

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol 10. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 14, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

Programme For The Third World War (XIX)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

In a popular Sunday newspaper Lord Vansittart refers to "the dupes of those Leftist pan-Germans, operating under cover of anti-Nazism" in the following words, printed in block capitals, with underlining, in the original:

"This has always been a phoney war, and we may get a phoney peace, unless at long last, these people are put, and kept in their place."

—*Sunday Dispatch*, August 1, 1943.

I might, perhaps, be allowed to add to the fairly modern adjective "phoney," one still newer, "microphoney."

Lord Vansittart was Chief Diplomatic Adviser to the Foreign Office. I draw a very sharp distinction between the highly-trained official, of which class he is a representative, and the infesting bureaucracy which crept in under the prestige of a totally different organisation designed for special objectives outside the routine of the business man. And I consider the paragraph I have quoted, in the light of the training and experience of its author, to be deserving of very serious attention. It is certain that it is made on the basis of exact knowledge, and I trust that the knowledge will be made available at such a time and place as will insure that it will be the basis of action.

But the general truth of it leaps to the eye. What adjective would you apply to a "British" broadcasting organisation from which, almost any night at 5.59 p.m. you may hear an unctuous voice murmur, "Good night, children; —everywhah" and at 6.01 p.m. a hearty fellow tell you, "Our bombers were out over Germany last night"? (And a good thing, too.) What adjective would you apply to a situation in which "statesmen" mouth clichés about a war for freedom, while men who fought in the first round of that alleged fight are imprisoned, without trial, without a formulated charge, and without hope of release? Or to a world in which forty million individuals, 99 per cent. of whom only wish to be allowed to mind their own business, are killing and wounding each other for some undisclosed objective known only to half a dozen men who don't agree on it themselves?

Lord Vansittart plants his indictment on too narrow a base. It is a phoney world, and a phoney war and a phoney peace are part of it.

Supposing I were to say to you, "I am organising a cricket club. You are all cricket enthusiasts, so I feel sure that you will join my club, and will deposit all your title deeds, stocks and shares, and other valuables with the secretary as a guarantee that you will obey my orders,"—you would probably remark that, under the circumstances, you

think you'll play golf.

But suppose you had been brought up from birth to believe that you *must* play cricket, and you must join my club, and that, of course, placing all your eggs in my basket was only a formality. And supposing that, when you were all neatly registered, I were to say, "This organisation, which we humorously call a cricket club, is really planned for plainer living, higher thinking, and more painful dying, and you can't resign,"—you would complain, wouldn't you? To which the answer is, "No, you wouldn't," because you in fact, don't. Most of you merely say that more people must join the club—"full employment."

In the face of a worsening world situation of which the foregoing little parable is not an unfair picture, it is still possible to speak of Labour as a "class" without more than one person in a million observing that the claim of "Labour" to be a class is just elementary lack of education. Labour is a function, not a class, and a Labour Government is government by function. We hear a good deal about rooting out Fascism, largely from the "Left" which agitates for "Labour." Again, not one in a million could define Fascism, which is rule by function—the corporative state. The hand ruling the brain. But not really, you know. A gang of crooks ruling everyone. A few Labour bosses, and a majority of Finance bosses.

If this business of the relation of function to policy were really difficult to understand, then it would be possible to believe that the native intelligence quota is so low that no blame attaches to anyone for its mishandling. But the native intelligence quota is not low and the general principle is quite easy to understand. Opinion is consciously misdirected by the agents of interests which know exactly what they are doing. Precisely, they are straining every agency of misdirection to lead the common man into a trap from which there is no escape.

At the present time there is hardly a Trades Union leader who is not telling his bemused constituents that he is going to make a new world in which "labour" is the only voice which matters. There is only one state of the world in which "labour" can even remotely claim to represent humanity, and that is—"in war, or under threat of war." In any sane civilisation "labour" has never been of so little importance, by reason of its displacement by power. And, if there is any sanity after this war, its importance will be less. The Trades Union constitution-makers are the worst enemies of their audience—if their audience pays any attention to what they say.

To any thoughtful Englishman (*pace* the Scot and Welshman) one of the more serious aspects of false propaganda is that it must inevitably recoil on the British people. It is most desirable that there should be a working agreement

with America, but we are going the worst possible way to obtain one. This fact is recognised in rather unlikely quarters. The *New York Times* of May 9, 1943 commenting on the egregious film *Mission to Moscow*, remarks, "The whole effort is to represent Soviet dictatorship as advanced democracy. This film is anti-British, anti-Congress, anti-democratic, and anti-truth..."

According to the Communist *Daily Worker* (U.S.A.), Messrs. Warner Brothers, the Jew film monopoly, are spending half a million dollars to advertise *Mission to Moscow*—nearly twice as much as was ever previously spent on advertising one film.

Almost contemporaneously (April, 1943) a widely read periodical *America Preferred* published an article *Do we win or lose the War?* In the course of this article the author remarks, "The American people are not committed to an amalgamation with the British Empire, and they will not tolerate any conspiracy to accomplish such amalgamation, once they realise fully what is intended. The American people have never voted to socialise or communise the United States, and there is no reasonable ground for believing that they ever will do so... The international bankers recognise that internationalism stems from collectivism, just as economic nationalism stems from individualism, but the bankers have no intention of yielding the control of the collectivised and socialised state to the 'proletariat,' and there is no great fear that they will be required to do so. With a proper understanding and respect for the lessons of history, they realise how absurd is the 'dictatorship of the proletariat.' This is the reason that international bankers are so generous with their subsidies to international communism. This is the reason that Mr. Hoover, Mr. Willkie, Earl Browder, Mr. Roosevelt, Judge Frankfurter, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Hopkins, Mr. Baruch, Ben Cohen and the partners of J. P. Morgan can be found in the same bed. Their points of agreement are fundamental. Their differences are trivial."

Amongst the less intelligent criticisms of the group of ideas known as Social Credit is that it is disguised anarchy—a kind of go-as-you-please free for all. The argument is equivalent to saying that a claim to choose whether I will play cricket or tennis is a claim to make the rules of cricket or tennis.

But the criticism has an important truth contained in it—a truth which the collectivist monopolists understand clearly. Freedom of choice does *ultimately* mean negative control. Negative control is the only control the man in the street requires. He needs a bridle on the mass expert.

If sufficient individuals disapprove of an article, it will

The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 2s. (Postage extra).

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

go off the market for the simple reason that it will have no market. But only if there is an alternative. If there is no alternative, you become the tool of the gangster. If you have freedom of choice, you needn't. Social Credit is the escape from gangsterdom.

This is a gangsters' war, for the benefit of gangsters and the perpetuation of gangsterdom. You can have just as many like it as you wish. To that end, the first essential is to demand the right to interfere in everyones' business, preferably without understanding it. That encourages everyone to interfere with you, and a good time is had by all. Then use as many words which have no ascertainable meaning, as possible. Demand higher taxes for everyone and complain about your own. Otherwise leave Finance severely alone. Professor Laski will help you.

A very few years of "peace" founded on these principles will ensure a hearty welcome to the next war.

All rights reserved.

Concluded.

Points from Parliament

House of Commons, July 28, 1943.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS: MINISTRY OF TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

Mr. W. Brown asked the Minister of Town and Country Planning in what circumstances, and for what purpose, members of his staff have been asked to give information as to what associations they are members of, what is the purpose of the associations, and what part they play in them etc?

Mr. H. Strauss: The request to which the hon. Member refers was made by personal and confidential letter not to all members of the staff, but only to officers in the administrative and technical grades. Some of these officers who had recently joined the Department had asked for advice as to how far they could properly continue to take part in the activities of outside associations concerned with planning. The purpose of the request was to inform the Department of the facts and so to make it possible to decide whether any general instructions need be issued.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL: AGRICULTURE

[The course of this debate was well summarised by Mr. Tom Williams, Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture, in replying to the Debate when he said, "I have heard Conservative Members pleading for the preservation of the Ministry of Food, import boards, assured markets, and contract prices—not only a revelation but a political revolution. I have heard Members of the Liberal party, National and Free, Members of the Common Wealth party, independent Members, and Members of the Labour party, all suggesting that that policy is the only means whereby we can ever hope to have a prosperous agricultural policy." The speech of Mr. Boothby (Aberdeen and Kincardine, Eastern) has technical points of interest:—]

Mr. Boothby (Aberdeen and Kincardine, Eastern): . . . We have had two great agricultural depressions within living memory, the depression of 1873 to 1880, and that of 1921 to 1939—because there was practically no let-up in the

depression during that period. The root causes of both were the same—monetary instability, involving price instability, and Free Trade. We must get down to fundamentals if we are to get anywhere. I believe the control of credit and the control of imports of food are absolutely fundamental to the problem. Unless we face the necessity of these two controls, we are, to a large extent beating the air. It is an issue which cuts pretty deep. It is nothing less than the issue of what kind of society we are going to establish after the war; and whether we intend to be predominantly a mercantile society, or an agrarian and industrial society. After the last war we went back deliberately, but mistakenly as I think, to be a predominantly mercantile society.

That issue was really decided by the country at the Election of 1923. I think the country made a wrong decision. It involved three things. It involved Free Trade; it involved the gold standard; and it involved the supremacy of the City of London and of finance. It also involved the ruin of our agricultural industry; because no farmer on earth, however efficient, can stand up to a continuously falling wholesale price level for a period of 15 or 16 years. Farmers are hit by deflation far more than any other primary producers because of the time-lag between their costs of production and the realisation of their produce in the markets.

The problem of agriculture is, fundamentally, a problem of prices; and it was the failure to recognise this simple truth that led to the tragic downfall of no fewer than three of my right hon. Friend's predecessors at the Ministry of Agriculture before the war. You cannot get away from prices. If you give the farmer a remunerative price—he does not ask for an excessive price—he can make a living. If you do not give him a price to cover his costs of production, you will have an agriculture which goes sadly down to grass, with the workers leaving the land, and the farmers gradually becoming bankrupt. That is what we had for 15 or 20 years.

There is a good deal of talk about planning to-day, and much of it is nonsense. Of course, we must have some kind of plan for the post-war economy of this country. The basic principle of a soundly planned economy is social and economic stability in terms of prices and wages. It has very little to do with public ownership or what is called nationalisation; and that is why I feel that so much in the political party argument that goes on in this country to-day is comparatively meaningless. An economy composed of private enterprise may be planned if it is well controlled from the centre. An economy composed of entirely socialised industries would be quite unable to function if it were not well controlled at the centre. It seems to me that, so far as agriculture is concerned, the vital strategic controls are two, namely the control of credit and the control of imports. We must face up to this fact.

... The point I want to make is that these controls now exist. We have, at the moment, control of credit and control of imports. I do not believe they are going to be removed. The question therefore is by whom, and in whose interests, they are to be exercised in the future?

I should like to ask one further question. How comes it that since the outbreak of war, with all the reduction in imports that we have had to suffer, prosperity has in fact returned to the countryside; and, not only that, but the people of this country are better nourished than they have ever been at any time in the whole course of their history? It is because a policy of expansion has succeeded the policy

of restriction of output. It is because, at long last, we have stable remunerative prices in agriculture; and decent wages, for the first time in history, for our agricultural workers. Last but not least it is because we have a Ministry of Food. I think the Ministry of Food provides an essential complement to the great work that the Minister of Agriculture has done; and I hope the Ministry of Food, or something like it, will not be abolished after the war, as was the case after the last war. If British agriculture is to survive, and the nutritional requirements of our people are to be met after the war, there must be a monetary policy designed to keep wholesale prices steady and at a remunerative level; there must be control of the import of essential foodstuffs; there must be rotational farming, maintained at a high level of production; and, last but not least, there must be a more efficient distributive and marketing system than we have had in the past. . . .

... I would like now to say a word on the machinery which we must envisage. Most hon. Members will agree that the Ministry of Food, in some form or another, and I hope as a separate entity, should be retained after the war. The work it has done for the health and welfare of this country is its own justification for retention. On a long-term view, it is essential that under the Ministry of Food commodity boards should be established which will, in conformity with the general policy laid down by the Government, first, control imports, and make bulk purchases of food abroad; second, purchase produce from home producers on a contract basis at prices to cover the cost of production, *plus* a reasonable profit; and, third, exercise a general control over marketing, and in particular over the key points of food distribution such as abattoirs, milk depots, processing centres, canning factories, and so on. These commodity boards would be the main wholesalers for the produce they handle, responsible for accepting it in the first instance from the farms, and for seeing that it is fed to the market in an orderly manner and in good condition.

... It is essential if the gap between the price paid to the producer and the price paid by the consumer is to be closed, that the producers should establish a far greater control over the marketing processes than they have ever done in the past, especially on the wholesale side. These commodity boards should release their produce to the home markets at prices to be decided by the Ministry of Food, designed to maintain the health of the community at the highest level. But even if we close the gap to a considerable extent by more efficient marketing methods, there may still be a gap between the price which ought to be paid to the producer, if he is to get a reasonable profit, and the price which the consumer may reasonably be asked to pay, especially among the poorer sections of the community. That gap must be filled by the State; and can be filled only by a direct grant from the Treasury, or by the principle of levy-subsidy, which operated with great success in certain cases before the war. . . .

In the United States 36 per cent. of the total Government expenditure is met by taxation, in Canada 47 per cent., and in Britain almost 52 per cent. A married citizen of the United States with an income equivalent to £500 a year pays exactly half as much income-tax as his counterpart in Britain, and whereas an Englishman earning the equivalent of \$5,000 pays \$1,623 in income-tax, an American pays only \$932.

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. 10. No. 23. Saturday, August 14, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

We have no particular love for the House of Savoy but we are not aware that it has done anything to deserve being complimented by General Eisenheuer. We notice that the King of Italy has allowed the secret-society-controlled proletariat of Milan and Turin to return the effusive thanks which the situation seems to require.

Mr. Pink-Geranium, O.B.E. (né Rosenblum) who was evacuated to Buxton, saw a grouse the other day, and hurried back to his office at 4 p.m. to decree that grouse shooting should begin on August 1 instead of August 12. Unfortunately he forgot, or didn't care, that most grouse come from much further North, and as it so happens are abnormally late this year owing to the late spring snow storms. The result of the edict would be to decrease very considerably the food value of the grouse "crop." Fortunately nobody pays much attention to Mr. Rosenblum much north of Buxton.

"Not more than a fifth, and possibly as low as a sixth of the Zionist population [in Palestine] is physically productive... the rest of the population consisted of all sorts of merchants, brokers, speculators and middlemen... which turned its hand to any venture which promised to net a few dollars as long as it did not require physical work."

— ALBERT VITON in *Asia and the Americas*.

"One of the most disastrous forces is the theoretical ideology of the labour unions. A social system was established which made it impossible for local industry to compete with European goods..." — *Ibid.*

"The only time in history when people of the British race descended to sheer and senseless vandalism, was when the unspeakable Cromwell rode about England and Scotland, purloining the contents of castles, tearing down their walls and filling in their rooms with rubble. And Cromwell was a savage ruffian who was inspired and rendered insane by a philosophy and theology of Teutonic origin."

— HAROLD L. WEIR, in a Broadcast from Edmonton, Alta, July 3, 1943.

This war being for security for all, neutrals have been warned that nothing will protect them against the United Nations if they harbour persons to whom they have been neutral.

The difference between a Trades Union leader and a monopolist-manufacturer is that one sells labour and the other sells the consumer. Bankers sell both.

According to 'BEACHCOMBER,' the great drive to make milk more incomprehensible has started, and many cows, confronted with a pail of de-phosphatised, heat-treated, semi-pasteurised, methylene-blue milk, are shouting, "That's not what I gave!"

"More and more cows are being kept in laboratories, so that they can remain under observation while eating their synthetic grass and chewing the new hygienic, non-porous, retaminated, oxylene cuds. It has been discovered by several of the apothecaries and soothsayers that milk need no longer taste or look like milk, and that if the small dairyman cannot afford all the expensive machinery for preparing stale milk, with dead germs instead of live ones in it, then he cannot expect the public to put up with his fresh milk, which has never got into the hands of the chemists."

SMUTS ON JEWS' REWARD

To-day, after nearly four years of war, we have won through to the verge of a new vista. Trials and tribulations may still be ahead, but now we can really look beyond towards the bright promise of a better future.

The United Nations, in this last phase before victory, realise, I feel certain, that Jewry has played its part in hastening the end of one of the bitterest periods of human history. Your loyalty to a cause in the defence of which so many nations of the world have joined together in the creation of that splendid whole, the United Nations, has never been in doubt. It has, in fact, found expression in service and sacrifice of no mean order.

Already we are beginning to realise that the most important aspect of the present world war is not the victory on the battlefield. Peace, fair and abiding, is the thing. You have helped us towards victory in the war; help us also towards victory in the following peace. Your reward will be great. Your reward will be a world freed from persecution and domination, a world in which Jewry will regain Zion. — J. C. SMUTS in a message to 340 delegates attending South African biennial Zionist Conference, week ending July 31, 1943.

"NEITHER REVERENCE NOR OBEDIENCE"

Mr. N. Kirschner, Chairman of the South African Zionist Federation, said: —

"England must expect from us neither reverence for nor obedience to the White Paper. No document written by man can bar our coming to Eretz Yisrael as a people returning to its own land."

NQTORIETY

According to *The Jewish Chronicle*, Douglas Reed, whom it describes as "the notorious anti-Semite," addressed a meeting at Urmston, near Manchester at which "No reference, direct, or indirect, was made to Jews."

The Patrons and Partisans of Usury

By NORMAN A. THOMPSON, B.A. Cantab., A.M.I.E.E.

(II)

THE CRITICAL ZENITH OF JEWISH SECRET POWER

Jewry has reached to-day the zenith of its secret power by the long, tortuous and concealed roads which it has so carefully planned and developed throughout the centuries. Freemasonry, entirely of Jewish origin in its folklore, passwords, signs, and the teachings which have issued therefrom so destructive of the natural evolution of the Gentile nations, has served Jewry for centuries as the leading source of its subtly spread world-wide propaganda. By gaining control of the money system Jewry has been able to exert a continuous degrading and disintegrating influence in every sphere of existence of each nation enslaved in its thrall, and so has finally prepared the way for its entry into the open domination of the World. Germany aided by her allies is the rival for this goal*, whilst the nations ranged against her aim merely to maintain and secure the right of each nation to the free development of its own culture and the control of its own national affairs.

It is not recognised perhaps in this country how far Hitler has failed since his advent to power to free Germany from the grip of the International Financiers. In 1933 he brought with him as a Minister without portfolio, Gottfried Feder, a Munich engineer and New Economist, who had been a colleague in his movement since 1919, and who was the author of *Der Deutsche Staat* which had been prefaced by Hitler as the "Catechism" of the National-Socialist Party. It was Hitler's professed intention under Feder's guidance to transform the basis of Germany's finance system from one of "orthodoxy" into one of sanity and equity, but in 1934 he replaced Feder by Dr. Schacht, a thirty-second degree mason, as Head of Germany's finances, the latter having previously resigned from his masonic lodge in the February of the same year.

Dr. Schacht, an adept in orthodox finance, for thirty odd years a friend of Mr. Montagu Norman and never popular with Hitler, when the moment came for his resignation used a prevailing influence in the appointment of Dr. Funk, the present controller of German economy, as his successor. Dr. Funk is still in command, and doubtless receives support from Ribbentrop, the fourth richest man in Germany, who collaborated with Schacht and was intimately in touch with other agents of "The International Finance."

An interesting paragraph appeared in the French London daily *France* of January 1, 1942, which reported that the various generals dismissed by, or opposed to, Hitler had recently rallied round Dr. Schacht, and that the latter had given a lecture on "The Role of economic Forces in the War," at the German Society of Military Science in Berlin, which was the occasion of a "*veritable manifestation*." It was also rumoured that the above group of generals was planning to get rid of Hitler, take power themselves and negotiate a peace. In such case we should have another "peace" treaty organised like that of Versailles by "The International Finance" treating behind the

backs of both sides, and based on economic and financial clauses to be modified later on to the taste and discretion of the organisers.

For it must be remembered that "The International Finance" hold important interests in the countries of both belligerents and will always seek to avoid in this war, as in the last, a crushing defeat for either. And in regard to this present war the question perforce occurs to one whether it is not partly to their influence that the recent successes of the Axis in the Pacific and Libyan fields, following the German reverses in Russia with their suggestion of perhaps still more disastrous results, have been due. A possible means for the purpose would be the causing of distortion, neglect or misuse of intelligence helpful to the side whose strength at the moment they desired to hold in check. In 1938 the Author met a Japanese General on several occasions on the Continent. He was an advocate of monetary reform as proposed by the New Economists, and was aware of the fangs and interests of the Money Power in his country. The Editor of *Forward* has recently pointed out that, during the same week that the construction of the Singapore base was begun, at a cost of £20,000,000, the financiers of the City of London loaned £25,000,000 to the Japanese. As usual High Politics allowed High Finance the privilege of "having it both ways."

During the earlier portion of his career as the military leader of France Napoleon received the support of Freemasonry, for he was destroying the independence of kingdoms and national political structures by their nature inimical to its aim towards universal power and bringing them under the unified control of the country where the influence of Masonry was already pre-eminently strong. When however it was realised that Napoleon possessed independent ideas as to the basis of economics and money, entirely opposed to those of orthodox finance, and wished to introduce a new monetary system into Europe for the benefit of all its peoples, steps were taken by the Patrons of Usury, together with Necker the French Finance Minister of Swiss origin, aided by the clever tongue of his daughter, Madame de Staël, and others, to diminish his popularity and counter his monetary projects. Finally the Rothschilds and their associates of London and Vienna financed the Waterloo campaign to crush him. The evidence of Napoleon as a "New Economist" is largely drawn from the memoirs of Caulaincourt, one of his generals, which curiously enough only became available to the public some twelve years ago. For details of this aspect of Napoleon see his Life written by Dr. McNair Wilson since the publication of the Caulaincourt memoirs.

By the Bank Charter Act of 1844 England was saddled with the Gold Standard.

In 1873 at the founding of the Reichsbank Germany was fitted with a similiar saddle on which Supernational Financiers could ride. It is worth noting that the German Emperor, when consulted as to the establishment of a National Bank, considered quite rightly that in view of its national importance it should be a State bank. He was, however, prevailed upon by the promoters to agree to the Reichsbank being founded on a private basis, for it was represented to him that in the event of his country being worsted in a war there was a strong precedent in Europe in favour of respecting private, as against State, property. The Reichsbank was then constituted with an original board

*See the author's *Humanity's Problems*, p. 2.

of 15 directors of whom 11 were pure bred Jews. This event corresponded with the moment when the International Financiers, having successfully exploited British industry since the beginning of the century, were concentrating on a similar exploitation of German industry and the development of an accompanying export trade so rich in opportunities for "middleman" financial operations.

By the purchase of British and sale of German securities after the hasty publication of the first report of the battle of Jutland, which underestimated the value and extent of the victory, and a subsequent reversal of this procedure at the publication of the second and more correct report, operators netted some £55 million sterling during an interval of about twenty-four hours. By chance, this story was also related independently to the writer five or six years ago in Berlin by a highly informed German intelligence expert.

Nor must anyone hoping for a "better Britain" ever forget the enterprising trading efforts, largely emanating from London, which neutralised our blockade during the last war. According to Admiral Consett, our Naval Attaché then in Scandinavia, in his book *The Triumph of Unarmed Forces* (1923) p. 296, the proportion of Scandinavian food stuffs sent to Germany (plus Austria) and to England, which in 1913 was 1 to 1½, was transformed by the beginning of 1917 to three to the former against one to England—a result held responsible for prolonging the war by about two years. On p. 288 is given the following quotation from a letter written by Admiral Consett in December, 1918 to Sir Esmé Howard, British Minister at Stockholm:—

"Unfortunately it was well known to all our allies and to the Americans in Scandinavia that we were ourselves competing with neutrals in supplying the enemy. It is obvious, therefore, that we were never in a position to approach even our allies with a view to restricting imports to Germany—far less America when she was a neutral—without causing friction. If the statistics of imports to Denmark for the year 1917 are carefully studied any uninstructed person would be tempted to assume that we had started the blockade at America's suggestion."

The *Official Report* of the House of Commons Debates for August 2, 1928, relates an exposure by the late Walter Baker, M.P. for East Bristol, of the methods and ramifications of the interests which conspired to acquire the rights and opportunities necessary to carry through a fusion in Cable and Wireless properties. The official report of the debate repays perusal, for the Press notices were most inadequate. Among an interconnection of well-known financial and trading firms both of English and Foreign origin, of directorships, Members of Parliament and Government officials, one notices such typical names as that of the late Lord Melchett, Lazard Brothers, F. A. Szarvasy, Hambro, Owen D. Young, Chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, and so forth. Lazard Brothers, whose mind was held to have conceived the merger, shared a director with *The Times* and Mr. Szarvasy was referred to as "the person of most interest in all this business."

A similar network of interested firms in U.S.A. was organised under the *aegis* of Sosthenes Behn, and the underlying aim of this merger was undoubtedly to place the control of cable and wireless communications of the world in the hands of Jewry.

In view of the present war situation the immediate

opening up of a new oil field for the service of Great Britain and her Allies would be of vital importance to their efforts. Such a field exists in Palestine, especially in the district of the Dead Sea. Its presence has been indicated by various exploring parties sent out by different nations, the Palestine Government's own handbook writes of it as "the most promising area," and its situation is strategically central and convenient. Nevertheless there has been a persistent and hitherto successful campaign to deny its existence. Years of unremitting effort have convinced the main advocates of its exploitation that the "Oil Kings" do not want this, as its development would diminish the vast profits they already draw from a restricted output. Nor do the Zionists want its existence made public, their hope being that it may become one of the great assets of their future "National Home" and World State.

The deposits of potash offer perhaps still more striking possibilities. There are vast quantities of potassium chloride dissolved in the water of the Dead Sea, an amount estimated by Government experts at 2,000 million tons, representing wealth commensurate with the cost of the war, but it would take many years to evaporate it. But still vaster quantities of potash in mineralised and easily mined form lie under the surface of much of the ground in this region, the oil in many cases is under these, and neither at great depth. Yet it is impossible to get the Government to exploit these urgently needed riches, or the Press to call attention thereto. In the Ministries concerned there seems to be a bottle-neck, which blocks information on the subject on its way to the Ministers, who can thus profess ignorance of the existence of these supplies. As for the great newspapers, only the *New Leader*, *Truth*, and the *National Message* (organ of the British Israel World Federation) have had the will and courage to draw attention to the scandal which envelops this question, whose immediate solution is of paramount importance.

One of the most convincing proofs of the existence of hidden, sinister influences, working their will to the detriment of our country is afforded by the case of the Hon. Violet Douglas-Pennant. Owing to her exceptional record of important posts held with uniform success Miss Douglas-Pennant was invited by the Air Council in 1918 to take command of the newly formed Women's Royal Air Force, which was then in a very unsatisfactory state. At the end of two months, her chief, Vice-Admiral Sir Godfrey Paine, expressed his strong appreciation of her work and told her with the concurrence of the Air Minister, Lord Weir, that the Air Council valued her services most highly and could not spare them in war time. Ten days later Sir Godfrey Paine on promotion was succeeded by the head of the Equipment Department, General Sefton Brancker, a total stranger to Miss Douglas-Pennant, who, without any adverse report from a Senior Officer was summarily dismissed by General Brancker, on Lord Weir's orders, from her post and from the Corps. She was informed only that "though most efficient Lord Weir had heard she was a woman no one could meet or have anything to do with." He added that she was unpopular with a Mrs. Beatty and a Miss Andrew.

Miss Douglas-Pennant was ordered to leave instantly, before even a successor had been appointed. Lord Weir did not see her or allow her to know what was alleged. Later in the House of Lords he stated that he had made no inquiry before ordering the dismissal, as it was "foreign,"

he said, "to my own methods of working." He added that he had been influenced by what he had heard from a Miss Andrew, a W.R.A.F. officer whose unfavourable opinion of her Commandant had, he said, shaken his faith in Miss Douglas-Pennant. Thus it transpired that Lord Weir had permitted this W.R.A.F. officer to interview him over the heads of all her Seniors and bring complaints against her Commandant. Miss Andrew was 23, inexperienced, and had had only a few weeks' service in the Corps.

The Inquiry or Court Martial authorised by Service Regulations was refused to Miss Douglas-Pennant, but after a year's agitation the House of Lords by a two-thirds majority voted the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate the matter. The Government stipulated that no Peer who had voted for the Inquiry should sit as a member of the Committee, which therefore, together with its Chairman, was nominated by the Government.

The Chairman at the outset placed Miss Douglas-Pennant in the position of having to prove wrongful dismissal without being allowed to know of what she was accused and without access to official papers. It was only allowed to emerge at the extreme end of the Inquiry—long after Miss Douglas-Pennant's case was closed—that secret charges had been brought to Lady Rhondda (Women's Branch of National Service) which, without testing, were conveyed by her to her own Chief, Sir Auckland Geddes, and then to Lord Weir and General Brancker, when the dismissal followed immediately. The Select Committee under the guidance of their Chairman omitted to make any investigation into the nature of the charges or to ascertain whether there was any reliable evidence in support of them, which is the more extraordinary as they were shown to have been brought by the two "mutinous" (the word applied in the Select Committee's report) ex-W.R.A.F. officers, Mrs. Beatty and Miss Andrew. Also the Committee were aware that Mrs. Beatty had been previously dealt with by a Court of Inquiry in another Corps for insubordination and making untrue statements regarding its Head. When it transpired during the Lords' Inquiry that secret charges had been conveyed by Lady Rhondda, the cross-examination of Lord Weir by Miss Douglas-Pennant's counsel, who were endeavouring to find out why he had dismissed her, was stopped by the Chairman. Later when certain witnesses came forward spontaneously to give important evidence on behalf of Miss Douglas-Pennant, because they saw that she was being wrecked by perjury, the Chairman refused to allow them to be heard unless she undertook to pay the whole of the expenses of all parties in the Inquiry from that moment onwards. Miss Douglas-Pennant was obliged to refuse these terms for financial reasons, and the Chairman then declared the Inquiry at an end.

Thenceforth a body of men and women, representing all grades of society and shades of thought, have carried on a campaign to obtain redress for Miss Douglas-Pennant, maintaining that no man or woman should be condemned without fair trial and opportunity for defence. In 1931 Sir William Jowitt, then Attorney-General, was led after full personal investigation of the case to draft a statement to be read to the House of Commons, which admitted the wrong that had been done, and that Miss Douglas-Pennant stood without blemish as to character or efficiency. The then Premier, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, agreed to it subject to Lord Weir consenting. Lord Weir objected and the Cabinet allowed his decision to prevail. Under the new premiership

of Mr. Baldwin, Sir Thomas Inskip became Attorney-General, from which position he wrote in a letter to a Member of Parliament as follows:—"The statement you want read, that she (Miss Douglas-Pennant) ought never to have been dismissed implies a censure upon Lord Weir, and it is exactly this that I am certain no responsible authority will ever agree to."

Since then fresh important evidence has come to light. According to the report of the Lords' Select Committee Sir Auckland Geddes "practically compelled" Lord Weir to act as he did, and it has now emerged that Sir Auckland Geddes was moved to bring this pressure to bear on Lord Weir because very serious accounts had reached him personally regarding conditions in certain Air Force Camps in which women were employed. Sir Auckland Geddes had asked Lady Rhondda to investigate rumours concerning certain camps, but during the House of Lords' Inquiry the names of these camps were withheld from Miss Douglas-Pennant and her advisors. Now that the names of these camps have been disclosed it appears from evidence beyond dispute that the women employed in them were never under Miss Douglas-Pennant's jurisdiction.

"CIVILISED SLAVES"

By B. M. PALMER

It is extraordinary, isn't it, that women still do not know what work is? An ex-woman probation officer writing in *The Times* has lamented the fact that she had to choose between her family and her work, and says, "How can the birth-rate increase while women are thus penalised?"

One of the fundamentals of the creed of Socialism is that work is a commodity to be bought and sold, and that any unfortunate person who does not succeed in getting a market for his work cannot expect to live unless Sir William Beveridge comes to his aid. That there is no fundamental difference between a population forced to sell its labour and a population of slaves is masked by the assertion that wage-earners are "economically independent." But that they are nothing of the sort is quickly brought home to them after a long term in hospital or in jail. It is useless to argue on a matter of equity. The position has been axiomatically stated thus:—

"If the facts of the case require that an individual must work before it is possible for him to obtain those things of which he has the need or desire, then he shall in no case be prevented from working by artificial restrictions. But if, without injury to others, he can be provided with these things without working, the fact that he has not worked for them shall be recognised as a matter of no consequence whatever."

— C. H. DOUGLAS in *The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket*.

It is now time, says Dr. Edith Summerskill, to practice Socialism in the home. Husbands must be compelled to hand over a proportion of their wages to their wives as a legal right in order to increase the wives' dignity as paid workers. This, with a family allowance of 8s. a week for the first and perhaps even more for the second and third child (paid out of taxation) will, it is hoped, result in an increase in the birthrate. And what is the alternative? If not, she says, "Within 50 years we shall be a middle-aged,

elderly population unable even to finance our social services out of the taxes of able-bodied workers." [Laughter... that was not reported in *Hansard*.]

This lamentable ignorance of even the elements of present day financial technique as embodied in the creation of credit and the compensated price, without which the financing of the war could not go on for an hour is, I suppose, what we have come to take as a matter of course from our representatives. But there is more to come. Dr. Summerskill bases her claim upon the sad case of Mrs. Blackwell, who, after saving 2/4d. a week for 17 years out of the housekeeping had it all taken away by her husband because he said it was his, and what is more, the Judge agreed with him, and said that his wife was a dependent.

I think the Judge was perfectly right. The money was the husband's and any attempt to weaken his claim on it is a signpost to slavery.

R. L. S. once defined the position of women as "civilised slaves among good-humoured savages." His intuitive genius saw straight to the heart of the matter; and it is one of the most encouraging signs of the soundness of human instincts that in spite of the terrible "work-psychology" of the age the relations of men and women in the oldest and most honoured of partnerships are still firm, and the civilised slaves are on the whole happy. In the case quoted there must have been other causes for unhappiness. Is it likely that a couple who would go to court over such a matter would have no other grievances? "Only a few men beat their wives," says Dr. Summerskill, "But that is no reason why they should not be protected." Quite so, provided it does not involve the domiciling of a policeman in every home in the land.

If there are readers who are inclined to say, "For God's sake let us do something, and why not encourage good intentions?" I should like to draw their attention to certain paving stones which most of us heard of in our youth. And here let it be emphasised that it is *not* necessary to stop the laying of those stones: by all means leave the roadmakers alone, until (and this is of supreme importance) they begin to put up sign posts and neon lights indicating that this is the road to paradise. When that happens it *is* my business, for I might get carried along with the crowd against my will, and so might those children whose interest I have so much at heart. For this reason I think this is the place to put it on record that Mr. C. Jinarajadasa, of the Theosophist Movement,* has suggested a world plan which is known as the Seven Seas Charter (to be amended and amplified by others). Under the heading of WOMAN he suggests:—

"Every married woman shall be allocated a part of her husband's earnings as her wage for her services to the joint family. Where a married woman earns a wage in work other than for her family, her earnings shall be pooled with those of her husband before determining her wage for services to the joint family."

Men and women will still marry even if Dr. Summerskill has her way, and succeeds in establishing legislation which takes away the right of each to ownership of what little money remains after taxes are paid, puts fetters on almost the only people left in existence who are not obliged

to sell their labour, and lays every minute detail of home economy open to government inspection. For, of course, this movement, like all other Socialist dodges, is an attack on ownership as such, ownership of money, ownership of the power to work, and ownership and privacy of home. The inner keep of the castle will be lost.

But lest I be again accused of destructive criticism, let us remind ourselves that there *is* a way to free the civilised slaves. They must have inalienable dividends, paid out of the material which will be saved when we have stopped throwing millions of pounds of goods and services at the Germans and Italians. It will then remain to see whether they will stay with the good-humoured savages, and bear their children. For then at last they will be *free to obey*.

It would be interesting to know who first suggested that that word should be removed from the Marriage Service?

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 Big Idea.....	2/6
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
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.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell.....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
Carthorse Conditions for All (the Beveridge Report issue of <i>The Social Crediter</i>)	2d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet)	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.)	1d.
The Job of a Representative.....	½d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

*In fairness to the Theosophist movement it should be noted that the Seven Seas Charter is put forward as a suggestion only; and in fairness to everyone else that the source from which suggestions come and the influence behind them has a good deal to do with their publicity.