

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 14. No. 10.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 12, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

Yes, Clarence, life is going to be very difficult, now we've beaten Germany. In order that we may again live on our exports, railway fares will go up, postage will be increased, whisky will be scarcer, houses will be smaller, there won't be any domestic service, and the "B".B.C. will tell how marvellous is the life of the Russian proletarian. In the meantime, the first and perhaps most superficially repellent of the Socialist dictators, Mussolini, has been "executed"; we have, as we foresaw, Herr Hitler-Schickelgruber-Rothschild with us no longer; and we shall be surprised if the Red Czar dies a natural death. We have no objection to these happenings, but it does irk us that the bumpings-off are confined to the exhibits in the shop window, while the instigators, together with the numerous oily little plotters and planners in Government Departments and international cartels, look round for a new driver for the repainted band-wagon.

Mr. Mackenzie King, who was partly educated at Harvard, was, from political obscurity, and when travelling in Europe, "chosen" Canadian Liberal Party Leader in 1919. Two years later, in 1921, he became Prime Minister. Note the approximate synchronism with Baldwin, the negotiator of the American Debt "Settlement."

"In 1921, Great Britain abandoned her alliance with Japan, yielding to the pressure of Canada, whose Pacific interests were much like those of the Americans. The next year, at the naval conference in Washington, Canada induced Great Britain to acknowledge naval parity with the United States. . . .

"The Dominions used the strongest influence in shaping the British policy in the League of Nations."

— *The Passing of the European Age*, by Eric Fischer.  
Harvard University Press, page 49.

Read the preceding paragraph twice over. It may enlighten you in regard to the apparent paralysis of the insane which afflicted us during the armistice years, suggest a reason for the present war, and illuminate the ultimate objectives. Mr. King has announced that the Canadian Army will be under U.S. Command in the Pacific.

So if you think the Japanese War is an unprovoked attack, and a side-show anyway, think again. The Labour Party violently opposed the fortification of Singapore. There is the strongest opposition in the usual circles in America to the return of Malaya to "Britain."

We fully appreciate both the immensity and the difficulty of the task; but that the whole attitude of the population of these islands must be reorientated in regard to "majority

rule" is not merely essential, but is a pre-requisite to our continued existence as a self-governing community. Entirely distinct and separate from any meaning such a method of conducting our business might conceivably possess, if it in fact existed, must be set the patent fact that not only does it not exist, but it is much further from reality than perhaps ever it was. That is to say, it bears the same relation to practicality that perpetual motion does to an aeroplane engine. It is a well-known fact that the pursuit of a perpetual-motion engine has sterilised more mechanical ability than was demanded by the invention of the internal combustion engine.

The confusion of the democratic idea, which, properly understood, is valid and workable, with majority rule, is deliberate and conscious on the part of a minority who realise that it is vital to their monopolistic objectives. The essence of democracy is a bilateral contract voluntarily made. The essence of majority rule is unilateral decision backed by mass action. Not only is it an essential totalitarian tyranny, but it has the makings of the worst tyranny the world can show.

"Bisniarck wished to break with the (German) National Liberals who had been his main supporters up to 1879. . . . they were able to do this because several Jews were prominent amongst the leaders of the National Liberals, but even more because the programme of the National Liberals—and of similar parties in other countries—was one which would naturally attract a considerable section of the Jewish citizens of any country. It was the party of industrialism against the landowners, of the city against the country, of the modern secular state. . . . of the new nationalism. It was thus the party which attracted Jews. They owed their citizenship to the wave of liberalism which accompanied the French Revolution. . . ." — The Rev. James Parkes.

And just see what a beautiful world they have made.

It is grimly humorous that the Alberta newspapers, which have been loud in their denunciation of "racial discrimination" when applied to Jews, whether refugees from Hitlers' tyranny or otherwise, are unanimous in demanding that the Japanese, moved from the Coast at the outbreak of war with Japan, should be removed from Alberta at the earliest possible moment. We certainly hold no brief for the little yellow men; quite apart from war feeling, they are not a suitable stock for Canada. But they are not one-fiftieth as dangerous as the Jews who must not be criticised. Nor, of course, have they such valuable advertising to place.

There is evidently something in the air of the North American continent which conduces to a sublime disregard for the injunction to attend to the beam in your own eye before devoting too much energy to your neighbour's mote. For some years, the favourite home sport in the U.S.A.

has been to castigate "Britain" for imperialism, and we are sorry to note from a letter to our threepenny Socialist daily which was, no doubt, delighted to print it, that an officer belonging to that splendid body, the Royal Canadian Air Force, feels impelled to take time out for a little fun and games in the old manner. Now, the fundamental principle of imperialism in the objectionable sense is the determination to impress your views on people who don't want to follow them. We have no hesitation in asserting that the essentials of imperialism are more rampant, and more crude in form and expression, on the North American Continent, than they ever were in Great Britain, and that, for the most part, the most vocal critics of this country are those whose knowledge of the British Empire least qualifies them to express an opinion on it. The gallant officer who signed the letter in question is apparently called Arthur Purvis. This may, of course be a North American Indian name, but if not, we might suggest to him that, without the British Empire of which he is so critical, he certainly would not be a Canadian to-day.

We have done a little criticising of British politics ourselves, and expect to do more, but this carping at the successful, because they have been successful, which is common to Socialists, Communists, and would-be assignees of the Pax Britannica, does not amuse us. Some of our critics have asserted their monopoly of virtue for so long without dissent that mere repetition has given weight to their fatuities. We are satisfied that as much harm is done to international relationships by permitting mis-statements of this nature to pass unchallenged as by their enunciation; and if we must have a Ministry of Information we suggest that it should do a little work on the subject.

The roots of this mischief are many and various; some of them are planted for the purpose of creating friction and embarrassment. But of the others, a looseness of expression ranks high in importance—the use of words to which is attributed a definition they do not possess. Amongst a spate of books designed to suggest to the American public that they have bought the world and paid the money, is one with the suggestive title *America's Role in Asia* by Mr. Harry Paxton Howard. Mr. Howard founds his thesis on the enquiry: "How far has our Government come to the realisation that not merely Japanese Empire, but all domination of one people by another people"—Great Britain inferred—"means inevitable and unending conflict over the spoils of such Empire?"

It would be easy to write several books on such a text, but at the moment, we are merely concerned to point out that it voices the heart-cry of Scotland against England, of the West Riding of Yorkshire against Lancashire, of the Fuzby-on-the-Mud Parish Council against the County Authority, and of every individual in the realm against the Inland Revenue. What are the boundaries of a "people"? When Jefferson negotiated the Louisiana Purchase, did he buy the right to "dominate" the Southern States? On what grounds other than pure expediency is the Monroe Doctrine, so bitterly resented by the South American Republics, based?

These enquiries, so far from being frivolous, pertain to the Riddle of the Sphinx, which mankind must solve or perish. At the moment, "the domination of one people by another" is being used to advertise the domination of every

people by a World Group.

If Mr. Harry Paxton Howard supposes that this situation will be improved by the substitution of the United States of America for the British Empire, then he had better write another book explaining the moral justification for the American Civil War and the subjugation of the Confederate States.

Social Creditors, like lesser folk, are entitled to a little innocent relaxation, and we present them with the following gem, uncut as received from a New Zealand Correspondent:

"Douglas Credit Fallacies Exposed"

"Leaders of the Movement Sincere but Misguided"

"Douglas was so enthusiastic with his idea that he went to Moscow and interviewed Stalin. Stalin listened intently [*sic*] and replied 'We base our Socialist economy on production for use under a planned economy, and no citizen is allowed to hire his fellow citizen to make a profit out of his labour.'

"The Douglas adherents had been noticeably quiet about this interview, said Mr. Conibear, but they side-tracked the real economic fundamentals by stating that Russia was a State-Capitalist country."

—*New Zealand Standard*, March 9, 1945.

Mr. Conibear was spreading sweetness and light on behalf of the New Zealand Labour Party.

Many of our readers will recollect the extraordinary wave of publicity, almost amounting to hysteria, with which "Technocracy" was launched in America, contemporaneously with the curious and furtive, but immensely powerful grip on British Government policy assumed by the Powers behind P.E.P. in the early thirties. No-one familiar with transatlantic methods could be under any misapprehension as to the presence of "Big Business" somewhere; but, at the time, the objective was not wholly clear. It has become clearer, and one of its disclosures is its implacable hatred of Great Britain. Its Director-in-Chief, Howard Scott, whose early antics caused its rapid, if not complete, eclipse, has specifically advocated that the United States take over Canada "by force of arms." In his view "America must possess [*sic*] all territories marked in red, on the accompanying map of the Technate" (Canada is so marked) "for the defence of the Continent... The United States of America is the dominant nation of this continent, and North America must be consolidated under its direction and leadership. The acquisition of these territories should be a mandatory part of the programme of continental defence for immediate achievement—either by purchase, negotiation, or force of arms."

—*America Now and Forever*, Pt. I. Howard Scott (Technocracy, A19).

Neither we nor others are likely to take Mr. Scott himself very seriously. But he is evidently supplied with considerable funds for kite-flying: and his "Party" is an adaptation, for the large public of engineering mechanics and minor technicians who dominate many American towns, of Mond-Turnerism, "The Big Idea." It will be remembered that the late Sir Alfred Mond spent much of his time in New York just then.

The Association of Scientific Workers, which wants "A Planning Board for the Highlands" is an example of the same racket, which is being worked through pseudo-professional associations everywhere.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Lords: April 17, 1945.*

### WORLD ORGANISATION FOR PEACE

*Viscount Samuel* rose to call attention to the proposals, made at the Dumbarton Oakes and Crimea conferences, for establishing an organisation of the United Nations for the prevention of aggression and the maintenance of peace; and to move for Papers. The noble Viscount said: ... first, there should be complete military victory over both Germany and Japan, followed by the effective and lasting disarmament of those two aggressive States; that, on the other hand, the peace-loving nations should maintain sufficient forces, parts of which should be designated beforehand and ready to take action, to prevent the recurrence of similar aggression from those two, or any other, nations; next, that there should be established an organisation of such peace-loving nations for the maintenance of peace and security, which in course of time should include all peoples; that the Statutes of that Organisation should be based upon the Dumbarton Oakes conversations, to give them their official title; further, that regional groupings of States should be encouraged for similar purposes; that there should be an International Court of Justice and a Council to promote economic and social co-operation. . . .

At the present time when war is still proceeding, naturally our thoughts turn mainly to the Security Council and its great task for the prevention of war; but in the next generation if that Security Council has been successful in its purpose then it will be the Economic and Social Council of the World Organisation which will hold the forefront of the stage. The noble Viscount, Lord Templewood, has a Motion on the Paper to-day to the purpose of which he will no doubt refer in the course of this debate. It may be that the Charter of the new organisation, which we hope will be drafted and endorsed at San Francisco, might be provided with a fitting preamble which would include declarations of purpose somewhat on the lines of those which he adumbrated in this House so effectively in a debate not long ago. . . .

Our own delegation differs from the rest and may have a special function to perform in that it represents the one great State which has no written Constitution. They will be meeting together in conference with the delegates of countries like the United States of America and the Continental States, all of which have written Constitutions and are accustomed to treat almost as a matter of course the necessity for the elaboration of a fundamental Statute which, so far as possible, shall deal with all foreseeable contingencies. In this country we have never done that and we find that our own method, on the whole, works better than the others.

It is long since Walter Bagehot showed how the powers of the Crown, the powers of the Cabinet, the powers of the Courts of Justice and the powers and constitution of your Lordships' House are all the products of growth and not of manufacture, and we may search in vain in any library for any document which shall specify them. . . .

I make these observations because I come next to refer to what is the most vexed question at the moment with regard to the constitution to be adopted at San Francisco—namely, the powers of voting in the Security Council on the application of sanctions. Speaking here on behalf of Liberals, I am compelled to say that we view that proposal with disagreement and indeed with grave concern—the proposal

which was accepted at the Crimean Conference that any one of the "major Powers," to use President Roosevelt's term for what were called the "Big Three" or the "Big Five"—an unhappy phrase to my mind—should have a veto on any action of the Organisation involving the employment of force for the restraint of a potential aggressor, even if the great Power, the major Power, was itself accused of aggression. Not only that, but if it is not itself accused of aggression it can veto the application of sanctions in any dispute between two lesser Powers in any part of the world. That seems to us a very unhappy proposal. The League of Nations had many defects and the new Organisation was rightly regarded as being in many respects a substantial advance upon the League of Nations, but this particular proposal is a retrograde step, for the powers that will remain with the Security Council will be less than those which were enjoyed by the League of Nations. . . .

If at San Francisco we are faced by the stark necessity of choosing between accepting this method of voting and conceding this power of veto on the one hand, and on the other hand of foregoing the co-operation of Russia in the whole scheme, I for one would prefer to accept the bad proposal rather than lose Russian co-operation. And my reason is this, that like all human institutions we should consider this new structure not for what it is only but for what it may become. . . .

*Viscount Templewood* had given Notice that he would move to resolve, That the San Francisco Conference provides an unique opportunity for laying the foundations of a system of international peace, for re-establishing the moral and material standards of civilised life and for safeguarding the individual liberties of the common man without which he will be unable to live his life free from fear and want.

The noble Viscount said: . . . Perhaps I do not attach to the agenda of the San Francisco Conference the same urgency that the noble Viscount attaches to the machinery. I approach the question of voting at the Conference upon two principles. First, power and responsibility must not be divorced; secondly, there must be no breach in the front of the United Nations. The difficulty is to apply those two principles in such a way that they will not estrange the smaller Powers. Looking as I constantly look upon the problems of Europe, I am convinced that it is essential for the recovery of European civilisation that we should have the fullest possible co-operation of the smaller countries of the Continent. . . .

The memorandum recently produced by the Dutch Government puts very well the point of view of the smaller Governments of Europe. I will allude to one point only—namely, that if the main provisions with reference to security are left in the hands of the great Powers there ought at least to emerge from the San Francisco Conference a statement of international conduct to which all the Governments assembled there would bind themselves. At present, under the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks Conversations and the Yalta Conference, the great Powers are left with almost totalitarian influence. There is nothing to guide the course of their international conduct. . . .

The question of security, I admit, is of vital importance to the future of the world, but I maintain that so long as the great Powers hold together there will be, at any rate in the future years immediately before us, no threat, no

(Continued on page 6)

## 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, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 14. No. 10.

Saturday, May 12, 1945.

### Aftermath

To elect is to choose. The elector who votes for any candidate we can see at the forthcoming election will choose nothing. He will only condone his lack of choice. He will 'rubber stamp' a policy already decided upon, a policy destructive of his interests. He will confirm his disfranchisement.

In a few constituencies the defeat of a candidate presumed to be invulnerable would count for practical purposes as an enfranchisement of those who stand to be injured by that candidate's policy, partly through substitution of a weaker agent for the stronger agent, but to a greater extent because in such constituencies the attack could scarcely be conducted without bringing to the forefront the real issues.

In any case the procedure indicated is the same, namely to canvass for a policy, and in view of the danger in which the community stands of surrendering its rights, perhaps irremediably, that policy should be resistance to the surrender. Hence the Anti-bureaucratic canvass.

Certain members of the present House of Commons are obvious targets for individual attention. They are those closely connected with centralisation of power in one form or another. Their constituencies should be flooded with the large volume of information made available, chiefly through the industry and insight of Major Douglas, which illuminates the history and motives of the inter-war years. Without their being a true point of origin historically, the events which led up to the Coal Strike and the Mond-Turner Conference, which was the first occasion in which the extra-national interests clearly and unmistakably showed themselves in the open, form a convenient starting point. There is now nothing to hinder a complete exposure of the links with I. G. Farben, P.E.P., etc., etc. The electorate may not be "standing by, fully informed and deliberately consenting" (to use the late Lord Hewart's formula); but many of its members are quite unmistakably on the watch, know there is more than a whiff of Grimsby in the political wind, and are disposed to give a name to their suspicions, though not in terms leading always to right courses of action. That state of affairs can be remedied.

To transfer power to institutions is to transfer power from individuals. There are three steps:—

"(1) The bringing about of a state of affairs in which International finance controls trade, industry and distribution, and would have no check on its extortions but for private enterprise.

"(2) The bringing about of major 'arranged' crises and depressions (as in 1928) and when intolerable conditions arise, as in Germany, and in the distressed areas in Britain,

it is said nothing can be done about it, because there is no money.

"(3) When these conditions bring on the inevitable war, you say that war is the major evil in this world and comes from 'private enterprise'; eleven millions or more a day is spent on pure destruction when eleven millions a month was not forthcoming for constructive purposes; and every device of propaganda is set in motion to advocate that the affairs of the world be handed over to a monopoly of the powers operating through finance and subterranean intrigue, so that effective revolt becomes forever impossible." The source of that invincible argument is Douglas.

### Hydro-Electric Schemes

The following, which we reproduce because of its general application, appeared in the *Dundee Courier and Advertiser* of April 21:—

Sir,—The letter of Mr. F. E. Geddes will render a valuable public service if it awakens a general consciousness that the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board is part of a considered scheme to utilise the war psychology for the permanent enslavement not merely of Scotsmen but of the world.

It may not have escaped attention that the T.V.A. (Tennessee Valley Authority) is frequently adduced as an example which is to be copied by the board. Physically there is no resemblance whatever. The T.V.A. purports to be a flood control and land reclamation scheme, and it is typical of what can only be described as the cynical disregard of political morality which seems inseparable from the partnership of Socialism and international cartellism which is the force behind it, that the area permanently flooded by the dams greatly exceeds the biggest area ever temporarily flooded before the dams were built. Nevertheless 58 per cent. of the capital cost up to 1943 was charged to navigation and flood control in order to make the apparent costs of power generation appear low. There is a loss to the taxpayer of 12,789,000 dollars, say £3,200,000, for 1943.

The real objective of the T.V.A. is however, quite probably that of the Hydro-Electric Board, and that is to bring an area under complete economic and administrative dictatorship. The ground has been prepared by skilful propaganda to the effect that the miseries of the Armistice years show that the "old system" was completely obsolete and must be replaced. In fact, the depression of 1929-34 was an essential part of the propaganda, and the same forces which are now creating world monopolies were implacably and successfully opposed to any action which would have weakened its effect. The intention of the policy is world-wide, and the New Zealand Socialist-Labour party, the C.C.F. (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) in Canada, the Australian Labour Party, the American New Dealers, "P.E.P." (the planners) in Great Britain, and in fact, organisations in every country draw their inspiration and support from the same source, which was originally located in Germany.

One of the individuals closely concerned with the inter-war stages of this activity was asked whether there was anything in "this nonsense" that a certain group aspired to the domination of the world. The reply was, "Of course there is. In a very few years we shall have achieved it, and nothing can stop us."

There are 27 objectors, covering most of the genuine interests of the district, to the Tummel-Garry project. We shall see what consideration they will receive.—I am, &c.,

C. H. DOUGLAS.

## More Power To Her Elbow

By B. M. PALMER

I think Number 231 of PEP's broadsheet *Planning* for March, "Household Appliances," was probably compiled by some of the best brains among the women employed by that vast organisation. Such words I know would be taken in many quarters as high praise, so widespread is the delusion that the best brains are at the present period of time occupied in the best possible way, and that all vast organisations are necessarily vastly desirable and vastly efficient. PEP is doubtless entirely satisfactory from the point of view of those who direct it, for their ultimate objective is the establishment of the centralised socialist state, governed by a few technocrats. But how many others among us desire this result? And as for the best brains among the women, they had probably taken university courses in B.Sc. Econ., in Sociology or in Domestic Science, a full time college training until the age of 20 or 22. After that, some years of experience in industry, research work, journalism or social services, probably in all four, until at last in the words of PEP's editor, they are capable of sharing in the "fact-finding, non-partisan attitude as the most constructive way of dealing with problems of public affairs."

This brings us to the question "What is a fact?" The whole of this broadsheet is crammed with figures which look like facts, and are treated as facts by the compilers. It may be a fact that 100 men suffering from D.T.'s are inclined to see things double; but if I treat this as a fact when catering for 100 normal men I am likely to underestimate their appetites. My fact is no longer a fact. But such a frame of mind would be no more ridiculous than that induced by present day training in the applied science departments of our universities, which unfortunately, are now gathering in women students in large numbers. This broadsheet is based on the assumption that "for several years after the war essential needs are bound to take priority. Massive industrial equipment will have to come first; then there will be the urgent reconstruction needs of other countries, worse hit by the war than Britain; finally, it will be the height of folly to allow any industry to produce luxuries for the home market if the alternative is to export them in payment for our vital imports." And the demand for household appliances has been worked out on a table estimating the distribution of families according to income. The poverty stricken year of 1938 has been taken as a basis for incomes; the attitude of mind of the compilers can be indicated by a quotation from page 6:—"An enquiry undertaken by Mr. Philip Massey, also in 1937-38, into expenditure by income groups from £250-£700 showed an average weekly expenditure of 1/6½ on household equipment and also of 1/4½ on laundry charges." (And how much did they spend on rates and taxes?)

To continue. "Pre-war statistics show that, for many appliances, a reduction in price has to be large if it is to lead to substantially increased sales. Large reductions in price would probably not be possible for certain appliances, such as electric irons, the output of which by individual manufacturers was already large enough to secure maximum economy. But for a great many other appliances output was not large enough, owing to the comparatively limited volume of sales or to the multiplicity of individual manufacturers; and for these it should be possible, by means of increased standardisation and mass-production, to effect

considerable reductions in manufacturing costs and prices.

"The number of persons who want a refrigerator is undoubtedly high, but expense is bound to limit the demand. . . .

"... The most satisfactory short-term arrangement would be to provide an appliance in the living-room capable of being used both for background heating and for topping-up. This can be done by means of closed stoves with openable fires such as were already on the market before the war, but never proved very popular in this country. They were widely used in Germany, however, where rooms tended to be warmer, though the annual consumption of coal per household was much lower than in Britain. . . .

"... Present economic conditions and lack of technical development in the efficient use of raw heat mean that an adequate heat supply is not within the means of a large number of families. . . ."

What is "raw" heat?

"Indications are, however, that there should be considerable advances in design in the immediate post-war years: the increased price of coal would alone make such improvement highly necessary."

The above being taken as "facts," the rest of the broadsheet is an admirable example of present-day research and statistics, typical of the sort of result being produced by sociologists everywhere. A full Report has already been submitted to the Board of Trade; this will be published (and distributed by the Oxford University Press) later in the year. "It is hoped that the Report will be of practical value to manufacturers and designers of domestic appliances, to those responsible for the installation of domestic equipment, and to those members of the wider public who have to decide what they will buy or hire for their own use." And so it will—It will be helpful in exactly the same way as a handbook on income tax is helpful to those who have to pay it—a guide-book to the servile state.

One more gem must be quoted:—"It is, however, significant that in the case of washing-machines several poorer families would sometimes co-operate to buy such an appliance on hire purchase. This suggests that sales would be considerable if prices were reduced. It seems probable that a number of such appliances may be purchased with War Savings and Tax Credits."

At one time I should have thought it sufficient to tell the women that what is physically possible is financially possible; but now I realise that to those educated on theories the "physically possible" has no reality. For they are just as much or even more cut off from reality as the fine lady of Victorian times, popularly supposed to have spent all her time in dressing, driving and entertaining. (This is by no means necessarily a true picture of her: she often had a large family of healthy children: but we will concede a point). The astounding fact remains that by the time the school and university has finished with them, most of our women have been so conditioned that they will contemplate the statement "This suggests that sales would be considerable if prices were reduced" without bursting into laughter.

But is it surprising, when the formative years of their lives have been spent in studying the records (not the facts) of both the present and the past and taking them as a standard against which to assess experience?

The "higher education" of women, so ardently fought for by the feminists, is now beginning to bear its terrible

fruit. "By the separation of large classes into mere agents of a function, engaged in never-ending toil of which the primary inducement is money, it has been possible to obtain the more or less complete co-operation of large numbers of individuals in aims of which they were completely ignorant, and of which had they been able to appreciate them in their entirety, they would have completely disapproved, while at the same time Education and Ecclesiasticism have combined to foster the idea, that so long as the orders of a superior were obeyed, no responsibility rested on the individual." (*Economic Democracy*.)

The problem is many sided, and if we do not constantly bear this in mind we shall fail to help where our help is needed as never before. To establish a correct relation between the economic voting power of the individual (*i.e.* his money,) and the proper development of the goods and services available is only part of it. Beyond that comes a correct understanding of the purpose of the industrial system, which is "the removal of material limitations and the satisfaction of the creative impulse." Thus while it is absurd to try to use the industrial system as a means for making work, to set up "efficiency" as an end in itself leads to the destruction of the creative impulse. It is my view that these principles apply just as closely to work in our homes. While few women would try to "make work" in their household tasks, there is a tendency, I believe, to feel that what is done at home provides no opportunity for the satisfaction of the creative instinct. The reasons for this mistaken attitude are many: lack of training, lack of equipment of the best possible quality, designed only for its purpose; or too much equipment of the wrong kind, so that life is almost reduced to the dull uniformity of pressing a button or opening a can; (this has already been observed as a tendency in the U.S.A.); lack of domestic service due mainly to the curious idea that what is done at home is a waste of time; ugly furniture, china, spoons and sauce pans; ugly working clothes not designed for the purpose, leading to the performance of all tasks in a sort of mental and physical fug.

And in the midst of all this hurry, dissatisfaction and unrest, we will, if we are lucky enough, buy a good copy of a Dutch interior to hang on our walls to look at when we can spare a moment, and wonder why it gives such rest and peace—only a woman seated quietly in a simple room, peeling red apples, while the sun shines through the open doorway, as though there were all the time in the world.

But we must hurry, or we shall be late for work, where today we have to draw a graph of estimated post-war demand;—and how important this is Mr. So-and-so explained to us yesterday.

Well now, what is time? is it not, so far as we simple women are concerned, a succession of moments, and is not each moment a little world in itself? It is what we are doing *now* that matters, not what we may perhaps be doing next week.

'Twas on a Monday morning,  
When I beheld my darling,  
She looked so neat and charming  
In every high degree;  
She looked so neat and nimble-o,  
A-washing of the linen-o,  
Dashing away with the smoothing iron  
She stole my heart away.

—English Folk Song.

## PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3)

military threat, to European security, whilst these other questions, the economic, social and moral questions, connected with the re-establishment of civilisation in Europe, are of the very first urgency and importance. Moreover, it seems to me that it is these questions, the economic, social and moral questions, rather than the military questions, the security questions, that are most likely to lead to disputes between the various Governments of the United Nations. That being so, I urge that a new and much greater importance should be given to the Economic and Social Council contemplated in the Dumbarton Oakes Conversations, that it should not be, what it appears to be now, a rather academic sub-committee to meet from time to time for certain specific purposes. I maintain that it ought to be an integral part of the Organisation, that it should be permanent and not intermittent, and that the great Powers instead of appearing as they have under the Dumbarton Oakes proposals, to have a rather intermittent and uncertain interest in these questions, should be permanent members of it.

It is these questions, the economic, social and moral questions, that are to-day most urgent in Europe. As I say, they are the questions that are most likely to lead to disputes between the various Governments. For those two reasons it is essential that the second part of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals should be brought into the very forefront of the San Francisco deliberations, and that out of that Conference there should emerge a strong, comprehensive and permanent Organisation, with its functions clearly defined, for dealing with these questions, which are doubtless in the minds of every noble Lord—the economic social and moral questions that are now so urgent and insistent in Europe—and which, unless there is a remedy, or an attempt at remedy, will leave Europe in the terrible state of anarchy and confusion in which it now finds itself. . .

Your Lordships may be interested to hear of certain developments that have taken place, in this field since last December. Those of your Lordships who were present at the debate will remember that I made two proposals. The first proposal was for an agreement, or possibly regional agreements, made between the Governments of the United Nations for the safeguarding of certain fundamental liberties, the destruction of which made Nazism and Fascism possible. Secondly, I proposed that, under the Economic and Social Council of Dumbarton Oaks, there should be formed a permanent organisation, generally speaking upon the lines of the International Labour Office, for collecting data upon the way in which these rights were being upheld or ignored, for stimulating public opinion, for generally attempting to do what the International Labour Office did in the case of economic questions, and for generally raising the standard of the whole world. It is interesting to note that, since then, a very influential Committee, in the United States, composed of many of the most prominent public men in the United States, has, on parallel lines, arrived at very much the same proposals. It is also interesting to note that Commander Stassen, one of the most influential public men in the United States, has made this question of safeguarding fundamental liberties the central object of a speech which he delivered a few weeks ago.

Apart from these individual expressions of support, there have been developments in the international field with regard to a proposal upon which the Crimea Conference at

Yalta made two comments, the proposal in the Dumbarton Oaks Conversations in which it is stated specifically that the Security Organisation is set up to—

“facilitate solutions of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.”

The Yalta Conference emphasised this objective twice in the Report of its proceedings. Since then, however, there has been another international conference, a Conference of the two Americas at Mexico City. I have often felt that we here in England are perhaps somewhat apt to underrate the importance of the Latin-American States. Be that as it may, here was a Conference at Mexico City, attended by the Latin-American States and by representatives of the United States, which dealt at great length with certain of these fundamental liberties and the means of safeguarding them.

Let me give you an example. The Conference particularly concerned itself with one of these fundamental liberties which is essential if Nazism and Fascism are not to reappear at some time in the future—namely, freedom of discussion. Let me read to your Lordships a clause or two passed by the States of North and South America, showing that this is a question which is not merely an academic question for a generalisation, but a specific objective upon which definite action can and ought to be taken. I quote now from the Report of the Conference:

“The Inter-American Conference on problems of war and peace recommends:

(1) That the American Republics recognise their essential obligation to guarantee to their people free and impartial access to information.

(2) That with this assurance in view, they undertake upon the conclusion of the war the earliest possible abandonment of those measures of censorship and control over the services of the Press and radio which have been necessary in wartime to combat subversive political tactics and espionage activity of the Axis States.

(3) That the Governments of the American Republics take measure individually and in co-operation with one another to promote a free exchange of information among their peoples.”

That is an instance not of an academic resolution upon one of these fundamental liberties but of a definite proposal to which the Governments of the two Americas have pledged themselves.

Lastly, there have been developments in this country as well. A great body of interest is already showing itself in the proposal to found an organisation to help to safeguard these liberties. I will give your Lordships only one example. In the course of the last two or three days, the Grotius Society, a Society of which the principal international lawyers in this country are members, has produced a very important and interesting report. I understand that the report has already been sent to the Press, and it will be in the hands of the public in a matter of hours, or at any rate in the next day or two. It might be thought that experts in International Law would take the line which I remember was taken in the course of the debate in this House by one or two noble Lords—namely, that these fundamental liberties, freedom of religion, a fair and equal system of justice, no racialism, and freedom of discussion, would essentially be internal questions, about which International Law should not concern itself. That is not the view of this body of expert international lawyers.

Let me read to your Lordships a sentence or two from their report. They say:

“...the welfare of the individual played a greater part in the

thoughts of the earlier writers on International Law than it has done in modern times. It was in the later periods that the conception of the ‘State’ and the rights and prerogatives of the State monopolised the teachings of the publicists to such an extent that some modern writers have proclaimed that International Law is exclusively a law between States, thus relegating the individual to a position in which International Law could accord him no protection.

This view loses sight of the fact that International Law has never been exclusively restricted to the relations between States as such. Indeed, in its origin, the *jus gentium* dealt with the individual rights of subjects of the Roman Empire. Nor must it be forgotten that successive European upheavals have left their mark both on thought and practice. It was, for instance, the horrors of the Thirty Years War which inspired Grotius and the movement which he initiated.

The growth of Nazism and Fascism in the years between the two World Wars and the actual events of the present war have proved conclusively that the destruction of human liberty within a State may be the prelude to national aggression and thereby endanger the basis of peaceful society.”

I cannot do better than quote to your Lordships that opinion of a body of well-known experts in the field of International Law...

...There is a dangerous feeling of disillusionment, almost of cynicism, growing up among many men and women in the world. There is a tendency, accentuated perhaps by the voting procedure contemplated in the Dumbarton Oaks provisions, that only force counts. Once again we are drifting back to another chapter of power politics, and the interests of the common man, the small man—just as the interests of the small State—are being subjugated to the demands of force and to the needs of the great Powers. If that be so, surely it is essential that the Conference at San Francisco should make its central objective the dissipation of those suspicions and disillusionments, should make it clear that its principal objective is to carry out the provision of the Atlantic Charter to make “all the men in all the lands” free from fear and want. If that be its purpose, if its purpose be to give hope to the common man, whose life and liberty have been endangered by Nazi and Fascist tyranny, and if further it can agree upon a convention or series of conventions, setting out these objectives, if it can set up an organisation, not at some distant time in the far future but now while these problems are so urgent and terrible, not only will it give hope to the common man, the small man, and to the small State, but it will complement the provisions about military security, and, by making the world freer and happier, it will lay the foundations to future peace much more effectively than any number of conventions about voting or military assistance at some problematical moment in the future.

### Bureaucracy

Lull-time fire losses, compiled by insurance companies, have mounted yearly during N.F.S. era despite extra men, appliances and standardisation.

The fire blitz was fought by the old local authority brigades and auxiliaries trained by them. N.F.S. was never tested for the work it was created for; but the cost of the fire service has risen from about £5,000,000 to over £30,000,000 a year.

—H. T. Hooker in the *Sunday Times*.

## Politics in Australia

(From Our Correspondent)

Canberra, April 18.

The centre of gravity politically here does not lie on the plane of party politics as advertised. The Liberal Party appears to be making progress in organisation on a policy of 'return' to 'sane' Government. But it is splitting at the top. The New South Wales provisional executive has split over the question of funds. One group maintains that funds may be collected from anywhere so long as the party allows no 'strings.' Those who are opposed to this object to the receipt of funds from the Institute of Public Affairs, in which they are supported by the *Sydney Morning Herald*. The Institute is, so far as can be seen, a 'middle' business organisation, with a Council which is semi-anonymous but includes, apparently, representatives of such businesses as Farmers, a department-store organisation, and Woolworths, as well as the Bank of New South Wales. The Institute, under another name, formed and financed the United Australia Party. At the present moment it is trying to mop up any stray sources of revenue in order to prevent the Liberal Party becoming self-supporting. On a lower level there is much mud-slinging on familiar party lines. The equipment of 'our boys' who are engaged in mopping-up the Japs, housing policy, which is 90 per cent. behind schedule in execution, are favourite dumps for ammunition to use against the politicians. What between drought, policy and strikes, strategic reserves come the revolution are being reduced. The bureaucracy hypertrophies. Mopping-up is good for another year at least.

To-day, an appendage modelled on *Time* of the *Sunday Telegraph*, attacks Truman obliquely through his association with one, Prendergast, an alleged gangster and racketeer with an effective political machine, who ended up in gaol on the usual charge of tax-evasion. Truman himself is 'quite honest'; the pity is his 'only sin,' his friendship for Prendergast, who is said to have got him his seat in the Senate.

### A "Times" Quotation

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

Sir,

Professor Neville's letter to *The Times*, quoted in your issue of April 28th, protesting against "Housman's imperishable tribute to the Old Contemptibles" being applied to the statesmen of the last war, is rather amusing. The poem in question is quite clearly entitled *Epitaph on an Army of Mercenaries*, and the relevant stanza is as follows:—

Their shoulders held the sky suspended;  
They stood, and earth's foundations stay;  
What God abandoned, these defended,  
And saved the sum of things for pay.

There may of course be some subtle pleasantry involved, but it seems more likely that both the Professor and *The Times* have merely been very careless.

Yours, etc., R. L. NORTHRIDGE.

### General Election

June 29, July 12 and a date in October are possible dates for the General Election mentioned by political 'tipsters.'

According to the *Review of World Affairs*, those who

- want an early election hope for the following programme:—
- (1) Thanksgiving Whit-Sunday. (2) Labour Party Conference on May 21 to 'pull out' its Ministerial Members.
  - (3) Labour Ministers resign after Recess, which ends on May 31. (4) Prime Minister gives notice of dissolution, May 31.
  - (5) Parliament dissolves June 21. (6) Polling day July 12.
  - (7) Announcement of poll August 2.

## 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.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
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.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate.....	3d.
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
The Issue: Electoral Canvass for an Anti-Bureaucratic Representation.....	1d. each; 3/6 a hundred.
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.