

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 12.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

## The Brief for the Prosecution

By C. H. DOUGLAS

### CHAPTER VII\*

We require an intergrowth of the German and Slav races, and we require too, the cleverest financiers, the Jews, for us to become masters of the world. We require an unconditional union with Russia, together with a mutual plan of action which shall not permit any English schemata to obtain the mastery in Russia. No American future!

— FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE: *Genealogy of Morals*, p. 187.

In the main, no great error is involved in dividing responsibility for world disasters into action on two planes. The first plane is that on which very long term policy, as we consider length of time, is pursued by the same organisation. An attempt to outline policy on this plane is contained in a previous work, *The Big Idea*.

But the instruments of this policy, Nations or States, are chosen and retained for much shorter historical periods, and are discarded when a better instrument becomes available. It is in this sense that "Germany" bears a large share of the guilt of the World Wars, and it is in this sense that it is possible to date the inception of the policy with accuracy, and beyond much danger of serious disagreement.

Frederick II of Prussia, commonly and revealingly called the "Great," ascended the Throne in 1740. He has fortunately left voluminous writings of which the *Political Testament* is possibly the most important. The language and sentiments of this work bear in many ways a striking resemblance to those of the so-called Protocols of Zion, and strengthen the belief that the source of the policy of both of them is Masonic. Anacharsis Clootz, who called himself "the personal enemy of Jesus Christ," was a close associate of Frederick, and was a high Freemason.

The philosophy of Frederick, if it can be so described, is not in doubt. He remarks:

"As it has been agreed among men that to cheat our fellow creatures is a base and criminal act, it has been necessary to find a word which might modify the idea; and the word *policy* has been sanctioned to that end. In all probability, this word was selected only for sovereigns, for

they cannot really be called rogues or rascals." (Note the curious suggestion of outside influence. — Author.)

"However that may be, here is what I think of policy. I mean, by the word *policy*, that we must always try to dupe other people. . . .

"This principle being laid down, do not be ashamed of making interested alliances from which only you yourself can derive the whole advantage. Do not make the foolish mistake of not breaking them when you believe that your interests require it; and above all, uphold the following maxim: 'That to despoil your neighbours is to deprive them of the means of injuring you.'" (Frederick the Great: *Political Testament*, pp. 8-9, Boston edition, 1870.)

It is possible that the preceding paragraph contains in the shortest form the guiding principle of German national action. And the instrument of this principle is the Great German General Staff. It is necessary to be clear in our understanding of this statement, because the words represent an idea which is completely unfamiliar to the average British or American mind, and misunderstanding of them leads to a misunderstanding of the problem of dealing with Germany. The Great German General Staff (G.D.G.S.) is Germany, and the German people are its instrument.

For instance, not very many people connect the attempt to bureaucratise Great Britain with the German General Staff. They do not understand that words such as "military" or "civil" are merely used in Germany for the deception of foreigners.

In Germany the "Civil Service" is simply a branch of the General Staff—an inferior branch. "Big Business" is another branch. "Eric Bramley-Moore," the pseudonym of an American banker resident in Berlin during the Armistice years, remarks:—

"During my work in Germany, I often negotiated for the release of funds belonging to American Corporations. Did I go to the heads of industries, or to the banks? Not at all. I went to the Economic Section of the German General Staff. In every important business firm in Germany there is an Economic Defence Leader, responsible, not to the company which pays him, but to the General Staff." (*Reader's Digest*, March, 1944.)

There is a direct line through Marxian Socialism and the endowment of the London School of Economics by Sir Ernest Cassel, the large sums donated to the Labour Party

\*The extracts now being published in *The Social Crediter* from Major Douglas's forthcoming *The Brief for the Prosecution*, of which the present is the third, are published with a view to the existing situation, and not in the sequence or detail in which they will later appear.

by German-speaking Jews, and its close connection with German Socialists, which connects the German General Staff with the attempt to bureaucratise this country. The object is simple. The G.D.G.S. knows exactly how to use a bureaucracy for its own ends, without that bureaucracy having any conscious participation. And the end is the downfall of Great Britain, as a step to World Dominion.

Once this central idea is grasped, the absurdity of supposing that we are merely menaced by Hitler and something called National Socialism, is only equalled by the naive idea that there is any fundamental antagonism between the *significant* German-speaking Jews whether in Germany, Wall Street, or elsewhere, and the heads of the General Staff. Both of them are completely indifferent to the sacrifice of large numbers of their co-racialists if the main strategy is thereby advanced.

Werner Bruck, himself a Jew, and Assistant to Walther Rathenau, one of the group of powerful German-speaking Jews who surrounded the Kaiser, says in his *Social and Economic History of Germany*:—

"This militarism has rightly been called the cement that bound the whole structure of society into an entity. It was, and still is, an outstanding expression of the efficiency of the Supreme State... the giant industrial plants, large savings banks, local branches of the Social Democratic Party (Marxian Socialists) functioned through men of the type of captains, or non-commissioned officers."

At the present time, when we are supposed to be fighting the German spirit as well as the German armed forces, we hear through all the main channels of controlled propaganda (and all the main channels are controlled) of the necessity for "economic planning." The original coinor and user of the phrase was General von Moellendorf, of the German War Office.

The German *Weltanschauung* of political and economic world hegemony must be recognised, therefore, as a coherent and unified policy having successful war as its continuous objective. It is in this that the fundamental difference between the German and the British General Staffs can be seen. The British General Staff is quite as capable technically and professionally, but its objective is quite different. The problem put to the British Staff Officer is to be prepared within the narrow limits of peace-time financing, for any eventuality, and especially for the more likely eventualities. His role is essentially defensive and strategically passive.

That of the German is offensive and active.

It may be desirable to point out at this juncture that the so-called efficiency of the German is purely functional and has led him from one disaster to another, as it would lead us if we copied it. The weakness of democracy, in its present form, is not lack of "planning," but in the existence of financial and industrial oligarchies whose mentality is sympathetic to Prussianism, and in fact is largely interlocked with it.

Since the origin of the Russian "Communist" policy is identical with that instilled into Frederick II by Anarcharsis Clootz, they are in essence similar. The coalition of Germany and Russia is logical, but the Russian mentality is very dissimilar to that of the German, and may easily contribute unrehearsed developments.

## Air Transport After the War

House of Lords: May 10, 1944.

### CIVIL AIR TRANSPORT

[*The Debate was on a Motion of Lord Londonderry's.*]

*Viscount Rothermere*: ... I did not hear... in the speech from the noble Lord who spoke for the Government, one single piece of information...

The noble Lord told us that B.O.A.C.\* was, as it always had been, the chosen instrument of the Government, that he could not say whether it would be in the future, that all he could say was that it had been and was still the chosen instrument.

... I do not know myself what attitude the Government take on this subject in the Imperial Conference, but I know that some of the Dominions have very decided opinions as to what should be the form of the instrument after the war. No doubt America also has opinions on the subject, and Mr. Berle may have expressed those opinions. I should very much like to know, if Lord Beaverbrook can tell us, whether Mr. Berle was in favour of a single chosen instrument for America, or whether he was in favour of private enterprise or of a series of chosen instruments operating over various routes. It would be a good thing if there could be agreement between all countries as to what instrument should be used... The kind of instrument used by America and the Dutch after the war will make a great deal of difference to the kind of competition we shall have to meet. Personally I favour private enterprise, but I am perfectly willing to hear the arguments on the other side. I cannot say that I favour a monopoly.

*Lord Beaverbrook*: Do you favour a chosen instrument?

*Viscount Rothermere*: Not as a monopoly. I would be perfectly prepared for it to be a monopoly if other countries were going to have a similar kind of chosen instrument, also operating as a monopoly. In those circumstances competition might be fair, but if America is going to have private enterprise that will be far too effective and too efficient to be beaten by a single monopolistic chosen instrument, because the moment you get a monopoly, even with the most skilful and most energetic men at the head of it, sooner or later complacency will creep in and a feeling will arise that they are there that they cannot be replaced, and that it does not matter very much how the service is run. I would remind the noble Lord, Lord Beaverbrook, that the Cadman Committee, when it reported upon Imperial Airways, made a recommendation, which was not carried out by Parliament, that there should be two chosen instruments. I am not saying that I agree with that opinion, but I certainly agree that there should be more than one single service operating on all routes. There must be some yardstick by which you can test efficiency...

I suggest that conditions have been greatly altered by reason of the war. I think we can safely say that five years of war have done more for the development of aircraft than, probably, twenty years of peace, and that, at the end of this war, we are going to be within a reasonable time of seeing aircraft of far greater range, and far swifter and more comfortable, than anything that has ever been seen up

\*British Overseas Airways Corporation.

to date. There is no question that, when that time arrives, civil aviation will not require any subsidies, but will be a service which will be highly profitable. We heard from Lord Essendon—if I heard him rightly—that, in his opinion a service to South America could be started by interests which would not require any subsidies of any sort. . .

The whole point of having a single chosen instrument is that it is right to have it if you have got large subsidies to pay and it is impossible for any private enterprise to work without a subsidy. Your Lordships, I am sure, do not like private enterprises living at the expense of Government subsidies. That really was the feeling at the time of the Cadman Report—that it was wrong that a company should live at the expense of subsidies. There can be no question, I think that the subsidies concerned were far too small. The subsidies given to Imperial Airways should have been on a level with the subsidisation of Pan-American Airways. Then, no doubt, they would have been able to give greater service than they did. When it comes to the question of subsidising a private company, in my opinion, that is a thing which your Lordships would probably believe to be wrong. But if a private company is willing to put up the money, to go without a subsidy, and yet to provide a service, I do not see what argument can possibly, in any circumstances, be made against such a company having a chance to do it. I believe most of your Lordships are against monopolies. Even the noble Lord sitting on my right said that he was against the monopoly of the B.O.A.C., because it was a monopoly. Yet it seems to me that all opinion is agreed that to give the right of monopoly from birth—which is what the B.O.A.C. has been given—to a service that does not accomplish that monopoly through destroying its rivals by reason of its great efficiency, is wrong. To give it monopoly privileges absolutely and completely, to have no yardstick of any sort to measure the efficiency of that line, would be a folly which, I am perfectly certain, neither the Government nor Parliament would undertake. . .

There is another matter with which I should like to deal. Lord Beaverbrook said that Mr. Berle had very generously promised that, after the war, American aircraft would be available to us, if we were short of transport aircraft ourselves. I cannot comment upon his statement for it was a most generous one. Mr. Berle also said that "it would be very bad business if we did not." Now that was a very frank and open statement, and the reason for it is quite clear. If, after the war, this country—taking this country alone for the moment—has to indulge in the buying of a great amount of American transport aircraft, we shall also have to fit up all the aerodromes they will use with the instruments necessary for those particular aircraft. It would be a most expensive matter to refit all those airfields with British instruments for the British aircraft which may become available later, and, no doubt, there would be a question whether we could afford the new instruments to put on the airfields to enable us to return to the use of British aircraft.

I suggest that this will be a case in which this country will be the more affected because of the situation in which other countries will find themselves placed. We had hoped that the aircraft industry of this country would not only provide aircraft for Great Britain, but that some other countries might look upon our industry as a fine one and order aircraft and airfield equipment from us. We ought to have

international business for our aircraft companies. But if the case is to be that not only shall we have no aircraft to sell but that we shall be so short of them that we shall have to buy from America, then we shall lose our aircraft market overnight, never, perhaps, to get it again. Once other countries have fitted up their airfields with the equipment necessary for working with American aircraft then—unless we were to produce an aircraft so revolutionary and so superior to all existing machines that all countries would be compelled to buy it—naturally, whilst the instruments on the airfields were good, those other countries would go on replacing their fleets with American aircraft. Therefore, so far as I can see at the present time, we are not only going to put ourselves in a difficult position by having to fly over British routes with American aircraft—which will certainly look extraordinary to many parts of the Empire—but we shall also have to forego all the export market, a proper share of which should come to this country.

The noble Lord, Lord Beaverbrook, said that we had had some setbacks, and that the Tudor, which he announced some time ago was going to be put on order for civil aviation, had been held up. He said that that was nobody's fault. If there was no technical fault, it must have been a political decision. I should also like to ask him about the Brabazon. . .

I should also like a little more light on the question of the bases. I welcome very much the international authority which is going to be set up to regulate the rules of the air, like the rules of the road, as I understood it, but I was not clear whether that international authority was going to own the bases. Up to that point I had the impression, from various speeches which had been made, that the bases would naturally revert at the end of the war, whoever may be occupying them now, to the country entitled to them, the country to which the area belongs, but that naturally we shall not deny their use to any country which wishes to use them. We should have the title-deeds to the bases, but not put up a notice that trespassers will be prosecuted. That was the impression I obtained, I think, from a speech by the noble Lord, Lord Beaverbrook. Today I understood, though perhaps wrongly, that this international authority was going to have something to do with the bases, and I should like that made clearer.

Are the bases going to revert to us at the end of the war, no matter in whose hands they are now or who may have built them or contributed towards building them? I do not refer to the bases exchanged for destroyers, which are on a 99-years lease; I am referring entirely to the airfields. Are they going to be put under this international authority which is going to be created? I should like that made perfectly clear, because I feel very strongly that the bases should revert to this country, and that in no circumstances should any other thought enter anybody's head. We should have the title-deeds to all the bases within the British Empire which have been built since the war, and I hope that Lord Beaverbrook in the conferences which he may attend will fight for that. Let anyone use them who wishes to do so, but the title-deeds must remain ours.

*House of Lords: May 11, 1944.*

#### CIVIL AIR TRANSPORT

*Lord Beaverbrook (replying to Viscount Rothermere):*  
... You speak of the Tudor. This is a political decision as  
(Continued on page 7)

## 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. 12. No. 12.

Saturday, May 27, 1944.

### Bi- or Multi-Control?

Frederich August von Hayek was born in Vienna, son of the late August von Hayek, Professor of Botany in the University of Vienna, in 1899. He married Hella von Fritsch in 1926 at the end of a five year period in the Austrian Civil Service. From 1927 to 1931 he was Director of the Austrian Institute for Economic Research, and was during the last three of these years also Lecturer in Economics in the University of Vienna, a post which he left for the Tooke Professorship of Economic Science and Statistics at the London School of Economics (University of London). He was naturalised in 1938.

*The Road to Serfdom* by F. A. Hayek, recently published, has been hailed as an outstanding destructive critique of the fundamental assumptions of the Planners, and is probably (Major Douglas's far more penetrating and philosophically complete contributions to current discussion alone excepted) the most significant piece of political writing since the late Lord Hewart's *The New Despotism*. Despite its heavy handling of the idea which has now grown to such proportions as to exclude all other ideas from the minds of those who entertain it, *The Road to Serfdom* has had a good press. Even *The Economist*, with placid indifference to the dangers which might be presumed to lurk in too much questioning, affirms that really there is not yet too much: that Professor Hayek's question, "Do we really want to surrender the virtues of freedom and democracy to get the advantages of complete planning?" "is not asked often enough." On the surface, it seems that *The Economist* can find nothing severer to say (or think) than just that "the truth is that Professor Hayek's heart and his head are not at one, and the heart will keep breaking in." *The Social Crediter*, in a passage of explicit agreement on the main issue, merely dissented to the extent of suggesting that it would be well if Professor Hayek's head broke in a little more: less exclusively concerning matters on which Englishmen are supposed to be so generally and generously well-informed that they are willing to fight about them at the slightest provocation, and more conclusively on matters concerning which they have been kept very much in the dark.

The theory underlying the absorption, in war time, of foreign gentlemen into the bosom of England is that those we so indulge like our ways better than those of the lands from which they have fled, and it may be true that no one can so well inform us of the dangers of totalitarianism as those who have watched their development and experienced

their rigour. Though this does not explain why the native product, equally observant, and hitherto more skilful to escape the pitfalls set for them, should be given the ineffective role of muted, distant and very discreet applauders 'off stage.'

From 1918 to 1930, *The Sunday Times* was preferred by readers who thought they could distinguish between 'blue' and 'true' blue, and resisted the transition to red through various shades of purple. They would certainly have approved of the admission of Professor Hayek to its pages. And they would have seen quite clearly his analysis of some of the consequences of 'bilateralism.' At that time, whatever may be the position now, they would have asked 'and what about multilateralism?' At that time 'bi' meant 'two' and 'multus-a-um' meant 'much' or 'many.' And it would have occurred to them to relate these terms to anything said about them in the sense that if a little is bad, more must surely be worse.

Professor Hayek warns his readers that the 'jargon of the economists invading Parliament' hides 'fateful issues.' "While it was possible to argue not long ago that at the interval of a generation we are moving in the same direction in which Germany went, this new propaganda suddenly opens the prospect that with one colossal stride we may move from a position corresponding to that of the Germany of 1913 to one more like that of the Germany of Dr. Schacht... a single false step, a single unnoticed decision on a highly technical matter, may commit us beyond recall to the evil course."

It is obviously of great value that this notion of irreversible actions in the political field should be given the widest possible currency. Professor Hayek's list of consequences of control of trade by exchange devices is also impressive. It is as follows:

- Bureaucratic discriminative control of the quantity of every commodity imported.
- Control of distribution.
- Control of raw materials imported, and control of the use of them.
- The same for exports.
- Control of manufactures and manufacturers.
- Control of markets.
- Control of industries.
- Control of substitutes.

He says:—"To occupy these key positions is to assume a control which directly or indirectly extends over almost the whole trade of the country. Even this is not yet the whole story... Experience has amply shown that this control can be enforced only if the Government has power to inquire pretty deeply into private affairs, and particularly if it exercises a comprehensive postal censorship... A state is soon reached where almost everybody who has anything to do with international trade can at any time be criminally prosecuted for some technical offence."

The reader must not however assume too easily that Professor Hayek is with us in wishing to replace criminal prosecutions by prosecutions of criminals. What he described he calls 'economic nationalism.' This is *bi-lateralism*.

Will Professor Hayek (since he, and not we, has the ear of the public) tell us of the consequences of the still more generous variety of control for which the multi-lateralist Chancellor of the Exchequer stands?

T. J.

## "A National Dividend is the Key to Personal Freedom"

ALBERTA SOCIAL CREDIT BOARD REPORT, 1943

A national dividend is the key to personal freedom in Canada, and constitutes the most effective means of increasing purchasing power without inflation, it is stated in the Annual Report of the Alberta Social Credit Board for 1943, which has been tabled in the Legislature.

*"While a chronic shortage of purchasing power existed before the war, it is not as evident while the war continues. The shortage will again manifest itself with an increased intensity after the war ends," the report says. "The chronic shortage of purchasing power must be eliminated in the post-war era."*

Increased wages cannot accomplish the same result as a national dividend. All wage increases must be included in prices. They merely spell higher prices, and do not increase the national income unless they are financed by the creation of debt somewhere in the present system. The net benefit of increased wages to the economy as a whole is exactly nil.

"On the other hand, the national dividend provides the necessary supplementary purchasing power, without debt and in a manner that prevents any increase in the price of goods. Moreover, the national dividend permits all people to buy that portion of the goods available but for which there was no effective demand (money)—goods which would otherwise remain on the shelves indefinitely, or which would be destroyed as has been done in the past on the pretext of over-production."

"Whenever it is suggested that the people's purchasing power should be increased by means of national dividends, always the cry is raised from certain quarters that this would cause inflation.

"Actually, a Social Credit economy would be proof against inflation, whereas under the present financial system, inflation can be averted only by means of rigid deflation, with the appalling havoc which accompanies this condition."

Compulsory and contributory insurance schemes cannot increase purchasing power in the slightest degree, and hence cannot prevent depression or lessen its intensity in any way whatsoever, it is stated in the board report. "There is only one way to avoid the consequences of a lack of purchasing power, and that is to find ways of increasing purchasing power and maintaining it at a proper level, without debt, interest or inflation."

*The present system is not a capitalist system in the true sense of the word. It is controlled chiefly by men who through the control of the creation of money and credit, control governments, corporations, small business and the individual.*

"The present system can therefore be more accurately described as a financial dictatorship."

"The existing system is sometimes called a system of free enterprise, and is heartily condemned as such. Though the present system is to be condemned, it is ridiculous to condemn it as a system of free enterprise. One of the chief objections that the average man has to the system is that

he has very little, if any, freedom of enterprise and that is limited to the amount of money he controls.

"The 'profit system' is another term applied to the present system and in condemnation of it. . . The profit motive is universal, and in itself is good. It provides a tremendous incentive to human progress and accomplishment. It is only when profit is made at the expense of others that it is wrong.

*"In other words, the abuse of the profit system is wrong. It is this abuse of the profit motive by the money power and the monopolies it controls, that must be eliminated," the report continues.*

On the subject of socialism, the board report states that "socialism, in whatever guise it may appear, is the doctrine of the supreme state."

The report says, "It is significant that a Canadian edition of *The Case for Socialism* has appeared recently and that in this version, there is one paragraph which reads as follows: 'This is Socialism; Community ownership of the means of producing and distributing wealth. . .'

"It would appear from even a cursory examination of the fundamental principles of so-called capitalism and socialism, that there are merely different shades of the same thing. They are both forms of dictatorship, varying only in degree.

*"Socialism would finish the job, already far advanced by the present financial dictatorship, of completely enslaving mankind. To some, the foregoing statement will seem fantastic. However, present trends in Canadian national affairs more than corroborate this conclusion."*

The report continues, "any keen observer can see that the trend of the modern financial system and that of socialism lead to the same ultimate objective—the creation of a world slave state."

Later, the report says, "An international government controlling money, a world police force, and taxation—a world in which Christianity and democracy have been completely destroyed—this is the New Order being planned for all people by socialist and international finance alike."

Observation of the trend of public opinion in Canada leads to two definite conclusions, which the report outlines:

(1) "That the majority of Canadians are thoroughly dissatisfied with the present economy. There are not many who care to champion the cause of the so-called capitalist system.

(2) "That the majority of Canadians are opposed to socialism in any form. They are openly suspicious of the true nature of socialist doctrine. A number of people have reluctantly subscribed to socialism believing it to be the only alternative to the present discredited economy.

"On the one hand the present financial dictatorship permits the people only a limited access to the goods they produce, while at the same time curtailing individual freedom. As the system becomes more centralised the encroachment on individual freedom becomes greater.

"On the other hand socialism through a process of levelling down of incomes would increase the number of people who would have only a limited access to the goods they produce and it is freely admitted that this result would be accompanied by a still greater curtailment of individual

freedom, and in its final form lead to the complete loss of freedom.

"The people of Canada want access to all the goods they produce together with the maximum of personal freedom.

"Money is the medium which gives people access to goods and services and adequate supply of money is also the means of ensuring the freedom of the individual. Just as the election ballot is the means of exercising political democracy, money is the economic ballot that is the means of exercising economic democracy and the guarantee of economic security.

"Individuals who have enough money and hence economic security are free:

(a) "From wage slavery. They are free to refuse to work under undesirable conditions.

(b) "To accept free state health services or seek out the practitioner of their own choice.

(c) "To choose the work they like the best, the place they prefer to live in, and the food and clothing that suits their individual taste.

(d) "To choose the hobbies and cultural pursuits with which to occupy their leisure.

"If we are to avoid a recurrence of the intolerable pre-war conditions imposed by ruthless international financial dictatorship, it is essential that the control of monetary policy be removed from financial institutions and restored as a sovereign power belonging to the people to be exercised by the people through their parliament.

"The hope for a new social and economic order in Canada will not be realised by political manoeuvring, but by the concerted action of the Canadian people, united by a knowledge of the true cause of their frustration in the past and a definite vision of the goal they hope to reach in the future."

## From the Canadian House of Parliament

*The following passages are from a speech made by Mr. James Marshall, M.P. on February 10 in the Debate on the Governor-General's Address in the Canadian Parliament:—*

...In order to obtain these objectives, methods are suggested. To me, methods are clearly the responsibility of experts. Neither the mass of the people of Canada nor the members of parliament are experts, so that I do not think that we are in much of a position to judge the merits and demerits of these various proposals. My opinion is that it is the business of members of parliament to frame and place upon the statute books of Canada laws which will make these proposals effective. Therefore, I think, we must first settle upon the objective. Having settled upon our objective, we should retain the services of competent experts to get us those things which the people desire. Having had these submitted to us, we should pass the necessary legislation. That is the only place where a member of parliament should come into the picture.

For instance, I should like to know the names of the people who have suggested to the government that the ills

of industry can be cured by the setting up or establishment of an industrial development bank. If industry want another bank, of course they must have it, if they feel that that will solve their problems. But I want to know which section of industry have petitioned for it. I want to know who have recommended this bank to the government, so that, say four or five years hence, we can highly commend them for their action if it has proven a success and has benefited industry, or, on the other hand, wreak our vengeance upon them if it has bound industry more strongly to finance. Personally I do not think it is a bank that they want; I think what they need are plenty of customers with plenty of buying power. Industry after this war will be capable of turning out goods in tremendous quantities; yet if the consuming public have no buying power, what purpose will be served by turning out so much goods? ...

... In conclusion, I want to say a word to the post-war international planners who are springing up like mushrooms all over the country. One of the most picturesque figures in all biblical history was that wise old patriarch Solomon, king of Israel. In his day he was pestered with planners, until in a fit of anger he turned to them and said, "The eyes of a fool are in the ends of the earth." I think that might be fittingly applied to the international planners of our day. We should wish our friends of the Soviet Union, China, France, Norway, Belgium, Holland and all other countries, success in reconstruction and re-establishment of their countries, but we ourselves should get on with the immediate task of solving our own problems at home. Haakon Lie, secretary of the Norwegian Federation of Labour, speaking recently to the Wellesley Institute of Social Progress, said:

"We do not want any army of occupation. We can administer our own affairs. We can buy what we need from Britain and America. All we want is our freedom. You can educate your administrators and send them over with the best will in the world, but in a short time they will be as much disliked as the German administrators."

That is something for our meddling planners to ponder. I feel quite sure, in my own mind that there is a very rude awakening coming to those individuals when the "cease fire" sounds and our young men return from overseas.

I see my time has gone, Mr. Speaker, and there still remains such important questions as agriculture, old age pensions, housing, and so on. They are all big questions, and when they are under discussion in this house I shall have something to say in respect to them. I do want to say, however, that each of these questions is capable of a simple solution. The old axiom "there are none so blind as those who will not see" applies most fittingly to our present administrators. Will it take a revolution to shake them from their complacency?

The miserable failure of the Hon. Mr. Ilesley, minister of finance, to carry out the Liberal Party pledge to "make money your servant and not your master" is strikingly illustrated in permitting existing interest rates on public as well as private debts.

It is to be hoped the Alberta government will not be influenced by the propaganda of Bond Dealers' Association and their satellites.

## PARLIAMENT

### CIVIL AIR TRANSPORT

*Continued from page 3*

I understand the meaning of your words. It is a political decision, and it is due to the need for special and particular equipment for the Royal Air Force at this crisis in war strategy... The next question my noble friend has asked is about bases. If we are successful in the international conference the international authority will control the user of bases.

*Viscount Rothermere:* Will it make the rules.

*Lord Beaverbrook:* I think I shall be able to make the position quite clear in one moment, if I can only lay my hands on a document amid the confusion I have brought on myself. It is a declaration by the Governments of Australia and New Zealand, and it is a declaration to which the British Government adhere subject of course to individual instances which must be affected by special bargains. There are special bargains. This is the declaration, that the two Governments—that is, the Government of Australia and New Zealand—accept as a recognised principle of international practice that the construction and use in time of war by any Power of naval, military or air installations in any territory under the sovereignty or control of another Power does not in itself afford any basis for territorial claims or right of sovereignty after the conclusion of hostilities. I think that answers my noble friend's question to his satisfaction.

*Viscount Rothermere:* And the British Government agree entirely with that resolution?

*Lord Beaverbrook:* That decision is accepted by the British Government subject to certain individual instances which must be affected by the terms of the arrangements made at the time—arrangements made with Newfoundland or somewhere else—which do not conform entirely to that situation. They are only individual instances.

*Viscount Rothermere:* Can we have any information about these instances? Are they many or few?

*Lord Beaverbrook:* No, they are not important. If you wish, I shall see if I can get the information for you. It is not important. As to the bases in the West Indies, that is a different situation. There we leased the bases for ninety-nine years. We leased them as a gift to the United States of America, and the United States of America made a gift of destroyers to Great Britain. These bases are leased only for military purposes. They cannot be used for civil aviation except with our consent...

My noble friend Lord Rothermere wants to know what are Mr. Berle's views. I do not know, but I think he favours private enterprise. I am not sure that he favours private enterprise exactly as we understand it. There are many versions of private enterprise. For instance, there is the private enterprise which exists in the *Daily Mail* and the private enterprise which exists in the *Daily Herald*—two different manifestations of the same thing! Then Lord Rothermere raised another question. He spoke of Mr. Berle's statement that "it would be very bad business if we did not." That was the statement attributed to Mr. Berle in relation to the supply of American aircraft for our purposes after the war, and supplied to us, I may say here, on the basis of non-discrimination. I was asked on what terms are we to get these aeroplanes. We are to get them on the basis of non-

discrimination. That is the language Mr. Berle used. I think Mr. Berle means to see that in relation to these aeroplanes we are not prejudiced in the slightest degree.

*Lord Winster:* Are we to pay for them.

*Lord Beaverbrook:* I do not want to raise that question. I do not know. We are going to be well treated. The Americans treat us well...

*House of Commons: May 11, 1944.*

### TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

#### Regional Schemes

*Mr. Ellis Smith* asked the Minister without Portfolio if his attention has been directed to the success of the planning carried out in the Tennessee Valley; and if plans are being prepared for several similar miniature schemes to be operated in areas like North Staffordshire and Lancashire.

*The Minister Without Portfolio (Sir William Jowitt):* I am aware of the American scheme to which my hon. Friend refers, but the conditions are not the same as those in the industrial areas in this country which he mentions. The Government will, of course, always keep under review the possibility of framing schemes for the improvement of the resources of these areas and of other parts of the country.

*Mr. Smith:* Will my right hon. and learned Friend give the House some indication of where the conditions differ in industrial centres in this country from the position in the Tennessee Valley?

*Sir W. Jowitt:* I would recommend my hon. Friend to read the account of the Tennessee Valley experiment, which is quite a different community.

*Mr. Smith:* I have read that very closely, and is my right hon. and learned Friend aware that President Roosevelt exhibited great courage when he insisted that this planning should be carried out around a Government building; and will he give an undertaking that it is the policy of the Government that similar planning, based upon social ownership, shall be carried out around the Government factories in this country after the war?

*Sir W. Jowitt:* Certainly, it is the policy of this Government to do all they can to promote effective and useful schemes.

*Mr. Wakefield:* Is it not a fact that there are many fine schemes in the British Empire which have been developed by private enterprise without going to the United States of America for them?

*House of Commons: May 16, 1944.*

### INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (JOINT STATEMENT)

*Mr. Stokes* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the British experts who collaborated in drawing up the Joint Statement by experts on the establishment of an International Monetary Fund were Treasury officials; and if not, from what organisations were they selected.

*Sir J. Anderson:* Yes, Sir. Apart from Lord Keynes, the United Kingdom experts who collaborated in drawing up the Joint Statement were permanent Treasury officials and

whole-time temporary officials who have been in the service of the Government throughout the war.

*Mr. Stokes:* Can the Chancellor assure the House that the whole-time temporary servants who have been in the employment of the Treasury for the period of the war are not drawn either from commercial or banking interests?

*Sir J. Anderson:* No, Sir, I do not think I could give such an assurance as that.

*House of Commons: May 18, 1944.*

### PUBLIC HEALTH NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

*Dr. Russell Thomas* asked the Minister of Health whether he will give an assurance that under the proposed National Health Scheme no doctor will be called upon to divulge the illnesses of patients to a third party, except in a court of law, in accordance with the tradition of medical practice.

*Mr. Willink:* There is no intention of departing, in this respect, from the familiar principles which have hitherto governed the doctor-patient relationship.

*Dr. Thomas:* In view of the fact that the illnesses of nearly all of us will be known to the Ministry of Health, could not those facts be used by a Government Department for its own secret purposes, contrary to the ancient tradition of privacy which has always existed between doctor and patient?

*Mr. Willink:* My hon. Friend has referred to something that could be done. I have said that there is no intention of departing from the present practice.

*Dr. Russell Thomas* asked the Minister of Health if he has now framed rules for certification of sickness by doctors under the proposed National Health Scheme, or whether he proposes to leave such certification to a doctor's free and unfettered professional opinion in accordance with the tradition of medical practice.

*Mr. Willink:* The answer to the first part of the Question, is, "No, Sir," and to the second part that the form and method of medical certification is one of many questions which I hope to discuss in due course with the profession's representatives.

*Dr. Thomas:* In view of the fact that the White Paper, of necessity, involves rules for certification which must again involve penalties on the doctor, are not these rules directed to ensure the increased productivity of the patient rather than his health and happiness? Do they not prepare the way for the mobility and direction of labour when the war is over?

*Mr. Willink:* No, Sir. The purpose of certification is to give those entitled to insurance benefits the evidence which they need.

*Mr. George Griffiths:* Will the Minister still keep as stiff a back on this matter as he kept last night at Croydon?

**WANTED.** Young wife of R.A.F. officer, with infant and dog, seeks accommodation in country on shared work and expenses basis. Write: "P" c/o *The Social Crediter*.

### SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is now in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

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

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.

### BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea .....	2/6
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket .....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort .....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy .....	7d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
The Use of Money .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold .....	4/6
Aberhart: Manning .....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee .....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards ..	8d.
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.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin ..4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
The Beveridge Plot .....	3d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt .....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus .....	3d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet) .....	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.) .....	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet) .....	1d.
The Representative's Job .....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.