

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 5. No. 26.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

THE CENTRALISATION OF POWER

By R. L. NORTHRIDGE

The project of Federal Union derives most of its support among well-intentioned, though misguided, members of the public from the argument that it will render future wars impossible. It goes like this: it takes at least two to make a quarrel, therefore make all countries into one big country and a quarrel between rival sovereignties becomes impossible. A parallel and equally logical remedy would be that every person in the world save one should commit suicide by the most convenient method; even more certain than Federal Union, this plan has gained no acceptance, which shows that there are still some limits to human gullibility.

The "reduction to absurdity" shows at once that there is a fire as well as a frying-pan: we have to remember that war, abominable though it is, is not the ultimate evil. There is something worse than war, something that men throughout human history have dreaded more than the hardships and dangers of battle. That is the loss of their liberty—their ability to think, act, and gain their livelihood in freedom. When the choice has been between that death-in-life and war they have chosen war. Before the Federal Union argument can be accepted, then, it must be conclusively shown that the project will not cause a loss of freedom to the individuals of the uniting nations. Otherwise we are choosing the greater of the two evils, and the remedy is worse than the disease.

The advocate of Federal Union of course admits that the loss of freedom is an evil; indeed, part of his case is that small nations, whose freedom is constantly menaced by their larger neighbours, can only preserve their integrity by uniting to become as large as their possible aggressor. Again, the argument is singularly naive: there is no natural law uniting aggression with size. Moreover, a small and highly militarised state might well be a thorn in the flesh of a much larger neighbour.

But even conceding that a large state may be a potential danger to smaller ones, security may be gained just as well by splitting the large state into two or three autonomous units. The argument works both ways.

It would therefore appear that the sponsors of Federal Union are concerned first and foremost with federation *per se*, and that their solicitude for the prevention of future wars is merely up-to-the-minute advertising designed to capture public opinion for their real objective. Turning a deaf ear to the propaganda, then, what we have to decide is whether Federal Union is in the best interests (i.e. the

increased freedom and security) of the individuals in the federating states.

It is a matter of common observation that, where a number of very small units exist together, amalgamation and centralisation will produce increased efficiency through specialisation and co-ordination of effort. That is the well-known "increment of association," and it yields a dividend whether the units be political, social or economic. But it is not generally realised that there is a very definite limit beyond which any further increase in size produces a decline in efficiency. The trend of biological evolution provides confirmation of this view, the field being held by creatures of very moderate size compared with the monsters of the Jurassic Age. As an association grows, the distance increases between the thing to be done and the man empowered to do something about it, resulting in ever-lengthening red tape and a loss in efficiency that may be concealed, but not in any physical sense off-set, by paper efficiencies such as bulk buying or readier access to bank credit. Moreover, within the association psychological tensions increase through the individual member becoming more and more a mere cog in the wheel, while the individual outside suffers from the growing power of the organisation which becomes able to neglect his wishes and assumes at last the monopolistic aspect of the trust or the dictator.

This is not mere theory, but a matter of common observation which any dispassionate onlooker may verify for himself. The growth of any association beyond the point of maximum returns in the way of freedom (both social and economic) for the individuals composing it serves one purpose, and one purpose only—the gratification of the will-to-power of the individual or group controlling the organisation. By means of departmental centralisation and the playing-off of one group against another ("divide and rule") effective protest by individuals or minorities becomes more and more impossible, their franchise is diluted to vanishing-point, and they are at length rendered

On Other Pages

The Monopoly of Power by B. M. Palmer

The Diplomats Get Mixed Up... by John Mitchell

What is Priestley Up To Now?

impotent by the mere size of the organisation they wish to reform.

"The danger which at the moment threatens individual liberty far more than any extension of individual enterprise is the Servile State; the erection of an irresistible and impersonal organisation through which the ambition of able men, animated consciously or unconsciously by the lust of domination, may operate to the enslavement of their fellows. . . . The real enemy is the will-to-power, the positive complement to servility, of which Prussianism, with its theories of the supreme state and the unimportance of the individual. . . is only the fine flower. . . . It (centralisation) has its counterpart in every sphere of activity: the coalescing of small businesses into larger, of shops into huge stores, of villages into towns, of nations into leagues, and in every case is commended to the reason by the plea of economic necessity and efficiency. But behind this lies always the will-to-power, which operates equally through politics, finance or industry, and always towards centralisation." —*Economic Democracy*, Chapter III.

In Federal Union we are witnessing the latest and most grandiose attempt towards world centralisation and control since the collapse of the Roman Empire. Probably most of its supporters are well-meaning dupes, but its direction and main financial support come from sources to which that term certainly does not apply. Many banks and financial houses are to be found on its list of subscribers, along with advocates of internationalism and a "planned economy;" and the ultimate objective is, quite undoubtedly, world government and a regimented population. National sovereignty interferes with this plan, therefore national sovereignty must go.

There can be few people in these islands who, faced by the prospect of a centralised World Super-State or the chance of war, would not choose the latter: indeed, we are fighting now because we believe there is something worse than war. Yet such a choice, as we have seen, is by no means necessary. A real peace, as distinct from a state of suppressed revolt, is far more likely to come from a number of autonomous nations small enough to ensure that the individuals within them are close enough to their political representatives to control them and thus ensure the freedom and economic security made possible to any civilised nation today by the progress of the industrial arts. A contented people, in control of their own government, will not engage in any war of aggression; such a peace is based on natural desire and not on the unstable foundation of an enforced obedience.

The British and French Governments at the close of the last war wished to divide Germany into the independent and self-governing states which were welded by Prussia into one whole in 1871, an example of the will-to-power in action and in defiance of the differences in the tradition, culture and temperament of the peoples involved.* In two generations, by centralised control and glorification of the state at the expense of the individual, the external characteristics of a population of 65 million were completely altered.

*Hanover especially gave trouble. Wilhelm Stieber, Bismarck's chief spy, records having received from the Chancellor a bonus of 200 thalers for managing to suppress a bitterly Anti-Prussian newspaper article before it appeared in the Hanoverian press.

"From the house of idealism typified by Schiller, Goethe and Heine, it has become notorious for bestiality and inhumanity only offset by a slavish discipline. Its statistics of child suicide during the years preceding the war [of 1914-18] exceeded by many hundreds per cent, those of any other country in the world and were rising rapidly. Insanity and nervous breakdown were becoming by far the gravest problems of the German medical profession. Its commercial morality was devoid of all honour, and the external influence of Prussian ideals on the world has undoubtedly been to intensify the struggle for existence along lines which quite inevitably culminated in the greatest war of all history." —*Economic Democracy*, Chapter II.

The reconstitution of Germany into its original states was opposed by America at the Peace Conference and the project was dropped. The centralised Federation of German States was left intact, and its aggressiveness restored and Hitler brought to power by the economic pressure of the early 1930's, which originated in Wall Street. It is worth noting that the world-wide starvation and misery produced by the economic "blizzard" did not occur through any breakdown of the productive mechanism, such as might be caused by a succession of vast natural disasters, but was purely a collapse of the financial mechanism of distribution. There are grounds for suspecting that it was deliberately contrived, but at the very best it was nothing short of criminal incompetence on the part of those international financiers to whom the sponsors of Federal Union would hand over absolute, and in practice irresponsible, control of the finances of the uniting countries.

Towards the end of the *American White Paper*, an account by two journalists of recent American diplomacy, the following curious passage occurs:

"The unification of a nation releases an extraordinary dynamic energy. After France was unified by Richelieu, all Europe had to go to war against France every thirty years or so, until France's energy was finally exhausted in the great campaigns of Napoleon. An even greater energy was produced by the unification of Germany in the nineteenth century, from one aftermath of which the world is now tragically suffering. And as the Napoleonic campaigns ended by uniting Germany, so a German victory will surely end by uniting the only outwardly United States. . . . But when we are truly united, the release of dynamic energy will follow. . . . It is stirring to try to imagine what may happen then."

While we can agree that unification and centralised control are probably the one infallible method for perverting and over-riding natural human desires and plunging the nations into war, those who are "now tragically suffering" may find the authors' detachment difficult to attain. However the writers are at least under no delusions as to the historic consequences of former Federal Unions.

It cannot be too firmly borne in mind that war is a symptom only of a disease in the body politic, and not the disease itself; to repress a symptom is to aggravate, not cure, the malady. Permanent peace can only be achieved by removing the causes of war, which are centred deep within the economic and political structure of the community and which can be effectively dealt with only by the aroused will and conscience of individual members. Federation; by making the individual ever more impotent, would render such democratic reforms impossible.

THE REAL ENEMY

By B. M. PALMER

Monopoly of Power is the real enemy.

"Modern war is impossible without centralisation, and the object of modern war is centralisation." . . .

"The remedy is exactly what you would expect it to be, once it is admitted that the disease is monopolistic. It is decentralisation."*

Picture the protagonists—two great masses of armed men, each supported by larger masses of wage-earning civilians and each manipulated by centralised sanctions, legalised despotism, and legalised mesmerism by way of the radio and the press. The Axis powers aim—the new order of Europe, under centralised control. The aim of the powers behind Federal Union, whoever they are—centralisation under an international Authority, with a fleet of bombing aeroplanes at its disposal.

The aim of the citizens of the British Empire? They have not spoken yet. But it is not centralisation.

The terrible position in which we as individuals find ourselves is the result of absentee management of the individual military sanction.

"Absentee management of his right to bear arms in his own defence has taken the right from him, and landed him in the greatest war of all time."*

How are we to reverse the tendency and resume control of our own military sanctions? The last sanction rests on force. It is useless to deny it. If we, as Social Crediters, try to evade this fact, we shall fail to deal with the situation.

No nation can be free unless it is free to make war, or not, as may seem good. Any attempt to take away or impose limitations on this inalienable right has only resulted, so far, in bigger and better wars, and, so far as I can see, will continue to do so, world without end.

C. H. Douglas wrote in the preface of *The Fig Tree* for September, 1936:

"Freedom is a real thing. It is the most important thing which is at stake in the world to-day, and it is beyond all things necessary that its nature should be understood. It is the

power to choose whether you will play cricket or whether you will play golf, or whether you will play neither. Quite emphatically it is not the power on the part of the non-player to change the rules of cricket or golf; that is not freedom, it is oppression. As the free men of Arbroath said to the Pope when he opposed the enthronement of Bruce, 'It is not glory, it is not riches, neither is it honour, but liberty alone that we fight or contend for, which no honest man will lose but with his life.'"

So that anyone who says "We must stop the war" is asking for an impossibility. You might as well try to stop the rash of measles, and so kill the patient outright. But you could strive for conditions in which measles might become a very rare disease, and finally die out altogether.

War is in its essence a protest against intolerable conditions, even when the warring armies are manipulated by international interests, as they are to-day. The average man "is not such a natural born fool that, having been maimed, blinded, killed or impoverished in the last war, he requires restraining from war as an amusement."

"The technical definition of war accepted by those whose business it is to understand war is that it is action taken for the purpose of imposing your will upon your adversary, or to prevent him from imposing his will on you."†

I think we are all agreed that when this war is over we want to be free. Even Messrs. Morrison, Eden and Attlee would not deny that with their lips, whatever they might do with their hands.

How are we to be free unless we have some means of preventing our adversaries from imposing their will on us?

If there is any means at the present stage of human development other than the possession of a military sanction, I should be glad to hear of it. It is said that wild animals can be quelled by a glance from the human eye, but an expeditionary force that set off through Central Africa armed with no other weapon would, in all probability, fail to reach its destination.

The problem is to protect British culture.

We can only protect our culture, if, by some means or other we resume our right to bear arms in our own national defence. This means that our Parliament, under orders from the electors, must regain complete control of the British army, without reference to any outside authority whatever.

We must be so strong that no other power will dare to touch us—we must "reduce any attack upon [our] principles to the relative position of a mob of bushmen armed with bows and arrows."†

That this could result from the rearmament programme on which we are now working there is not the least doubt, provided the people become aware of the situation. The great peril is that at the end of the war they might be hoodwinked once again into a policy of "absentee management"—they might relinquish the sovereign right of Parliament in favour of an "International authority."

The danger is by no means past though I do not think it is so great as it was. The Dominions are more aware than we.

If, as a result of this war each unit of the Empire resumes and retains its own decentralised military sanction, the agony will not have been in vain. We shall then be in a position to deal with centralised financial interests. Not otherwise.

February 26.

REFUGEES FOR THE NEW WORLD

The Virgin Islands (in the West Indies) and Alaska are both suggested by Americans as possible havens for refugees from Europe.

Mr. Charles Harwood, of New York, the newly-appointed Governor of the Virgin Islands says that he favours such a proposition "with proper restrictions and safeguards."

A bill which would create an international refugee quota from which settlers for Alaska would be drawn has been introduced into the House of Representatives by Samuel Dickstein. It has been referred to the House Immigration Committee of which Representative Dickstein is Chairman.

**Whose Service is Perfect Freedom*, By C. H. DOUGLAS. Chapter XXI.

†*Warning Democracy* by C. H. DOUGLAS,

WHAT IS PRIESTLEY UP TO NOW?

The Socialist organisation entitled *Our Struggle* which has Sir Richard Acland, M.P., at its head announces with great satisfaction in its typescript *Progress Report IV*: "in less than a year, it is the literal truth that everyone with any claim to intelligence at all, is convinced that in order to win, we have to establish a new kind of society. It would be pleasant, of course, if all these people clearly foresaw and agreed about the precise form of the new society, and pleasanter still if they all agreed with us. This is hardly to be expected at this stage. But their incomplete agreement in no way detracts from the importance of the fact that they are solidly agreed that there must be a new way of life.

"That being so, it is clearly of the first importance that there should be provided some rallying point to which all people who share the belief in the need for some change can be attracted, even while they still disagree or do not clearly foresee every detail. We are glad to be able to say that this rallying point will now be provided by a Committee presided over by Mr. J. B. Priestley, under the title *The 1941 Committee*, which will make its first public statement before the end of January."

In a folio issued to announce its birth *The 1941 Committee* declares, "We

must fight for a positive as well as a negative purpose. . . .

"To promote a better distribution of the national wealth and permit the accumulation of capital reserves by poor people, a progressive annual tax on all property must be established.

"Where great monopolies provide such essential services as transport, fuel, and power, they must be owned by the community and run exclusively in the public interest."

The above is the most definite statement in the leaflet. Otherwise it is phrased in the same vague semi-committal language which the public has become accustomed to expect from Mr. Priestley.

The *Our Struggle* group, however, has hopes. What sort of hopes these are may be gauged from its own statement: "it is still going to be our task to show the people, who with us, desire a new society that they cannot get it short of Common Ownership of the great resources. You may say that if they have not agreed to this they have agreed to nothing. That is not true. They have agreed that from now on the money power shall not direct our national economic affairs in its own interest. Some of them think this power of direction can be taken away

from the big money, while individuals still continue to own individual parts of these great resources. We think not. In spite of this disagreement we think the 1941 *Committee* should become the rallying point of our efforts now, for on almost all the subjects requiring immediate action now, it will be found overwhelmingly possible to work with them. In the meanwhile we can convert them to our ideas about the need for Common Ownership as the means to the new society they desire, just as we have converted them in the last twelve months to the belief in the need for a new society as the only means to the victory which they desired."

How necessary it is to be objective in one's outlook, instead of being carried away by fine phrases! It is the policy in *action* which matters, not the policy in *words*.

J. M.

"PRIESTLEY PARTY"

The following passage is from the *Evening Standard* of February 17:—"I have been asked how Mr. J. B. Priestley's No Name Group (now the 1941 *Committee*), hailed by some of the ardent Left as a new party in politics, are getting on.

"My latest advices from this front are that the General Staff, consisting of about 14 and including Sir Richard Acland, M.P., Messrs. T. L. Horabin, M.P., Zilliacus, Kingsley Martin, Gerald Barry and Francis Williams, met recently, to concert a campaign at the house of Mr. Edward Hulton, the publisher. I understand that Mr. Julian Huxley was also in attendance.

"At this gathering a memorandum was submitted, of which it was said: 'If anyone does not agree with it, he can leave the room.'

"The ultimatum-memorandum was then read over.

"One or two of the company, objecting, started for the door. At this incipient mutiny the Commander-in-Chief called out:

"'If there is any reasonable amendment we are most willing to discuss it.'

"I am informed that it was decided to leave the drafts of the revised Unalterable Points to the objectors. There the matter rests."

"I Don't Like Committees . . ."

Mr. Priestley's reputation is based on a few realistic books, among which "Wonder-Hero" is probably the most direct and "The Good Companions" the most popular.

It is not that Mr. Priestley does not know what is wrong. In his book *Wonder-Hero* one of the characters, the doctor at Slakeby, said:—

"If I thought it would get us out of this I'd turn Bolshie tomorrow. But it won't. And I don't like Bolshevism. I don't like Soviets, committees, fools who win elections, officials, half witted comrades and damned interference with everything and everybody. I don't like public ownership of property. What the public owns nobody owns; like something between a museum and a lost dog. There's only one thing, young man, that the government should look after, often it doesn't look after now, and that's

money. . . .

"We've either got to stop the money game altogether—which would be damned inconvenient—though if you've ever met a very rich man you'll find that he manages almost entirely on a system of credit and hardly touches a bob—or failing that, we've got to create fluid money, going briskly into circulation among consumers, and stop talking silly nonsense about gold standards and listening open-mouthed to bankers. The next time you're asked your opinion about anything for the Daily 'What is it.' shout that at the top of your voice—don't forget that—at the top of your voice, or they won't hear you."

ON MR. PRIESTLEY'S AIMS

J. B. Priestley, Esq.,
Broadcasting House,
Upper Regent Street,
London.

Dear Sir,

In Progress Report 4 (unsigned), of *Our Struggle* (10 Gerald Road, S.W. 1) it is stated that "this rallying point will now be provided by a Committee presided over by Mr. J. B. Priestley, under the title of 'The 1941 Committee' which will make its first public statement before the end of January."

The following are extracts from a pamphlet (unsigned) headed *The 1941 Committee*:—

"Production must be planned centrally and the execution strictly supervised by the State. Productivity must be increased by concentrating production on the most efficient units."

"Compensation must depend on the willingness of the compensated to do work of national importance or to train for such work, as determined by the Government."

"To promote a better distribution of the national wealth and permit the accumulation of capital reserves by poor people, a progressive annual tax on all property must be established."

"Where great monopolies provide

such essential services as transport, fuel, and power, they must be owned by the community and run exclusively in the public interest."

"The control of production, trade and investment must be developed so far as it is necessary to secure full employment and prosperity."

"Experience has shown that, in the long run, the problem of reconciling Dominion independence with Commonwealth collaboration, can be achieved only on the basis of British and Dominion membership of a wider organisation."

"Salvation will depend upon the closeness of Anglo-American co-operation in post-war reconstruction. On the cessation of hostilities there will be many urgent problems which will not wait for solution in leisurely discussions at the peace conference, and Anglo-American responsibility for preparing detailed plans during the war, is therefore very great. Every effort should be made to enlist the co-operation of the U.S.S.R."

"In practice it will be found that European economic reconstruction is not feasible unless it starts by accepting the accomplished fact of State control of economic life and is guided by a major political purpose."

"That purpose is the development

of the fullest possible political and economic co-operation with all the peoples who share our conception of life, and our willingness to agree to whatever diminution of sovereignty may be necessary for the creation of a close-knit European union within the framework of a world association of States."

If correct this provides a needed clarification of the aims to which you are working, and I request your confirmation or otherwise of the authenticity of these statements by a Committee of which you are Chairman.

Yours faithfully,

HEWLETT EDWARDS.

Seascale, Cumberland; February 18, 1941.

J. B. Priestley, Esq.

Dear Sir,

On Feb. 18th I wrote you (copy enclosed) regarding statements which are said to be those of a Committee of which you are the Chairman.

It seems courteous to inform you that, failing your reply I propose to publish these letters on March 3.

Yours faithfully,

HEWLETT EDWARDS.

February 25, 1941.

Hitler the Bolshevik

"The most famous Bavarian soldier, General von Epp, began to recruit men to oust the Red Government in Munich . . . [which] fearing the attack, arrested hundreds of hostages, chiefly officers; and now a very sinister thing happened, which deserves a much greater place in the history of the Jews in politics than it has received. Among the hostages were twenty-two members of the "Tulle Society," a small and unimportant body which fostered the cult of old German literature, traditions, folk-lore, legends and the like. Anti-Semitism was an integral part of its teachings, so was anti-Christianity. It was an insignificant group, without any power or possibility of putting its theories into practice. It had no single politician among its members, only a few old

professors and noblemen.

"Of all the hundreds of hostages precisely these twenty-two people, including several women, among them Countess Westarp, were taken out and shot by the alien Jewish government of Munich.

"The Epp Free Corps took shape for the expedition against Red Munich. All the figures who later played a big part in the European drama gathered for this smaller one—save Hitler.

"Hitler was in Munich. He was still a soldier. He had, as he tells us in *Mein Kampf*, taken that fearsome anti-Bolshevist oath in hospital at Pasewalk. He was already resolved to save the world from Bolshevism. Yet he did not spring to save Munich from Bolshevism. He did not make his way

out to join the Epp Free Corps although he avowedly burned to fight. He was in Munich and he was a soldier. But the soldiers in Munich were under orders of the Red Government, the Jewish Government ruled from Moscow. If he was in barracks, he must have been—a Red."

—from "Nemesis" by Douglas Reed.

THE ART OF GENERALSHIP By General Sir Archibald Wavell

(The three Lees-Knowles lectures
republished as a pamphlet).

Price: 7d. post free.

Obtainable from

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

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. 26.

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

Saturday, March 8, 1941.

DO WE LOOK FOR A HAVEN?

A stranger who joined himself, in the religious sense, to a Jewish community used to be called a proselyte, and although the word was never popular perhaps amongst British peoples, the process of proselytizing—in some subtle forms—has not by any means lapsed. The Greek word on which the word is built means “come” and the idea was, presumably, that the outsider was welcomed into a sheltered or safer philosophic abode.

As the Social Credit state will be the opposite of a Utopia, the suggestion is made that the Social Credit movement should be such as to make an impact rather than be a proselytizing influence. That is to say, those who wish to spread Social Credit ideas should not give the impression that they are offering, in any sense, a come-in-out-of-the-wet-camp to individuals of the community. In fact any impression made should be rather in the way of a challenge, an appeal such that individuals will be induced to embark on a truly personal and adventurous way of life.

Anyone desirous of making realism the most important basis of a philosophy of life's activities will not be satisfied with the more or less obscurantist ways of Romanic hierarchy, of imperialistic evangelism, of Single-tax-ism, of Socialism, of Communism, of Fascism, of any phase of monopolism, or of non-constructive pacifism. Many who belong to one or other of such “schools of thought” want to be crusaders for a better social order, but to each one the Social Credit message may come with enlightenment, with an appeal to face facts first, and with a warning to avoid the tyranny of loosely used abstract words, and stock phrases or labels.

In much of what is termed education (secular and religious) mere teaching seems to occupy a far too important or prominent place; there are moulding processes tending to produce uniformity or conformity rather than stimulating exercises to encourage initiative and self-development. Students who are picked out as “bright” may merely have minds with sponge-like absorbent qualities, and have been trained to memorise effectively. The academies do in fact turn out large numbers of pupils whose intelligences are warped or narrow, and whose minds are lacking in basic certainty and resilience if they are confronted with ideas which have not been “text-booked” by tradition, or backed and approved in official circles.

“But,” one may ask, “even if there is some shadow of relevancy to the problems of personal development in the above rigmarole, what has it to do with the work of Social Crediters whose special urge is to bring about a more satisfactory cohesion amongst related beings?” The answer is not to be compassed in a phrase or two; but human society can never become a heavenly commonwealth unless it is composed of free human beings, and not of slaves, or ants, or robots, or stage-managed marionettes who prefer or accept a ‘haven.’

C. H. ALLEN.

U.S. BRAINS TRUST IN ENGLAND

With Mr. Winant, the new United States Ambassador, when he arrived in England, came Mr. Benjamin Cohen,

Mr. Cohen comes from Indiana,

Mr. Wendell Willkie's home State.

He graduated at Chicago University, and devoted himself to legal studies. In 1933, when only 39 years old, he became Associate General Counsel to the Public Works Administration. Since 1935 he has been General Counsel to the National Power Policy Committee in Washington. His special task has been the drafting of legislation on financial matters, such as the stock-exchanges and public securities and on public utilities and national power policy. His appointment to his present post is described as illustrating “the importance that Mr. Roosevelt places on the new Ambassador's work.”

Mr. Cohen has also taken a keen interest in Palestine. He was Counsel to the American Zionist Delegation in London and Paris in 1919-21, and is a Trustee of the Palestine Endowment Fund and a Director of the Palestine Economic Corporation.

“THE ECONOMIST'S” OPINION

“There is some evidence that Mr. Hepburn has a substantial body of support in the country and before the war ends the question of monetary policy may become a very live issue in Canada.”

—“The Economist,” March 1.

Social Credit Secretariat

Mr. W. M. Hooton, M.A., has accepted the position of Treasurer of the Social Credit Secretariat in succession to Mr. F. C. Luxton (resigned).

Social Credit Expansion Fund

Mr. W. M. Hooton, M.A., has accepted the position of Treasurer to the Social Credit Expansion Fund.

Mr. F. C. Luxton

Mr. F. C. Luxton succeeded Mr. J. E. Tuke when he resigned the Treasurership of the Social Credit Secretariat, and has continued in this office since the removal of the Secretariat to Liverpool. Mr. Luxton has on several occasions expressed a desire to retire and in acceding to it members of the Secretariat tender their warm thanks to Mr. Luxton for his constant services, and their best wishes.

T. J.

THE DIPLOMATS GET MIXED UP

By John Mitchell

Signs are not lacking that there is a conflict among those higher-ups who have power to influence the foreign policy of Great Britain.

Conflict No. 1 concerns Sir Robert Vansittart who has been broadcasting on the Germans and implying that Germany will have to be broken up after the war into small units. This has provoked an angry correspondence in *The Times* and a denial from a Government spokesman that Sir Robert, who is the Chief Government Diplomatic Adviser, is voicing the Government's policy.

Conflict No. 2 concerns the late Lord Lothian, who in a speech in the House of Lords on March 2, 1937, said that the "old anarchy of multitudinous national sovereignties" is "going to disappear, either through federation, which is the democratic way, or through an integration consequent on the rise of the great totalitarian powers. We can see the process going on in Europe and Asia under our eyes, whereby the great military powers, either by compulsion or by the magnetic attraction of their own strength, consolidate a group of otherwise autonomous units to whom they promise peace, security and prosperity in return for entering their orbit and for accepting mutually satisfactory arrangements for trade. World unity is, of course, at present entirely out of sight. But that the world is going to fall into four or five main political and economic groups, each in great measure self-supporting, each under the leadership of a great state equipped with modern military and air power, at any rate for a time, seems certain. Nothing that we can do can prevent it."

Later in 1937 he said in regard to Russia: "Their greatest need is that Central Europe should settle down, and that is only possible, in my view, under German leadership."

Evidently some members of the British Government thought differently. Otherwise why are we at war?

Notwithstanding Lord Lothian's published views he was sent to Washington as British Ambassador, ostensibly to persuade America to help us in the war. But, in 1936 he had said in a speech at Chatham House: "The United States has made up her mind, once for all, that her intervention in Europe in

1917 was a waste of effort, that somehow or other Europe must solve her own problems and that she is not going to be associated in any way with European commitments."

Two months ago Lord Lothian died suddenly, and official denials had to be issued in America to counter rumours of poisoning. In these circumstances the following extract from a leader in *The Saturday Evening Post* of January 4, 1941 becomes interesting:

"The question is: Who is going to reconquer Europe?"

"England alone cannot do that. She can hope to do it only with the aid of American man power. That is what Winston Churchill has been saying in a cryptic manner. To say it bluntly would be a blunder. Everything but men. That is what Great Britain has been asking for. Everything but men. That is what the American Government has been promising. But this is form and formality.

"The only British official who has mentioned men, if he did—meaning by men an American expeditionary force—is Lord Lothian, the British ambassador. And it was an oblique incident. In November, immediately after the American election, he was returning from London to his Washington post, and he had left behind him, in London, the Ediphone recording of a speech to be broadcast to the United States. When the speech came through on the air, the Columbia Broadcasting System's listeners were astonished to hear him say, 'But we also need planes, men and ships, if we are to be sure of defeating the Nazi threat to liberty.' Immediately came a cable, not from Lord Lothian, who was on his way, but from the British Government, saying that what he had said, or meant to say, was 'planes, finance and ships.' The Columbia Broadcasting System so corrected it, but with this explanation: 'There seems little doubt from our playbacks of the recording that Lothian said "planes, men and ships."'"

"It was perhaps a slip of the diplomatic tongue."

Perhaps! Whose "slip" was it that the Dies Committee, according to *The Economist* of February 1, 1941, recently reported that America gave more help to the Germans during the first year of

the war than to the British?

Conflict No. 3 concerns Mr. Churchill's statement last year that the affairs of Great Britain and the U.S.A. would become "mixed up together." *The Daily Express* Leader on February 25 said: "The good will of America is our greatest asset in this war. If we lose that good will we take a short cut to big trouble. Helen Kirkpatrick in her article on this page accuses us of stumbling along that short cut."

Helen Kirkpatrick is the London correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News*. She said she (meaning presumably the interests behind the *Chicago Daily News*) was greatly perturbed by the state of Anglo-American relations.

"On the surface they are splendid; underneath they reveal frictions and strains which are grave today, but which tomorrow may become disastrous.

"A small minority in Britain, and in America, hope that through this war we may be able to create solidarity in the English-speaking world. But we have first to win the war.

"The present policies pursued by Britain will neither impress the American people with the seriousness of the problems which face you and us today, nor with the desirability of an Anglo-Saxon union. If either is to be achieved, it must be on a basis of realism and knowledge."

"But if we are to win the peace after the war we must avoid a repetition of that black period in Anglo-American relations which followed the last war."

Miss Kirkpatrick's specific complaint was: "Yet at this critical moment we are haggling over details, over import duties on defence materials, equipment, and even on the household goods of our naval and army officers. One can only hope that this doesn't provide a criterion of the way in which we shall work together on more complex matters after the war.

"You are falling between two stools now. Your policy presumably, as formulated in the British Embassy in Washington, prevents you from doing the kind of propaganda which would bring the United States into the war.

"And yet your policy, as drawn

up in London and Washington, is doing nothing to make real friends of the British and American people once the threat of common danger is removed."

Evidently there are persons influentially placed in British Government circles who are determined that Britain's right and power to decide her own policy shall not succumb to 'American' attempts to interfere with it any more than to German attempts. Does any

one believe that the American *people* wish to exercise the sort of threat that is implied in Helen Kirkpatrick's article? There is an important section of the American people whose ancestry is Anglo-Saxon. If the Washington Government is not careful it will find this section of American citizens as determined to break up the U.S.A. into separate sovereign states in order to ensure that government in America

represents the will of its electors, and as capable of doing it as Britons are likely to be in breaking up Germany into her original separate sovereign states so that the German people can find it possible to control their government and be protected from Central Government regimentation which they have demonstrated their inability to control. Peace *will* then come to the world.

J.M.

The Penguin Hansard

In the introductions to Volumes I and II of the Penguin *Hansard* we are told—

"It is doubtful if any free parliament has ever succeeded in making its proceedings adequately known to the citizen body which elected it.

"The Penguin *Hansard* is the first attempt to report the House of Commons to the public."

"All speeches are quoted verbatim. They have often been cut, even heavily cut. Omissions are usually indicated. . . ."

"In selecting material. . . . no other aim than to shorten the record has been pursued."

Thus, I have hopefully purchased the two volumes. No. I covers the period August 24, 1939, to May 13, 1940, and selections are devoted to the transition *From Chamberlain to Churchill*.

No. II covers September 5, 1939, to August 8, 1940, and deals with *The National Effort*.

Volume I is interesting, certainly dramatic, and to some extent enlightening. There is, however, something missing and having read other extracts from *Hansard* which reveal some M.P.s as probing causes, pushing for realism and ardently defending individuals against increasing control I wondered—!

Perhaps such glimpses as I sought were not appropriate to the subject *Chamberlain to Churchill*. Again, the *Hansard* extracts which I have on my files begin only at May 29, 1940. Perchance no probing had been done before then?

Volume II, dealing as it does with *The National Effort* and extending to August 8, 1940, might properly quote some of the M.P.s questions on finance and power? I skimmed its pages—I turned to the index of M.P.s whose

speeches are quoted. This is what I find:—

STOKES.—21 lines: refers to a Board of Invention, the Bofors Gun, and to Area Boards.

BENSON.—11 lines: the government should control prices.

GLENVIL HALL.—Not quoted.

CRAVEN ELLIS.—Not mentioned.

ACLAND.—Not mentioned.

LOFTUS.—Not mentioned.

DAVIDSON.—1 line: "Will there be no Office of Works in it?"

SOUTHBY.—Not mentioned.

HERBERT.—Not mentioned.

In the few minutes I had to spare I reversed the search and turned up copies of *The Social Crediter*, beginning with June 1, 1940, and noted extracts from Parliament to which my attention had been drawn:—

On May 29: MR. STOKES and MR. BENSON asked who controls the Bank Rate.

On June 4: MR. STOKES, supported by MR. GLENVIL HALL drew attention to the fact that the Bank of England self-assesses its profits for Income Tax. On June 10: MR. CRAVEN ELLIS called for reduced Bank Rate.

On June 18: MR. STOKES required that the nation should create money on its own behalf.

On July 9: On a Supplementary Vote of Credit 1940, Messrs BENSON, ACLAND and LOFTUS required that the rate of discount on Bills be reduced.

On July 23: Messrs. DAVIDSON and STOKES inquired into the Banks' contribution to the war effort.

These, so far as I know, receive no mention in Penguin *Hansard* Volume II dealing with *The National Effort*!

Truly, it is difficult for electors to be informed as to what is said in Parliament.

It is, of course, impossible to reprint

at a low price, all that is said. It is, however, unfortunate that these Penguins, so far as I know at present, make no mention of the many questions, statements, and proposals, to which *The Social Crediter* has drawn our attention. The student of Parliamentary Reports who comes across the latter is led by them to a totally different conception of the state of things: is led, perhaps to glimpse Reality? C.P.

A WHOLE POLICY IS SUPPRESSED

In the light of what C.P. has to say about Penguin *Hansard* the Forenote to *The Press Ban on Parliament* reproduced below is interesting, and readers may ascertain for themselves that the latter publication fulfils a vital need of the general public which is fulfilled by no other publication:—

It is not contested that space in the Press for the reproduction of Parliamentary matters is of necessity limited, but what the following pages make evident is the fact that many members of the House of Commons are aware of a fundamental question of policy which is consistently and deliberately hushed up in the columns of our newspapers. Readers therefore remain ignorant of a vital policy which is being represented in Parliament together with the facts relevant to it.

Lack of space is not an adequate reason for the entire suppression or exclusion of these matters....The job of the Press is to provide INFORMATION that will enable readers to form their own judgments and opinions, whereas our "free" Press has to-day become an instrument for propagating the policy of the financial interests which control it. And the choice and presentation of both articles and news items are directed to cultivating views and opinions which conform to this policy.

PARLIAMENT

MINISTERIAL OFFICES: NATIONAL FINANCE: WAR DAMAGE

February 20.

Oral Answers to Questions.

(37 columns)

MINISTERIAL OFFICES

Mr. Mander asked the Prime Minister the number of new Ministerial offices created since the outbreak of war; and whether he will consider their reduction wherever possible, in the interests of economy and Parliamentary independence?

Mr. Attlee: Twenty-two. I will circulate a list of the new Ministerial offices created since the outbreak of war. Ministerial appointments are continually under my right hon. Friend's review, and he will not lose sight of the considerations mentioned by my hon. Friend.

Mr. Mander: Is this not a matter which could suitably be referred to the Select Committee on National Expenditure?

NATIONAL FINANCE

BANKING, FINANCE AND CREDIT

Mr. E. Smith asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will appoint a committee to inquire into banking, finance and credit, with a view to reporting as soon as possible on how credit can be best utilised for the benefit of the nation, the establishment of a national central financial authority, the stabilising of prices and a long-term policy for a planned economy?

Captain Crookshank: No, Sir. My

right hon. Friend does not think such an inquiry is either necessary or desirable at the present time.

Mr. Smith: In view of the fact that industry is now being mobilised in the war effort, does not my right hon. and gallant Friend consider that finance and credit should also be harnessed to the nation's needs, and, if so, are not the suggestions made in the Question essential steps to take with that object in view?

Mr. Granville: Will the Financial Secretary take into consideration that the direct taxation of industry has now reached a point when it is necessary for industrial concerns, with the extension of capital outlay and war production to borrow from the banks in order to pay taxation?

NATIONAL FINANCE

Written Answers.

(14 columns)

TREASURY DEPOSIT RECEIPTS

Mr. Loftus asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether Treasury deposit receipts borrowed by the Treasury from the joint stock banks at 1 $\frac{3}{8}$ per cent. are convertible at any time into subscriptions to long- or medium-term Government loans bearing a considerably higher rate of interest?

Sir K. Wood: I would refer my hon. Friend to the reply which I gave on 3rd December, 1940, to similar Questions on this subject to my hon. Friend the Member for Evesham (Mr. De la Bère). I should add that the rate of interest paid on Treasury deposit receipts is not 1 $\frac{3}{8}$ per cent. but 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. Rostron Duckworth asked the Minister of Health whether he is aware that many old age pensioners in the country, drawing supplementary pensions, are willing to do gardening and similar work for which there is a demand, but are afraid that if they do so they will have to forfeit their pensions and not, when the work ceases, be able to reclaim them; and whether he will make a statement as to the extent to

which these pensioners may accept such work?

Mr. E. Brown: An old age pensioner in receipt of a supplementary pension who gets work for which he receives more than 5s. in any week must report the amount of his earnings to the Assistance Board. Whether he can continue to draw a supplementary pension when working depends on the amount he earns, but pensioners can be fully assured that the fact that they have been working will in no way affect their right to a supplementary pension when the work ceases.

February 25.

Oral Answers to Questions.

(37 columns).

EMPIRE BASES (LEASE TO UNITED STATES).

Sir A. Southby asked the Prime Minister whether it is his intention to give time for a Debate in Secret Session on the whole question of the bases in the British Empire which it is proposed to lease to the United States of America, including their future administration?

Mr. Attlee: No, Sir. My right hon. Friend has no such intention at the present time.

Sir A. Southby: When is the House of Commons likely to be given an opportunity of expressing its views on this very important subject?

LANDLORD AND TENANT (WAR DAMAGE) ACT, 1939.

Mr. W. H. Green asked the Attorney-General whether resulting from promised active consideration it is the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to afford some protection to tenants of houses rendered uninhabitable by enemy action from the payment of full rent for such houses?

The Attorney-General (Sir Donald Somervell): The answer is, Yes, Sir, I have already stated in reply to previous Questions that the Government are proposing to introduce further legislation to that contained in the Landlord and Tenant (War Damage) Act, 1939, to deal with the rights of those whose

READY NOW

The Press Ban on Parliament

Compiled and edited by

JOHN MITCHELL

(includes as a separate section:

What Capital Levy Means to You

by C. H. DOUGLAS)

PRICE 1/6 net.

(Postage on single copies 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. extra.)

from—

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,

12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

houses have been damaged through enemy action. The particular instance to which the hon. Member refers will be dealt with in this legislation.

Mr. Green: While I thank the right hon. and learned Gentleman for his reply, will he appreciate the need for expedition, in view of the distressing conditions under which thousands of these tenants are now labouring, as a result, in some cases, of living in their shelters while the full rent is being demanded for their houses; and, further, will such legislation include ground rent as well as house rent?

The Attorney-General: Of course, I cannot anticipate what will be in the legislation....

Sir W. Davidson: Will the Attorney-General pay attention to the special case of boarding-house keepers who have suffered so much?

Mr. Craven-Ellis: May I ask the learned Attorney-General whether, in a case occurring in Southampton, where the tenant has been summoned and judgement has been given, the tenant, who has no money with which to pay, can seek protection under the Emergency Powers Act?

WAR DAMAGE BILL

(98 columns).

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House," put, and agreed to.—[*Sir K. Wood.*]

Bill accordingly considered in Committee.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Kingsley Wood):.... I want first, to refer to Clause 1, which has an important aspect in connection with the administration of the Measure. Hon. Members will remember that it deals, among other things, with the relationship between the Treasury and the Commission, which, of course, also involves the position and authority of Parliament. The Committee desired to secure, first, that there should be publication of any regulations or directions concerning these matters, secondly, that the directions should be general, and thirdly, that Parliament should have control over any such directions as might be given. Therefore, the Amendments which I shall move provide, first, that the directions under this Clause shall be made by way of regulation, secondly, that they

shall be of a general character, and thirdly, that nothing in them shall be construed as authorising the Commission to exercise any of its functions in a manner inconsistent with the provisions of the Act, and—by virtue of a new Clause to replace Clause 50 in the Bill—that they shall be laid before Parliament so as to secure the necessary control which the Committee thought desirable.

.... I would now like to say a word or two on another matter which was a subject of considerable discussion—the question of value payments, particularly as compared with assessment of the compensation to be made in respect of cost of works payments.... Criticism centred on the comparison between the amount of the value payment and the cost of works payment, and particularly on the fact that value payments were to be made by reference to prices current in March, 1939. While the criticisms of the Clause put forward by the Government were such as I have indicated, the alterations proposed proved, in fact, impracticable and could not be sustained. The more one considers the matter the more one realises that the difficulty arises in endeavouring to say now what will be the position after the war... I have, therefore, Tabled a number of important Amendments which provide that when the time comes for the payment of value payments in substantial volume the matter shall be considered by the War Damage Commission.... It will be his [The Chancellor of the Exchequer's] duty to consider the report and then I propose that the Treasury, shall have power in the light of the recommendations which may be made by the Commission, to increase the sums which would otherwise be payable under this Measure. I also ensure that any order that the Treasury may make increasing the value payments under the provisions of this scheme, shall be laid before the House and shall be subject to an affirmative Resolution. In other words, the final decision must rest with the House of Commons and the matter must explicitly come before the House before anything can be done.

.... I pass to another important Clause which was also subject to considerable discussion in Committee, namely, Clause 20, which deals with the contributions of mortgagees in certain cases. I think there were two main criticisms of the original Clause, first, that the methods proposed to determine the respective liabilities of mortgagor and mortgagee were not flexible enough

to get a fair apportionment between the parties, and second that the Clause, as then drafted, would create great difficulties in that it left the mortgagee and mortgagor to find out for themselves the value of mortgaged property—the figure which would determine their respective liabilities for contribution, and therefore very important. It was also urged that the Clause should be widened by increasing the limit on both residential and agricultural contributory properties. In the light of these constructive criticisms we have accordingly reframed the Clause. Under the Amendments which appear on the Paper in my name, the area will be widened in which contribution by mortgages will be made and the amount of those contributions will be increased. It is also proposed that the scope of cases in which the mortgagee will contribute should be widened by increasing to £150 and £500 the figures of annual values for non-agricultural and agricultural properties respectively. These new figures, of course, compare with the original figures of £100 and £250; therefore I have again made a considerable extension in that matter.

Perhaps more important still is the new scale which I am now proposing so far as the contribution of mortgagees is concerned. These contributions will now begin where the interest of the mortgagee is more than 33½ per cent. instead of where the interest is more than 50 per cent., and it is proposed that between 33½ and 50 per cent. the mortgagee will contribute a sixth, that between 50 and 66⅔ per cent. he will contribute a third, between 66⅔ and 75 per cent. he will contribute a half and above 75 per cent., if he has that interest in the property, he will contribute two-thirds. That is a very considerable alteration on the original proposal....

There is one further alteration that I should mention. In the course of the discussion it was suggested that there ought to be some simple method enabling the value of residential property to be ascertained without recourse to the courts, and, to meet that suggestion, it is now proposed that, in the event of a dispute, and at the request of the parties concerned, the Inland Revenue, who, of course, have no interest at stake in the matter, may determine the value for parties who are not able to agree, and in that event their decision shall be taken as final.

Mr. Barnes (East Ham, South): Do both parties have to agree to that request?

Sir K. Wood: Yes. If they cannot agree, there is no recourse but to go to the Courts, but I should think most people would be reasonable as this independent valuation is available and it would be cheaper... my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade and I have come to the conclusion that it is in the general interest that a scheme should be devised which should be simple in character and follow the lines of the Personal Injuries scheme, that such a scheme should give free cover and protection up to a certain

sum to all owners of chattels irrespective of income, and that beyond that amount it should be made possible for voluntary insurance to be effected up to a reasonable amount. This, of course, is a very important departure. We propose that every householder in the country should receive free compensation up to £200, together with an additional £100 for his wife and an additional £25 for every child under 16, and for persons who do not come within these categories—like lodgers and persons living in hotels—there shall be free compensation

up to £50. In addition to the free grants it is proposed that people should be able to insure at the following rates: Up to £2,000, £1 per cent.; from £2,000 to £3,000, 30s. per cent.; from £3,000 to £10,000—I took the highest limit put on the Order Paper by hon. Members—£2 per cent. The only restriction I would make would be the obvious one that the amount of cover should be limited in respect of such things as jewellery, antiques and specially valuable articles.

THE APPROPRIATION OF FURNITURE

The following letter was sent to the Lord Mayor of Ilford:

*The Worshipful the Mayor of Ilford,
Mayor's Parlour,
Town Hall,
Ilford.*

Sir,

It has recently been brought to my notice that the Home Office has given authority, under the powers granted to it by Parliament, to local authorities to enable them to appropriate furniture, stored in depositories, for the use of evacuees.

Now I am due to go into the Armed Forces, although the Government departments cannot agree as to whether or not the order involving myself should at present be implemented. I have considered placing my effects in a store,

but I do not propose to do that in view of the possibility of their confiscation.

While perhaps the Ilford Council may not be so concerned with this order in comparison with provincial corporations, it seems desirable to me that the relevant document from the Home Office should not be filed without comment. The action taken by Mr. Morrison is an attack on private property, and I think that the right of individuals to genuine private property is an essential condition of freedom.

I would point out that, with the appointment of Lord Halifax to the U.S. Embassy, there is no member in favour of the last Government: now in the Cabinet.

It is hardly encouraging to prospective members of the Forces that Mr. Morrison, a conscientious objector when my father was fighting against

the Reich, should be giving authority for the use of my chattels while I may be absent on Service.

There is still a huge number of unemployed in the country, and I cannot imagine that we are unable to manufacture household goods if these are required.

I am led to understand that political party interests had been forsaken until victory has been won, but this particular order cannot be dissociated from Left Wing policy in regard to private property.

May I ask the Council to look into this matter, and take the action I think is required?

Yours faithfully,

A. R. TURPIN.

197, Clayhall Avenue, Ilford; January 8, 1941.

DIARY OF EVENTS

FEB. 26—Mr. Eden and Sir John Dill, having arrived at Ankara on February 25, were received by Prime Minister of Turkey and Foreign Minister. Japan made 'final offer' in negotiations for peace between French Indo-China and Thailand.

R.A.F. again attacked 'invasion bases.' British forces have captured Mogadishu, capital of Italian Somaliland.

FEB. 27—General Sir John Dill met Marshall Chakmak, Chief of Turkish General Staff. Mr. Eden saw diplomatic representatives of Russia, Bulgaria and Jugoslavia and summoned Sir Stafford Cripps from Moscow.

FEB. 28—Vichy Government accepted Japan's terms for settlement of conflict between Thailand and Indo-China.

In Albania, R.A.F. shot down 26 Italian planes without loss. Italians in Libya have been reinforced with some German mechanised units.

MAR. 1—The King met Mr. Winant, U.S. ambassador, at station. Bulgaria joined Axis, signed pact. Bul-

garian troops were moving to Turkish frontier. R.A.F. attacked Wilhelmshaven and other targets during night.

MAR. 2—Mr. Eden and Sir John Dill arrived in Athens. More German troops entered Bulgaria "to protect her against Britain" (German Foreign Office). British forces continue to advance in Eritrea.

MAR. 3—Vishinsky, Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs, handed Bulgarian Minister in Moscow a note stating that "The Soviet Government, faithful to her policy of peace, is not in a position to support Bulgaria in carrying out her present policy..." Announced that Mr. Eden's and Sir John Dill's talks with Turkish leaders satisfactory. Colonel W. S. Donovan, President Roosevelt's 'unofficial observer' arrived back in England.

MAR. 4—Captain O. Lyttleton, President of the Board of Trade, announced industrial reorganisation involving closing of factories working only part time on non-essential goods, e.g. cotton, wool and other textiles, hosiery, pottery, boots and shoes; and regulations to prevent new firms starting. Many factories on essential goods to be amalgamated.

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.

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 Wavertree 435.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP. Lunch-hour reunion on the first and third Thursday in each month at 12-30, at the Plane Tree, Great Russell Street. Next reunion on March 20. 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, Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

WOLVERHAMPTON: Will all Social Crediters, old and new, keep in contact by writing E. EVANS, 15 Links Road, Penn, Wolverhampton.

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 (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 1/2d.
and
'This 'American' Business' 3d. each 12 for 2/-

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster 4d.
The Nature of Social Credit ... (out of print)
Debt and Taxation 2d.
ALSO
The Douglas Manual (out of print)

- The Economic Crisis: Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report (out of print)
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 2 1/2d.)
Barrier to Health by Dr. Douglas Boyd..... 6d.

Leaflets

- Invincible Britain by John Mitchell2d. each, 1/6 doz.
What we are about by H. E.50 for 1/6
Hitler and Churchill Finance by John Mitchell50 for 1/9
Bomb Hitler! by C. H. Douglas100 for 1/3
What 'Capital Levy' Means to You by C. H. Douglas.....100 for 2/6

All from

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

BELFAST D.S.C. GROUP

Public Meeting on March 14, 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.