THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 5. No. 12. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1940. 6d. Weekly.

Mr. Bevan, M.P. Attacks the Press, but not Parliament

There is a device consisting essentially of a peg or stake driven into the ground and a rope or chain uniting the peg with one of the larger domestic animals. This simple device is called a 'tether.' Yet another device is the 'hobble,' which, by uniting one leg of an animal to another leg of the same animal, limits the speed of the animal, but does not interfere with its range of movement otherwise, as the tether does. The tether and the hobble limit the freedom of movement of grazing animals. The farmer, or shepherd, does not say to the ass or goat: 'Now, look here; if you walk too fast for me to catch you (or, if you eat all the best grass before you attend to the tares sown by bureaucracy), I will beat you with a stick when I catch you, or lock you up in a barn for a week.' He says nothing, and the poor animal does as best it can, and no doubt lives well enough to serve the interests of its owner.

The ass and the goat have no newspapers to tell each other and themselves that this state is "The Freedom of the Press." Nor does the ass or the goat, when their owners' interests are best served by permitting exhaustion or decay to remove the poor beasts, bleat (or bray) a pious denial that such can possibly be its fate, because, if nothing else prevented so uncomfortable an end, "the inestimable blessing of living in a free country, loyally and assiduously served by a 'free press' would do so."

Swift remarks that the Nauplians in Argos learned the art of pruning their vines by observing that when an ass had browsed upon one of them it thrived the better, and bore better fruit, in this manner supporting the opinion of Pausanias, that the perfection of writing is entirely owing to the institution of the critics. Having every regard for the farmer, and particularly the English farmer, the Scots farmer and the Welsh farmer, we may suggest the opinion that his tethering and hobbling and such like practices are due to care for his land and the fertility thereof. But then, asses and goats have no newspapers, as has been mentioned, to inform them in this wise and we have, and must never call a man an ass again, since the difference is so plainly established!

That the 'freedom' of the press dear to the pens of the press isn't freedom, but a sort of 'hobbledom' or, worse, 'tetherdom,' in which the nose for news can never sniff any nearer to forbidden fruits than a chain of astonishingly short length permits, has often been suggested in these pages, and even the links in the tether have been properly counted and described: credit-advertising-propaganda. And now comes along Mr. Aneurin Bevan (an M.P.!—one of those whose speeches can only be heard by Mr. Cornelius's staff and not at all by the 'free' writers of unofficial reports). We welcome Mr. Bevan, who is a man who knows—and tells, thus after many 'cycles of Cathay,' providing a second or a third exception to the rule of Chinese tradition that 'those who know tell not; those who tell know not.' Mr. Bevan (would that Bevin were as good!) writes in a journal called *The Tribune*. He says:—

> Parliament is not having fair play. It is being starved of what is the breath of life to a representative assembly —publicity. The great national newspapers are not playing the game. They are almost as dull as Goebbels' drilled robots. They are fed with official news and official propaganda. There was a time when it was necessary to take several papers in order to keep up to date. Now one is enough. Indeed, even one is an extravagance. You can get all the newspapers tell you from the radio, and heaven knows nothing could be duller than that.

Our new ally goes on to say that Mr. Duff Cooper tried to introduce a censorship (which is merely a device for carrying a tethered animal about on its patch when failing vision can no longer direct its steps), and 'the Press was quite right to fight and defeat it.' (i.e., the grazer just didn't like being handled: this is often a peculiarity of tethered beasts). But, despite the weaknesses of presentation here shown, Mr. Bevan realises that "Duff Cooper won't try to do it again. He doesn't need to. You don't need to muzzle sheep." It seems mean to cavil at so great perception, so we will merely remark that muzzling is a process applied not to barkers but to biters—and what mortal ever heard of the Press biting? There is a reference to 'luscious meadows' gratefully nibbled; but the nibblers 'soon feel lonely and nip back to join the stolid ranks of the dull and respectable flock.' Well, if they *do*, ever, ...

But again discernment shows itself: Mr. Bevan realises that the concealment practised by the Press is careful: policy dictates it. Stubborn debate has over and over again forced the Government to reverse its policies—soldiers' pay, the Defence Regulations, the Swinton Committee. Nevertheless, "only a feeble dribble of these find mention in the newspapers, and when they do the papers seem to do their best to conceal the fact *that it was the House of Commons that raised the matter*." (our italics). Then Mr. Bevan points his finger at the expertly cautious Priestley and mentions the mass of letters "which would make Priestley's heart sink" but the lack of *support*. "What is urgently needed," he says, "is support for the back-bench Members

against the official machinery, both of the Government and of the political parties."

Quite so! But each member of parliament had enough support to get himself elected. Whose was that? And where has it gone? It was REPUTED (by the 'free' Press) to be electoral support. Is there much harm to come from regarding this matter in the light of Scots law which ordains that if a man and woman claim to be man and wife and are reputed to be man and wife, then they shall be deemed man and wife? If electors deem themselves to have elected a representative, and if the representative himself deems himself to have been elected by the electors, is there anything (excepting the representative) to prevent his acting in a manner permitted to him by claim, reputation and the law? The answer is in the representative himself. They have come to a pass, and it may well be that a pragmatical assessment of the situation would concede great need of assistance to the honest Member of Parliament. He is in a minority? He is in a rapidly increasing minority *of the House;* upon examination it is not inconceivable that he is often in actual majority of the *attending* House. Cannot all the honest men arrange to turn up at once? And if the honest Member see himself suddenly under the impact of a political realism starker than it has appeared to generations of puppet players with the nation's affairs, and is affrighted, is there no stout counsel to sustain his courage before the wolves of parliament? To explain the habits of wolves? To reveal the terrors to which even wolves are prone?

Will Mr. Bevan, who asks Priestley to show a little precision, a slight sense of the concrete, show the way? Mr. Bevan says that "in the most critical period in its history Parliamentary proceedings trickle to the constituencies along a track chocked with prejudices, clogged by commercialism and festooned by hostilities." He appeals for a public hearing for himself and 'other back-benchers who are trying to raise a critical voice above the loud bleating of the official fold.' But he then says: "The first function of representative government is advocacy." No, it isn't. The first function of representative government is representation. He asks the Press (which he knows is 'kept' and cannot respond even if it would) to "reveal the House of Commons as a robust and hard-hitting assembly of *controversialists*. . . . ." Look here, Mr. Bevan, there will always be controversy, even between men well qualified to carry out any set task, concerning the details of carrying it out; and this controversy can only be resolved by 'cutting the cackle and getting to the 'osses.' This is the established method in all those practical affairs which Mr. Priestley knows little or nothing about. To get a job done you give it out to some fool who will undertake it—on terms; which terms may include severe penalties if he fails to make good his word that he can do it. That is not only the right way, it is the only way to get any job done PROPERLY. So what's all this controversialism in the House of Commons? What is it about? Is it about who's to do the job, or is it about WHAT THE JOB IS? All the machinery exists (besides a vast amount of explosive to destroy it) to REPRESENT the answer to the last question to Parliament correctly and emphatically; that is to say, to YOU. You won't have much difficulty in answering the first. But, if the worst comes to the worst, let Parliament try an advertisement in *The Times*.

T. J.

Mr. Morrison in Whitehall

"The way I want to run the Ministry of Home Security," Mr. Herbert Morrison, Minister of Home Security, is reported as saying recently, "is not merely to run a great State machine from Whitehall, as if they have got all the brains and knowledge.

"But they have a lot which newspapermen do not always realise.

"There is a lot of knowledge and virtue somewhere else—in county councils, right down to the parish council and to the man in the street and his wife.

"They have got ideas and I want to know what they are. Anyone who can put up suggestions and constructive proposals and expedients I want to hear about them. I want them to filter to Whitehall."

But what Whitehall has not, and cannot have without at the least an inversion of Mr. Morrison's list, is any idea of when a solution is satisfactory, that is, acceptable to the majority of people concerned. If this is not true, then it must be that unsatisfactory "solutions" are being deliberately imposed for some reason unconnected with the immediate objective of winning the war without losing the peace. For there is no doubt that obsolete finance, labyrinthine red tape and excessive 'planning' are holding back our war effort—not increasing it. They cannot be judged a satisfactory 'solution.'

And, as Mr. Morrison himself said jocularly at a lunch given to him by the Fabian Society, "My powers as Home Secretary are, in fact, enormous. I could put you all 'inside' if I liked —and then let you out again."

BELFAST D.S.C. GROUP

Monthly Group meetings on the first Tuesday in each month. Next meeting, December 3, Subject:

Some Experiments in Social Credit.

Public meetings on the third Wednesday in each month. Next meeting December 18, Subject:

Why Fear Dominates the World.

All meetings in the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at 8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon. Sec., 17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.

Letter to the Editor

Sir,

THE AMERICAN ENIGMA

In reference to the letter published in the *Scotsman* and reprinted in this weeks issue of *The Social Crediter, I* should like to say that I was speaking to an individual as regards the attitude of America in not helping this country, in its present plight, with armed forces, and his view was that America had done quite right, as the landing of a large army would entail the necessity for a great increase in food-stuffs which, obviously we could ill-afford; therefore American help in this respect would be more of a hindrance than help.

Yours etc.,

G. CRAWLEY.

London; November 19, 1940.

A large army has to be fed in any case. In the letter referred to an alternative was suggested that, if America believes as she asserts that Britain is her first line of defence, she should "take the easier course of making available to us ample supplies of all kinds of munitions of war without payment."

EYE ON PARLIAMENT

The following passages are taken from the House of Commons Official Report (Editor, P. Cornelius), known as 'Hansard'. The date and occasion of the words are given above each section, and the speakers' names by the side. The number of columns occupied by the printed report of each section cited is also given. Lack of space imposes a severe limitation on the selection of matter for reproduction.

November 12.

FOOD SUPPLIES

Oral Answers (37 columns).

EXPORTS.

Mr. De la Bère asked the Prime Minister whether, in connection with the exportation and manufacture of foodstuffs, such as biscuits and chocolates, he will take steps to place the control and authorisation for export of these commodities under the Ministry of Food, with a view to his authority overriding, when necessary, the Department of Overseas Trade and the Export Council, since many members of the working public employed throughout the night and others utilising air-raid shelters throughout the night, are unable to secure adequate supplies at the present time?

The Lord Privy Seal (Mr. Attlee): Exports of the majority of important foodstuffs, except to the Colonies, are controlled by the Export Licensing Department of the Board of Trade, in consultation with the Ministry of Food and other Departments concerned. Exports to the Colonies are controlled by import licences, issued by the Colonial Administrations in agreement with the Colonial Office and the Ministry of Food. The Minister of Food sees no reason for altering the existing arrangements. Where commodities are in short supply in the United Kingdom—for example, chocolate and biscuits—it is due to the supply position, not to the exports, which are negligible in volume. The actual quantities of various foodstuffs, the export of which might be licensed, is at the present moment under discussion, and the question of still further restricting the small quantities of foodstuffs in short supply which are at present exported will be considered. In the case of biscuits, which make demands upon our supplies of sugar and fats, the present export is only a small proportion—about 5 per cent.—of the normal export.

Mr. De la Bère: Can my right hon. Friend suggest that the 3,000 tons of biscuits exported during the last three months is a negligible quantity? Is he not aware that owing to these considerations a first-class muddle has occurred, and that the public are without biscuits and slab chocolate to-day. Will he not take definite action to put these matters right, and not allow Mr. D'Arcy Cooper to go down to Reading and say that the export trade in biscuits is to be maintained, when there are not enough for home consumption. It is a grave scandal and I shall have to raise the matter on the Adjournment.

POST-WAR PLANS

Mr. Mander asked the Prime Minister whether he will consider the advisability of including amongst possible post-war aims the admission to the British Commonwealth of Nations of all our present Allies on terms to be mutually agreed?

Mr. Attlee: I have nothing to add to the reply given on 29th May to my hon. and gallant Friend, the Member for the Chatham Division of Rochester (Captain Plugge).

Mr. Mander: Will my right hon. Friend be good enough to clarify in this connection a statement by General Sikorski, Prime Minister of Poland, in which he showed a certain interest in a development of this kind.

Captain Plugge: Since that offer was made to France, surely it could be extended to the countries which have not surrendered and are continuing to fight with us?

BANK ADVANCES.

Mr. Craven-Ellis asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer from what source the banks are obtaining the means to make advances to the Treasury known as bank deposits; and is it intended to liquidate these borrowings from the sale of National Savings Certificates or bonds?

Sir K. Wood: The banks are able to lend to the Government by way of Treasury deposit receipts as a result of the increased liquid funds in their hands arising from the increase in their customers' deposits. As regards the second part of the Question, the proceeds of sales of Government securities to the public are not earmarked to particular purposes but, along with the proceeds of taxation, are available to meet all Government expenditure, including the repayment of short-term debt.

Mr. Craven-Ellis: Have not these credits been brought into existence by the action of the banks, and is it not advisable at this time that the Government should be responsible for the creation of credit for war purposes?

Mr. De la Bère: Are these credits not costless credits? They cost the banks nothing.

Sir K. Wood: I have already answered various questions which my hon. Friend has put.

Mr. Shinwell: Does not the right hon. Gentleman realise that we must adopt a new conception of finance if we are to win the war?

Sir K. Wood: I have no doubt that my hon. Friend would agree to adopt the suggestions that have been made by his hon. Friends.

On the Adjourment:

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY.

(14 columns).

Captain Vyvyan Adams (Leeds, West): . . . With your leave Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am raising the question of the salary and position of somebody who has been regarded for too long as a kind of sacrosanct and inviolable figure—the right hon. and gallant Gentleman who is variously kown in this House as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury, the Chief Whip, the right hon. and gallant Member for Rugby (Captain Margesson), the Patronage Secretary, and most commonly, of course, as "the usual channel."

The last is a complete misnomer. In the House of Commons for years now to the ordinary Member who has tried to do his duty to Parliament, his country and his constituents he has been a block and a dam. In fact he has on many occasions succeeded in muzzling our Parliamentary Freedom. I am one of those who believe now and have believed for a long time that stronger policies and wiser statesmanship applied years ago would have avoided this war and at the same time would have preserved freedom for Europe. Peace might have been preserved if the present Prime

Minister had entered the Government as recently as April of last year. That is my opinion; but in any event unless we surrender to fatalism we must credit the policies which we formulate in this House or which the Government founds upon Parliamentary consent with some effect on events.

But year after year .... for no less than nine years the Chief Whip has in two Parliaments driven huge majorities to support policies which have culminated in this catastrophe. It is a catastrophe from which we must emerge victorious or perish. We have to-day—and no thanks to the Chief Whip—a Prime Minister whose leadership electrifies the Empire. He is a guarantee of our perseverance and the symbol—the earnest of our coming victory. Yet the Chief Whip did all he could—and did it successfully—to exclude him from the Government until the war came, which the Prime Minister prophesied and which he might have prevented. ....

When I see somebody requiring support for a Government whose coming into being he did his best to prevent, I rub my eyes. I cannot help asking whether the right hon. and gallant Gentleman is immune from every semblance of decency. ....

It is an incredible thing that a man should acquire such a powerful position in this House that he seems to arrogate to himself the right to treat with "indulgence" or "leniency" the exercise of a Member's private right of judgement. This kind of sentiment, this kind of belief, this principle, is enough to make Edmund Burke turn in his grave. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman—many people say this privately, and I do not see why one should snarl in a corner and not say it publicly, for our whole principle of government is founded upon the freedom of expression of ordinary Members' opinions—the right hon. and gallant Gentleman has tried to convert this, the first assembly of the world, to which our constituents elect us to use our own judgment, into a school with himself as chief usher. I have no regrets for refusing to concur in or for opposing the policies which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman has tried to order the House to support. I will enumerate some of them, and many hon. Members will agree—perhaps not with complete unanimity—that those policies are now exposed as catastrophic failures and mistakes. The acquiescence in the building of a German Navy, which we were not even allowed to debate, although we asked for a debate across the Floor of the House; the Hoare-Laval proposals, Spain, the pitiable attempts to neutralise Italy, slack rearmament, the appeasement of the Nazis, Austria, and finally—something which I dare to say in spite of what has been said to-day—the crowning dishonour of Munich. .... Never has the country or a great party suffered such injury from a single individual so powerful. And the power for evil is still there, sitting just by the Mace. Who can be certain that this prince of appeasement is bent on absolute victory?

Mr. Bellenger (Bassetlaw): The hon. Member for Gateshead (Mr. Magnay) has asked the House to dismiss this matter and to have a sense of dignity. I prefer to have a sense of reality, and I would say to the House and to my right hon. Friend, whose advice I am prepared to accept, that this smouldering discontent which has been voiced to-day has also been in existence in the Labour party, but, fortunately, we are not prepared to absolve members of the Tory party as a body from actions which they have taken in the past and placed on the shoulders of the Patronage Secretary. ....

The matter which I view with disquiet is not the discipline of any chief whip, because any hon. Member, if he has independence, can deal with his chief whip, but the interference by the party machine with hon. Members in their own constituencies if they do not voice the point of view which happens to be that of the party caucus. I would not tolerate that, and I hope that the hon. and gallant Member for West Leeds would not. I have a high regard for his independent point of view, with which I have agreed on many occasions when he spoke for disarmament, but for a long time I did not support him because I was a realist. I can accept my right hon. Friend's advice to-day, because I am a realist, but let him understand as I think he does, that there must always be independence among hon. Members, particularly in relation to their own constituencies. If there is any complaint against the Chief Whip to-day it is that he interferes in the constituencies when hon. Members have not always spoken in the same language as he has.

Mr. Charles Williams (Torquay): With regard to the last remark of the hon. Member for Bassetlaw (Mr. Bellinger), I would say that if you want to be certain as a Conservative Member to keep your seat, let the Chief Whip interfere in your constituency. You can then get a life-long seat. In the Press and among people of ill-will, they are always saying that the Chief Whip has interfered in a constituency. I have known it only on one or two occasions, but whenever it has happened the Member gets back in an infinitely stronger position than before.

November 13.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS (PROPAGANDA).

Oral Answers (38 columns).

Mr. Sorenson asked the Minister of Information whether he will consider the propaganda value of demonstrating the nature and value of democratic freedom by circulating in our Dominions, Colonies and foreign countries reports of Debates in this House on social and constitutional issues or by encouraging the publication and wide circulation of extracts from the OFFICIAL REPORT?

Mr. Cooper: Full reports of Parliamentary proceedings are already made available by various means to all countries in which they are likely to be appreciated. If, however, the hon. Member has any suggestions to make with regard to any particular country, I will be glad to consider them.

Mr. Sorenson: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that it is not sufficient merely to make them available but that certain value resides in the circulation in as many countries as possible of illustrations of the free discussion that takes place in this House of Parliament? Would he not consider the possibility of circulating both sides of discussions that may take place here in order to demonstrate our superiority in that respect?

Mr. Cooper: I will do everything I can to increase such publication.

Mr. Sorenson: Will the right hon. Gentleman do everything he can to see that these Debates are circulated?

Mr. Cooper: I will see what steps can be taken, but I do not think that merely circulating the OFFICIAL REPORT would be the right way of dealing with the matter.

Written Answers (22 columns).

FLOUR.

Mr. Leach asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food whether he will forbid the adulteration of white flour with calcium salt and a

synthetic vitamin until the House of Commons has had an opportunity of discussing the matter, especially as a large number of doctors are entirely opposed to the proposal?

Major Lloyd George: The decision to introduce a calcium salt and synthetic vitamin B1 into flour was reached by the Government after receiving a recommendation from the Scientific Food Committee, of which Sir William Bragg, President of the Royal Society, is chairman. My Noble Friend cannot admit the implication in the first part of my hon. Friend's Question, and he is unable to give the undertaking asked for.

Sir E. Graham-Little asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food whether, in view of the confusion in the public mind resulting from the lack of any definite standard of flour warranting the description of wholemeal, he will take measures to prevent the sale of inferior products wrongly using that designation, and will prescribe a formula to which flour so described shall conform?

Major Lloyd George: Questions concerning the standardisation of high extraction flour are being considered by my Noble Friend's Department in connection with the policy of the Government announcement in the House on 18th July with regard to the quality of flour.

Sir E. Graham-Little asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food, whether, in view of recent experimental research at the Lister Institute demonstrating the nutritive superiority of wholemeal flour tested against white flour reinforced with synthetic vitamin B1, he will reconsider the Government's decision as to the provision of a war loaf?

Major Lloyd George: My Noble Friend is aware that a high extraction flour has some points of superiority from the nutritional point of view over white flour reinforced with synthetic vitamin B1. The reasons for the Government's decision to reinforce white flour while securing that wholemeal flour is also available to the public were explained to this House on 18th July last, and the Government sees no reason to reconsider the decision then announced.

Sir Ralph Glyn (Abingdon): .... The House will probably remember that control then [1914-1918] was totally different from what it is now, and was I think, infinitely better than it is now. That is a personal view and must not be taken as representing the view of any of my colleagues on the board of a railway. When the railways were previously controlled they were taken over under what I think was called the Defence Forces Act and the Regulation of the Forces Act of 1871. The great difference was that the Railway Executive Committee did not consist of people who had been interested in the railways, as is the case to-day, when it includes a retired ex-general manager and as secretary, a gentleman who was associated with another railway company. It was the President of the Board of Trade who protected the public interest by himself being the chairman and the president of the council which controlled the railways. The railways then were far greater in number than they are to-day, but the general managers, officers and supervisory staff of each railway functioned as they had always functioned, but under the general direction of the Railway Executive Committee presided over by the President of the Board of Trade.

When the war ended it was, I think, in 1919 that the Ministry of Transport was created, and from that date the Minister of Transport took over the duties from the President of the Board of Trade and himself assumed control. I believe that that worked very well. An even more interesting thing—and I very much agree with the hon. Gentleman opposite in his arguments about inflation—was that during the last war period of control no rates or charges were increased throughout, except for passengers, when in 1917 fares were deliberately raised in order to check an increased amount of travel which was not considered necessary. Otherwise, there was no increase in rates or charges at all, and, speaking personally, I regret that they were increased the other day. That was my personal view; I thought it was a foolish step which ought not to have been taken, and I said so. However the railways themselves are not in control of their own affairs; there is instead a bureaucratic control over which there is no control by anybody. We all recognise, of course, that my right hon. Friend the Minister of Transport has only just assumed office, and we also recognise that he is faced with a most terrible problem. I am perfectly sure that there is nobody in this House who is more likely to solve it with success than is the present Minister, and we are all delighted to see him there. That must not be taken as the view of anybody interested in railways. The House knows that he takes a perfectly fair and even view.

CREDIT FOR WAR FINANCE

The *Birmingham Gazette* of November 12 published in a prominent position an article by Mr. Wilfred Hill, the Birmingham industrialist whose speech on the necessity for mobilising national credit free of interest to win the war was reported in a recent number of *The Social Crediter*.

The Social Crediter has been informed that Mr. Hill agrees with the points put forward by Mr. John Mitchell of which the main one was that the cessation of the payment of interest on huge credits which the banks are subscribing to National War Loans, while important, is secondary to the question of repayment of principal.

Mr. BRAND

Mr. Butler, the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, gave a list of the names and qualifications of members of the Mission to South American countries.

Included in these was the Hon. Robert Brand, C.M.G.:—

Managing director of Lazard Brothers and Company, merchant bankers, Deputy-Chairman North British and Mercantile Insurance Company, Director of Lloyds Bank Limited and the Times Publishing Company, Limited. He was Deputy-Chairman of the British Mission in Washington 1917-18, Financial Advisor to Lord Robert Cecil when chairman of the Supreme Economic Council Peace Conference, Paris, Vice-President of the International Financial Conference of the League of Nations, 1920. Mr. Brand is a well-known economist and a Fellow of All Souls, and is the author of a book entitled *War and National Finance* (1921).

HOSTILITY TO ALIENS IN ISLE OF MAN

Because of an alleged growing hostility towards enemy aliens interned in the Isle of Man, the Council of Christian Congregations, composed of clerical and lay representatives of all the Anglican and Free Churches in Douglas and district, has issued an appeal above the signature of the Bishop of Sodor and Man and the Rev. H. E. Bennett.

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..

Editorial Office:
4, ACREFIELD ROAD,
WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL.
Telephone: Gateacre 1561.

Business Office:
12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.
Telephone: Bank 5260.

Vol. 5. *No.* 12. *Saturday, November* 30, 1940.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"Our New Civilisation must be based on Social Security," said Mr. Bevin, Minister of Labour, in a speech enthusiastically reported by the B.B.C.

No, Clarence, *not* individual security. Don't be selfish. Think of Sacrifice. You obtain Social Security, by taking securities away from individuals. Don't you know any slum towns like Rotherham, for instance, where the rates are 20/- in the pound and the Town Hall is simply too twee? "Who dies, if Wigan lives?" in fact. Didn't you know that man was made for the Sabbath, Clarence?

• • •

A few weeks ago, Mr. Bevin painted a rosy picture of the millenium he was engaged in constructing. All the best Welfare schemes of forty years ago on the model of Mr. Henry Ford and the Sunlight Soap Settlement, were trotted out, evidently under the impression that they were quite new and attractive, and that the Labour Party had thought them up. The oration ended with the awe-inspiring reflection, transparently sincere, that if it hadn't been for the Labour Party, the Empire on which the sun never sets might never have had Mr. Ernest Bevin as a Cabinet Minister, and Mr. Ernest Bevin might never have had £5,000 a year. It's a solemn thought, chaps.

• • •

A few days ago, the writer had to spend six hours at a famous main line station. On arriving at the station he was informed that damage had occurred twenty-four hours earlier, fifty miles further South, and that only two passenger trains had passed in the day. Two hours later a long train came in, empty. Nobody knew anything about it. Enquiries from a seething mass of would-be passengers elicited the information, as a dead secret, that it was going to a small town fifteen miles further North. It eventually left with about ten passengers. During the next two hours, a succession (thirteen to be exact) of light (i.e., uncoupled) engines sauntered through the station.

Then there was an air raid, all the lights went out, and three moaning Minnies within less than half a mile announced the fact. Officials shouted "Everyone in the Shelters" and through the mirk another long train came in. The driver said he didn't know where it was going but the Station Master might. Feeling that home was nothing like this, it was decided to try this train, in case it went somewhere else. The train left in about three minutes, its destination still closely guarded from the Enemy (the would-be passengers) and ran four hundred miles North faultlessly to time.

Discussing this new conception of railroading with an official of the line, his only comment was, "What do you expect, when you can't stick on a luggage label without a written order from three or four —— sons of —— who couldn't run a toy railway if it had more than two clock-work trains?"

• • •

You didn't know that Mr. Ernest Bevin had the once-over in New York before being made Minister of Labour? Well, you do now.

COMIC OR SINISTER?

The *Daily Telegraph* of November 25, opened its leader with these words:

"By a striking coincidence of spite two journals yesterday chose the end of a week in which Mussolini shrieked and Italy reeled under British blows to accuse the Prime Minister and the War Cabinet of betraying our cause by a 'strange reluctance' to injure Italy."

The two papers referred to are the *Sunday Express* and the *Sunday Dispatch.*

Lord Beaverbrook, the proprietor of the *Sunday Express,* is a member of Mr. Churchill's Cabinet. This fact, which by itself makes the attack by his paper on Churchill and the Government extremely odd, is not alluded to by the *Daily Telegraph.*

The *Daily Telegraph* leader says:

"These two papers, *Sunday Express* and *Sunday Dispatch,* seem only concerned to stir up ill-feeling and doubt to feed the ignorant and the foolish with mysterious stories of hidden hands and treason in high places."

What is the game? Is the public becoming suspicious? And is this an attempt to shy the public off the truth? The *Daily Express* is given to airing the small man's grievances in order to popularise itself, but always leaves them high in the air. It is strange that this should happen a week after the publication of Major Douglas's letter in this journal on November 16, under the title "Why Isn't Hitler Bombed?" This letter which has been reproduced as a leaflet, is, according to reports, creating great interest.

Bomb Hitler and Shorten the War!

By C. H. DOUGLAS

This leaflet is rousing great interest, particularly in districts that have suffered under heavy bombing.

Prices: 1/3 for 100; 5/- for 500; 9/- for 1,000.

Obtainable from—
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,
12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.

THE PRESS BAN ON PARLIAMENT

By John Mitchell

The following extracts are taken from the introductory and the concluding chapters of the manuscript of a book entitled "The Press Ban on Parliament."

It is not contested that space in the Press for the reproduction of Parliamentary matters is of necessity limited, but what the following pages make evident is the fact that many members of the House of Commons are aware of a fundamental question of policy which is consistently and deliberately hushed up in the columns of our newspapers. Readers therefore remain ignorant of a vital policy which is being represented in Parliament together with the facts relevant to it. Lack of space is not an adequate reason for the entire suppression or exclusion of these matters. The job of the Press is to provide INFORMATION *that will enable readers to form their own judgments and opinions; whereas our "free" Press has to-day become an instrument for propagating the policy of the financial interests which control it. And the choice and presentation of both articles and news items are directed to cultivating views and opinions which conform to this policy.*

The purpose of this book is to present to the public a certain policy, a certain attitude to events, and certain facts which have been expressed in Parliament but totally *un*represented in the National Press.

There cannot be any real doubt that if appreciation of the policy, and the facts upon which it is based, as expressed in the collection of utterances in this book* were widely held, it would not only be possible, but the Government would be compelled, to take long overdue measures to make victory certain, shorten the war and ensure that we as a people and individually derived such concrete benefits from the resulting peace that we could truly say that we had won the peace as well as the war.

The present Government, as can be demonstrated quite easily, is even more subservient to powerful international interests than was Mr. Chamberlain's. The daily papers, without exception, have continually proclaimed, and still reiterate that the Government under which we now suffer was brought into being through pressure of "public opinion." It is simply not true. What public opinion existed in the week Mr. Churchill became Prime Minister was either passively acquiescent or indifferent. *Active* liking or disliking of the change was in a definite minority. The change of Government was brought about by the Press who stampeded Parliament, and the public, with the aid of a small band of well-drilled and determined M.P.s in Parliament. The real relation of public opinion to the crisis which ushered in Mr. Churchill as Prime Minister of Britain was summed up at the time by Colonel Sir George Courthope, M.P. for Rye. Speaking in the House, he said:

"Without looking for causes, I believe that if the speeches to which we have listened to-day, criticising the Government in general and the Prime Minister in particular, had substance behind them they would be fully reflected in the postbags of Members of Parliament. I have always found, that whenever there is any general feeling of grievance or dissatisfaction one's constituents are always ready to write to their Member and express it.

"In some of the speeches which we have heard to-day condemning the Government we were told that the overwhelming desire of the country was for a change, and all that sort of thing, but I should have expected my postbag to have reflected it. I have kept a note of my letters during recent weeks. I have had three letters from individual constituents expressing a desire for a change of Prime Minister. . . .

"On the other hand, I have had a multitude of letters expressing regret at the fact that certain sections of the press and certain individual speakers are allowed to continue making attacks, some of them scurrilous and many of them unfair, upon the Government and the Prime Minister. There have been many of those, and quite a number of organisations have been moved by that feeling to pass resolutions and send them up. As far as my postbag is concerned—and I expect other hon. Members have had much the same experience—there is no sign of this general and overwhelming desire amongst the electorate for a change either of Government or of its leader."

The public were in fact mystified, and it is not surprising. There was something mysterious and sinister about the Norwegian campaign. The exaggerated reports of the Press and the confident utterances of Mr. Churchill strike a strange note against the recorded happenings which have been endorsed. A dead hand appeared. "We know now that at Bergen," said Commander Bower (Cleveland) in Parliament, "and a little later at Trondheim, the ships of His Majesty's Navy were ready and waiting to emulate the exploits of my friend Philip Vian in the *Cossack* after he went after the *Altmark*. But no, the dead hand from above descended and stopped these operations. Wild horses will not drag from me what dead hand it was. All I can say is that it was the dead hand, and it came from above. Everybody knows it."

Mr. Churchill was the First Lord of the Admiralty at the time.

The current activities of the Press recall their attitude to the Munich affair. At the time this arrangement was undoubtedly acclaimed by the public. Since then and up to Mr. Chamberlain's resignation the Press almost with one accord has presented it as a betrayal. At the time of the Norway Debate, with the possible exception of one or two independent local dailies, there was not a single daily paper which did not either pour contempt on Mr. Chamberlain for the Munich arrangement or alternatively fabricate stories that the public distrusted him for what he agreed to at Munich. Now that Mr. Chamberlain is dead,

* Many of the speeches referred to have been published in *The Social Crediter*.

the American Ambassador and many others are freely quoted in the Press explaining quite truthfully that Britain would certainly have suffered defeat had she gone to war at the time. This would have meant "betrayal" *and* defeat. Said *The Times* on November 13:—

"Though he won not peace, but the postponement of war, we can see now that the time he gained may well have made the difference between the triumph of the forces of evil and the ultimate survival of the British Commonwealth."

And Sir Nevile Henderson, speaking at Ipswich on November 18, 1940 said:—

"I do not know whether the critics of Mr. Chamberlain realise that on September 28, 1938, we did not possess any Spitfires, we had only one or two experimental Hurricanes, and only seven modern A.A. guns for the defence of London, out of 400 estimated as the minimum necessary. Germany could have dropped 2,000 bombs a day on London, and we could have given no reply.

"I would like to ask Mr. Chamberlain's critics, realising what cards he held in his hand, what they could have done either to avert or delay war."

Churchill opposed the Munich arrangement.

The daily Press, which so loudly proclaims itself as "free," has become an organ *primarily* of opinion (propaganda) instead of keeping to its true function of being an organ of information. By the careful intermixing of opinion with information, by the suppression of some information, by the judicious placing of *emphasis* on its presentation and arrangement of information, by the quotation of all sorts of *anonymous* "authorities," by a generous use of rumour and by a ruthless parade of adjectives the realities of almost any situation can be distorted by the Press to produce a desired effect on the *uninitiated* public *unless the true facts reach them from some other source.* If, as is the case, the interests which determine *broadly* the policy of all the daily papers are identical, then it is not easy for the public to get at the true facts. When, further, it is arranged that the daily papers are at loggerheads over all sorts of issues of no great importance *to the interests,* so that one section of the public is played off against another, the fact that the *same* interests determine the policy of *all* the papers can be successfully hidden and the myth of a "free" press maintained.

The two big issues which confront the country, which must be settled if we are not to return to another uneasy "peace" of economic frustration and insensate competition, containing the seeds of yet another war, are:—

(1) The modification of the financial system, so that adequate power to decide *what* industry shall produce is possessed by the general public in their capacity as consumers. This means the increase of purchasing power by *other* means than the raising of wages or salaries.

(2) The re-assumption by Parliament of what Major C. H. Douglas has termed "representative sovereignty."

If reform of the financial system is to produce results satisfactory to the public, the Government's policy has got to conform to the wishes of the electorate. But the financial policy of the Government is to-day as it has been for a very long time past dictated by financial interests. Reform of the financial system to produce results satisfactory to the public is therefore interdependent with reform of the Parliamentary system. It will be useful here to quote from a speech in Parliament on May 13, 1940, by Mr. George Balfour, M.P. for Hampstead. He said:

"I want to refer to one portion of the speech made by the right hon. Member for Keighley (Mr. Lees-Smith). I ask hon. Members to accept my assurance that what I say has nothing of a controversial character about it. I only wish to put on record the remarks of the right hon. Member to the effect that his three right hon. Colleagues had joined the Government before the arrangement was confirmed by the Labour Party Conference; before they were free to accept. In that event I want to put before the House this one simple point, and I am sure I shall have the general agreement of the House. Members of Parliament have always understood that this is the great free Parliament of the people and that we are answerable only and solely to the electors. That is the point which I wish to put on record to-day, and that whenever this House departs from this principle and hon. Members are answerable to another outside body—

"*Mr. J. J. Davidson* (Maryhill): If there is an Electricity Bill before the House.

"*Mr. Balfour*: For my part I am answerable to no one but the electors. If any hon. Member deserts that principle and allows any private interest to intervene, if any hon. Member is answerable to any other outside body in performing his duties in this House, he deserves to be turned out. If there is any departure from this principle the whole structure of our parliamentary system breaks down. I hope in less arduous times that the principle will be re-established in full Session that no Member has a right to be answerable to any outside corporate body. I trust that the time is not far distant when in perfect harmony we may be able to debate that principle."

Those readers who have read *The Party System* by Hilaire Belloc and Cecil Chesterton will not underrate the importance of Mr. Balfour's speech. It is a fact that to-day the Executive, by which is meant the Front Benches (Opposition as well as Government), controls Parliament; whereas, of course, the position should be reversed so that Parliament controls the Executive. The story is too long for it to be recounted here how the Executive achieved control of Parliament. Those who are in any doubt that it does or how it does cannot do better than read *The Party System.* The fact is that the Front Benches are close oligarchical corporations with a close although secret liaison between each other, membership of which is secured by co-option (although this may not appear to be so since the Labour Party goes through the motions of electing its Front Bench Members); those who already occupy positions therein do the co-opting. In other words Ministers are not nominated by Parliament or the Crown, but co-opt themselves.

As Belloc and Chesterton say: "In a thousand ways the position of a man who renders himself obnoxious to the governing group can be made unpleasant; in a thousand ways submission to them can be rewarded with little favours."

But the party system is the chief instrument of this

inversion of authority. Those who control the machine control patronage. Each party has enormous secret funds, subscribed by bankers, wealthy Jews and others on conditions which influence policy and the selection of candidates. It is inevitable that under such a system a large proportion of Members of Parliament are primarily interested in self advancement, power and honours; that there will be a premium on such a type of man and that that type will gravitate quite naturally to the position. Likewise most, if not all peerages, baronetcies, knighthoods and other honours are purchased by services or money to the party.

Elections are a costly business and there are few candidates who do not have to rely upon financial support from the secret funds of their party. Possibly the most powerful instrument which the Executive and the party wield over the individual member hinges upon *the fixed custom* of dissolving Parliament when a majority is expressed against any Minister. This threat of forcing another election is constantly in the background. The ordinary and honest Member who disagrees with Government policy can be coerced by it. He can be made to face the prospect of another election with no party funds behind him if he has revolted; so that he is, in fact, confronted with the threat of a fine (his election expenses) and not being returned to Parliament.

A Member of Parliament should, of course, be responsible to one set of people only—his constituents. But because his election expenses in practice are paid out of a secret fund at the disposal of the party organisers he becomes responsible to the party caucus instead of to his constituents.

Clearly therefore no financial policy will be forced upon the Government by an unreformed Parliament, nor be adopted by any Government which is not forced to do so by Parliament. The reason is that practically the whole personnel of Parliament and Government has, over a long period, been directly or indirectly selected by the Interests which provide political parties with their funds, the chief of which are banking interests—and mostly international banking interests at that.

It has only been possible to maintain this system because the public, although suspicious of it, has not been really alive to its corruptions and abuses. "The desire to disclose maladministration and corruption is up against a tremendous 'hushing up' power," said Mr. Garro Jones, speaking in the House on May 2, 1940. Naturally all Government policy has had to take account of public opinion in a negative way; there are limits to which any anti-social policy can be carried without arousing effective anger from the public. The professional politicians are experts at "sailing near the wind" in this respect. Needless to say the daily papers have done nothing to enlighten the public about this matter except in so far as they have played the game of party politics by laying what faults they have revealed solely at the door of the political party to which their readers are opposed whilst whitewashing their own party. The national dailies are themselves subject to the influence of the same Interests which control the political parties.

The party system could be completely destroyed by the electorate refusing to elect party hacks and by sending to Parliament their own men determined to see that the Government produced results they want. In reality it is not necessary to go as far as this, for the first thing which electors should do is to instruct their existing Members of Parliament what results they want and insist on getting them. If the determination put behind that demand by the electorate is of such a strong character that if they did not get what they wanted they would refuse to vote for that man again and put their own man in instead, they would find that existing M.P.s would recognise that the game was up and that it was no longer in their interest to take the whip from their party or from the Government in Parliament and instead would obey their own electors. In such circumstances the Government might play the old game of resigning and endeavour to make this a reason for dissolving Parliament and for holding a General Election. But since Members of Parliament will this time already be armed with the instructions of their electors an election will be quite unnecessary (this of course is without prejudice to the necessity of holding periodic elections, or, alternatively, introducing some other means of enabling electors to change their representatives if they are so minded) and Members of Parliament can assert themselves and can proceed to nominate new Ministers *responsible to them* without submitting themselves to re-election. Ministers to-day scarcely trouble to veil their contempt for Parliament. Consider this reply of Mr. Ernest Brown on October 22, 1940 to a speech by Mr. De la Bère. Mr. Brown said (note the italicised portion):

> ". . . . Just one word to the hon. Member for Evesham (Mr. De la Bère). I am always prepared to listen to a man who speaks passionately about anything, for I sometimes speak passionately myself, and I am quite prepared to listen to him, as I have done many times, on his favourite witch hunt. He is the champion witch hunter of the House; the witches he hunts have nearly always been corporations, which have neither bodies to be kicked nor souls to be saved. . . . . It is an advantage to the House of Commons and to Ministers to have strong views put strongly. But when my hon. Friend the Member for Evesham comes to tell me in the House of Commons that he knows all about the War Cabinet, its composition, its deeds and misdeeds, I must refuse to take him seriously. *He is talking about something he knows nothing whatever about. If and when he becomes a member of a War Cabinet, he may have a right to speak —if secrecy will allow him.* I would make this assertion, that if he ever did become a member of the Government, his language would be much more temperate than in the course of his witch hunting."

Here, then, is the admission by a Minister, at one time a Cabinet Minister, that far from controlling Ministers, Parliament "knows nothing whatever about" what they are up to.

Parliament has to be reformed with the object of Members of Parliament reassuming their rightful function of representative sovereignty. By this is meant that the electorate in theory *are* and in future will have in practice to become by their own efforts the sovereign power in this country; Members of Parliament must become responsible *solely* to that section of the electorate which elects *them*—their constituents. Their responsibility is to represent the wishes of their electors, and obviously they cannot do this unless their electors instruct them as to what they want.

It is extremely important to recognise the limits within which both electors and M.P.s can exercise their functions

effectively. It is at this point essential to distinguish clearly between Policy and Administration. POLICY is concerned with *where* you want to go, *what* you want to do or have done; whereas ADMINISTRATION is concerned with *how* to do it and the doing of it. Neither electors nor M.P.s are experts, *in their capacities as electors and representatives,* on how to do the things which electors want done. The function of electors is to tell their M.P.s what *results* they want, and the function of M.P.s is to *represent* this demand for *results* in Parliament. It is emphatically not their job to discuss or consider how to do it. As it is to-day many M.P.s who are generally not competent to do so, or are at most third rate experts, cause confusion, endless talk and delay, resulting in wrong decisions, by discussing methods. *How* to do it is the job of the Permanent Staff of the Government—the Civil Service, or private or semi-private services not administered by the Government—the medical service, the banking institutions, the transport services, the industrialists, the farmers, etc. It is impossible to over-emphasise the importance of electors, M.P.s, Government and Permanent Staff keeping to their respective functions and not going outside them. Failure to do so has one of its dangerous results in the deplorable growth of bureaucracy which we are witnessing to-day, when so called "experts" determine method as well as policy. Naturally if electors had control of policy, bureaucracy and interference with the individual would be the first to go. The job of Ministers of State in this arrangement is to wield the sanctions of State—the police, the armed forces, etc.—to compel obedience from the experts to the production of *results* demanded by the electors. At present Government and experts are using these sanctions to dictate policy as well as method. In practice it is very infrequently necessary to use the sanctions; their presence is sufficient. In any case a healthy organism will work by inducement, not compulsion.

I have now described the machinery for the correct functioning of Parliament in its separate parts. All that is necessary to work it is an exercise of will by the electorate, correctly applied. The electors, have the power (the sanctions) to force an existing M.P. to obey them, or to replace him. M.P.s have the power, *if the electorate are behind them,* to force the Government to obey; and the Government has the power to compel or induce the Permanent Staff to obey.

But THE INITIATIVE, the starting of the machine working, must come from THE ELECTORATE, *if the electors' policy is to be carried out.*

The Banks in Wartime

A letter published in the "Alnwick Gazette."

Sir,

Many of your readers who saw Mr. F. Bransby Carlton's letter in your columns last week must have been amazed. Certainly I was. Mr. Carlton is employed by the "Economic League" and for years has been writing propaganda letters to the Press. But what amazes me now is that so much of his letter should be devoted to the defence of banking—as if the experience of this war had taught us nothing and as if it were not blatantly obvious that there is a 'catch' in it somewhere. Why! even before the war the fundamental fact that banks create money was being so exposed by critics who wrote to the Press that the banking fraternity was advised to allow the criticisms to fade out by the simple process of taking no notice of them.

What then is the purpose of this latest letter from Mr. Carlton? Criticism has never faded away as was hoped, so the exigencies of war are now sought as a reason for stifling it altogether. Mr. Carlton says that since the Germans in their broadcasts in English twit at orthodox finance our criticism now savours of fifth column activity and plays into the hand of our enemy.

What a clumsy effort to intimidate us! If propaganda is to gain any credence at all it must not be all lies. It must have some element of truth—and as the lawyers say, 'the greater the truth the greater the libel.' So the Germans mix up some truth about finance with their lies about other things. We play right into their hands by attempting to defend finance, as Mr. Carlton does. The very last thing they want us to do is to take the wind out of their sails by putting our system in order.

Thank God, there is now evidence of enlightenment in all quarters. The politicians must be becoming wise to it or they would not make their promises of a better world. Even dull-witted economists now tell us that if we put our financial system right we need have no worry for the future. One ecclesiastic has actually discovered that finance will have to adapt itself to production and not production to finance.

No, sir! criticism of the present system of creating money can never fade away or be stifled out. We are fighting against the tyranny of Nazism and I refuse to believe that we are so dull and stupid as not to see and fight the tyranny of finance.

Abraham Lincoln said to Congress: "I have two great armies; the Southern Army in front of me and the financial institution in the rear. Of the two, the one in my rear is my greatest foe." We are so placed to-day but we are without hope unless we beat them both.

I am, etc.,

A. SMART.

Thornbrae, Alnwick; October 18, 1940.

142

Christmas Gift

A Newcastle correspondent writes: "Many Social Crediters must now be giving consideration to the matter of Christmas Presents—'what shall it be' and 'how much will it cost?'

"May I be permitted to suggest that in many cases, these problems may be solved by providing a 'Trial Subscription' for *The Social Crediter* for those of our friends who are likely to renew the subscription.

"Such a Present would far exceed, in value, its financial cost, which may vary from 2s. 6d., to 30s."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION FORM

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

Please send *The Social Crediter* to

Name .....

Address .....

.....

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-
„ Six „ „ 15/-
„ Three „ „ 7/6
„ One „ „ 2/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

THE REFUGEE PROBLEM AND A NEW IDEAL

By B. M. PALMER

"Idealism is just as inseparable from Realism as one end of a stick is from the other."

It is one of the anomalies of our times that the existence of disinterested human love evokes surprise. The Mayor of a London borough was so moved by the kindness shown to one of his ailing refugees that he wrote to the press, telling how the people at the railway station made her as comfortable as possible, and someone promised to pay for a taxi when she reached her destination. "Kindly actions and cheery words," he said, "are going a long way to lighten the burden of many of our fellow countrymen."

Everyone will endorse this opinion. Most of us, I think, have experienced heartfelt relief that in spite of all, our countrymen are so good at heart. The historic incident at Dunkerque has been followed by countless others, less spectacular perhaps, but no less important in cumulative effect. But why the element of surprise?

There is a connection here, not at first apparent, with the disappointment felt by many worthy people that "voluntary effort, selfless though it is," has not proved itself equal to dealing with the terrible problems arising from the evacuation of the bombed areas. They cannot understand its failure. Their instinct tells them it ought to have been a success.

I think they are dimly aware of one of the four fundamental propositions on which a sane political system must be built:—

"Labour is not exchangeable; product is."

"No attempt will be made to prove these propositions," writes Douglas, "since their validity rests on equity."*

It is useless to argue with anyone who denies the fact that work should be induced, not compelled.

We each of us possess one thing only that can never be taken away from us, except with life itself; our power to do work. That power is our real capital, our own property, and no man has a right to commandeer it, or to force us to sell it.

When war broke out, and ever since, we have had countless proofs that our people were willing to do their best for victory—victory over "evil things." In the end the war can only be won by our real capital, nothing else will count at all. What, then, is preventing the great rush of this energy on to victory? At the moment of writing, when serious air raids are developing over the Midlands, any stemming of that tide of power may have the most serious consequences.

Those who have read *Economic Democracy* will not expect me to use my own words. The following quotation gives the most apposite answer to this question, though it was written in 1919:

"What is called credit by the banker is administered by him primarily for the purpose of private profit, whereas it is most definitely communal property. In its essence it is the estimated value of the only real capital —it is the estimate of the potential capacity under a given set of conditions, including plant, etc., of a Society *to do work*. The banking system has been allowed to become the administrator of this credit and its financial derivatives with the result that the creative energy of mankind has been subjected to fetters which have no relation whatever to the real demands for existence, and the allocation of tasks has been placed in unsuitable hands."

It will be found, I feel certain, that the solution of the Evacuation Problem will be one of the major conditions of victory. At present it is regarded as a side line, a makeshift business. Our long acquiescence in the evils of the present banking system has resulted in the acceptance of a false philosophy. The success that the bankers have had in controlling our real capital has led to a belief in two kinds of work, voluntary work and paid work. This is a false distinction. It has led to the idea that voluntary work must be done with the minimum of training and equipment, since access to these things can only be obtained through bankers' licence (money) and money can only be obtained by means of paid work. Thus the volunteer is doubly penalised; he (or she, for I believe women are going to bear the brunt of the refugee business) is prevented from being efficient and yet blamed for his lack of proficiency when he is put to the test.

The excellent opportunity for building camps during the first year of the war was allowed to slip. Now there is no time, and the winter is on us.

The refugee problem can only be tackled now in an atmosphere of goodwill by voluntary workers who have access to enough financial credit to pay their own reasonable expenses. This applies to everyone, refugees, householders and organisers alike. Even *The Times* admits that "compulsion" is likely to fail. We can go farther and say that if it is tried, it will fail, and will contribute to our defeat.

It cannot be expected that in the midst of a major war there will be much time to stand and stare at the results of our own criminal blunderers in the past; our self-preservation will depend on the rapidity with which we can adapt ourselves to new conditions.

It is absolutely certain that the goodwill and energy manifested by our people in the midst of their trials are quite sufficient to solve this problem, provided the banks could be compelled to do their part—to make available sufficient money tokens to ensure the distribution of all goods that can be spared from our war effort.* If this were properly organised, having due regard to the amount of raw materials available and the number of unemployed, the lot of the refugees could soon be made tolerable. But it would involve the giving up of an old prejudice and the adoption of a new ideal.

The old prejudice—that no money can be distributed except in exchange for work done, or to be done at some future time.

And the new ideal:—

"The ideal at which to aim is that of the greatest possible freedom in voluntary and non-penal association, by which to effectuate, for the benefit all, the proposals of any member of Society."

November, 20.

**Economic Democracy,* Chapter VIII.

*The National Dividend and the Just Price.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

BIRMINGHAM and District Social Crediters will find friends over tea and light refreshments at Prince's Cafe, Temple Street, on Friday evenings, from 6 p.m., in the King's Room.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Association: Weekly meetings every Tuesday evening at 7-30 p.m. at the Friends Meeting House, King Street, Blackburn. All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow, Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats. Enquiries to R. J. Northin, 11, Centre Street, Bradford.

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER is obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Meets regularly on the first and third Sundays in the month. Time 2-30 p.m. Enquiries to Secretary: Miss J. E. Taylor, 11, Nook Rise, Liverpool 15.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP. Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association. It is important that all Social Crediters on Tyneside should maintain contact. Write Hon. Secretary, R. Thomson, 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; or 50, Ripley Grove, Copnor.

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.

WOLVERHAMPTON: Will all Social Crediters, old and new, keep in contact by writing E. EVANS, 15 Links Road, Penn, Wolverhampton.

The Social Crediter

If you are not a subscriber to *THE SOCIAL CREDITER*, send this order without delay.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd.,
12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

Please send *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* to me

Name .....

Address .....

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-
„ Six „ „ 15/-
„ Three „ „ 7/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer,
Social Credit Expansion Fund,
c/o The Social Credit Secretariat,
12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

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

Name .....

Address .....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND.)

Name.....

Address.....

TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE,
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Advisory Chairmanship of Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute

£ : : , { per month, per quarter, per year,

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

I herewith enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the above mentioned funds.

Signature.....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.)

144

Books to Read

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy ..... *(edition exhausted)*
Social Credit 3/6
Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
The Monopoly of Credit 3/6
Warning Democracy ..... *(edition exhausted)*
The Tragedy of Human Effort ... 6d.
The Use of Money ..... 6d.
Approach to Reality ..... 3d.
Money and the Price System ... 3d.
Nature of Democracy ..... 2d.
Social Credit Principles ..... 1d.
Tyranny ..... ½d.
and
"This 'American' Business" 3d. each 12 for 2/-

By L. D. Byrne:—

Alternative to Disaster ..... 4d.
The Nature of Social Credit .... 4d.
Debt and Taxation ..... 2d.

ALSO

The Douglas Manual 5/-
The Economic Crisis:
Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report ..... 6d.
The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold 4/6
Economics for Everybody by Elles Dee ..... 3d.
The Power of Money by J. B. Galway .....3d.
The Purpose of Politics by H. E. .....3d.
Tax-Bonds or Bondage and the Answer to Federal Union by John Mitchell...1/- (Postage 2½.)

Leaflets

Invincible Britain by John Mitchell .....2d. each, 1/6 doz.
What We Are About by H. E.....50 for 1/6
Hitler and Churchill Finance by John Mitchell.....50 for 1/9
Bomb Hitler ! by C. H. Douglas.....100 for 1/3

All from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

MISCELLANEOUS

H.E. and family are spending Christmas in Eskdale, Cumberland (no jazz, no bombs), and would greatly enjoy the company of other Social Crediters. For addresses of inns write to E. M. E., Fernbank, Seascale, Cumberland.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., at 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.