

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 5. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

## SIR ERNEST BENN ON BUREAUCRACY

By John Mitchell

There can be little doubt that the most prolific cause of complaint among the public at the present time arises from the action and inaction of Bureaucracy. Many who complain against Bureaucracy may not be able to express a reasoned case against it, but they do know it is wrong. Bureaucracy is therefore in a different position from, for instance, that of the money system a few years ago, because the majority of the public was willing to blame anything but the money system for their troubles. The question which naturally arises is: Why does Bureaucracy continue if practically everyone is against it? It is in his failure to answer that question that Sir Ernest Benn falls down in his otherwise exceptionally able indictment of Bureaucracy in a pamphlet just published, *The Political Method*.\*

In this pamphlet Sir Ernest Benn says: "Democracy is rapidly deteriorating into Bureaucracy with a very thin covering of political veneer. Parliament, created to voice the opinions [sic] of the people, is in danger of becoming an office for the legalisation of bureaucratic ambitions." Democracy, he says, is that "The people through the ballot box demand something and the Government (if necessary through its executive) proceeds to supply that demand." But, "The position now is that the bureaucracy, always seeking and, from the bureaucratic point of view, quite properly seeking for new fields to which to apply the uniform bureaucratic method, uses the politician, now the advertising agent of the bureaucracy, to put its suggestions over to the people. Thus democracy becomes bureaucracy."

Before we discuss Sir Ernest Benn's shortcomings let us sample some of his

blows against the bureaucrats. One of the shrewdest of these is directed against the device called "Priorities," concerning which he says: "There is, in fact, no end to the possibilities of complication when once the new science of Priority is invoked. As against the simple, natural way of 'first come first served,' Priority has all the arguments. In private affairs arguments give way to practice, convenience, and expediency, but in public affairs arguments must rule supreme. Thus everything and everybody stand back until it is decided that some small part or section can go forward, the result being considerable delay to the project, whatever it is, considered as a whole.

"At the Ministry of Munitions in 1915 my duty was to persuade manufacturers to employ men and women trained by the County Councils to operate lathes, milling machines and other simple forms of machine tool. I started as a business man, and in a month or so placed some thousand of these 'trainees,' who proceeded at once to help the flow of munitions of which the Army was in such dire need. I had never heard of Priority (the word does not exist in business), but I was responsible for a few million rounds of ammunition. For my pains I was summoned before my superiors and informed that no manufacturer was to be supplied with my trainees until the Priority Department had certified that there was no other manufacturer whose requirements, coming into a higher category, had not first been satisfied. In the result my papers started circulating round Whitehall Gardens and going from one floor to another of the Hotel Metropole until the training scheme was given up in despair.

"Since those days Priority has developed. The new Ministry of Building in its very first announcement

speaks of Major Priorities and Minor Priorities, which will for years hold up all building while avenues are being explored and no stone is left unturned.

"The competitive, profiteering, capitalistic, free trade system has no doubt, its drawbacks, but it does deliver the goods. Priority in its infancy lengthened the Kaiser's war, and it is too early to say by what length of time the Hitler war will be extended by the Major and Minor Priorities that are hindering its progress as I write."

He then advises us to consider how the Bureaucracy has grown fat on milk. Parliament becomes talkative because a wretched Socialist informs the House that six separate independent milkmen are sometimes to be found serving milk in the same street (the Socialist wouldn't mind, of course, if all six men were employed by the Co-operative Stores). The bureaucrat has his opportunity and steps in, and "It is interesting to reflect that by 1940 if all the officials associated with the marketing of milk from the Central Milk Marketing Board down to the humblest milk officer in the smallest council office, were put to push milk carts, there would be traffic congestion in most of our streets."

What happened when someone had the bright idea of evacuating children overseas: "There was a movement, which Hitler prevented, to send children overseas to escape his bombs. When by means of the submarine he made that plan too risky, it was discovered that the staff, which had been gathered together in a few weeks, numbered more than the children who had been evacuated, and as is the practice in these modern days, so that no hardship would fall upon the staff, arrangements were made for their absorption by other departments, arrangements which ignored

\*Post-War Questions No. 1.—*The Political Method* by Sir Ernest J. P. Benn, published by The Individualist Bookshop Ltd., 154 Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4. Price 6d.

the interests of all the staffs of all the taxpayers who had to foot the bill."

Bureaucracy would get a very thin time if it wasn't bolstered by the law and Sir Ernest Benn hits a nail very hard on the head when he says: "...To-day we adopt another plan. Parliament does not say that something shall not be done and if done penalties shall be imposed. It says in effect, that nothing shall be done except by permission, a completely different conception. . . . . The law, as understood by the Victorians, was designed to punish the evildoer and to leave the rest of us free to get along with the civilising work of producing amenities for all. The modern law is of a wholly different kind. It holds back forty million individuals, among whom is to be found all the energy required for the provision of all our needs, in order to prevent the operation of a few undesirable persons picked out by the Socialists and supposed to represent the average individual."

Merely as an indictment of Bureau-

cracy this pamphlet is a useful piece of work, but in a manner more vivid than most people might employ, Sir Ernest Benn is only telling them what they already know. What purpose is served by doing that if, as is the case, they are only to be told to retreat to the position they started from (Private Enterprise as it was in Victorian days) and stay there? The pamphlet tells us:

"If we are prepared to set free all the individual genius existing in our midst, to accept the policy of unrestrained production, to recognise the blessings of competition, to respect the common law against the restraint of trade, and to suffer the inconveniences and inequalities inherent in nature's way, we could of course multiply indefinitely the comforts and amenities available for everybody."

Sir Ernest Benn seems to think that Socialism and Bureaucracy grew in a vacuum, whereas, of course, they could not have gained the ground they have, unless there were serious faults in the system for which they are supposed

to be sound substitutes, and unless they made a pretence to correct these faults. A man who advises us to go back to such a system is a reactionary and there is no support or place for reaction in this country to-day. To refer to the system to which Sir Ernest Benn would have us return as one of "unrestrained production," as one possessing the "blessings" of competition, and "respecting the common law against the restraint of trade" is downright misrepresentation. Bureaucracy and Socialism are the spawn of the Monopolisers of credit. The orthodox money system is a system of restriction of production, restraint of trade and of vicious artificial competition which is the direct cause of war. It is the breaking of the Monopoly of credit and the distribution of ownership of the whole of this credit to the people which is required, and which can be done even in war time. If Socialism and Bureaucracy are to be banished this can only be achieved by the establishment of a stable order giving freedom of initiative to the individual.

## PARLIAMENT

*War Damage Bill: Distribution of Industrial Population: Local Authorities (Finance): German Refugees: Co-operation of Banks: Jamaica (Constitution).*

### WAR DAMAGE BILL

(65 columns)

January 29.

*The Chairman:* Most of the Committee realise that when there are a number of Amendments, all directed to the same point, the Chair selects the one which it thinks most useful for discussion.

*Mr. Pickthorn (Cambridge University):* . . . I should like to ask one question about his use of the word 'important' If importance is to be measured entirely by the size of the interest concerned, there may be some matters which I think ought to receive full discussion which may not be regarded as falling into the "important" class. For instance if by act of God—or the devil—bombs happened to fall in particular directions, there might be so much capital damage that the whole control of higher education would be taken out of the independent hands in which it has been for many generations and become entirely centralised. Therefore matters, which may seem small in themselves from the

point of view of money value compared with the whole amount of damage, may be of very great public and political importance in other directions. I should like to be assured that they will be taken into consideration in the conduct of these Debates.

*The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Kingsley Wood):* . . . The whole mischief of the Amendments on the Paper is that they aim at giving the property owner compensation related not to the value of what has been destroyed but to the cost of its replacement. Again, this proposal to which I am referring will involve payment of compensation on an unduly generous scale in many cases and more particularly when the property destroyed, by reason of its age or other causes, possessed only a small market value. I suggest that in fact when one comes to consider this matter in the light of the considerations which I have put forward, and tries and thinks of some really effective practical proposal, one is driven in the end to the same conclusion to which the experts and we were driven when we examined this

matter. We gave a tremendous amount of time to it, as obviously was necessary. In the end we were bound to come back to the proposals of the Bill. The basis of the proposals of the Bill is this, that where the restoration of property is not an economic proposition, monetary compensation should be paid on the basis which, while taking into account the vital factors of depreciation and market value—they must be taken into account—provides a reasonable basis and a basis fair between one property owner and another. In other words, the more one looks at this problem the more one is driven to the conclusion that war-time values would certainly be unfair. Some properties to-day are worth practically nothing at all. Other properties have gone up tremendously in value according to the particular areas where they are situated. It would be impossible to base value payments upon such figures . . .

*Mr. Craik Henderson (Leeds, North-East):* . . . As it stands at present, as has already been pointed out, the man who suffers most is to receive least, and this Amendment which I have put down

is an attempt to meet that difficulty. I do not think it is unfair that a man who has had his house destroyed should receive a value payment based on the value in 1939 if he is not going to rebuild. That is a fair basis if he is simply going to get the money. But if he has got to rebuild, and a great many proprietors will require to rebuild, how is he going to do it? The cost of building even at the present moment would be at least double the value payment he would receive. Where is he to get the finance to rebuild at the end of the war? . . .

*Mr. W. H. Green (Deptford)* . . . It is possible to argue, as the Chancellor quite rightly says, that it may mean something beyond the loss sustained, that the person will receive, in place of a house built perhaps 20 years ago and subject therefore to depreciation, a new house of greater value. That is one way of looking at it, but I will ask the Chancellor or the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury to look at it in this way: a man has struggled, as hundreds of thousands of our people have done, to be in a position to own his own house, which is about all that hundreds of thousands do own in this country. After years of struggle, a man has a house which he can call his own. It is destroyed. At the time of its destruction it may be worth, say, £700. I take a case which is fairly general in the bombed areas. I am not concerned about the huge hotels or great houses in the West End—others will look after their interests. I am thinking of the working man who looks to this Act for the wherewithal to get his house erected again after the war. But, when the war is over, it may cost £1,000 to rebuild that house. In hundreds of thousands of cases houses will never be rebuilt—at least, as the property of those who originally possessed them. I know that there are difficulties, and that there are arguments against it, but there is a good deal to be said for the principle that a man who loses his property should be in a position at the end of the war to replace it and, as the Bill stands; I do not see that that is possible . . .

January 30.

**Oral Answers** (37 columns)

#### DISTRIBUTION OF INDUSTRIAL POPULATION

*Mr. Cary* asked the Minister without Portfolio whether he will give an assurance that the Report of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the

Industrial population will form the main basis of post-war reconstruction; and, further, will he consider the advisability of setting up permanent machinery of administration which could form the cadre of a National Industrial Board?

*The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Greenwood)*: I have already considered the Report of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population and, in consultation with my colleagues who are responsible for the many Departments concerned, I am taking into account the recommendations contained in the Report, including those which relate to the establishment of a National Industrial Board.

#### LOCAL AUTHORITIES' LOANS

*Mr. R. C. Morrison* asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury whether permission is given to local authorities to convert outstanding loans to a lower rate of interest?

*Sir J. Edmondson*: No, Sir; not at present.

*Mr. Morrison*: Will the hon. and gallant Gentleman represent to his right hon. Friend that local authorities and their ratepayers are facing serious financial difficulties? With the Government borrowing at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. and 3 per cent. they resent having to continue paying interest on loans at 6 per cent.

*Sir J. Edmondson*: My hon. Friend can rest assured that this matter will be constantly borne in mind.

#### Written Answers (67 columns) GERMAN REFUGEES (EMPLOYMENT)

*Mr. Mander* asked the Minister of Labour the number of Germans classed as victims of Nazi oppression now in employment in this country?

*Mr. Bevin*: I regret that the records of my Department do not enable me to furnish this information.

#### LOCAL AUTHORITIES (FINANCE)

*Sir R. Gower* asked the Minister of Health whether he will state the names of the local authorities with whom the Government is now in consultation regarding their financial difficulties?

*Mr. MacDonald*: As a result of the announced intentions of the Government that if, as a result of the war, the machinery of local government in any

area is in danger of breaking down, the Government will come to the assistance of the local authority for that area, I have been approached by authorities in the London area, in certain coastal districts, and in certain other towns which have been subjected to severe air attack.

#### WAR DAMAGE BILL

(53 columns)

**CLAUSE 8.**—(Provisions for securing the national interest in the making of payments).

*Mr. Denman (Leeds, Central)*: I beg to move in page 6, line 21, at beginning, to insert

“The Minister of Works and Buildings after consultation with.”

The purpose of the Amendment is to substitute for the Treasury the Minister of Works and Buildings as the authority responsible for the planning policy in reconstructing war damaged areas . . . Clause 8 makes it possible that the reconstruction shall be, to use the words of the Bill,

“in conformity with the national interest, as respects town and country planning, the provision of housing accommodation, the development of industries and services,”

and so on. In fact, it makes possible a reconstruction worthy of a victorious war. On the administration of this Clause depends the lay-out of important parts of Britain and of cities in which substantial blocks of citizens will live their lives. The Bill imposes this task upon the Treasury who will have to give directions. Many departments will be concerned, such as Health, Transport, Trade, Labour and the Defence Services. It is indeed difficult to find a Department that is not interested. The picture which is provided by the Bill is that each Department brings its own contribution to the Treasury, which fits the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle into a complete whole and gives directions as to policy. None of us doubt that that puzzle will be solved with high intelligence and workmanlike skill and that we shall be confronted with a typical piece of competent co-ordination.

The Amendment asks that that work shall be given to the Minister of Works and Buildings simply because co-ordination is not enough. If the work is to be done worthily we must have a Department not only acting as a centre of knowledge and information, but capable of giving continuous study and of evolving a creative policy and applying it with continuous drive and direction. I suggest

that the Treasury cannot possibly fulfil that task for two reasons. It has not the officials or the Ministers who can give time to that kind of work. The Financial Secretary is, in peace-time, notoriously one of the hardest worked Ministers in the whole body of Ministers, and for the Chancellor of the Exchequer this matter could be only a very small by-product of his main tasks. It is not in that spirit that the work should be accomplished.

Suppose there were suggested a rather mean reconstruction of Coventry; what use would it be for us to try to bring the Chancellor of the Exchequer to account for it? He would not have the knowledge of the subject of the continuous supervision which would enable us usefully to criticise him. It is not his job. A further point is that the Department responsible for planning must be a spending Department in outlook. It has to envisage the spending of colossal sums of money. It is always wrong to try to turn the Treasury into a Department with the outlook of a spending office, because it is not its business. I have much too high a respect for its sense of duty to suppose that it could possibly do that well. The Amendment does not seek for a moment to deprive the Treasury of its proper control, which must be absolute. We do not want to remove from the Treasury the control that must exercise as a co-ordinating body when it is faced with an unresolved dispute between, say, the Minister of Works and Buildings and the Ministry of Health . . .

*Mr. Kenneth Lindsay (Kilmarnock)* In spite of what the Chancellor of the Exchequer has said I wish to support the Amendment . . . The Chancellor of the Exchequer says that the Ministry of Works and Buildings is only one Department among many, but I would remind him that at the time of the Barlow report—and, after all, it took two years to get that report written—many people were talking about the importance of having some policy in regard to the location of industry. That report asked for the establishment of a Ministry with a Cabinet Minister at the head—which we now have in the new Ministry—to take over powers under the Town and Council Planning Act, the powers of the Ministry of Transport and other kindred powers, and have responsibility not only in regard to the powers of the old Office of Works but also powers which had been distributed among a number of Ministries during the last 20 years.

The Amendment suggests that we should make the new Minister into a

person who can co-ordinate these various Departments. I know we cannot do that by this Bill, but I suggest that the more we can bring into this Bill the Minister of Works as the proper person to co-ordinate other Departments, the more chance we shall have in the future of replanning on better lines. Every hon. Member, I believe, agrees with this and it seems to me that there is a chance in this Bill of making the Government realise that there is a strong feeling in the country that the new Minister of Works should have larger functions than the old Office of Works . . .

*Mr. Benson (Chesterfield)*: It seems to me that the suggestion is that we ought to accept his Amendment in order to give the Ministry of Works and Buildings a free advertisement. It is a very nice idea that we should boost the new Ministry, but I think that putting words into the Bill is the last method we should adopt of boosting a Government Department . . .

*Earl Winterton*: I would like to support what has been said by the hon. Member behind me (Mr. Benson) and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. With great respect I venture to suggest that it is a very dangerous idea which is at the back of the minds of some hon. Members who are seeking to anticipate a decision on an immense question of policy about which a lot of us would have a great deal to say. People who have spent their lives in local administration would object to the idea of setting up a supreme Poo-h-Bah in the shape of a Ministry of Reconstruction to override all local authorities. Such a matter cannot be decided until we have another Bill and we ought not to anticipate discussions which will arise on the big town-planning Bill which we must have after the war. Quite apart from that, it is entirely wrong from the Ministry's point of view to make the Ministry the deciding authority. The deciding authority must be the Treasury. With great respect, I venture to say, "For goodness sake let us keep to the main question, which is an attempt to repair the terrible damage done to thousands of individuals—and to rich people as well—and get payment for them as soon as possible." If we are to clutter up the Bill with other considerations we shall never see it through Committee.

. . . Amendment negatived.

*Sir Harold Webbe (Westminster, Abbey)*: . . . The purpose of this Clause is to secure that the expenditure of this great sum of public money and the development to which it will give rise

shall be in conformity with the national interest. That is the one object with which no one can possibly quarrel, but I suggest that the Clause, as it is now drafted, goes further than is necessary to achieve that purpose. The Executive in this country has already been armed by Parliament with very considerable powers of controlling development and controlling such matters as will fall to be dealt with under this Bill. Town Planning legislation, Housing Acts, Building Acts and such legislation have already given to the central and the local authorities a considerable measure of control to secure that the national interest is not impaired by wrong development. In this Clause these powers are being very widely extended. As the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer has said, they are being extended into fields where Parliament has so far had no opportunity of discussion or consideration, and where it has certainly not made up its mind, but where, at any rate in the immediate war conditions in which we live, it is necessary that we should take a chance and delegate the authority of Parliament in this way to the Treasury in the national interest and in the interest of national defence. Already, additions to the list of groups and subjects in regard to which direction should be given have been suggested and the Chancellor has undertaken to consider them, and if possible, add them to the list. I do suggest that, having taken into account all these types of case, in which, as far as this Committee at the moment can see, there is likely to be no need for directions of this kind, and having given to the Treasury and to the Commission by authority of the Treasury power to deal with all these cases, the Committee should say that that is enough to go on with and should not add the phrase which appears at the end of sub-section (1) of the Clause:

"and any other matters as respects which it appears to the Treasury that such directions are required."

That is a perfectly blank cheque by which to give directions on any matter whatever and even though these directions might be embodied in published Regulations and directions laid on the Table of the House, and subject to the veto of the House, I submit that that would be yet another extension of the very unsatisfactory tendency which has been shown in recent years. There is far too much government to-day by Regulations and Ministerial orders. Speaking as one who has spent some

years as a member of a local authority, I can certainly say that this method of producing a Bill, which lays down policy in a skeleton form, and leaves the details—very often important details—to be filled in by Ministerial orders and Regulations makes any kind of intelligent criticism of a great many Measures quite impossible. . . .

*Captain Crookshank:* . . . . These words do not mean a blank cheque on any matter whatsoever. The matter is governed by the opening words of the Clause which say:

“The Treasury shall give to the Commission directions for securing that the provisions of this Part of this Act relating to the making of payments in respect of war damage shall be executed in conformity with the national interest.”

That is not quite the same sort of thing as my hon. Friend has in mind.

*Sir H. Webbe:* I beg to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

**February 4.**

**Oral Answers (32 columns)**

**BANKS (CO-OPERATION).**

*Sir Patrick Hannon* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, since the outbreak of war, he has received the full co-operation and support of the principal banks both in London and the provinces; whether he is satisfied by the effort made by the banks to strengthen and maintain war-time credit; and whether the response of the banks to requests and suggestions from the Treasury and Public Departments has been satisfactory?

*Sir K. Wood:* The answer to all parts of the Question is in the affirmative.

*Sir P. Hannon* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the total sum lent by the five leading banks to the Government since the beginning of the war, including the increase in balance-sheet totals, sums released by the decline in call money, bills and advances, investments in Government securities and loans on Treasury deposit receipts?

*Sir K. Wood:* The answer contains a number of figures, I will, with my hon. Friend's permission, circulate it in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

*Sir P. Hannon:* Does the Chancellor agree that his Answer indicates the extent to which the banks of this country are co-operating with the Gov-

ernment in raising funds for the war?

*Sir K. Wood:* Yes, Sir. That is what my answer does.

*Following is the answer:*

The published accounts of the five leading banks do not enable me to state precisely the amounts lent by them direct to the Government since the beginning of the war, but the following figures will give my hon. Friend an indication of the sums involved. In the period between August, 1939, and December, 1940, the deposits of the five leading banks increased by £473,000,000, which together with a decrease in advances of £59,000,000 increased their liquid resources by £532,000,000. Cash balances, money at call, etc., and cheques in course of collection, increased by £130,000,000 and the balance of £402,000,000 was accounted for by an increase of £262,000,000 in bills discounted (consisting almost exclusively of Treasury bills and Treasury deposit receipts), and an increase of £142,000,000 in investments (almost exclusively in Government securities).

**JAMAICA (CONSTITUTION).**

*Mr. Stokes* asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will give an assurance that before any Order in Council is made altering the Constitution of Jamaica opportunity will be given for discussion in this House?

*The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. George Hall):* As was stated in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Riley) on 29th January, the question whether the constitution of Jamaica is to be amended is among those which are being discussed with the Governor of the Colony who is now in this country; and I should prefer not to make any further statement pending the outcome of those discussions.

*Mr. Stokes:* Is my hon. Friend aware of the great anxiety felt by residents in the Island on this subject, and will he give an assurance that neither the sale nor the leasing of the whole Island to a foreign Power is contemplated?

*Mr. Hall:* That is another question, but I can assure my hon. Friend in regard to the question of constitution that, if changes are agreed upon then, I think, the Government will consider the question of the matter being considered by this House.

*Captain Cunningham-Reid:* Would

the hon. Member give an assurance that there will be no leasing or sale of our possessions in the future without first consulting this House?

*Mr. Hall:* No, Sir.

*Sir A. Southby:* Would the Under-Secretary convey to the Prime Minister the desirability of a statement at an early date on the whole subject of leasing and the constitution of these bases?

*Mr. Hall:* That can be done. The House will remember that a conference is sitting at the present, and I have no doubt that at its conclusion a statement will be made.

*Sir A. Southby:* Is the Under-Secretary aware that this House is desirous of knowing exactly what is being done, and what will be done in the future, before a final decision is taken?

*Mr. Thurle:* Is my hon. Friend aware that the great bulk of Members of this House are very happy with the arrangement with America in regard to this matter?

*Mr. Stokes:* Are we to understand that the Cabinet feel at liberty to dispose of British possessions without consulting this House?

**M.P.'S' ATTACK ON MINISTER**

Charges of “bullying” and of failure were levelled against the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. R. S. Hudson) during a brief debate on agriculture in the House of Commons on February 11.

*Mr. de la Bère (Evesham, C),* who urged more material, manpower and capital for the land, said: “The Minister has antagonised the human element throughout the country. He has failed, and he must resign.”

*Mrs. Tate (Frome, C)* said: “The Minister has not learned that however much you may be able to bully in private life, you cannot bully the yeomen of England, nor can you bully the soil of this land. I beg the Minister, when next he speaks to the farmers, to speak with greater sympathy and understanding, because the yeoman stock will not stand for his bullying.”

**London Liaison Group**

For the next meeting see page 12.

## 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.

Vol. 5. No. 23.

#### Business Office:

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

Saturday, February 15, 1941.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

### "INTERESTS" BEHIND SIROIS REPORT

The recommendations of the Sirois Report were vigorously assailed by Arthur W. Roebuck, K.C., member of parliament for Toronto. Mr. Roebuck is a former attorney-general for this Province of Ontario and the *Edmonton Bulletin* describes him as an authority on constitutional questions.

Mr. Roebuck reviewed the purposes of Confederation and the great success of the federal scheme adopted and proceeded to describe how the Sirois Commissioners propose to "re-confederate" the nation.

His speech was a striking warning against the crippling of Canada's war credit by the heaping of two billion dollars provincial debt burden on the Dominion government at the very time it is engaged in prodigious war spending and at the same time limiting the Dominion's powers of taxation, and equally a warning against the destruction of provincial autonomy by placing the provinces under control of the money power whose headquarters are located at Ottawa. He suggested that certain interests are backing the report for their own private gain.

As reported in *The Social Crediter* the Sirois Report has been "thrown out"—a notable victory for the forces attacking banking interests in Canada.

*The Times* displays anxiety lest Mr. Winant's interest in 'world affairs' should be thought to date from his attachment to I. L. O. Mr. Winant served in the (American) Air Force before his appointment to the International Labour Office, "so that" his interest in world affairs does not date

from that. Wonderful what a lot you can see of the internationalist plot from really high up in the (American) air!

Benghazi (like Dunkirk)—*Improvisation* (not centralisation!): *The Times* says so.

From Winston Churchill (not the novelist):—"There is an almost universal innate revulsion against interventions in the biological scheme of things. We none of us quite like them, and custom and religion will probably resist them. And custom and religion are probably right, for we do not seem to be making such a wonderful success of our present system that we can afford to have thrust upon us political problems such as will arise if the very make-up of mankind becomes the plaything of the bureaucrat."

### THE LABOUR PARTY

A writer in the *New Statesman and Nation* has been deploring the condition of the Labour Party. "Physically the Labour Party is dying." Hundreds of local parties have a name to live but are dead. The three chief reasons for the condition of the Party, according to the *New Statesman's* contributor are:—

1. The absence of members on one or more of the services.
2. The black out.
3. The political truce.

"Political activity was the king-pin that kept the party wheels securely attached to the war chariot. When we renounced it for a truce the pin came out and in hundreds of localities the wheels came off....

"Only by including the first three

months of 1940 in the 1939 balance sheet—a shrewd device—was it possible for the 1939 Balance Sheet submitted to the Bournemouth Conference to show £7,553 revenue from local parties as against £8,383 for the preceding twelve—not fifteen months. Significant as that was the story for the year just ended is much more serious. Revenue from local parties will not total £5,000...."

We could suggest other reasons than those quoted by the writer. The first is that the leaders of the Labour Party have their eyes on the Treasury Benches. They are utterly and violently opposed to the penetration of new ideas into the movement: they wiped away the last pretence for their existence as a Labour Party when the leader of the opposition accepted £2,000 pounds a year to "oppose" the great "enemies of Labour." They have thrived on the teachings of the Webbs, planners, orthodox economists, the Fabian Society (which is now linking up with Federal Union): they have placed in positions of authority in the movement men whose incompetence would have been instantly observed had they not been shielded by the pernicious doctrine of collective responsibility.

If the Labour Party dies two things will have killed it: Social Credit and its own inherent weakness and unreality.

E. J. P.

### THE (I. S. M.) PLAN

The *Daily Express* reports that the new American Ambassador to this country, Mr. John G. Winant, is bringing to London plans for a new world order of Democracy, "which, it is hoped, America and the British Empire will be able to guarantee when the war is over."

"According to well-informed sources in Washington, the final peace plan which the American Government has in mind envisages the establishment of an international society of mankind based on economic as well as political democracy.

"It calls for social justice and economic security for the vanquished as well as for the victor nations.

"In an attempt to bring about a lasting peace, it will offer the citizen of every nation freedom of religion and speech, and contains definite plans to solve the unemployment problem which is expected to follow the war."

## SHOW-DOWN COMING IN CANADA

After an unsuccessful initial attempt, at the Conference called to 'put-over' the Sirois Report to make Canada totalitarian, Mr. MacKenzie King threatened desperate measures. These are reported in the *Edmonton Bulletin* to be as follows:

1. Invade the succession duty field.
2. Increase the income tax rate.
3. Discontinue advances to the provinces to enable them to meet their maturities.
4. Ration gasoline, thus reducing revenues to the provinces through gasoline taxation."

"But," says the *Bulletin* "before the weaker provinces are engulfed in the consequent chaos, there will be another Dominion-Provincial Conference, probably in the late spring, at which the partners of confederation will have a second chance to avert catastrophe. For the moment the smoke of the wreckage obscures the real significance of what has happened.

"The rebel provincial leaders have either gone home or are remaining here in splendid and unenvied isolation. Premier Hepburn is expected to dissolve and go to the country within six weeks."

Every device of propaganda and misrepresentation is being used by some of the Canadian papers to isolate and attack the three Provincial Prime Ministers, Mitchell Hepburn, Aberhart and Pattullo. The following is the sort of thing to be found in the Press reports on the Conference:

"The prospect of provincial leaders appearing in the garments of monetary reform at this critical stage in the war, plainly takes on a sinister turn in view of plans to put on a big war loan early in the summer and to enlarge the war savings program. Nothing is better calculated, it is felt, to upset the war effort by knocking out the financial foundation of Canada's fight against Hitler. Since inflation is the plain alternative to the Sirois reforms, as far as Mr. Hepburn and Mr. Aberhart are concerned, there is growing conviction that Ottawa will have to launch a drastic counter-attack. Meanwhile Ottawa is waiting for Mr. Hepburn to show his hand, following his announcement that the Ontario cabinet would consider his plan of monetary reform."

Most outspoken of the Provincial

Premiers against the Report was Mr. Hepburn of Ontario. When asked who was responsible for calling the Conference, he said, "King unloaded the full responsibility upon Finance Minister Ilsley. Ilsley was definitely made the goat. He (Mr. King) said he was influenced by Ilsley and Ilsley probably was influenced by the financial interests."

Mr. Hepburn followed his highways minister, Mr. T. B. McQuesten who, a few minutes earlier had declared, "Our association with this so-called conference is over." Mr. Hepburn was not spared by the Press. One paper reported:

"Mr. Hepburn was choleric, ill-tempered, prone to attribute scoundrelism to other people. He indicated his drift toward rubber money by applauding Mr. Aberhart on the first day of the conference, and by coming out flat-footed against orthodox finance on the second. He did so after listening to Mr. Ilsley. He said: 'We have to get away from the orthodox system of money, and we might as well come to it now.' Mr. Hepburn's pet word, during the two days, was 'nefarious.' He closed on it—that he and his delegation would withdraw and leave 'the wreckers of confederation, under the guise of patriotism, to continue to carry on their nefarious work.'"

"So it ended.

"Mr. Ilsley's speech rocked the dissenters who appeared not to have thought that the Dominion meant any harm. But the gun was pointing right at them. It was loaded, and nobody could watch Mr. Ilsley urging his case with a suppressed, livid passion, without knowing that the trigger will be pulled.

"New and higher Dominion taxation will cripple provincial taxes. Dominion aid to the provinces will cease. Gasoline rationing will slash provincial revenue. The prospect for provinces is one of unrelieved gloom. There will be no complaining to Ottawa because this war must be fought and taxpayers will pay gladly for victory.

"And so the business of getting another conference began the moment this one failed. Mr. King is ready whenever the dissenting provinces are willing to sit down at the conference table."

After the conference Mr. Hepburn stated that he was well pleased with the result. "The Federal Government," he

said, "tried to put over a blitzkrieg to force us to abandon our rights and privileges under the guise of a war effort."

The next day, under such banner headlines as "Hepburn Urges New Money for War Needs," the Press reported Hepburn's Financial Proposals. The following are extracts from his statement:

"My first proposition is that the authority for creating money now vested by the constitution in the Dominion government should not be delegated to any other authority, public or private . . .

"During this time when the very existence of the state is threatened the government should not be required to hire or borrow money from others and to pay high rates of interest, except that which might be termed a reasonable service charge, for the use of the very thing which the Dominion government alone has the right to create.

"By attempting to prosecute the war, which is in fact a great industrial and economic effort, by means of money either exacted at burden-some rates from the taxpayers or borrowed at unreasonable high rates of interest, is merely to load down the government with extra burdens which discourage and prevent an all-out participation in the war effort of the Democracies . . .

"In time of war, governments . . . must realize that so long as the goods and services necessary for the prosecution of the war effort of the nation are available the problem of creating money to secure these goods and services is of very secondary importance . . .

"Heavy taxation is bound to grind down the producers and particularly the primary producers . . .

"An increase in the quantity of money is not of itself inflation. The problem, as I understand it, is not the issue of new currency to retire all existing bond obligations, thereby flooding the country with useless and worthless paper money, but rather to make available sufficient new currency in order to take care of the expanding requirements of war time . . .

"This war in which we are engaged is not being waged for money and its cost will never be expressed in terms of money. The real cost will be written in terms of human sacrifice."

J. M.

## Mr. Solon Low on 'Treasury Branches'

Mr. Solon Low, Provincial Treasurer of Alberta, has unmasked an organised campaign to make political capital out of "grossly misleading" statements concerning the government treasury "branches" instituted in the Province as part of the 'interim' plan. At the same time he announced that the government was preparing to expand this service.

Mr. Low said that "All this untimely and misleading propaganda has been emanating from a small group of political antagonists to reform, who seem as yet unaware of the realities of the extremely critical situation which has developed in the world." In spite of this, he said, and in spite of the fact that the purpose and policy of the treasury branches as an essential feature of the interim program has been explained and has been endorsed by the people of the province, "it is necessary that their statements should not go unanswered."

Mr. Low said that it had been represented to the public that the treasury branches had cost Alberta taxpayers about \$336,000 in the last fiscal year and that this amount constituted a complete loss to the people.

"It is as sensible to state that because the treasury services cost \$336,000 there was a deficit of that amount, as it would be to assert that education services showed a deficit of \$2,868,000, the agricultural services a deficit of \$573,000 and so forth," said Mr. Low.

Continuing, Mr. Low said:

"In the case of all public services the justification of the cost is the value of the services to the people. The critics of the treasury branches argue that the need for economy requires the elimination of the cost of the branches. On that argument the cost of government services in general could be reduced to nil by the simple procedure of eliminating them all—health, education, relief, debts, highway and other services.

"I agree with these critics that the need for economy today is imperative. But we probably differ on the meaning of the word 'economy.' I would refer them to the Greek derivation of the word, and they will find that originally it meant 'home management.' Its correct application is 'good housekeeping as applied to the management of the entire social life.' That is the urgent need today, not only in Canada but in every

country. Nobody in their senses could dispute that.

"Is it good management to give the people of Alberta the services of treasury branches. On balance do they gain or lose by having these facilities? That is the test.

"In the first place, let us take the financial cost of \$336,000. Of this amount \$86,000 represented the return of taxes collected in the form of consumer bonuses. It was no more a 'cost' than a straight refund of taxes, because everybody was eligible to get the bonus. The higher their income and the greater their purchases the more bonus they could obtain, so that they could have gained a refund in this way in proportion to the taxes they paid. Could anything be fairer?

"Was the bonus the best way to refund these taxes? What about the remainder of the cost of \$250,000? What did the people get for that? Let us now examine these questions.

"By bonusing goods obtained by consumers with vouchers and by making Alberta-made goods the basis for the amount of bonus, the manufacturers and producers of Alberta-made goods obtained the benefit of a most thorough-going system of sales promotion for their products. As anticipated the results have been quite spectacular, for to our knowledge a number of manufacturing concerns have found their sales steadily expanding and in some cases expanding at a rate which has taxed their productive resources. In other words by making Alberta consumers 'Alberta-made conscious' we have boosted the development of Alberta manufactures and other products.

"This in turn has meant increased employment and increased payrolls. Which in turn has meant further increases in the demand for Alberta-made goods and so on.

"It is no exaggeration to state that as a result of the Interim program, the people of the province—manufacturers, producers, wage-earners and everybody else—have benefitted, in terms of increased business, to the extent of many times the cost of maintaining those services. This in itself has boosted revenue receipts by the government by far more than the \$250,000 paid out in

maintaining the treasury branches service.

"That is the true picture of whether the treasury branches are an economic proposition. As yet all the people of Alberta may not have fully realised the tremendous advantages they are obtaining by these facilities. But an increasing number are doing so, as is evidenced by the number of resolutions reaching the government, urging an extension of the interim program in accordance with the mandate given the government at the last election.

"As a matter of fact, the government has been working for some months on the expansion of Treasury Branch service and the announcement will be made at an early date in response to the growing demand for such action. For the present all I can say is that in its preparation of plans for giving extended services in all branches of the interim program the government has kept clearly in mind these vitally important considerations:

"(1) The responsibility resting on the province to direct the development of its economy to the dominating task of making a maximum contribution to the national war effort.

(2) The need for laying strong foundations now to meet the problems of post-war reconstruction.

(3) The growing necessity for relieving our people—particularly farmers—of the acute economic conditions arising out of the agricultural situation.

(4) The need to incur no expenditure which does not constitute a sound economic investment.

(5) The importance of avoiding any action which might impair the national unity so essential at this time.

"This policy which I feel confident will be endorsed by every responsible-minded citizen—and I hope, it will help those who have been pressing us for action to understand why the preparation of future plans has taken a little longer than might have been possible under normal conditions.

"As we move in 1941 let us stop all this political scrapping and get on with the great job before us as an united people with a single purpose—to concentrate our energies on defeating the totalitarian enemies of our country and empire, and out of victory to build a greater Canada based on an economic foundation of prosperity and peaceful progress, in which all will be secure and all will be free."



# “TRUE” FREEDOM”

By B. M. PALMER

Do you remember that priceless bit in *Eyeless in Gaza* where the young Fabian says:

“If you want to be free, you’ve got to be a prisoner. It’s the condition of freedom—true freedom.”

And his ‘cynical’ friend replies:

“The contrary of a thing isn’t the contrary, oh no! It’s the thing in itself, but as it truly is. Ask a diehard what conservatism is; he’ll tell you its true socialism. And the brewers’ trade papers; they’re full of articles about the beauty of true temperance. . . . True temperance is a bottle of claret with each meal and three double whiskies after dinner. Personally, I’m all for true temperance, because I hate temperance. But I like being free. So I won’t have anything to do with true freedom. . . .”

“What’s in a name? . . . Practically everything, if the name’s a good one. Freedom’s a marvellous name. That’s why you’re so anxious to make use of it. You think that if you call imprisonment true freedom, people will be attracted to prison. And the worst of it is you’re quite right. . . . Truth, it’s one of the magical words. Combine it with the magic of ‘freedom’ and the effect’s terrific. . . .”

“Curious that people don’t talk about truth. I suppose it sounds too queer. . . . It’s like *berri-berri*, or *wagga-wagga*. . . . If you want to make the contrary of truth acceptable, you’ve got to call it spiritual truth, or minor truth, or higher truth.”

That isn’t cynicism, though I suppose Huxley came, at last to believe that it was. It’s realism, since I suppose we must use an abstract word occasionally. A better description of the magical methods of the present day Socialist cum Bankers’ press could scarcely be written. Notice that the Socialist comes first. A few years ago it would have been Banker cum Socialist. This is important, as I know you will agree, from the point of view of strategy.

You can’t help surprise as you reach the end of the book and find that Huxley’s ‘cynical’ hero (himself perhaps) falls into the same trap, and speaks of “unity of mankind, unity of all life. . . .”

even “reality of unity!”

Of course it’s not a new book; it pre-dates *Ends and Means*, to which it is in some senses an introduction, and which it anticipates in the passage:

“Means determine ends, and must be like the ends proposed. Means intrinsically different from the ends proposed achieve ends like themselves, not like those they were meant to achieve. Violence and war will produce a peace and a social organisation having the potentialities of more violence and war.”

Huxley is one of the minority who sees clearly that means and ends are inseparable. But I cannot agree with his assumption that force is evil in itself. Is steam evil in itself? It might be used to move a mechanism contrived for an evil end. It might not.

But this isn’t a review, and I haven’t much more to say about Huxley; but it is surprising to find, over and over again, that one who sees so much, should not see the last links in the chain of reasoning. He never grasps the self-evident fact that if war were the worst evil that could befall, no one would fight—Peace is not an end in itself.

The pacifists, after all, have never been put to the test, for they have always been protected from the consequences of their pacifism—and their very existence is due to the protection that culture has received from force. “Quite demonstrably, force has brought one nation after another to a certain type of pre-eminence. With that pre-eminence has come a rise of culture, arising, I think, not out of force, or finance, but out of economic prosperity which is the bait used by finance,” wrote C. H. Douglas in chapter VI of *Warning Democracy*. This chapter is of the greatest value to us at the present time. I do not think we have studied it closely enough.

“The danger of a decline once this level of a new culture is reached, is not, in my opinion, due to that culture itself. It is due to the failure on the part of that culture to develop a system of finance, and a use of force, which is sympathetic to the general spirit of the new culture.”

This, it seems to me, is not only

the justification of the present war against a bestial military dictatorship and a financial despotism but the indication that in building up our own military power we may be providing ourselves with a very useful sanction to be used in a new way.

Judging from what Mr. Anthony Eden says about the future of Abyssinia, and the International protection and help that is to be afforded to that long-suffering country after the war, there may come a time when he and his associates may suggest to our armed forces that for the sake of “true freedom” they should lay down their arms and submit to disarmament in the interests of an International authority. On that day, Mr. Aldous Huxley may not remember his own opposite remarks on “true freedom”; but our soldiers, sailors and airmen, with minds unclouded by intellectual subtleties and strengthened by practical experience, may refuse to walk into the prison where they are told freedom is to be found—they may remember what Internationalism and Mr. Eden did, or didn’t do, for Abyssinia in the past, and may decide that they will no longer tolerate absentee management of their right to bear arms in defence of their own culture!

This might give new meaning to the phrase, “military dictatorship”; but it will be the expression of the will of a nation in arms to defend its own national sovereignty, and that is something we want. We should then be in a position to develop “a use of force which is sympathetic to the general spirit of the new culture,” and save our culture from the utter destruction which is planned for it.

## THE EDITOR OF “THE ECONOMIST” AND DOUGLAS

*From a review in “Truth” of “An Outline of Money” by Geoffrey Crowther. Geoffrey Crowther is the Editor of “The Economist.”*

“ . . . Not the least valuable section is an appendix in which Mr. Crowther reprints four articles written a few years ago in examination of the Douglas Credit Scheme, of which he is a reasoned—and highly reasonable—opponent.”

## CORRESPONDENCE WITH LORD CHELWOOD

*Lord Cecil of Chelwood, P.C.,  
Haywards Heath,  
Sussex.*

My Lord,

The death of the Marquess of Lothian in circumstances reminiscent of the death of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice in the second year of the first world war would seem to suggest that the position of British Ambassador to Washington in wartime is one of the more dangerous administrative occupations.

Both of these men were supposed to be in good health, and both died suddenly after suggesting to the U.S. government that deeds not words are necessary to win a war.

As it seems to me of vital importance that your Lordship should be made acquainted with the arresting facts contained in the enclosed booklet\* I beg your acceptance of a copy.

Yours faithfully,

(signed) W. L. RICHARDSON.

*Byways, Hillside Road, Sidmouth; December 22, 1940.*

*W. L. Richardson, Esq.,  
Byways,  
Hillside Road,  
Sidmouth.*

Dear Sir,

I am desired by Lord Cecil to acknowledge your letter of 22 December, and to say that there was no similarity between the deaths of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice and Lord Lothian. Sir Cecil Spring-Rice had been ill a very long time before he died.

As for the booklet you enclosed, Lord Cecil desires me to point out that, wherever he could check them, the facts were entirely wrong.

Yours faithfully,

E. VERA LAZARUS,  
Private Secretary.

*Chelwood Gate, Haywards Heath, Sussex; January 3, 1941.*

*The Rt. Hon. Lord Cecil of Chelwood, P.C.,*

My Lord,

Major Douglas, having acquainted himself with the contents of your letter to me of January 14, desires me to

\**This American Business* by C. H. Douglas.

say that if your Lordship would state which facts in the booklet are "entirely wrong" (? incorrect) he will either verify or withdraw the assertion of them.

Yours faithfully,

(signed) W. L. RICHARDSON.

*Byways, Hillside Road, Sidmouth.*

*W. L. Richardson, Esq.,  
Byways,  
Hillside Road,  
Sidmouth.*

Dear Sir,

I am desired by Lord Cecil to thank you for your further letter, and to express his regret that it is not possible for him to find the time to underake your suggestion.

Yours truly,

I. M. BUTLER,  
Private Secretary.

*60, St. Martin's Lane, W.C.2; January 14, 1941.*

*The Rt. Hon. Lord Cecil of Chelwood, P.C.,  
60, St. Martin's Lane, W.C.2.*

My Lord,

I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 14 inst, and presume that you will have no objection to the publication of the correspondence in the Review in which the article first appeared.

Yours faithfully,

W. L. RICHARDSON.

*Byways, Hillside Road, Sidmouth; January 24, 1941.*

*W. L. Richardson, Esq.*

Dear Sir,

I am desired by Lord Cecil to thank you for your letter of the 24 instant and to say that he has no objection to the publication of his correspondence with you, if you think that will serve a useful purpose. He is prepared to leave it to your own judgement whether you do so or not.

Yours truly,

I. M. BUTLER,  
Private Secretary.

*60, St. Martin's Lane, W.C. 2; January 30, 1941.*

### Miss Thompson Again

At the request of Senator Vandenberg, the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee has decided to ask the State Department whether "definite commitments" to the United States on the use of the Royal Navy in return for American aid, says a Washington report.

Senator Vandenberg produced for the committee an excerpt from an article by Dorothy Thompson, which said, "Our all-out aid for Britain is accompanied by definite commitments of Britain to us regarding the British Fleet. It presupposes a community of interests."

### "BARRIER TO HEALTH"

by Dr. Douglas Boyd

Price 6d.

Your doctor should have a  
copy!

# THE DISILLUSIONS OF A POLITICIAN

It is doubtful whether the dying reflections of John Hamer Shawcross\* are intended as the apotheosis of his life of betrayal; I wish I could think they were.

This is the story of a politician who falls, through 679 pages, to ambition. It contains the skilful development of characters on the background of modern politics and during the descent to his coronet Shawcross says some very nice things:

"No government that ever will be can do more than maintain a clear framework within which the essential acts of private life may go on." (unfortunately it can, and does). "The more a government confines itself to that, and keeps out of the way of the lives of the people, the better government it is . . . ."

"He asked himself bitterly whether statesmen might not be the true pests and cancers of human society. They had controlled the affairs of the world for centuries, and the affairs of the world seemed to him now beyond any control at all. He could not think of any matter of statecraft that was not conducted with more complication, less honour and

simplicity, than would go to such a matter between a few private human beings. It looked as though the time was coming when mankind would have to devise a sharper and more stringent means of controlling those who conducted its business . . . ."

After the war,

"The people in whose name both sides are fighting will say, 'Thank God that's over,' and, a good deal poorer and sadder they'll settle down till another saviour comes along to run them. If I could be sure of having one prayer answered I would pray for this: that for fifty years, throughout the whole world, politicians of all breeds would leave the people alone. We might then have a better world. We couldn't have a worse one . . . ."

Cheers and hurrahs! How true it is—but how fatiguing to see so many arrows shot into empty air . . . . There is a time for everything and perhaps patience can be postponed until to-morrow. Targets exist, why not use them? And can we never have a philosophic politician capable of seeing just a glimpse of democracy beneath its filthy rags? Must we always see party politics as its

only raiment? Must we always be condemned to aimless abstractions?—prattle of "poverty in plenty," and never a word to say whose word that is?

Dying, (is "to fall asleep" still currency for death?) Shawcross ponders Life:—

"Disillusions and despairs went at last the same way as dreams and desires. One came in the end to an equipoise, to an acceptance of all that life could give or take away."

Dear me, oh dear me, how sad, but after all, disillusions, despairs, dreams, desires, equipoise and acceptance all must have reference to some real thing. And for Hamer, being a politician, that would naturally be the next thing his electorate wanted; which might well be lower taxes; he would better have reflected something like this:—

"Disillusions of more taxes today and despair at the prospect of more taxes tomorrow went at last the same way as dreams of lower taxes and desires of no taxes. One came in the end to an equipoise, to an acceptance of all the taxes life could give or take away".

Life?

H.E.

\*Fame is the Spur by Howard Spring. Collins.

## Nightmare

"Kindly sign the white form and return to Desk 14 Counter 10 Room 12 Section D Floor 7. Then bring the pink counterfoil of the yellow form and fill in as instructed on the back, age, nationality, birthplace, birthtime, occupation of parents, whether single, married or a widower, number of children, official or natural, and where they are being educated. Thanks. Now produce your magenta form and hand it in at Counter 15 Room 10 Section M Floor 12. The clerk will in exchange give you a red form which you will bring back to me. Don't lose your brown form but return the counterfoil for registration and reference. Now produce your Registration Card No. 4 and attach same to White Form No. X124AB/5, retaining same for reference."

"I see."

"Where's your day sheet?"

"I ... I ... I ... er—"

"Let's see your papers."

"Yes ... er ... I—"

"Oh, here we are! National Existence Form No. 4X/1456."

"I ... I ... I ... Yes."

"Attach this form to the yellow counterfoil with your Registration Form No. 1. That's it. Now let me see."

"Yes ... I—"

"Take this card up to Room 50 Counter 16 Desk 4 Section C Floor 2, ask the clerk to file your brown form with Registration Card No. 1 and give you a check-pass marked A2/B4. Take this to the next counter and purchase a sixpenny existence stamp, affix same to your yellow counterfoil and keep it for general inspection at the end of the month."

"Yes—Thanks awfully. Er—"

"That will be 10½d. please. Thanks. Three halfpence change."

"I—er ... Where did you say? Oh yes, of course. I see. Yes."

— A. F. THORN.

## LINES WRITTEN AT MALVERN

*and addressed to all who claim Divine Sanction for their own schemes of interference with the lives of others.*

So, gentlemen, you're privy to God's plan!

To you a revelation has been made That puts your Saviour's teaching in the shade!

To you has been vouchsafed the power to scan

The past and present of this creature man

And plot his future! You are not afraid As humbler men would be. You know your trade

And boldly flaunt the trademark of your clan.

God is not mocked, so do not be deceived.

Your claim to knowledge of the primal cause

And sequence infinite of cosmic laws Shall be assessed by what you have achieved.

God,—God alone can make His purpose plain,

And woe to them that take His Name in vain.

— EXCALIBUR.

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. Tel. Wavertree 435.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP. Meeting, February 20, at 12-30 p.m., at The Plane Tree, Great Russell Street. 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.

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.)

WANTED!

A reader wishes to buy one copy each of Economic Democracy, Warning Democracy, and The Douglas Manual.

For each one that he is successful in obtaining he will give 2/6 to the Expansion Fund.

Write to A. S. Love, Bank Chambers, St. Thomas Street, Weymouth.

Books to Read

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy ..... (edition exhausted)
Social Credit ..... (temporarily unobtainable)
Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
The Monopoly of Credit ..... (temporarily unobtainable)
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 ..... 2d.
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 ..... (unobtainable)
The Economic Crisis: Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report ..... (temporarily unobtainable)
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 2½d.)
Barrier to Health by Dr. Douglas Boyd..... 6d.

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.

BELFAST D.S.C. GROUP

Public Meeting on February 19, 1941. Subject: The Nature of Democracy. Speaker: Mr. L. A. Lyons.

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

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

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.)