and I have been considering what can be done to minimise this danger. I propose therefore to take power by another Defence Regulation to enable us to arrange for the medical examination of children in shelters with the object of watching their health generally, detecting incipient disease and enabling direct medical advice to be given to parents. We are also taking power to examine any persons in a shelter who are thought to be suffering from an infectious disease or to be verminous and to require their isolation, removal to hospital or cleansing as the case may need. The Regulation will enable rules of this kind to be made for public shelters in any area in England or Scotland. I believe that by these means we can do much to safeguard the health of the public and particularly of children. But the safety of children in war-time is a problem which the Government will keep constantly under review and on which policy may have to be varied as the phases of the war change.

Sir Percy Harris: While generally approving of the statement, particularly the conditions about education, will the Minister consider making regulations to prevent the return of children without reasonable cause, once they have been evacuated?

Mr. MacDonald: I did answer a Question upon that point at Question Time to-day. We have examined the matter carefully, and we have come to the conclusion that it would be impracticable to compel the children to stay in the reception areas. We are, however, taking all the steps we can, short of compulsion.

COMMUNIST CONVENTION.

Sir A. Knox asked the Home Secretary whether his attention has been drawn to the People's Convention, advertised to be held at Manchester on 12th January; and, whether, since its object is to create anti-war movement in this country, he will consider the desirability of banning the Convention?

Mr. H. Morrison: This convention is being organised by the Communist party, who probably hope by means of such a gathering to gain some support from loyal people who have no intention

of impeding the war effort and are unaware of the ulterior motives for which the conference has been organised. I must hold myself free to exercise, whenever the need arises, the power conferred upon me by Defence Regulation 39E, and it would be wrong for me at this stage to fetter my discretion by announcing beforehand whether use will or will not be made of that power. I will, therefore, confine myself to saying that one of the disadvantages of prohibiting the meeting is that such a course would not be likely to contribute to the enlightenment of those whom the organisers hope to beguile. . . .

Mr. McGovern: Is the Minister not aware that this is not a genuine anti-war conference but is merely conforming to the Stalin-Hitler Pact; and will he ask for a report from the hon. and learned Member for East Bristol (Sir Stafford Cripps) at headquarters as to why this conference has been convened?

NEGOTIATIONS (HERR HITLER).

Mr. Cocks asked the Prime Minister whether, in order to make it clear to the world that in no circumstances can there ever be any negotiations with Herr Hitler, His Majesty's Government will consider, after consultation with the Allies, issuing a declaration to the effect that Herr Hitler, having broken every pledge and treaty, has placed himself outside the bounds of civil and social relations and, as the general enemy and disturber of the peace of the world, is abandoned to public justice?

The Prime Minister: These admirable sentiments so happily expressed do not at this moment require to be embodied in a formal State declaration.

Mr. Cocks: Would not those historic phrases apply more properly to Herr Hitler than to the much greater man to whom they were originally addressed—Napoleon?

The Prime Minister: I always deprecate comparisons.

Written Answers (30 columns)

COAL INDUSTRY.

SUPPLIES, BRISTOL.

Lord Apsley asked the Minister of Transport whether, in view of the fact that Bristol is much nearer to supplies of coal than many other places, the city is in fact obtaining its supplies from such sources or from elsewhere?

Mr. Grenfell: I have been asked to reply. While some adjustment of the kind suggested in the Question has already been made in order to reduce transport, it must be recognised that the coal requirements of this part of the country could not wholly be met from local sources as regards quantity or quality.

FOOD SUPPLIES.

BREAD (PRICE).

Captain Cunningham-Reid asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food whether he is yet in a position to announce the future price of white bread and wholemeal bread?

Major Lloyd George: Yes, Sir.

My Noble Friend has decided to make an Order to prevent any increase taking place in the price of bread for a period of at least three months. He is, however, satisfied, as a result of a costing investigation conducted by the Ministry's Director of Costings, that in those parts of Great Britain where household bread is being sold below 8½d. per quarter or 4 lb. loaf, the increase, which has taken place since the outbreak of war, in the bakers' costs of production and distribution would justify raising the price by ½d. per quarter. As, however, such an increase in the price of bread would mean a substantial addition to the cost of living, especially to poorer families, my Noble Friend has decided that the necessary adjustment should be secured by a rebate in the price of flour to the bakers concerned instead of an increase in the retail price of the loaf. The Ministry of Food will, therefore, be prepared to arrange for a reduction to be made of 4s. per sack, which is equivalent to ½d. per quarter loaf, as from 1st December to all bakers in Great Britain in respect of bread made by them and sold by retail at 8d. per quarter or less. It will be granted, in the first instance, for three months, during which period the cost is estimated at £750,000. The baking industry have given my Noble Friend an assurance that bread made from high-extraction flour, that is, flour containing not less than 85 per cent. of the wheat berry, will continue to be on sale throughout the country at the same price as white bread and in sufficient quantity to meet the local demand. High-extraction, or wholemeal bread will be eligible for the subsidy on the same terms as white bread.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

BIRMINGHAM and District Social Crediters will find friends over tea and light refreshments at Prince's Cafe, Temple Street, on Friday evenings, from 6 p.m., in the King's Room.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Association: Weekly meetings every Tuesday evening at 7-30 p.m. at the Friends Meeting House, King Street, Blackburn. All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow, Blackburn.

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

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER is obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Meets regularly on the first and third Sundays in the month. Time 2-30 p.m. Enquiries to Secretary: Miss J. E. Taylor, 11, Nook Rise, Liverpool 15.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP. Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association. It is important that all Social Crediters on Tyneside should maintain contact. Write Hon. Secretary, R. Thomson, 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; or 50, Ripley Grove, Copnor.

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.

The Social Crediter
If you are not a subscriber to *THE SOCIAL CREDITER*, send this order without delay.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd.,
12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

Please send *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* to me

Name

Address

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-
" Six " " 15/-
" Three " " 7/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer,
Social Credit Expansion Fund,
c/o The Social Credit Secretariat,
12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

I enclose the sum of £ : : ,
as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name

Address

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND.)

Name.....

Address.....

**TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE,
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.**

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Advisory Chairmanship of Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute

£ : : , { per month,
per quarter,
per year,

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

I herewith enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the above mentioned funds.

Signature.....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.)

Books to Read

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy
(*edition exhausted*)
- Social Credit 3/6
- Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
- The Monopoly of Credit 3/6
- Warning Democracy
(*edition exhausted*)
- The Tragedy of Human Effort ... 6d.
- The Use of Money 6d.
- Approach to Reality 3d.
- Money and the Price System ... 3d.
- Nature of Democracy 2d.
- Social Credit Principles 1d.
- Tyranny 1d.
- and
- "This 'American' Business" 3d. each
12 for 2/-

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster 4d.
- The Nature of Social Credit ... 4d.
- Debt and Taxation 2d.

ALSO

- The Douglas Manual 5/-
- The Economic Crisis:
Southampton Chamber of
Commerce Report 6d.
- The Bankers of London
by Percy Arnold 4/6
- Economics for Everybody
by Elles Dee 3d.
- The Power of Money
by J. B. Galway 3d.
- The Purpose of Politics
by H. E. 3d.
- Tax-Bonds or Bondage and the
Answer to Federal Union
by John Mitchell...1/- (Postage 2½)

Leaflets

- Invincible Britain
by John Mitchell 2d. each,
1/6 doz.
- What We Are About
by H. E. 50 for 1/6
- Hitler and Churchill Finance
by John Mitchell..... 50 for 1/9
- Bomb Hitler!
by C. H. Douglas..... 100 for 1/3

All from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

BELFAST D.S.C. GROUP

Group Meeting on January 7, 1941
In the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at
8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon Sec.,
17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications,
Ltd., at 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.