

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 11. No. 18.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 8, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

MODERN SCIENCE (XI)

The second congress of a body known as the World Fellowship of Faiths was held in London in July, 1936. Mr. Warren Weston's account of it is introduced by a cartoon depicting the procession ascending the steps of St. Paul's Cathedral with their banners, *e.g.*, Theosophy, Judaism, Spiritualism, Buddhism, *etc., etc.*; while in the foreground, bringing up the rear, Satan, winged, birectaed and satyrical, informs the onlooker, *sotto voce*: "This is the first time we've been actually invited." At the moment, I cannot confirm that the thousand delegates to the congress, under the presidency of the Maharajah Gaekwar of Baroda did, in fact, retire from University College and the Queen's Hall to St. Paul's. The point is the incongruity of the notion that "the mutual appreciation of each other's standpoint" is, in practice, whatever it may be in theory, anything more than a solvent for all standpoints, a submergence of differences which are vital, with the object of discovering a common basis which is significant and unimportant in inverse ratio to the height of the layer of differences removed. "We descend to meet." This is characteristic of Satanism: an instance of inversion: ascent becomes descent.

It is the distinguishing mark of Life that it grows away from what unites it, the tree from the soil, the animal from the stock, man from the herd, the child from the family, the idea from the brain. The exhortation of the Sermon on the Mount, *Be ye perfect*, is hardly needed; for completion is the universal objective of all things that live. Shall we dissolve our literatures in the dictionary? They are all there: merely their differences of emphasis, or mere place and order have been removed, and all that remains is the common idea—words, words, words! Kedarnath Das Gupta and the communist Charles Weller, who founded the Fellowship of Faiths in Chicago in 1924, doubtless had their own ideas of the 'unity' they desired to effect. If they hadn't someone else had. It is this 'someone else' by whom political society is cursed. The Prince Consort, who found Cambridge "not a patch on the Universities of his Fatherland" was not at Bonn very long: eighteen months, we are told, shortened by "the unusual vacations"! There "his talent for mimicry and the grotesque was often exercised for the amusement of his companions. A University, especially a German University, with the oddly accentuated ways of its professors, can never fail to provide abundant materials for this kind of gift." (Theodore Martin: *Life of the Prince Consort*, a work which, I am told, 'Professor' Joad has just announced to be an example of 'inaccurate' history. The 'B.B.C. becomes as sensitive to the tastes of members of the reading public as the Postal Workers' Union is of the integrity of

their communications). Stockmar, that wonderful man, had advised that Vienna was no school for a German Prince. "The Universities? their training was too one-sided and theoretical for one whose vocation would be to deal practically with men and things on a great scale." Yet Stockmar himself had arrived in England, as it were, great 'scale' in hand, with the "childish, petty, narrow-minded and cumbrous ways at that time in vogue in Germany, more especially in the smaller States," and had to familiarise himself with "business in its various branches" and be afforded "from an advantageous position, an insight into the colossal movements of the social and political life of England." (Stockmar: *Memoirs*). How our views adapt themselves to our intentions! Prince Albert went to Bonn in 1837, when the reputation of that University was "maintained by Bethman Hollweg, A. W. V. Schlegel, the younger Fichte, Löbell, Kaufmann, Perthès, d'Alton and others." That list won't help us much. There is a clue in a strange letter from Bunsen to one of his sons, written in London on July 15, 1851 (italicised passages as in original, *Memoirs*, Vol. II., p. 265): "Tell your excellent B—that he should not take it ill of Germans that they give him as an Israelite the hindmost place—that will not be of long continuance; it is ever more becoming clear to me, in beholding the Jewish dispensation from the standpoint of universal history, that whoever will not give up the world's history in despair, must assume in his own soul the future fact of the Christianising, Hellenising, Germanising, of the Jewish system; and say to himself, as a son of Israel, that he is *thus* brought nearer to Abraham than he was before. Such sons of Israel must therefore help the sons of Japhet to *Hellenise* Christianity, to raise it to the idea of entire humanity; in other words, to found the *true* Hero-worship with the *one true* Dionysos-Osiris at its head. That sounds absurd, but it is yet true!"

Mark it, ye Aristotelians! What, is the man above your heads whose friendship with Stockmar, "the disciple of Stein," was "sacred and consecrated, having been sworn on the altar of the fatherland, and in view of Westminster Abbey" (Bunsen to Usedom, 1848: *Memoirs*, Vol. 88, p. 197)? Or, as we should say, 'in the German Embassy in Carlton Terrace.'

It was not long to the first London School Board. Was there a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Bahaist, a Confucian, or a Swedenborgian on it? Anyhow, there were the first of the Agnostics, Anglicans, Roman Catholics, a Baptist and representatives of other denominations, while Women's Rights, in the person of Dr. Elizabeth Garrett, polled 20,000 more votes than any other candidate in the ten divisions of the Metropolis. At Liverpool and Manchester, to ensure that the mixture should be arithmetically exact, the religious of all denominations met and agreed to their proportionate repre-

sensation without the formality of public contests, a course which resulted, at Manchester, in the unopposed return of six Anglicans, two Wesleyans, two Roman Catholics, two Secularists and a Presbyterian. Good enough! No one knew whither he was being propelled in any case; but all were quite sure they would get there, if they could only prevent everyone else from doing the same.

Here was one critical phase in the life-history of the "one true Dionysos-Osiris," not certainly his germination; but as certainly a growth-point on the road to the Stockmar-like antics of (say) Smuts. And no one in England seemed to know what they were doing or why they were doing it. A consequence of general compulsory education? Not yet. But a consequence of some concealed social force as easily particularisable, stage for stage, period for period, setting for setting: a *social* force, not an *extra-social* force. When these "advances" (I mean to imply the military figure) occur, does no one witness them? I am convinced that not only is there present a constant stream of fully-conscious, antagonistic witnesses; but even some among the actors see and understand. I cite the inspirer of the cartoon in the *Sunday Express* for July 25, 1943, as one of the latter, whoever he was. At the earlier time, Abercromby, Speaker of the House of Commons, told Melbourne, nicknamed by Stockmar *Pococurante*. (the "well-meaning," "indolent," "honest," "careless" Melbourne), "he felt it would be his duty to call attention in Parliament to the unconstitutional position of the foreigner Stockmar. Melbourne replied that Stockmar was a person who filled a gap caused by circumstances in certain relations, with his (Melbourne's) knowledge and approval. Lord Melbourne related the circumstance later to Stockmar, who exclaimed, 'Tell Abercromby to bring forward his motion against me in Parliament; I shall know how to defend myself.' The Speaker, however, remained quiescent." Stockmar tells the story himself. Was it not Lady Rhondda's rule to "admit freely everything that is *already known*?"

The Stockmars still know how to defend themselves, and the Abercrombys are still 'quiescent.' But as the weight of evidence, accumulating through the centuries, piles up in the scale-pan, will the beam at last not slowly alter its direction?

(To be continued.)

TUDOR JONES.

ABERHART MANNING

The memoir of Mr. Aberhart published in the EDMONTON BULLETIN, and that journal's report of Mr. Manning's speech on policy broadcast on his becoming Premier of Alberta.

With portraits of Mr. Aberhart and Mr. Manning.

Price 9d (Postage extra).

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

RESCUING THE JEWS

The Jewish Chronicle of December 31, 1943, says:—

"The resolution proposing that a United States Government Commission of diplomatic, economic, and military experts should be set up to organise the rescue of Jews from Europe, which was recently introduced in both Houses of Congress, has failed to get through the Senate. It is, however, intended to put the resolution before the Senate again in the New Year.

"The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs had unanimously approved the resolution, which had been jointly submitted by Republican and Democratic Senators. The corresponding Committee of the House of Representatives, on the other hand, had rejected it.

"Mr. Breckenridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, in the course of his testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, declared that the British and American Governments are ready to contribute \$4,000,000 each to a \$10,000,000 fund for the purchase of food to be dispatched to Jews in the ghettos of Poland and Czechoslovakia, according to reports from members of the Foreign Affairs Committee in Washington.

"The food supplies, they said, are to be distributed through the International Red Cross. The balance of \$2,000,000 would be contributed by an unnamed American Jewish organisation.

"Previously Mr. Long had informed the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the United States were ready to take all the new refugees who came out of France or other occupied territory. Spain, he said, would assist them.

"The release of this information together with the statement that 580,000 refugees had been admitted to the U.S.A. since Hitler came to power ten years ago, led to the belief at the time that the House Committee had been turned against the resolution."

DARLAN'S ASSASSIN NOT AN ENEMY AGENT

The Commissariat of Justice at Algiers has issued an official statement, "at the request of the family of Fernand Eugene Bonnier de la Chapelle," denying that the man who killed Darlan last year was either an Italian agent or in the pay of Germany.

"HE THAT KEEPETH THE LAW—"

"'He that keepeth the law, happy is he'; 'Blessed is the man that feareth the Eternal, that delighteth greatly in His commandments';—that is the Hebrew notion of felicity; and, pursued with passion and tenacity, this notion would not let the Hebrew rest till, as is well known, he had at last got out of the law a network of prescriptions to enrap his whole life, to govern every moment of it, every impulse, every action."—From *Culture and Anarchy*, by MATTHEW ARNOLD (1869).

Growth of Canadian Social Credit Movement

In a speech broadcast in November, the Hon. E. C. MANNING, Premier of Alberta, referred to the growing interest in Social Credit throughout Canada:—

Did you know . . . that in that one Province [Quebec] alone there are five thousand persons each pledged to give three hours every week to building up the Social Credit organisation, and to the spreading of information and knowledge about the Social Credit movement and the true democratic way of life? Did you know that the Quebec organisation can now be numbered in the hundreds of thousands? Did you know that several broadcasts every week, beside mass meetings, are spreading knowledge of the Social Credit principles to an ever increasing number of persons throughout that Province?

In Ontario and Manitoba also a lot of good solid ground-work is being done. . .

. . . Our friends in Saskatchewan likewise are beginning to organise for action. . . And in B.C. there are very encouraging signs that democratic monetary reform is becoming a really live issue. Recent press reports indicate this, and it should provide the Social Credit groups in that Province with an opportunity such as they have never had in the past.

You know, ladies and gentlemen, we have been fighting a lone battle against the ills of our antiquated money system for so many years now that we are in danger of becoming too provincial in our outlook. We are apt to overlook the importance of the rapid growth of Social Credit support across Canada. To-day people are thinking in terms of national issues—and from one end of Canada to the other they are reaching out eagerly for information about Social Credit. They have lost all hope in the old parties and they know that the old economic order of financial dictatorship with all its inefficiency and injustice must be swept away. Canadians, irrespective of their racial stock, are freedom loving people. They do not want to get rid of a financial dictatorship only to find themselves in the clutches of a political dictatorship. They do not want to jump out of the frying pan into the fire. Instinctively they know that there is a way which will give them the economic security they rightly desire, and at the same time guarantee for them their individual freedom in all its fullness.

More and more progressively minded but freedom-loving people are coming to realise that Social Credit provides the only practicable solution. It is not surprising that the financial monopolists, the would-be political dictators and all those with a vested interest in keeping people in either economic or political bondage, are alarmed at the growing interest across the country in Social Credit. They are trying to reassure themselves by shouting that it is dead—that it is a fallacy—that it has failed in Alberta and so on and so forth. But the louder they shout the more they boost it. The Social Credit tide is flowing with ever increasing strength—and nothing will stop it. You cannot resist the united will of an enlightened people.

We are entering upon a new phase in our battle for freedom from economic bondage. From a provincial organisation originally confined to Alberta we are today witnessing the growth of a strong national Social Credit movement. . .

In this struggle we have been opposed, obstructed and attacked by the powerful forces of the financial interests, who are determined not merely to continue but to intensify the economic bondage which they have imposed upon mankind.

To-day brave men are fighting, yes—and dying, so that we may have the opportunity to build a new post-war order of social justice. Our fight for the past eight years is their fight to-day. And while they are crushing the military enemies of human freedom on the European battlefronts, we will be equally as resolute in overthrowing the hidden enemies of human freedom on the home front. . . .

The issue has developed beyond this Province. It has become a national issue. Let us, then, reach out and join hands with our fellow Canadians across the dominion, and reinforced, march forward to the victorious peace without which victory in war will be an empty mockery.

Beveridge-As-You-Go

An article in the *Economist* for December 25 discerns an anomaly in State administration which sets one hierarchy of civil servants working out a complete system of pay-as-you-earn taxation upon wages and salaries and a second hierarchy evolving "the complex rules by which Social Security benefits and allowances are to be paid in a revised Beveridge plan." The author suggests that our aim should be to economise on administration by amalgamating these two operations into one, to be called Beveridge-as-you-go, which means that a single set of officials would as it were balance out your tax payments and Beveridge 'benefits,' and administer the result.

There could be no more complete admission that the Beveridge 'benefits' designed to induce the complete regulation of our lives are merely our own earnings re-allocated with a large proportion deducted to pay for the costly and unpleasant process of being well and truly regimented. Only such superb earnestness as the *Economist's* could refrain from recognising the trick which relieves the victim of his earnings for the avowed purpose of depriving him of his independence and even of the right to choose his own work.

But even more significant in that it uses the now commonplace technique of confusion of ideas are later passages in the article:—

"The ultimate aim of Beveridge-as-you-go should be two-fold: a minimum cash income provided for every citizen, employed and unemployed, rich and poor, old and young: and a simple proportional income-tax deducted at a flat rate from all incomes however arising. . . And what more decisive demonstration of economic democracy could there be than that every citizen should be given a minimum by the community, and pay to the community a fraction of all he earned? [To provide the income]."

Demon est deus inversus. Must we suppose the *Economist* has never had occasion to inquire into the question of the *unconditional indalienable* minimum incomes which could be made possible on the basis of the increment of production assured by the continuous technical advances of machine production? It may be: for such would ensure a freedom of the individual which would sweep out of being bureaucrats, conditional 'benefits,' controls, and all their prophets.

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. 11. No. 18.

Saturday, January 8, 1944.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"Article 170 of the Treaty of Versailles specifically prohibited German export or import of munitions or armaments. By 1925 it was known that:—

"... in open violation of the Treaty of Versailles, the Germans shipped munitions to the Argentines... Rottleil (I.G. Farben's wholly owned subsidiary) still makes and sells excellent military powders, and German factories for munitions have been built or openly offered to build in Spain, Argentina, Mexico, etc. (*Munitions Industry*, U.S. Senate Report No. 944).

"... Although these violations of the disarmament clauses of the Peace Treaty were known to the State Departments of Great Britain and the United States, no action was taken. Imperial Chemical Industries, formerly the British Nobel Company (*sic*) refrained from any protest because of its cartel agreements with I. G. Farben."

—*Germany's Master Plan*, p.33, by BORKIN AND WELSH.

At this time, and at all significant times during the re-armament of Germany, Stanley Baldwin (Honest Stan.) was Prime Minister of Great Britain. He is still uninterned under Regulation 18B.

"The Dean of the Faculty of one of our [Canadian—Ed.] universities said to us the other day: 'I should be very happy to come out openly on the side of Social Credit; but I should be out of a job in eight hours and my place would be filled by one of your enemies.'"

—*Vers Demain*, Quebec, November 1, 1943.

It should be remembered that Russia is fighting Germany because Germany attacked her. That was very lucky for us. The United States is at war with Germany and Japan because Japan attacked her, and Germany declared war on her. That was probably lucky for us, too.

We are fighting Germany because Germany attacked Poland, and everybody said "Stop Hitler." Just how lucky that was, time will show. We are fighting Japan because we hadn't enough to do.

We mention these trifles because the prevailing idea seems to be that we declared war on Germany in order to bring in a brand new economic and social system by fighting Germany, Japan, and Italy single-handed. Since, much against their will, others are in it too, we are fighting—oh, give over, Clarence, can't you!

And when Germany is beaten, Russia will be out of the war, but we shan't. So what?

An American magazine announces that a well-known American Aircraft Company helped the R.A.F. to win the Battle of Britain. Well, you can't say they didn't mention the R.A.F.

The best Scotch whisky is being sold in the United States at less than half the price paid by the consumer in Great Britain. This is called Lease-Lend in reverse, and is the basis of the New Order.

It is stated on good authority that the United States will furnish 73 per cent. of the combined force under General Eisenheuer which will invade the Continent. Probably about 27 per cent. of the invasion force will do the actual fighting.

Pierre Samuel du Pont de Nemours (1739-1817), the founder of the U.S. chemical trust which is the opposite number of I.G. Farben and I.C.I., was alleged to be a member of the Illuminati, the Secret Society which planned the French Revolution. The fact that his son was named Eleuthere, a name connected with the mysteries of Eleusis, seems to lend colour to the theory. E. I. du Pont, Inc., is the most powerful financial-industrial group in America.

The only conclusion to which we can come is that every effort is being made to induce "the workers" in this country to fall over backwards into the arms of a military strike-breaking organisation by fostering a fanatical and unreasoning adulation of a dictatorship on the Russian model, which is brooding speaking, like any other model. It's a clever trick, but we think it will fail. The phony strikes in America, which are promptly quelled by the Army, are part of the game.

THE UNCOMMON MAN

"A general, planning a campaign, has to reckon up the numbers in his armies, not individual qualities. He has to accept the myth of the common man.

"A myth can be very useful, so long as we know it for a myth; when we begin to mistake it for a reality, it becomes dangerous. To treat people as if they were all alike is the way of the dictator in a totalitarian country, and the way of a bureaucrat in a country which may delude itself into thinking it is a democracy.

"The fundamental fact about human nature is not to be found in our likenesses but in our differences. After you have finished talking about the brotherhood of man open your eyes and look at your brothers, and recognise that you belong to a family of which no two members are alike. Look at yourself and recognise that the essence of you, what makes you a personality, is not what you have in common with other men, but what is peculiar to yourself.

"In other words, you are an uncommon man. . .

"Democracy does not mean the rule of the common man; . . . there is no such person. Democracy is the form of government that gives the utmost possible freedom to the uncommon man."

—WALTER MURDOCH in the *Melbourne Herald*, Oct. 1943.

Post-War Relief and National Sovereignty

"It would be supreme irony for us to win victory, and then to inherit world chaos simply because we were unprepared to meet what we know we shall have to meet. We know the human wants which will follow liberation," said President Roosevelt, 'sending' the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration last November, and Mr. Roosevelt's speeches are reputed to be supervised by Mr. Robert Sherwood, the playwright, whose works are a persuasive combination of uplift with popular appeal.

But *do* we know these human wants? And if we may discern them at the good common level of food and medical supplies which Mr. Roosevelt instances in his speech rather than the complete economic replanning which the disgruntled *Economist* would prefer to read into the name, is this necessarily a reason for over-riding fundamental national sovereignties and interests by a supra-national body over which the people of both liberating and liberated countries have no control?

U.N.R.R.A. is claimed as democratic because it works by Committees. So it does,—by a coven of committees which to attain any efficiency must eventually hand back the power of direction either to one of themselves or to the executive.

The machinery set up consists of, firstly, a Council on which all the member nations of U.N.R.R.A. are represented (at present they number 44). The function of this Council is to "make" policy. Secondly, a standing Central Committee, comprising representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Soviet Russia and China, with the Director-General of U.N.R.R.A. as Chairman (without a vote). The business of this Committee is to make decisions—which must be unanimous—and to report to the Council, which may by a majority vote reverse these decisions. The Central Committee is responsible for the appointment of executive personnel. It will initiate schemes, call for supplies and engage such transport facilities as may seem possible. The Director-General, head Executive, reports to the Central Committee and to the Council. There are also the Supplies Committee; Regional Committees to advise the General Council on activities in different zones of operation; the Technical Standing Committee on Repatriation, and others.

All these committees are not so much international as supra-national. At present there are two Regional Committees, the European Committee, which will sit in London under the Chairmanship of Colonel Llewellyn, Minister of Food, and the Far Eastern Committee. Within the European zone, the decisions of the European Regional Committee as to the needs and allocations of supplies to each country override the decisions of all countries (member or otherwise) within that zone. Similarly, the Supplies Committee works closely with the Combined Boards—the Combined Food Board, the Combined Raw Materials Board and the Combined Production and Resources Board—the bodies at present handling the pooled resources of the Allies and allocating them according to the needs of war.

Now the agreement signed by members of U.N.R.R.A. in Washington expressly stipulates that "all purchases by any of the member Governments to be made outside their own territories during the war... shall be made only after

consultation with the Director-General, and shall, so far as is practicable, be carried out through the appropriate United Nations agency."

Hence this powerful supra-national body controls the access to all available supplies of food and raw materials throughout a great part of the world. That, at least, is how the blue-print runs. It is a mechanism designed specifically for the purpose of coming between the production of food and raw materials, and its consumption, a function previously reserved (on the grand scale) for the money-mechanism. It is a bankers' trick, which perhaps accounts for the fact that a one-time banker is at its head, and the assertion that it is for the good of all concerned is one that will only be assured by the results attained.

The possibility that this mechanism is devised to achieve other objects than those accepted by its members is suggested by the appointment as Director-General of Mr. Herbert Lehman, Jew, Zionist, banker, Governor of New York, and member of Mr. Roosevelt's 'Brains Trust,' in whom wide powers have been vested. Does not such an appointment smack more than a little of the melodrama of a Hollywood film? Sir Arthur Salter, who from the school of P.E.P. planning has graduated through the Ministry of War Transport, will be able to show his capacity in a wider field now as he has accepted Mr. Lehman's invitation to join the staff of U.N.R.R.A. at Washington.

The two most powerful sanctions to order and control the people of the world are food and armaments. Hitler is using both: he starves those with whom he disagrees (if he does not shoot them). In war-time both sanctions are under close and centralised control, and the hand which exercises that control enjoys stupendous power. In peacetime armaments are outside the rules, and while hitherto food has been controlled indirectly by money, the money trick is now almost played out. Co-incidentally there developed this supra-national organisation claiming a broad monopoly of the most vital sanction of peace, undermining national independence, and in practice using the economic difficulties of war to build a false unity which has been repudiated by the peoples concerned. U.N.R.R.A. is a powerful weapon which can be turned against its own members and used not only to maintain the continued subservience of Europe (to masters no less unwelcome than Hitler) but the practical fusion of the Allies into a United Nation. In this way it does indeed bridge the gap between war and peace, preserving in peace, by methods of war, the ultimate control of life usually only resigned to the State in times of war. Wars may be fought for life, but what they bring is death; and the methods apt in waging war are not successful in fostering life.

But the individuals ("representatives" of nations) who compose U.N.R.R.A. are fortunately more human than the instrument put into their hands, and the organisation has deviated somewhat from the rigid blue-print laid down for it, which would have led the 'policy-makers' to an unwelcome policy.

A British representative at the conference suggested that nations with the money and the shipping should be allowed to buy for their own use outside U.N.R.R.A.—thus preserving their right to do the best they could for their own people and to define and negotiate that best. The Director-General of U.N.R.R.A., no doubt seeing his last sanction over the

members vanishing, remarked that the adoption of this suggestion would turn U.N.R.R.A. into a mere debating society. Finally a compromise was reached and these countries (e.g. France and Holland) are to be entitled to approach the Combined Boards direct, but U.N.R.R.A. is to have the right of veto if this results in unfair distribution of supplies.

National sovereignty, in fact, is still alive, and seems to be kicking the planners harder than they bargained for. The *Economist* observed of the plans laid down at Atlantic City:—

“As far as can be gathered from the published reports, nothing in the plans laid down at Atlantic City foreshadows a more constructive, co-operative and unified European economy. At every point, the emphasis has been laid on national sovereignty, on sovereign independence, on the authority of Governments each in its own circumscribed territorial sphere. A suggestion was put forward by one of the British delegates that all inland transport of supplies in Europe should be put under an international authority, for the experience of the last war had shown that, without some unified control, it was impossible to distribute goods according to the most immediate need. It does not appear that any such authority is envisaged. Similarly, the provision of medical relief—the sphere in which, above all, immediate need should determine the method of operation—may be made dependent on the consent of the local authority.

“Much more serious is the reported decision to take the second ‘R’ out of U.N.R.R.A. Rehabilitation is not to be the concern of the Administration. It will have no power to consider or initiate long-term schemes of recovery. It will have no word to say about their financing or their dovetailing with other schemes in neighbouring areas. . . Obviously local Governments must continue to exercise proper authority. But what is ‘proper authority’ in this sphere? Has nothing been learnt from the chaotic economic nationalism of the twenties and thirties? It may be said that U.N.R.R.A. is not a fit instrument for building up international institutions in Europe. To this the only answer is that it could have been, if the goal of international collaboration had been properly envisaged from the start.”

The Atlantic City meeting was poorly reported in this country, and it seems as if the silence was intended to muffle the shock of other more revolutionary conclusions than those which have yet been made known. That is not to say that U.N.R.R.A. is not still a dangerous weapon against national, and so individual, sovereignty: but the task to which it is set has been modified, and other agencies must be developed to achieve the drastic, extreme ‘underpinning of greater (political) unity’ by economic means, advocated by the planners. E. E.

THE BEVERIDGE PLOT

An exposure of the network of oppressive restrictions which comprise the Beveridge Plan for ‘Social Security.’

Price: 3d. (postage extra)

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

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: December 14, 1943

DEATH SENTENCES (UNITED STATES TRIBUNALS, UNITED KINGDOM)

Commander Sir Archibald Southby asked the Home Secretary whether he has any information as to in how many instances the sentence of death has been passed by the U.S.A. tribunals set up in the British Isles and whether such sentences have been carried out; and whether the execution has taken place in this country?

Miss Wilkinson: I am informed that sentence of death has been passed on seven members of the United States Forces by United States Tribunals set up in the United Kingdom. In two cases the sentence has been commuted to life imprisonment; two cases are still subject to review; in one case the sentence has been confirmed, and the execution was fixed for 14th December. In two cases the sentence of death has been carried out by the United States Authorities in this country.

WAR SITUATION AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Wing-Commander James (Wellingborough): . . . The second point to which I want to make reference is the future of Anglo-Soviet relations. I believe that all of us want to see a practical working friendship with Russia and I have encouragement to believe that it is possible, encouragement not from what I read in newspapers but from what I am told by friends who have lived in—not merely visited—Russia in the inter-war period and during this war. They tell me that they found the Russians with whom they dealt to be people with whom they could live, and who were personally likeable. They tell me also that from their experience, Anglo-Russian co-operation and friendship are possible. It is very encouraging. For Russia to join with us and the United States, she has obviously to do one thing, which is to emerge from the isolation into which she plunged herself after the last war. From that isolation she must emerge. I say that because I believe it is necessary to dispel illusions and to smooth out difficulties by being frank. There are one or two points more, which I want to make. I find myself disturbed by two distinct voices with which the Russian propaganda machine speaks. Many of us can read this for ourselves in the “Soviet Daily War News” which is sent to us. On the one hand, there is a sort of leading article, containing generalities to which nobody can take exception, such as statements about the rights of individuals and of small nations, and so on—articles that might well appear in *The Times* in its saner moments. On the other hand, you get occasionally violent political partisan attacks on the Governments of not only neutrals but Allied countries, and these are very disturbing because they are political attacks. These criticisms appear to me to be outside all bounds of propriety in the circumstances. One hears nothing analogous to that in this country. I very much hope that after the Teheran and Cairo Conferences that greatest and most powerful Czar, Marshal Stalin, will give the word and stop it. . .

House of Commons: December 15, 1943

LEAGUE OF NATIONS (CONTRIBUTIONS)

Major Petherick asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how much, in pounds sterling, of the income of the League of Nations in 1942 was derived from contributions of countries of the British Empire and how much from the rest of the world?

Mr. Eden: Of the League of Nations income in 1942, £292,424 sterling was derived from contributions by countries of the British Commonwealth and Empire and £107,568 from contributions by other member states. This latter figure excludes payments amounting to £53,706 made by members of the International Labour Office who are not members of the League of Nations.

Mr. Lipson: Are not those figures very creditable to the countries of the British Empire?

House of Commons: December 17, 1943

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT)

Mr. Bevan asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury the number of Members of the House of Commons who are now in the paid service of the Crown; the number of Members who are attached to Government Departments in a capacity which entitles them to expense accounts with the Crown; and the number of Members now performing duties which have required the issue of the Prime Minister's certificate?

Mr. Assheton: I regret that I have not been able to obtain the information with regard to the first and second parts of the Question. With regard to the third part of the Question the answer is 21.

ADJOURNMENT (CHRISTMAS)—PEACE AIMS

Mr. Rhys Davies (Westhoughton): ... I would like to know what is the mind of the Foreign Office on the old problem of the balance of power in Europe? People who do not agree with me about war and peace, some in high places, admit now that it is a great error on behalf of the British people to play the game of the balance of power in Europe, to fight with Germany against France in one decade and with France against Germany in another and then urge those two great Powers deliberately to quarrel with each other so that neither will ever be strong enough to challenge the might of the British Empire. But now another Colossus has arisen to upset all that. Russia has emerged as a mighty power in Europe; and if the British Government wish to pursue the policy of the balance of power in Europe I am not so sure that they will not be confronted in future with the views of the Soviet Union on this vital problem. The British Government might, therefore, find itself faced with complete failure if we continue to play the balance of power in Europe at the end of this war. If the House and the people of this country want a pointer as to what is likely to happen in that connection, they have it in the recognition of General Tito, the Croat Communist. What has happened? The British Government, on behalf of a capitalist country, for-

sooth, and the United States Government, a still more capitalist country, are at last recognising that leading Communist in Yugoslavia as their champion in the fight against Fascism in the Balkans. I am not suggesting for a moment that they should not—that is not my point—I want to show that it is an indication of the trend of events in Europe. It looks as if, with the complete crushing of Fascism in Europe, there will arise the enthronement of Sovietism all over the continent in its place. Where would His Majesty's Government stand, then, on an issue like that?

In the lengthy speech made by the Foreign Secretary the other day he devoted only a few sentences to peace aims because, as I have stated, the slogan is now "Unconditional surrender and nothing short of that." This is what the right hon. Gentleman said:

"What we are seeking, what we are working for, when we approach these matters in harmony with the United States and Russia, is not to impose a three-Power will upon Europe"—
[OFFICIAL REPORT, 14th December, 1943; col. 1432, Vol. 395.]

I welcome that statement nevertheless.

... On this point of building up a group of great Powers like Great Britain, the United States, China and Russia, we are told that they are to determine the form of world organisation for peace at the end of this war. If I know human nature at all I am confident that there is no possibility of peace in the world if three, four or five great Powers join together and imagine that they can police the whole world with the power they possess. They will automatically incite another group against them. As this is a total war, I am all in favour of total peace. If it is a global war, I want a global peace too.

I do not know whether hon. Members know what happened to the United States at the end of the last war. The fact that America did not come into the League of Nations resulted very largely in the emergence of this present world conflict. I doubt if this war would ever have occurred if America had come into the League, and it is worth while therefore asking ourselves why she did not. Woodrow Wilson returned to his native country at the close of the 1914-18 conflict and talked large about his great idea, the League of Nations. It was a noble idea, but strange enough, the country that gave birth to the idea did not join the League. I am told on the very best authority that at least one of the reasons was this. The British Commonwealth comprises this country, South Africa, New Zealand, Canada and Australia; and, although all told we only muster about 70,000,000 or 80,000,000 people, we entered the League as five separate units. On that basis the United States, with 130,000,000 people, would have to come in as a single nation and that in spite of the fact that they regard themselves as 47 separate units federated in what is called the United States of America. I am not bold enough to suggest a remedy for that in the future. I am only suggesting that the issue ought to be considered. If we are to have a world organisation for peace, what is going to happen, for instance, to Russia, with its 160,000,000 people made up of very many separate republics inside that country, each of which may regard itself as important as Canada, New Zealand, Australia or even South Africa? I consider this as one of the most important points that can be raised in connection with the future world organisation for peace...

We went to war ostensibly to safeguard the independence

of Poland. I did not expect the Foreign Secretary to say what happened at Teheran on that score. I am not influenced by the way one bit by official *communiqués* either. I do not expect the Government to disclose all that transpires at conferences, but I should like to know what is going to happen to Poland. Poland had attached to it in 1939 a patch of the Ukraine with 7,00,000 Ukrainians. The people of this country are bewildered about the war. They are inquiring as to whether, after all the bloodshed and devastation that have taken place, the Poland for which we went to fight in 1939 will be the Poland which will emerge at the Peace? It would be worth while to know whether the Government have anything to say about the future of the country. Then, what of Finland, Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania and Bessarabia? Is it too much to ask my right hon. Friend to give us some idea about the destiny of those countries? I am very sad to see countries devastated by war. I suppose everyone will join me in that sentiment. A devastated Europe must mean a bankrupt Great Britain at the same time. . . .

To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

*Associations desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in the following:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members
of Association

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat.†

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy for every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Deputy's Signature.....

To accompany the above form, a brief statement is requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,
Director of Organisation and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The following Groups and Associations are registered as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

GREAT BRITAIN

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. A. Crothers, 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
BRADFORD D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
GLASGOW D.S.C. Group: W. Forrester, 81 Mitchell Street, Glasgow, C. 1.
LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., T. H. Rea, 23 Clarewood Place, Fenham, Newcastle, 5.
PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
PRESTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., B. H. Ferguson, 46 Atherton Road, Fulwood, Preston.
SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19 Coniston Avenue, Redbridge, Southampton.
STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.

Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), RUBERY AND REDNALL (Birmingham), WOKING, and WOODFORD (Essex). Enquiries concerning these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

AUSTRALIA

- New South Wales Hon. Secretary.
NEW SOUTH WALES D.S.C. Assoc.:
WOMEN'S SECTION
DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH
THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN
(The above are closely allied)
INFORMATION SHEET
COWPER D.S.C. Group Miss Grace Marsden.
NEWCASTLE (N.S.W.) D.S.C. Group W. H. Hand (Editor).
BELMONT D.S.C. Group J. McDonald.
Mr. Morrow.
Mr. Murray.

South Australia

- ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group C. H. Allen.
GLENELG D.S.C. Group H. W. Lee.

Western Australia

- PERTH D.S.C. Group W. F. Andrews.
EAST PERTH D.S.C. Group A. Cook.

Queensland

- QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association A. W. Noakes.

Victoria

- MELBOURNE D.S.C. Groups:
A Group A. J. O'Callaghan.
B Group F. C. Paice.

Tasmania

- HOBART D.S.C. Group James Guthrie.

NEW ZEALAND

- PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association G. J. Billingham.

SOUTH AFRICA

- PORT ELIZABETH D.S.C. Group L. W. Smith.

CANADA

- VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group Mrs. Brooks.
OTTAWA (Parliamentary) D.S.C. Group.