

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 8. No. 14.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"...in his opinion, very little had altered in Russia. Before 1917 about four to five hundred thousand people lived really well; about the same number do so to-day.

"About twelve million enjoyed reasonable conditions of life. It might be about the same, to-day. The rest just didn't count. . . . The difference is, of course, that no-one, rich or poor, lives as well as their counterpart did before 1917." (The population of Russia is about one hundred and seventy millions. — Ed.)

*With Sikorski to Russia:* MAJOR VICTOR CAZALET, M.P.

"I think, too, that a great but not unnatural mistake was made by foreign observers who believed that the severities and miseries of the collective farm campaign, which cost countless lives, had alienated the peasants from the Kremlin, irreparably. They did not understand the sad but realistic fact that all who had opposed collective farming were dead or exiled."

*The Kremlin and the People:* DURANTY.

"At Singapore. . . . Britain's hitherto dominant position in Asia was dealt a death blow. For in the Far East, unlike Europe, British authority has throughout been based on racial prestige. . . . In the unconditional surrender exacted from Lt-General Arthur Percival, as in the earlier dismissal of Sir Robert Brooke-Popham, there was a certain tragic symbolism. It was intensified by the fact that General Percival rose from the ranks to see his career ended as a prisoner of the Japanese. . . . And the humiliation, by earlier standards, of a Chinese War Lord [Chiang Kai-Shek] advising the British Raj on India, is supreme."

— DR. FELIX MORLEY, in the *Saturday Evening Post* U.S.A.

Dr. Morley views with resignation the incorporation of the best bits of the Empire in the United States.

"The United States, in spite of their delight at the downfall of England as a world power, are very much upset at the state of affairs in the Far East, which seems irreparably lost; and at the expansion of Japan."

— GENERAL LUDENDORFF'S prophecy of the course of the war: *The Coming War* 1931.

The Hebrew word for "Galilean" means "Gentile"—non-Jew.

This war will be won when the English, Scottish, and Welsh realise that "organisation" means attributing to a

mechanism the qualities of an organism. Probably the last country to realise this will be the U.S.A.

As between Germany and Great Britain, sympathy in South America, and particularly in the key country, the Argentine, is or was, definitely pro-British. As between Germany and a British-New-York-American-German-Jew coalition, sympathy is definitely pro-German.

Just as we sabotaged our invaluable friendship with the Islamic culture of the Near and Middle East to please the Zionists, so we are sabotaging in South America the prestige of the English, ("palabra de Ingles" — the Word of an Englishman) to please the Wall and Pine Street Jews.

No Clarence, I wouldn't say the war was won yet. When the Jews sold the Russians in 1917, the Germans thought they'd won the war, but when the British sold the Arabs to the Jews, the Germans found that the 'Americans' had won the war. I should wait to see who's sold last, before celebrating. How would you like a separate Russo-German Peace? Has the Jap Ambassador left Russia?

Of course you can't have any petrol for your Austin Seven. Regular Oliver Twist, you are. Don't you know we sent seven 8,000 ton tankers through the U-boat zone, to Spain, full of petrol, last week alone, so that the Spaniards could have their week-end runs to the sea-side? At Gibraltar. We're World-Planners, we are.

The Austerity racket is a branch of "Economic Warfare." Minister, Dr. Hugh Dalton (Eton, Kings, Fabian Society, London School of Economics, P.E.P., £3,500 per annum). Instead of petrol for your Austin Seven, you get two Spanish oranges of the 1925 leftover. The shells are said to make excellent slug-traps.

When the war is over (!) you will have become so used to higher thinking and plainer living that you will positively like to produce more and consume less.

The New Zealand Railways once had a good restaurant car service. And then the blessings of nationalisation came to them and the service was "Rationalised," *i.e.*, cut down and made less convenient and the restaurant cars were abolished.

What was it I heard you say, Clarence?

The June issue of the *Review of World Affairs* published by the Imperial Policy Group names Mr. Clement Davies (incorrectly spelled *Davis*) as one "who had played some

part in bringing Mr. Chamberlain down." Mr. Clement Davies is (*Who's Who*, 1941) a director of Lever Bros., and Unilever Limited, and Lever Bros., and Unilever, N.V.

To know anything about the lull on the eastern front you have to be able to say 'yeh'—and live there.

As was not pointed out in Parliament in a question querying official listening-in on the telephone, if you first arrange for your lines to wheeze and groan under the number of calls, and then introduce 'priority' calls, you then have an excuse to inflict upon the public systematised eavesdropping. It would never do for 'priority' calls to be abused, would it?

We note in passing that the national debt at May 31, 1942, amounted to £13,520 millions, and that the increase since March 31, 1939 was £6,500 millions.

The Co-operative movement, which already distributes one third of the milk supplies of this country, has offered to undertake, on a non-profit basis, the work of the 50,000 producer-retailers and 30,000 dairymen now distributing the remaining two thirds of the milk.

## THE GIFT-HORSE

By B. M. PALMER

Those ladies who write indignant letters to *The Times*, complaining that the carefully guarded secret of their ages must be stated in their application for new ration books can scarcely recognise the conditions in which we are now living.

Whether their sensitiveness can be spared in the present crisis "is for our rulers to decide" says *The Times*, in the best manner of Charles Augustus Fortescue. Ours not to reason why.

These ladies are merely experiencing, in a very minor degree the insolent bureaucratic demand for truthful answers to the most intimate of questions, which the poor have had to endure in increasing measure since the existence of poverty became a vested interest. But under Socialism there can be no secrets. Officials of the Ministry of Health, Food and National Service know all about us, and may penalise us if we try to withhold the truth.

In the same issue of *The Times*, and on many other days, letters have advocated family allowances. None of their writers thought they were advocating the extension of the principle of Public Assistance to every family in the land. In order that this should be thoroughly understood, *The Daily Mirror* hastened to close the gap in its leading article for Tuesday May 12, in these words:—

"A system of family allowances to be democratically sound should apply to all. New snobbish distinction between those who draw the money and those who do not should be avoided." And added—

"Some M.P.'s do not want their six hundred a year. They get it all the same."

It is obvious, as the word implies, that family allowances are intended to place the recipients under an obligation. An army of officials will have access to all details of family

life, records may be kept of health, heredity, school progress and so forth, and results tabulated and made into graphs. How students of "socio-economic forces" must long for the rich field of investigation which will then lie open! Their knowledge of a woman's age will be as nothing, in comparison with other facts she may be compelled to divulge.

You see, if some families did not have the allowances they would be comparatively free. It is control that is wanted. It has even been suggested that all allowances should be in kind for fear the parents might spend the money on themselves.

I think we can take it for granted that these allowances are 'skeduled', but not of course for the benefit of those receiving them, only as a means for further control. Nothing whatever of real benefit will ever be offered to us. We are perfectly justified in looking every gift horse in the mouth, and if we fail to do so, we shall have only ourselves to blame if, later, we find we have made a bad bargain.

Monetary reformers may consider the family allowance as a halfway house to the National Dividend. It is more likely to lead in the opposite direction. Nor is it any answer to assert that an allowance would become a dividend if it were paid out of money created for the purpose instead of out of taxation. A national dividend implies unrestricted access to the national wealth. What is the use of money which we cannot spend as we desire?

The completely unrealistic frame of mind of many reformers is exemplified in the letter of Mr. Seebom Rowntree, who partly based his claim for allowances on the fact that in 1936 children of parents with incomes over £250 a year were  $3\frac{1}{4}$  inches taller and  $8\frac{1}{4}$  lbs. heavier than those whose parents were below the poverty line, quite overlooking the fact that under food rationing all children's diets are equal, consisting mainly of adulterated starch and fat substitutes. In a few years time there will probably be equality in health, on a low standard.

And on what shall we spend our new dole?

It is worthy of note that no publicity was given to these allowances until the rationing and coupon system were so well established that individual choice in board, clothing and shelter had practically disappeared. In such circumstances the extra money could be used for little beyond the payment of rates, taxes and insurance premiums. At present it may also be used for education, but there is little doubt that individual choice of schools may be 'skeduled' to disappear as soon as the system of allowances is established—may, in fact, be conditional on its acceptance. All those who accept state allowances must accept state education—I think that is practically certain.

[Look at Mr. So-and-so—he spent his allowance on sending his son to an art school—waste of money—what will he be fit for in after life?]

However, there is one point that occurred to me this morning and I set it down here for what it is worth—'skemes' and 'skedules' can only be developed in periods of comparative tranquility—no rigid coupon or rationing system could possibly have been developed in this country during 1940-41. Conversely the complete Hitlerian rationalisation attempted in Germany *must* crumble under intensive air raids and will probably do more to disturb morale than the bombing.

Whether we shall have the mental resilience to abandon

the 'skedules' and resume our rational way of life when the crisis comes is on the knees of the gods? No—in the hands of social crediters who know what they are doing now.

## News from Alberta

In February two Canadian visitors to Australia, the Reverend Dr. Robertson Orr and the Reverend Dr. McMaster Kerr, addressed a gathering of social crediters at Sydney.

Dr. Orr said that the interest of himself and Dr. Kerr in Social Credit was purely religious, and in Alberta they had seen a great Christian experiment being made, headed by Mr. Aberhart. Mr. Aberhart expressed his own high resolve by a paraphrase from Lincoln's Gettysburg speech: 'That this Province, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that Government of the people for results demanded by the people shall be shown to all the earth.'

Dr. Orr then referred to the disallowance of the Albertan legislation by the Canadian Federal Government. The disallowed legislation had been designed to distribute to the people of Alberta the wealth of Alberta, an aim to which no reasonable or intelligent person could raise any objection. It had been declared *ultra vires*. Dr. Orr went on: "The Canadian Government disallowed legislation that might have been passed by the Supreme Court, and it allowed legislation to go to the Supreme Court which it knew the court would declare *ultra vires*!"

"In Canada the judiciary is far more under Government control than it is here. *There is not a person who has been appointed to the Canadian judiciary whose resignation was not in the hands of the Minister for Justice on the day of his appointment!*" (Our emphasis).

Dr. Orr had asked Mr. Fraser, the present Prime Minister of New Zealand, what New Zealand had achieved without adding to the public debt, what social credit principle had he implemented. Mr. Nash had said: 'Well, I'm afraid I can't tell you that.' Mr. Aberhart had replied to a similar question that Alberta had not borrowed one dollar since his government took over in 1935. Mr. Aberhart thought the chief difficulty in introducing social credit was that the people were ignorant and ill-informed, unaware of their power.

"Taking the British Empire from north to south and from east to west," continued Dr. Orr, "Alberta is the only Government in the British Commonwealth that has not increased taxation or debt."

After describing briefly the Treasury Branch System and its operation, which has doubled the demand for goods and services produced in Alberta and which has to some extent by-passed the disallowed legislation, Dr. Orr referred to the social credit experts sent by Major Douglas to advise the Government, and said of Mr. L. D. Byrne: "His special function is to advise the Government on its Social Credit legislation and a very fine and capable man he is."

Dr. McMaster Kerr, in the course of his address, declared:—

"IT IS MY FIRM CONVICTION, AND I MAKE THE STATEMENT WITH A FULL SENSE OF THE SERIOUSNESS OF WHAT I SAY, THAT BEFORE THIS WAR ENDS CANADA IS GOING TO HAVE A SOCIAL CREDIT GOVERNMENT."

## Points from Parliament

MAY 20.

Oral Answers to Questions

### COAL INDUSTRY

#### MINERS (RELEASE FROM ARMY)

*Mr. Robertson* asked the Secretary for Mines why the applications made by Fordel Mains (Midlothian) Coal Company, Limited, for the release from the Army of their surface foreman, Guardsman T. Craig, have been refused; and whether he is aware that this man is grade 2, employed in a sanitary squad at a home depôt and anxious to get back to his work in the pits, where he would be doing work of greater national importance?

*Mr. Grenfell*: The arrangements for the release of men from the Army relate to men for whom underground work is immediately available. The application for the release of Guardsman T. Craig for employment as a surface foreman is, therefore, not within this arrangement.

*Mr. Robertson*: Is the Minister aware that Guardsman Craig is a key-man and that his firm miss his services? Is he aware that this firm have, without success, made every effort to release him and that he is employed only on these duties? Will the hon Gentleman not make representations to the Army authorities for his release?

*Mr. Grenfell*: I recognise that there are key-men not working underground, but the agreements for releasing men so far are confined to men for whom work underground is available. I will, however, take note of what my hon. Friend says.

*Mr. Tinker*: Will the Minister consider making a public statement on what exactly men have to do when they want to get back to the mines?

*Mr. Grenfell*: I do not think it can be made plainer. It has been done, and 20,000 applications have been made. The men are not returning because of the limitations of the terms of release which the Government have set down.

*Mr. T. Smith*: Is the Minister aware that many miners in the Services for whom applications have been sent are now writing to complain that they have heard nothing more about it?

*Mr. Grenfell*: There is a delay. Applications were made a long time ago, but at the moment releases are few compared with the number of applications.

*Mr. R. J. Taylor*: Is the Minister aware that men are being sent who do not want to go?

*Mr. Grenfell*: That is not supposed to be the case. I cannot help it if there are individual cases, but men are under no compulsion to go home.

### MAILS, NORTHERN IRELAND

*Dr. Little* asked the Postmaster-General whether he will make enquiries into the cause of the delay in the delivery of letters and other mail, in many instances, from Great Britain to Northern Ireland; and whether he will give instructions for a more expeditious delivery in order to obviate disappointment and meet the wishes of the community?

*Mr. W. S. Morrison*: I am not aware of any general complaint of delay in the delivery of correspondence from Great Britain to Northern Ireland. I have received very

(continued on page 6 at the foot of column 2)

## 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. 8. No. 14.

Saturday, June 13, 1942.

### SOCIALISM IN PRACTICE

"We have started from the position that only in war, or under the threat of war will a British government embark on large-scale planning." — *Planning* (Organ of Political and Economic Planning) October 4, 1938.

That the good work of P.E.P. under the Chairmanship of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff (Managing Director of Marks & Spencers Ltd.) goes on apace is everywhere evident. In a recent number of the *Drapers Record* in a paragraph headed "Hosiery Manufacturers Face Complete Regimentation" is given an account of interviews between the representatives of the Trade in Leicester and the Director of Civilian Hosiery, Mr. L. Foyster (of Marks & Spencers Ltd.) who has commandeered a local hotel as a base of operation.

Mr. Foyster's plan involves, according to the *Drapers Record*, "Destruction of Goodwill, the forcing of numerous firms out of business, and replacement of practical men with a lifetime of experience by hordes of officials headed by a chain-store representative..."

"Utility" is now the operative word, not only in the Hosiery Trade, but in the world of dress. Utility means large scale planning (see above) and plays inevitably and straight into the hands of the big, centrally organised concerns. Designation—that is, the licensing of those firms chosen to deal with the making-up of 75 per cent. of all the available cloth supplies—is done officially by the Board of Trade at Millbank.

Designation seems to be a matter as mysterious as the holding of War Loan or the controlling interest in popular newspapers. As the editorial in the same number of the *Drapers Record* puts it: "Whom have the B.O.T. designated? For some reason unknown, we are told their names will not be published. That is strange, because lengthy official lists of firms registered under the Limitation Orders are available. One hears in certain quarters sinister suggestions to account for this secrecy—suggestions which, if in the slightest degree warranted, would call as the first step for a thorough comb-out at Millbank."

The tragic shortage of raw material is undeniable and so is the need to apportion it in some way. But let us make the right inferences. If "Socialism", as Miss Ellen Wilkinson says—and she ought to know—is what we are tasting now in the organisation of the Home Front, then one or other of two things follows. Either it is being introduced under cover of the war, or else, if the war situation is not consciously being used to socialise the nation, then, referring back to the significant quotation from *Planning*, war and Socialism are inseparable—the

rationing of butter in order to have guns.

In theory nothing can stand in the way of those who commit themselves to an abstract idea as distinct from its results, and theoretically at any rate, as we see from *Planning*, even the unbelievable horrors of a modern war can be contemplated as an opportunity, in fact, the only one, for its achievement in an atmosphere of opposition.

For this reason, if for no other—and keeping in mind what human nature is capable of—it is obviously well so to organise society that no single idealist (that is, large scale planner) is individually in a position to control sufficient power as to make him a preponderating influence in "events" where large masses of his fellow human beings are concerned.

N. F. W.

### SNOUTERS?

The daily press reports that teams of inspectors, most of whom are trained accountants, have been given power to enter business premises—manufacturers', wholesalers' or retailers'—to inspect their books and ask questions. The newspaper said that their purpose was "to stamp out black markets in controlled commodities."

### THE LATE HANGMAN

The American weekly magazine *Time* of February 23, 1942, wrote:—

"To combat rebellion in Europe it seemed logical that Germany should choose its bloodiest man. Reinhard Heydrich is six feet tall, lean, trim, yellow-haired, 37. He is pale, thin-nosed, thin-lipped... Within the Gestapo he has a fancy nickname 'The Green Basilisk.' Most Germans call him simply *der Henker* (the Hangman)..."

"Heydrich managed to keep his name out of the papers until three or four years ago. He stood in the shadow behind the lurid light of Heinrich Himmler, head of all the German police. Himmler's top man for the uniformed police is General Kurt Daluge; for the Gestapo, Heydrich. But Heydrich is much more powerful than Daluge, and he might, if it came to a test, prove more powerful even than Himmler..."

"A onetime official of the Berlin Gestapo, now a refugee in England, described the situation thus: 'Without him (Heydrich), Himmler would be just a senseless dummy.... Heydrich is young and intelligent, brutal, despotic, and merciless. He uses Himmler cleverly....'

"Heydrich has always been reticent about his birth and youth: it is possible that this man with the viciously Nordic head had a Jew for father. He was born at Halle to a musical academy director, listed in an old musical directory as 'Bruno Richard Heydrich (properly Suss).' Suss is a common Jewish name in Germany.

"Last summer *Der Henker* stated his theory of police work: 'The complete understanding of the opponent in his fundamental intellectual element, complete understanding of and police inquiry into his organisation and its leading personalities, and finally the systematic opposition, crippling, destruction and abolition of this opponent by the executive power.'"

## “ANTI-SEMITISM AND TREACHERY”

By COLLIN BROOKS

*Our thanks are due to the author and to “Truth,” in the June 5 issue of which it appeared, for permission to reproduce the following article. Of the Jewish Question, which Mr. Collin Brooks defines—and his definition is a useful one—as the question whether an alien race should be allowed to attain more than a limited amount of power, influence and economic command in a community which has given its members harbourage, there must soon be a settlement. However much more can, and will, be said on this issue, what Mr. Brooks says is relevant and of immediate application. On the same day as the “Truth” article appeared, the “Jewish Chronicle” reported that what Mr. Israel Cohen advocates and Mr. Brooks condemns had become part of the law of two States of America, New York and New Jersey, whose governors have signed bills which require public utilities, labour organisations and all firms doing defence and war work to submit to the State Labour Department pertinent records on their employment policies, give the State Industrial Commissioner “sweeping power to investigate and prosecute war contractors who discriminate against applicants for a job because of race, creed or colour,” and make such discrimination punishable by fine. Though not yet ‘official’ in England, Mr. Israel Cohen’s policy is thus already ‘official’ in America:—*

The title of this article is borrowed, with all acknowledgments, from *The New Statesman and Nation* for May 30. In that issue of that paper appears an article, occupying a page less three and a half inches, signed by Mr. Israel Cohen. Mr. Cohen’s thesis seems to be that because “among the various instruments employed by Hitler in his war for world domination, one of the most effective has been anti-Semitism,” and because “in Great Britain, too, the anti-Semites are largely identical with those who are regarded as dangerous to their country, for all Fascists and most of the others interned under Regulation 18B have been guilty of Jew-baiting,” therefore anti-Semitism equals treachery. Before examining Mr. Cohen’s main contention, it will not be without value to consider his premises. Was anti-Semitism employed by Herr Hitler as an instrument in his war for world domination, or did the spectacle of the strangle-hold which the Jews had upon German industry, professions, land ownership and social life cause Herr Hitler and others to become anti-Semitic? (Anti-Semitic, of course, is a faulty term. What is meant is anti-Jew. It would be more honest to use that description.) In political life things which are equal to the same thing are by no means equal to one another. If Herr Hitler and John Bull are both anti-Jew, it by no means follows that John Bull is Herr Hitler or that Herr Hitler is John Bull. If Mr. Israel Cohen and John Bull are both anti-Hitler, it by no means follows that Mr. Israel Cohen is John Bull, or that John Bull, being anti-Hitler, is automatically pro-Cohen.

“In Great Britain the anti-Semites are largely identical with those who are regarded as dangerous to their country, for all Fascists and most of the others interned under Regulation 18B have been guilty of Jew-baiting.” The thought of Mr. Israel Cohen for one moment calling men of the breed and record of Admiral Sir Barry Domville, that gallant sailor who represented his King and countrymen with honour so often from the Conference of Paris to immediate pre-war years, mere Jew-baiters is so nauseous that it cannot be dwelt upon with restraint. But if “the Fascists and most of the others interned under Regulation 18B” are really considered primarily as anti-Semites by Mr. Cohen and his friends, much is explained. It begins to look as if these Britons, many of them very distinguished citizens whom the King had delighted to honour, owe their incarceration in Brixton or the Isle of Man not to their political views but to their anti-Semitism, or supposed anti-Semitism. Is it possible that the vials of official wrath were unloosed upon such

bodies as the British Union, not because it stood for a philosophy of the State which was obnoxious, but because it circulated, during Mr. Hore-Belisha’s term of tenure of the War Office, a leaflet which pointed out that the Army of to-day was with reference to contractors all right because it was led by a Jew, fed by a Jew and clad by a Jew?

*We have come to this pass, if Mr. Israel Cohen and his sponsors of “The New Statesman” are right—that a man’s or woman’s loyalty now to King and Country is to be tested by whether or not he or she is “sound,” from a Jewish point of view, on the Jewish question. What is the Jewish question? It is the question whether an alien race should be allowed to attain more than a limited amount of power, influence and economic command in a community which has given its members harbourage.*

What is so loosely called “anti-Semitism” in most countries is actually an emotion of resentment that an alien race, admittedly gifted, comes in time not only to usurp positions of power and wealth but to take upon itself functions of government and administration, and conducts itself with an air of arrogant possession towards its sheltering land. With every increase of numbers or of influence it begins to change the district of its adoption into something which is not congenial to the native temperament; it warps or violently twists the national traditions. It converts, for example, Cheetham Hill, Manchester, or Roundhay, Leeds, or Golders Green, London, or pleasant up-river residential districts into areas of economic prosperity but of social strangeness. It begins to dominate political parties, so that second or—at best—third generational citizens of Britain begin to lay down the lines on which the political development of the nation must go forward. When Palestine was placed under Mandate to Britain, the first Governor-General representing Britain was a Jew. At a moment of stress the Viceroy of India was a Jew. When for some reason part of the traditional responsibilities of company officers and seconds-in-command in the Army were taken away from those who had hitherto fulfilled them and given to newly appointed “welfare officers,” the chief welfare officer, now an esteemed and distinguished Peer, was a Jew. When recently Mr. Herbert Morrison incurred some public criticism about his attitude to Germany and the House of Lords debated the topic, his words were not explained to that Noble House by a fellow-member of the Government but by a spokesman from the Opposition Bench who was a Jew. At the side of each of the great democratic leaders and their

Ambassadors in a position of great influence but without public responsibility stands a Jew. To the safest—or assumedly safest—townships of these islands, when London became dangerous, flocked large collections of Jews; on outgoing liners to Canada and America, before Japan entered the war, were always large proportions of Jews. Now in logic and humanity there is no reason why most of these things should not have been so and should not be so—but the fact remains that the race which is native to this land begins to resent the ubiquity of the alien race in positions of power and safety, and agrees with the Chief Rabbi that the Jews have a special responsibility to comport themselves with honesty and humility, which many of them—though doubtless a small fraction of the whole body—do not. For Mr. Israel Cohen to argue that this resentment is akin to pro-Hitlerism is absurd. If the alien race were something quite other, the resentment would still be the same. If, for example, every Jew in Great Britain were a Chinaman or a Lascar—if the highest to the lowest placed Jews to whom our land has given hospitality by some magic were replaced by any other orientals—the resentment would be the same. It might be unjust and unreasoning, but it would have nothing whatever to do with pro-Hitlerism.

No community of the British is more truly patriotic than that which inhabits the Province of Ontario. In 1937 there swept Toronto a wave of resentment against the growing number of Jews and their deportment. One morning the wall of one of the bathing beaches was found painted in large letters with the words "We've given you Palestine, for God's sake leave us this beach." This was a spontaneous exhibition of a similar resentment before there was any question of treachery or pro-Hitlerism, and in a Province without any signs of organised Fascism. In his article Mr. Israel Cohen quotes from the *Deutsche Afrika-Post* which reads: "In the interests of South Africa Jewry must be put energetically in its place, and here Hitler could help the true patriots. . . . One cannot get rid of the Jews as long as one is bound to England." This extract he prefaces by the statement that "South Africa has also been afflicted for some years by anti-Jewish organisations." Since the policy of the Party behind *Deutsche Afrika-Post* is one of extreme nationalism, of Africa for the Afrikanders, the only fair inference is that the growth of Jewry in South Africa, and its deportment, must have been galling indeed if Hitler himself is preferred to its continued presence. Surely what Mr. Israel Cohen calls "anti-Semitism" is not a sign of treachery or moral delinquency in those who exhibit it, but a cold, inescapable criticism of the race which has aroused it.

*A normal Englishman, Scotsman, Welshman, Canadian, South African would say: "If we give the hospitality and shelter of our land to this unfortunate and homeless race, noble as so many of its members are, pitiable as all are in their landlessness, surely they should comport themselves like guests and not try to wrest from us either by luck or cunning the control of our affairs, whether political, social or industrial. This is our land, these are our traditions, and we wish neither to be orientalised. Let the Jew take shelter here from the persecutions and afflictions which have injured him elsewhere, but let him remember that he is still a tolerated guest, and let him not be the usurper of that place and power which for the spiritual health of our own race should be occupied by men of our own breed and past."*

What Mr. Israel Cohen says, with the goodwill of *The*

*New Statesman*, is something startlingly different, and something extremely sinister. He says: "When the war is over and Hitlerism is crushed, anti-Semitism will presumably no longer be serviceable as an instrument of treachery, but it will possess an infinite capacity for generating political discord and social unrest. It will therefore be necessary, in the interests of peace, not only of Jewry but of the world in general, that the most effective means should be adopted for its suppression. . . . The task will not be easy, but unless it is boldly and intelligently tackled and satisfactorily accomplished the world will be troubled for generations to come."

When the war is over, in short, if you as a Briton dare to express any anxiety about the hold which Jewry is taking over your national institutions, you will be effectively suppressed, presumably by Regulation 18B or some similar means. It will no longer be possible for Mr. Israel Cohen to say: "That man is an anti-Semite, therefore he is a traitor," but he will be able to say: "That man is an anti-Semite, therefore he is a troubler of the peace not only of Israel but of the world in general; suppress him." Before such an attitude become general or official it is, of course, possible that the British may suddenly realise that the root cause of anti-Semitism is Semites. Mr. Israel Cohen's suggested method of dealing with Britons who may not relish the numbers or influence of the race to which they have hitherto given tolerant shelter is suppression. That is brutal. Expulsion would be more kind. The question of who is to expel might be left to the majority voice of the race which happens to be native to this land, and whose fathers between the days of Edward the First and Oliver Cromwell first made it great. :

## PARLIAMENT

*Continued from page 3*

few such complaints in the last few months and full inquiry is invariably made into individual cases. I shall be happy to give careful consideration to any case which the hon. Member has in mind if he will let me have particulars together with the covers of any delayed correspondence.

## MAY 21.

### Oral Answers to Questions

#### POST-WAR TERRITORIAL SETTLEMENT

*Mr. Kennedy* asked the Minister of Labour whether he has any statement to make with regard to the continuance of the Military Training Act?

*Mr. Bevin:* Yes, Sir. The Military Training Act, which was passed in May, 1939, was to remain in force for three years and then expire subject to a provision whereby, upon an Address by each House of Parliament, an Order in Council might be made continuing its operation for a year at a time. On the outbreak of war, it was superseded by the National Service (Armed Forces) Act but was not repealed. The Government have considered whether steps should be taken to prolong the Act for a further period but have decided against this course. The Act would, in any event, be inoperative for the duration of the war and it is scarcely possible now to anticipate the provisions of this nature that will be required after the war. It is therefore proposed to allow the Act to expire on the 26th May next and so leave a clear field for the enactment, at a later date, of such legislation as circumstances may show to be desirable.

**MILITARY TRAINING ACT, 1939.**

*Wing-Commander James* asked the Prime Minister whether he will give an assurance that His Majesty's Government will enter into no treaty agreement anticipating a post-war territorial settlement except conjointly with all our Allies and after first submitting any such proposal to Parliament?

*The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Richard Law)*: I have been asked to reply. I do not think it would be possible to give so far-reaching an assurance in these precise terms, since a variety of contingencies have to be kept in mind. As regards consultation with Parliament, His Majesty's Government do not propose to depart from the existing practice, with which my hon. and gallant Friend is doubtless familiar.

*Mr. Maxton*: Would the hon. Gentleman refresh the memory of the House as to what the existing practice is?

*Mr. Law*: I should have thought that the existing practice was well known to the House. It was last laid down in July, 1929, by the then Foreign Secretary, Mr. Arthur Henderson, and I think my hon. Friend would find it in the OFFICIAL REPORT for 17th July 1929.

*Major Casalet*: Has not the principle already been set out in the Atlantic Charter, and also in certain statements by the Prime Minister?

*Mr. Law*: I do not think there is anything in the Atlantic Charter which refers to this Question.

*Mr. Maxton*: Was it not laid down that all Treaties should be submitted for approval to this House before final ratification?

*Mr. Law*: The agreement at that time was that all treaties subject to ratification should be submitted to this House before they were ratified.

*Mr. Maxton*: Was not that practice departed from in regard to the Abyssinian Treaty, the only one produced since the war started?

*Mr. Law*: I think the hon. Gentleman will find that the Abyssinian Treaty was not subject to ratification.

*Sir H. Williams*: Is it not the case that the Atlantic Charter is not a treaty, but only a declaration of intention by two eminent persons?

**POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION (STAFF).**

*Mr. Lindsay* asked the Paymaster-General what official staff he has at his disposal in connection with reconstruction; and what are the private research institutions to which the Government has delegated specific inquiries and tasks?

*Sir J. Fowitt*: The staff at my disposal wholly engaged on reconstruction problems consists of nine officers of the administrative grade with clerical, etc., assistance. In addition full use is being made of the accumulated knowledge and experience of the various Government Departments in regard to problems falling wholly or partly in their respective spheres. Special inquiries or research are also being carried out on behalf of the Government by the Social Reconstruction Survey of Nuffield College, Oxford, and the Royal Institute of International Affairs as well as by certain private individuals.

**FINANCIAL AND INSURANCE BUSINESSES (STAFFS)**

*Sir G. Broadbridge* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he proposes any further steps to secure the release of man-power from financial undertakings?

*Sir K. Wood*: A great deal has already been done by private initiative under general Government guidance, but I think that a further review of the situation is now called for, and in consultation with my right hon. Friends the President of the Board of Trade and the Minister of Labour and National Service I have appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Lord Kennet to ascertain and report what practical measures, whether by way of some form of concentration or otherwise, can still be taken to secure the greatest possible release of man-power in the sphere of banking, including investment trusts, finance and discount houses and stock exchange businesses, in ordinary insurance business and in industrial assurance. I contemplate that the Committee will act in three panels, one looking at banking and allied businesses, the second at ordinary insurance and the third at industrial insurance. I hope that the Committee after completing its survey will remain in being in case it can continue to be of further assistance to the Government in the same sphere. The following have been good enough to agree to serve on this Committee:

Lord Kennet (Chairman), Mr. F. H. E. Branson, Mr. J. C. Burleigh, Mr. G. Cunliffe, Mr. T. G. Davies, Mr. D. T. Garrett, Mr. E. H. Lever, Sir Felix Pole, Sir Robert Witt, C.B.E., Sir William Wood.

**JUNE 2.****MINISTER OF WORKS AND PLANNING BILL**

CLAUSE 6.—(*Provisions as to Orders in Council.*)

*Mr. Bossom (Maidstone)*: I beg to move, in page 4, line 7, at the end, to insert:

Subject always to any such Order in Council being laid before Parliament not later than 21 days before the date on which it is to be brought into operation, and provided that no such Order shall be made at any date beyond six months after the date of the Armistice."

As I understand it, this Bill is dealing primarily with post-war planning, but this Clause as it stands confers abnormally wide powers on the Minister, giving him the power to legislate, without reference to Parliament, by Orders in Council. The House has agreed on many occasions that for war needs Orders in Council are imperative, but this Bill is not a war Measure, and therefore there is no such urgency. The Bill is more concerned with after the war, and I cannot see why the Minister desires to have these rights instead of giving the House the right to discuss such matters or know of the Orders in Council in the ordinary way.

The Committee on the Ministers' Powers proposed a series of safeguards, but this Bill includes none of those safeguards, although they have been introduced in the case of nearly every Bill since the recommendation was made in 1932. It is unfortunate that this new Ministry should ask for these special powers. To my mind these special powers are not needed, and I hope that the Minister will look favourably upon this Amendment and will not create a precedent by insisting upon this privilege which will, I believe, be undesirable in the eyes of this House. . . .

*Mr. H. Strauss*: I think that my hon. Friend the Member for Maidstone (Mr. Bossom) and other Members who have supported his Amendment have overlooked the

qualifying words which govern this provision. . . . The powers sought under this provision are limited to what is necessary or expedient having regard to transfers effected under the Act. The Subsection says:

"His Majesty may, by Order in Council make such incidental, consequential and supplemental provisions as appear to His Majesty to be necessary or expedient having regard to any transfer effected under this Act."

It repeats in sub-paragraph (a) the words:

"To such extent as appears to be necessary or expedient as aforesaid."

It does not confer, either by this or any other Clause, such powers on the Minister as my hon. Friend suspects. My hon. Friend the Member for Maidstone suggested that something unprecedented was being done. That is not so. There are numerous precedents for conferring power to amend Statutes by Order in Council. . . .

Its purpose is to incorporate in various documents the change of name and to make various consequential changes rendered necessary by the transfer. My hon. Friend the Member for St. Albans (Sir F. Fremantle) attributes powers to the Minister which are certainly not conferred by the Bill. . .

I can give the most explicit assurance that no sinister use is going to be made, or in my opinion could be made, of the powers contained in this Section of the Bill. . . .

*Mr. Bossom:* May I have a definite assurance that these powers will not be used to do anything other than bring into the Bill exactly what has already been approved by this House and that nothing new will be introduced under the guise of an Order in Council?

*Mr. Strauss:* I want to give the most explicit assurance, but I am not sure that the words my hon. Friend asks me to repeat would be entirely appropriate for the purpose. The whole Clause is purely subsidiary machinery. It is for rewriting various documents in appropriate language made necessary by the transfer. . . .

*Mr. Maxton (Glasgow, Bridgeton):* . . . I am here as a detached person and I have listened with interest to the Minister's defence against the Amendment. This Clause gives the most sweeping powers to some official somewhere in a backroom to repeal or rewrite the law in any way, not for a week or two, but for a long-term period. All that we have to limit the great power which we are handing away is an undertaking from the Under-Secretary. We accept it as coming from him for the period while he remains in office and has some influence on the matter. It is, however, a pretty weak limitation.

*Mr. Strauss:* . . . There are words of limitation in the Bill itself to which I have drawn attention. It would be entirely contrary to those words of limitation if this power were used to alter the effect of any Act or instrument beyond what was necessary by reason of the transfer of powers which are mentioned in the limitation. I ask the hon. Member to read the Bill. I do not know whether his fear is that the limitation will be wholly ignored by a Government Department.

*Mr. Maxton:* I am not making the case that it would be wholly ignored, but the Parliamentary Secretary might not be in office when these documents are rewritten and brought up to date. Whatever this fellow in a backroom writes will be the law and he will decide to what extent he recognises the limitation.

(To be continued)

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Use of Money .....	6d.
"This 'American' Business" .....	3d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold .....	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson .....	6d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report .....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne .....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance .....	2d.

Leaflets

The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell .....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
Taxation is Robbery .....	50 for 1/9; 100 for 3/-
(Please allow for postage when remitting).	

FROM K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

## SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* is in the 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 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.

A deposit of 15/- will be required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

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.  
 BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 73 Manor Rd., Blackpool.  
 BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.  
 CARDIFF S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 8, Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.  
 DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.  
 LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.  
 LONDON D.S.C. 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 June 18.  
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.  
 SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.