

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 13. No. 26.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 3, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

"The statesman who should attempt to direct private people in what manner they ought to employ their savings would not only load himself with a most unnecessary burden, but assume an authority which could safely be trusted to no government whatever, and would nowhere be so dangerous as in the hands of a man who had folly and presumption enough to fancy himself fit to exercise it." — Adam Smith.

But of course Adam hadn't met Sir William Beveridge.

"The most valuable additions made to legislation have been enactments destructive of preceding legislation and the best laws which have been passed, have been those by which some former laws were repealed... It is clear that the progress of civilisation cannot be due to those who, on the most important subject have done so much harm that their successors are considered benefactors simply because they reverse their policy."

— *History of Civilisation in England*. Buckle Vol. I. p. 200.

It is stated in the press of February 17 that Dr. Schacht has gone to Switzerland to arrange terms of peace. The whereabouts of Mr. Montagu Norman is not indicated.

*Aide-mémoire* to the New Jerusalem. Motto, "Any lie will do, if it's big enough." *Step one*: Deify "Labour." "Labour produces all wealth." Talk about "vested interests" but sanctify majorities. "Vox populi, vox dei." *Step two*: Give everyone a vote every five years. Provide "full employment." *Step three*: Abolish private incomes and private property and identify majorities with "labour." "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." Identify production hierarchy with social and political hierarchy. Communist bureaucracy. Apotheosis of dialectical materialism. Sabotage wealth by useless production, export and world-war. *Finale*: Armageddon.

Between you and me, Clarence, it appears to be necessary to tell the world how thoroughly we've thought things out, and therefore how clear it is that if only we have our way, the Golden Age is upon us.

For instance (a) This racial theory is all nonsense, and must be stamped out. (b) Aren't the Russians marvellous? (a) Look what Socialism has done for the Russians. (b) It's not the German people, it's National Socialism we're fighting. (a) We demand Social Security. (b) There ought to be a lor to take it off 'im. Soak the rich. (a) An Englishman's home is his castle. (b) Compulsory billeting (a) The coal belongs to der beople (b) Three times the price to what it was when it didn't, and you can't get it. (a) Nationalised

electricity for everyone. (b) But you can't have it when it's cold. (a) More wondrous motor roads coming (b) Motor tax 30/- per horse power to encourage you to use them. (a) Scotland's being depopulated (b) Let's turn it into a fertiliser factory to coax the population back.

Of course there are others, Clarence, but you can see for yourself that the lessons of the past twenty-five years have not been lost upon us, and with the help of the London School of Economics... (remainder of peroration lost in tumultuous cheers).

Congressional appropriations to the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) to 1943 amounted to more than £163,000,000. This is the project which is being quoted as an example to the North of Scotland Hydro-electric Board. The greater part of this would normally be recovered in taxation, much of it from individuals who have never been nearer to Tennessee than Professor Laski to productive labour.

Nothing in the history of literature is more remarkable than the nineteenth-century reputation of Thomas Carlyle, who, with his *Frederick the Great* and *French Revolution* has done much to poison the wells of history. It is probable that a knowledge of the influences which worked to build up his absurd prestige would throw a good deal of light on current events.

"The Nazis? The trouble with them is that they've never done a stitch of honest work. They don't want to work; they want to rule."

— "German Prisoners." *Saturday Evening Post*.

For Nazis, read Fabian Society, most Trades Union Officials, and the Champions of Labour generally.

What a racket, and how it's lasted! Frederick of Prussia, written up by Carlyle, Engels the millionaire-child-exploiter and his ghost-writer Marx, Bismarck, Ballin, Rathenau, the Chemical Cartel, the big industrialists and the ambitious bureaucrats and Trades Union officials. "We're all Socialists now." Many colossal fortunes, thousands of considerable estates, publishers, and price rings, all working with the international finance racket to benefit "der gommen beople." Well, it's been a marvellous game, but we think it's nearly finished. Mr. Emanuel (God with us) Shinwell, is showing the way to go home.

"BIGNESS Without BUREAUCRACY"! — Article in *The Recorder*, February 3. (Or "Relief from D.T.'s without giving up drink!")

## British Broadcasting

Recent incidents indicate the peculiar relationship which appears to exist between the "British" Broadcasting Corporation and Parliament.

On February 7, Lord Elibank asked that fuller reports might be given of proceedings in the House of Lords, and received the reply from the Deputy Speaker that the B.B.C. was responsible, not Parliament. Upon this Lord Elibank was reduced to requesting Lord Cranbourne to *exert his influence* with the B.B.C. And in the House of Commons two days before, Mr. Brendon Bracken replying to Mr. Gallacher, who had asked why the communists had been left out of a series of news reports, said (with the same suggestion that you must keep on the right side of this august corporation) "Because I am afraid you are not on comradely terms with the B.B.C." (Laughter.) High jinks indeed: and while the dog's attention is thus diverted "the caravan moves on."

All parliamentarians know that the B.B.C. charter will soon expire and that the question which will then confront the House is: *What are the conditions under which British Broadcasting will be conducted in the future?* So Mr. Ellis Smith innocently asks whether consideration had been given to the action which was required over the renewal of the B.B.C. charter; Mr. Attlee replying that consideration was being given to the matter. (*Daily Telegraph*, February 2.) This *suggestio falsi* seems too obvious for sound tactics, but parliamentarians know parliament best. Meantime (*Daily Telegraph*, January 11) Lord Hankey's Television committee appears to buttress the suggestion of the perpetuation of the B.B.C. by assuming it, in recommending that the B.B.C. television station at Alexandra Palace should resume transmission—which could hardly be before the major question is brought before the House.

It seems possible that all Members are not informed as to the precise position which will arise upon the expiration of the Charter. Therefore, inform them. Any who require further advice about this should write to the Director of Organisation, Social Credit Secretariat. — H. E.

## THE ONE-PARTY TYRANNY

"Lenin invented... the system of totalitarian one-party tyranny which stamps out all actual freedom completely. Mussolini and Hitler borrowed Lenin's technique... Stalin—who despises the masses, and fears freedom—perfected it on the home ground, extinguishing in Russia the last surviving trace of the democratic concept of the Rights of Man. His Great Purge, in which an estimated 300,000 persons were shot or imprisoned, was a purge of all who might conceivably oppose his despotic power."

—Max Eastman: *We must face the facts about Russia.*

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: February 13, 1945.*

### REQUISITIONED LAND AND WAR WORKS BILL

*Mr. Key (Bow and Bromley):* ... It is all to the good that we should devise machinery and provide powers for preserving for the community what can be preserved of the value of buildings and works which have been carried out on requisitioned land during the war, but it would be wrong to maintain such as were brought into existence in the stress of the war, because of the dire necessity of national safety, at the sacrifice of public rights, social amenities, cultural well-being, or the beauty of the countryside, merely because restoration would involve considerable expenditure of money, time, and labour. I still think that what is wrong with the Bill is not that it aims at the preservation of works and buildings, but that it seems to make money the only measure of merit, and to sacrifice public rights of way, the beauty of our commons and open spaces, the proper planning of our countryside, and the beneficial use of our land, to a mere cash calculation of the cost of restoration. We have spent freely, and rightly so, to preserve our powers of democratic development and freedom of speech and movement, and it would be a tragedy if one outcome of the money so spent were the robbery from the common people of their rights of access to common lands and footpaths, which they have struggled through the centuries to secure...

*Mr. Turton (Thirsk and Malton):* ... Sheep farming, which before the war was the life of that rural community, has disappeared as a result of this damage to the moorlands. The cost of restoration is far in excess of the value of the land whether you use the phrase "the 1939 value" or "the 1945 value."

Do we understand from the concession that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has announced, that the Government will see that that land is restored? It must be remembered that when we talk about the value of land, it is not Schedule A value, 1939 value or 1945 value. The value I attach to this land is the cost of the improvements that our ancestors put into the land. If you go back over the last 300 years, and on any acre of Britain, you will find that nine times the annual value has been spent in improvements on such land. This land is a permanent asset to the people of England and England will never tolerate that asset being left derelict as a result of the war. I would ask the learned Attorney-General when he comes to reply to make it clear that, in respect of these moors and similar cases, the land will be restored.

I, perhaps, feel personally about this matter because early in 1940 my battalion, in which I was then serving more actively, was stationed south-west of Amiens, and we found ourselves in a curious country quite unlike the battlefields of France after the last war. The country was deserted and derelict. It had not been restored after the last war. When you went to Lens or La Basse you saw great new buildings, but that little rural area south-west of Amiens had been left because it was not of such economic advantage to the French nation to restore the countryside as it was to restore the more industrial areas. That area was without soul and without spirit and I vowed that after this war, if I could help it, we would never let the same thing happen to rural England...

(Continued on page 6)

**GROCCERS and anyone connected with the GROCERY TRADE are requested to communicate with the Social Credit Secretariat, 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.**

## A Broadcast Review

The following is a review broadcast from Hobart, Tasmania, by "J.G." of *An Open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury*, by Captain Arthur Rogers:—

This booklet, which has just been reprinted in Australia, is a criticism of the Report, *Malvern, and After*, which was issued by the Industrial Christian Fellowship, with a commendatory introduction by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Captain Rogers examines in a masterly manner this Report from the standpoint of Christian doctrine, and in the process reveals a very remarkable position.

In his introduction the author makes this very important and necessary warning:

In considering plans for our future, as individuals and as a body-politic, it is of first importance to bear in mind that the most dangerous of false doctrines are not those which instantly repel good-natured, patriotic men and women of normal commonsense. The most formidable forms of misleading doctrine are those which contain the least easily discernible departures from truth. They are those doctrines which over-emphasise one aspect of a truth at the expense of truth as a whole; and, particularly in our own country, they are those false doctrines which make some strong appeal to emotions which are not unworthy.

This brings us to the very heart of the work and problem of all those who are anxiously fighting to prevent our civilisation sliding headlong into the abyss.

There is hardly an institution in existence to-day of which we can say that it has not been diverted from its original purpose.

The only legitimate policy of our institutions was epitomised for all time by Jesus of Nazareth when he said that "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath."

It is on this fundamental Christian doctrine that the Social Crediter takes his stand, and in so doing comes into conflict with the organised and massive forces of the Devil himself.

Here then is direct guidance for every practical man in the political and economic field.

It is plain enough to see that our institutions have been captured and are being used against us for our enslavement. What are these institutions? What are they supposed to do, and what are they doing?

The Trade Unions, the Political Parties, the great industrial and financial Monopolies, the great Departments of State—are they serving man? Are they making it easier for us to live Christian lives? Have they made life happier and more secure? Have they brought that abundant life which we are promised? Have they made it possible for the honest man at the bottom of the ladder to reach the top? Do you need the answer?

Not only have they failed to do any of these things, but they have turned this fair planet into a Dante's Inferno, a cultural wilderness to which the white man has replied with the most dramatic and tragic answer known in History. He has decided to commit racial suicide; he has decided that he will not permit any children of his to suffer the shame

and degradation he has suffered.

This tragic attitude of the ordinary man is not dictated by what he himself has suffered so much as his belief that he is powerless to control his own destiny; powerless to control his own institutions, his union bosses, his Parliamentary "representatives," and the swarms of Government officials who can humiliate and penalise him, but from whom he cannot obtain redress by any process known to him.

And what has the Report, *Malvern, and After*, to say about those minions of Caesar who have abused every privilege and reduced man to the position of a serf without a serf's security? It says:

The Church must conform to modern tendencies, *i.e.*, more planning by the rulers of the State—Caucus, *plus* trade union boss, *plus* international monopolist.

Captain Rogers complains that the Report ignores what those in power have already done to produce present conditions, and is amazed that it should recommend that the process which produced the present chaos should be interrupted. He states:

Our recent Administrations, in the pursuit of policies akin to those set out in the Report, have been concerned to impose "protection" and "safeguards" in every sphere of our national life. The "safeguarding" of industry through open and concealed subsidies, through tariffs and quotas, marketing-boards, rationalisation, commissions and other forms of control, has fostered the growth of over-capitalised combines, inevitably at the expense of economic businesses conducted to the benefit of all concerned. In other words, legislation of recent years has almost consistently rewarded greed, irresponsibility, incompetence and wastefulness, while penalising the self-reliant efficiency which is the natural outcome of healthy competition between responsible men. This legislation has led to an invasion of the just rights of the citizens as a whole.

It doesn't require much experience to see that the ever-growing mass of artificial restrictions and regulations so dear to the heart of the modern planners is not doing the job, and that an increasing number of penalties of ever-increasing vindictiveness must be imposed on the reluctant taxpayer to force him to fit into the new world which is being planned for him.

It is also very obvious that the social conditions in the totalitarian states which demand a gigantic police force complete with Gestapo, conscription of labour and threats of such diabolic power that their secrets cannot even be imagined—if this is the type of organisation which some Church leaders want introduced to this country then the sooner they are challenged the better. And the time to do so is now. If they do not stand for such a regime, let them say so in public.

I hope that organisations in each State will form committees to see that this book is distributed to all those interested in the preservation of the Christian inheritance.

By MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS

Security: Institutional and Personal

(Newcastle Address, 1937.)

6d.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

Liverpool.

## 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: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Tele-*  
*phone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,*  
*LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.*

Vol. 13. No. 26.

Saturday, March 3, 1945.

### A Cross Current

An editorial in the *Ottawa Citizen* of December 28 criticising Mr. Norman Jaques, M.P., for his defence of British action against E.L.A.S. must make its writer squirm if he re-reads it after the various reports by Trades Unionists and others on the rabble who were only prevented from further murder and loot by the action which the *Citizen* hastened to condemn. It has the excuse that the Southam Press, of which the *Citizen* is a component, takes the *Times* news service, which was faithfully dealt with by various Members in the Debate on Greece. Nevertheless, the editorial in question is not reassuring. For a newspaper published in the Canadian capital to give expression to such phrases as "the Communist bogey" and "They (the Nazis) are the supreme

THE SIZE OF CIVIL SERVICE WHICH  
 SUITED THE BANK OF ENGLAND IN  
 1931 WILL SUIT US NOW

REFUSE TO VOTE FOR ANY CANDIDATE  
 WHO DOES NOT PUT THE REDUCTION  
 OF THE CIVIL STAFFS TO 20% BELOW  
 THE 1931 FIGURE as THE FIRST ITEM ON  
 HIS AGENDA

Pay them if necessary: but don't pay them to  
 put Great Britain in irons

THE POWER OF THE BUREAUCRACY  
 MUST BE REDUCED

crusaders against so-called Bolshevism," is ill-informed, if it is not worse. It is of a piece with the nonsense that it is Germany we are fighting, not the Germans, and we shouldn't pay any attention to anything the Germans may do but just walk straight to Berlin.

The simple fact is that our Transatlantic friends, both above and below the 49th parallel, are too far from this war. They are living in that atmosphere of cloudy idealism which, perhaps more than any other factor enabled the Germans to flout the Treaty of Versailles. One raid, such as that on Coventry, on Montreal or New York would do more to in-

hibit the tendency to assume that Great Britain is always wrong, than any amount of argument. In the meantime, we would suggest in all friendliness to the *Citizen* that it pay less attention to current Red herrings, and more attention to facts. If its staff have not the time or inclination to piece together the mass of evidence into which "communist bogeys" and "so-called Bolshevism" fit, then let them leave that aspect of the matter to Mr. Jaques, and remember the Russo-German Pact of non-aggression, the march of Russia into stricken Poland and the plight of Finland, Latvia and Esthonia, to mention only three of the countries experiencing Russian neighbourliness. After that, they might take a look at a map showing the Strait between Alaska and Siberia.

### Red

There is something rather curious, and certainly outside the law of averages, in the occurrence of the word "red," in its German or Yiddish forms, in the names of prominent political figures. President Roosevelt (Red-field) is greatly swayed by Judge Rosenman ("Sammy the Rose") who is over here telling us what to do next. Lord Rothschild ("Red-shield") we all know. Miss Rosa Rosenberg ("Red-mountain") has advised Prime Ministers for decades, Theodore Rothstein (Red-stone) was the notorious Bolshevik Jew who was retained in a confidential position in a British Government Department when Russia was financing attempts to produce a revolution in Great Britain, the Rosenthals, (Rose-dale) Charlotte and Joseph, worked like beavers in Egypt to turn the Arabs against the British in 1922, and mysteriously escaped sentence, Pinhas Rutenberg (Red-mountain) a Russian Jew, acquired the Palestine Electrical concession, the notorious plotters club founded by Marx in Soho was called the Rose St Club, Lenin's close adviser, Kameneff, whose real name was Rosenfeld (Red-field), form a list by no means complete. Compare this list, however with the Smiths and Schmidts.

### A Letter to the *Daily Mail*

The following letter, signed Austin O. Cooper (Chester) sent to the *Daily Mail* on February 6 but not published therein, raises an important public issue:—

Sir,

WAR GRATUITIES AND TOKEN PAYMENTS.

Recently the Chancellor of the Exchequer informed the "House" that between 3.9.39 to 31.12.44 borrowings amounted to £13,975 millions. In view of official statements that borrowings represent about 50 per cent. of total expenditure, the cost of the War to date can not be less than £28,000 millions.

Who is better entitled to the corresponding credit than Jack Tar, Tommy Atkins, Percy Prune, and Citizen John, who purchased victory with their Blood, Sweat, Toil and Tears?

What proportion of this huge credit £28,000 millions should in justice be distributed to the Services in discharge of their entitlement?

Your correspondent, Garry Alligham, in yesterday's issue estimates the Treasury view to be a paltry £36 millions (War Gratuity Element) which is little more than one tenth of one per cent.!

Not even a Token Payment!!!

Yours, etc.

## The Public Mind

(*Impressions of a Public Address in the Grand Central Hotel, Belfast, on February 15, 1945.*)

This is not a précis of Dr. Douglas Boyd's most clear and able exposition of the reality behind Compulsory Medical Insurance which he gave under the title of "National Health Insurance—Totalitarian or Democratic," but may usefully record the reactions of the general public—the articulate members at least—to the speaker's plea for the Democratic as opposed to the Totalitarian approach to the problem of health. Superficially, these reactions were not encouraging. But it has to be remembered that the valuable exponents of Public Opinion, who always emphasise the humanitarian aspect, while they get the applause, do not necessarily get practical support. At public meetings we are ready to applaud the idea that our neighbours' interests should come before our own—abstractly the Poor and Down-trodden make good stooges—but somehow we find our own interests asserting their priority next morning.

Dr. Boyd, who emphasised the point that the insurance envisaged in the White Paper was not insurance in the accepted sense of the term, but simply additional taxation, without control of the contribution, warned his audience of the Prussian origin of the idea of State Medicine. Dr. Hayek's book *The Road to Serfdom* had also been alluded to from the Chair. Nevertheless, one gathered from the "Socialist" speakers present that they didn't care a hoot where the idea of State Control came from, it was a "good" one and the only hope of the poor man ever getting his "rights."

It is noticeable that there is a tendency among the ideologists to return some of the Social Credit brickbats. The speaker was told that this term Totalitarian was being abused; it was no more than a label—which, alas, is true enough. The medical profession and the general practitioner were "no great shakes" anyway, and charged as much for their services as they thought they could get, which of course was not the way of the speakers.

But the noticeable thing was the entire disregard for anything but the most immediate and limited results, or any appreciation of a radical difference between the British and German method. No one could deny that the Hitler Youth Movement produced virile and fit young men in the quickest possible time, we were told. If that was the result of Totalitarianism then that was the thing we wanted, regardless of the label on it—or of what German youth was presently doing with its virility. Curiously enough, in view of the military situation at the moment, there was only one reference to Russia; this was to the efficiency of the Russian Army Medical Service. For some reason, it was not Joe Stalin's night, but Adolph Hitler's, and the Bismarckian way with the individualistic "pretensions" of the Medical Profession.

One must not give the matter undue weight. There were perhaps five or six speakers in all, and one of them admitted to having mis-spent quite a lot of time in collecting statistics in the north of Scotland for Mr. Seeborn Rowntree, but their pro-German unanimity was so pronounced as to be phenomenal, when one considers the picture before us of what the plight of Germany at the moment must be, as a direct result of this yielding up of individual liberty of action to the State. Liberty, by the way, was another abused term, and meant liberty to starve—another

statement difficult to deny. What we have here is just the dire results of mass-suggestion upon the thinking faculties of the man-in-the-street. Results—any but the most immediate—count for absolutely nothing beside the Plan; the programme that has been carefully "plugged" and fixed in the public mind by means of hammered reiteration from every angle, by means of which each individual is "to get his own back."

Among many, two points were prominent: the strange and quite unabashed—perhaps unconscious—elevation of Germany and the Hitler way, at this particular stage. And second, the crippling handicap laid up on any particular plea for individual liberty of action by the persisting conviction that there isn't enough money to go round. Financial stringency is the argument for every additional move in the direction of centralisation, and equally, every effort of individuals or groups to defend their liberty of action—and after all the only effective way you can support Liberty is to preserve your own—is hamstrung by this same persistent conviction, since individual and sectional liberty is bound up with the need to get an adequate share of an apparently inadequate part of wealth.

Dr. Boyd dealt ably and good-humouredly with his questioners—or would haranguers be a better term?—but individually they gave the impression of having come there with closed minds, and with no intention that the seals should be broken. — N. F. W.

## Loss of Liberty

The following passages are from Chapters of Sismondi's *History of the Italian Republics*, dealing with the closing years of the Italian Renaissance:—

"The period was at length arrived, when Italy which had restored intellectual light to Europe, reconciled civil order with liberty, recalled youth to the study of laws and of philosophy, created the taste for poetry and the fine arts, revived the science and literature of antiquity, given prosperity to commerce, manufactures and agriculture,—was destined to become the prey of those very barbarians whom she was leading to civilisation. Her independence must necessarily perish with her liberty, which was hitherto the source of her grandeur and power. In a country covered with republics three centuries before, there remained but four at the death of Lorenzo de' Medici; and in those, although the word 'liberty' was still inscribed on their banners, that principle of life had disappeared from their institutions. . . ."

"So long as habits of liberty are preserved amongst a whole people; so long as every class has an equal horror of slavery; a sudden explosion of the sentiment which fills every heart suffices to accomplish a revolution—to render vain the effort of usurpers, or to overthrow a recent tyranny, though at the moment it may have succeeded in establishing itself. The despot, even when he has silenced by terror the people whom he has oppressed and disarmed, always feels at war with them; he has too much to fear from every class, to hope, with any chance of success, to attach any of them to his cause. But when absolute power has been established long enough for the violence of its first origin to be forgotten; when the majority of the men in the prime of life have been born under its yoke, and have never

known a better state; the usurper finds himself supported by the inert part of the nation—by those who, incapable of thinking, or of investigating for themselves, must be contented with borrowed ideas, and with blindly assenting to every doctrine which the government may promulge. With the loss of liberty is lost also that free and animated intercourse which warms the soul, and diffuses noble sentiments even among classes unenlightened by the knowledge of the past, or by the experience of foreign nations. In slavish countries, the prince alone speaks, amidst universal silence; he dictates the proclamations of authorities, the sentences of the tribunals; he even inspires the language to be uttered from the pulpit or the confessional: because the disposal of the revenue is at his will, he appears as a dispensing providence; and makes the people believe he gives all that he does not take from them. The indigent are grateful to him for the public charities; the labourer for the justice and police which protect his property. The populace of towns applaud the rigour which falls on the higher classes. The national pride takes offence at the foreigner who expresses his pity for an unhappy and ill-governed people; and the vanity of the vulgar is interested in the support of what exists. If any memory of the period of liberty is preserved amongst the ignorant classes, it only refers to unhappiness and pain. They have heard of the efforts, the sacrifices, made by their fathers in defence of the people's rights; but they see only the evils of the struggle, while the result, because it is not of a material nature, escapes their imagination. They conclude that bread was as dear, and labour as painful, in the days of liberty as in their times; and to the privations they endure were then added dangers and violent catastrophies, of which fathers transmitted to their children some terrible details. Slavery, it is said, so debases man as to make him love it; and experience confirms the maxim."

#### PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 2)

This is no party issue. Actually in my own constituency, constituents of all three Parties have asked me to vote against this Bill. Whether I do so or not, now depends on the reply I get from the learned Attorney-General. May I say this, however, that this Bill means a great deal not merely to the lawyers, not merely to the citizens of this country, but principally, I find, to those who are serving overseas. When I was serving overseas I often thought why I was fighting. I did not think just of vague ideals, or even merely of hatred of the enemy, but principally of my vision of England—the commons, the cornfields, the moors and woodlands, old houses. Having talked to people, I think that is a very common attitude of the man abroad. He wants to get back to those things to that England he knows, not to a great army of hutments, not to long vistas of cement and cold, scarred billets that once were houses. That is the message, I think, that the men fighting will give to Parliament to-day—Restore England whatever the cost, whatever the Treasury says.

*Major Sir George Davies* (Yeovil): ... My third and final point is that this Bill smacks of a cheeseparing economy. Although the Government assure us that that is not the case, it looks as if the main consideration had been how to save the State money in various directions in compensation which it would normally be incumbent upon the State to find. It is true that we here in this House of Commons are the guardians of the National purse, but we are

also guardians of something which, I think, is of infinitely greater importance. This old country of ours is carrying the scars of years of war, many inflicted by the enemy and many inflicted by ourselves owing to the exigent demands of war time. It is up to us, as trustees of that heritage, to do all that we can to eliminate those scars and replace the conditions that existed before; to do what is right and proper, even if it costs money; to reinstate those rights and privileges which our people have uncomplainingly given up, because they felt that every effort should be made to bring the war to a successful conclusion. That principle, I maintain, and not the economic one, should be the thread upon which this Bill hangs; otherwise, we shall find ourselves selling our heritage for a mess of pottage.

*Viscount Hinchinbrooke* (Dorset, Southern): ... The hon. Member for Thirsk and Malton said that our country would never stand finance as a governing consideration in its affairs, and I entirely agree with him. It is not only the tribulations of taxation which have imbued people in this country with a hearty and healthy dislike of the Treasury and all its ways, and I say that in spite of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer's kindly and progressive administration at the Treasury. The three public relations officers whom he has appointed might take note of this. The long-standing failure of the Treasury to get its story, if it has a story, across to the public is most marked. In the years before the war, when the Service Departments were sorely in need of a friend at court, the whole weight of Treasury influence was piled into the scales against them. The Treasury was pruning and cutting down long after this House had expressed itself overwhelmingly in favour of a large measure of rearmament, and now in this Bill, at the end of the war—

*Mr. De la Bère* (Evesham): Is the Noble Lord talking about the Bill?

*Viscount Hinchinbrooke*: Yes, I am. In this Bill, at the end of the war, when the entire country wants war works areas to be converted to peace-time use, houses to be restored to their owners, agricultural land to revert to the farming community, and common lands to be reinstated for public enjoyment, the Treasury appears again as a mysterious influence, ranging itself this time with the Fighting Services against the citizen, dominating what ought to be an independent Commission, and infusing this whole Measure with narrow, catch-penny ideas of financial advantage. I think there is an excellent opportunity for the House to teach the Treasury a lesson in public psychology, and I hope that in the course of the passage of this Bill through the Committee stage we shall succeed in relegating the Treasury to its proper place among the more important Government Departments concerned. I would add this, that if the Treasury is to be the main co-ordinator of other Government Departments and the chief economic planning entity in the State, it is fully time that it applied itself more to matters affecting human rights and values, and less to the technique of banking and accountancy.

Hon. Members must really forgive me for entertaining strong feelings on this subject. A very large part of my constituency has been requisitioned for war purposes. Many hundreds of people have been uprooted. Farmers have been dispossessed and have been unable to till their fields. A whole village, complete with church and houses dating back to Tudor times has been engulfed. Billeted troops have

liberally discharged their fire-arms through windows and into old panelling. Tanks have torn up roads and crashed through fences and gateposts and into the walls of buildings. Hutments and establishments of every sort and kind have sprung up like mushrooms, pock-marking the downs and valleys. The fever of military destruction and improvisation has settled upon a tranquil corner of England famous to lovers of Thomas Hardy and beloved by holiday makers for the view of sea and coast...

We ought to amend this Bill to ensure that there is some appeal from the whims of the military mind. We all recognise the need for powerful armed forces in this country for many years to come; if that were not so this Bill would be rejected out of hand. But the civilian has his claims, too, and the Ministers for the great Civil Departments must be imported right into the body of this Measure to give due weight to the hopes and plans of the ordinary man, who is, after all, entitled to reinstatement in his home and occupation if only as a reward for the willingness and nobility of his sacrifices...

*Mr. Pickethorn* (Cambridge University): ... I noticed especially this time the right hon. Gentleman's insistence upon the sacredness of house property. I feel that this a very dangerous argument. Of course, in a sense the house is peculiarly sacred, just as the right to personal safety of a little girl of six is a peculiarly sacred right. We would all think it peculiarly wicked to beat up little girls of six, but when the argument is used apparently in such a way as to subsume that it is quite right to beat up big girls of 16, then this argument of the peculiar sacredness of dwelling houses does seem to become very dangerous. I now see that I have before me no less than six Members of the Socialist Party displaying some interest in a Bill which goes deep to the roots of property. I would beg them to consider that they might be right or wrong in supposing that property must be destroyed, and that in that destruction you may have political security, but that there are some people who take the opposite view that, if you destroy it, there will be no security and no liberty. The Chancellor argued to-day about the peculiar sacredness of dwelling-house property, as though somehow or other, all property should be regarded as sacred, but, as I say, I think that is an extremely dangerous argument...

*Squadron Leader Sir Gifford Fox* (Henley): ... The whole basis of the Bill is finance. There is no question of fair play or of giving a fair deal to the people who have been affected by the various requisitioning notices. In my Division there are a number of large houses which were requisitioned at the beginning of the war. In many cases they were offered to the Government as hospitals. Since then large hutment camps have been built round them, chiefly by the Americans. Many thousands of pounds have been spent on these camps. The houses are very valuable and the families lived in them in peace time. As I understand the Bill there is nothing to stop the Government turning the people out of their homes and taking over the whole place to run it as a holiday camp. The hon. and learned Member for Carmarthen, who is the only supporter of this Bill, seemed to take a great delight in this. The fact remains whether people have got small homes or large homes, those are their homes, and where their affection is. I do ask for fair play for these people who, in many cases, were the first to offer their homes for hospitals and have after-

wards, owing to the exigencies of the war, found that there have been great extensions.

Another problem which is seriously alarming my constituents is that of commons. On two of these commons, large hospital hutment camps have been built, costing something in the neighbourhood of £200,000. We demand that these camps should be removed and the commons returned to the people...

*Commander Galbraith* (Glasgow, Pollok): ... The extraordinary thing is that there is no right of appeal for the owners. That is a most extraordinary omission. It denies one of the fundamental rights of the individual, rights which have been possessed by the people of this country for centuries. I very much doubt the wisdom of giving powers to the Board of Trade to decide what use is to be made of requisitioned factories without any check whatever. Surely this House has not reached the stage when it is prepared to empower the Board of Trade to seize any factory it sees fit to seize and to put it to any purpose it sees fit, without any control or machinery through which the owners can be assured that reasonable consideration will be given to their rights and objections. Unless some machinery of that nature is set up, the Board of Trade will become the dictator of British industry, and that is a position which I am certain it will be unable to occupy either to the satisfaction or to the benefit of the people of this country...

*Commander Sir Archibald Southby* (Epsom): ... One Member said to-day that this House was the guardian of the public purse. I say that it is the guardian of something much more important, the national honour. It is the duty of a Government to be most scrupulous in their dealings with those whom they govern. Let me remind the Government and it is perhaps time that it was said—that the Government are the servant of the people, and not their master. This country is not as yet a totalitarian state. Yet if ever there was a Bill brought into this House which was designed to increase beyond all reason the power of the Executive this Bill is it...

No Bill recently has stirred popular feeling in the country quite so much as this one has. Let the Government understand that the people are beginning to be very critical of the grasping of power by the Executive. Men fighting overseas are not fighting to come back to a country in which no liberty any longer exists. They want their open spaces...

*Lieut.-Commander Joynson-Hicks* (Chichester): ... What is the primary object of this Bill? As I understand, it is to regulate the restoration of the requisitioned land, and land which has been used by the Government during the war and to do so in an orderly and proper manner. The emphasis as I see it is upon the word "restoration." That I believe is the Bill's primary object and intention. It is an amenity intention, but what we really have is a financial Measure. I understood that it had been decided not long ago, in fact I think it was during the last Debate upon the Finance Bill, that finance was to be the servant and not the master of our policy, but clearly I think this Bill shows that the matter has got out of hand again, and that finance is once more becoming the master of policy and not its servant...

*House of Lords: February 15, 1945.*

#### INSURANCE POLICY

*Lord Monkswell:* My Lords, the first of the White

Papers before us sets forth part of an immense scheme for dealing with the principal evils that flesh is heir to. Poverty and ignorance and ill-health are all to be abolished by law and unconditionally. The particular evil with which this White Paper deals is poverty. A set of regulations is to be drawn up, and is, at once, to be passed into law so that, no matter what happens, every citizen is to be for ever sure of being able to pass his life in comfort and, if need be, in idleness. Such safeguards as are suggested to prevent this latter are, obviously, futile and illusory. And all these revolutionary reforms are to be achieved by a stroke of the pen. It is so easy that one wonders how it is that nobody has ever done it before. There is only one thing that could cause misgiving—how long will it last? . . . What arrangements are there for ensuring this continuous supply? There is not a word about it in the White Paper, and I noted, without surprise, that the noble Lord who introduced this Motion was exceedingly careful not to say a single word on this subject. . .

Between the wars by far the most notable financial change was that the whole of the employed working classes were, on an average, allotted wages and subsidies which provided them with somewhere about double the goods and services they had had before 1914. To achieve this the goods and services in question must somehow or other be made available. It is, I think, obvious that no increase approaching the amount required was produced. . .

These proposals are exactly calculated to increase the shortage, which, as I have already remarked, is the principal cause of inflation. It cannot be too often repeated that inflation, by its very nature, must destroy all hope of social security, no matter what measures are passed by Parliament. The fatal mistake that political philanthropists are always and for ever making is to assume that goods and services will produce themselves, and that all that need be done is to regulate their distribution. The fact, of course, is that production is a delicate and complicated matter that can easily be thrown out of gear, and that all sorts of things, particularly costs of production, methods of production, supply of capital and import of raw material have all to be carefully and skilfully arranged before production becomes possible. It is dishonest and futile to promise the working classes all sorts of good things without, at the same time, making it clear to them that their own co-operation in accepting economic rates of wages and conditions of service is the foundation of the whole matter and that without this co-operation the whole scheme must collapse. . .

Wages pegged at a heavily inflated level will ensure the permanent devaluation of our currency, and this at a moment when, being extremely short of free capital, it will be essential to maintain the value of the currency. . .

All the big political parties have united to make to the voters of this country what I for one regard as a whole series of reckless promises of a large number of extremely expensive social reforms, which for many years at least, will add nothing to our material wealth. It must also be remembered that every halfpenny spent on the social services, in so far as these services do not pay for themselves, is an added cost of production. . . .

The Government policy is to ignore facts, make social security a first charge, and, except for floods and floods of entirely unconvincing talk, to leave production to look after itself. The thing is impossible. I am unfavourably im-

pressed by the attempt which is being made by the advocates of all these social security measures to represent them as a crusade against the ills of life; to my mind they would be more accurately described as a political variation of the confidence trick.

### WANTED

HOUSE or FLAT to rent within 30 miles of London, preferably unfurnished. Information would be greatly appreciated by Social Crediter. H, c/o *The Social Crediter*.

## 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
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
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
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	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.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.).....	1d.
The Representative's Job.....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED  
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.