

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 10. No. 6.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 17, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

Programme For the Third World War (II)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Most crooks in a big way are Saviours, although, through the ages, at long intervals, there have been Saviours who were not crooks. These latter can generally be identified by the fact that they are unpopular until a long time after their, in the main, violent death. But we are not now concerned with them.

Al Capone saved both the whisky business and the American sufferers from the local urge to mind other people's business and provided the excuse for setting up the American Gestapo, Herr Schickelgruber-Hitler-Rothschild is saving Europe from Bolshevism and providing the opportunity for America to reconstruct Europe and Signor Mussolini has disposed of plenty amidst poverty. The list is in no way exhaustive.

The technique of this saviour business is simple and was well understood by Robin Hood, who took all you had, and gave you back your car fare. Modern Chancellors of the Exchequer, beginning with Mr. Lloyd George who took ninepence from us all and gave some of us fourpence back, subject to tax, regard it as the core of Finance. Generalised, the idea is to arrange an intolerable situation, and save you from it at the cost of accepting one barely tolerable. You are threatened with going all the way to Moscow, if you don't agree to go half way to Moscow. If you don't like Churchill, try Emmanuel Shinwell.

In considering the probable slogan for the next World War now so confidently predicted in well-informed quarters as a preliminary to giving up some more freedoms to avoid it, we shall, I think, be well advised to look at the well-tried principle just enunciated, and to consider whether any developments of the pre-1914 and pre-1939 periods are common to the "improvements" which have been introduced into civilisation, and whether they appear to follow the standard technique. Such an enquiry will be found to provide somewhat remarkable information.

Now, *once you have surrendered to materialism*, it is quite true that economics precedes politics, and dominates it. It is not in Bolshevism, Fascism, the New Deal, and P.E.P. or the London School of Economics Fabian Society that we shall find the origins of what we are looking for. These are ostensibly political systems, and derive from, rather than give birth to economics. While this is obvious and axiomatic, it is not so obvious, although equally axiomatic that the principle works both ways. That is as much as to say, *if you can control economics, you can keep the business of getting a living the dominant factor of life, and so keep*

your control of politics—just that long, and no longer.

Now let us look at the developments in economic control. Don't confuse this with technical progress, with which it has nothing whatever in common. Probably the most important aspect of this subject is one with which the general public is completely unfamiliar, although some of its component members might be interested to know that the curious, illogical, and immensely publicised attack on what is called "the profit motive" is designed to provide what Lord Stamp called suitable psychological preparation. To the small circle familiar with the subject, it is known by the innocent title of "management control."

It may perhaps be remembered by those who notice such things that one of the usual and effective replies to the complaint of oppression by large corporations, banks, railway and public utility companies, *etc.*, is that the average shareholding in them is of the order of a few hundred pounds. The personal control of the partner or majority stockholder has been replaced by the small shareholder. The argument is of course exactly the same as that which measures democracy by the percentage of the population having votes. That is easy to apprehend when your attention is drawn to it. What is not so easy, and requires a good deal of technical knowledge of a highly specialised kind, is to understand the rapid and extensive, and very silent revolution which has been taking place in the legal power of the stockholder over an undertaking for which (on the idea of the reality of money) he provided the capital. Since most of this alienation is the work of German-American-Jewish lawyers, commonly called Corporation Counsel, it had, up to the outbreak of the present hostilities, developed further in Germany and America than in Great Britain. Possibly with the able assistance of Mr. Benjamin Cohen, Jr., of the U.S.A., who has been here for some time, there are signs that we are catching up, and the organisation of the Bank of "England" is clearly devoted to it.

However that may be, it is patent that the separation of ownership from control, which is a feature of stock dispersal and legal devices such as voting trusts (one of which has just been constituted by Sir Stafford Cripps, Minister of Aircraft Production, in respect of the arbitrary acquisition of Messrs. Short Bros.), proxies, and other devices, is being pursued systematically in regard to industrial property, just as it is, under the agitation for "nationalisation" in regard to land and credit.

It would take us much too far afield to pursue this aspect of the policy into its amazing ramifications. But two results are significant. The first is that the shareholder is at the mercy of the stock-market. His connection with what was originally his property is little more than the loose expectation that a group of men, who have nothing to expect

from him and little to fear, will consider his interests, which they are continually told by the "B."B.C. and the Archbishops, are dubiously moral. Most shareholders would agree that they don't get much consideration and will get less. If his stock is not exchangeable for valuable considerations (and who controls the Stock-Market?) he is expropriated.

The second is that he can have no say in the use that is made of "his" property. It becomes, in theory, the tool of a neutral technocracy, but anyone of ordinary common sense knows that it obeys the policy of whoever appoints the management. Let us say, capturing export trade. It is the International Banks who appoint the management.

This systematic separation of control from ownership and responsibility began in Germany during the days of Ballin, Rathenau, Bleichroeder, Deutsch and others of the Jewish ring of bankers and industrialists who surrounded the Kaiser. It was transferred to the United States by the Warburgs, Schiffs and Strausses with such lawyers as Felix Frankfurter assisting. The core of the idea is power without responsibility. You cannot effectively punish a corporation or sue a Government Department.

It should be noted that this technique was highly developed many years before either Bolshevism, Fascism, the New Deal, or P.E.P. were heard of. Bearing this in mind, we are in a position to follow the technique into governmental systems, and to consider the activities of various contemporary (if temporary) celebrities.

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: April 6, 1943.

FUEL AND POWER

POINT OF AYR COLLIERIES (CONTROL)

Sir Stanley Reed asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what the reasons were for the issue of the Order to take over the Ffynnongroew Colliery, Flintshire, from the Point of Ayr Collieries, Limited; whether any criticisms had been made of its management; whether he is aware that it had the highest output per man of all the collieries in North Wales and the best safety record, and had been free from stoppages since the great coal strike of 1924; and whether his attention has been directed to the comments of Mr. Justice Singleton* in giving judgment in the appeal against the vesting order?

[Sir Stanley Reed's was one of eight questions submitted on this point.]

The Minister of Fuel and Power (Major Lloyd George): The decision to take control of this undertaking, whose technical efficiency has never been in dispute, was only reached after the most careful consideration, lasting many months. There has been considerable friction, extending over several years, in the North Wales coalfield as a result of the refusal of the undertaking to agree to the request of the North Wales and Border Counties Mine Workers' Association to be allowed the same facilities on behalf of its members at this colliery as are allowed to the Association at all the other collieries in the district. My hon. Friends

will appreciate that the co-operation of all engaged in the industry is vital to the war effort. Repeated attempts have been made to remove the causes of this friction by my Department. The North Wales Coalowners' Association have also done everything in their power to assist; this resulted in the resignation of the Point of Ayr Collieries from the Coalowners' Association.

During my visit to the district last autumn, I realised that the situation was becoming worse, and I was seriously perturbed as to the effect it would have on production in the whole district. Since then I have kept in constant touch with my Regional Controller in the North Western area. His reports showed quite clearly that the situation was becoming steadily worse. I further received in the middle of January last a confidential report from Sir John Forster, who had been appointed, at my request, by my right hon. Friend the Minister of Labour and National Service to make an independent investigation. Sir John came to the conclusion that if the causes of the friction were not removed there might be trouble throughout the North Wales coalfield. Accordingly it became my duty to consider whether this situation might not seriously affect the production of coal. I decided that having regard to all the history of this matter there was no means of bringing the friction to an end, other than by taking control of the undertaking under Defence Regulation 55 (4). While I am willing at any time to consider removing the control, I must first be satisfied that the danger to the war effort, which led me to impose it, has been removed and will not recur. I am not so satisfied at present.

My attention has been called to the comments of Mr. Justice Singleton. I was advised that as the Courts had no jurisdiction to consider the reasonableness of my Order, and as my responsibility in this matter was to Parliament, and in particular to this House, it would not be correct, either legally or constitutionally, for evidence to be submitted to the Court as to my reasons for making this Order. A submission to this effect was made to Mr. Justice Singleton by the Solicitor-General and no evidence was therefore called on my behalf. The learned Judge decided the case in my favour, on the ground that I was the responsible person and that I had the right to make this Order. Mr. Justice Singleton's comments on my conduct were, therefore, made in the absence of any evidence on my behalf and it is, I think, right that I should add that the learned Judge made it clear that these comments were outside his province in the case.

Mr. Rowlands: Is it not a fact that the relationships between the employers and the employees have been most cordial at this colliery and that there has been no stoppage there since 1926, which is unique not only in the history of this region but in the history of pits throughout the whole country?

Major Lloyd George: That has nothing to do with the point I made, which was that there are in this colliery a large number of men who belong to a union and who desire the same rights at this colliery as are available in every other colliery throughout the country. My only interest is to see that everybody is treated alike. . . .

GOVERNMENT-ACQUIRED PRIVATE UNDERTAKINGS (SHAREHOLDERS)

Mr. Simmonds asked the Prime Minister whether he

Continued on page seven.

* See *From Week to Week*, page 3.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Opposition is developing both in England and America to centralisation in medical practice. Some doctors are perhaps slower in appreciating the significance of centralisation of medical authority, actual and projected, than are their patients. When that is so, their patients might include in their demands on doctors for results the demand for protection from bureaucratic intervention into their private medical affairs—the projected bureaucratic policy as stated in the Beveridge Report is that the end point of a comprehensive health and rehabilitation service is “restoration of capacity to work.” Why not restoration of the capacity for “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness”? Through lack of understanding doctors may inadvertently betray their patients’ interests.

Mr. James Marshall, M.P., has applied for the registration as working with the Social Credit Secretariat of a Federal Parliamentary Douglas Social Credit Group, and his application has been accepted.

Answering a question in Parliament, Colonel Sir George Courthope said that the total area of woodland in England and Wales, according to the latest estimate, is 2,040,000 acres; the Forestry Commission has charge of 629,000 acres of land, of which 325,000 acres are already planted, 139,000 acres still to be planted and 165,000 acres unsuitable for afforestation. In Scotland the total area of woodland is 1,040,000 acres; the Forestry Commission controls 603,000 acres, of which 183,000 acres are already planted, 118,000 acres yet to be planted, and no less than 302,000 acres unsuitable for afforestation.

So that just about one half of the land acquired by the Forestry Commission in Scotland, and more than one quarter of that in England, is unsuitable for the professed purposes of the Commission.

In his judgment, in the case of Point of Ayr Collieries, Limited, v. Lloyd George and others, in which Point of Ayr Collieries, Limited, challenged an order made by Major G. Lloyd George taking over control of their colliery at Ffynnongroew, Flintshire, Mr. Justice Singleton discussed the history of the colliery. He said that it had been in the hands of the same family for generations, and workmen also had worked in the colliery generation after generation, and there had been a steady continuity of management. Over a long period the colliery had had a wonderful record from the point of view of accidents, output, and work; it was an amazingly good record in every respect. The relations

between the owners and the workmen had been uniformly excellent.

His Lordship said that he was satisfied that the witnesses called by the plaintiffs (the colliery) were honest and truthful. No evidence was called for the defendants, and it struck one as a little surprising that a colliery with the best record should be the one colliery which the Minister selected to put under control. One could not help wondering how it all came about.

The Legislature had put the responsibility on the competent authority to come to a decision. The authority might make a right decision or a wrong decision, but if he brought his mind to bear on the matter and acted in good faith it was not for the Courts to say whether he had acted reasonably. That being so, the plaintiffs’ action must fail.

But there were other considerations of a public nature to which he thought he ought to refer. The Minister ought obviously to satisfy himself as to its necessity before making an order of this kind, which clearly ought not to be made lightly, though there might be circumstances which would necessitate speedy action. In this case the owners, managers and workmen of the colliery had a record of which they might all be proud, and he could not believe that there was really any serious threat of trouble. The necessity for preserving an atmosphere of fairness was just as necessary to-day as ever, perhaps even more necessary. If there had really been any prospect of trouble he could not help thinking that some other way might have been found for dealing with it. And if in such a case the Minister thought it necessary to take control of a business he might at least inform the owners of the grounds on which he was acting.

Mr. G. D. H. Cole and Social Credit

The following letter was addressed to Mr. G. D. H. Cole on March 1, and, being still unacknowledged on March 26, it was copied and sent by Registered Post to Mr. Cole, with a copy of the enclosure which had accompanied the previous letter. Mr. Cole has not acknowledged this communication:—

“Dear Sir,—Our attention has been drawn to a pamphlet entitled *Monetary Systems and Theories*, of which you are the author. Among statements more qualified in form there is on page 23 the explicit assertion that Major Douglas’s A plus B theorem ‘is simply not correct.’ Will you either disprove the mathematics of ‘Financing of a Long-term Production Cycle’ (copy attached),* which embodies in a convenient form the demonstration alleged to be fallacious, or the premises?

“If there should be no satisfactory answer to this invitation, the Social Credit Press will be informed.”

The publishers of Mr. Cole’s pamphlet were Rotary International (in Great Britain and Ireland), Tavistock House (South), Tavistock Square, London, W.C.1.

Like Mr. Cole, they are being informed of the publication of this note.

* See *The Social Crediter*, November 28, 1942 or *World Review* (leaflet) 1d., from K.R.P. Publications, Limited.

NOW OUT.

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.

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. 6. Saturday, April 17, 1943.

Financing the Secretariat

From its inception until the outbreak of war, the Social Credit Secretariat was financed mainly by its supporters in accordance with an individual 'self-assessment' of their ability to contribute.

With the outbreak of war, many personal incomes were affected by uncertainty, heavily increased taxation and enlistment. The proprietors of *The Social Crediter* raised the price of the paper to a figure which made it unnecessary for the Secretariat to subsidise it to the same extent as formerly, thus effecting a saving in its expenses. The destruction by enemy action of the premises in Lord Street, Liverpool, shared by the Secretariat and K.R.P. Publications Limited, in conjunction with the means taken to consolidate the position, further diminished the call on available funds, and the Secretariat's supporters will assent to the statement that the organisation is exceptional in that it is not constantly appealing for financial support, despite the fact, which is deserving of emphasis, that it does not accept 'ear-marked' subscriptions and is not under patronage of any description.

The not unsatisfactory state of affairs indicated is subject to influences of two kinds. Rising costs and the postponement of overhead charges, the incurring of which would be regarded as matters of course in normal circumstances, but which cannot continue indefinitely, threaten to swell the debit figures. On the other hand, increased employment and opportunity, accompanied by a shortage of consumable goods, despite the efforts of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to 'cream' all unspent money, should afford the Secretariat means of meeting such contingencies. Taxation is Robbery, and is moreover a diminution of the powers of citizens to obtain after the war the world they want.

It has been suggested that supporters who have not voluntarily assessed their ability to support the Secretariat might suitably be invited to do so, and that those whose circumstances warrant a revision in an upward direction of an earlier undertaking should make this fact known to the Director of Revenue. Revisions indicating a less favourable position on the part of supporters, which reach us from time to time, are accepted with a double regret. It is hoped that this announcement will be effective, since personal approach to supporters involves much added work by a depleted staff. The call upon the Secretariat for service is increasing. Large numbers of new readers of *The Social Crediter* do not otherwise support the movement which has attracted them, and to them a cordial invitation is given to communicate with us. Letters should be addressed:

The Treasurer, Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15, and marked "Treasurer" on the envelope.

THE EXPANSION FUND

The Social Credit Expansion Fund was instituted late in 1937 for the purpose which its name implies.

Expansion, apart from the steady growth which is the profit earned by the day to day service of all those in association with the Social Credit Secretariat, is a contingency towards the opportunity for which every Social Crediter looks forward with expectation and hope. No major opportunity for expansion has occurred since the institution of the Fund. Nor at any time since its inception would the Fund have provided the considerable necessary means for an operation of a truly expansive character. The requirement which it is desired to satisfy is availability, instantly, of means to meet a situation the details of which are unpredictable, as well as to provide for relatively small needs, expansive in direction, not a proper charge against the Social Credit Secretariat, which is, and is meant to be, self-supporting.

We should be ready for Expansion at all times, and more ready as the time for it approaches. A form for subscription is printed in this issue of *The Social Crediter*, and will be repeated at intervals. The Fund is "expended by the Administrators at the sole discretion of Major C. H. Douglas."

CRAFTS REGISTER

It would be of great service in several departments of the Secretariat if, in addition to the names and addresses of supporters and readers of *The Social Crediter* and other Social Credit publications, information concerning the work in life of which they have most knowledge were available. No useful purpose would be served by specifying here the trades and professions in which directors are most interested at the moment. Such interests shift with changes in the political situation. Those who care to do so are invited to communicate in confidence, when next they have occasion to write, such personal details as are here indicated. The briefest description is all that is necessary.

"The Same Everywhere"

Article 355B (which is episcopal teaching of the Catholic Church) of the report of the *Premier Concile Plénier du Canada*, held at Quebec in 1909, runs:—

"We must be on guard against the error of those who hold that, in our country, the character of masonry is not the same as in other parts of the world. Let the shepherds of souls and other priests refute carefully, as a very pernicious error, this lying and fallacious affirmation, and let them teach the faithful that the aim and character of this society are the same everywhere, although it tries to reach its common end, not by the same means, but by different methods appropriate to the various temperaments of the peoples and the various circumstances and places."

— Quoted from *Vers Demain*, December 15, 1942.

'Magna Carta est Lex . . .'

The first part of this translation of Magna Carta appeared in THE SOCIAL CREDITER of April 10.

54. All barons who are founders of abbeys, and have charters of the Kings of England (for the advowson?), or are entitled to it by ancient tenure, may have the custody of them when void, as they ought to have.

55. All woods that have been taken into the forest in our own time shall forthwith be laid out again; and the like shall be done with the rivers that have been taken or fenced in by us during our reign.

56. All evil customs concerning forests, warrens, and foresters, warreners, sheriffs and their officers, rivers and their keepers, shall forthwith be inquired into, in each county, by twelve knights of the same shire, chosen by the most creditable persons in the same county, and upon oath; and within forty days after the said inquest, be utterly abolished, so as never to be restored.

57. We will immediately give up all hostages and engagements delivered unto us by our English subjects as securities for their keeping the peace and yielding us faithful service.

58. We will entirely remove from our bailiwicks the relations of Gerard de Athyes, so that for the future they shall have no bailiwick in England. We will also remove Engelard de Cygony, Andrew, Peter, and Gyon de Canceles, Gyon de Cygony, Geoffrey de Martyn, and his brothers; Philip Mark and his brothers, and his nephew Geoffrey, and their whole retinue.

59. And as soon as peace is restored we will send out of the kingdom all foreign soldiers, cross-bow men, and stipendiaries, who are come with horses and arms to the injury of our people.

60. If any one hath been dispossessed or deprived by us, without the legal judgment of his peers, of his lands, castles, liberties, or rights, we will forthwith restore them to him; and if any dispute arises upon this head, let the matter be decided by the five-and-twenty barons hereafter mentioned, for the preservation of the peace.

61. As for all those things of which any person has, without the legal judgment of his peers, been dispossessed or deprived, either by King Henry, our father, or our brother, King Richard, and which we have in our hands, or are possessed by others, and we are bound to warrant and make good, we shall have a respite till the term usually allowed the croises, excepting those things about which there is a suit depending, or whereof an inquest hath been made by our order before we undertook the crusade; but when we return from our pilgrimage, or if we do not perform it, we will immediately cause full justice to be administered therein.

62. The same respite we shall have for disafforesting the forests which Henry, our father, or our brother, Richard, have afforested, and for the wardship of the lands which are in another's fee, in the same manner as we have hitherto enjoyed those wardships by reason of a fee held of us by knight's service; and for the abbeys founded in any other fee than our own, in which the lord of the fee claims a

right; and when we return from our pilgrimage, or if we should not perform it, we will immediately do full justice to all the complainants in his behalf.

63. No man shall be taken or imprisoned upon the appeal of a woman for the death of any other man than her husband.

64. All unjust and illegal fines, and all amerciaments imposed unjustly and contrary to the law of the land, shall be entirely forgiven, or else be left to the decision of the five-and-twenty barons, hereafter mentioned, for the preservation of the peace, or of the major part of them, together with aforesaid Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, if he can be present, and others whom he shall think fit to take along with him; and if he cannot be present, the business shall, notwithstanding, go on without him; but so that if one or more of the aforesaid five-and-twenty barons be plaintiffs in the same cause, they shall be set aside as to what concerns this particular affair, and others be chosen in their room out of the said five-and-twenty, and sworn by the rest to decide that matter.

65. If we have disseised or dispossessed the Welsh of any lands, liberties or other things, without the legal judgment of their peers, they shall immediately be restored to them. And if any dispute arise upon this head, the matter shall be determined in the Marches by the judgment of their peers; for tenements in England, according to the law of England; for tenements in Wales, according to the law of Wales; for tenements in the Marches, according to the law of the Marches, the same shall the Welsh do to us and our subjects.

66. As for all those things of which any Welshman hath without the legal judgment of his peers been disseised or deprived by King Henry, our father, or our brother, King Richard, and which we either have in our hands, or others are possessed of, and we are obliged to warrant, we shall have a respite till the time generally allowed the croises, excepting those things about which a suit is depending, or whereof an inquest hath been made by our order before we undertook the crusade; but when we return, or if we stay at home, and do not perform our pilgrimage, we will immediately do them full justice according to the law of the Welsh, and of the parts afore-mentioned.

67. We will, without delay, dismiss the son of Lewelin and all the Welsh hostages, and release them from the engagements they entered into with us for the preservation of the peace.

68. We shall treat with Alexander, King of Scots, concerning the restoration of his sister and hostages, and his rights and liberties, in the same form (and manner) as we shall do the rest of our barons of England, unless by the engagements which his father, William, late King of Scots, hath entered into with us, it ought to be otherwise, and this shall be left to the determination of his peers in our court.

69. All the aforesaid customs, privileges, and liberties which we have granted to be holden in our kingdom, as much as it belongs to us towards our people, all our subjects, as well clergy as laity, shall observe as far as they are concerned towards their dependents.

70. And whereas, for the honour of God and the amendment of our kingdom, and for quieting the discord that has arisen between us and our barons, we have granted

all the things aforesaid. Willing to render them firm and lasting we do give and grant our subjects the following *security*, namely, that the barons may choose five-and-twenty barons of the kingdom, whom they think convenient, who shall take care with all their might to hold and observe, and cause to be observed, the peace and liberties we have granted them, and by this our present charter confirmed; so that, if our justiciary, our bailiffs, or any of our officers, shall in any case fail in the performance of them towards any person, or shall break through any of these articles of peace and security, and the offence is notified to four barons, chosen out of the five-and-twenty afore-mentioned, the said four barons shall repair to us, or our justiciary, if we are out of the realm, and, laying, upon the grievance, shall petition to have it redressed without delay. And if it is not redressed by us, if we should chance to be out of the realm, if it is not redressed by our justiciary, within forty days, reckoning from the time it hath been notified to us, or to our justiciary, if we should be out of the realm, the four barons aforesaid shall lay the cause before the rest, and the five-and-twenty barons; and the said five-and-twenty barons, together with the community of the whole kingdom, shall distraint and distress us all the ways possible—namely, by seizing our castles, lands, and possessions, in any other manner they can, till the grievance is redressed according to their pleasure, saving harmless our own person, and the persons of our queen and children; and when it is redressed, they shall obey us as before.

71. Any person whatsoever in the kingdom may swear that he will obey the orders of the five-and-twenty barons aforesaid, in the execution of the premises, and that he will distress us jointly with them to the utmost of his power; and we give public and free liberty to any one that will swear to them; and never shall hinder any person from taking the same oath.

72. As for all those of our subjects who will not of their own accord agree to join the five-and-twenty barons in distraining and distressing us, we will issue our order to make them take the same oath, as aforesaid.

73. And if any one of the five-and-twenty barons dies, or goes out of the kingdom, or is hindered any other way from putting the things aforesaid into execution, the rest of the five-and-twenty barons may choose another in his room, at their discretion, who shall be sworn in like manner as the rest.

74. In all things that are committed to the charge of these five-and-twenty barons, if, when they are all assembled together, they should happen to disagree about any matter, or some of them, when summoned, will not or cannot come, whatever is agreed upon or enjoined by the major part of those who are present shall be reputed as firm and solid as if all the five-and-twenty had given their consent; and the foresaid five-and-twenty shall swear that all the premises they shall faithfully observe, and cause with all their power to be observed.

75. And we will not, by ourselves or others, procure anything whereby any of their concessions and liberties be revoked or lessened; and if any such thing be obtained, let it be null and void; neither shall we ever make use of it either by ourselves or any other.

76. And all the ill-will, anger, and malice that hath arisen between us and our subjects, of the clergy and laity,

from the first breaking out of the dissension between us, we do fully remit and forgive. Moreover, all trespasses occasioned by the said dissension, from Easter, in the sixteenth year of our reign, till the restoration of peace and tranquility, we hereby entirely remit to all, clergy as well as laity, and, as far as in us, do fully forgive.

77. We have, moreover, granted them our latters patent testimonial of Stephen, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Henry, Lord Archbishop of Dublin, and the bishops aforesaid, as also Master Pandulph for the Pope's security and concessions aforesaid.

78. Wherefore we will and firmly enjoin that the Church of England be free, and that all men in our kingdom have and hold all the aforesaid liberties, rights, and concessions, truly and peaceably, freely and quietly, fully and wholly, to themselves and their heirs, of us and our heirs, in all things and places, for ever, as is aforesaid.

79. It is also sworn, as well on our part as on the part of the barons, that all things aforesaid shall faithfully and sincerely be observed.

Given under our hand, in the presence of the witnesses above-named and many others, in the meadow call Runnymede, between Windsor and Stanes, on the fifteenth day of June, in the seventeenth year of our reign.

.....So as we are first acquainted therewith, or our justiciary, if we should not be in England.....and in the same manner about administering justice, deforesting, or letting them continue.

(Translation published by C. F. ASHTON in 1938.)

"ONLY THE BRITISH UNDERSTAND"

In *The Aeroplane Spotter* for February 25, 1943, an officer of the U.S. Army Air Forces is quoted:—

"In the fall of 1940 a number of Boeing B-17cs [the first Flying Fortresses] were to be refitted... for service in England... In the Spring of 1941 these ships were ferried to England. We gave the British specific instructions that these 'planes were to be used for training purposes.

"... We explained to the British our doctrine for the use of the 'planes. We told them that the crews had to be well trained... and that by using them as trainers, trained crews could be ready to operate the new, properly equipped Fortresses when we delivered them. For some reason, which only the British understand, they decided to use the 'planes offensively."

The officer goes on to describe the unhappy experiences with these machines, and concludes: "We knew they were not combat worthy for we had been able to build only a few experimental models... The Summer of 1941 found our Air Force working frantically to improve the Flying Fortresses. The British experience emphasised three terrible needs: The system of defensive gunnery had to be changed; it was imperative that ships operate in considerable numbers...; the crews had to be trained thoroughly as units."

Parliament

Continued from page two.

will give an assurance that it is the intention of the Government eventually to restore to private enterprise undertakings which have been purchased by the State in the name of increased war production?

Mr. Astor asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will consider a procedure whereby, in cases where the shares of a firm are compulsorily acquired under war-time measures without the consent of the shareholders, they should be held in trust during the war and, after the war, offered to the former shareholders at a price fixed by a similar procedure to that whereby they were acquired?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Kingsley Wood): I have been asked to reply. I am not clear precisely for what purpose my hon. Friend the Member for East Fulham (*Mr. Astor*) suggests the creation of a trust. Where shares are acquired to secure effective control of an undertaking they are transferred to the Treasury Solicitor and held by him on behalf of the Government. The disposal of the shares cannot be very well dissociated from the larger question of disposal of property and assets of various kinds acquired or created by the Government during the war. On this point, as I informed my hon. Friend the Member for Tynemouth on the 1st April, the question is receiving preliminary study, but decisions as to the scope and method of such disposals will depend upon a variety of circumstances and considerations which cannot be fully assessed at the present time, including of course, the possibility of changes in the nature and value of the assets while they have been in Government hands.

Mr. Simmonds: Is it not a fact that the trade unions have received from the Government assurance as to the restitution of their proper rights after hostilities, and does not my right hon. Friend think that both equity and constitutional government demand that a similar assurance should be given to private enterprise?

Sir K. Wood: I think the Prime Minister has covered a good deal of that in his reply.

Mr. Astor: Will my right hon. Friend give existing shareholders receipts for the shares when they are taken over, so that they will be able to put forward a claim for them subsequently?

Sir K. Wood: I will consider that.

EMERGENCY POWERS (DEFENCE) WAR PRODUCTION UNDERTAKINGS (GOVERNMENT NOMINATED DIRECTORS)

Mr. Simmonds (Birmingham, Duddeston): I beg to move,

"That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying that the Order in Council, dated 22nd March, 1943, made under the Emergency Powers (Defence) Acts, 1939 and 1940, substituting a new Regulation for Regulation 54CA of the Defence (General) Regulations, 1939, a copy of which was presented to this House on 23rd March, be annulled."

In moving this humble Prayer, I ought to say that I

am supported by no fewer than 128 Members of this House, and although the majority of them are members of the Conservative Party, we do enjoy the support of six Liberals and one Independent Member....

I should state what are the present powers possessed by the Government with regard to the handling of difficult questions of management, particularly in industry. First, a Minister can appoint a controller of the undertaking, and this he will do under Regulation 55, paragraph 4. It is not my intention to read out the individual paragraphs unless I am pressed so to do, because I am anxious to be as brief as possible. If, when a controller is appointed, some of the directors of the undertaking are obstreperous, there is power in the hands of the Minister for the replacement of obstructive directors, under Regulation 78, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a). If, further, the Minister is unable, as he thinks, to satisfy himself as to the efficient running of the undertaking in the national interest, he may order the purchase of the shares of the undertaking, under Regulation 78, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (b). These, then, are the weapons, up to date, in the Ministerial armoury. They have been adequate for a not inconsiderable number of Ministers for nearly three years, and yet we now have this new Rule and Order 437 brought before us.

What does the Rule permit a Minister to do? It says that, if a Minister thinks it wise in the interests of improving the efficiency of an undertaking so to do, he may force on to the board of that undertaking a number of directors, not exceeding three and in any event not constituting a majority, but subject to a highly ambiguous proviso relating to the magnitude of the financial investment which the State may have in the undertaking....

I feel... that if an undertaking did accept the money [financial assistance from the State] there is an obvious case for the State having the right to call for representation on the board. But the point I make is this; as the Regulation now stands would these State directors be financial directors in the usually accepted sense of the word? I think the House will need to assure itself on this point, because that is the crux of the whole thing. It will want to be certain that they are not in fact administrative directors being forced on to the board by the back-staircase of a financial phantasy... I would say that a financial director in the sense that I am using the word—and it is the usually accepted sense in commerce—is one who is placed upon the board because the owner of a certain interest in the business desires that that director should protect the financial investment... there must be many cases where, for instance, the financial director is a chartered accountant and has no knowledge at all of the affairs of the business... Let me therefore examine this point as to whether these directors are financial or administrative directors. In paragraph (1) we have these words: "...for the purpose of improving the efficiency of the war production of the undertaking..."

These words strongly suggest, to my mind, that these are administrative and not financial directors, and in this I am strengthened by reference to Statutory Rule and Order 196 where are these words about State directors: "...experienced in the direction of companies of a like character..."

Why were these directors to be experienced in the direction of companies of a like character? Obviously because it was desired that they should be men who knew

the type of business and who could play their full part in the direction of the undertaking. . . .

But if we refer now to paragraph (i) sub-paragraph (a), we see that the public moneys which may be invested in the company are public moneys which in the opinion of the competent authority are substantial in amount; that is to say, the Minister in the supply Department or whoever else is utilising this Order would himself decide whether the sums of money were substantial. It is perfectly obvious that if this is so, there must be a very wide circle of companies about which, if the Minister desires to place a director upon their board, he could say that in his opinion the investment of the State was substantial. He might bring himself reluctantly to accept his own view that the investment was substantial, but even if he jibbed at being persuaded by himself in this matter and thus to stretch the very elastic powers in this Order, he need be nothing daunted, for with a fine Gilbertian touch, inspired by the best traditions of Strophon, he would find it was not, in fact, necessary to make any investment at all. All he would need to do would be to propose to make an investment. . . .

[Mr. Simmonds then quoted the definition of the undertakings to which the Regulation would be applicable, and continued:—]

It will be well within the knowledge of the House that unless, in fact, an undertaking comes within this definition, then no labour is permitted to it by my right hon. Friend the Minister of Labour. It thus follows that all operative undertakings come within this Regulation, and that is a point which I think should be well appreciated by all hon. Members. . . .

. . . I think the comparable arrangements on the labour side would be for the Government to appoint members of the executives of the trade unions. [Laughter.] . . .

Sir John Mellor (Tamworth): . . . Whereas that old Regulation to which I have referred was ill-conceived, on balance the new Regulation is a worse one. The old Regulation at least provided to the company some right of objection. It was provided under the old Regulation that if the directors of the company passed a resolution objecting to an appointment by the Minister, then that objection should be valid unless the Minister took the further step of appointing an authorised controller under the provisions of Regulation 55.

I want to know why that right has disappeared in the new Regulation. I recognise that there are some minor improvements in the new Regulation, but the disappearance of that right of objection, on balance, makes the new Regulation very much worse than the old. I recognise that the Government must have whatever powers of control are necessary for the war effort. There can be no question about that, and the Government have now far reaching powers of control, which my hon. Friend has described, under Regulations 54 (c), 55 and 78, but the Regulation with which we are concerned does not confer any power of control at all. The other Regulations confer powers of control so far-reaching that one can hardly imagine that any powers could be carried which would be greater. But this Regulation confers no power of control, because it is expressly provided that the Government nominee directors shall not constitute a majority of the board. I regard this as giving power of interference without responsibility, enabling intrusion of an undesirable character which will be

likely to create ill-feeling and a diversion of effort. I think I could describe this Regulation as introducing the infiltration of bureaucracy into industry. . . .

(Further extracts from this Debate will appear in next week's issue of THE SOCIAL CREDITER.)

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer,
Social Credit Expansion Fund,
c/o The Social Credit Secretariat,
49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

I enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas

Name

Address

Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to the Social Credit Expansion Fund and crossed "& Co. account payee only."

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 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.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.

Leaflets

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.
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.