

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 8. No. 18.

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

SATURDAY, JULY, 11, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

No, Clarence, we cannot confirm the suggestion that the Directors of the Bank of "England," accompanied by the Band and Choir of the "B".B.C., open their day's activities by singing the Internationale, otherwise known as "The Red Shield, Field, Flag, or what-have-you."

All of the Directors speak English, but some of them cannot sing.

There is a curious passage in Sir Paul Dukes's *Story of ST 25*, a book dealing with the author's experiences as a member of the British Intelligence Service.

On page 357 it is stated, "A Lithuanian minister told me he had asked a Bolshevik leader on what Red Power really rested, and had received the reply: On Jewish brains, Chinese bayonets, and the crass stupidity of the Russian people."

This reference to Chinese bayonets occurs also in some of the Protocols of Zion, although not in the usual Marsden Edition, and seems to link up with the story that there is a very old-established colony of Jews in China, all members of a powerful Masonic institution, and that Chiang Kai-Shek is their military nominee.

Mr. Lloyd George, who was abysmally ignorant of the rudiments of Finance, but Solicitor to the Zionist Federation, was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Liberal Government re-elected 1908. This Government was originally elected on a cry of "Chinese Labour"—perhaps the most extraordinary political "racket" in British history. Once elected, no-one heard any more of "Chinese Labour", and Mr. Lloyd George embarked on a campaign of scurrility which enriched the English language with a new verb—to "Limehouse." Based on this a system of punitive taxation of landholding accelerated the ruin of the British countryside and consolidated the era of mortgagees sucking the life out of "owners" too worried, and too misinformed to realise what was happening to them. The bungalowoid growths, the defertilised soil, in fact, every feature which the Jew-inspired Socialists endeavour to attribute to private ownership, are the direct result of the policy, which, while doubtless prepared long before, was put into top gear by Mr. Lloyd George. It was a childishly simple policy. Land doesn't grow money. We live in a money economy. See that the produce of the land fetches the minimum quantity of money, by bringing in Foreign produce and take, by taxation, all, and more than all, that it does fetch. Always be ready to lend money on mortgage. You can rely on the landowner to ruin himself by playing your game.

It is an odd coincidence that the final (?) chapter was inaugurated by an election cry of "Chinese Labour."

It is gradually leaking out that, as widely suspected, we are being sacrificed to "American" armament manufacturers exactly as was the case in the 1914-1918 phase of the war.

It appears that the only tank in Libya in any numbers which had a gun capable of dealing with the German tanks was the American "General Grant" with a 75 MM gun.

Our own big tanks have been sent to Russia. As Lord Beaverbrook so charmingly put it, "The British public would be shocked if it knew how many had been sent."

The gun on the "General Grant" tank cannot be traversed, and is aimed by aiming the tank, just as the fixed guns on a Fighter Aircraft are aimed. It is utterly impossible to bring the gun to bear, accurately, in the time available in a moving tank battle and a hit, except by accident, is unlikely.

In publishing a letter commenting on this situation, *The Times*, a London daily news-sheet owned by the American-Dutch-Judeo-Christian family of Astor, heads it, in large type, "Tanks and Guns. German and *British* Design." (Our emphasis).

Mr. Austin Hopkinson, M.P. (Independent) has introduced into recent speeches in the House a note of honesty which, slightly to mix the metaphor, shines like a good deed in a naughty world. In all seriousness, his attacks on Lord Beaverbrook, his contempt for the cant that the pampered Trades Unionist is a radiant angel of self sacrifice and that the present colossal bureaucratic mess is a marvel of "efficiency," provide the first gleam of light in political circles that has appeared for many years.

We are told that Mr. Hopkinson is an anti-Social Crediter. We should worry.

Lady Waterhouse, in a clever life of her husband, Sir Ronald Waterhouse (*Private and Official*) explains Mr. Bonar Law's toleration of Lord Beaverbrook (Sir Max Aitken) by remarking that Bonar Law had an admiration for success quite irrespective of the means by which it was achieved. Could anything be more delicately put?

Incidentally, the book in question is a monument of omission, while remaining interesting. Few people could explode more political dynamite, and no book has less.

"Gwilym Lloyd-George's Waste Watchers look awfu' like near relations of the Snoopers. Just more useless

irritation. Who wants to waste fuel at present prices? Whipping the willing horse is bad at any time."

—Dundee Courier and Advertiser.

Or, as we say in the South, a little more Ogpu-Gestapo-G-men-experienced-official-from Scotland Yard is one more step to the heaven of the New-Order-for-Heroes-to-live-in.

Truth has 'timeously,' as they still say up in Scotland, unearthed an article in the *New Leader* for January 31 last, in which Alfred Norris published his excellent invention 'Cashintern' to denote the Comintern's financial allies. He suggested that the Cashintern might organise the Czarists into a People's Convention, and carry our propaganda into Russia, telling the Russian people to "open up a second front in the East," "Help our gallant British allies," "Wavell must be sustained," etc. Stalin should not mind the Cashintern setting up a party in Russia now that he is fighting for democracy. All we know about the Independent Labour Party is what is self-evident, namely that it is not under the same kind of control as the Great Free and Independent Parties. It is kept short of money; but not short of erroneous ideas. Not that "Nicaragua and Company" is an erroneous idea by any means. Why, by the bye, did "Russia" sell its shares in the North China Railways to "Japan"? Couldn't they have been lease-lent?

"After the next armistice, Schacht is being scheduled to make a bee-line for New York to plead the cause of the Reich through every personal contact he has."—PIERRE HUSS, 'former special correspondent in Berlin,' in the *Sunday Express*.

Hm! P'raps.

The Marquess of Donegall would shoot ten bureaucrats "(with an occasional politician thrown in)" for every mile of British retreat anywhere in the world. Well, of course that's up to him; but after all the Mississippi-Missouri is only 4,060 miles long. Eleven times 4,060 is 44,660. And then what?

Dr. R. Downey, Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool, said in Liverpool recently that the principal purpose of any family allowances scheme was to attempt to offset the weaknesses and evils of the current wages mechanism.

He regretted the evils were not attacked at the roots. That the State should help in cases of necessity was in pursuance of a good social principle, but the attractions of "something for nothing" created a bad social mentality.

A correspondent suggests that booksellers in the Farringdon Road have a standing order from Jewish interests to give the latter the first option on all books touching the Jewish question that fall into their hands.

The provincial treasury department announced recently that Alberta government stock registered in London and held principally by people residing in England totalled \$17,223,556.

The author of the article *Who is the Promoter?* in

*The Social Crediter* of June 27 is Mr. D. W. Cox. We regret that his name was erroneously given as E. Cox.

THE IDEA AND THE WORD

"Whenever you hear much of things being unutterable and indefinable and impalpable and unnamable and subtly indescribable, then elevate your aristocratic nose towards heaven and snuff up the smell of decay. It is perfectly true that there is something in all good things that is beyond all speech or figure of speech. But it is also true that there is in all good things a perpetual desire for expression and concrete embodiment; and though the attempt to embody it is always inadequate, the attempt is always made. If the idea does not seek to be the word, the chances are that it is an evil idea. If the word is not made flesh it is a bad word."

—G. K. CHESTERTON in *A Miscellany of Man*.

"All jobs ought to be interesting. But they aren't, and nothing could make them, under the present conditions. Part of the interest of any job is its function, but if its function is perverted, as the proper function of all jobs is perverted, then the interest is perverted too. And unless you develop the same perverted interest, the job will kill you—or oust you."

—RANDALL SWINGLER.

THE CONFORMING COUNCIL

From *The Times*:—

"...An official list of members of the [Youth Advisory] council was issued later as follows:—

".....; Mr....., Schoolmaster,..... (conformation awaited) ....."

"More Dangerous than the Black Death"

*The substance of an article by SPITFIRE in "Today and Tomorrow" of June 11.*

The first of a series of feature articles by Bruce Hutchinson received great prominence in the press a few days ago. Bruce Hutchinson is described as "Political Writer of the *Vancouver Sun*"—not a very creditable title in these days of slimy politics...

If you have not read this remarkable article, here is how it starts:

"Washington, D.C., June 1.—The thing we call the world revolution comes to focus here in Washington. From here the largest productive machine ever built by men is being painfully converted from peace to war. Here a new way of life is being shaped for the American people. Here a new system of society, its shape still unknown, is being erected almost overnight. Here a new international order is being planned. Here the United States is finally making up its mind to underwrite the post-war world.

"Of all the great revolutions in human history this is the largest in its ultimate effect on the whole human family. Yet a stranger would never suspect from the outside look

of Washington what is under way."

Evidently Mr. Hutchinson is no stranger there. He must have been led into those inner sanctums where the "new *international* order is being *planned*". . . .

"World revolution"—where have we heard those words before? Ah! yes, of course—that is what the Third Internationale, world H. Q. of Communism, has been promising us for the past twenty years. And now we are told that it "comes to focus" in Washington.

In fact, Washington, according to our inimitable Mr. Hutchinson, is an altogether remarkable place. From there, he tells us, "the largest productive machine ever built by men is being painfully converted from peace to war." Presumably the rest of the U.S.A. is doing nothing about it—it's all being done in Washington. . . .

Now, isn't that interesting? While the American people are engaged in war "to preserve their way of life," a bunch of bureaucrats in Washington is shaping "a new way of life" for them.

Well, there are just two "ways of life" in the sense of a social system. The totalitarian, based upon the Supreme State and the subjection of individuals to its dictates; and the democratic way of life, based on the inalienable right of man to 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.'

The way of life for which the American and British people are fighting is the latter—but some anonymous authority, vaguely termed "Washington," is preparing a new way of life for Americans. And the people do not even know the kind of new society which is being shaped for them, so we are told.

This can mean only that whatever is in store for the people is going to be imposed upon them *from the top*. The only kind of social system which is imposed from the top is dictatorship.

"Anyway, what's that got to do with us in Canada?" you may ask at this point.

A whole lot, if our own Canadian mouthpiece of all this propaganda is to be believed. He goes on to say that in Washington "a new *international* order is being planned" and "the United States is finally making up its mind to underwrite the post-war world."

The implication of that statement is that the American people have ceased to be of any consequence. The mind of the United States is now located in Washington and whatever is decided there represents the mind of the United States.

This Washington mind is planning a new world order. The people of Canada have not been consulted, neither have the peoples of Britain, Australia, France, Denmark, Norway, Brazil, New Zealand, or any other country. So this new international order is not going to be what the people want. It's going to be what a bunch of planners—bureaucrats—think will be good for the world.

And presumably by "under-writing the post-war world" is meant that they will "boss" it. . . .

The only kind of "international order" which can be "planned" by some anonymous group of men behind closed doors in Washington, London, Moscow or anywhere else, to be imposed on a war-exhausted world, must, by the very manner in which it is conceived, be a dictatorship—and the chances are that in its final form it would be indistinguish-

able from the hideous tyranny involved in the Federal Union proposals of Messrs. Streit, Warburg, & Co. or the "New Order for Europe" of Hitler, Goering & Co., which are fundamentally similar in pattern.

At least Bruce Hutchinson has performed an invaluable service to the people. He has warned them frankly what kind of "devil's brew" is being concocted for them as a reward for victory over the forces of totalitarianism.

But he goes further. In a few vivid words he describes the surroundings in which these supermen are planning the future of mankind:

"This probably is the most luxurious town in the world—every public dining room filled at fabulous prices, every bar flowing with torrents of liquor, every street packed, every taxi cab crammed, every store doing more business than ever before, everyone with money in his pocket."

But that is not the pattern of "the new way of life" being prepared for the American *people*. . . .

The article proceeds:

"No wonder that the thoughtless man cannot see through this weird facade to the stark shape of America behind it, the shape of a nation headed for poverty, the danger of economic disaster just a short way off, the awful crisis of a war which can be lost before the leaves fall again."

. . . . The rest of the article deals with the tough time coming for the American people during the war, the dangers they have to face and the apparent lack of a realisation of these. However, compared to the dangers of what they may have to meet *after* the war, if these planners have their way, it will be child's play. . . .

The American people are basically sound—and thank God that they are; otherwise it would be a grim outlook for this continent.

Is it not curious that the "planners" and, of far greater importance, the super-planners behind the planners, seem to think that they can manage the affairs of the whole world, when they made such a ghastly mess of the pre-war U.S.A.? It seems to be a characteristic of aspiring dictators that even though they are incapable of organising their own household, they are quite prepared—in fact determined—to organise the whole world.

Men of that mentality, when they get power, are more dangerous to humanity than a universal epidemic of The Black Death.

#### FOOTNOTES TO FOUR FREEDOMS

"Freedom of Speech"; well, even slaves may chatter. So long as they're unarmed it doesn't matter.

"Religious Freedom"; well, what are the odds? So long as Mammon heads the list of Gods!

"Freedom from Want"; no breeder would deprive Good cattle of the means to keep alive.

"Freedom from Fear": a counsel of perfection? Not if there's always ample police protection.

Freedom to act, to choose or to refuse?  
Ah that's a very "different pair of shoes!"

— EXCALIBUR.

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,  
LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 8. No. 18.

Saturday, July 11, 1942.

### "Anti-Semitism and Treachery"

There is, in Jewish argument, a distinctive idiom, easy to describe, but more important to learn to identify. This reflection comes to mind on reading the retorts which have been appearing in the *Jewish Chronicle* to Mr. Collin Brooks who lately wrote so soundly about the Jews in *Truth*. The issue of the *Jewish Chronicle* for July 3 contains, on the leader page, a paragraph headed with the title, "Anti-Semitism and Treachery," of the article in the *New Statesman* which drew Mr. Brooks's very penetrating fire. The paragraph began with mention of a "small-scale invasion of America by a band of German saboteurs," and said "There is thus uncovered another confirmation of the direct connection that exists between anti-Jewish activities and anti-State conspiracy, between anti-Semitism and treachery." Every pro-Nazi, says the newspaper, is anti-Jew. One has to turn to a much later page in the still voluminous *Jewish Chronicle* to find, in small type, an editorial answer to a letter from Mr. Collin Brooks. In the words of the Jewish editor, Mr. Brooks "should have observed that no one ever went so far as to say that every anti-Semite is a traitor—so that there was, and is, no possible ground for him to feel that the revelation was in any way aimed at him or his sympathisers." The 'revelation' here mentioned is that of the 'large proportion of traitors who have been anti-Semites.' It is not here intended to convey the impression that the German Nazis are traitors to the Jews; although it can hardly be contended that Fascist 'Jew-baiters' outside of Germany are comparable in number to the Germans themselves.

The words of the *Jewish Chronicle* should be noted for they are an explicit repudiation of the only card they play, whether it was dealt them from the pack or not.

T. J.

By a question in the House of Commons recently Captain Crowder elicited the fact that the total number of non-industrial civil servants in this country had risen from 443,000 at the outbreak of war to 696,669 on April 1, 1942, an increase of about 58 per cent. In addition the staffs of new Government Departments established since the war amount to more than 82,442 made up of 13,611 in the Ministry of Transport; 1,320 in the Ministry of Economic Warfare; 35,811 in the Ministry of Food; 13,488 in the Ministry of Information; 1,638 in the War Damage Commission; 13,784 in the Ministry of Aircraft Production;

335 in the Office of the Minister of Production; and others in the new Ministry of Fuel and Power. It was pointed out that some of these Departments are carrying out duties which were performed by pre-war Departments so that the numbers given include some staff transferred.

Allowing 29,111 from the total of 779,111 to cover duplicated numbers, 750,000 people out of 45 million in this country are civil servants. That is to say one person in every 60 is a potential bureaucrat.

### CORRESPONDENCE

#### Pope Benedict XIV and the Jews

Sir,

There are many historical precedents which prove that we have to be on our guard against the Jews, that unique and ubiquitous tribe. The Popes, while striving to protect the Jews from physical violence and to secure respect for them as human persons, have always aimed at protecting Christians from Jewish philosophy (Naturalism) and try to prevent Jews from obtaining control over Christians. Pope Benedict XIV, in the encyclical letter *A Quo Primum* (1751) addressed to the Polish Hierarchy, wrote as follows:

"In this matter as in all others we follow the same rule of conduct as our Venerable Predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs. Alexander III forbade Christians under severe penalties to become domestic servants in Jewish households. 'They ought not', he wrote, 'to serve Jews for pay in permanent fashion.' Explaining the prohibition, he says 'Jewish customs and ours are in complete opposition and, on account of their superstition and perfidy, they will easily pervert the minds of the simple and the ignorant who will be thus living amongst them continuously and familiarly.' Pope Innocent III, after having stated that the Jews were being admitted into their towns, warned them that the method and conditions governing such admission should be such as not to allow the Jews to return evil for good. 'When they are thus admitted out of pity into familiar intercourse with Christians, they show their gratitude to their hosts in their customary fashion. The popular saying has it that they return thanks like the rat in the sack and the serpent cherished in one's bosom. . . .' In like manner in the Decretal *Cum sit nimis* he forbade the giving of public appointments to Jews 'because they profit by this by showing themselves bitterly hostile to Christians.'" (Extracted from *The Rulers of Russia* by Fr. DENIS FAHEY.)

The principle of individual responsibility must be applied all round, to our enemies as well as ourselves. We cannot fight against a system. We are fighting against individuals. Major Douglas, in *The Big Idea*, concludes by advising us to mind our own business, but he qualifies this by saying, "allow no man to make a business of minding you."

Where are the Jewish farmers, engineers, and manufacturers? Why do they gravitate to the more fluid undertakings, finance, entertainment, fashions, distribution, journalism, law, medicine, etc.? Is it because the magic of social hydraulics enables them to move objects at a distance with small effort and remain unrecognised?

Yours etc.,

P.L.

Cardiff, June, 1942.

## THE DEBATE ON THE CENTRAL DIRECTION OF THE WAR

While many points of interest have been omitted from the press reports of the two days' debate on the Central Direction of the war, which took place in the Houses of Parliament on July 1 and 2, the ground has been covered more faithfully and fully than on any previous occasion during the past few years. The official report occupies 332 columns in *Hansard*, and the speeches, wearisomely, but apparently unconsciously, repetitive, tell the same story, which may be justly summed up in the words, brief as they are, chosen from the speech of Mr. Price (Forest of Dean):—

"During the week-end, I took care to consult my constituents and talked to the average man whom I came across, and the general feeling was a mixture of anger and alarm. The public is talking as our allies are talking, and it is a grave disservice to maintain an artificial agreement when none really exists. Therefore, I feel that a Debate like this, even if I do not go into the Division Lobby against the Government, is essential to clear the air. The workers in some of the factories are saying, 'What is the use of our producing guns and tanks if they are not any use?' Young men in my constituency are being killed and wounded, not because they are not braver than the Germans, but because they have not the right instruments to use against them. I should be false to my position in this House if I did not feel extremely strongly on this matter."

A detailed analysis of the first fifteen speakers shows that there was not one of them who did not recognise that "something was wrong," and only three, of whom one was a Minister, attributed what was wrong chiefly to circumstances antedating the present Prime Ministership. Over and over again the motive for abstention or a vote against Sir John Wardlaw-Milne's motion of no confidence in the central direction of the war was expressed as fear of the effect such a vote would have, in Germany, or in America, or in the field. They "must not wreck the boat." Eight out of the first fifteen members to speak alleged that the House of Commons was either uninformed or misled on material issues; nine that unsuitable weapons were responsible for difficulties in the field; ten that 'incoordination' in one form or another (not merely 'not enough planning') was dangerously prevalent; five complained that criticism of the administration was regarded as an offence; but only three criticised the services; while four expressly stated their belief that the fault did not lie with the fighting services. For the civil service, there was no praise: "files, minutes, forms to be rendered in quadruplicate and sometimes in sextuplicate, returns, A.C.I.'s, A.M.O.'s—one after the other papers descend," an "avalanche of paper."

Passages of peculiar interest, unreported in the newspapers, so far as we know, were Earl Winterton's enigmatic statement concerning a 'preponderating' reason. He said:—

"I would like to say quite frankly that I agree that the Government of 1935, of which I was a member, along with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the right hon. Gentleman who is immediately opposite me, and many other people in the House, must be condemned for its failure to provide equipment which, in the result, has proved to be necessary. At some future date when it would be right to do so under the Official Secrets Act, I shall seek per-

mission from the Prime Minister of that day to disclose a fact in connection with the armaments policy of Mr. Chamberlain's Government which will show what the real reason was—it is not the reason given by the critics—for the slowness in the production of armaments. I cannot give that reason now because of the Official Secrets Act, but I am entitled to refer to it, and it is of historical importance and interest. I am perfectly entitled to say, in reply to an attack made upon that Government, that if anyone knew all the facts he would know that there was one preponderating reason which was responsible.

"Let me say one other thing about this first phase. The hon. and gallant Gentleman who has just spoken failed to mention in his criticism of the Chamberlain Government one thing which cannot be brought out too often in Debate. That Government—and I think the Chancellor of the Exchequer would agree with me, as would anyone who held office in it—handicapped as it was by the considerations to which I have referred—and perhaps I might say, in parenthesis, is it not really ridiculous at this time of day that anybody should get up and say that all the blame rests with the Government before the war? . . ."

"My hon. and gallant Friend is perfectly entitled to say that the Government must bear the greater blame, but he is not entitled to say what he did say, all through his speech, namely, What is the use of attacking the present Government when all that has happened and all the defeats which we have suffered are the result of what went on two years ago? They are not. They are very largely the result of what this Government and of what this Prime Minister have done; not entirely, but very largely, and that is why I find myself once again in a difficulty. If I vote for this Motion, I unequivocally condemn this Government for something for which they are not wholly responsible, and if I support the Government, I give them *carte blanche* and say that they are the most wonderful Government in the world."

Later in the debate, Wing-Commander James said Sir John Wardlaw-Milne "might have referred to the pernicious damaging and crooked dealings of Lord Beaverbrook. I do not know how far I am allowed to go in that respect. I will only say that there are times when it is very difficult to believe that Lord Beaverbrook is not a deliberate Fifth Columnist. I was very glad when an hon. Member referred to the procedure of impeachment. It is a legal procedure which has only fallen into disuse by this House since 1805, but has been used as recently as 1868 in America—a proceeding particularly appropriate to Lord Beaverbrook. Another criticism he might have made relates to the activities of Professor Lindeman. If the Prime Minister's estimate of Lord Charnwood is correct, the opinion of every scientist and industrial or business man I have ever met is wrong, and thus there is a strong *prima facie* case that the Prime Minister is not right in this respect."

On the second day, the curious rapprochement of Lieut.-Colonel Elliott and the member for Ebbw Vale (Mr. A. Bevan) attracts attention: "I rejoice in having been able to ring my lance against his shield and in being able to say, 'Here is an adversary against whom anyone will be proud to tilt in the House of Commons.'"

When Mr. Lyttelton sat down, and even he admitted that there had "been delays, which are by no means all the fault of the United States, in the production of this par-

tical machine," Mr. Clement Davies asked: "Should I be in order, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in moving that this House do not proceed further with this Debate, in view of the terrible disclosures that have been made about the position, and that we should proceed at once to consider the impeachment of the persons responsible for this state of affairs?" The Deputy-Speaker was sure that such a motion would not be accepted by the Chair at that point. When Mr. Davies came to speak, he did not disclose any deeper understanding of the ground for impeachment than that the Government lived "in an atmosphere of romance" which they themselves had created.

Mr. Churchill started his speech by deploring the criticism which had undermined confidence in him, and asked that the story should not end there.

He then reviewed the course of the offensive campaign in Libya eight months ago and showed that, contrary to Mr. Hore-Belisha's statements, this offensive was not a failure, and that our Army had taken 40,000 prisoners and had driven the enemy back 400 miles. The military misfortunes of the last fortnight in Cyrenaica completely transformed the situation throughout the Mediterranean. We had lost 50,000 men, and large quantities of stores. Rommel had advanced nearly 400 miles and was now approaching the Nile valley.

Mr. Churchill then discussed the fall of Tobruk, which occurred in a single day with the loss of 25,000 men. It was unexpected by General Auchinleck and the High Command of the Middle East, but the question as to whether or not it should have been held was disputable and could only be decided by those on the spot with a full knowledge of the enemy's approaching reinforcements. The decision to hold Tobruk and the disposition made for that purpose was taken by General Auchinleck beforehand, but the War Cabinet and its advisers had thoroughly agreed with him, and was ready to take responsibility. The Prime Minister went on:—

"The Hon. Member for Kidderminster asks where the order for the capitulation of Tobruk came from. Did it come from the battlefield or from Cairo, or from London, or from Washington?"

"What a strange world of thought he must live in if he imagines that I sent from Washington the order to the capitulation of Tobruk. The decision was taken to the best of my knowledge, by the commander of the fortress, and certainly it was most unexpected to the Higher Command in the Middle East."

Mr. Churchill next referred to complaint that the newspapers had been full of information of "a very rosy character," and described the reasons for the buoyant spirit of the newspaper correspondents, adding that the generals who were conducting battles had other preoccupations. He said:—

"Although we have always asked that they should keep us informed as much as possible, our policy has been not to worry them, but to leave them alone to do their job. Now and then I send a message of encouragement; sometimes a query or suggestion, but it is absolutely impossible to fight battles at Westminster and Whitehall. The less one interferes the better."

Describing the effect in the United States of accounts of the feeling in Britain Mr. Churchill pointed out that the criticisms made by minorities in parliament, smoking room

gossip and Fleet Street talk were worked up into serious articles seeming to represent that the whole basis of British political life was tottering.

As his mission to America had to do with military movements and movements of military supplies he did not propose to add anything to the statement already made on the subject by himself and President Roosevelt.

With reference to the shipbuilding situation he said that the United States was building now about four times the tonnage that we are building, and in 1943 will build between eight and ten times as much. The ship building programme, with the measures taken for the protection of shipping, would ensure a substantial gain in tonnage at the end of 1943.

Turning to the Libya battle Mr. Churchill said that one of the most painful parts in this battle has been that in its opening stages we had been defeated under conditions which gave good and reasonable expectation of success. The sustained air attack on Malta had been successfully warded off; but reinforcements for Rommel had got through. We had had equality of armaments and numerical superiority of tanks, but on June 13, 130 out of the 200 tanks in action had been lost, and Rommel's consequent superiority in tanks had allowed him to advance. Mr. Churchill mentioned that reinforcements were reaching the British army and added, "After the lecture I have been read by Mr. Hore-Belisha, it is perhaps wrong of me to say that we will hold Egypt, but I will go so far as to say that we do not regard the struggle as in any way decided." He said that in the last two years we had sent out from this country, the Empire and to a lesser extent the United States 950,000 men, 4,500 tanks, 6,000 aircraft, 5,000 (nearly) pieces of artillery, 50,000 machine guns, and 100,000 (over) mechanical vehicles.

Next Mr. Churchill dealt with the question of the quality of our armaments, pointing out that until last year the threat of invasion had been so imminent that there had been no time to make improvements at the expense of supplies or to follow the proper procedure in design of making first models and then experimental test tanks: tanks had gone straight into mass production from the designers' drawing boards, with the result that they had had grievous defects, the correction of which had caused delay. Nevertheless more than 2,000 tanks had been sent to Russia, some of which were later, better models.

While he regretted that dive-bombers were not yet available in any numbers, Mr. Churchill believed that we should not have been justified ourselves in giving up other armaments which could not have been made simultaneously with the resources at our disposal. A series of accidents had delayed those ordered from the United States.

He had urged General Auchinleck to take over the command of the battle personally, but had accepted his decision to leave General Ritchie in charge, until on June 25 General Auchinleck had himself taken over. Mr. Churchill went on:—

"We at once approved his decision, but I must frankly confess that the matter was not one in which we could form any final judgment ourselves so far as the superseded officer was concerned. I cannot pretend to form a judgment upon what has happened in this battle.

"I like commanders on land, on sea, and in the air, to feel that between them and all forms of public criticism the

Government stands like a bulkhead. They ought to have a fair chance, and more than one chance.

"Men make mistakes and learn from their mistakes. Men may have bad luck and their luck may change. We will not get generals to run risks unless they feel they have behind them a strong Government."

The Government had complete confidence in General Auchinleck.

Referring to the Japanese attack, and to Hitler's activities in Russia, he thought the war would be a long one. The prospect was now much better for the United Nations, although there was no reason to suppose that it would stop when the final result had become obvious.

He described the garrisoning of Australia by Australian and United States Troops, and the establishment in India of a larger army than had ever been there before in the history of the British connection. The situation in the Pacific had been eased by the destruction of aircraft and their carriers by the United States Forces.

Mr. Churchill drew his speech to a close by reviewing the situation in Parliament:—

"I now wish to speak to the House words of great truth and respect—as the diplomatic documents say—and I hope I may be granted the fullest liberty of debate.

"This Parliament has peculiar responsibility. It presided over the beginning of all the evils that have come upon the world. I owe much to the House, and it is my hope that it may see the end of them in triumph. This it will only do if, in the long period which may yet have to be travelled, it affords a solid foundation to the responsible executive Government placed in power by its own choice.

"The House must be a steady and stabilising factor in the State, and not an instrument by which the disaffected sections of the Press can attempt to provoke one crisis after another.

"If democracy and Parliamentary institutions are to triumph in this war, it is absolutely necessary that governments resting upon them shall be able to act and dare, that the servants of the Crown and Parliament shall not be harassed by the nagging and snarling of disappointed men, that enemy propaganda shall not be fed needlessly out of our own hands, and our own reputation disparaged and undermined throughout the world; that, on the contrary, the will of the whole House shall be made manifest upon important occasions, that not only those who speak but those who watch and listen and judge shall also count as a factor in world affairs. . . .

"Sober and constructive criticism or criticism in secret session has its place. But the duty of the House of Commons is to sustain that Government or to change the Government. If it cannot change, it should sustain. There is no middle course in war-time.

"Much harm was done abroad by the two-days' debate in May. Only the hostile speeches are reported abroad, and much play is made of them by enemy propaganda.

"A division, or the opportunity of a division should always follow a debate. I trust, therefore, that the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the House will be made plain, not only in the division, but also in the days which follow, and that the weaker brethren will not be allowed to usurp and almost monopolise the proud authority of the

House of Commons.

"The majority of the House must do its duty. I ask no favours for myself or for His Majesty's Government. All I ask is a decision one way or another.

"There is an agitation in the Press, which has found its echo in a number of hostile speeches, to deprive me of the function which I exercise in the general conduct and supervision of the war. I do not propose to argue this myself in detail, because it was much discussed in a recent debate.

"Under the present arrangement the three Chiefs of Staff, sitting almost continually together, carry on the war from day to day, assisted not only by the machinery of the great Departments which serve them, but by the combined General Staff, making their decisions effective, through the Navy, Army and Air Force, over which they exercise operational control.

"I supervise their activities, whether as Prime Minister or as Minister of Defence. I work myself under the supervision and control of the War Cabinet, to whom all important matters are referred, and whom I have to carry with me in all major decisions.

"Nearly all my work has been done in writing and a complete record exists of all the directions I have given, the inquiries I have made, and telegrams I have drafted. I shall be perfectly content to be judged by them.

"I undertook the office of Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, after defending my predecessor to the best of my ability, in times when the life of the British Empire hung upon a thread.

"I am your servant, and you have a right to dismiss me when you please. What you have no right to do is to ask me to bear responsibilities without the power of effective action.

"If, to-day, or at any future time, the House were to exercise its undoubted right, there is only one thing I would ask them, that would be to give to my successor the modest powers which would have been denied to me.

"But there is a larger issue than the personal issue.

"The mover of the vote of censure has proposed that I be stripped of my responsibilities for defence in order that some military figure or other unnamed personage should assume the general conduct of the war, that he should have complete control of the armed forces of the Crown, that he should be the chief of the Chiefs of Staff; that he should nominate or dismiss the generals or the admirals, that he should always be ready to resign—that is to say to match himself against his political colleagues if he did not get all he wanted: and that he should have under him a Royal Duke as Commander-in-Chief of the Army, and, finally, I presume, though this was not mentioned, that he should find an appendage in a Prime Minister to make the necessary explanations, excuses, and apologies to Parliament when things go wrong, as they often do and often will.

"This is, at any rate, a policy. It is a system very different from the Parliamentary system under which we have lived. It might easily amount to, or be converted into, a dictatorship.

"I wish to make it perfectly clear that, so far as I am concerned, I should take no part in such a system."

Sir John Wardlaw-Milne interrupted here to say:

"The Prime Minister has forgotten the original sentence. 'Subject to the War Cabinet.'"

Mr. Churchill: "'Subject to the War Cabinet,' against which this baffling potentate is not to hesitate to resign on every possible occasion. It is not a plan I could take part in, and not one which would commend itself to this House."

## Points from Parliament

JUNE 27.

### Oral Answers to Questions

#### SUPPLY: COMMITTEE—COLONIAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Pickthorn (Cambridge University): ... I ventured upon the indulgence of the Committee merely to ask those questions. I hope I may be forgiven if I say one other thing. I am sorry that the hon. Member for Bridgeton (Mr. Maxton) is no longer here, but something he said ought, in my judgement, to find some rejoinder from this side of the Committee. He talked about the war ending the territorial lines that were in lawful existence at the beginning of the war, and he even seemed to assume that the United States Government or the Russian Government, or any other entity which has been on our side in the war, would have some right at the end to decide which portions of the Colonial Empire were to continue to be *de jure* under the British Crown and which not. My right hon. Friend who opened the Debate, by implication, repudiated any such suggestion, but I think that this ought to be repudiated in much stronger terms and much more clearly than has yet been done. If I may say so without arrogance or impertinence, it ought to be done also in other places than this House and by persons of greater importance than my right hon. Friend the Under-Secretary and even than his Noble Friend. It ought to be made clear by the most important persons in the Government.

We have on the whole nothing to be ashamed of in the history of the British Empire and there has been a great deal of the most offensive rejoicings, almost, at the misfortunes which that Empire is now suffering, from a good many quarters. There has been a great deal of excessive defending of what needs no defence, but there is one thing for which no Government can be excused. The Government which fails to protect territories and populations for which it is responsible and which, having failed, sits down under that failure in any particular area and does not do everything at whatever cost, over whatever time and space, to see that that failure is reversed and repaired, can have no right to survive, and will have very little prospect of surviving. The time is long overdue to make it clear that we are conscious of our sins in that respect, that we are profoundly penitent for our failures to defend these territories and populations, and that we are absolutely determined to see that what this generation can do shall be done to ensure that such defects and deficiencies as those from which these territories have suffered shall not be a risk which any of them shall run again.

"'Sentimental' is our word for the nice ideas of other people. 'Realistic' is the word we use to hide our brutalities from ourselves."

## 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 .....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Use of Money .....	6d.
"This 'American' Business" .....	3d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.

### Also

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold .....	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson .....	6d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report .....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne .....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance .....	2d.

### Leaflets

The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell .....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
Taxation is Robbery .....	50 for 1/9; 100 for 3/-

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

## SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* is in the course of formation. It will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon the subject, as well as standard works on banking, currency and social science.

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

For further particulars apply Librarian, 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

## 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., 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.  
 BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 73 Manor Rd., Blackpool.  
 BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.  
 BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.  
 CARDIFF S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 8, Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.  
 DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.  
 LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.  
 LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.  
 Lunch hour re-unions on the first and third Thursdays of the month at 12-30 p.m., at The Plane Tree Restaurant, Great Russell Street, W. C. 1. Next Meeting July 16.  
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE D. S. C. Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.  
 SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.