THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 5. No. 6. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1940. 6d. Weekly.

The Results of "Planning" in Russia (I)

The history of Russia since its capture by the Bolsheviks in 1917 has been in keeping with the evil manner of its overthrow. One of the main instruments used in its downfall was Rasputin, whose influence upon the Russian State began about three years before the Great War. Concerning him that careful recorder, De Basily, says he "became the occult instrument of a group of intriguers to such an extent that eventually all the Ministers of the Imperial Government practically owed their nomination to his influence. Whereas, formerly, the ability and the political views of the candidates for the highest posts in the State had determined their nominations, the conditions now guiding their choices was that they 'loved our Friend' . ."

The Ministers thus appointed by secret interests produced the conditions which enabled Bolshevism to triumph. De Basily tells us for instance that: ". . . The Tannenberg defeat and the heavy losses sustained in the retreat from the Carpathians by the troops without arms, shocked the army and the whole nation, and the responsibility for the reverses was in a great measure ascribed to the Government. Rumours of treachery in Government circles began to circulate. The War Minister, General Sukhomlinov, who had been a special protegé of Rasputin, was even suspected of treasonable intelligence with the enemy."

These terrible events bear the hall mark, not of a constructive social force inspired by the desire to benefit humanity, but of evil designs. The results of practical socialism in Russia show that well-meaning idealists were merely tools in the hands of ruthless interests. Not only is there the evidence that the ideal in practice is a monstrous tyranny of inefficiency, but there is also demonstrated the fact that socialism is an almost perfect vehicle through which interests may pursue other than social objectives.

The Times on October 1 gave up three quarters of a column to a letter from that antiquity of Socialism, George Bernard Shaw, in which the writer claims that collective farming in Russia "has been enormously successful and has mopped up the Kulaks and Moujiks as irresistibly as our factories mopped up the children of the old hand-loom weavers.

"The moral is that, instead of wasting our energies in abusing Stalin, we must take a leaf out of his book and organize our agriculture on modern lines, as he has done." As an effective comment upon this we could quote the Communist novelist, Panferov, who in his novel *Brusski,* has very well described the state of mind of those who put collectivisation into effect: "We must beat the idea of property out of man," they said, "just as dust is beaten out of a mattress. Since the peasant is trying to bargain with us, let us knock the wish out of his head . . . To prevent the peasant from fixing himself solidly on the land, as the rook does to his nest, we must talk to him the language of guns, and dynamite every farm, together with its builder." The communist Zakhar, the hero of this novel, is conditioned to accept this situation and says: "We are manure. We are fertilizing the soil, in order to breed a new nation. Look at me. I am a victim. Yes, I offer myself as a sacrifice and I don't cry my eyes out because I haven't got any trousers. Everybody must sacrifice himself—some of their own free will, and others under compulsion. You just refuse to be a sacrifice, and we'll twist you like a ram's horn."

Possibly not many people take Mr. Shaw's politics very seriously, but the trend towards socialism in practice is a menace which threatens all of us, and a consideration of the results of socialist "planning" in Russia justifies the worst fears that could be entertained in regard to it.

"PLANNED" CONSUMPTION

The first point which would interest any realist would be, of course, what the individual citizen got out of socialism in practice. On October 5, 1940 *The Economist* informed us that "the maldistribution of goods still remains the weak spot of Soviet economy as a whole."

A table prepared from Russian statistical books by De Basily shows that the prices of such staple foods as buckwheat, rye bread, butter, meat and granulated sugar were in 1936 from 266 per cent. to 566 per cent. greater than they were in 1913, whereas the average monthly wages of the workers were only 100 per cent. higher in 1936 than they were in 1913, and furthermore that the average monthly wage was one sixth lower in 1936 than it was in 1926-27 that is, before the imposition of the Five Year Plans, which eradicated almost completely all private enterprise. The

percentage of income spent on food in 1930 was 60.8 per cent; in 1935 it was 67.3 per cent. Before the Revolution only 50 per cent. of the average workers' income was spent on food, a sure proof that purchasing power has declined.

Reports of observers who have visited Russia confirm that these figures reflect facts:

M. Ernest Mercier, a leading French Industrialist, stated in his book *U.S.S.R. Reflexions,* published in 1936, that the purchasing power of the average wage of a Russian worker is lower than that of the unemployment allowance paid in France. He says: "It is evident that one of the chief dangers to the Soviet regime lies in the difficult situation of the working population, eighteen years after the outbreak of the Revolution... and this preoccupation will induce the Government... to establish round Russia an absolute barrier in order to prevent the penetration from outside of any information concerning the social conditions of the workers in the various other countries...."

M. Rene Grosclaude, Swiss engineer, who was employed from 1933 to 1936 in an oil distillery at Tuapcé in the Caucasus has written: "Life is not easy for the Russian workers, with their average monthly earnings of 200 roubles. What can they buy? Alas! their factory co-operative store supplies them with 300 grammes (about 11 ounces) of bread per day, and 50 grammes (about 2 ounces) of sugar every two months. They have to buy the rest of their requirements in the free market, by paying 32 roubles for a kilogramme of butter, 12 roubles for meat, 2.50 roubles for a litre of milk. The 200 roubles are soon exhausted. To buy a suit of clothes, 400 roubles is needed, which represents the pay for 60 days' work; for a pair of shoes, 150 roubles, or 22 days; for an overcoat, 250 roubles, or 37 days .... A few months later, going back to Switzerland, I again saw, in passing through the customs at Negoreloie, the map with its multicoloured dots (indicating achievements of the Soviet regime). I know now those magnificent factories. I know what those astounding statistics are worth. I have seen how the 'freest workers in the world' are kept under surveillance. I understand why the country was surrounded with barbed wire, and why no Russian worker is allowed, under any pretext, to leave his country... In Europe there are many unemployed, but everybody has something to eat, while in Russia everybody works but they all go hungry."

Andrew Smith, an American communist, went to Russia full of enthusiasm and spent some years working at his trade in Moscow. According to the picture he paints, there are 11,000 men working at the Electro works in Moscow. They are distributed, in groups of 500 people, among wooden huts, where they sleep on mattresses and bags stuffed with straw or dry leaves. They have neither blankets nor pillows. In order to sleep they cover themselves with the clothes they have just taken off. There are no lavatories and the workers wash under the pumps in the courtyards. The wages vary from 100 to 150 roubles a month or 3 to 5 dollars (in purchasing power). With this pittance they must feed themselves, while meat of the cheapest quality costs 3 roubles a kilogram. A pair of the cheapest shoes is priced at 55 roubles, or half the monthly earnings. Moreover the wages are never paid in full. The State tax (10 per cent.), cultural tax (2 per cent.), and the trade-union subscription; and compulsory payments to different national and social organizations are always deducted on pay-day. After having worked for several years in a Moscow factory, Andrew Smith not only tore up his Communist Party membership card, but on his return to America hastened to warn his compatriots of the troubles awaiting those who went to the U.S.S.R. in search of work. "Even the unemployed" he writes, "live better in the U.S. than the workers do in the Soviet Union. The Russian people would be happy to eat the bread that the American workers, and even the unemployed, throw in the garbage pail." These facts are taken from Andrew Smith's book *I was a Soviet Worker,* published in 1936.

According to Sir Walter Citrine, the monthly wages of the average Soviet worker vary between 190 roubles (Skorokhod shoe factory) and 250 roubles (Kirov Engineering Works, the former Poutiloff works in St. Petersburg). In the autumn of 1935, when Citrine visited Russia he estimated that the purchasing power of the rouble was equal to 1/80th of the pound sterling (3d.) This estimate seemed to him rather to favour the rouble than otherwise. *Note*: In January, 1937, £1=24.74 roubles. Vide Walter Citrine, *I search for Truth in Russia,* London, 1936.

He estimated that the average weekly wage worked out at only 21s. 1½d.

A convinced Communist, Victor Serge, wrote in his book *Destin d'une Revolution* published in 1937: "Did one live better before the Revolution? People of about 40 are unanimous in asserting that one did from the triple point of view of food, clothing, and housing... I have more than once heard mothers deplore the fact that their children had not known the good times when, on the occasion of religious holidays, such excellent things were provided as pastry, jam, cream."

De Basily reports that the *Bulletin de la Societé Francaise d'Electrotherapie et de Radiologie* published in its issue for October 1936 an article by Dr. Denier, who spent a month in Soviet Union studying the organisation of the medical services. He praises the material conditions in which scientific work is carried on in the "Institutes of Experimental Medicine," but adds that a sharp line must be drawn between the situation of the doctors engaged in scientific research and the general practitioners. "The normal salary of a doctor does not amount to more than 400 roubles, which is not enough to live on, and therefore he usually fulfils two or three functions... He lives with his family in one room, which has to serve as dining-room, bedroom, library, kitchen, etc. What our Russian colleage suffers from most is the suppression of individualism. Life obliges them to conform to everyone's way of thinking. Everything is shared—his material existence, his intellectual life. He has nothing to feed upon but official newspapers, official literature, and a small number of professional books. How can he subscribe to foreign reviews or buy foreign books when the rouble has no value outside the U.S.S.R.? He cannot go to congresses abroad, because it is forbidden to leave the country... The material conditions are hard for our Russian fellow-doctors, but it is the moral constraint which is most odious."

W. G. Krivitsky, ex-chief of the Soviet Military Intelligence in Western Europe in his book *I was Stalin's Agent* writes: "Pictures flash through my mind... of industrialisation and the super-human demands it made upon all of us, of collectivisation and famine when we barely had the rations to keep us alive. And then the great purge sweeping all before it, ...

"There were occasions when even this faith was badly

shaken, ... In 1933, when the Russian people were dying by the millions of starvation, and I knew that Stalin's ruthless policy was the cause of it....

"One morning soon after my arrival I walked with a companion to the village where these peasants lived. The spectacle I beheld was appalling. Half naked little brats ran out of dilapidated huts to beg us for a piece of bread. In the peasant's co-operative store was neither food nor fuel—nothing to be had. Everywhere the most abject poverty dismayed my eyes and depressed my spirits...."

The communist Pierre Herbart in his *In the U.S.S.R.* writes: "Country girls accept service for something like forty roubles a month, without board, provided they are given lodgings. They sleep in a corner.... They eat the remains of food on the plates, boil tea-leaves which have already been used several times, and soak stale bread in this hot water."

In 1929 the Government organised eating-houses, a "whole State network of feeding in common." In 1932, 16,200,000 people of whom 70 per cent. were workers, fed at these places. The Soviet writer, Gladkov, has this to say about these eating houses: "We cannot feed people in human fashion. The canteens are a nightmare, a sheer mockery of the people. I go to a factory kitchen and I feel sick at the mere sight of the frightful food. I go to works where the food is brought in thermos flasks. This blue broth stinks of corpses and cesspools. The workmen prefer to be contented with only bread and water."

J. M.

(To be continued)

OUR LEADING SOCIALIST DAILY

By B. M. PALMER

O, it's a lovely war—according to *The Times*. How good it is for our characters! How happy we all are: How we all get together! How splendid it is, in the grey light of the morning all-clear, to form "the habit of silent thanksgiving for the bare fact of unadorned existence."

Unadorned.

It was really disgraceful: At one time we took a certain amount of comfort for granted. How dared we? "In ordinary times hot water, gas, electricity, snug beds and regular meals excited no more wonder and gratitude in us than the air we breathe." But now "we have learned the importance, and the uncertainty, of food and drink, of shelter and warmth, and in doing so we have surely been brought much nearer to those for whom, in the bad past, that uncertainty did not wait upon the catastrophic stroke of a freakish fate, but was a standing feature of their lives."

So much, and a great deal more to the same effect, we were told on October 8. On October 7, we were informed, on the authority of Henry VIII, surely one whose words should be held in much respect, "Idleness is chief mistress of vices all," and the leader closed with these words:—

"Almost everyone in civil life is more or less over-worked, and almost everyone is a good deal the better for it; for, as most doctors will attest, there is no sounder tonic for the average man than a dose of overwork. Out of which comes the curious truth that, save when immediate tragedy comes their way, an enormous number of ordinary, peaceable citizens are personally, in this time of horror and trial, extraordinarily happy. There is work to be done now in this island, by them for the national cause, which is also the cause of the world; and not for anything would they choose to be living in another land or at another time."

I tried this out on my charwoman who, after half a life-time spent in cleaning other people's houses, may be said to know something about work. Her remarks were not complimentary.

The poisonous part of these two essays consists in their judicious admixture of truth and lies. More often than not, when I open *The Times* at the leader page it is with a feeling of shame that I read the words which will appear before the Empire and the world as the expression of English educated opinion. It is obvious that the writers of these articles have had all the advantages of the best public school education. Their prose has classic dignity, they are never at a loss for an apt phrase, they use their mother tongue with the ease of the craftsman. And yet—what is missing? The discerning reader, will, after a time, find that it is *sincerity*. These men are writing to order, and their work is branded with those vices said to be England's worst—hypocrisy and snobbery.

Now it is a fact that humour and hypocrisy cannot live together. You never find a spontaneous joke in *The Times;* there are elephantine attempts, but, "let us remember what is fitting," they seem to say, "we can never be vulgar; we may feel for the poor, but not with them." Everything is written from the point of view of the man who has known better days. Not for one moment could it be admitted that "in the bad past" either *The Times* or its readers did not take a daily hot bath and enjoy regular meals. But now, in the wonderful present, these comforts are uncertain for us all, and therefore we are "brought much nearer" to those for whom comfort is always uncertain. We are in the fashion.

Pure, unadulterated snobbery is this, licking the shoes of those who are above, while administering a kick to those below. What is the use of being "brought nearer," anyway? The only practical result that I can see from the disgusting state in which many have to live now, is an influenza epidemic before many weeks have passed. I wonder where these gentlemen spend their nights? I'd take a five pound bet that it's not on a tube station platform, "four feet from the edge after 7-30 p.m."

Some copies of this paper find their way into every dominion of the Empire. I want to tell its readers that *this* is not the real England—posturing, preaching, hypocrites, who have experienced nothing but a fairly high standard of bourgeois comfort and are now so afraid of losing it that they are ready to sell their souls to wheedle themselves into the position of overseers in the new service state to which our "leaders" are trying to drive us; a state where there shall be "overwork" for all because doctors say it is good for you; where existence shall be "unadorned" in the

grey light of the all-clear; where we shall all be nearer together, and where we shall think of hot water, snug beds and regular meals with wonder and gratitude, not as automatic comforts. Gratitude—to whom?

Perhaps a bomb will fall on me, before this new world comes to be.

I don't think it will—I believe I shall live to see a far better world than that pictured by *The Times*.

In view of the fact that there are still large numbers of unemployed, it would be interesting to know: (a) How it is proposed to provide overwork for all; and (b) the names of the doctors advocating "overwork" as a cure for our present ills.

I once knew a doctor who worked in the out-patients department of a large East End hospital. He told me how middle-aged men and women came to him in a chronic state of general ill-health. He did what he could for them, but it was not very much, for what they really needed was a good rest, and then far shorter working hours. "But what was the use of saying so? I might as well have told them to take a glass of sherry before meals."

And as for being happy, it seems almost useless to explain to *The Times* that it is not the *work itself* that brings happiness but the *object* for which the work is being done. If the English are happy now, and I believe they are, it is for two reasons; first, because they are working for the common objective of victory, and second, because they believe that victory will bring an alleviation of their present miseries; and there is not one of them who is not looking forward to living in better times, when the war is over.

But, if, when victory comes, those whose policy *The Times* is now supporting succeeded in foisting on us a further programme of overwork and an unadorned existence, if they do, I hope that the "deserving" poor will turn and rend them.

By the way, there is a clue that should not be missed: "The ordinary, peaceable citizen." I thought there was something reminiscent of bank chairmen about the thing.

October 9, 1940.

NEWS & VIEWS

Britain's Good Intentions Towards Jewry

New York, Sunday.—Mr. Arthur Greenwood, Minister without Portfolio in the British War Cabinet, has sent a message to Rabbi Wise assuring the Jews of America of Britain's good intentions towards Jewry after the war, it was revealed here to-day.

The message is described by the American Press as the first public declaration on the Jewish question since the start of the war. It states that when victory is achieved an effort will be made to found a new world order based on "ideals of justice and peace," in which the "conscience of civilised humanity would demand that the wrongs suffered by the Jewish people in so many countries should be righted."

The Press Association learns in London that Mr. Greenwood sent his message to Rabbi Wise about a month ago through a close personal friend who was journeying to America on a series of lectures.

The message which was brought to the United States from London by Rabbi M. L. Perlzweig went on: "In rebuilding a civilised society after the war, there should be a real opportunity for Jews everywhere to make a distinctive contribution. All men of goodwill must assuredly hope that, in the new Europe, Jewish people, in whatever country they live, will have freedom and full equality before the law with every other citizen."

In an interview, Rabbi Perlzweig said he was certain that Mr. Greenwood "speaks for England," and that his message was subject to earnest consideration by the British Government.

Rabbi Wise compared Mr. Greenwood's declaration with that of Mr. Balfour in 1917. In a sense, he said, Mr. Greenwood's declaration had "wider and farther reaching implications," since it dealt with the status of Jews all over the world."

—"*Scotsman*," *October* 7, 1940.*

• • •

Mr. Greenwood originally emerged into politics from Leeds, which was at that time, whatever may now be the case, a focus of Jewish influence.

His career has been an example of the control which is exercised over Labour policy by the Jews. Punitive taxation, nationalisation of land and property—all the mysterious appeals to transfer wealth to some mysterious "public" (i.e., money-lenders)—but not a word against Finance, and in particular, the Jewish International Financier. On the contrary, every support for "internationalism," Bank of International Settlements, League of Nations, Labour Internationals, etc.

Now it is clear that this war was planned by internationalists, who backed Hitler because he intended, and openly stated his intention, to internationalise or Germanise Europe. We are justified in asking who authorised Mr. Greenwood to commit this country once again to espouse the cause of the world's mischief-makers? Are we going through blood and sweat and tears merely to decide whether Mr. Moses Sieff and his kidney Judaise Europe, *via* Hitler or *via* Mr. Greenwood?

• • •

The Compulsory Insurance of real property against damage by air-raids is of course a scarcely veiled Capital Levy. It is intended to still further tax *in money* for the benefit of those interests which *make* money, the rural property owner in order to form a fund to place at the disposal of Sir (or Lord) Reith so that he may rebuild, without expense to them, the City property mainly owned by Insurance Companies, whose hidden reserves are more than ample for the purpose. If this measure goes through, it will be a signal victory for international finance and a fresh assurance of Britain's good intentions towards Jewry at the expense of the British.

•

Mr. Emil Davies, the Jew International banker and Freemason, who is Chairman of the London County Council in place of Sir Oscar Warburg, the Jew International banker and Freemason of the Hamburg family, is a State Socialist.

He will no doubt consider that the nationalised London which is to be built on the ruins of the London bombed by National Socialist Germany will be much better security for the interest

* A passage, from another source, to the same effect was published in *The Social Crediter* of October 12.

on the international loans to be floated "after the war." Everything works together for good, as the pious Sir John Reith would say. It was stated on good authority that Mr. Davies was the anonymous but experienced banker who assisted Mr. Arthur Greenwood *et al.* to produce the notorious Labour Party Report on Social Credit.

• • •

We suggest that every owner of property write to his insurance company and inform it that should compulsory insurance of country property against enemy action become law, all existing property insurance will be allowed to lapse, and no further premiums will be paid. You can't make omelettes without breaking eggs.

• • •

If International Judaeo-Masonry were half as clever as might be expected from its purchasing power, it would not have been announced that, as Mr. Anthony Eden said, a new order would be built through war, until the war was a little further towards its end.

A new order will be built—but it is long odds against its being anything like that which either Mr. Eden or Herr Hitler have in mind.

Refer to *Fable from the Ish*, reprinted from *Punch* in *The Social Crediter* of September 7, and have a good laugh at the British (and other) Israelites.

• • •

Every war in which Great Britain has been involved for the past three hundred years has benefited financiers at the expense of the people. Every tax which has been imposed on any section of the British Public for the past hundred years has been a tax for the benefit of international finance and its satellite, Big Business. Consider the steady grading down from the castle to the villa, from the villa to the cottage, from the cottage to the slum, the ruined farms and farmed-out land, the drab, ramshackle Council "houses" as compared with the Cotswolds, or any village clustering round a big house which antedates the punitive taxation which made local administration of property impossible.

Does the picture presented by the "progress" achieved or the use made of science in the last hundred years under the influence of a gang of international crooks using legitimate aspirations to foist on us a spurious Socialism, encourage you to hope that they have any objective other than their own aggrandisement and your further enslavement? Or do you consider that the bureaucracy which they control and appoint is likely to provide the kind of Freedom for which you are exhorted to fight and die? Or are you only defending "the Right" to be Free?

• • •

Mr. Anthony Eden is going to give you a new order in Europe—but you won't find out what it is till you've got it. Father knows best. And Hitler is founding a new order in Europe. All you can see of it looks suspiciously like the new order in Russia, which is like the old order in Russia, but more murderous, inefficient, anti-British and ineffably ignorant. And Japan is going to give Asia a new order, which Mr. Eden and President Roosevelt are determined to stop.

The only place which is going to have the "old" order, as exemplified by the accumulation of all the monetary gold in the world, is the U.S. Odd, isn't it?

COSTLESS CREDIT

Douglas Jay, City Editor of the *Daily Herald*, said on October 11:—

"Our big banks are now creating credit at a rather rapid rate to lend it to the Government.

"This is one of the ways in which the gap between expenditure on the one hand and money raised from the public by taxation and loans on the other is being covered.

"Barclays Bank increased its lendings by way of the new Treasury deposit receipts from £5,000,000 to £19,500,000 in September. And Barclays' total deposits rose by £27,000,000 to £498,530,919.

"Total lending by way of Treasury deposit receipts by Barclays, Lloyds, Midland, National Provincial and District Banks during September was £50,500,000. And the total increase in deposits was £84,657,000.

"Readers ask me whether the new credit being lent to the Government by way of deposit receipts is 'costless credit' and whether the Treasury ought not to decline to pay any rate of interest on these loans. At present the banks get 1⅛ per cent. per year on deposit receipts and rather over 1 per cent. on Treasury Bills.

"It is not possible to say that any particular sort of loan from the banks to the Treasury represents 'costless credit.' But when the total of deposits in existence is being increased by the banks and lent to the Government you may be sure that virtually costless credit is being created.

"In those circumstances a practically negligible rate of interest ought to be paid, otherwise the banks are bound to increase their profits out of the process by the mere fact of the increase in their interest-bearing assets.

"That is why a much lower rate of interest than the present 1 per cent. or 1⅛ per cent. ought to be paid to the banks on new lendings from now on."

• • •

Mr. Jay's facts justify much harsher conclusions than he has drawn from them. It is beginning to be widely realised that the banking profession has not yet come into line with the rest of industry in helping, instead of impeding, the war effort.

FOR WATERPROOF SHELTERS

Women living on the Wythenshawe estate, Manchester, threaten a rent strike unless shelters are waterproofed, drained and fitted with bunks.

At a meeting recently they gave the city council a week in which to move. They threatened to storm the council meetings.

Councillor W. Johnson, leader of the city council's Labour group and a member of the civil defence emergency committee, told Manchester Labour Party delegates at another meeting that the Government had allocated cement to Manchester and would permit all available labour to be used on shelter work. Satisfactory estimates were received for the work and accepted.

The Government, however, would not at first allow the contracting vehicles to leave London, where all the materials were. That difficulty was now overcome.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Home and abroad, post free: One year 30/-; *Six months* 15/-; *Three months* 7s. 6d..

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

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

Vol. 5. No. 6. *Saturday, October* 19, 1940.

Mr. CHURCHILL'S CONCERN

It ought not to be too difficult a proposition to grasp (as a proposition, and you cannot grasp a proposition excepting as a proposition, whatever you do with it once you have grasped it) that the OBJECTIVE of the official governments of the whole world throughout the past twenty years (doubtless longer) has been WAR. What were these 'governments' working for? They were working to secure war on the largest possible scale. They succeeded. Somehow or other the natural question: "But who wants to go to war with whom?" intervenes between the ordinary process of understanding in most people and the meaning of this proposition.

To answer their question may help to remove the difficulty. The answer is "nobody wanted to go to war with anybody." Going to war WITH someone wasn't the policy of the 'governments.' The policy of the 'governments' was merely WAR. Granted there must be a taking of sides (or an imposing of sides), it wasn't where the line was drawn that mattered so much as that *a* line should be drawn, because, without the alignment there could be no war, and war, not the alignment was the policy (the objective) of the world's 'governments'. Why did the 'governments' of the world entertain this policy of war? Because to quote Mr. Israel Moses Sieff's characteristically boastful journal *Political and Economic Planning*, "only in war, or in conditions approximating to war could the British Government be got to undertake planning on a large scale." It is to be noticed that Mr. Sieff's journal did not say 'only in a war between Timbuctu and Kamchatka, or between England and Germany' was planning possible, and doubtless his preoccupation with planning in England was on the score that, while not *of* England, he lives *in* England. No one suggests that it is only England that the planners wish to plan. They wish to plan the 'old order' away everywhere, in favour of the 'new order'; and they assert that no one anywhere in the world will submit to the 'new order' unless war or conditions approximating war weakens natural resistance.

The fact that war has been merely an intermediate objective does not, however, alter the characteristics of war as it is fought. It affects only the end to which it is fought. It explains why a speedy and decisive victory for one of the sides (whatever the sides may be) is not what is sought. Indecision, prolongation, extension are what is sought by the 'governments' and it is here that the 'governments' are most clearly in opposition to the people who (in so-called 'democratic' countries) have elected them.

In his speech to the House of Commons on October 9, Mr. Churchill displayed some concern because of a tone "in certain organs of the Press, happily not numerous, a tone not only upon the Dakar episode but in other and more important issues that is so vicious and malignant that it would be almost indecent if applied to the enemy." The *Daily Telegraph* in an editorial professes to have knowledge concerning the occasion for Mr. Churchill's remark and assures him that if at any time he should think it expedient to name the few newspapers which have offended "the whole the decent Press would approve." Is it the indiscretions of *Hansard* that are stigmatised — indiscretions studiously avoided by "the whole of the 'decent' Press?" It is our business, as it is the *Daily Telegraph's*, "to make some study of the Press as a whole;" but our studies still leave Mr. Churchill in undisputed possession of the honour of being Invectivist-in-Chief against the 'common enemy.' We are interested in both the common and the commoner enemies: in the fight to keep our country inviolate from the *heel* of the aggressor and to render it secure from the wiles of the serpent. The Prime Minister's proposal to tax the country property owner to restore demolished city property owned in the main by insurance companies is one of the wiles of the serpent—or, if you like, of the Snake of Israel. Neither Mr. Churchill nor anybody else can long continue to confuse criticisms levelled against fraud with criticisms levelled against nothing in particular beyond the natural bias of politicians in favour of the retention of an unmerited share of public reputation and of the rewards which (whatever their real source) are held to accompany it.

If the Prime Minister's concern is personal, it is probably well-grounded. *Hansard* is evidence on this point where the Press (which now prints only one side) is not. It may be he would be less concerned if he understood more clearly than he does that no sensible man in England cares a brass button which cypher has the honour of representing him in Parliament, or in the Cabinet, provided he *does* represent him. No sensible man in England is in the slightest degree interested in the question of an alternative to Mr. Churchill in the Premiership. Sensible men are becoming more and more concerned with the question of an alternative to the present misuse that is made of the parliamentary system which, democratic in name but not in effect, throws the onus of responsibility upon the people for deciding who shall do and how shall be done things which no one in his senses wants done. We want to win the war and to win it quickly. We want to win it for ourselves.

T. I.

CHARGE d'AFFAIRES

Mr. Herschel Johnson will act as Chargé d'Affaires, when Mr. J. P. Kennedy, the United States Ambassador leaves. Mr. Kennedy is returning to Washington shortly. Mr. Rudolf Schonfield, the First Secretary of the Embassy, has recently been appointed by the State Department to represent his Government with the half-dozen Allied Governments now residing here.

Civilisation and Man's Divergence from Reality

By H. E.

Alternative tendencies are apparent in the development of living things. The oak, which does not reach full strength unless it stands alone; the fir which flourishes in dense forests. The bird, typical of independent life which draws little from association with its kind; the ant, which has surrendered independence and is part only of its centralised society. Man stands between, seeking both freedom and the advantages to be drawn from association with others. History records these factors as contending, but it is their resolution which is required; whereby each individual can himself select, as between these alternatives, the balance which suits him.

With his own unaided hands man may do much; his life will lack elaboration; but in general he will survive, as witness the vast period (perhaps half a million years) when substantially each person formulated his own aims; and if he could, attained them. If he wanted meat he killed it; or shelter, he found or made it; the minimum of co-operation, the least complication, the fewest points of friction in his life with others. That life had its points; Elliott Smith* produces much and convincing evidence to show that primitive man was contented, good natured, kind to his children, and fond of a joke; and perhaps our sophisticated sun-bathers, divested of very little, are much akin to one phase of his existence. But man acquired an urge towards the fuller development of the life within him; although he had not the language adequate to give it definition. It was this which led him to co-operate with others for greater results (in terms of life) than he himself could gain; and co-operation is the seed of what we call civilisation.

Elliot Smith puts the origin of civilisation at the first large scale essay in co-operation, the opportunity for which came (as all such advances) from the genius of an individual. And with this, primitive man was faced, in a single generation, with novel problems. These concerned the grasp and definition of his own objective; the organisation which would produce it; and the use and control of his own capacities within that organisation.

Throughout the slow emergence of mankind from something which was not man, and for periods contrasted with which the five or six thousand years of history's record seem almost nothing, a certain way of living prevailed. Men lived in families; groups of thirty or forty human beings wandered, infrequent and casual in their contact with others, over plains and mountains and through forests; hunting, fishing, and gathering food wherever it could be found. Six thousand years ago there was none but followed that way of life, nor ever had been, since man was man.

Changes followed. Certain of these groups used as food the seeds of wild grasses, notably rye and barley, in the Delta of the Nile. An individual of genius discovered how, by cutting and damming channels, the flow of water, and so the growth of these grasses, could be controlled and increased. And this made possible a regular supply of food, which was an increase in security and hold on life far beyond that which had existed. That was the infancy of irrigation and agriculture; and with larger quantities of grain came the need for storehouses, and this necessity produced the first buildings. The flooding of the Nile became the central event for this community; and from the need to anticipate its occurrence originated astronomy and accurate time measurement. Elliot Smith produces a weight of evidence which indicates that this, or something like it, was the manner of birth of the vast complexities of the social organisation in which we now find ourselves embedded.

It is probable that primitive man had no abstract conception of freedom; he lived it, choosing, within the small circumference of his environment, this or that alternative. This choice was limited by nature but by little else; he could do or not do what he wished, and that is the substance of freedom. To him this must have seemed "as natural as nature," a part of his own being; but immediately on that discovery which contained such possibilities of increase in the scope of freedom .... he lost it. Within a generation man entered into slavery, submitting to the domination of one man. Osiris, the man of genius, became King, the first King; and God, the first God. Irrigation, agriculture, astronomy; each craft and science as it was born, became a secret cult, a Mystery, which centred in him. Believed to be the veritable author and channel of life, none could live apart from the worship of Osiris. All must obey his hierarchy of priests; for with them lay the power to bestow or withold the source of life itself; and so the inborn faith in a fuller life was transmuted into faith in Osiris. The end was suborned to worship of the means.

The expansion which followed culminated in the civilisation of Egypt, the precursor and model of centralised states whose practice is domination; whether the means be priestcraft, finance, or force of arms. It is not necessary to idealise the primitives nor disregard such parts of civilisation as are tolerable, to realise that, in applying an increasing grasp of reality to the fulfilment of his objective, man has had but limited success. Civilisation was founded on the relationship of those who dominate to those who submit, and that relationship is still the basis. Willing co-operation to attain a defined result conjoined to the full ability of the individual to cease co-operation at will—that is a relationship scarcely known to history, although to pre-historic man it was a commonplace. Nevertheless since man came to realise that he had lost his freedom, ceaseless endeavours have been made to regain it, by individuals and by groups. Christianity; the Greek and later Democracies attempted it, but as organisation developed all became injected with that virus which they sought to destroy; and in attempting to impose freedom by domination they destroyed themselves. The framework of human relationships which will enable men to secure desired objectives while still retaining personal liberty, has been lacking; and the road to its discovery has been blocked.

In entering upon this experiment primitive man required organisation; for irrigation, if not systematic, is not effective. He had no previous experience, but the search for organisation need not have led to slavery. He was,

*The background of this article is from *Human History*, by G. Elliott Smith, published by Johnathan Cape.

perhaps, incapable of defining his objective—food with freedom—but that need not have led to the loss of freedom. He required faith, "the substance of things to come," but that need not have been diverted from those things to the person of the man who promised them. It is true that the complete attainment of his aim involved a precision which at that stage was beyond him. But in his hand he held the key—the process of trial and error.

Throughout long ages that guide had not failed him. In the use of fire, the development of flint instruments, the attainment of skill in hunting, fishing, finding food; substantially, in pre-Osirian days, the clean-cut recognition of results was not obscured. If some different berry or root were tried as food, or a new tool or method of hunting, it worked or it did not work; and the experience so gained built up a skilled tradition which was successful in bringing men with greater certainty a little more of what they sought. It is significant that immediately upon man's first considerable attempt at co-operation for these same results, the issue became blurred. Why did he not pursue the same method, trying this or that manner of co-operation until he found the right solution? But he did not, and instead the ability to make such varied experiments was taken from him. Almost at once society became re-cast into the fixed mould of domination and submission. A screen was erected between man and the natural consequence of his actions. Food (life) no longer rested on the reactions between himself and his surroundings, but became dependent on submission and obedience to those who ruled him.

That men should so easily have surrendered freedom is astonishing, illuminated perhaps by the consideration that they did not know they had it. But those other men who took it, who devised the screen of misplaced faith and invented rewards and punishments as the mechanism of slavery —that could not have been done in ignorance. Submission is passive, but domination active. Elliot Smith makes mention of pre-Osirian cults, but not in relation to what followed. But this conjunction of hypnotic process and the surrender to it has not the appearance of complete novelty; suggesting rather the seizure by a pre-existing and relatively impotent agency of the real power over nature which came with the practice of irrigation and agriculture. Whatever its origin, this dark force is not one sided; domination must have its counterpart in submission. Domination; rooted in vanity and pride, which, reaching out to the control of others is destructive to life and man's objective. Submission; as of man to man, founded on fear—the rejection of life and human attainment.

The possibilites open to action taken along the grain of reality are limitless, but which possibilities are discovered and perpetuated depends upon the objective by which action is inspired. Bread did not exist before man made it with "life" as his objective; nor poison gas, with a different aim. Long ages ago mankind set out on an exploration of the universe and the beginning of civilisation marked a departure, in the endeavour to work with others for a common objective; and that involved the arrangement of human relationships in the organisation of action. The present dislocation and threatened destruction of society is the consequence of the perpetuation of the relationship of domination and submission which was then set up. And ultimately what makes this possible is a force which must be called "hypnotic." Osiris had nothing more than such a force with which to induce the implicit faith that the results he promised (food) could only be secured through him.

This relationship has produced the nexus of falsity in which succeeding hypnotisms have flourished; the thousand sanctions exerted by the Egyptian deities, and their transference to later religions; the mysteries of freemasonry and the like; the codification of domination and submission in Judaic religion; the investiture of "money" with imaginary sovereignty, and of "work" with moral quality; of "leaders" and institutions with powers of "government" of those whom they should serve.

These are the dark forces at the disposal of those who dominate the modern world; Hitler and other militant dictators preferring the mechanism of war, and Bernard Baruch and Moses Sieff as representative of "finance," the dollars which as they imagine, control such forces. But neither could have the least effect if men were not conditioned (hypnotised) to accept it. (No three year old child would ask for work when he wanted food; and we are counselled to become "as little children.")

Elliot Smith has shown how, by the insight of some one person, the innate conservatism of man is from time to time shifted to a new centre. Such an advance is initiated by genius, uncovering some new sector of the nature of things; and may be used towards that "life more abundant" which is man's objective. It will be so used only if man, in the "truth of his being" lives and acts in re-presentation of that objective.

For six thousand years men have struggled and have almost foundered in attempts, against relentless opposition, to co-operate in moulding the powers of nature to their own ends. The knowledge of those powers is multiplied, but not the spirit of man which alone can focus their operation upon his own objective. But another shift in the centre of gravity of men's affairs is possible; it may be that it is imminent.

Unless man submits to the destruction of society he must advance in his exploration of reality and set his affairs upon a more secure foundation. That advance must lie in the connection between knowledge of the physical universe and man's objective; and is to be found in the adjustment of human relationships, to the abandonment of the framework of domination and submission which is entrenched in opposition.

Another framework of relationship is possible, such as will interlock the principles of freedom and self control—as these exist in man's own nature—to the effect that individual action will be in line with the results desired by man from his society.

> The primary requisite is to obtain in the re-adjustment of the economic and political structure such control of initiative that by its exercise every individual can avail himself of the benefits of science and mechanism; that by their aid he is placed in such a position of advantage, that in common with his fellows he can choose, with increasing freedom and complete independence, whether he will or will not assist in any project which may be placed before him.
>
> — C. H. DOUGLAS.

That is the outline of a framework of society which, reflecting those relationships natural to human beings, would work. Insight and understanding have made possible the next stage in man's exploration of the nature of reality.

POOH BAH

At a meeting of the Charges (Railway Control) Consultative Committee at which he lodged a protest against the proposed increase of fares, Mr. W. J. Lovell, General Secretary of the United Commercial Travellers' Association, during his cross examination of Sir William Wood, Vice-President of the London, Midland and Scottish Railways and member of the Railway Executive Committee, put the following question:

MR. LOVELL: There is only one other question, and I want to get it clear. We were told in your cross-examination by one of the learned Counsel here at the front table, that the railway companies, or, rather, the Railway Executive Committee, are merely acting as agents for the Minister of Transport.

A.: Yes.

Q.: An agent presupposes a principal, does he not?

A.: Yes.

Q.: So, in effect, the Minister of Transport is acting as Minister of Railways?

A.: He controls them.

Q.: He is the Controller; I do not object to the word Controller.

A.: Yes.

Q.: So we are now faced with this very delightful Gilbertian situation, that the Minister of Transport, as the Railway Executive Committee, applies to himself for an increase in fares, which he submits to this Committee for this Committee to refer back to himself again, so that he finally can bring in an order permitting an increase in fares—in other words, he is somewhat in the nature of a Pooh Bah?

A.: Well, you do not expect me to accept all that statement!

Q.: I do not expect you to reply to it, but I suggest that that is the position?

THE CHAIRMAN: And it is not far out.

MR. LOVELL: It is not far out, is it?

A.: No.

LORD BEAVERBROOK'S ASTHMA

"Important eyebrows in important places gave a sudden jump one night last week when the *Evening Standard's* 'Londoner's Diary' was seen to contain a paragraph that Lord Beaverbrook's asthma was returning with the bad weather.

"First rumours of impending Cabinet changes were going the rounds at the time. There had been reports that Winston Churchill and his normally dynamic Minister of Aircraft Production were not getting on as well as usual.

"Because of his asthma, or for other reasons, Lord Beaverbrook had absented himself from several meetings of the War Cabinet.

"As Lord Beaverbrook owns the *Evening Standard* and, before entering the Government, took a deep interest in the 'Londoner's Diary,' dictating several paragraphs for inclusion every day, wiseacres read into the statement the possibility that he might have to take a rest from Government work.

"Some people said they knew for a fact that Max's departure for treatment was imminent. Others said that in any case Lord Beaverbrook was due for a change and would succeed ex-Premier Neville Chamberlain as Lord President of the Council.

"When the Premier issued details of his Cabinet changes following the announcement that Neville Chamberlain had resigned, there was no reference to Lord Beaverbrook in any way.

"Those who had been sure that 'The Beaver' was to be President of the Council were puzzled; those who thought his asthma serious were nonplussed.

"The only denial issued about that time relating to Lord Beaverbrook's activities for or on behalf of the Government was to the effect that he had not flown to Berlin several times recently, as suggested in New York reports, to arrange peace parleys with Adolf Hitler."

—"*News Review*," *October* 10, 1940.

• • •

Lt.-Colonel Moore-Brabazon, the new Transport Minister, is a personal friend of Lord Beaverbrook.

The Wheat Problem

In a recent statement Mr. Aberhart protested against the delay in arriving at a settlement of the wheat storage problem and the problem of money advances to farmers compelled to store grain on their farms.

The Alberta Premier pointed out that this grave problem was brought to the attention of the federal government as far back as last July. At that time the need for immediate action was stressed, but no solution has yet been arrived at.

"We were given to understand that a solution would be reached by Saturday last, but it is now Thursday and no decision has been made," stated the premier. "This is the greatest indictment of the Dominion government, the banks and the wheat board and their jointly espoused method of handling our economic problems."

In the course of his statement he said:

"Ottawa is stalling on this wheat problem because tongue-in-cheek bankers won't co-operate. Ottawa doesn't need interest collecting bankers who have demonstrated their utter disinterest in Western Canada. The Bank of Canada can finance the storage of grain on farms and let the farmers get the benefit of the storage charges. Here's a chance for the Prime Minister to make good his boast of 1935 that the Bank of Canada would be given control of the currency and credit of the country. He now has sufficient cause to see that it is done because is this not a national emergency and have not the private banks refused to help? .....

"The bickering that has been going on between the Dominion government and the banks and all this talk about lack of storage is a national disgrace. Since we can cope adequately with the demands of our complex war effort surely we can build enough granaries to store this year's crop and the crops for the next ten years if need be.

"But that shouldn't be necessary. The people of Western Canada are asking why the Argentine was able to unload her last season's crop, largely on the British market, while Canada's crop lay stored in our elevators—and piling up storage charges. They are coming to the conclusion that there has been gross inefficiency somewhere and that this inefficiency is wholly responsible for the dilemma they face at present. . . . .

"The people of Canada . . . . will hold the Dominion government, the banks and the vested interests wholly responsible for any collapse that may follow because these parties to this muddle have stolidly refused to apply scientific principles to economics even as our engineers apply such principles to mass production in industry."

EYE ON PARLIAMENT

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

October 8.

War Situation (72 columns)

The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill):

. . . I do not propose to give the House a detailed account of the episode at Dakar. . . . This operation was primarily French, and, although we were ready to give it a measure of support which in certain circumstanecs might have been decisive, we were no more anxious than was General de Gaulle to get involved in a lengthy or sanguinary conflict with the Vichy French. That General de Gaulle was right in believing that the majority of Frenchmen in Dakar was favourable to the French Free movement, I have no doubt; indeed, I think his judgement has been found extremely sure-footed, and our opinion of him has been enhanced by everything we have seen of his conduct in circumstances of peculiar and perplexing difficulty. His Majesty's Government have no intention whatever of abandoning the cause of General de Gaulle until it is merged, as merged it will be, in the larger cause of France.

There is, however, one part of this story on which I should like to reassure the House, as it concerns His Majesty's Government alone and does not affect those with whom we have been working. The whole situation at Dakar was transformed in a most unfavourable manner by the arrival there of three French cruisers and three destroyers which carried with them a number of Vichy partisans, evidently of a most bitter type. These partisans were sent to overawe the population, to grip the defences and to see to the efficient manning of the powerful shore batteries. The policy which His Majesty's Government had been pursuing towards the Vichy French warships was not to interfere with them unless they appeared to be proceeding to enemy-controlled ports. Obviously, however, while General de Gaulle's enterprise was proceeding it was specially important to prevent any of them reaching Dakar. By a series of accidents, and some errors which have been made the subject of disciplinary action or are now subject to formal inquiry, neither the First Sea Lord nor the Cabinet were informed of the approach of these ships to the Straits of Gibraltar until it was too late to stop them passing through. Orders were instantly given to stop them at Casa Blanca, or if that failed, to prevent them entering Dakar. If we could not cork them in, we could, at least, we hoped have corked them out, but although every effort was made to execute these orders, these efforts failed. The Vichy cruisers were, however, prevented from carrying out their further purpose of attacking the Free French Colony of Duala, and of the four French vessels concerned, two succeeded in regaining Dakar, while two were overtaken by our cruisers and were induced, persuaded, to return to Casa Blanca without any actual violence.

The House may therefore rest assured—indeed it is the only point I am seeking to make to-day—that the mischievous arrival of these ships, and the men they carried, at Dakar arose in no way from any infirmity of purpose on the part of the Government; it was one of those mischances which often arise in war and especially in war at sea. The fighting which ensued between the shore batteries at Dakar, reinforced by the 16-inch guns of the damaged *Richelieu*, and the British Squadron was pretty stiff. Two Vichy submarines which attacked the Fleet were sunk, the crew of one happily being saved. Two of the Vichy French destroyers were set on fire, one of the cruisers was heavily hit and the *Richelieu* herself suffered further damage. On our part we had two ships, one a battleship and the other a large cruiser, which suffered damage —damage which although it does not prevent their steaming and fighting will require considerable attention when convenient. . . .

Mr. Lees-Smith: There is another question, on which I do not ask for an answer, about another mistake made in the Dakar expedition. It requires comment. The Prime Minister explained that General de Gaulle was right in believing that French feeling was favourable, when the expedition was initiated. Therefore the project and the expedition were no doubt good, but for the fact that, between the initiation of the expedition and its arrival at Dakar, and even while it was on the sea, the entire situation changed. We were, in fact, forestalled, before the expedition reached Dakar. The impression I received from reading the episode was that another major misfortune of the adventure was that it was persisted in after the conditions of success had disappeared. Clearly, when General de Gaulle reached the port under the new conditions he had no chance of success, even with British ships behind him. Dakar is a very heavily defended port. I am told that it is the second most heavily defended port in the world. Remembering all the circumstances, it is clear that, even if the British ships had engaged, it would have been impossible for the attack to be successful, unless much larger forces had been brought in. The major error, apart from the ships, was that of continuing the expedition when it must have been very well known that success would have been impossible.

That brings me to one of the lessons of this exploit. I have once mentioned the matter before, and I wish to draw attention to it again. It is very surprising that the Intelligence Services were not fully informed of the situation in Dakar long before General de Gaulle arrived, and well in time to prevent the final fiasco which took place. It is clear that the German Intelligence Service has been very much more efficient than our own Intelligence Service. Dakar is a very favourable place for our Intelligence Service. There are plenty of British residents, and British traders have been there for a long time. It is puzzling to understand why our Intelligence Services were not better informed than they appear to have been.

Mr. John Morgan (Doncaster): . . . With regard to Dakar, I was hoping that his general admission that it was some fault on our part which enabled the Dakar authorities to be reinforced meant that the Prime Minister was accepting the major blame, for this country as a whole, for the failure of the expedition. Because we allowed

that force to proceed through the Straits, so making all the difference to the de Gaulle expedition, the fault was ours. If we admit that we, in error, allowed that expedition to proceed—which had the effect of discounting the effectiveness of de Gaulle's expedition—the fault was ours, then we should accept the full responsibility for failure.

Mr. A. Bevan (Ebbw Vale): May I interrupt my hon. Friend to say that a very much more sinister rumour is in circulation to the effect that de Gaulle himself said that he thought the enterprise ought to be abandoned but was overruled by the Prime Minister? If that is not true, it ought to be denied.

Mr. Morgan: That is not a question to which I can properly address myself, and I have no intention of doing so. . . .

Mr. Stokes: . . . I was astonished by the Prime Minister's statement that the First Lord of the Admiralty did not, apparently, know what was happening to these ships. As the hon. Member for Mossley (Mr. Hopkinson) said, the right hon. Gentleman had only to read the daily Press to see that the ships were coming through Gibraltar. Everybody wondered why. Everybody thought there was a deep plot, and that presumably all the ships would surrender when they were safely down the West Coast of Africa. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the Governor-General of Nigeria and the Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in West Africa were in agreement with this scheme and whether they supported it from their local experience of what the feeling was in the district. Secondly, rumour, which, of course, is frequently wild, suggests that the forces that went to Dakar were perhaps not sufficient. I should like to ask whether it was left to the officer commanding the naval forces off Dakar to decide whether he should attack or not, or what was the decision given from this end? That is an important point which ought to be cleared up, and the blame ought not to be laid upon that officer without the position having been made clear to the British public.

That raises the question in my mind—whether or not the Higher Command, be they the Air Force, Army or Navy, are being interfered with too much by politicians who think they are generals? There is a great danger in that. We had experience of it in the last war.

October 10.

Oral Answers to Questions

(18 columns)

Mr. Parker asked the Under-Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs what progress had been made with the proposals for evacuating children overseas; and whether he can give approximate figures as to the number of children, British and foreign, respectively, who have left the country in the last four months privately, and under Government scheme?

The Under-Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs (Mr. Shakespeare): Figures for the four-months period are not available. During the three months ending August, 1940, however, the number of British children aged 5 to 15 years, who had their normal residence in the United Kingdom and who left the country under private arrangements for the Dominions and the United States of America were 4,579 and 1,617 respectively. The number of aliens aged 0-15 years, who had their normal residence in the United Kingdom and who left in the same period for the Dominions and the United States of America were 46 and 359 respectively. The number of children who have arrived safely at their destinations in the Dominions—or are nearing their destinations—under the Children's Overseas Reception Scheme is 2,666. There was no movement under the scheme to the United States of America. As the hon. Member will be aware, the scheme has been suspended for the time being.

WAR AIMS.

Mr. Mander asked the Minister of Information whether he has any statement to make with reference to the policy of war aims and post-war plans on which the Government are working, and the campaign intended, to give the public a definition of these aims; and whether the position of Allied Governments fighting with the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations will be included?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Information (Mr. Harold Nicholson): I regret that I am not yet able to make any statement.

Mr. Mander: In view of the fact that the Ministry of Information announced in the Press that, from 7th October, there was to be a campaign in the country on the subject, and in view also of the fact that the Government are examining post-war plans at present, why is the hon. Gentleman unable to say anything to the House of Commons about it?

Mr. Nicholson: The matter is under constant examination.

Mr. Mander: Owing to the unsatisfactory nature of the reply, I beg to give notice that I will call attention to the matter on the first occasion that the House meets after to-day.

CAMOUFLAGE

Camouflage of the Banks by the Banks for the Banks:—

These people who have any real knowledge about war-time finance are aware that the main purpose behind the financial propaganda which is being drummed into the people through the medium of the various "savings" campaigns, is to disguise the fact that the bulk of the money which is borrowed by the Government is credit created by the banks. "War Weapons' Week" in Cardiff was inaugurated at a lunch presided by the Lord Mayor, revealed something about how the "savings" mount up. The Lord Mayor after saying that the Prudential Insurance Company were sending a cheque for £50,000, "referring to promises already made" mentioned contributions from Sir W. Reardon-Smith and family, £110,000; Mr. Walter T. Gould, £30,000; Frederick Jones and Co., £25,000; Guardian Line, £5,000; Cardiff Gas Company, £5,000; F. Bowles and Son, £1,000 free of interest; and Crynant Colliery Company, £1,000. One un-named bank promised £50,000, another un-named bank £25,000, and he said he had good reason to believe that four others of the great banks would contribute about £50,000 each, and the Cardiff Trustee Savings Bank £1,500. . . Altogether there was a grand total of £515,000.

It would be interesting to know how much of the money not subscribed directly by the banks, was money loaned to subscribers by the banks.

HIGHLY INTELLECTUAL

The centipede was happy quite
Until the toad in fun
Asked her which leg went after which.
That worked her mind to such a pitch
She lay distracted in a ditch,
Considering how to run!

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.

BELFAST D.S.C. Group. Monthly Group Meeting on First Tuesday in each month, in the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at 8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon. Sec., 17, Cregagh Rd. Belfast.

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 Wavertree 435.

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

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association. It is important that all Social Crediters on Tyneside should maintain contact. Write W. Dunsmore, Hon. Secretary, 27, Lawton Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; 16, St. Ursula Grove, Southsea; or 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor.

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

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

The Social Crediter

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

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

Please send *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* to me

Name .....

Address .....

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

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

EXPANSION FUND

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

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

Name .....

Address .....

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

Name.....

Address.....

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

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

I will, until further notice, contribute

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

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

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

Signature.....

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

Books to Read

By C. H. Douglas:—

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

By L. D. Byrne:—

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

ALSO

The Douglas Manual 5/-
The Economic Crisis:
Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report ..... 6d.
The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold 4/6
Economics for Everybody by Elles Dee ..... 3d.
The Power of Money by J. B. Galway .....3d.
The Purpose of Politics by H. E. .....3d.
Invincible Britain by John Mitchell .....2d. each, 1/6 doz.

and

Tax-Bonds or Bondage and the Answer to Federal Union by John Mitchell...1/- (Postage 2½.)

All from

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

LECTURES AND STUDIES

The correspondence course is being distributed on the same terms and conditions which held previously.

The syllabus (3d. post free) may be had on application to:

Mrs. B. M. Palmer,
35, Birchwood Avenue,
Sidcup, Kent.

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