

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 7. No. 21.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 31, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

### THE BIG IDEA (III)

I think that there are two simple concepts which it is essential to grasp in considering the nature of the conspiracy against the individual. The first is that bureaucratic Socialism is probably the most inefficient method of conducting an economic system which has ever been devised. The second is, that a reasonably efficient economic system, such as *Laisser Faire* combined with a sane financial system, would make "employment" ineffective as a means of Government. Having thoroughly grasped these ideas, it is well to remind oneself that wisdom was not born with us, and is unlikely to die with us. In other words, others have grasped these simple facts, probably some time ago.

From the purely economic point of view as distinct from the destruction of war, efficiency of the scientific management type is completely unnecessary. There is no necessity for cut-throat competition, and it is not "natural." There is no genuine scarcity which is not consciously produced, and I am beginning to disbelieve in the idea that there ever was any genuine unavoidable scarcity.

What is quite clear is that every advance in productive capacity with diminishing human labour effort, has been nullified, and even more than nullified, so that economic life is less secure, and, in relation to possibilities, less widely civilised, than it was five hundred years ago. And that this situation has been used with Satanic cleverness to transfer more and more power to those who have caused it.

Socialism, or to give it its correct name, Monopoly, is not a *production* system, which is exactly what one would expect from its origins. That this is a simple statement of fact is being demonstrated in this country at the moment. It is a legalistic system based on a power complex supported by a set of abstract slogans which its policies and results contradict, where these have any concrete meaning. The idea so skilfully inculcated that confiscation of property will assist in the distribution of wealth is, of course, completely without foundation. Socialism is a restriction system, as any examination of Socialistic practice in the Trades Unions will confirm, and it has two well defined fundamental principles—centralisation of power, both economic and political, and espionage.

That is to say, every advance towards Socialism is an advance towards the Police State, as anyone who will give five minutes attention to the increase in the number of licenses he now requires in this country (which even yet is less completely enslaved than Russia and Germany) can see for himself. And if anyone supposes that the licensing system is purely a war expedient, then I can only envy his optimism.

Now, it is commonly supposed by those who have not devoted much attention to the subject that the German-Jew, Karl Marx, is the father of modern Socialism. This is incorrect. There is not a single original idea in Marx.

"He found everything that his system contains in the British Museum. His Communism was that of Babeuf, his theory of wage slavery was current during the French Revolution, his idea of the class war had originated with Weishaupt, the Illuminist, his theory that labour produces all wealth had been formulated by Robert Owen and the Chartists, his theory of surplus value had also been proclaimed by the Chartists." — (WEBSTER).

What is much more important is that at the time that Marx was practically living in the British Museum, supported by the German, Engels (who had made an immense fortune by exploiting Lancashire child labour), the whole country was ringing with attacks on the financial system, Cobbett was attacking the Bank of "England" and the Jews, Atwood was writing on currency, and the disorganisation and distress which culminated in the "Hungary Forties" was only kept from assuming the proportions of a panic, by the employment provided by railway and canal development on privately subscribed funds. There is not a word about the dominant position and responsibility of finance to be found in Marx, and Socialism has attacked every form of property, and at this moment is attacking every form of property, except that which is the monopoly of the international financier, and has steadfastly refused to have anything to do with financial reform. Practically every one of the theories which Marx had welded into the Communist Manifesto had been tried out experimentally and all, with the exception of the Co-Operative Movement, which is mainly the child of Robert Owen, whose psychology was correct, had failed completely. Had, of course, the Co-Operative Movement obtained control of its own credit, which it never did, and never tried to do, it would inevitably have developed into a completely successful social and economic system.

By 1848, Socialism, as it had been attempted, was dead. "It is evident that at that date, some pact was formed between German Imperialism and the Jews of Germany. . . Socialism, a derelict concern, was now taken over by a Company. That Company was the German-Jewish band of 'Social Democrats'" — (WEBSTER). Bismark, it will be remembered, speaking of these people thirty years afterwards, said, "we march separately, but we fight together." This statement seems to close any discussion as to the relation between Marxian Socialism and the constant state of war and threat of war which has been existent since the inception of the Bismarckian Reich.

Now, the policy of the Bismarckian Reich was the policy of Anacharsis Clootz the Freemason, and the same policy which "Hitler" is pursuing at this moment—the United States of Europe, dominated by Germany, and the monopolistic trust, first developed in Germany, and controlled by a great Bank of the type which the Bank of "England" has now become, was the perfect complement to the propaganda of the Social Democrats. The Jews at the head of the *Deutsche Bank*, the *Dresdner Bank*, and the

*Disconto Gesellschaft* were in constant contact with the German Socialists, and regarded them simply as part of the bureaucratic organisation of European States otherwise insulated from German-Jewish influence.

To what extent Marxian Socialism was a genuine workers' movement, or had as its object the real good of the under-privileged can be gathered from his published correspondence, in which he refers to the French as "Parisian chatterboxes" and to "the English Trades Union *schweinhunde*" (pig-dogs). Marx worked for Bismarck, tried to paralyse the resistance of the French to Prussia before 1870, just as the Socialist movement in Great Britain has worked for the fifteen years from 1920 to 1935 to make a German victory certain, and was stated to have received £10,000 from Bismarck for his services, and did not deny it.

His gratitude to this country for having sheltered him can be gathered from his message to the Internationale in 1870; "The English are incapable of making a socialist revolution, therefore foreigners must make it for them. The

point to strike at first, is Ireland, and in Ireland they are ready to begin their work."

Events, however, were against Pan-Germanism and the bureaucratic State. The latter half of the nineteenth century saw the tremendous rise in the power of the British Empire, and the comparative prosperity of a mercantilist system during a period of rapid expansion. Socialism languished.

The United States of America began to come into the picture, and the Big Idea had to ensure that there was no complication from that quarter. William Jennings Bryan and his bi-metallist campaign were more menacing to the money-power than anything in Europe, and Max and Paul Warburg left the inner circles of German-Jewish finance in the flesh only, to become "Americans."

(To be continued).

(All rights reserved).

C.S. Douglas

LET US ALL SING

## A Ditty of Control

By KEVIN PADRAIG

What is the thing  
That'll ring  
The knell of freemen  
And bring  
To two or three men  
Despotic knavery;  
And to all men  
Slavery?  
CONTROL.

To-day we have on us  
Birth control  
Life control  
Travel control  
Bread-wrapper control  
Oil control  
Gas control  
Jewellery control  
Wage control  
Price control  
Timber control

But we haven't got  
Control control.

And we haven't got  
Money control.

Nor have we yet got  
Interest control.

If you repeat the word  
Control  
One time  
Two times  
Three times  
Four times  
Five times  
Six Times  
Seven times  
Eight times  
Nine times  
A thousand times

See what happens:

Control, control,  
Control, control,  
And so forth  
And so on  
*Ad infinitum*  
Till you're damn crazy  
Repeating it  
It suddenly seems  
That the word  
CONTROL  
Is meaningless.  
Stupid.  
Silly.  
Crazy (like you)  
Nutty, balmy,  
Batty, nerts;  
Until, in fact  
You declare that there  
Is no such word as  
Control.  
Then, my children,  
When your mind  
Reaches that  
Conclusion  
It has reached  
The conclusion  
That the psychological  
Controllers  
Want it to reach.  
"Psychological conditioning"  
Says Stamp,  
Will permit  
The ramp  
And the imposition  
Of tax mountains  
Hardly dreamed of  
In early years.  
Therefore, it is reasoned,  
The more you are  
Burdened with  
Control  
The sooner will you  
Not believe  
There is any

Control.  
Because then,  
My children  
Your mind will be under  
CONTROL.  
*Let us all sing a ditty  
Of control  
That will rouse every city  
'Neath the Pole  
Hey, nonny nonny and a  
Breakfast roll;  
Control, control, control  
(Damn it, don't you know  
there's no such word?)*

## Envoi

Dat ees der leedle tingk  
Dat vould bringk  
To der shentlemens  
And der shentlevemens  
A measure of gontrol  
Vit der honey  
Of der money  
Chust a ledle stingk.  
(We meansh a stingk  
dat pricks you; not der  
stingk that hits der nose;  
der pricker on the branch,  
Not der flavor of der rose).  
All togeder den, we singk  
Till ve make der velkin ringk:  
*Let us all singk a ditty  
Of gontrol;  
Dat will rouse every city  
'neath der pole.  
Hey, nonny, nonny, and a  
Hoi, yoi, yoi  
Gontrol, gontrol, gontrol  
Get into line there you  
blank, blank, blankety  
blankety blankety  
So-and-soes.)*

Reprinted from "Today and Tomorrow."

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Reliable information is reaching us from Australia and New Zealand which indicates that a good deal of money and trouble is being expended to pervert the Social Credit Movement.

The method is easily recognisable as proceeding from international finance and is almost identical with the methods by which the monetary reform agitation, commonly known as "Bi-metallism" was used by Kuhn, Loeb and Company to assist the centralisation of American Finance in the Federal Reserve Board, with Max Warburg and the Schiffs in almost complete control. The spell-binder, quite possibly not aware of his backers, who is active in the Antipodes, is stated to be of semi-Jewish extraction.

"My chief interest in the Jewish question is to keep it out of the money movement," stated the editor of *Money* in October, 1941.

Right every time: and how about keeping the Jews away from the money, Barney?

Lord Wardington, chairman of Lloyds Bank, in his annual address to shareholders gave some details of the scheme under which the banks have agreed to open accounts for traders for clothing coupons.

Nearly 3,000,000,000 coupons have been issued on the present ration of 66 per head. At present they have to be counted and checked at each stage of their journey from the ration book to the textile mill or tannery.

Under the proposed scheme the actual coupons will pass only once, from the retailer to the bank, which will then replace them with certified transfer orders—coupon cheques. The banks are undertaking this scheme for the Board of Trade.

It was reasonably to be expected that the banks would acquire some sort of footing in the coupon systems. The aim of coupons, it was stated at their introduction, was to limit consumption to the amount of goods produced, and to distribute them fairly. Presumably the issue of coupons was carefully based on the amount of goods available in a given time; and it is obvious that, had the impulse been there, the coupon-system could have been used very effectively to nullify, supplement or otherwise modify the power of those behind the money system. No monopolist takes kindly to the supercession of his powers.

Real credit has been defined as "the correct estimate of capacity to achieve."\* For war purposes real credit in the form of the capacity to make clothing, has been arbitrarily limited to a certain volume, where it has been "couponised." While we have no doubt that the administration by the banks of the coupon-banking will be excellently run, it is to be hoped that they themselves take seriously Lord Wardington's roguish remark that no overdrafts on these coupon accounts will be admitted: the horrors of the orthodox rules of banking applied to other forms of tickets as well as money are not to be contemplated lightly.

The City Editor of the *News Chronicle* on January 19 gave some interesting figures on the importance of the small

\*C. H. DOUGLAS: *The Control and Distribution of Production.*

firm in war production, based on the official statistics of 1936:—

"The statistics relate to the personnel employed at factories and works and we find that out of a total of 141,394 such works, no less than 108,765 (or 77 per cent.,) employed only 25 persons or fewer. A further 9 per cent. of the factories employed between 25 and 50 workers; 6 per cent. employed 50 and 100, and 5 per cent. between 101 and 250.

"If, therefore, we define a small factory as one employing no more than 250 workers, we find that no less than 97 per cent. of our factories—137,294 out of 141,394 in 1936 fell into that category.

"A further 2½ per cent. employed from 251 to 1,000 workers and could be described as moderate-sized, while only 519 firms or four out of every thousand, employing 1,000 and more could fairly be described as 'large.'

"Of course, the percentage of all workers employed by the large firms is much greater than the percentage which such firms bear to the total number of firms. Even so, some 52 per cent. of all workers in the factories were employed by the small firms—the 1 to 250 class—and only 18 per cent. by the 1,000 and upwards class."

He added that these facts were given to him at a small gathering of industrialists interested in gingering up production. One of the group summarised it: "You can't have aeroplanes without the small man."

"The New Forest is to be used in a big communal farming experiment," according to Dr. F. W. Kenchington, assistant executive officer to the Hampshire War Agricultural Executive Committee, "the aim being to keep the Forest commoners on the land and to breed cattle in large numbers."

The Government have prepared a ranch scheme, and 1,000 acres in the Beaulieu area have been taken over for the initial experiment. If the scheme succeeds it will be extended to 10,000 acres, with a Government grant of £5 an acre. The ultimate aim is 20,000 acres to support 10,000 head of cattle.

"No living inhabitant of the Soviet Union has been corrupted by ease or luxury," says H. R. Knickerbocker in *The Daily Express*.

Don't they wish they had the chance?

Bradford Corporation Finance Sub-committee have recommended that the Association of Municipal Corporations should be urged to take, without delay, requisite steps with a view to reducing the rate of interest now payable by municipalities on loans to the same rate of interest as is paid by the Government.

Bradford was the centre of a strong Lower Rates Campaign.

There is a rumour going round that the "best" people of New York are arranging that their sons shall be drafted in the garrison troops for South America. Less influential cowboys and cowherds will be sent to England. If things go wrong they are in for a bad time. There be bulls amongst the goyim.

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*

One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 7. No. 21.

Saturday, January 31, 1942.

### HANG THE KAISER

"The Allies publicly arraign the ex-Emperor William II for a supreme offence against International Morality and the Sanctity of Treaties. The ex-Emperor's surrender is to be asked for from the Dutch Government and a special tribunal is to be set up consisting of one judge from each of the Five Great Powers. The Tribunal is to be guided by the highest principles of international policy and is to have the duty of fixing whatever punishment it thinks should be imposed." — *Daily News*, May 8, 1919.

"Representatives of nine allied countries . . . place amongst their principal war aims the punishment, through the channel of organised justice, of those guilty and responsible for these crimes, whether they have ordered them, perpetrated them, or in any way participated in them." — *The Times*, January 14, 1942.

But the report of the Inter-Allied Conference at St. James's Palace makes it clear that the delegates understood only too well, by bitter experience, the part played in the war by the *character* of the German people. Speaking of post-Versailles policy, M. Pierlot on behalf of the Belgian Government, said, "They knew where 20 years of this policy had led them. The lack of firmness and cohesion shown by the conquerors did not only allow Germany to re-arm until she became the strongest nation; it also helped to encourage, in actual warfare, a repetition of those barbarous methods of which Germany had shown herself guilty.

"Let us never again forget this: the finest principles, the most firmly established laws and moral codes, run every risk of being ignored unless sanctions are applied."

General de Gaulle concluded his speech with these words: "But if it is legitimate and necessary to ensure full punishment for crimes committed, it is quite as legitimate and necessary to take the essential measures so that a renewal of such crimes should be made impossible. We are certain that the solidarity which unites martyred Europe to-day will continue to manifest itself to-morrow, when our task will consist in ensuring that Germany will never again be in a position to harm the world."

Although it is possible that neither the Belgians nor the French, hitherto the principle sufferers under "the pest of Europe," are clear as to the measures to be taken to preserve their national sovereignty against a renewal of these terrible experiences, it is certain that they would not agree that the present war is a mere episode caused by the emergence of 'that man Hitler.' General de Gaulle emphasised that this was the third time during a century that the French had suffered the atrocities inevitably accompanying all Ger-

man occupations. As the strength of the Reich grew, the extent and violence of these occupations had increased.

No mention of this part of his speech was made in *The Times's* leading article on *The Allies in Conference* (January 14). But it contained these words:—

" . . . And even this tragic catalogue does not exhaust the full tale of atrocities now being perpetrated all over Europe and set in motion by Hitler's cruel will.

"The declaration, by proposing to seek out and punish those personally guilty of the worst barbarities of the Nazi tyranny, rejects the hateful doctrine of corporate responsibility which Nazism, both before and since the war, has sought to propagate. It is no part of the allies' programme to make whole races or whole communities suffer, as Hitler has continually done, for offences committed by some of their members."

No clearer evidence could be needed of the determination of the powers behind *The Times* that the general public should accept the idea that "it's all that — Hitler." In the paragraph quoted above it has been very cleverly done, by means of a false analogy that only those with a certain understanding of the meaning of democracy will detect. There is absolutely no parallel between the brutal shooting of fifty innocent Frenchmen because the murderer of a Nazi officer has not been caught, and the upholding of the fact that a people are responsible for their own leaders. If the German people are not responsible for Hitler, who is? We should very much like to learn this from *The Times*, but fear it would not be part of its plan to vouchsafe such enlightenment to its readers. For our part, we are convinced that although nothing can absolve the German people of the ultimate guilt of suffering themselves to submit to such tyranny, a frank answer to that question would involve the disclosure of the names of certain persons who helped to make that submission the completest and most abject in history. But it is desired that their identity shall never be disclosed; it is not intended that *they* shall suffer with Hitler—they must live to repeat the process.

Thus the "Hang the Kaiser" and "Punish Hitler" campaign are seen to be identical—remove their tyrants and the German people will be found to be no different from any others. It is no accident that this view is put forward by the dupes of the "Federal Union" propaganda whose success depends on the destruction of national sovereignty, and with it the doctrine of a nation's corporate responsibility for its "leaders." The two go together—sovereignty and responsibility are both to be surrendered to an international authority, and with them will go all sanctions and freedom: for freedom and responsibility are as inseparable as the two sides of a coin.

Bearing in mind the admirable definition that "justice is minding your own business" we feel confident that a plan could be formulated by which every nation in Europe could be induced to mind its own business, and force the component German states to mind theirs. But this will not be done if we listen to the sentimentalities of Mr. Gilbert Murray: "the soldiers are not yet quite willing to commit the cruelties ordered by the Nazi leaders, though of course, not venturing to protest or resist." (*The Times*, January 20).

For all practical purposes the crimes of the leaders are the crimes of the nation.

B. M. P.

## WHAT, AGAIN CLARENCE!

By N. F. W.

You can treat a book like this\* in several different ways. There is the vein exemplified in the Notes of the Week of this paper. Or you can regard it as a public menace, and speculate apprehensively whether the average citizen both here and in the States is so bone-headed as to fall for its specious reasoning; or whether he has still retained a nose for propaganda and false emphasis. Or one can let oneself respond combatively to the intense personality and egotism of the writing, which is urgent to the verge of hysteria, and displays more than ordinary blindness to what does not suit its requirements and its thesis.

The thesis is universality, regretfully modified by circumstances to a union between the United States and Great Britain plus its Empire. But it is to be noted that the book, its "fraternal" theme notwithstanding, contains from beginning to end not the faintest reference to any affinity of tastes or culture between America and Great Britain, nor, indeed, does it show the least appreciation of a possible need of any, as a basis for union. The tie-up envisaged is an association of the purest legalism, utterly inorganic. Indeed, the sharpest, most lasting impression left by this presentation of the case is of having been in contact with just that spirit of intolerant and insistent egotism of mind that makes of even everyday co-operation—surely the first step to union of any kind—a practical impossibility.

In truth, the book is not so much an exposition of the intellectual thesis of universality, as of a pathological urge towards more bigness—megalomania, in short. Mr. Streit doesn't want the moon, but he wants the world well and properly secured by means of Lord Lothian's "overwhelming force behind the Law," to prevent, as he says, the danger "of the prolonged concentration of power in one man's hands."

It is, unfortunately, of the nature of dictatorship that it is debarred from the approval or promotion of dictatorship as a general practice. Does it really appear to Mr. Streit's literal mind or is he merely at pains to convince his readers that his one-man problem, as above, is met and solved by giving control of the entire world, or at least the English-speaking section of it, into the hands of four or five men—the Federal Cabinet—and that thereafter no one can call it dictatorship? That's Democracy, that was!

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about *Union Now With Britain* is that in spite of its name, Britain—described somewhat naively by the author as "a nation of 47,000,000 Churchills"—as a cultural, human factor, simply does not exist for Mr. Streit. True, she speaks American—"The proposal is," we read on page 20, "that we Americans invite the men and women of the other democracies that speak our language . . . to unite with us"—she speaks American, or a colourable imitation of it, and has rather usefully, as it turns out, spread that language to a lot of the other, and strategic, parts of the earth's surface, which presumably she hadn't sufficient wit to federate to herself, but left foolishly free—as the author describes it: "like the spokes of a rimless wheel." She is, above all, the owner of a still highly serviceable fleet, whose retreat at

least to Canada, in the event of Hitler over-running the British Isles, would be ensured by Union. Beyond that, nothing.

The basis of the book is unmitigated opportunism. It would not be exaggerating to say that from beginning to end there is not a suggestion that Anglo-Saxon culture is a matter of any preponderance or consideration whatsoever in human affairs. Or, in fact, that the British nation is good for anything except as a ladder, and none too safe at that, by means of which the land of Mr. Streit's adoption may manage to keep above the rising tide and reach to where he wants her to be.

On this theme he is quotable. "At bottom peoples can organise such" (world) "government in two ways only. . . . The *government-to-government* method is the old way of Europe. . . . The other, *man-to-man* system. . . can be called the American way—the only system of inter-state government that has proved it can do the task." The italics are not mine!

It will be seen that for Mr. Streit the British Commonwealth of Nations contains no social ideal at all; none at least that fits in with his theories and his requirements and that therefore he can afford to recognise. His cultural horizon is, naturally enough perhaps, bounded by the United States; but that the tone and tempo of American culture might not be temperamentally acceptable to Britain's is a point that has never occurred to him, or one that he thinks of no account.

It is, however, when the author really gets down to his task of convincing the average American citizen of his interpretation of their destiny, and drops social philosophy for practical politics, that he becomes truly enlightening. His object is over-night conversion by the well-tried method of panic and threat, combined with material inducement, and in his haste he says more than an earful.

"We Americans," he complains on page 131, "have less control over what the British Government will do to-morrow than the British Government had over the French Government in the French debacle." "What about Canada?" he writes persuasively to an enquirer on page 171. "You wouldn't willingly let Hitler be New York's neighbour in the North, would you? How would you defend Canada. Along the lines that Washington is now following? Those lines leave the Canadian Government free to go to war over-seas when it pleases". . . "In the present meeting in Ottawa one Canadian ranks with thirteen Americans. If that is good Americanism then why not give New York State with its 12,000,000 people at least as much voting power as Canada has in these grave problems of defence?" "Let's end this diplomatic [*sic*] system of governing our relations which gives the British Commonwealth six votes (one for each State) to our one, and organising them henceforth on the American Federal Union basis, where representation is proportional to population. *That would give us a majority in the Union Government.* Are you against that?" Sez you! The italics are mine. I would point out that the above was written in the spring of 1941 while the United States was still technically a spectator in the war.

To a likely question posed by himself as to whether Union would "harm our industries or farmers?" Mr. Streit answers with an emphatic, No. "Gigantic opportunities," he continues with glowing enthusiasm, "would be opened up. A rise in the standard of living of millions of consumers

\**Union Now With Britain* by CLARENCE K. STREIT.

would result from the expansion of markets and the consequent lowering of prices for mass-produced goods. Even a relatively slight expansion in their known markets would enable U.S.A. automobile manufacturers (to take only one example) to cut prices." And, of course, there would be nothing so obsolete as a British or Dominion tariff; so that there would be no further need for Rovers, or Austins, or Rolls-Royces.

Whether Mr. Streit is sincere or not in his contentions is, I think, beside the point. I have not wilfully quoted him out of his context; but the extracts I have taken are, in my estimation, the author at his frankest, and disclose the true motive force and realism of his book, which is not made clearer, but only confused and hidden by his theoretical padding, which I think may most of it be dismissed as mere wishfulness—the state of affairs described lately in the Notes of the Week as "theory in search of a fact."

Federal Union is no coincidence. Nor is Mr. Streit—neither he nor those he represents. They fit in too well with "the general design of things" for that. It should repay to keep one's eyes open, for although much that Mr. Streit and his backers advocate seem contrary to nature, we must not forget that human history can, unfortunately, show many outrages on nature. These men, whoever they are, know what they want, and give no indication of being squeamish—in fact, where their interests are concerned their inhibitions may be assumed to be negligible.

"To defend America" concludes Chapter 12, "we must be true to American principles, and apply them where they most need applying now. To save our Federal Union and its freedom we must now carry them across the seas to the British as boldly as our fathers [*sic*] carried them across this continent." These "democrats," we see, harbour no weak-kneed notions as to individuals in association getting what they want. Dictatorship they abhor, but the thing that Britons *must* have, and quick, too, is American principles, regardless of whether they want them or not. And as proof of the pursuance of this mission, is found at the end of the book a list of Propaganda H.Qs. already established in every major unit ('States' already, by the way, to Mr Streit) of the British Commonwealth of Nations—not excepting India!

I think for its blatant and pushful salesmanship of a purely self-interested idea the book must be designated vulgar—all propaganda is fundamentally vulgar, and those who indulge in it must be prepared to have it so called, at least by the discriminating. But I feel the climax is reached at the opening of the last section, which, despite paper difficulties, displays two whole pages completely blank but for one sentence in very small italics, thus: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend.—Jesus." The hint has been dropped. So now we know!

## PARLIAMENT

JANUARY 20.

Oral Answers to Questions (31 columns)

### HOUSE OF COMMONS SPEECHES (ELECTRICAL RECORDING).

*Captain Plugge* asked the Prime Minister whether he will consider making arrangements for the broadcasting of important speeches made in the House of Commons, in view

of the fact that such arrangements were made in connection with the recent speeches by the British Prime Minister to Congress in Washington and in the Canadian House of Commons?

*The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill)*: I have considered this matter long and carefully and also with diffidence, as to some extent at the present time it affects myself. It certainly would be a very great convenience, and would, I believe, be welcomed by the public, if an electrical record of major statements about the war could be made. This record could be used for subsequent broadcasting, which might be deemed to an advantage. In my own case I have been constantly asked to repeat the speech I have delivered in the House over the broadcast later. This imposes a very heavy strain, and is, moreover, unsatisfactory from the point of view of delivery.

It has been represented to me that in the Dominions and in the United States there are very large numbers of people who would like to listen to a record of the actual speech or parts of it rather than to a news summary, such as are usually compiled—very well compiled—by the British Broadcasting Corporation. Moreover, such a record could be used at the most convenient hours in the various countries concerned, which now encircle the entire globe. I should hope, therefore, that the House might be disposed from time to time to grant me or any successor I may have during the war this indulgence. As an innovation of this kind in our practice should be most carefully watched, I should propose that an experiment should be made in the case of the statement I have been asked to make at an early opportunity upon the present war situation. There must necessarily be in this statement a good deal that is of some interest both in America and Australasia as well as in India and South Africa. A Motion will, therefore, be placed on the Paper for discussion allowing this procedure to be followed on this occasion only. As a separate Motion will be required in each individual case, the House would have full control of the practice; and if it were found to be objectionable or invidious or not in the public interest, it could be dropped. Evidently the practice would not be suitable to periods of Party Government.

The record would be the property of this House and its use, in the event of any controversy arising, would be a matter for decision by the House under Mr. Speaker's guidance. As this is a matter which affects the customs of the House, I shall leave the decision to a free Vote.

*Sir Hugh O'Neill*: I take it that my right hon. Friend did not mean that he would actually broadcast to the public while making his speech? [HON. MEMBER: "No."] In any case is it not a fact that the main function of this House is debate and criticism, and if the practice of broadcasting is to be adopted, or possibly even taking records of *ex-parte* statements by the Prime Minister or anybody else, ought not replies to these speeches to be similarly recorded?

*Mr. Hore-Belisha*: While I recognise, of course, the great importance of my right hon. Friend's statements and the keen and appreciative desire of the public to hear him, will he bear in mind that Parliament, of its nature, is not a platform but a representative Assembly intended to express the whole will of the nation? Will he, therefore, see that any account that is given of the proceedings of Parliament will be impartial and unbiased and will give expression to all points of view? Before the House is committed

to this course and before the Motion is put down, would it not be possible to appoint a Committee under your aegis, Mr. Speaker, to consider this proposal in all its implications?

*Captain Plugge:* While I thank my right hon. Friend for his reply does he think it right that the British listening public should be granted, through the B.B.C., facilities for listening to an Allied Prime Minister in an Allied Parliament such as a President of the United States in Congress, yet be denied the same facilities for listening to their own Prime Minister in their own Parliament?

*Sir William Davison:* Are we not right in thinking, from the statement of the Prime Minister, that this would be a purely exceptional war measure when all parties are united under his leadership and that it is not intended to be a precedent for the broadcasting of ordinary matters of party politics?

*Mr. Shinwell:* Who said so?

*Mr. Thorne:* Will the Prime Minister consider the advisability of having the speech he made in Canada printed for circulation?

*Commander Sir Archibald Southby:* Will my right hon. Friend bear in mind that the two speeches to which the Question refers were not made in the course of Debate, whereas any speech made by my right hon. Friend in this House must be made in the course of Debate and may be criticised by Members of this House, whose criticism may be divorced from his speech?

*Mr. Mander:* Is it the intention that the whole speech, with any interruption which might occur, would be recorded just as it is made, or would there be editing by Mr. Speaker or anybody else?

*The Prime Minister:* The idea is that a record should be made for subsequent use. This would be convenient because of the great difference in time between this country and the United States, Australasia, India, South Africa and so forth. I also have the feeling that in the circumstances of this war, when matters have to be spoken of which intimately affect so many of our Dominions and Allies, there might be advantages in taking this course. But I am entirely in the hands of the House. If they do not feel they can give me this easement on this occasion as an experiment, I shall not take it amiss in any way, and I will do my best over the broadcast that evening to repeat what I have said.

*Mr. Hore-Belisha:* Would my right hon. Friend consider the proposal I have made, which is not made in any way to hamper? Would he appoint some small representative committee of experienced Members of this House who might consider all the implications and various difficulties which might arise—for instance, the difficulties of interruptions?

*The Prime Minister:* No, Sir, I am leaving it to the House. I think the House is quite as competent as any particular group of individuals to consider this matter. I dealt myself very carefully with the question of the records. It would be a matter for decision by the House, under Mr. Speaker's guidance, as to whether anything should be left out or should not be reproduced—for instance, if anything was said which revealed a military secret. This is now removed from the published records, and similar latitude would be provided for in this case. I do not propose to adopt the right hon. Gentleman's suggestion.

## Business of the House

### PARLIAMENTARY VACANCIES (NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES)

*Mr. De la Bère* asked the Prime Minister whether, in view of the practice which has been prevalent of nomination by the various political organisations to fill a vacancy caused by death or retirement of a Member of Parliament, he can state the total number of candidates returned without a contest since the beginning of the war, and give an assurance that no legislation will be introduced precluding the standing of a candidate for Parliament who is independent and unconnected with the political party organisations, which would have the effect of rendering admission to the House of Commons one of co-option?

*The Prime Minister:* I have been informed that since war began there have been 47 uncontested and 26 contested returns of hon. Members to this House, and with the exception of one case (Cambridge University), the results have not changed the numerical strength of the different Parties as they stood at the outbreak of war. In reply to the second part of the Question, it is not proposed to introduce legislation to restrict the nomination of candidates.

*Mr. De la Bère:* Does my right hon. Friend realise that the whole matter wants a great deal of thought and vigilance so as to see that no abuse does creep into these matters for the duration of the war?

*The Prime Minister:* Yes, Sir.

## JANUARY 21.

### Oral Answers to Questions (35 columns)

#### ROYAL AIR FORCE

##### AIRCRAFT (SPARE PARTS)

*Mr. Garro Jones* asked the Secretary of State for Air whether he is aware that the director of repair and maintenance under the Ministry of Aircraft Production is stationed in one town, that his technical staff are stationed in another town, that the Air Ministry organisation for the provision of spare parts is situated in a third town, and that the actual supply of spare parts is the function of a director of depots situated in a fourth town; that this system involves inordinate delays due to correspondence and other paper work; that important communications upon which the supply of equipment depends frequently take two or three months to make the complete circuit of reference; and whether he is prepared to consider proposals for a better arrangement?

*Sir A. Sinclair:* I am aware that the dispersal to which the hon. Member refers is administratively inconvenient, but in the existing circumstances governing Government Department locations and accommodation this must be accepted as inevitable. Because it causes delay in the transit of correspondence, special arrangements for the delivery of urgent communications have been made. The supply of spare parts to the Royal Air Force is carried out by maintenance units under the control of a group commander whose headquarters are adjacent to those of the Air Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Maintenance Command; therefore I cannot agree that the arrangement must involve any considerable delay in the supply of equipment. If the hon. Member has any suggestions to make, my right hon. Friend the Minister of Aircraft Production and I will, of course, be glad to

consider them.

*Mr. Garro Jones*: Is the right hon. and gallant Gentleman aware that many of those who are responsible for administering this part of the machinery of supply are greatly concerned about the dispersal of the various Departments, and that delays amounting to three or four months in correspondence regularly occur?

*Sir A. Sinclair*: I am aware that this dispersal, which is forced upon us by circumstances outside our control, does involve serious disadvantages. I am taking every possible step to minimise these disadvantages, and I am in consultation with the Minister of Aircraft Production now. I shall be very glad to receive any suggestions.

*Mr. Garro Jones*: Will the right hon. and gallant Gentleman make an explicit investigation into the possibility of bringing these various Departments into closer geographical relation?

*Sir A. Sinclair*: I should be very glad indeed if it were possible. That is certainly an aspect of the problem which is very much in the mind of the Minister of Aircraft Production and my own, and will be part of the study which we are now giving to the matter.

### RECORDING OF PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT

*The following Motion stood upon the Order Paper in the name of The PRIME MINISTER.*

"That the statement on the War Situation to be made by the Prime Minister in this House on the First Sitting Day after January 25 be electrically recorded, with a view to being subsequently broadcast."

*The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill)*: As there appears to be so much difference of opinion about this Motion which stands on the Order Paper, I do not intend to press it.

*Sir Hugh O'Neill (Antrim)*: In view of the statement which the Prime Minister has just made, can he say whether it is still his intention to broadcast to the country on the same day as he makes his speech in the House of Commons?

*The Prime Minister*: Yes, Sir. I shall do so.

*Sir H. O'Neill*: In view of the fact that it is obviously a great strain on the Prime Minister to make two speeches on the same day, one in the House of Commons and one on the wireless, would it not be better in future if he arranged to make his broadcast statements on days when he does not have to make an important speech in the House of Commons?

*The Prime Minister*: I will bear that in mind, but my reluctance to do the same thing twice over on the same day arises less from fatigue than from certain inartistic qualities naturally inseparable from a re-hash.

*Captain Plugge (Chatham)*: While appreciating the reasons prompting my right hon. Friend to withdraw this Motion, may I ask him if he will not consider appointing a small Committee of the House of Commons to look more fully into the implications of this question as a result of my suggestion yesterday?

*The Prime Minister*: I think I have had enough of it.

*Sir Percy Harris (Bethnal Green, South-West)*: Does the Prime Minister realise how much the House of Commons appreciates his democratic instinct and his desire to defer to

the general feeling of the House?

*Mr. Shinwell (Seaham)*: Has the Prime Minister ever considered whether there is another Member of the Government capable of undertaking these broadcasts?

*Sir William Davison (Kensington, South)*: Does the Prime Minister realise that the objections which are felt to his original proposal arise from fears that it would set a precedent for ordinary matters of party politics, and would not democracy be well advised to show that it can adapt its procedure to deal with times of national emergency?

*Mr. Hore-Belisha (Devonport)*: Further to what the right hon. Baronet the Member for South-West Bethnal Green (Sir P. Harris) has just said, may I say how much this action will be appreciated as being in marked, significant contrast to what would have happened in dictatorship countries? It is a most generous gesture.

### SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND

#### SOCIAL CREDIT CIRCULATING REFERENCE LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* is in course of formation. It will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a considerable number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon the subject, as well as standard works on banking, currency, and social science. No charge will be made to registered annual subscribers for this service but a deposit of 15/- will be required for the cost price of postage, which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion. A packing box, which must be returned with the books borrowed, will be supplied free. For further particulars, apply Librarian, 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

### REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

*Information about Social Credit activities in different regions may be had by writing to the following addresses:*

BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.

BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.

BLACKBURN S.C. Association: 168 Shear Brow, Blackburn.

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

DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.

LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.

LONDON Liaison Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.

Lunch hour re-unions on the first and third Thursdays of the month at 12-30 p.m., at The Plane Tree Restaurant, Great Russell Street, W. C. 1. Next Meeting February 5.

MIDLAND D.S.C. Group: see Birmingham.

NEWCASTLE-on-Tyne Douglas Credit Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.

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

SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.