

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 5. No. 22.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

### PARLIAMENT

#### The Treasury: Russian Imports: Sedition

January 23.

##### WAR DAMAGE BILL

(64 columns) \*

*Major Milner (Leeds, South-East):*  
.... The purpose of my Amendment, which is to leave out Sub-section (2) of Clause 1, is.... in the second place, to ensure that the War Damage Commission is in effect the body which will have charge of the operations of the Bill.

There are three grounds for inviting the Committee to delete this Sub-section. The first is that its inclusion means that in effect, and subject, of course, to any specific provisions in the Bill, the whole administration and conduct of matters arising under the Bill would be in the hands of the Treasury and not in the hands of the War Damage Commission at all. The Commission would merely be a channel, or more properly, an agent of the Treasury. It would be bound hand and foot by directions given by the Treasury, and it appears to me that this matter is particularly important, because there is no provision whatever in the Bill for any publicity to be given to any directions which the Treasury may think it right to give the Commission, and it would be possible under the Bill for the

Treasury to give confidential or secret instructions to the Commission as to the way in which it should conduct its business. Many of us feel that there is already far too much power given to the executive in some directions. In most cases, however, we have knowledge of the directions, regulations or instructions given by Government Departments, but in this case, unless my right hon. Friend agrees that some publicity shall be given to these directions, that will not be the case and it will be possible, of course, for the directions to be quite contrary to the spirit intended by Parliament and the country.

My right hon. Friend may say that nothing of that sort is intended, and no doubt that it is merely the intention of the Government or the Treasury, which in effect means the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself, to give directions on comparatively minor matters, but on perusing the Bill, hon. Members will see the possibility of extending it in a much wider fashion than that. For example, it will be possible—and I am subject to correction—for directions to be given as to the period in which claims shall be made under clause 3. The period may be short, and I believe that, in the opinion of the Committee and the country, it may cause great hardship, and, therefore, it is clearly desirable that the period should be fixed by the Committee, or that publicity should be given to any directions given by the Treasury on that matter.

Under Clause 4 it will be competent, if this Sub-section remains in the Bill, for the Treasury to give directions as to what shall or shall not be relevant circumstances in considering payment of cost of works, and thus it might be possible for the Treasury to alter the basis of the cost of works. Under Clause 7 it will be competent for the Treasury to give directions as to any question which arises

in giving effect to either Clause 4, 5 or 6. Reference to the Bill will show that Clauses 4, 5 and 6 are among the most important, if not the most important, in the Bill. Hon. Members will see that it will be possible for directions to be given on these matters. Under Clause 8, the Treasury may direct the Commission that damage shall not be made good in any particular, or, indeed, in any general case. Under Clause 9, directions may be given to the Commission as to when payments shall be made. There again, it would be within the competence of the Treasury to alter entirely the intention of Parliament and inflict hardship upon claimants.

These are not the only reasons why I ask for the deletion of this Sub-section. It must be remembered that, in the first instance at any rate, the Commission will not be administering public money. The first £200,000,000, or whatever may be the proceeds of the premium payments, will be contributed by property owners, and therefore it does not seem reasonable that the Treasury should have the right to give these directions to which I have referred. I submit that it is only fair that these contributors, subject always, of course, to the national interest, should have some say about what is being done with their money. If the Treasury is to limit by directions the payments to be made by the War Damage Commission there may be a certain saving, though not a very substantial saving, but it is, I submit, unreasonable that the Treasury should have the final and decisive voice in matters of this kind.

Finally, I submit that to confer such a wide power as this on the Treasury would be contrary to the spirit in which these proposals were introduced to Parliament by the Prime Minister and approved by the country. Claimants are entitled to expect generous though just administration, free from red tape and

\* In "Hansard."

#### What 'Capital Levy' Means to You

A leaflet by

MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS.

##### PRICES:

1/6 for 50; 2/6 for 100;  
11/- for 500; £1 for 1,000.

Obtainable from

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

petty restrictions.... In my submission we should be wrong in conferring such wide and general powers on the Treasury as this Sub-section proposes, without having even the safeguard of publicity and I invite the Committee to accept my Amendment.

*Sir Patrick Hannon* (Birmingham): I rise to support the Amendment... It is true that we have been conferring upon the Treasury inordinate powers in relation to the administration of public Acts in this country and I think that, in this Bill, some limitation ought to be placed on the extent to which the Treasury may interfere directly with the work of the War Damage Commission. We have had recently an immense volume of Departmental legislation. During the last war, a constant complaint was that we were legislating in almost every Department, by means of orders, and that the interpretation of Acts was dependent on orders. I hope that some limitation will, in future, be placed on this kind of extension of the power of bureaucracy in this country. It is wrong that we should remove from Parliament the powers that Parliament ought to exercise, in order to ensure fair play among those who were affected by the administration of a Measure of this kind.

#### "FAIRLY AND SQUARELY"

I hope my right hon. Friend who, I am sure, realises the full significance of this Amendment will make a statement upon it which will satisfy the country that this Measure is to be administered fairly and squarely in the interests of all those whose property is damaged by enemy action. In these times people are passing through a very severe ordeal. There is much suffering in the country as the result of the destruction of property and damage done to thousands of homes, in respect of which claims will be made in due time. It is important that these people should feel and that the whole nation should feel, that in the administration of this legislation there will be perfect fair play and that the Treasury will not unreasonably or unfairly interfere with the administration of an Act which means so much to so many people.

*The Chancellor of the Exchequer* (*Sir Kingsley Wood*): .... I would point out first that this provision has been put into the Bill not to create a bureaucracy or give special privileges to the Treasury, but to ensure effective Parliamentary control over the administration of the Measure. If there were no such provision, the whole administration of this important Act, involving

very large sums of money, would be left to the Commission. Unless some such provision as this were included, the House would not be able to exercise any control over this administration. ...

Let me explain why the word "Treasury" is used and incorporated in this Bill. There are a number of Departments which are concerned with the administration of this Bill and of public policy. There is the Ministry of Works, .... the Board of Trade, which is concerned with factories under these proposals. .... Under these circumstances it was impossible to say that the Commission should act under the direction of half a dozen different Departments. They must be co-ordinated through the Treasury, not with the Treasury as a sort of watchdog of the public purse but as the principal co-ordinating Department of the Government. ....

#### SECRET DIRECTIONS

It is not my desire .... to give secret and hole and corner directions on this matter and whether it should be by way of directions or by way of regulations which the Chancellor shall make under this Clause I will see that it shall be put into action on the lines of the Amendment which says: " . . . shall . . . be laid before Parliament. . . . "

... I must also emphasise this of course: that no directions which I or any Chancellor may give could interfere with the provisions of this Bill when it became an Act or any other Act of Parliament. Under this Bill certain powers are given to the Commission by which it can do this, that or the other. It is largely a matter of coming to an opinion on a certain set of facts. These conditions must be respected by the Chancellor just as the Commission must respect them. ... Obviously the determination as to the individuals who shall form the Commission must be made by the Minister who is responsible to Parliament for those appointments. However vital their interests might be, one could not accept the suggestion that a body of people should nominate these Commissioners, for this would remove the whole of the personnel of the Commission from the sanction and authority of Parliament. Having regard to the vital duties which the Commission will have to perform, obviously in this case the Chancellor of the Exchequer must take the responsibility for the composition of the Commission, in order that he may be able in Parliament to answer

for the decisions and choice which he has made. If this were not done, Parliament would have lost all authority in this matter now and in the future, and would have no authority over the personnel.

*Mr. Garro Jones* (Aberdeen, North): ... I had listed all the powers which were given to the Treasury by this Bill by direction and order—some by order and some by direction. My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for South-East Leeds (*Major Milner*) recited some of them, although he did not recite them all.

... We are most anxious that the powers to be exercised by the Treasury, whether by direction or by order, shall be subjected to some form of supervision by the House of Commons. What are the assurances which the right hon. Gentleman gave us on that score? He told us that the object of the Sub-section was not to give power to bureaucracy, but to lay the administration open to Parliamentary criticism. Well, if that is indeed the object, then we require riders to the assurance which the right hon. Gentleman has given. First, I think that the powers of the Treasury ought to be exercised by regulation rather than by direction in this proposal, and in the other proposals which will subsequently come before the Committee. ...

#### ASSURANCES

*Sir K. Wood*: I gave undertakings that I would put in the Bill that the directions under this Clause should be general, that I will assure publicity and that I will see that they come before Parliament. I want to do this by regulation if I can. ...

*Major Milner*: ... While I must not be taken as accepting all that the Chancellor has said about the deletion of this Sub-section doing away with Parliamentary control, I agree that he has met us handsomely and that his promise appears to be satisfactory. In these circumstances, I beg to ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Sir H. Williams*: ... If my property were destroyed and if there were left one brick on which I could reconstruct the house and get a cost-of-works payment, I should do so, because it will be infinitely better to have a cost-of-works payment than a value payment. In many cases with a cost-of-works payment a person would get more than he would if his house were completely destroyed. This is one of the issues

which in some way or other we shall have to face. I realise the difficulties of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; he wishes to keep down the total amount of payments as much as possible in our interest, because none of us wants to pay too much by way of premiums. Democracy cannot work unless people forgo at large meetings in the evening, and I hope it is realised that, but for the present circumstances, public meetings would be taking place on the matter now under discussion. I feel sure that public meetings will be resumed shortly when it is light in the evenings, and I am sure that if public opinion were able to operate freely in respect of this whole problem of the relative position of value payments and cost-of-works payments, we should be subjected to the most intense pressure. Although I appreciate and sympathise to the full with the difficulties of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in questions of value payments dating back pre-war, I think that before this Bill ultimately becomes law, value payments will not continue quite as they are now. . .

January 28.

Oral Answers (27 columns).

### ECONOMIC WARFARE

UNITED STATES EXPORTS TO RUSSIA.

*Rear-Admiral Beamish* asked the Minister of Economic Warfare what official information he has of large quantities of cotton and other goods exported from the United States of America reaching Russia and later Germany; and will he give full details of such imports to Russia and say whether the shipping concerned is subject to navicerts?

*Mr. Dalton:* I have little evidence that United States exports to the Soviet Union reach Germany directly, but ample evidence that the Soviet are exporting Russian goods to Germany and replacing these goods by imports from the U.S.A. United States exports of cotton to the Soviet Union, which are normally negligible, amounted during the last quarter of 1940 to 30,000 tons, considerably more than recent annual imports into the Soviet Union from all sources. Large quantities of cotton are now being exported from the Soviet Union to Germany.

In regard to other important commodities, exports of copper and brass from the U.S.A. to the Soviet Union rose from small quantities before the war to 57,000 tons, and exports of wheat from negligible quantities to 100,000

tons in 1940. Exports of petroleum amounted to 114,000 tons during the first eleven months of 1940. Both wheat and petroleum are commodities of which the Soviet Government have undertaken to supply large quantities to Germany under their recent trade agreements. The value of exports of oil-drilling machinery from the U.S.A. to the Soviet Union during the first eight months of 1940 was nearly double that of the exports during the whole of 1938 and there were considerable further shipments during the last four months of the year. Shipments from the United States to the Soviet Union are not subject to navicerts since the trade routes concerned lie outside the navicert area.

*Rear-Admiral Beamish:* Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether any representations have been made either to the United States or to Russia on this matter?

*Mr. Dalton:* We have made it quite clear to both countries concerned what are our feelings in regard to this matter. I hope that, as a result of conversations now taking place with Washington, it may be possible to take some steps to reduce this practice.

### CIVIL DEFENCE

GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES.

*Mr. Stokes* asked the Prime Minister whether he will give an assurance that no further leases or sale of land in the British Commonwealth will be granted or made to any foreign country before consulting this House?

*The Prime Minister:* I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given to him by my right hon. Friend the Lord Privy Seal on 3rd December last.

### POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION.

*Mr. Sloan* asked the Minister without Portfolio whether his study of reconstruction after the war will include the constructive proposals of the Labour party for national ownership of mines, transport, land and banks?

*The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Arthur Greenwood):* Yes, Sir. Constructive proposals from any responsible source will be welcomed and carefully considered.

*Mr. Shinwell:* Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that it is going to be mighty difficult to ignore the constructive proposals of the Labour party after the war?

*Mr. Sloan:* Will the right hon.

Gentleman keep in mind that the millions of working-class workers who are regimented in the military and industrial machine in this fight for democracy are looking forward to the complete socialisation of industry?

### SUPPRESSION OF "DAILY WORKER" AND "WEEK"

(70 columns)

*Mr. Bevan:* . . . It was only a few months ago that some newspaper proprietors, not after an official meeting of newspaper proprietors but, I imagine, after conversations with Members of the Government, approached the proprietors of two very important newspapers in Great Britain with very large circulations. The Government, they were told, were very worried about the line they were taking. The proprietors of those two papers said, "If that be so, we should like to discuss the matter with the Government," and they saw a Member of the War Cabinet. That Member of the War Cabinet said—mark his words—that in his view the line taken by those newspapers was subversive—[*Interruption.*] Yes, the "Daily Mirror" and the "Sunday Pictorial"—and the Cabinet Minister was the Lord Privy Seal.

At that time the propaganda of those two newspapers, which were both supporting the war, was a propaganda against the unwisdom of retaining certain members in the Government.

. . . It is quite easy to stamp on the "Daily Worker," but when a working man or woman finds that one paper is vigorously taking up his grievances, some of which are very real, it is a much harder matter to persuade that man or woman that the attitude of the "Daily Worker" to the war is in fact mistaken. The man who has done more work on those lines and achieved more successes on those lines than anyone else in the country is Mr. Victor Gollancz, and I quote his judgment with confidence:

"There is no doubt whatever that at every stage in the conflict the 'Daily Worker' has adopted a policy which can have no other intention whatever than to weaken the resistance of the people to the Hitler menace."

Moreover—and these are not his words but mine—it has done so with, at times, an inconsistency which did not match the attacks made on the consistency of other papers. . . .

*Mr. Lees-Smith:* . . . I do not propose to quote extracts, as I do not wish to speak at any great length. I

## AMERICA AIDS BRITAIN!

That the New York newspapers so exclusively quoted by the B.B.C. do not reflect all shades of American opinion is shown by the following from the *Courier-Journal* of Louisville, Kentucky. The author is James S. Pope and he wrote under the title: "America Aids Britain—For Cash."—

The phrase of the moment is "Aid to England." I, for one, am sick of it. Dr. Gallup says practically all Americans favour "aid to England." Most of our columnists speak learnedly of the "aid" we already are giving Britain. Our president delivers himself of the odd observation that our "aid to England" has reached its peak. (You may be tired of those quotation marks, but so am I.)

Has there ever in the strange history of civilised men been any such colossal, such maddening, such utterly stupid and indefensible hypocrisy as that represented by the phrase "Aid to England"? In heaven's high name, how have we aided England? When? Whose sac-

rifice produced the aid? I'll tell you what we have done. It is very simple.

We have SOLD England an indeterminate number of military airplanes. She has paid cash. She has come and got them. We have SOLD England, I understand, some old rifles and various shipments of ammunition. She has paid cash. She came and got them. We have SOLD England, it is hinted, some tanks, especially some tanks we wanted tested on desert battlefields. We have SOLD England grain and sugar, iron and cotton, shoes and ships and sealing wax.

England must (under our law) pay cash. England must (under our helpful law) come and get them.

Finally, in a moment of benign generosity, we traded England some rotting destroyers for some air and naval bases so valuable to our defence that even Mr. Churchill had difficulty justifying the deal to his parliament.

We are going (as part of our mag-

nificent program of "aid to England") to sell her more and more planes, if our factories will just decide to produce them fast enough. We are going to sell England practically anything she wants—if we don't want it first—and we are going to let her use our own American ports to load her purchases into her own ships.

And Napoleon called England a nation of shopkeepers!

Oh, America, thou valiant, thou strong. Land of freedom. Eternal foe of cruelty and oppression, defender of men's minds, men's properties—of men's "rights."

What an inspiration we are to the suffering humanity of older, more benighted lands. We are opening our hearts. We are opening our order books. We are ready to sell England several useful items.

We are in the throes of a pleasant national orgy of "Aid to England." Ain't it wonderful!

(*PARLIAMENT—cont'd from page 3*).

need not deal with the early days of the war, but before it began there was no newspaper so ferocious as the "Daily Worker" in attacking the Government for not standing up to Hitler, and, indeed, on the day before war broke out, when, as hon. Members know, there seemed to be doubt as to whether the Government were going forward, the "Daily Worker" issued a manifesto calling the country to action in order to push the Government into war. Three weeks later, when Poland was divided up between Germany and Russia, they suddenly turned in their tracks—they double-crossed those who had followed their lead—and ever since then have developed what I think it is necessary really to understand, the thesis laid down by Lenin for Communists in time of war. It is this thesis which is called revolutionary defeatism. Now the thesis of Lenin's doctrine was this, that in a war between two Powers, neither of which is Communist, such as Great Britain and Germany, such a war was merely a war between two rival imperial groups, and Communists were equally hostile to both. Therefore the duty of Communists in each state was to try to defeat its own Government, and even though Communists in the other State were not to succeed in similar efforts,

nevertheless, the Communists in each State were to conduct a war for the defeat of his State on his own front. That is the doctrine of revolutionary defeatism with which we have to deal. It is no use saying, "But this is a war for political liberty," because the Communist creed has no place for political liberty. It advocates political liberty in an Amendment on the Order Paper, but only so that it may destroy political liberty when an opportunity comes. The whole Communist creed is that when it can, it will deal with its political opponents with a merciless ferocity comparable with that of Nazism itself. So we are dealing not with passionate men who stray over the line, but with a conspiracy, a sixth column, whose endeavour it is to impede our efforts at national survival. . . .

*Mr. Gallacher (Fife, West):* . . . Why did the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Keighley (Mr. Lees-Smith) refer to the Lenin thesis? Why did he not refer to his own thesis, which I will read to him? It is the thesis of Members of this side of the House, it is his own thesis and the thesis of the Secretary of State for the Home Department:

"If war threatens to break out, it is the duty of the working classes and their parliamentary representatives in the countries

involved, supported by the co-ordinating activity of the International Socialist Bureau, to exert every effort in order to prevent the outbreak of war by means they consider most effective, which naturally vary according to the sharpening of the class struggles and the sharpening of the political situation. In case war should break out anyway, it is their duty to intervene in favour of its speedy termination and with all their powers to utilise the economic and political crisis created by the war to arouse the people and thereby hasten the downfall of the capitalist class rule. . . . Proclaim your will in every form and in all places; raise your protest in the parliaments with all your force; unite in great mass demonstrations; use every means that the organisations and strength of the proletariat place at your disposal. To the capitalist world of exploitation and mass murder, oppose in this way the proletarian world of peace and fraternity of peoples."

That is his own thesis. It is the thesis of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and it is the thesis of the Lord Privy Seal and of the Minister of Labour. It is so easy to make a speech of the kind to which we have just listened, which is approved and supported by the Home Secretary.

*Mr. H. Morrison:* What is the date of the thesis?

*Mr. Gallacher:* 1912. Why did the right hon. Gentleman not give the date of Lenin's thesis? Lenin's thesis was prepared following and on the basis of that resolution. . . .

## To an Overseas Correspondent

By B. M. PALMER

Thank you for your long and interesting letter with its description of your beautiful homeland. May I quote from it? You write: "All my life I have lived in scenes of beauty—it makes me desire that others should know beauty too, get out of slums, depressing streets, dirty back yards, endless rows of tired shops and pubs, all the creations of the Dark Forces which are uppermost in men's minds, rather than the will to alter their environment. One knows that those who live in their millions in such areas have child-like minds, and lack the ability to overcome obstacles. Can we do it for them, even with the application of Social Credit principles?"

We cannot supply other people with will-power, or with a desire to alter their environment. There is not, in fact very much we can do for such people, except live our own lives according to social credit principles, in so far as we are able.

I have no patience with those who pretend it is easy, especially at first, but there is one comfort, perhaps the way of transgressors is harder! Please don't take that too seriously, it doesn't do to think of ourselves as pioneer martyrs. All I mean is that we must free our minds of every vestige of desire to reform other people. The desire for 'improvement' must come from them.

The "transgressor," who, you know, is usually a very good man or woman, cannot look at other people's way of life without saying, and often in their hearing (which when you come to think of it is extremely rude): "You ought not to—" "Why don't you—" "If I were you I shouldn't—" or "What else can you expect if you *will* do that?"

The first thing we have to learn is to stop all criticism of that kind, and look after our own gardens. And in doing that, in trying to remove some of the obstacles that lie in our own path, we shall be helping others too.

R.L.S. wrote somewhere "I am not sent into this world to make other people good, but to make them happy, *if I may*."

It is the last three words that are important; they imply that permission must first be granted. We can do nothing for others except in the position of a servant taking orders, and that is the whole secret of democracy.

If I were you I should not upset myself unduly about the fierce indigna-

tion which is felt and expressed in *The Social Crediter* against those responsible for this terrible war. Do you expect people to witness and undergo these terrible things which affect them so nearly and not give vent to their anger at the cause of them. It is all very well to talk about Dark Forces, but these forces are incarnate in people. No war is won simply by thinking 'good' and inspiring thoughts. What are 'good' thoughts unless they give us material strength? Since you have mentioned the example set by Jesus Christ, it would be as well to remember that the expressions "hypocrites" and "generation of vipers" were pretty strong and were the words applied by him to the dictatorial classes of that day, who were enslaving the people under the Law.

If there were enough Social Crediters with strong enough convictions, the thing to do would be to follow his example exactly—arm ourselves with whips (the sorts used in our own prisons would do very well) and drive the money changers out of the temple. But since the whips would be answered by machine guns, the modern equivalent of the whip, our only course is to see that the control of the machine gun is retained by the British people when this war is over. For it is in their organisations that the conception of free life for the individual has received its greatest expression.

Unless the British people and the Empire retain control of their armed forces and refuse to have any truck with International Federation the Social Credit of the community can never begin to function. It is pernicious nonsense for the "leaders" of the church to tell the people "right is might;" some of them even have the face to say so while incendiaries and high explosives are falling on our cities, killing a thousand people a week.

Until 'right' learns to make itself as strong as 'might' it will never conquer. We have got to learn to use our weapons in the right way, or there will be no hope for the world.

I do not want to deny for one moment that our present sufferings are brought upon us by our own past actions, but this, in my opinion, makes no difference to the course that must be taken to overcome our present difficulties.

Chapter VI of C. H. Douglas's *Warning Democracy (Finance and Brit-*

*ish Politics* is the title of it) gives much valuable light on this question—the most important facing the world to-day.

This chapter was written in 1926. In speaking of our problems, Douglas says:

"The desired solution has no basis in sentimentality or abstract Pacifism. To be successful, it has to be a solution which can fight. As I have just said, and as must be only too obvious, modern scientific civilisation is irresistible in war. I believe it is possible to provide a financial system which will so abolish the artificial differences of interest between individuals that any community, nation, or continent which will successfully put these principles into operation will either compel imitation from the rest of the world, or will reduce any attack upon its principles to the relative position of a mob of bushmen armed with bows and arrows, who might be so rash as to attack a modern army equipped with all the terrible weapons of modern warfare."

And just one more point. You can't alter human nature. It is, of course, true that cruelty and exploitation both of man and beast are everywhere. But this cruelty is not innate in human nature. If it were our case would be hopeless. It is an acquired characteristic which has developed as a secondary result of evil economic conditions. Win the fight in which we are now engaged—the double fight against military dictators on one side and financial dictators on the other—and men would then have leisure to think about what they were doing, and to return to a normal way of life. First things first.

In any case we must win the war. Do you realise that it is only in the English speaking countries that there is any glimmering of the pleasant place the world may some day become?

### WARNING

War strode the Earth, slaying and threatening, and day after day Charon ferried great multitudes across the Styx.

And by and by came a day when only one shivering Shade waited to cross. Charon rowed the Shade over in silence, and having set him down was about to return to the world.

"Stop," said the Shade. "Don't return. I am the Last."

## 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.

Vol. 5. No. 22.

#### Business Office:

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

Saturday, February 8, 1941.

## MENACE

For the second month in succession, the Memorandum of the Imperial Policy Group draws attention to the Communist menace.

The author of the memorandum alleges that 'communists' in this country have been busy fermenting discontent in factories and that some of them receive information from 'the enemy' and communicate information to 'him' as well as assisting 'him' to the best of their ability in other directions.

The Imperial Policy Group has greatly extended its range of action since the war began, an accomplishment due in part to the quasi-authoritative sources of its information and in part to a considerable impression of English patriotism it manages to create. We say 'quasi-authoritative' in regard to its sources because that is as nearly the correct expression as we can find: it means that it is *as though* the writers of these memoranda had access to information shared by persons 'in authority' and by few besides. And by 'an impression of English patriotism' we mean an impression calculated to appeal to the genuine Englishman on the ground of the genuine Englishman's regard—care, love, loyalty: what you like—for his country. (Yes, it is *his*, although he may be at the moment in uncertain possession of it.)

Now, beyond making allegations against the 'communists,' the writer of the memorandum for February goes a step—two steps—farther. He urges the Government to root them out. That is one step.

The second step is to indicate to the Government where they may be found.

This second step particularly excites our interest. One might think

that to a government bent upon exterminating the country's enemies, a clear indication of their whereabouts would be distinctly helpful. And so of course it would. But the memorandum is by no means clear on this point. All it says is that the culprits are not to be found where the Government (or its servants) have already laid hands upon them—e.g. in the offices of the *Daily Worker* and *The Week*; but are "far behind the political scene,"—or in other words, "in the woodpile."

There is, of course, a kind of information that is very much more definite in regard to its negative than to its positive aspects. After due examination a public health expert may say that a typhoid-carrier is "not in this dairy." He might also say that the dangerous person is in some other dairy "far behind." But in regard to sedition-carriers, whose virus hails from a different pool, the analogy does not seem to apply. Like ourselves, the Imperial Policy Group either knows who and where the venomous "higher-ups" are or it doesn't. Assuming that it knows, there's no need to keep it dark. We don't. By all means let us have their names. Not necessarily *all* their names. Merely a sufficiency of names to make an impression on events. Indeed, there is no other course. Surely the Imperial Group would not unnecessarily burden the strained resources of the State with an added responsibility?

Assuming that Mr. Churchill heeds the group's admonitions, what will be the upshot when he recovers from his first shock of horror and alarm? Will he enquire of the group concerning whether or not he has guessed right this time? Since he has not guessed right after seventeen months of war (and

several of pestilential interference with his country's war effort) is he sure to gain discernment at the first attempt? If not, does the group then fall to in renewed yet inarticulate efforts to induce attention to its patriotic indications? And how long is this to go on? T. J.

## WAR HELPS THE CENTRALISERS

In an article entitled "Industrial Mobilisation" the "Economist" of January 25 describes the process of centralisation under war conditions:—

"Thus, Mr. Bevin's plan for industrial mobilisation requires an addendum—a plan to *demobilise* labour in the non-essential trades. And it is a plan that cannot be applied to individual firms in isolation, but to whole trades or industries. The limited amount of work that is allowed or adjudged necessary in these trades or industries must be done in the most efficient way, by the most efficient units; wasteful or uneconomic units, whether firms or departments of firms, must be closed down. It is not hard to find examples: small firms struggling on with disproportionately large staffs; redundant shops and offices; sales organisations. No firm or department, serving no proved use, has any inherent right to remain in business, though all have a claim to compensation for compulsory closing down or to the means to maintain useful plant in running order. The work of weeding out will not be easy. It involves a system of pooling: the distribution of quotas of labour and materials to groups of businesses; and their allocation to individual concerns under firm Ministerial direction. It means that civilian production will be carried on by industrial groups with their resources and rewards.

"It ought not to be too difficult. It is a main part of German war economy; and the tendency in war is for trades and industries to come closer together in the combat against common difficulties, and for their associations to grow in strength and authority—and rapacity. The task of the Government now is to make pools of economy out of these pools of interest...."

## "BARRIER TO HEALTH"

by Dr. Douglas Boyd.

Price 6d.

Your doctor should have a copy!

# "THE ECONOMIST" AND SOCIAL CREDIT

By John Mitchell

The banks have published their Annual Accounts and held their Annual Meetings; the bank chairmen have made their traditional speeches and the city editors have contributed their customary comments upon them. Mr. McKenna as usual has made the most provocative statement, and this statement concerns the costless creation of credit. Unable to say that credit has not been *created*, and also unable to say that its creation is not an almost costless process, because too many people would not believe him today, Mr. McKenna has attempted to confuse the issue by drawing a Red Herring across the trail. He asserts that the new deposits, (caused by the issue of this credit to the Government who pay it to contractors, the latter paying it into their bank accounts), cost more in services than the interest paid on fixed deposits. The answer to this of course is that the cost of servicing deposits is quite a separate matter, it does not prove that the actual creation of the credit is not nearly costless. As a matter of fact Mr. McKenna gave figures which show that even the servicing of current accounts costs considerably less than 1%. So that it can be seen that a single payment of  $\frac{1}{2}\%$  would amply cover any costs incurred in the actual creation of credit. The cost of servicing accounts is a matter which obviously should be settled between the bank and the *depositor*.

The work of Social Crediters in enlightening the public about the creation of credit by the banks has made such splendid progress in this country that nearly all the bank chairmen adopted a defensive attitude in speaking of their profits, and *The Economist* evidently felt impelled to deal with the matter in a peculiarly frank article on February 1, entitled "The Growth of Bank Credit." This article says: "The rise in bank deposits over the year 1940 is, of course, entirely due to the direct use of bank credit in helping to fill the void of the budgetary deficit . . . Treasury deposits alone had by the end of the year risen to £313,500,000, in addition investments had risen over the year by £162,138,000." These two items alone amount to £475,638,000.

*The Economist* thinks that the increase in investments by the banks is the "weak link" in the armour of the banking position. Because "Their in-

crease for the year is £162,318,000; but of this as much as £135,236,000 occurred in the last six months of 1940. Admittedly the banks have given their full support to War Weapons Weeks throughout the country, encouraged by pressing appeals to play their part and in the full conviction that they were doing their duty. But one must seriously question whether the  $2\frac{1}{2}\%$  per cent. War Bonds or any other of the Government's tap issues are a fitting vehicle for the expansion or creation of bank credit. It is an expensive basis for such expansion, and if utilised for this purpose to a much greater extent it would provide some justification for accusing the banks of extracting excessive profits out of the peculiar conditions created by the war."

Since the banks have been drawing interest out of the taxpayers' pockets on the best part of £8000 million of War Debt since that Debt was incurred from costless credits created by the banks in the last war it might seem a little strange that the proprietors of *The Economist* should now suddenly be giving expression to pricks of "conscience" about it. But obligingly and candidly they admit the reason for it:

"The growth of bank credit and its genesis in Government financing appear to have made the bank chairmen as a whole peculiarly sensitive to the charge of profiteering, a charge based on the growth of resources which, as the advocates of Social Credit are never tired of telling us, have been created without cost to the banks."

*The Economist* thinks that the banks will continue to be allowed to monopolise credit if this untenable position is faced up to and: "the facilities and service granted to depositors should be paid for by the depositors themselves and not subsidised by the Exchequer . . . And if the new current accounts become really self-supporting the credit thus created can be given a less expensive counterpart than the new medium-term securities with which the banks are now in process of filling their investment portfolios. It would be wholly wrong if the expense of doing banking business were allowed to over-ride the principle that purchasing power newly created to finance the community and based on the Government's credit should not bear more than the most nominal rate of interest."

*The Economist* no doubt hopes that

those or most of those who have raised this matter into an issue which they and the bank chairmen have had to discuss openly will be content to close the discussion with the admission that banks have created large sums of credit for the Government upon which they should only receive a nominal rate of interest. This is a vain hope, for the admission in regard to the costlessness of the credit thus created and that the payment of interest upon it should be duly restricted is of very secondary importance to two other admissions, which they have perhaps made unwittingly. The first of these is that the credit created is based upon wealth which does not belong to the banks—the nation's wealth, erroneously termed "the Government's credit" by *The Economist*. As all money, including this credit, is a claim against real wealth, the banks have no right therefore to claim the credit as their own and it should be issued as a credit instead of as a debt to the nation. Secondly *The Economist* admits that the new credit has been issued as purchasing power, which the Government is using not as capital but as income to purchase current production. This is tantamount to admitting that the normal national income is insufficient to buy all current production unless it is supplemented by new purchasing power issued direct from the banking system.

That is what Major Douglas said over twenty years ago, and Social Crediters will not "tire" in drawing the attention of their M.P.'s and the public to *The Economist's* statement and its endorsement of the correctness of what he said.

When the war is over, instead of the Government spending the new purchasing power which it is found necessary for the banking system to issue in order that the "surplus" production need not be destroyed, production restricted or exports be made to exceed imports, this additional purchasing power must be issued direct to consumers, so that they can choose *individually* what to spend it on. The people of this country want the freedom to plan their own individual lives, not to have it planned for them by lives, not to have their lives planned for them by highly centralised organisations created for the purpose and usurping the individual's right to spend his own money. Mr. Greenwood please note.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### SLOGAN FOR PEACE

To the Editor, *The Social Crediter*,

Dear Sir,

I have just received a letter from Wellington, N.Z., the envelope of which had the stamp cancelled with a Post Office stamp bearing the slogan:

#### INCREASE PRODUCTION AND HELP WAR EFFORT

I am asking the writer of the letter to write to his M.P. (in New Zealand) that when peace is declared the slogan should be *kept*, but altered to:

#### INCREASE PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY PEACE NEEDS

i.e. "Do not restrict out-put, nor destroy production."

Yours truly

S. R. NORMAND.

*Tigh-an-Rhu, Bridge of Weir, Refrewshire; January 24, 1941.*

### FREEMASONRY

Sir, I am deeply interested in the excellent articles on Freemasonry by Mr. John Mitchell which appeared in recent issues.

I am not a Freemason, but have studied it from a common-sense angle in conjunction with Archaeology, genuine History and the esoteric meaning of the Scriptures while recognising that there has always been an influence at work greater than that of Freemasonry.

For this reason I think my understanding of Freemasonry may perhaps be of interest and I give it to you for what it is worth.

Freemasonry, and in this I include English and Grand Orient Masonry and all the secret societies with which they are allied, is fundamentally the substitution of human for Divine influence exercised for destructive and constructive purposes. Hence "Builders and Destroyers" vide Government advertisements.

In its destructive rôle such as we are witnessing to-day, it is often termed the rule of the Devil, which, since the initiative for this destruction emanates from an individual, is not inept.

The origin of Freemasonry or its equivalent is symbolised by what is known as "The Fall," when primitive or prehistoric man was induced, by partaking of the fruit of the "Tree of Knowledge" to forsake the Divine or Natural inspiration, laws and values, and became a prey

to the influence of money and false ideas.

The power wielded by Freemasonry lies in the concealment from mankind of Truth or Reality as represented by these Divine laws and values in their application to humanity, which are only to be ascertained from a close observation of the working and objective of Nature as portrayed by Jesus of Nazareth who was undoubtedly aware of the purpose for which this power was being misused by the Levitical priesthood.

Freemasonry is responsible for the division of the nations, which is essential for its rule.

Freemasonry faces all ways and, by instituting forces of polarity such as destruction to produce construction, action to provoke re-action, excision to promote growth, etc., it stimulates the working of Nature towards a determined objective.

How and by whom the vast possibilities of this stupendous concealment of Truth were first recognised and put into operation I doubt if anyone can tell us, but reference to the Bible, Genesis XLIX, v. 6, indicates that the secret was in the hands of the Simeon and Levi branch of the family of Israel.

It was undoubtedly Freemasonry which enabled selected members of this tribe, i.e., the Builders or the Elect, to assume the hierarchy of the Israelite people under a Chief Priest or Elder, a power which they hold to this day.

Subsequently, and possibly from the time of Moses, and a tribal safeguard in the Ten Commandments, this power, with an organised recurring plan or conspiracy, has been exercised by the hierarchy for the promotion of the dispersed Jews and destruction of the nations, in pursuance of their Messianic ideology, vide the same biblical reference v. 8.

It is on this ideology that the Talmud and other Jewish "religious" doctrines are based and a reflection of this doctrine is to be found in what are termed "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" which relate to the conspiracy in operation through the centuries and the means by which the nations and empires of the past have been laid low and/or reconstructed.

With the concentration of universal money control, political power, publicity and other monopolies in the hands of a few Jewish magnates, and with Jews

everywhere in key positions, it only remains through the medium of this war, with its bombing, taxation and destructive legislation etc., to deprive non-Jewish individuals of their money, property and independence, failing their extermination, for this ideology to be fulfilled.

Some idea of Jewish-Masonic aims and their interpretation of the Scriptures may be ascertained from some of the literature issued by the Covenant Publishing Co., Ltd., which is an off-shoot of the B'nai Brith (Sons of the Covenant) a secret society of great antiquity associated with Grand Orient Freemasonry, through which the war is being stage-managed and directed.

No one will deny that notwithstanding the diabolical excesses for which it has been responsible, Freemasonry, by providing an incentive for those who have guided and furthered the material development of humanity through the centuries in pursuance of this false ideology, may have fulfilled the Divine purpose since "God is not mocked."

Now with that development more or less perfected the time has arrived for the institution of a spiritual equivalent through the resuscitation of an untrammelled Divine Influence intelligently recognised and directed.

If, then, Britain and the British Empire are not to go the same way as the other great nations and empires of the past with a resultant collapse of civilisation, what is known as the Jewish question must be answered by the Jews themselves and answered the right way.

What is the Jewish question? It is this: ARE THE JEWS AS A NATION OR A RELIGIOUS SECT, ZIONIST OR OTHERWISE, COLLECTIVELY OR INDIVIDUALLY AWARE OF AND ACCOMPLICES IN THIS UNIVERSAL ANTI-NATIONAL MASONIC CONSPIRACY WHICH THREATENS TO DESTROY THE WHOLE WORLD, OR ARE WE ALL THE UNWITTING VICTIMS OF A COMPARATIVELY SMALL ACTIVE GROUP OF INTERNATIONALLY ASSOCIATED FANATICS?

My belief is in the latter. If I am correct then it is for those Jews who are not implicated to locate and destroy the Masonic centre of initiative which is their Kahal, or the Jewish State within the State.

Failing this we must, through Parliament, invoke the aid of what is left of the Law and do it for them with probably disastrous results to a mainly ignorant innocent people.

GUY ANDREWS.

*Shortacres, Crowborough, Sussex; January, 1941.*



## DISPUTE IN UTOPIA

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Information, Mr. Harold Nicolson, according to the B. B. C. and the press declared to the Anglo-Swedish Society recently that we in union with other peoples will surrender some of our political and economic sovereignty to an international government. As we are at present at war to defend this sovereignty, many of us with our lives, it seems to be extraordinary that Mr. Nicolson should be allowed to make such a statement with impunity.

The Government seems to take it for granted that the sovereignty of the British people can be surrendered to anyone but the Germans, whether the intended recipient asks for it or not, and without consulting the British people. Some Ministers and M.P.'s give the impression that they are vying with each other to see which can give away most. It now transpires, if we are to believe M. André Maurois who has published a book called *Why France Fell*, that Mr. Churchill did not offer to give away only fifty per cent of the voting power of the British Parliament to French Deputies and the interests they represented, but fifty per cent of the voting power of other Parliaments in the British Empire as well—Parliaments which are supposed to be agencies for the implementation of the sovereign will of their own national citizens. An extract from M. Maurois's book published in the *Daily Telegraph* says:

"At the last moment Winston Churchill had thought that he could persuade the Reynaud Cabinet to continue the fight by offering to unite the two Empires under a single government presided over by a Frenchman."

Typical of the vagueness which surrounds this momentous act of the chief executive of a *democracy* in which he attempted to give away *our* power

to decide *our* policy, is the editorial comment of the *Daily Telegraph* inserted in parentheses after the quotation from M. Maurois' book. This said:

"The statement by M. Maurois that a Frenchman was to preside over the unified government is not confirmed by anything which has been made known in this country."

The *Daily Telegraph* did not question M. Maurois' statement that Churchill's offer concerned the Empire and not only Great Britain. The following day, however, January 30, it reported that the statement had caused "considerable comment in the Lobby" and "In Government circles it was stated positively that no such offer was ever made. Mr. Churchill offered a joint Anglo-French citizenship with an increased governmental co-operation. It was never suggested that a French statesman should rule the two Empires."

"Increased governmental co-operation!" According to the "Declaration of Union" published in *Hansard*, "France and Great Britain shall no longer be two nations" and "During the war there shall be a single War Cabinet."

The international idealists are not getting it all their own way. In a leading article in the *Daily Telegraph* on January 31, J. B. Firth reviewed a new book by Viscount Cecil entitled, *A Great Experiment*. Viscount Cecil's aim is a "European General Staff and Secretariat" and "Questions of social and economic progress, including possibly a common currency and a common tariff policy, and it may be a Confederation Flag, would doubtless arise. If, as is vital for permanent peace, a scheme of international limitation of armaments is adopted, it might possibly involve an international air force under the control of the European General Staff." But Viscount Cecil, who has spent a lifetime

trying to put internationalism into practice, is apparently not so optimistic about the prospects of setting up such a tyranny as are some of our young Federal-Unionists, for his reviewer, J. B. Firth, says:

"He rejects the various Federation schemes which are finding support in some quarters. They would be no more acceptable, he thinks, to the countries concerned than was the scheme of Imperial Federation which the late Lord Milner sponsored a quarter of a century ago.

"The Dominion statesmen emphatically turned down that proposal on the ground that their countries would never accept the rule of any Imperial legislature or executive in which they would each only have a minority voice. The Constitution looked fine on paper, but it would not march. How can it be supposed, therefore, that Great Britain, or the United States, or France, or indeed any country large or small, would accept a constitution under which it might find itself committed to war, or to free trade, against its own wish, by a combination of other states?"

"World economic conditions also may be catastrophic," says Mr. Firth, "and many, like Viscount Cecil, are demanding that economic nationalism shall be 'broken down.'"

"It is easy to talk of 'breaking it down' and easy to hold up the prospect of a common tariff policy for Europe, but the idea will probably prove as chimerical as would be that of a common climate. The World Economic Conference of a few years ago, which was a terrible fiasco, should be a warning. Economic nationalism cannot be 'broken down' without breaking down every form of nationalism...."

Mr. Harold Nicolson says we are to have "A new order without slave states." It is up to us to see that the new order is without slaves. J.M.

## "EVACUATION TO STAY"

Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, Minister of Health, said on January 18:

"Evacuation is a great social experiment that is teaching us many practical lessons about the planning of a better society when the fighting is done. We must so arrange things after the war that children who live in industrial towns can make visits every now and then to draw

fresh draughts of health and life from England's lovely country side.

"There is already a number of schools that can be used for this purpose. We shall add to this number as soon as the opportunity offers. But we need not rely on them alone. I do not believe we have heard the last of billeting town children in country households on the day that peace is declared. There are many country people who would be glad to welcome young visitors again for a

period. If we can give the necessary financial help in war we should be able to do it in peace.

"I hope this is a seasonal migration which has come to stay. I hope that after the war we shall have a glorified children's country holiday fund or a children's country schooling fund on a national scale. It would have a permanent effect in improving the physical and moral fibre of the nation...."

## POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY

One of the greatest evils and dangers of our time, as Douglas has so often pointed out, is the separation of power from responsibility. Dictators are no accident. They are the inevitable result of the deliberate and world-wide concentration of power in fewer and fewer hands. Economic power is concentrated by "big business," combines and monopolies. These are but stages in the development of State monopolies, which often masquerade under the attractive title of "nationalisation." As the size and extent of monopoly of any business grows, so control tends to become more and more political and less and less the province of the genuine trader, with his technical knowledge. The great evil of absentee managers arises. Thus in time we inevitably arrive at State or "National" Socialism and a Soviet or Nazi State.

Power is concentrated above all through money. Those who have the monopoly of the use of the Nation's credit, carrying with it the sole right to create and destroy the Nation's money, wield the real power in the state. Furthermore, these unseen and unknown individuals have no responsibility to the people and no liability to produce any real wealth whatever. Their power is political, for they control policy. It is economic, for they alone can create valid claims to wealth. In the untrammelled use of their power they exert untold influence on the physical, moral and spiritual life of every individual, therefore of the nation. Yet the Executive, the Cabinet, refuses to allow even Parliament to know the names of the controllers of the Nation's credit—the Board of Directors of the Bank of "England"!

Concentration of power is one of the major causes of war. The supreme issue to-day is centralisation versus de-centralisation. Security for the individual in peace-time and the avoidance of future wars will depend very largely upon the extent to which power to direct national policies is restored to the individual citizens whose very existence depends upon their decisions. Power must be re-united with responsibility in the individual. Even the distribution of economic power known as "the dole," a clever piece of Socialist mechanism for power-centralisation, must be revised so that it carries with it responsibility for

such contribution to the national wealth or effort as is required, as well as the personal responsibilities which no *free* man can escape—for without them he is not free.

It is vitally important, therefore, that such a policy of deliberate de-centralisation of power and re-awakening of individual responsibility should be consciously framed and worked for. If this is to be done we must be clear what we are about; we must define our aims, our *policy*, in precise terms. We want to re-unite power and responsibility. What do we understand by "power" and what by "responsibility"? The meaning of power is only too well known. Power signifies rule and domination, with the sanctions of force behind it. But responsibility is a much maligned and misused word. What is commonly meant by responsibility is, more often than not, in reality power. For example, the Home Secretary is said to be responsible for the Police. What is meant is that he has *control* over the Police with the sanctions of the State behind his authority.

If we turn up "responsibility" in the dictionary we find that it means "capable of discharging duty; able to pay; liable." To sponsor a person is to go surety for him. To be responsible is to give oneself as surety, to accept liability for the consequences of one's actions. Perhaps this meaning is more clearly conveyed in the atonym "irresponsible"—to take action regardless of the consequences.

To be really free—to be our own masters—we must be free to take decisions on policy, which means to decide what we want done, and a willingness to abide by the consequences. Under any scheme of State provision the improvident and incompetent are rewarded equally with the provident and the skilled. The individual, having been deprived of power over his own destiny, naturally loses all sense of responsibility for his actions. He recognises no liabilities either to himself or to the nation. This sapping of power and of the sense of responsibility from an ever increasing proportion of our people has been the persistent work of Socialist "Planners." It leads to degeneration to Communism via State Socialism and "National

Socialism." Such a policy, once put into effect, steadily gains momentum until there is no sense of responsibility left with the people. They become slaves—or "cattle." All initiative is killed. A break away from the process becomes more and more difficult—and more and more essential if any semblance of Christian civilisation is to be preserved.

Like most things to-day this policy needs reversing. The exact opposite would be to *distribute* claims on the national wealth in return for some *contribution* to that wealth, but to leave the individual with the power to exercise his privilege for his own and his dependant's good—or evil, so long as he did not interfere with the similar rights of others. If he made unwise use of his power to live and enjoy the privileges of citizenship he, or his dependants, would in time be eliminated. Socialism, on the other hands, makes for the survival of the *un-fit* and is therefore *anti-social* in the true sense.

Instead of dictatorships—by individuals, Cabinet or Finance—open or concealed, we must have *real* democracy; i.e. decisions on policy must be taken by those who will themselves have to bear the consequences. We must ensure the greatest possible *decentralisation* of control through money. The National Dividend, based of course upon the wealth available as the result of national effort over a long period, itself the accumulation of individual effort, would be a means of restoring a sense of responsibility to the individual. It would be a means of remedying just that very loss which our moralists deplore, but are generally too puritanical to admit as a right to others.

C. H. J.

### SAPIENCE

"For one thing I thank God," said the pale faced vegetarian, "namely that in the midst of a busy life I have never caused innocent blood to shed."

And from the tall grass came a chorus of terrified voices exclaiming, "Kind Sir, we beg of you to tell us how we may insure our lives against your assertive feet."

# WAR DEBT TO AMERICA

By WILLIAM BELL

The recent re-publication in *The Social Crediter* of Douglas's famous proposals for dealing with "our" debt to "America" in his letter of September 11, 1922, to Prime Minister Lloyd George prompted me to refer to my *Journal* of that year. It was my pleasure to arrange for a series of lectures for "the pioneer of the New Economics," a task which he undertook in October, 1922, in Yorkshire. At the Leeds Rotary Club he dealt with the "American and Inter-Allied War Debts," the subject of his well-known letter to our Premier a month earlier.

Though none of his audience at Leeds knew beforehand on what subject Douglas would address us, yet I was privately warned in advance that a certain Rotarian was going to "put it across" the guest of the day, irrespective of his subject. After hearing Douglas's cogent reasons behind his proposals made to the Premier the previous month, this Big Gun of the Leeds Rotary Club proved to be a damp squib. For he apparently deemed it wiser not to speak at all. There was an awkward pause, every eye centred on him, while his neighbours tried to persuade him to "get on with it." Much to my amusement and to the disgust of his Big Business confères (representing many millions of paid-up capital) he got up at last to say that as he was not a political-economist or a scientist or an engineer, he was therefore not qualified to criticise the lecturer's proposals. Then he sat down abruptly, surprising even his poker-faced clubmen into betrayal of their dismay.

The only person bold enough to oppose Douglas was a gentleman earn-

ing his living as a scientific-management exponent. This professional advocate of "Taylorism" was not convinced it was a *financial* question we had to solve, but a purely *personal* one. Make your workman an efficient unit in production; educate him along scientific lines; let masters and men "get together" to learn one another's points of view, and the problem would solve itself, he urged. Then getting himself befogged in his "sob-stuff" rhetoric he dithered on till, tied in knots of his own word-spinning, he too sat down abruptly, probably aware that his stuff had little relation to the American War Debt.

The only comment necessary on this Taylorian oracle's "remedy" for the disease of Industrial Depression is that the "Economic Blizzard" blew him out of business; and a few years later he was faced with another kind of "get together"—with his creditors.

Of course, Douglas did not tell his audience at Leeds that the High Financiers then in control of the British "Government" would see to it that his proposals to Mr. Lloyd George were not made to "America." But he realised that such an offer would force the Americans to "show their hands." If they "turned it down," it would at least uncover the mercenary basis on which they entered the war, and how ignorant they were of the trend of the times.

The re-publishing of Douglas's 1922 proposals have happily chimed with an admission made by Mr. Morgenthau, this week. The Secretary to the U.S.A. Treasury is reported to have said, referring to Britain's War Debt (now about £1,432,250,000), that he "had never expected the Old World

war debts to be paid." Asked by a Senator "if he was prepared to charge these off for keeps," Mr. Morgenthau replied: "I did some time ago—mentally." Thus the rejection of the Douglas proposals put before those "hard-headed" Yorkshire business-men nearly 20 years ago proves them not to have recognised a financial truth when it was close under their noses.

About that time I was using the Rotary movement as a field in which to sow the seeds of "Economic Democracy." On one occasion my casual remark that "our" War Debt to "America" would never be paid raised a terrific storm of indignation. A highly inflammable patriot called for the instant withdrawal of my insinuation that England would be so dishonourable as to repudiate a penny of her War Debt. The tactful Chairman reminded the outraged Rotarians that I had neither used the word 'repudiation' nor insinuated the policy. And there the storm in a tea-cup subsided for the nonce, though ripples disturbed the placid surface of Rotarianism when ever I used the same statement.

Incidentally, addressed so many times as "Brother Bell," I was at last constrained to protest that I was not a Freemason, nor was this a Masonic Lodge but a Rotary Club. In my innocence I had not then learned what came to my knowledge later that the Rotary movement is more or less a branch of Freemasonry—Rotary wheels within wheels moving along the well-worn grooves of High Finance, though the majority of Rotarians are probably blissfully ignorant of the fact.

## SOCIAL CREDIT IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Mr. V. J. Dury, Campaign Director of the Electoral Campaign in Western Australia, writes:

".... Informed Social Crediters realise that no reform is possible unless the overwhelming sanctions of the people are behind the results required. Some great work is being accomplished and many Road Boards are discussing Money from the Social Credit angle. Undoubtedly the stock of real democracy is rising steadily and is beginning to show

itself in all sorts of places....

"The West Australian Teachers Conference recently passed a unanimous resolution to be forwarded to the State Premier requesting him to ask the Federal authorities for sufficient money as per section 504 of the Bank Commission's report to build teachers' homes and also to provide other educational facilities.

"In Western Australia we are becoming increasingly interested in capitalising the advantage we are obtaining in respect to our State Parliament. The

work which has been done over the last ten years is certainly showing results."

## PRUDENT CHOICE

The name of Lord May is being mentioned "for a prominent post" on the special board to control the administration of the war damage compensation scheme.

The *Sunday Express* remarks that "Lord May is sixty-nine. He started work as an eight-shilling-a-week boy clerk with the Prudential Assurance Company."

**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 Creditors** 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, L'pool 15 or Tel. Wavertree 435.

**LONDON LIAISON GROUP.** Meeting, February 6, at 1 p.m., at The Plane Tree, Great Russell Street. Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

**NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association.** It is important that all Social Creditors 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.)

**Books to Read**

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy .....  
(*edition exhausted*)
  - Social Credit .....  
(*temporarily unobtainable*)
  - Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
  - The Monopoly of Credit .....  
(*temporarily unobtainable*)
  - 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 ..... 1½d.
- 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 .....  
(*unobtainable*)
- The Economic Crisis:  
Southampton Chamber of  
Commerce Report .....  
(*temporarily unobtainable*)
- 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 2½d.)
- Barrier to Health  
by Dr. Douglas Boyd..... 6d.

**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 March 4, 1941.

Subject: Social Credit Abroad.

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.

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.)