A woman writing to the Daily Mirror says:—

"I'm glad civilians have got to take their share of danger in this war. I remember the last, when every newspaper had casualty lists of soldiers killed at the Front—lists long enough to sicken your heart.

"I remember the ambulances bringing mutilated men home from the Front. I remember the haggard faces of the women who waited.

"And now, while the enemy machines whirr overhead and I wait for whatever may come, I try to turn my thoughts away from my own danger, to remember at least men are not crouching in foul dug-outs, tormented by vermin, and soon perhaps to be torn on barbed wire or sink for ever in the slimy mud.

"I try to remember all this, and remembering it, say quite honestly I am glad that the boys of to-day have not to go through all that and that instead I have to take my share."

During the period of intense air fighting in August, military casualties only amounted to some two hundred and fifty, while civilian casualties ran into thousands.

As one who has sometimes to work while air battles are raging overhead, I must confess to a good deal of sympathy with this woman letter-writer's point of view.

Trying as it is to lie for the best part of a night in a cubby hole, with such home-made protection as can be improvised, I do not believe for one moment that such mental discomfort, and it is mostly mental, can be compared with the misery borne by hundreds of thousands of women during the four years war, when those dearer to them than life itself were living in a physical hell.

In this most extraordinary war, so strange as to be almost fantastic, the misery inflicted upon the people of this country has not been primarily physical. It has been mental and emotional. It is probable that, taking the people as a whole, the vast majority are better fed in spite of rationing, while the young men in the army, after the evacuation of Dunkerque, have spent a not unpleasant time under canvas, during this wonderful English summer. Yet the mental tension is never relaxed. A battle quite as important as the air battle, is to be fought out in the minds of our people, and from indications, I think we shall win both.

Now there is one thing quite certain—the old type of warfare experienced by our grandparents and parents, in such wars as the Franco-Prussian and Boer War has gone for ever. Henceforth we are all potential casualties.

Now there are some people—not many, thank God—who still believe we might very well go on just as we always have, if only we had a professional army capable of bearing the increasing beastliness which a persistence in the policy of orthodox financiers makes inevitable. Such people do not realise that some time about the beginning of this century a certain point in evolution of the world was reached which meant that an entirely new method of self protection must be struck anew by the naive effrontery with which it was generally agreed that the business of the Empire was primarily to develop the overseas investment system, and the job of the navy was to protect our trade routes, so that Britain might remain the workshop of the world. The grandfathers of those men who are now tackling our daily air-raids thought it automatic that trade would always follow the flag; not realising that their jingoism was used as a screen behind which financiers like Cassel and the Rothschilds manoeuvred whole armies for the protection of their own private interests.

It was for such purposes as these that our professional army was kept fully occupied in the beastliness of war; that three hundred typhoid patients were crowded into accommodation meant for fifty in indescribable conditions of misery, in order to protect the Beit interests in South Africa.

"Orthodox finance appears to have a subtle connection with this doctrine of force. Force and Finance, if not the same thing, are complementary. 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, and subsequent to that rise of culture forces appear to have been set in operation to transfer the pre-eminence elsewhere.”

(C. H. Douglas, 1926) *

In the light of this statement, it seems that at the beginning of this century this country had reached a point where it was in a very favourable position to advance to a higher level of culture. This would have involved “the elevation of such qualities as kindness, mutual consideration, toleration of new ideas, dislike of aggression, in fact all that group of virtues which we call civilised, or, if you prefer it, Christian.”

During the first decade of this century there was a great awakening of the social consciousness, manifested in, for instance, the Labour Movement and the Women's Suffrage Societies. There is no doubt that the most disinterested idealists gave the best part of their lives to the attempt to break through into the new age which they felt was just ahead; but they did not recognise the nature of the problem which they had to tackle. It was “to develop a system of Finance and a use of force, which is sympathetic to the general spirit of the new culture.”

But orthodox financiers knew what was happening. They decided to combat this awakening so inimicable to themselves, by attacking it on two main lines. First the general corruption of that culture itself, partly by suborning its personnel, and partly by introducing into it attractive but iniquitous elements which can be summarised into one word, Jazz; and secondly by involving the most highly developed of these nations in the Four Year's War of 1914-1918, which should result in the transfer of the headquarters of Finance to Wall Street.

Now it seems to me, at the moment of writing, that the awakening of the social consciousness of every well-intentioned citizen, which had already begun, meant that already he had taken his place in the firing line. The days of the old professional army were gone. In August, 1914, there were no longer any civilians in the old sense. Whether we knew it or not, we were all fighting to preserve our conception of civilisation and for the first time we were fighting against Finance, not for it. Now, twenty-six years later, the distinction between civilian and military has entirely disappeared: And I believe it was necessary for the difference to go, before the truth could be made manifest “that the world would not have German Kultur [inculcated brutality in the interests of totalitarian financiers] at any price.”

There is nothing like a little experience of the real thing.

Since 1919 enough has been revealed concerning the nature of Finance to make possible its development in harmony with the spirit of a new culture; but it is not yet fully realised that this new life, existing as yet only in the unconscious desires of the people, will need protection from many enemies until its growth in power and beauty will draw all men towards it. Thus the sword cannot be sheathed yet, and perhaps for long years it must be bright in its scabbard. But force will be used in a new way; the sanctions behind it will rest with the people and their representatives, and not with a delegate no matter how plausible he (or it) may be.

Phenomena of Our Time

Mr. Keynes.

Mr Keynes has “surveyed British finances after a year of war,” and when doing so has departed from all traditions of professional economists in that however half-heartedly and incompetently he has done it, he has recognised that the national wealth is not measured by some financial standard, but consists of such realities as houses, the ability to replace which is dependent upon our physical capacities to build, and not so-called “financial resources.” He hopes that we shall have learnt some things about the conduct of currency and foreign exchange, about central control, and about the capacity of the country to produce” before the war is finished.

But if Mr. Keynes has learnt something, he has still a great deal to learn about the realities underlying economics, for a large part of his speech was given up to a very un-realistic discussion of how “to prevent an inflationary rise in prices.” With typical orthodoxy he ignored the obvious remedy of instituting price control, and instead reverted to the time-old theory that the only way of regulating prices is to deprive consumers of the power to purchase.

Lord Stamp.

Even Lord Stamp has learnt something. For the first time he has admitted that purchasing power can be increased by the creation and issue of new money. He told an audience at a civic luncheon in Bristol that if the Government could not get “our own purchasing power through taxes and loans, they would automatically be creating new purchasing power of their own, and would be overbidding us with it in the market.” Lord Stamp of course threatens that this would bring disaster upon our heads. Living up to his sobriquet of “Sacrifice” Stamp, he invoked the old bogey of price inflation and was unable to see any other way of regulating prices than by making consumers sacrifice their purchasing power.

Norman Crump.

A City Editor, Norman Crump of the Sunday Times has actually recognised that when a bank lends money, it increases deposits in the banks. He informs us, in the Sunday Times on September 29, that the Government, “can borrow direct from the commercial banks, but the money so borrowed is still paid out to those working for the Government, and so still finds its way into the public deposits at their banks, thereby enlarging the commercial banks' deposits.” He was describing the process which was involved when the Government recently borrowed £110 millions from the Clearing and Scottish banks “by means of the new device of Treasury Deposit Receipts.”

Other information he gives us is that “during the first pre-war year the floating debt increased by £402 millions, and there were no obvious untoward effects directly attributable to this apparently inflationary development.” An elaborate explanation follows to put people off the suggestion that the banks created money to pay for the Treasury bills which make up this debt. We are told however that the deposits in the banks increased by £236 millions during this period.

NEW YORK

"New York is not only the largest Negro city in the world, but the largest Italian city and the largest Jewish city.”

—R. W. G. Mackay, quoted in the News Review, September 26, 1940.
NEWS & VIEWS

MASONRY IN EIRE

A correspondent writes that according to his friend, Masonry is often well-informed about Masonic plans, the statement published in the Catholic Times, some considerable time ago, that the headquarters of Masonry was transferred from Prague to Eire was correct. This change came about as a result of a Peace Treaty between American and French Branches of Masonry. Under this Treaty, World-Masonry, including that of Great Britain and Ireland, was again reunited and new headquarters of this world organisation was to be established at Cork.

Under this Treaty also, it was agreed to work for a United States of Europe whose Capital was also to be Cork. The men who brought about this agreement were Mandel, the French Minister, Bullitt, the American Ambassador to France, and an American Diplomat stationed in Dublin. The American Ambassador to Paris, Mr. Eden and Lord Beaverbrook from England took part in two conferences in Eire on these matters. The war has naturally upset some of these plans, but legally the General Secretariat of World Masonry has, as its address—Rushbrook, Cork: For the duration of the war the work of this Headquarters is conducted in New York.

Eire is to be united and its “freedom” guaranteed by U. S. A. and Great Britain.

ALBERTAN HARVEST

In a report issued recently by Hon. D. B. Mullen, the Alberta minister of agriculture, the largest crop in the history of the province was forecast for Alberta this autumn. It is estimated that 203,000,000 bushels of wheat, 114,000,000 bushels of oats and 34,500,000 bushels of barley will be threshed.

For the whole dominion a wheat crop of about 561,104,000 bushels has been predicted by the Dominion bureau of statistics in a bulletin reporting the first estimate of the production of principal grain crops, hay and clover, and the condition of late-sewn crops.

This would be 71,481,000 bushels larger than the 1939 crop. Of the 1940 crop total, 534,000,000 bushels were produced in the prairie provinces, distri-

buted as follows: Manitoba, 71,000,000 bushels; Saskatchewan, 260,000,000 and Alberta, 203,000,000 bushels.

ALBERTA, MOST PROSPEROUS WESTERN PROVINCE

Less ‘relief’ was given Alberta in Dominion contributions in May than to any of the four western provinces, according to a report issued by the national registration branch of the department of labour at Ottawa.

Alberta’s total for the month was 36,770, made up of 29,654 urban and 7,116 on agricultural ‘relief’.

Numbers on ‘relief’ in other western provinces for the month of May were: Manitoba, 48,130; British Columbia, 60,578, and Saskatchewan, 123,907.

ROMANTIC

“He wore a blue beret to match his serge suit, brown suede shoes and a steel helmet slung over his shoulder. She was also blue-suited and complete with tin hat. As the two turned into a quiet lane to reach home through a garden gate in a wall, his arm rested over her shoulders. A pleasing picture in, so to speak, war mufti of Mr. and Mrs. Montagu Norman.”


I TAKE MY A.R.P. TO A DEATH PARTY

Only a genius, we think, could have thought of the deep ear-plug as a substitute for the deep shelter. As we see it, nothing now remains to be done except to fit the public with blinkers and the whole problem of air-raid protection will be completely solved.

—Lorne Nocott in the “Daily Mail,” September 27, 1940.

HOW MUCH WORK?

A reader from Newcastle reports that in a film called “Idleness! Is it a Vice?” showing recently at a News Theatre in that City, Major Douglas’s name was given as an authority that only two hours ‘work’ for each man each week were necessary. The commentator asked “What do you think?”

The film was produced by the Strand Film Company.

DOMESTIC

Readers of The Social Crediter will be receiving their copies late, this week, and the face of some of the type will be different: the war, in the shape of an incendiary bomb, interrupted and delayed printing.

In the Daily Express, we are told, essential editors and sub-editors cling grimly to their desks amid the falling bombs, merely clapping on their tin hats in gestures of defiance. The Daily Telegraph now brings out a Manchester edition, which we are assured is the Daily Telegraph even if it looks more like the Express. Pictures in the News Chronicle showed underground corridors studded with desks and editors, each with the requisite number of shirt sleeves and telephones. The Times frequently deals with the situation by simply not arriving in the provinces. Each paper adapts itself to war conditions in its own way: The Social Crediter has neither the tin hats of the Daily Express nor the deep corridors of the News Chronicle, and it is regarded as essential that it should avoid the vague fate of ‘not arriving.’

Some of our readers write to say that their retailers declare that The Social Crediter is no longer being sold through newsagents. This is untrue. It is being distributed, as it always has been, through wholesale agents, and all retailers should be able to obtain supplies. In case of any difficulty send the names and addresses of your newsagent and the wholesaler with whom he deals to The Manager, K.R.P. Publications Limited, 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

CABINET CHANGES

Cabinet changes announced on October 3 include the resignation of Mr. Chamberlain from his office of Lord President of the Council and his succession by Sir John Anderson. Mr. Herbert Morrison moves from the Ministry of Supply to that of Home Security, and is succeeded by Mr. Andrew Duncan who was President of the Board of Trade. Sir Andrew Duncan is followed at the Board of Trade by Captain Oliver Lyttelton, a non-parliamentarian for whom a seat will have to be found. Sir John Reid becomes Minister of Works and Buildings, a newly established Ministry. Mr. Ernest Bevin, Sir Kingsley Wood and Sir John Anderson enter the War Cabinet, the other members of which are Mr. Churchill, Lord Halifax, Mr. Arthur Greenwood, Mr. Attlee and Lord Beaverbrook.
Mr. Colin Clark has produced what The Economist terms "a very important new book." The title of the book is *The Conditions of Economic Progress* and the title of The Economist's article reviewing it is *The Wealth of Nations*. This article gives a sufficient indication of the contents of the book to make it appear not worth while to wade through its 504 pages or to spend 25/-, the price at which it is advertised. It might be asked, "Then why bother about it at all?" The answer to that is: If we lived in a sane world no one would have any use for Mr. Colin Clark and he would be regarded as a nonentity or a bad joke. But the world being what it is we have to recognise that Mr. Colin Clark is taken very seriously by a lot of people in important positions. Keynes in his *How to pay for the War* says of him: "There is no one to-day, inside or outside government offices, who does not mainly depend on the brilliant private efforts of Mr. Colin Clark (in his National Income and Outlay, supplemented by later articles)."

The main purpose of the book is "the collection of figures for the national income of every country in the world, expressed in common terms and for an identical period of time" and "he has also collected figures, for a large number of countries, to show the growth of national income through time and to illustrate a great number of other matters."

According to The Economist he has "numerically compared the wealth of the inhabitants of the nations of the world." Among the conclusions reached is that "there has been on balance, no rise in the average standard of living in the United States since the beginning of the present Century." Two tables are reproduced by The Economist, one of which shows in International Units (an invention of Mr. Clark) what is claimed to be the average real income per head of a long list of countries and another showing "World Income," and it is said in particular reference to these two tables that "the book contains a wealth of figures from which numerical proofs of economic truths can be drawn." The Economist immediately proceeds to draw "economic truths" from them, for they say "the two tables sufficiently dispose of the mischievous slogans that the world is suffering from "poverty in the midst of plenty" or that "the problem of production is solved."

Further on we are told that Mr. Clark, "is not, of course, taken in by the popular explanation that differences in national wealth are due to national resources or national character." Here, then, we have again this heinous curse of every nation paraded and defended once more—the use of money as an instrument of value—so that by the monopoly control of it, it can become the instrument of government—instead of as an accounting system serving the sole purpose of distributing real wealth.

Mr. Clark, unwittingly or unwittingly, is being used for the purpose of perpetuating financial abstractionism. The conclusions of all orthodox economists are belied by those of scientists and engineers; where the former discover scarcity, the latter find plenty. No single profession, within the limits of its function, has failed so dismally as that of professional economists, whereas the scientist and engineer has demonstrated by practical achievement a skill and knowledge greater probably than any other profession.

The measurement of wealth is not obtained by measuring money supply, but by the quantitative measurement of energy resources and energy conversion; resources which enable man to acquire a larger control over his environment. Major Douglas has defined Wealth as: "The rate at which a nation or any other corporate body or individual can deliver goods and services esteemed conducive to well-being."

Scientists and engineers tell us that within the last 100 years we have multiplied the original output rate of the human engine by 9,000,000: that most of this 9,000,000 (or 8,766,000) occurred after 1908.

The same experts tell us for instance that during the last 100 years we have multiplied the original output rate of the human engine by 9,000,000: that most of this 9,000,000 (or 8,766,000) occurred after 1908.

The rate of tilling soil has increased to eleven hundred times that of the human engine, by the most modern methods.

A modern straightline continuous brick plant will produce 300,000 bricks a day with 20 men on the machine (the rate used to be 450 bricks a day per man).

Whereas in the U.S.A. a century ago one man produced not more than 23 tons of pig iron per year, and another man took a year to produce 800 tons of iron ore, in 1929 one man produced 20,000 tons of iron ore per year, and that the best blast furnaces enable one man to produce 10,000 tons of pig iron per annum.

In the face of this evidence given by men who have proved by results their technical capacity (which neither Colin Clark, The Economist or Mr. Keynes have ever done), which is confirmed by many authorities, orthodox economists are capable only of producing a financial system which distributes no more real wealth to the community to-day than it did in 1900, these economists must be the world's worst enemies and the sooner they are rendered harmless the better.
Explanations Needed

The Jewish Chronicle, commenting on the results of the sudden influx into the countryside of Jewish refugees from London says that "the Gentile and the Jew must be explained to one another."

The article continues:

"A tour round a reception area in the Home Counties last week-end has convinced me that the Defence Committee must exercise the utmost vigilance in the present situation. While it is true, as The Jewish Chronicle has claimed, that the Nazi raiders have bombarded anti-Semitism out of London—that is, that Jews and Gentiles in London as a whole have realised themselves to be common and equal victims of Nazi brutality—it is true also that there is a danger that anti-Semitism may be blown out of London into the reception areas.

"Many of these small towns and villages are intensely individualistic, and regard all outsiders, let alone Jews, as 'foreigners.' Indeed in some of these reception areas the term and concept 'Jew' has come to be applied to all evacuees from London whenever it is desired to refer to them or perhaps think about them with disapproval.

"... The stupid behaviour of a small minority of Jews—several instances of sheer thoughtlessness and lack of consideration came to my notice—is a gift from heaven to the Fascists. One potent source of anti-Semitism is the practice of booking rooms for two or three persons and then surreptitiously introducing many more."

THE SECOND TEST

The following passage is from "A Personal Record" by Joseph Conrad.

But when the time of ordeal came round again the doorkeeper let me into another room, with the now familiar paraphernalia of models of ships and tackle, a board for signals on the wall, a big long table covered with official forms, and having an unrigged mast fixed to the edge. The solitary tenant was unknown to me by sight, though not by reputation, which was simply execrable. Short and sturdy as far as I could judge, clad in an old, brown, morning suit, he sat leaning on his elbow, his hand shading his eyes, and half averted from the chair I was to occupy on the other side of the table. He was motionless, mysterious, remote, enigmatical, with something mournful, too, in the pose, like that statue of Guillian (I think) de Medici shading his face on the tomb by Michael Angelo, though, of course, he was far, far from being beautiful. He began by trying to make me talk nonsense. But I had been warned of that fiendish trait, and contradicted him with great assurance. After a while he left off. So far, so good. But his immobility, the thick elbow on the table, the abrupt, unhappy voice, the shaded face grew more and more impressive. He kept inscrutably silent for a moment, and then, placing me in a ship of a certain size at sea, under certain conditions of weather, season, locality, etc.—all very clear and precise—ordered me to execute a certain manoeuvre. Before I was half through with it he did some material damage to the ship. Directly I had grappled with the difficulty, he caused another to present itself, and when that, too, was met he stuck another ship before me, creating a very dangerous situation. I felt slightly outraged by this ingenuity in piling up trouble upon a man.

"I wouldn't have got into that mess," I suggested mildly. "I could have seen that ship before."

He never stirred the least bit.

"No, you couldn't, the weather's thick."

"Oh! I didn't know," I apologised blankly.

I suppose that after all I managed to stave off the smash with sufficient approach to verisimilitude, and the ghastly business, went on. You must understand that the scheme of the test he was applying to me was, I gathered, a homeward passage—the sort of passage I would not wish my bitterest enemy that imaginary ship seemed to labour under a most comprehensive curse. It is no use enlarging on these never-ending misfortunes; suffice it is to say that long before the end I should have welcomed with gratitude an opportunity to exchange into the Flying Dutchman. Finally he shoved me into the North Sea (I suppose) and provided me with a lee-shore with outlying sandbanks—the Dutch coast presumably. Distance, eight miles. The evidence of such im- placable animosity deprived me of speech for quite half a minute.

"Well," he said—for our pace had been very smart indeed till then.

"I will have to think a little, sir."

"Doesn't look as if there were much time to think," he muttered sardonically from under his hand.

"No, sir," I said with some warmth.

"Not on board a ship I could see. But so many accidents have happened that I really can't remember what there's left for me to work with."

Still half averted, and with his eyes concealed he made unexpectedly a grunting remark.

"You've done very well.

"Have I the two anchors at the bow, sir?" I asked.

"Yes.

I prepared myself then, as a last hope for the ship, to let them go in the most effec tal manner, when his infernal system of testing resourcefulness came into play again.

"But there's only one cable. You've lost the other."

It was exasperating.

"Then I would back them if I could, and tail the heaviest hauser on board on the end of the chain before letting go, and if she parts from that, which is quite likely, I would just do nothing. She would have to go."

"Nothing more to do, eh?"

"No, sir. I could do no more."

He gave a bitter half laugh.

"You could always say your prayers."
DAKAR

"Say, Sadie, hey you heard the latest? We got the gol-durned British to build a naval base at Singapore out of their taxes, an' we made 'em break their alliance with them there Japs, an' now we're goin' to take over the base to defend 'em against their allies, and look after their rubber plantations for 'em. Wouldn't that make you rock? 

"Reckon this here Dakar must be somewhere in G'iply, Sadie. Seem to reckonerise one of our Winston's successes. Ever since we put him in to hand out the pork, the gol-durned British hev had so many successes that ef it hadn't been for their flyers whalin'th'tar outer the Heinites, the war would hev been won by somebody. Kain't hev that happen yet awhile—plenty bits of pork for the British to hand over, yet. Understand the New York Times had front page all set with 'Napoleonic Conception by Britain's Greatest Statesman' three weeks before Winston knew where he was goin' to be great next. Waal, bust my Jachin an' Boaz, I reckon you hev only to be in with the Gang. 

"Hey to teach these Japs a lesson, Sadie. Reckon we'll make a loan to these Chinese so as they'll teach the Japs Uncle Sam ain't to be trifled with, an' then we'll take the Chinese tungsten mines for lettin' the Chinese fight the Japs. An' ef that don't do it, we'll stick the Russians on 'em. Every means short of war, Sadie."

Without mincing matters, it is the opinion of the present writer that the sooner Mr. Churchill ceases to be the Government the better. By the Government is meant the determinant and executive of English—or British policy; and by the better is meant anything the reader likes that is not the elimination of higher human stocks in the interest of the ascendancy of lower human stocks, 'higher' and 'lower' in this connection being measurable by definable standards, e.g. freedom in the exercise of genuine initiative. Obviously this definition of better' may be narrowed down at will and expressed in a variety of ways with reference to world politics. Winning the war AND the peace is one of them.

Dakar, the most westerly port in the eastern hemisphere, a key point of the world, has just been reinforced and strengthened in open allegiance to the Vichy Government. An expedition which the press of this country were waiting to advertise as a brilliant Churchillian stroke has miscarried, and a considerable addition to the strength of the crippled Richelieu has been permitted to pass through the Straits of Gibraltar into the Atlantic.

The excuses which have been published to explain this crescendo of blunders assume that that young 'spokesman of Free France,' General de Gaulle is the individual from whom such an explanation should come. But why? Doubtless, if he were as 'free' as the scattered troops whose banner he is waving are alleged to be, General de Gaulle could cast light in some dark places, including the Downing Street of the 'Indissoluble Union,' of England and France. He is not likely to do so. Originally an ardent advocate of mechanisation of the French Army, General de Gaulle became a political figure very suddenly and in circumstances still almost entirely unexplained. To jump from eminence in the technical field to eminence in the political field is, as every one knows, highly unusual. That such a leap should carry one into a highly equivocal position is not remarkable. It is, however, remarkable that the Government (that is to say, Mr. Churchill) should allow such a position to develop to the detriment of British prestige and the confusion and frustration of British interests.

"The Government," says Lord Beaverbrook's paper, The Express, has announced that 'this incident is now closed.' Parliament is reported to be of a different mind. It may not stick to its mind. A disposition to change it should be countered by all the popular pressure that can be mobilised. But, above all, what is needed is not Churchillian flowers of speech, however terminologically exact," concerning the geographical scenario: what is needed is a direct assumption of responsibility for the conduct of the war to the British people, not to the absentee managers whose raucous criticisms reach us from across the Atlantic. Lord Beaverbrook's The Express flants the headline: "U.S. Expects ...." If proof were wanted concerning the direction in which the Government is looking for direction, there it is.

Dakar is said to constitute a threat to the United States of America —A most excellent reason for a descent on the part of that extraordinary entity from the lofty seat of the prize-fight promoter into the arena!

DARTINGTON HALL STAYS

During last June the parents of children of Dartington Hall School, the establishment of which Mr. W. B. Curry, the Federal Unionist, is headmaster, were canvassed on the subject of taking the school abroad. The large majority were in favour of doing so, and the possibilities of removing the bulk of the school to the United States were thoroughly investigated. The problem that seemed insuperable was that of money, which could not be taken to America; nor could the school's income in England be used as a security for a loan there. Eventually the plan was abandoned.

Mrs. Elmhirst was an American and a millionairess in her own right, formerly married to an American millionaire.

Which seems to show that somebody finds the school more useful in England.
Liverpool Protest Against Socialisation of Trade

It will be seen from a report at a meeting of the Council of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce which is published below that strong opposition against a socialist measure which the Government has initiated is being manifested. It would seem that the occasion is an appropriate one for traders individually and for Chambers of Commerce to bring the Government to heel, and at the same time to clarify for the benefit of traders in general the real issues which are at stake. The following points are made to assist any reader of this paper who is willing to take the matter up with the local Chamber of Commerce:—

B. D. KNOWLES, Secretary,
The Southampton Chamber of Commerce,
Chamber of Commerce Building,
Cumberland Place, SOUTHAMPTON.

Dear Mr. Knowles,

I should like to draw your attention to a meeting of the Council of Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, a report of which is attached. You will see from this that there is strong opposition to a socialist measure which the Government has initiated; and it would seem that the occasion is an appropriate one for traders individually and Chambers of Commerce to bring the Government to heel, and at the same time to clarify for the benefit of traders in general the real issues which are at stake.

(a) The formation by the Government of the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation is clearly designed to expropriate the business of Export firms; or in other words to socialise the Export trade of the country.

(b) The suggestion inherent in this action, that a governmental body or Civil Service Department is technically competent to carry on this business as efficiently as the private Exporters themselves is arrant nonsense.

(c) That if there were any good administrative reasons for the formation of such a central body the only proper procedure for doing it, if equity and efficiency were to be served, would be to place the responsibility with the Exports Merchants' own organisation, dictating to them the policy of the Government as decided by national needs in this matter, whilst holding out to them such inducements (sanctions) as would ensure the effective administration of the policy.

(d) That in point of fact the Export Merchants declare that obstacles, real and artificial, have stood in the way of their developing Export Trade as the circumstances require, and that the Government has not taken every action in its power to remove these obstacles which they could have done without interfering with the business of the merchants.

(e) That the merchants themselves on the basis of a proper statement of the true position, defining the obstacles in their path, should take the initiative by (1) making representations to the appropriate Government Department for action to remove these obstacles (2) instructing their respective M.P.'s to force action from the Government, (3) also if necessary by informing the public of the position and mobilising general pressure on M.P.'s.

(f) That the action of the Government in forming and arming the U.K.C.C., that is in taking this means of socialising the Export Trade, is only part of a general policy for destroying private enterprise in every sphere of national activity and imposing Socialism on the country; and that this aspect of the matter should be recognised by the Export Merchants and publicly and mercilessly pilloried in conjunction with the persons and interests responsible for the policy.

(g) That the time has come for all private traders to recognise that the causes of the many artificial handicaps under which they struggle are inherent in the financial system and can be fully remedied without resort to Socialism; and that if recognition is not given to this and action taken upon it, private enterprise will continue to be falsely arraigned by socialists and the powerful financial interests behind the policy of socialism, as inherently inefficient in itself, and the present dynamic situation in which the masses can be persuaded to accept "changes" will be used to destroy private enterprise and foist socialism on the country.

September 27, 1940.

JOHN MITCHELL.

Report taken from the “Liverpool Echo” of September 24, 1940.

The Fetish of Bureaucracy

Frank criticism of Government intentions concerning the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation were voiced at a meeting, to-day, of the Council of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce.

The General Trade Committee's proceedings embodied correspondence which:—

Recorded that the Association of British Chambers of Commerce had made representations to the President of the Board of Trade in support of Liverpool's protest against the proposals of the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation to usurp the functions of existing merchant organisations and with Government support and taxpayers money to take away merchants' business. A reply to the Association's representations had not yet been received.

Attention was also directed to a
Board of Trade announcement dated September 10, that two representatives of the Corporation would sail shortly for the Argentine with the object of setting up an organisation to facilitate the important trade between the United Kingdom and South America.

That the Board had authorized the Corporation to take steps to facilitate the holding in South America of adequate stocks of United Kingdom goods which South America requires.

That the Corporation will not itself trade but will use existing trade channels and help in opening new ones.

In view of this statement it was decided that after consultation with other interests a questionnaire be prepared, and submitted to the Board of Trade for their reply.

TRADERS' PROTESTS

Mr. F. Adamson (Chairman of the South and Central American Trade Section) explained that some months ago an article appeared in certain morning papers to the effect that the Government had contemplated the setting up of an organisation to act in practice as a merchanting organisation for selling British manufactures overseas. On protests being put forward by interested traders, it was officially denied that the Government had any intention of doing this.

Now the Corporation had been formed. Nominally founded to deal with certain operations outside the sphere of existing merchant organisations, it was now to take upon itself the character of an export merchanting department, notwithstanding the official denials previously made. On August 28, he received a letter from the secretary of the National General Export Merchants' Group to say that the attention of Sir Cecil Weir, a member of the Export Council, had been drawn to the announcement regarding the forthcoming activities of the Corporation in South America, and that the Corporation wished to interfere as little as possible with the business of the merchant, consistent with the Government's determination to afford every assistance to the development of export trade.

On September 13, he was further informed by the secretary of the merchants' group that Lord Forres (the chairman of that group and a co-opted member of the Government Export Council) informed the meeting of the group held on September 12, that he had received repeated assurances that the Corporation did not intend to trade, their aim being to assist the export merchant who is unable to hold stocks in the country of importation, by holding stocks themselves against the requirements of the merchant, who would therefore be assisted rather than interfered with in his trade. A provincial delegate present at the meeting had reported that Lord Forres stated that it was no use asking the President of the Board of Trade to receive a deputation to discuss this matter, as the U.K.C.C. had come to stay and, indeed, one of the directors of that company was preparing for a trip to the Argentine to fix up arrangements there. He understood that two of the directors were to make this trip, not one.

According to his informant, Lord Forres explained that he had the assurances that the U.K.C.C. did not intend to compete with the export merchants as such, but they proposed to stock in large quantities certain goods in the Argentine and possibly elsewhere, which would be sold from stock by their agents.

That was not an interference with the merchants' business but an absolute destruction of that business. It was easy to see how a Government department, financed with Government funds—provided to some extent by the merchants themselves—would be given facilities for obtaining export licenses, Ministry of Supply permits, priority classifications, and other concessions which would be denied to those whose legitimate business it was to deal with that trade.

Once a Government department had been set up, whatever it worked efficiently or whether it did not, it became a permanent institution and would not be compelled to close down as a merchant firm would, simply because it did not run its business efficiently and show profitable results.

The proposed operations of the U.K.C.C. were the thin end of the wedge, and perhaps not so thin as that. Unless the merchant interests in the country considered their business of sufficient interest to them to justify fighting for it, then they might as well prepare to face the inevitable closing down of their businesses.

The Government could do a great deal more to secure the export drive they wanted by devoting their attention and energies to the removing of obstacles, artificial and otherwise, and thus making it possible for merchants to work in cooperation with manufacturers in this country for the maintenance and development of the export trade.

SAD REFLECTION

It is a sad reflection upon the mentality of those concerned in high quarters to think that at short notice a Government department (especially if run on lines similar to any of the existing Civil Service Departments) could be set up satisfactorily to replace existing merchant organisations which possessed a flexibility free from the official red tape and established precedents which were the fetish of bureaucracy.

The meeting unanimously decided to send the questionnaire to the Board of Trade.

MORE PLANNED MILK

The Ministry of Food announces that orders have been made under the Defence Regulations modifying the functions of the Milk Marketing Boards and conferring upon them additional powers to enable them to carry out the Ministry's milk policy.

The object is to keep up production, control prices, economise transport, and to use supplies to the best advantage of the whole country.

The additional powers will be exercised under the Ministry's general supervision, and will be subject to any specific directions of the Minister.

The boards will have powers to specify to whom the milk shall be sold, to decide where milk shall be delivered, and how it shall be transported, and to find the prices and terms on which it can be sold.
“IF ENGLAND TO HERSELF...”

The people of this country are fighting for their independence as they have fought before. Whether they will do so with success on this occasion will depend upon whether they are allowed to. The responsibility lies with the Government.

Two things are absolutely necessary for victory against the formidable odds which face us; a united purpose, and a correct organisation. At present we have neither of these.

It is to be feared that the Government has not yet learnt the lesson of France. It does not yet understand for what we are fighting. We are not fighting for Federal Union, or World Order; we are not an outpost of American civilisation; we are fighting for our homes, our manner of life, our independence, and the control of our own affairs in these islands. This alone can unite the vast majority of us into an invincible nation, immune from internal disruption.

If we are forced to fight under a false flag, and for ideals and purposes which we had scarcely heard of before the beginning of the war we are doomed to defeat. Those who still imagine that the small number of Nazi sympathisers in this country are the sole source of weakness are gravely mistaken; they are probably the least. If there is a fifth column of German agents and British traitors who want a fascist Britain dominated by the rulers of Germany, there is a bigger column of Russian agents and British traitors who want a Stalinist Britain dominated by the rulers of Russia, and a still bigger column of those who want a Wall-street and Hollywood Britain, dominated by rulers of America, who already hold the purse-strings of the world.

It is safe to say that the whole lot of these traitors and foreign agents do not amount to ten per cent. of the population. The pro-Nazi column is being dealt with drastically, the pro-Russian column is suspect, but enjoys a certain immunity owing to the inexpediency of offending the Russian Government at this time, but the pro-American column dominates our Press, our wireless, our Cinema, our Government, and hides its designs upon our independence behind the fellow feeling which, arising out of a measure of common blood and language, exists between the British and American people.

This last column is the chief source of danger to this country, because it is a danger to which few people are yet awake. Most people's reaction to it expresses itself as a certain coolness and cynicism towards the Government propaganda, which is a very serious thing at this desperate stage of the war. The affair of the Franco-British Union offer was a shock which has left behind it a suspicion that a Government which could suddenly attempt to destroy the identity of this nation without consulting us, is not to be trusted with our independence.

If we are to be presented with the same type of false choice as were the French people, the same fate will befall us as befell them. Our Britain, like their France, has been independent for a thousand years. If we are told that we must choose between a Britain dominated from Berlin and a Britain dominated from New York, a few will choose the first, and a considerable number the second, but the majority will lose interest in the fight and go home, and the Nazis will add one more to their conquests.

It is therefore a matter of the most vital practical importance from the point of view of victory in the war that the Government should without delay remove all suspicions that it will again attempt to barter our independence for a political union with another country. If the U.S.A. or any other country with interests in a Nazi defeat gives us help or becomes our ally we shall welcome them, but all question of political union must be postponed until both peoples can express their views in a general election.

This is the first necessity. A divided nation cannot stand against a people such as the Germans who have been unified into an efficient tool in the hands of a few men by the ruthless use of propaganda backed by armed force.

On the other hand, even if it were desirable, we have not time to transform ourselves by the use of similar methods into a totalitarian state of comparable efficiency. A hastily improvised Nazi state can never fight the parent model. Our hope lies in the immediate liberation of the spontaneous energy and power of adaptation of a free people, and the adoption of the only form of organisation which will allow of this.

This means, at the same time, Decentralisation, each in the field to further Centralisation, and further which it is appropriate.

It is vital that the direction of the defence of these islands shall be in the hands of one man, with the power to enforce his orders. This is no matter for committee management. Although his colleagues in the various Ministries must be available as assistants and advisers they must have absolutely no power to obstruct him. In particular, if the Bank and the Treasury retain their power to obstruct any move in the public interest which costs money, we are doomed to defeat.

The adoption of this centralised control is already on the way, it is only a question of whether it will be in time. But in any case it will be worse than useless if it is not accompanied by a drastic shattering of the network of regulations and restrictions which a centralised bureaucracy has imposed upon the people. Handicapped by a Civil Service of which the chief function in recent years has been, without cynical exaggeration, the obstruction of all simple and direct action, how can they be expected to deal effectively with a situation which cannot be foreseen in detail! It is speedy adaptation or death; and red tape means death.

The situation is fantastic. We have been waging an industrialised war with a million unemployed, and even now, in the very jaws of an invasion, the chief difficulty for mil-
lions of volunteers is to find a job! Everybody has a dozen maddening 'red tape' stories to tell. Simple jobs held up while officials try to pass the responsibility from one to another, forms to fill in ad nauseam, letters to be passed to and fro and filed, regulations to be looked up, inspectors to see that peace-time rules are kept, and meanwhile vital defence works and shelters are delayed, tired soldiers are left without accommodation, volunteers are kept doing nothing until they are thoroughly discontented, and material is wasted in enormous quantities.

Everybody knows that there must be an end to this obstruction of the national effort. There is a rising feeling against it, and there has been one great hopeful sign that when the crisis comes red tape will be cut to smithereens. At the evacuation of Dunkirk half the ships and volunteers 'had no right' according to the regulations to be taking part in a military operation. I do not believe that the Nazis can defeat us; we can only defeat ourselves.

If we can get unity of purpose in Government and people to preserve our independence, if we can get a clear-cut centralised responsibility for the major strategy of defence, and freedom of initiative in carrying it out, we shall not only win the war, whatever the odds against us, but we shall also find that the same purpose, and the same organisation, will enable us to win the peace; and if we fail, we shall know the reason why!

C.G.D.

How Effective are Raid Precautions?

The following extracts from an article in Truth by Captain Bernard Acworth, D.S.O., R.N., are an interesting comment upon the results of the Fifth Column activity of the daily press in exaggerating the fear of air raids:

"Though the total damage caused by the raids is imponderable, it can be divided into two distinct categories: the effect of the bombs themselves, which are only slightly remediable, and the effects of the 'precautions,' which are almost entirely removable.

"But what of the damage caused, not by the bombs, but by ourselves through wrong or excessive 'precautions.' What, for example, of the 'black-out'? Has it stopped aircraft finding London, or England, or, when here, dropping their bomb-load? No. Has it given an exaggerated idea of fire havoc and thus increased alarm? Yes. Does it impede rescue work and the detection of the troublesome time-bomb? Yes. Does it prohibit the aimimg of bombs at, for example, the railways? No, if our own experience is relevant, supported by our own night bomber pilots' reports.... For these five sound technical reasons the black-out must go. A return to normality is necessary.

"The third extravagant precaution was the wholesale evacuation set in motion by authority when air-raid alarms were expected to be truly terrible. It has broken up families, ruined thousands of businesses, and disorganised the normal life of the country. A return to normality is an urgent need. Government influence should be exercised to get the people to their homes, Big Business to its offices in London, and the Civil Service, by order, back to its warren in Whitehall.

"Propaganda was responsible for the Air Raid Panic Precautions, and Propaganda must now undo the mischief it has done. This should take the form of devoting incomparably less time to the danger of air raids and more to their ineffectiveness. The country urgently needs a sound and courageous Air Raid Policy — a new A.R.P. Fear of bombs, their noise, is a product of ignorance and lack of a sense of proportion — not of any lack of physical courage. Ignorance is apt, as conscience is bound, to make cowards of us all."
WHICH WAY?

Under the title Which way for The World? there are some interesting views expressed in a critique which appears in the September issue of British Industries, the official publication of the Federation of British Industries.

The book under review appears to be of little value, but the writer of the critique has much good sense. Of the rise of the Industrial era he says:

"The attitude towards economic questions, which we conveniently sum up as individualism and laissez-faire, has provided a short and strange interlude in the history of our country."

"From 1820 until 1860, the date of Cobden's famous Commercial Treaty with France, the current of individualistic thought was in flood tide. It reached its height about 1870. From that time began the decline which has spread with increasing acceleration right down to the present day."

"In its beginnings, the decline was scarcely perceptible; concealed perhaps by the fact that there never was a period of undiluted laissez-faire. Since then, Factory Acts, Public Health Acts, Merchandise Marks Acts, Import Duties Acts and social legislation of various kinds have increasingly intervened to restrict freedom."

"If the period of free trade was short for this country, it was even briefer for others; for neither Germany, the United States, nor any other prominent industrial nation has ever given serious heed to its basic theory."

"The simple truth is that free trade suited the United Kingdom manufacturers of the day, but it did not suit those of other countries when the time came for them to industrialise also."

And this in conclusion:

"The last war did not interrupt the historical process, it merely accelerated it. Why then should there be any doubt as to what the future is to bring to-day? "The choice seems to lie between two alternative lines of development only. Either the world will break up into a series of small units which will strive independently, or with a limited measure of mutual co-operation, to form more or less self-sufficing groups of moderate size, or the barriers separating many of the pre-war nations will be broken down completely, and from their constituent elements will be built up even larger economic units than before the war."

"The latter is the alternative favoured by economists and liberal thinkers, whose dream is of an international Eldorado of ever-increasing magnificence, complexity and size."

"By comparison the common man's instinctive craving for the security and homeliness of small units may appear small and ignoble. But it may well be, as has almost invariably happened in the past fifty years, and even longer, that economic history will once more refuse to conform to the aspirations of economists."

The processes of history take account of the small as well as the great. Size is not everything. In great Empires the quality of individual life usually declines: it becomes plain and commonplace. A writer from another field recently gave expression to this view, which to-day is gaining more and more adherents in the following terms:

"The little tribal community of Israel, the little City State of Athens, the relatively small England of Elizabeth's time, mean far more in the history of Civilisation than the British Empire. I am for small nations as against large ones, because I am for a kind of Society where men have some practical control of their lives."

While doubt may still be felt as to whether this will in fact prove to be the way of life selected by events, the whole trend of our past leaves no room for doubt on one point at least: there can be no going back to the pre-war type of economic society."

There is the voice of the plain man, and of England. The voice that has tended to be drowned during the last twenty years in shouts for Service and Sacrifice, and more Sacrifice, and the strains of cinema organs and jazz bands.

It is still and small, like the voice of Truth, and it may continue to go unheeded for a while yet, but ultimately it will swell and increase through the sheer number of individuals whose voice it is, and it will be heard.

J. M.

Labour and the Cabinet

"When Labour rank and file returned to the House of Commons after the Parliamentary recess their first demand was for more frequent meetings with their leaders in the War Cabinet, Lord Privy Seal Attlee, and his Socialist colleague Arthur Greenwood, Minister Without Portfolio."

"Since Clement Attlee took office in the Churchill Government he has seldom mixed with his old friends in the smoking rooms; he usually replies to their queries in formal letters signed by his secretary......"

"Real underlying anxiety of Labourites is, however the increasing influence which Lord (No War This Year) Beaverbrook has over Prime Minister Winston Churchill."

"The Beaver is rumoured as the author of a plan for cutting down the membership of the War Cabinet to three—Prime Minister Churchill, Labour Minister Ernest Bevin and himself."

"A notion of this kind was discussed recently at a short week-end party at Chequers. Ernest Bevin was present, and refused to have anything to do with it."

"Those who support Trade Union Leader Bevin declare he is not a politician and does not want anything to do with politics."

—News Review, September 26, 1940.

MUNICH

"It is now generally accepted that Hitler considered himself to have suffered a grave diplomatic defeat at Munich. He wanted to fight there and then, because he knew that Russia had no intention of moving, that France was in a hopeless state and that Britain was totally unprepared. The responsible Conservative leaders knew this too, and in the teeth of an hysterical and uninformed opposition which had all along been shrinking that we had only to call Hitler's bluff to make him collapse, gained a year's respite in which to begin our preparations for a modern war."

—Bedoyere in the "Catholic Herald."
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