

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 7. No. 2.

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"While we sympathise with these people, our first consideration should be for our own people. . . . in the case of certain Members of this House, one has only to say the word 'Jew,' and they lose all sense of reason."—MRS. TATE, M.P., in the Debate on 'friendly' Aliens, July 10, 1940.

"The most fantastic feats of exaggeration were performed in this field; to them belong the titles *The Annihilation of German Jewry* (in the *Spectator*), *The Extermination of the Jews in Germany* (with an introduction by the Bishop of Durham). I should like anybody with a memory to bear these titles in mind and recall them when the war is over; he will find that the Jews in Germany have neither been annihilated nor exterminated, but that the great majority of them are still there, trading and practising." . . . "In Prague, just before Hitler marched into that city, was a rabbi. . . . who instructed his people that Hitler was the Jewish Messiah, because the result of his work would be to open to the Jews all those countries throughout the world which were still closed to them."

— DOUGLAS REED in *A Prophet at Home*.

"The preservation of *peace*. . . was the only way to prevent the further spread of Communism. . . . if war came it was bound to spread. In *peace* it could not spread—twenty years of Communist decline in all countries outside Russia, had proved that." —IBID.

"The second fundamental mistake was to believe that a change from the Imperial to the Social-Democratic label made it safe to deal with a greatly over-centralised Germany.

"In fact, unregenerate over-centralisation merely made plain the path for the new German Messiah, Hitler."

— LORD VANSITTART.

"I should like to think that our civil population would learn a lesson from the French people how to endure suffering for their Fatherland. For I am convinced that the German people would never have stood the annihilation of towns and villages for four years as the French have stood it. The hysterical outcry of our people, at the invasion by the Russians of East Prussia, which compelled our General Headquarters to dispatch immediately an Army Corps thither, and thereby lost us the war, is a case in point."

— GENERAL VON DER GOLTZ.

The invasion of East Prussia took place within three months of the outbreak of the 1914-1918 War.

Lord Woolton says there is almost a normal supply of

food. As his Department is wasting more food than would keep a large city in peace-time and we have umpteen million of the food producers and distributors out of action, you can see how difficult it would be to keep alive on this planet if we didn't have a world war every twenty years. But then we shouldn't have Lord Woolton.

One of the most vicious fallacies of the period is that numerical majorities have rights, simply because they are majorities. It originally had validity in the pragmatic fact that a sufficiently large majority could militarily overwhelm a minority.

The opinions of the majority were never more unreliable and unrelated to reality than they are at present when they are misled by the Press and the "B." B. C. and have no appreciable military power.

Only *individuals* have rights, and these are being systematically infringed by the manipulation of majorities, real and bogus.

"It was a revelation to me to find how closely the main streets of our cities have come to resemble each other, nowadays. None has any individual character left; of none could you say, this could belong to no other city than Manchester, this, if I were dropped here by parachute, I should immediately know to be Sheffield. In every one the same shops stood side by side—somebody's red-and-gilt chain store, somebody else's cheap tailors, somebody else's white-and-gilt teashop, yet another somebody's mass-produced-cheap frocks for women."

— DOUGLAS REED in *A Prophet at Home*.

The Chairman of P.E.P. is Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, of Messrs. Marks and Spencer, Limited.

Pre-view of a Planned England.

It is part of a curious propaganda in the United States to speak contemptuously of "the European mentality."

Practically everything of value in the Western Hemisphere derives directly from the European mentality. Some of the worst features in the world to-day derive directly from the grafting of Asiatic mentality onto an American background, such as New York and Hollywood.

"No monetary limit to help Russia." — SIR KINGSLEY WOOD, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Edinburgh, September 6, 1941.

Of course not. It's only when millions of Britons were starving on Tyneside and in South Wales, that we couldn't do anything because of monetary limits.

OPINION

A Meeting of Financiers

The following extracts are from an article which appeared in *Ken* (Chicago, U.S.A.), November 3, 1938:—

"In the spring of 1934, a select group of city financiers gathered around Montagu Norman in the windowless building of the Bank of England in Threadneedle Street. Among those present were Sir Alan Anderson, partner in Anderson, Green & Co.; Lord (then Sir Josiah) Stamp, chairman of the L.M.S. Railway System; Edward Shaw, chairman of the P. & O. Steamship Lines; Sir Robert Kindersley, a partner in Lazard Bros.; Charles Hambro, partner in Hambros, Bros.; and C. Tiarks, head of J. Schroeder Co. . . . But now a new power was established on Europe's political horizon, namely: Nazi Germany. Hitler had disappointed his critics. His regime was no temporary nightmare, but a system with a good future, and Mr. Norman advised his directors to include Hitler in their plans. There was no opposition, and it was decided that Hitler should get covert help from London's financial section until Norman will have succeeded in putting sufficient pressure on the Government to make it abandon its pro-French policy for a more promising pro-German orientation.

"Immediately the directors went into action. Their first move was to sponsor Hitler's secret re-armament, just about to begin. Using their controlling interests in both Vickers and Imperial Chemical Industries, they instructed these two huge armament concerns to help the German programme by all the means at their disposal. . . . In the same year English armament firms placed huge advertisements in the *Militaerischer Wochenblatt*, offering for sale tanks and guns, prohibited by the Versailles Treaty. A statement made by General Sir Herbert Lawrence, chairman of Vickers furnished the necessary evidence that the British Government knew about and approved these advertisements. When, at his company's annual meeting, he was asked to give assurance that Vickers arms and munitions were not being used for secret re-arming in Germany, he replied: 'I cannot give you an assurance in definite terms, but I can tell you that nothing is done without the complete sanction and approval of our Government.'

Internationalism in the French Army

May 22.—"General Georges was asked point blank why the promised counter-attack had not been delivered. His liaison officer spoke for him and answered that the General could not give orders so far in advance of the inclinations of the divisions. This was an eye-opener and it is only now that it is brought home to me that the formation of soldiers' committees regularised in the French Army in 1936 by Monsieur Leon Blum's regime have so far undermined discipline. G.Q.G. is definitely handicapped by the spirit of internationalism that exists to such a great extent among the rank and file. Another point that was brought home to-day by a French officer is the fact that at least one-third of the French Army is recruited in the densely populated North. It is this northern area that is now in German occupation, with the result that one man in three has already lost his home and his place of employment."

—*Diary of a Staff Officer at Advanced Headquarters, North B.A.F.F., 1940.*

A LETTER TO "THE SCOTSMAN"

Sir,

Lord Balfour of Burleigh is reported in your columns as having said, at the Town and Country Planning Association conference at Largs, that "under a Central Planning Authority he could see that Scotland would be in a favoured position. There would be no reason why she could not manage her own affairs. With the Scottish Secretary of State and the Scottish Office they would be able to settle what they wanted, and get their plan into proper relationship with the national interests. Scotland had nothing to lose by having her affairs related to the national interests. If, however, there was to be an unco-ordinated struggle for industry between England and Scotland, then England would win. A Central Planning Authority could do nothing but good for Scotland."

Several points emerge from this passage. Lord Balfour of Burleigh evidently holds that if the English planned industry in England and the Scots planned industry in Scotland (and why not the Welsh in Wales and the Canadians in Canada?), then an "unco-ordinated struggle" would result, in which England would win. Now, if English interests could secure a preponderance in Scotland in spite of Scottish efforts at self-protection, then with a joint Central Planning Authority surely English interests would preponderate even more, and more insidiously at that, with less possibility of democratic control. It has been a matter of general experience that the larger an administrative unit becomes the greater grows the irresponsibility and inefficiency of the administration.

Moreover, if the noble lord has a taste for central planning, why stop at a tie-up with England? Mr. Churchill, in his latest broadcast, announced that the U. S. A. is the "most powerful State and community" in the world; one has heard that the standard of living is higher there, not only for the more opulent ranks of society, but for the manual workers; charwomen, for example, are said to travel to their business in automobiles. Some share of these delights might be secured for Lochee and the Cowcaddens if Lord Balfour of Burleigh would consent to Scottish industry being merged under a Central Planning Authority with that of the U. S. A. Central planning is a notable feature also of the Soviet Union, a territory about as extensive as the moon, and concerning whose system of government much that is flattering has lately been printed. Perhaps the Scots should, therefore, set up a Soviet Republic, and ask Comrade Joe for affiliation.

Central planning is widely fashionable these days; indeed, the majority of Europeans are learning about it at first-hand in practice. Mr. Paul Einzig, in various works reviewed in your columns, has expounded the in-and-out of central planning as dispensed from Berlin. Norway, for instance, is tied up with Germany under a Central Planning Authority; but, curiously enough, the neighbouring Swedes are too stolid to appreciate the beauties of the arrangement.

As Juvenal put it, and Louis XI quoted it in *Quentin Durward*, the grand question is *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* "Who shall plan the Planners?"

Every Scot will, however, doubtless agree with this statement of Lord Balfour of Burleigh: "Scotland has nothing to lose by having her affairs related to the national interests." It is time that Scottish affairs were conducted in relation to Scottish national interests.

I am, &c., DOUGLAS YOUNG.
Ardlogie, by Leuchars, Fife; September 9, 1941.

RECIPE FOR DISASTER

The Theory of Free Trade is now rarely met without the ghost of the Gold Standard sitting on its tail, eagerly waiting an invitation to materialise. It has been pointed out before in these columns that "*laissez-faire* was a perfectly sound policy, if it had had a sound financial system. By controlling the financial system, the bankers diverted to themselves just as much of its benefits as they could use, and prevented its natural consequences from becoming general." Its contemporary attachment to the Gold Standard is a precaution of the international bankers to ensure the easy picking of the spoils—it would be impossible for trade to be even approximately free if it were tied to the Gold Standard which by its very mechanism discriminates powerfully against trade in the home market. In present conditions, and without the introduction of a financial system that gives results satisfactory to the majority of individuals in this country, with 'free' trade we should have been led just as surely to war as we were with protection. Earlier in the century the desire on the part of all the larger powers to trade freely with anybody *outside* their own frontiers resulted in an increasingly fierce struggle for export markets which proved one of the main causes of the first Great War.

Yet there are those who are anxious to re-introduce both these conditions.

In the May issue of the Carnegie publication *International Conciliation*, Professor Nicholas Butler, President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, introduces in the preface a Mr. Deryck Abel as a "student of promise, who since his discharge from the British army as a result of a serious wound, has resumed the study of modern diplomatic and economic history." The result of Mr. Abel's studies is an essay entitled *Economic Causes of the Second World War*. Mr. Abel's thesis is that Free Trade (plus the Gold Standard) and peace are one and the same cause, and he describes the fomenting of the present war in terms of the thwarting by Protection of the drive to export. He does not inquire as to the cause of this drive to take goods out of the country where want and necessity, often for those very articles, exist even among the people manufacturing them, and he seems to assume that the imposition of 'tariff walls' against the corresponding influx of goods from some other state in the same predicament is a whim rather than a palliative for an experienced evil, and can be revoked without the reappearance of that evil. By 1935, in a single lifetime, Free Trade (plus Gold Standard) had led to a fierce struggle for export markets and a war against the Kaiser, and then Protection had produced a still fiercer struggle for export markets and threatened to develop into war against Hitler.

At this juncture, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler convened an international conference of sixty statesmen, economists, historians, distinguished bankers and business men from ten countries. They all met at Chatham House in London, and conferred in *private* in order that delegates from countries where a censorship existed might express their views frankly and freely:—

"In addition to Dr. Butler and the Italian and German delegates, the members of the conference included M. Paul van Zeeland, Premier of Belgium; M. Jacques Rueff, Directeur-Adjoint du Mouvement Général des Fondes in the French Ministry of Finance; M. René Seydoux, Sous-

Directeur de l'Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques; Dr. E. Heldring, former President of the Amsterdam Chamber of Commerce; and Mr. Frederic M. Sackett, former United States Ambassador to Germany. Several British statesmen, the Marquess of Crewe, Sir Austen Chamberlain, Sir Herbert Samuel, the Marquess of Lothian, Mr. Arthur Henderson, and Viscount Cecil took part. The contingent of economists, publicists, and historians included Dr. George P. Gooch, Mr. Francis W. Hirst, Commander Stephen King-Hall, M.P., and Professors W. A. Mackintosh of Ontario, Philip Jessup of Columbia University, Arthur L. Bowley, T. E. G. Gregory, Gilbert Murray, Lionel C. Robbins, and Sir Arthur Salter.

"After three days of discussion, the delegates drew up four resolutions, which were passed unanimously.

"The first resolution recommended consultation between the United Kingdom and the United States of America, the world's greatest creditor nations, for the purpose of agreeing upon measures to enable the debtor nations to meet their obligations in goods and services and thus of materially assisting in the work of creating stability and restoring confidence."

"Furthermore, it urged the formation of low tariff or free trade unions on the model of the Ouchy Convention and it approved the decisions of the Montevideo Conference.

"The second resolution advocated an arrangement between the governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on the provisional stabilisation of exchange on the basis of gold, allowing for any necessary changes and with a view to the establishment of a stable world gold standard.

"The third resolution expressed vigorous support of all policies seeking to augment the authority of the League of Nations and the Pact of Paris, to develop the habit of the judicial settlement of disputes by using the Permanent Court of International Justice, the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and commissions of inquiry and conciliation." . . .

In fact these idealistic gentlemen in search of peace proposed the application of principles two of which together had in their own lifetime been an immediate cause (as far as any such immediate causes are valid) of the greatest war until then, and the subsequent return to one had produced probably the most appalling economic crisis in history, and the seeds of a new and greater war.

Indeed, a present member of the Advisory Council in Great Britain of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Sir Alan Anderson, was reported to have been present in 1934 at a conference at which 'British' interests decided to finance German rearmament.

Many taking part in Dr. Butler's conference have since been prominently associated with proposals to 'unite' or federate political units, and more particularly with the suggestion of union between Great Britain and other countries—France, America, the northern states, the democracies. Again, most of the proposals for such unions incorporate among their principles that of Free-Trade-cum-Gold-Standard, an association which has existed since the formation of the American Federation itself. This is only a slightly different emphasis on the same policy: the fact that its advocates have consistently ignored the results of this policy, as well as the disastrous nature of those results, is no recommendation for its future application.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Editorial) 4, ACREFIELD ROAD, WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL, Telephone: Gateacre 1561; (Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 7. No. 2. Saturday, September 20, 1941.

“No Interruption in the Good Work”

From a staunch supporter resident in Vancouver, B.C., we have received a letter in which he writes: “Should you require financial aid for continuance, I trust you will make it known as we are anxious that there should be no interruption in the good work.”

This anxious sentiment has appeared and reappeared in correspondence received at the Secretariat, manifesting the loyalty and determination of Social Crediters from all parts, which neither time nor superficial adversity can damp. Never before has the world been so “hazed,” but never before has the situation been so pregnant with possibilities for the future good of mankind; and just as our correspondent is anxious to pull his full weight it will be the wish and determination of all Social Crediters to assure for the Secretariat the means of maintaining the present service which as *Hansard* has been revealing, is reaching high and influential circles as well as a greater mass of the people.

With all modesty Social Crediters feel, and must feel, that even in these days of relative political inactivity they have the responsibility and the opportunity for materially influencing the fashioning of the future of society.

Conscious of the violent fluctuation and uncertainties of fortune which Social Crediters, with their fellows, have experienced and presumably must expect to share, as Director of Revenue I have been most reluctant to issue appeals for financial aid for the Secretariat. It is reasonable to suppose that the majority of overseas supporters have not been suffering from the repercussions of war to anything like the same degree as have our home supporters and so I may perhaps draw to the careful attention of Social Crediters, and particularly overseas supporters, the welcome inquiry of our staunch Vancouver subscriber.

Neither the Director of Revenue nor the Secretariat can know your circumstances—but YOU do. You have already been informed that the Secretariat's office and its contents were destroyed through enemy action. Obviously this is a source not only of financial loss but replacement liability and so I would ask that not only the need for re-housing and re-equipment of the Secretariat but also the possibly more important, if more obvious, day-to-day financial needs of such an organisation should be constantly before your minds: for the Secretariat is the centre, the focus, of a living movement.

Each of you knows what YOU can do: you can do no more—may you do less? If there should be those at home

who cannot maintain their previous level of contributions and donations, perhaps our supporters overseas will be able to give a helping hand in this transitional period. Never forget what the movement's aim is. It is not only legitimate but right that where possible, subscriptions should be asked for and accepted from an ever widening circle of persons who are becoming conscious of the Dead Hand.

All contributions to the Secretariat will be promptly acknowledged and will always be utilised to the best advantage in furthering the policy of our Advisory Chairman, Major C. H. Douglas, whose precise anticipation, realistically forejudging the course of events, is not only confirming for Social Crediters, but is converting those even in “high places” who are no longer the victims of blind and prejudicial ignorance concerning the inalienable rights of man.

J. B. GALWAY,
Director of Revenue
Social Credit Secretariat.

Russian Resources

News Review of August 28, in an estimate of Russian resources, said:

“Production of electric power [in Soviet Russia] per head of population as late as 1939 was one-third that of Germany, and less than Italy's.

“The *per capita* production of steel was little more than a quarter of Germany's.

“In several industries 1939 production was lower than in 1938, because experienced technicians were removed in the ‘purge’ and plant machinery was overstrained and neglected.

“Because of the Soviet Union's immense size, and the concentration of raw materials and industries, the railway system has always been overtaxed, so that one area may have a huge surplus while another is in the throes of famine.

“On an average, in the last few years, every gallon of oil raised in Russia has had to be transported a distance of more than 750 miles. About 75 per cent. of Russia's total oil supplies come from a single Southern area, and 60 per cent of them were swallowed up last year by farm tractors alone.”

Those ‘Daughter’ Religions

The ‘daughter religions’ of Judaism:
Yes, father makes them an allowance.

New Leaflet

TAXATION IS ROBBERY

Prices: £1 for 1,000; 12/6 for 500; 3/- for 100;
1/9 for 50. (Postage extra).

Obtainable from—K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

PARLIAMENT**War Situation: Grampian Electricity Bill**

SEPTEMBER 9.

Oral Answers to Questions (37 columns)

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION (Social Survey)

Sir P. Hurd asked the Minister of Information whether he has now reviewed the work of the Social Survey Section of his Department; and whether he will see to it that the public shall in future be left to use the accepted means of ventilating grievances and securing redress through elected local bodies and elected Parliamentary representatives?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Information (Mr. Thurtle): I am now reviewing the work of the Social Survey Section of my Department. Though my review is not yet complete, I can assure the hon. Member that this social survey is being conducted for the purpose of obtaining necessary information for Government Departments, and not in order to assist the public to ventilate grievances.

Sir P. Hurd: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the work of this Department in the past has trenched very largely upon the proper function of Members of Parliament?

Mr. Thurtle: If it is any reassurance to my hon. Friend, I can assure him that my right hon. Friend is no believer in what is called "snooping."

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (2½ columns)

Mr. A. Bevan: Do we understand the Prime Minister correctly when he says it is proposed after the third Sitting Day to ask for an Adjournment of the House for a further period?

The Prime Minister: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Bevan: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this announcement will give rise to considerable dissatisfaction in many parts of the country? If the Government have not Business with which to engage the House, will the Prime Minister give some of us an opportunity of consulting with him in order that we may propose some Business? Does he not realise that considerable harm will be done to Parliament if the House again adjourns? [*Interruption.*]

The Prime Minister: In these matters one follows precedent—

Mr. Bevan: The war does not.

The Prime Minister:—and the precedents of the last war were very instructive.

Mr. Bevan: This is a very serious matter. If the right hon. Gentleman does insist on the House adjourning, some of us might insist upon a Division.

The Prime Minister: Even that would not deter me from pursuing a course which I thought was for the general convenience.

Mr. Bellinger: Can the right hon. Gentleman give the House an indication now of how long the Adjournment will be for, because it might help us to make up our minds?

The Prime Minister: Obviously the length of the Adjournment is a material point, and on that a statement will be made on the next Sitting Day.

Mr. Gallacher: Will not the right hon. Gentleman reconsider this matter, in view of the demands being made upon workers to suspend and limit holidays? This is a very bad example to the country.

The Prime Minister: The labours of the House are not measured by the length of our Sittings any more than are the contributions of Members measured by the number of their speeches.

WAR SITUATION (89 columns)

Mr. Henry Strauss (Norwich): . . . To any student of the English and American languages who examines the Charter carefully it is quite obvious that it is predominantly an American document. I do not suppose there is anybody in the House who has failed to notice that, but if there is, I could easily quote the passages on which I base that view. Most of us would do a great deal for Anglo-American friendship, but one of the things we ought not to do is too readily to express agreement with magniloquent declarations of principles which have not been very carefully examined and which are put forward by a nation which made very profound mistakes in regard to Europe at the end of the last war and shows every sign of making similar mistakes at the present time. . . .

Earl Winterton: . . . We have almost an approach to the Russian system in respect of the two political commissars, one in the Near East and the other in the Far East, the Minister of State and the Chancellor of the Duchy.

Mr. J. J. Davidson (Glasgow, Maryhill): But they are political commissars for one particular party.

Earl Winterton: I understand that they are political commissars for the Government, for the Prime Minister. We are not, as has been often said in this House, a very logical people. I am not sure that we are yet awake to the tremendous importance of this joint action on the part of Russia and ourselves in this war. It is the Russian Army and the British Navy and Air Force which are going to defeat Germany if she is to be defeated in a military sense. If America entered this war to-morrow she could not by the very nature of things have an army of sufficient mechanised power to fight the German Army in Europe on a large scale under two years. . . .

Mr. Cocks (Broxtowe) [began his speech by assessing Hitler's war-aims as a conquest not only of Europe but of the whole world, and the establishment at the centre a Greater Germany with the present Germany as its industrial centre. He gave a brief review of how the new order would work and of the life of subject peoples under such a regime, and outlined his idea of what our war-aims should be. He believed, also, that peace-aims should be discussed, and in this connection described Mr. H. G. Well's charter of the rights of man and the current proposals that nations should be bound in "some federation, or political union, or by several federations, closer in texture than anything contemplated in the Covenant of the League of Nations". He thought Hitler had done by force one good thing. He had broken down a dozen tariff barriers and brought into practical politics the possibility of a reunion of Europe. The model he suggested was the Roman Empire, and his method would be primarily an economic one.]:

. . . . Let all the States which formed part of the

Roman Empire, those West of the Rhine and South of the Danube, or as many as can be persuaded, come into one Customs union, all tariffs being abolished. The Balkan States, for example, produce raw materials but they are poor because they have not been able to find markets. They will be able to find those markets in the manufacturing areas of Britain, France, Belgium, Northern Italy and elsewhere. A union or federation ought to have one currency as well as one tariff policy. The Scandinavian nations could come in if they wished, and Germany could be admitted if she carried out certain stipulations and conditions. Every nation would have to accept the charter of the rights of man on pain of being deprived of the benefits and protection of the union. I should like to see a European system of education and a European judiciary. Of course, there would be international control of transport and postal facilities, perhaps European postage stamps, and so on. Political frontiers would be weakened because there would be no Customs houses and no separate armies, and some States—such as some of the Balkan States—might be merged into one. The more things become European, the less stress there will be upon national rights and privileges, but differences between various States or Provinces could be settled by a federal court or senate or other machinery. The private arms industry would be abolished and military forces limited and controlled.

For all of this, of course, machinery would have to be worked out and in the meantime Russia and the Allies could look after the defence of the union. We have the germ of an international army in this country in all the continents and headquarters of the various Allies which would be able to look after the defence of the union. I believe America would take more than a friendly interest in this and would co-operate in a good deal of the international work, but possibly she would not wish to join the union herself. If she did, all the better. Possibly Russia would not wish to join the union politically but would be content to organise in her own vast sphere from the Baltic to the Pacific. She would, however, be able to take advantage of all the international machinery in regard to transport, trade facilities, the provision of raw materials and so on. Possibly she might link up with Poland, Finland and other countries. Those great store houses of raw materials in Africa and other tropical regions would come into the scheme, the control of which would be international rather than European. I envisage a policy of pooling, rationing and quotas on the lines suggested by the Minister of Labour and, I think, by the First Lord of the Admiralty. . . .

I am one of those who like to keep their feet firmly on the ground. I like to see exactly where I am going. I have sketched the outline of the structure which may be built if we have the power and opportunity and determination, and there is nothing in it that is inconsistent with the Atlantic Charter. . . .

Captain Poole (Lichfield): . . . The point made by the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down [Mr. Clement Davies] was that we should have a second front at the present time, and, he asked why we have not got one? I do not know whether the hon. and learned Member has really faced, or has made any effort to assess, what is required to establish a second front on the Continent. I know nothing of military technique and strategy. The whole of my military experience is that little bit which has come

to me during the past two years of this war. But, being engaged in supply and the obtaining of supplies, I do not agree with the many people who seem to think that you can send a force of 10,000 or 20,000 men here, there and everywhere and land them, so that there is your Army and your second front. I think it would do the hon. and learned Gentleman good if it were possible for him to go through the whole of the routine and work which is necessary before a small force can land in Iceland, the Shetlands, the Orkneys or anywhere else. Then, when he talks about establishing a second front which has to compete with the panzer divisions of Germany, he may consider what force would have to be assembled and successfully landed, so as to be able to hold a large stretch of territory for a fixed time and consolidate a position on the Continent.

Those are the difficulties of the establishment of a second front. We hope they will be overcome. We all hope and pray and trust that soon it may be possible for us to establish a front. I am not in a position to say when; the hon. and learned Gentleman is not in a position to know when, and I think he is ill-advised to ask the Government when. I think none of us has the right to ask the Government to disclose their plans, unless it is desired to jeopardise the lives of hundreds of thousands of our fighting men. . . . Whatever we are giving to Russia—and I am not disturbed in my own mind as to our relationship with Russia—we dare not and cannot disclose it at the present time without jeopardising the lives of the men who are shipping the cargoes across the seas. . . .

SEPTEMBER 10.

PRIVATE BUSINESS

GRAMPIAN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY ORDER (CONFIRMATION BILL (*By Order*)).

Order for Second Reading read:

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

Mr. Keeling (Twickenham): . . . The object of this Bill is to authorise the Grampian Electricity Supply Company to erect hydraulic works in two glens—Glen Affric and Glen Cannich—in Inverness-shire. This Bill is recommended to Parliament after an inquiry in Edinburgh held last April by four Commissioners, two Members of this House and two Peers. Because of the war the Commission sat in secret, but I think it is no secret to say that in their recommendation of this Bill to the House they are not unanimous. I rise to move the rejection of the Bill. . . .

I suggest that the real issue we have to consider is whether the interests of the Highlands ought to prevail over the interests of the Grampian Electricity Supply Company. . . .

The Highlands have a great natural asset in their water power. Under powers previously granted by Parliament half the potential water power of the Highlands has already been granted to two companies—The British Aluminium Company and The Grampian Electricity Company. The Grampian Company already produce over 200,000,000 units per annum at their stations at Rannoch and Tummel Bridge. Barely 2 per cent. of the production of the company is used in the Highlands. The remainder is sold either in the Low-

lands and coastal districts or is sent to the grid.

It is true that there is a new Clause in the Bill, Clause 21, which purports to give the Highlands the first call on the electricity generated under the present scheme. I suggest that that priority is entirely illusory. It does not give priority to the Highlands proper, but it gives priority to the Grampian Company's distribution area, which includes not only the Highlands but also the Lowland regions of Kincardineshire, Aberdeenshire, Banffshire, Moray and Nairn. There is nothing in the Clause to prevent the whole production of the company under the Bill being sent outside the Highlands proper. . . .

In the circular which hon. Members will have seen during the last day or two a good deal is made of a plebiscite which has taken place in areas covered by the Bill, and it is stated that the population were almost unanimous in favour of the Bill. But I think this statement circulated to hon. Members is somewhat lacking in candour, because it does not mention that every one of those persons to whom the plebiscite inquiry was sent are tenants of Highland Estates, a subsidiary of the promoters of this Bill, and it is hardly to be supposed that they would have answered this questionnaire in a way unfavourable to their own landlords. I submit, therefore, that the Bill will not help the Highlanders.

I may be asked, "What is your policy for helping the Highlanders to use their own water power?" My answer is the answer which has been given over the last few years by all disinterested investigators. It is this, that you can only help the Highlanders to use water power by introducing small power plants, perhaps one in every glen or strath in which you can expect a demand either for the needs of agriculture or for small industries. . . . To grant further hydro-electric powers over a wide area to a private interest will, I submit, embarrass if not stultify the post-war planning of the Highlands. As a writer in the *Times* this morning remarked:

"The question of the development of Highland water power ought to be dealt with as part of the larger Highlands problem."

The promoters of this Bill, in the statement to Members which I quoted just now, have said:

"Post-war planning is absolutely unaffected by this Bill."

I do not suggest that that is an attempt to deceive Members, but it does seem to show a reckless disregard of what is true and what is not true, and it does create in my mind a suspicion that the promoters of this Bill are trying to seize profit for themselves out of the people's preoccupation with the war. . . . In the hills and forests and glens, . . . people escape from the narrowness, the monotony, the sordidness, the noise and the dirt of their daily occupations, and every time you injure a glen such as Glen Affric you are injuring very many people who depend upon beautiful scenery to restore their nerves and to revive their minds and souls. Without very good reason you ought not to inflict this injury upon them. I have tried to show that no such good reason exists. This Bill may benefit the promoters and the contractors for the work, but it will not serve the needs of the Highlanders, and it will prevent the post-war planning of the Highlands in the interests of the Highland people. It is an unnecessary Bill, and I ask the House to reject it.

(Further extracts from this debate will be given next week).

THE 'FABULOUS' SASSOONS

The Sassoon Dynasty by Cecil Roth (Robert Hale, London; 280 pp., 12/6).

Conceived as an object-lesson to the German people, the proof that a civilised state can only benefit by the absorption of gifted foreign families, this book traces the history of the Sassoons from Baghdad in the early years of the last century to India, to China and the east, and to England at the present day. A brief description is given of the building of the family business and its associated enterprises, the parts played by the various members of the family in extending its ramifications, and the huge structure of philanthropy which was its apologia, and which yet played a considerable part in the efficiency of the business by educating prospective employees and providing for them amenities and charities extending over the whole range of their activities from birth to burial.

In 1858, after the Indian mutiny and when the majority of Eastern Jews were 'revolving round the axis of the firm of Sassoon,' Sassoon David Sassoon, the third of the eight sons of the original David Sassoon who had migrated from Baghdad to Bombay in 1832, came to England where he was eventually joined by most of his brothers. The success of the brothers was meteoric: they acquired landed property, founded and purchased metropolitan papers (at one time Rachel Sassoon directed both the *Observer* and the *Sunday Times*, and a friend, Moses Levy, later Lawson, and still later Lord Burnham, founded the *Daily Telegraph*); they won the friendship of the Prince of Wales, forming with the Rothschilds, the Cassels and others the nucleus of the Marlborough House set; and sometimes they entertained, on behalf of the British Government, the crowned heads of the East.

Although the Sassoons were on intimate terms with many of the leading British statesmen soon after their arrival, the first to enter politics officially was Sir Edward Albert Sassoon, who was elected a member for the Hythe division of Kent in 1899. Sir Edward had married the lively Aline Rothschild of Paris, and they entertained at their home such people as James Balfour, Margot Asquith, John Sargent, Winston Churchill and H. G. Wells.

In the first World War at least fourteen grandsons and great-grandsons of the original David Sassoon held commissions in the British army. Siegfried Sassoon won fame as a poet decrying the horror and stupidity of war. In 1917 he issued a proclamation: "I believe this war is being deliberately prolonged by those who have the power to end it." After the war he joined forces with Philip Snowden and became for a time literary editor of the *Daily Herald*. The head of the family, Sir Philip Sassoon (Sir Edward's son), on the other hand, rose to become the private secretary of Lord Haig, the commander of the British Army in France, in which capacity he went from time to time to London on missions "which brought him in close touch with men like Lord Northcliffe or with the Prime Minister himself." After the war Sir Philip was appointed Parliamentary secretary to Lloyd George, "whose philo-semitism was such that to be a Jew was in itself a recommendation." He accompanied the Prime Minister to a long series of International Conferences, "receiving an insight into the political game that few others could aspire to." The Reparations Conference of May, 1920, at which Lloyd George and Chamberlain represented Great Britain, and Millerand and

Marasal represented France, was held at Sir Philip's country house situated on the border between Kent and Sussex, "easy of access from London and close to the ports of embarkation for the Continent." Some months later Marshal Foch, General Weygand, Sir Henry Wilson and M. Venizelos were the guests of Sir Philip at another conference.

From 1924 to 1937 Sir Philip Sassoon was Under-Secretary of State for Air in successive governments in the House of Commons. He once summed up his opinion of the representatives of the British people as "The House of Commons with those seven hundred mugs to look at—ugh! worse than any prison."

It is with great regret that Mr. Roth towards the very end of his panegyric history of this 'fabulous' (his favourite adjectives seem to be 'fabulous' and 'legendary') dynasty has to record that Sir Philip allowed himself, in his capacity as Air Ministry Official to be entertained by Hermann Goering whose hands "were defiled with Jewish blood," and, even worse, crossed the Atlantic in a German luxury liner, "entering into superfluous relations with men who would have made life impossible for him had he lived in Germany." While Mr. Roth as a Jew strongly condemns this 'un-Jewish' behaviour, he is anxious that no responsibility for the disastrous policy pursued by the Air Ministry during the years 1924-1937 should be placed on the shoulders of his hero. It was "not his fault, but his misfortune" that his days at the Ministry coincided with a period which has later come in for severe criticisms.

It was on the basis of this air policy that we started to fight in the second Great War. B. J.

"Hitler's Policy . . ."

"From the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, which is the most monstrous forgery of modern times, the bulk of Nazi methods and Nazi policy, domestic and foreign, is derived," declared Dr. Hans Kosmala in a recent speech at Glasgow, reported in the *Glasgow Herald* of September 5.

Dr. Kosmala, who is Polish by birth, is head of an organisation training missionaries for the Jewish field, which was formerly based at Leipzig and Vienna and is now established in London. He has discovered remarkable resemblances between the philosophy of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* which go far to explain the real connection between anti-Semitism and Hitler's New Order.

"We are witnessing to-day," said Dr. Kosmala, "one of the profoundest ironies of world history. It is not the Jews who are striving after world domination, as the Protocols would have us believe, but their Nazi persecutors and accusers.

"They are attempting to foist these spurious documents upon a credulous world. Nazi policy is the literal fulfilment of the Protocols. Every phrase and word of them sounds as if they were taken from Hitler's political text-book *Mein Kampf*."

"There are States in which all Visionary Men are accounted Madmen: such . . . [is] Rome: such is Empire or Tax."—WILLIAM BLAKE.

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

Information about Social Credit activities in different regions may be had by writing to the following addresses:

- BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.
 BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
 BLACKBURN S.C. Association: 168 Shear Brow, Blackburn.
 BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
 LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.
 LONDON Liaison Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.
 MIDLAND D.S.C. Group: see Birmingham.
 NEWCASTLE and Gateshead S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.
 PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: 115 Essex Road, Milton, or 10 Ripley Grove, Copnor.
 SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy	3/6
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Use of Money	6d.
"This 'American' Business"	3d. each 12 for 2/-

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold	4/6
Lower Rates (pamphlet)	3d.
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson	6d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report	6d.
Is Britain Betrayed? by John Mitchell	2d. each 12 for 1/6
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	2d. each 12 for 1/6

(All the above postage extra).

Leaflets

Bomb the German People	100 for 1/9
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell	9d. doz. 50 for 2/6
(The above are post free).	
Taxation is Robbery	100 for 3/- 50 for 1/9
(Postage extra).	

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