

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 11.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

No, Clarence, the Battle of Egypt wasn't won by McArthur the Magnificent, but it will be, my lad, it will be. But in 1942, it was won by the decadent British, and the exploited "colonials" of a tyrannous Empire, with contingents from an effete Europe. They were led by officers of no capacity, drawn from a clique within a clique, and mostly trained in nurseries of incompetence, Woolwich, Sandhurst, and Dartmouth. These officers couldn't possibly be good, anyway, because most of them were hereditary soldiers, and only coal-mining requires hereditary aptitude.

The armies, navy and air-forces were almost entirely equipped with weapons and munitions produced by an out of date system operated by second-rate employers, in their spare time available from supplying and transporting arms and munitions to Russia (Pop. 170,000,000) and U.S.A. (Pop. 130,000,000) and replacing those lost in the Second Front in France (Pop. 42,000,000) as the result of placing the British Army under the Unified Command of General Gamelin and the Freemasons.

Population of once-great Britain, 45,000,000.

• • •

General Scotti, the Italian Commander captured in Egypt, where he and his troops had been left behind by the Germans in their flight, is a member of the family of Scotti of Piacenza. This family is directly descended from a Scottish Douglas who, as was very common in those days, went to the Continent in the XIV Century to gain military experience in the perennial wars there. He settled in Italy and was granted large estates, and the family still uses a modification of the coat of arms of the Douglas family "on a field, argent, a heart imperially crowned, gules. On a chief, azure, three stars of the field."

The coat of arms of the Scotti of Piacenza has only two stars, and they explain this by saying that in the strife between the Guelphs and the Ghibbelines, which rent the Continent into two opposing camps, the Scotti took the side of the Ghibbelines. Any odd in number was taken to indicate the Guelphs, and the odd star was dropped from the arms in consequence.

• • •

No, Clarence, notwithstanding the family likeness and aptitudes, General Smuts and Mr. Montagu Norman are not twin sons of Satan. There is a difference in their ages.

We have not seen the birth certificate of Sir Henry Strakosch.

The Ministry of Information has not as yet pointed out that if seven million wireless sets could be shut off for one hour per day, assuming each set to consume about 100 watts, a saving of 700,000,000 watt-hours, or 700,000 electrical units per day could be effected, or that if all sets were shut off when 'tripe' is being broadcast, the fuel situation would probably cease to give cause for alarm.

A NEW ZEALAND PLAN

A repercussion in New Zealand of the Malvern Conference is that the 'People's Plan' has been sponsored by the New Zealand Social Credit Movement—an organisation in no way associated with the Social Credit Secretariat.

The following is an extract from a letter to a New Zealand correspondent:—

"The 'People's Plan' has reached me since I wrote you on October 12. This has been read with attention. . . .

"Page 13: Free vitamins, medical examination, and one meal a day. Page 17: Motherhood endowments, the right of women to full pay prior to and after childbirth. Page 19: Nutritional education, standard loaf—wholemeal. Page 21: Other divisions of industry to be organised on a voluntary co-operative basis with employees receiving an equitable share. Page 39: Seaweed from the New Zealand beaches. Page 42: Education to develop spirit of service. . . . The quotation of such items is sufficient indication of their origin—offspring of the 'isms.' If you have read Stuart Chase's *Tyranny of Words* you will know all I want to say about page 30. Justice, Liberty, Service and Co-operation—a new world order mission composed of World Leaders—these windy abstractions are the traditional currency of the devil. Balloons which we are supposed to watch while the Armourer gets to work with his rivets.

"It is for individual men to determine—in their action—their own destiny. Freedom is as necessary to an individual as it is to a child in learning to walk. Freedom is the ability to choose or refuse alternatives as they arise. . . . Granted an increase of freedom proportionate to production, all such points as above, from vitamins to seaweed, would be settled (in *doing*, not saying) by people choosing what they want. And if they don't want seaweed then it's just too bad.

"Talking to Douglas recently, he said: 'I pay some attention to what a man says, and a great deal of attention to what he does.' Motives? I am sure that your Mr. Nash has the very best brand of motive; he is going to do the people a power o' good; and so is the Archbishop of Canterbury from whose Malvern conference the 'People's Plan'

is, I gather, derived. It is certainly not derived from Douglas.

"I think it was Lord Vansittart (a man worth watching) who recently said that the Englishman is kindly and generous to a fault but that his besetting weakness is the inability to recognise the existence of evil. The point which we have got to get home to ourselves, as well as to others, is that there is always someone waiting with the chains and the rivets while we watch the balloons. Ready to pin prospective mothers down to pre-natal pay, duly inspected and certified correct by the officer appointed... *cattle*. It is recognition of this truth which is required. Therefore I again stress the importance of *The Big Idea*—brought into relationship with daily events.

"If you agree (as I am sure you will agree) with the substance of this letter I would suggest that it is for you to take the initiative; not contesting what others are saying so much as acting on a line of your own. Too many people's eyes are set on those pretty balloons—look for others who hear the chink of the fetters." H.E.

Pensions Schedule

The text of the schedule of pensions for injuries sustained in this war and the comment on it given below are quoted from the October issue of the "British Legion Journal."

By authority of the Pensions Ministry the *British Legion Journal* is able to make public for the first time a summary of the scale of pensions for specific injuries sustained by members of the forces in this war.

It is not, as in 1919, attached to the Royal Warrant, nor has it been open to inspection except by officers of the Ministry.

In one or two cases the assessments are better than those of 1919, notably the assessment for total deafness, which is now 100 per cent., as compared with 70 per cent. in the last war.

The Legion has long argued that a stone-deaf man is as handicapped as a blind man. This is recognised in the new scale of pensions.

The loss of one eye is assessed at a lower rate. Whereas it was compensated by a 50 per cent. pension in the last war, it has gone down to 40 per cent. in this war.

The pension for amputation of a leg below the knee with stump exceeding 4 inches is now reckoned at 40 per cent., as compared with 50 per cent. last time.

Apart from family allowances or rank additions the pensions rates in 1942 are:—

Per cent.	£	s.	d.	Per cent.	£	s.	d.
100	...	1	17	6	50	...	0 18 9
90	...	1	13	9	40	...	0 15 0
80	...	1	10	0	30	...	0 11 3
70	...	1	6	3	20	...	0 7 6
60	...	1	2	6			

ASSESSMENTS OF SPECIFIED INJURIES IN THEIR FINAL AND STATIONARY CONDITION

AMPUTATION CASES—UPPER LIMBS.

DISABILITY	ASSESSMENT
Loss of both hands or arms	100 per cent.
Amputation at or below shoulder	50 to 80 per cent.
(according to site of amputation and whether right or left arm).	

Loss of thumb	30 per cent.
Loss of 4 fingers	40 per cent.
Loss of 3 fingers	30 per cent.
Loss of 2 fingers	20 per cent.
(reduction of 10 per cent. if left hand).	

AMPUTATION CASES—LOWER LIMBS.

Double amputation	100 per cent.
Modified Syme amputation, both feet	80 per cent.
Amputation at or below hip	40 to 80 per cent.
(according to site of amputation).	
Modified Syme amputation, one foot	30 per cent.
Loss of all toes on both feet	20 to 30 per cent.
(according to site of amputation).	
Loss of all toes on one foot	20 per cent.

OTHER SPECIFIC INJURIES.

Loss of one eye, the other being normal	40 per cent.
Loss of vision of one eye, the other being normal	30 per cent.
Loss of sight	100 per cent.
Loss of a hand and a foot	100 per cent.

OTHER DISABILITIES.

Very severe facial disfigurement	100 per cent.
Absolute deafness	100 per cent.
Left-handed men.—In the case of left-handed men the compensation in respect of the left arm, hand, etc., is the same as for a right arm, hand, etc., and <i>vice versa</i> .	

Farinacci and the Vatican

Farinacci, former General Secretary of the Fascist Party, accuses Mr. Myron Taylor, President Roosevelt's personal envoy to the Vatican, of being personally responsible for the "terror-raids" on Genoa, and the Vatican and the *Osservatore Romano*, its official organ, with being "definitely pro-British and pro-American." Farinacci says that "so far not a word of comfort has been addressed to the population of Italy" by the Vatican over the recent air-raids.

The Forestry Commission

By J. H. E.

The House of Lords Debate reported in last week's issue of *The Social Crediter* revealed some defects in the Forestry Commission. There are others. Take for instance the statement that it has 246 State Forests, total acreage 1,144,000 acres, total area of Forest 714,000 acres. This leaves 430,000 acres to be accounted for. What has happened to them? Why have they been acquired if they can't be planted? A good proportion of the land is under farming, which is as it should be as far as the land is concerned: but surely if all that acreage is farms, it should come under the Agriculture Board? There are no agriculture experts on the Forestry Commission. There are Estate Agents who look after the buildings and bridges and roads, but no one to help the farmer.

But not all of this surplus land is under farms. There is, for instance, a forest in the Lake District, called Hardknott, with a total area of approximately 7,000 acres. Of these only about 4,000 are fit for farming or turning into forests. This leaves a large surplus of 3,000 acres, most of which lies on the flanking slopes of such mountains as Bow Fell, Crinkle Crags, and Harter Fell. One wonders what the Forestry Commission wants with all this land. Has the Commission a sense of the aesthetic? Or is the land

going to be turned into a mountain fortress whereto the Commissioners can rush when being overtaken by a howling mob demanding land for individuals rather than land for the State? One can imagine them holding out with machine guns and spaghetti on the slopes of Great Gable, Green Gable, Red Pike, the Pillar Mountain, the Dodd,—for the Commission owns many slopes on these fine masses.

And at the head of all these fine figures, these commissioners, these open air foresters, these men of the woods, bronzed and eager for twenty mile walks over the roughest of terrain, at the head of the whole organisation of the Forestry Commission is the Paymaster General, a portly figure saying yes and no, voting the money which is necessary to run it—all the guts, bronze, and thighs like tree trunks are held breathless, waiting for the soft fricative notes of the Paymaster General saying, "Yes, Sir Blank, you may have 25/6 to go to this forest, or 14/9 to buy a spade to dig in that forest!"

The Forestry Commission has farms on every forest. Now it is obvious that the farms should be considered primarily. Suppose a 10,000 acre forest which is being planted up has ten 200-acre farms on it, and another 1,000 acres suitable for pasture and meadow land for the farms. What generally happens (though not always) is that the easiest land is planted up first, *i.e.*, this meadow and pasture. This at once confines the farms and prevents any thought of their expansion. Then, later on, the more difficult job of planting the high moorland behind the pasture is considered. The reason for this procedure is, cost. The Forest has to be planted as cheaply as possible, so the obvious thing to do is to plant the easiest land first. After all, you may be shifted from that area before the really tough problem of planting the moorland comes up. And then, when you *do* start to plant, the question of sheep always arises. For these, originally grazing on that pasture just planted, have been driven to the outskirts of the forest moorland for their feeding. Gradually they are driven further and further away from their home farm, entailing more and more work for their farmer, for less and less sheep (as the ground is planted up), and the final result is that all the sheep are driven off and the farm thereby converted from a stock farm to a sort of glorified small holding, with now useless outbuildings.

This brings us to our next subject, that of Forest Workers' Holdings. These are a very good idea. Essentially they consist of a cottage and ten acres of ground rented very cheaply—about £15 per annum—to men, on the understanding that they will do a certain minimum of work on the forest every year. Actually they work on the forest all the year round. But there are one or two snags to this scheme. The Forest Workers' Holdings are for the working man with not much capital, yet if they are to be worked properly they cannot be taken by a man without capital. For ten acres of ground takes some stocking,—say two cows, three pigs, poultry, geese, vegetable garden, pasture and meadow to work; say £120—while the Forestry Commission allows a man only ten pounds of capital; this is obviously not much good when you can only buy a fifth of a cow with it. The men on these holdings are paid three pounds a week and overtime. Their week is 48 hours. The work in the forest is manual labour of the hardest kind—there is no harder work in the whole of England. It is backbreaking, painstaking, breathtaking work: bent over a rutting spade, one of the

heaviest tools ever invented by man, they cut at heather, bracken, tough grass knots, stones, boulders, and solid rock. And all to plant trees 70 per cent, of which are foreigners to England!

The Forest—the thing round which the whole of the Forestry Commission revolves—how is it estimated for? A man in an office says; "We can plant this area for three pounds an acre, or four pounds an acre," and for that it has to be done. Originally the Forestry Commission started out with the right idea—to be a spending concern, and not a profit making concern. Money had to be spent to reforest England. But somehow or other this ideal has shifted.

Receipts are now as important as bills, the whole business turns on making the forest pay as much as possible. To this end it has been elected to plant conifers in most districts. The Commissioners have stern and no-foolin' arguments about this. They say, "The tree with the biggest yield per acre is conifer not hardwood. The conifer with the biggest yield per acre is Spruce. Although spruce commands a lesser price than Scots pine (or did before the war) it grows more cubic feet per acre, and a greater amount of cash per acre can therefore be obtained from Spruce. Therefore plant Spruce."

Poor England! She was once a noble country, nobly afforested. Sterling British oak there was, massive, colossal and strong, a veritable bulwark of old England. Beech there was, gleaming and fine and straight, true and thickset as a mast stepped in one of Drake's frigates: ash, pliant, caressing and straight as a willow wand; elm turning her curling limbs to the sky; birch twinkling black and white through the mysterious depths of the virgin forest; rowan, red berries and silver leaves; hawthorn and elder tangling themselves in the undergrowth. And above all, rearing its towering head, was the clean boled, massive strength of the mighty Scots Pine. And now all these fine forests are gone, denuded through two wars, and what will remain? Darkling forests of Spruce, Norway and Sitka; darkling forests alien to England's sunny temperament; regular, orderly forests of larch, such as England has rarely seen before; even the mighty giant, the Scots Pine, has to toe the line and be regimented; no wonder he bows his head with shame. And WHY? Because the Bank of England controls the Policy of the Forestry Commission: and because it is thought that English people will always put up with this kind of nonsense.

NOW READY:—

"The Tragedy of Human Effort"
By C. H. DOUGLAS

Major Douglas's Liverpool Address, October, 1936.

ALSO

"The Policy of a Philosophy"

The first republication in pamphlet form of the address given to a conference of social crediters in June, 1937.

Price: 7d. Each.

from all booksellers, or from the publishers (postage 1d.)

K. R. P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL. 15.

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. 9. No. 11.

Saturday, November 21, 1942.

Social Credit in Quebec

We do not think that English-speaking Social Crediters realise the position of Social Credit in the Province of Quebec. The Province has a population of something over three millions, of which over a million are in Montreal, which is much like other cities.

But of the remainder, probably 180,000 read *Vers Demain*, the admirable Social Credit paper whose paid circulation is over thirty thousand (more than all the rest of the Social Credit organs combined); a large proportion of these belong to the Credit Association which operates on the same lines as the Treasury Branches in Alberta, but is unofficial.

There are many aspects of the Quebec situation which are most intriguing. Quebec, then called French or Lower Canada, entered the Dominion with a disproportionate representation in Parliament, and still retains over one quarter of the Members, while the very large number of French Canadians in Manitoba and the West make them a formidable political force in other Provinces also.

It is true to say that the French Canadian, while primarily a Canadian, is much less of an American than the average Canadian citizen—partly, of course as a matter of language, but also definitely by reason of race and tradition. His affinity is much more Catholic, quite apart from religion, than it is Yankee-Puritan.

Ecclesiasters

The Archbishop of Canterbury is apologising for the fatness of archiepiscopal salaries.

He seemingly does not notice the parallel with the humbler incompetent who is willing to take a lower wage to hang on to his job.

There are men (and some of them in the Church of England) worth double the present joint archiepiscopal salaries for goods, spiritual and temporal, which they could deliver.

At the Albert Hall the two overpaid clerics who block the way to the practice of Christianity in England were tied up to Sir Stafford Cripps. At Birmingham they had Mr. Winant to take 'tone' from them. The two triangles intertwined would make a neat star for the facade of a synagogue.

With the overpaid Archbishops at the four side points of the star, Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Winant would

occupy positions at the upper and lower points—and it wouldn't matter which occupied which.

At least it is a star which shines backwards! Witness:—

"A little more than fifty years ago the country was split from end to end on the question of the disestablishment of the Church of England. For reasons that have *never been thoroughly explored* [our italics] a great Nonconformist agitation which had lasted many years suddenly died down. It has never been revived and there is no indication that it will be. Hence the surprise with which a few weeks ago we read Sir Stafford Cripps's remark at the Albert Hall that the Church should be ready to consider disestablishment and disendowment." — *The Sunday Times*, November 15.

T.J.

Planners at Work

Protests against the transfer by national service officers of skilled tradesmen from their employment with the medium-sized and smaller building firms to do labouring work for large contractors in other parts of the country were made at a meeting of the Federation of Greater London Master Builders recently.

Delegates spoke of skilled men arriving on large contract sites and being told that they were not wanted, but would be "fitted in" and being employed on digging trenches; of carpenters acting as labourers to bricklayers and bricklayers acting as labourers to carpenters; and of men being engaged on digging holes and filling them up again. It was alleged that the smaller builders were being exploited at the expense of one section of the industry, and one of the delegates declared that he had a great objection to his men being transferred to his larger competitors. Another said there were thousands of labourers in London to-day drawing unemployment pay while the Government were taking skilled operatives to do labourers' work.

Victoria Resists Centralisation

Another move further to centralise power in Australia was obstructed when, early in November, a joint meeting of both Houses of the Victorian Parliament, after debating the proposals of Dr. Evatt, Attorney-General of Australia, to amend the Commonwealth constitution, passed a resolution expressing the opinion that the proposals were couched in language too wide and indefinite, that they would destroy the Federal character of the constitution, undermine the authority of the High Court as the guardian of the constitution, and abolish the existing safeguards of popular rights. The Labour Opposition refused to vote, on the ground that the Legislative Council did not represent the electors at large, and walked out when a vote was taken without a division. Non-Labour speakers condemned Dr. Evatt's amendments, and Labour members supported them.

Mr. Dunstan, the Premier, said that he would concede additional powers to the Commonwealth, but these ought to be granted as necessity arose, and their scope ought to be specifically limited. If Dr. Evatt's amendments were accepted the Commonwealth would be able to do almost anything.

MILK

By B. M. PALMER

The milkman told me that this was a free country when he broke the news that after this week I should be served by one of the multiple concerns. However much I may dislike this arrangement I cannot obtain my milk from any other source. I may not even continue with my usual supplier by fetching milk from his depot. "And bread will soon be the same," he added.

The milk industry is now nationalised.

That the whole ordering of the milk industry for war-time service is full of hidden complications is undeniable. The following information has been gathered from the *Home Farmer** for October last:

In October Mr. Sidney Foster resigned his position as Honorary Director of Milk Supplies at the Ministry of Food. General Manager of the Milk Board, he had served the Government since 1939 first as adviser, then as director of milk supplies.

According to the Editor of the *Home Farmer*, he resigned because the issue was one of public interest, and he felt he could not be associated with the milk policy now being pursued by the Ministry. He said the list of thirteen different "margins" makes the handling of a gallon of milk more lucrative to the big middleman (whose volume of business automatically reduces his cost per gallon) than to the smaller firms; it leads to unnecessary wholesaling services and to an increase in the spread between producer and consumer prices.

When interviewed by the Editor of the *Home Farmer*, Mr. Foster agreed that, far from welding all interests into a common service, the Ministry of Food were interposing themselves between producers and distributors in a way that was splitting the industry into two unrelated parts.

The Ministry of Food have declared that the services of the "level-delivery" producer are neither necessary nor desirable. About 14,000 dairy farmers are involved, with an annual turnover of £400,000 derived from their premiums. The Ministry decided that the wholesaling side of the industry should level out all supplies. They will not pay the producer his "level-delivery" premium at $\frac{3}{4}$ d or 1d a gallon, to equalise the needs of a dairyman. Instead, they will pay the wholesaler 2d for the same service.

They express the hope that economies will be made in transport and yet fail to see that every gallon of milk sold by a wholesaler makes two, or three, or four journeys, instead of only one journey when milk is sent direct from farm to dairy.

That is the gist of the statement made by the Ex-Director of Milk Supplies to the Editor of the *Home Farmer*. The Editor comments that, "whereas, under the Milk Marketing Scheme there was a uniform buying price, the buyers were now confronted with more than a dozen prices. The highest price—and therefore the lowest margin—was reserved for the small buyer. The devaluation of the business of the 'little man' has been accomplished under war-time administration, and by weighting the scales more heavily in favour of his powerful competitors his ability to survive is considerably weakened. . . .

"Mr. Foster did not dispute the iniquity of a system that started off the already-favoured in a still more favourable position. Why should a buyer who takes supplies from 40 individual farms obtain a price advantage over another buyer drawing from 30 farms? There is no justification on the ground that the larger number of farm units produce the milk cheaper, or that the milk is sold at a lower rate.

"Obviously we have here a gesture to the big men in the trade. It reverts to the pre-Milk scheme position (now officially sponsored) of dairymen delivering to their customers on unequal terms. It is retrogressive, and the Board—and consumers—have reason to be anxious over the eventual outcome. . . .

"The sliding scale of prices in favour of the 'big' man will send up the buying price of milk rounds and small businesses, and *the Ministry will buy these for the 'big' man*. With the milk combines and companies receiving at least $1\frac{3}{4}$ d per gallon more than small retailers—and receiving it from the Government—this trend is inevitable."

The following information was gathered from Essex local papers:—

Essex milk producers at a meeting addressed by Mr. David Gemmill, chairman of the N.F.U. Milk Committee, at Chelmsford, passed the following resolution:—

"The milk producers of Essex are of opinion that the Ministry of Food have failed to provide a satisfactory explanation of the price structure in the milk industry—a structure which subsidises the big distributor for being big, and the small distributor for being small. This meeting submits that this fantastic arrangement is only to be explained by the ill-advised influence of distributive interests upon the Ministry of Food.

"The meeting also emphasises that the Ministry have created conditions of control enabling distributors to withdraw service premiums, and have in fact encouraged them to do so. It is submitted that the responsibility for this position must be accepted by the Government, and that producers must be compensated for the £400,000 which they have lost. If the Government fails in this respect the greatest discouragement will have been offered to the maintenance of greater milk production against the national interest.

"Since the new structure prejudices the interests of both producers and consumers, it is hoped that the matter will receive the close attention of the general public, who should demand inquiry into the operation of the new arrangements and their financial results as soon as possible."

Members of the Executive Committee of the Essex County Farmers' Union have protested at the position in the milk industry.

Mr. Hollis Clayton presided over the meeting, which was addressed by Mr. Quedsted, regional representative of the Milk Marketing Board, who spoke in strong terms of the extent to which distributive interests were endeavouring—and to some extent were succeeding—to wrest control of the industry from producers.

The chief point of protest was that, while the public were being led to believe that the Ministry of Food were taking control of the milk industry so as to effect economies in distribution, only the "little men" and producer retailers were to have their distributive margins reduced.

Large distributors were to have a larger margin for

*Published by the Milk Marketing Board, Thames Ditton, Surrey, and printed by the Amalgamated Press, Gt. Sumner Street, S.E.1.

distribution than the small men. It was felt that the matter required to be brought to the close attention of the general public.

The meeting was urged by Mr. Quedstedt to start a "bombardment" of the Ministry of Agriculture and Members of Parliament to look into the whole matter.

The Secretary, Mr. Walker, suggested that the opening of the bombardment might be deferred until the result of the President's discussion with Lord Woolton were known. The meeting, however, gave instructions for messages of protest to be sent.

But we as consumers also have our grievances.

It is required to show that the interests of consumers and producers are one, and to bring pressure to bear accordingly.

B.I.S. REPORT

By the courtesy of a correspondent we are enabled to quote passages from the Annual Report of the Bank of International Settlements for the year ended March 31, 1942. The majority of the directors of this bank, whose headquarters are at Geneva, are from German or German occupied territories, although its president is an American. The concluding passage of the Report, which, it will be noted insists on the further jettisoning of "narrow national ends," is that which recently caused the demand in Parliament for the dissociation of Great Britain from the Bank by the complete withdrawal of her two directors, Mr. Montagu Norman and Mr. Otto Niemeyer.

For the first time since 1934 the U.S. did not absorb the whole current output of gold in 1941. Of the new gold produced in that year, amounting to approximately \$1,435 million, only one half, \$742 million, went into the monetary gold stock of the U.S. . . . It is not possible to indicate fully from the published data the destination of that part of the current gold production—approximately \$700 million—which was not taken by the U.S. in 1941.

. . . . At their peak in March 1938 the gold reserves of the U. K. totalled more than \$4,000 million; by the outbreak of war they amounted to \$2,038 million. On September 1, 1941, *i.e.*, after two years of war, all but \$151 million of this gold had been expended. In the same two years the British Government in addition, made use of dollar balances, market securities and various other investments to the extent of somewhat more than \$1,000 million. . . . In March 1941 the Lend-Lease Act provided \$7,000 million. . . . and a further provision of nearly \$6,000 million in October of the same year. After the U.S. had become involved in the war, the amount of lend-lease funds was increased to a total of \$48,000 million and by March 1942 lend-lease agreements had been concluded with thirty-four countries.

. . . . To judge from pronouncements by authoritative persons in practically all countries, gold may be expected to retain its function as an appropriate medium for the settlement of balances on foreign account, and will thus continue to be held, together with foreign currencies, in reserve for such payments. . . .

Conclusion

A great war has a double aspect: on the one hand, severance of relations with enemies and, on the other, a

closer association among countries on the same side of the barrier. Thus, contrasting with the element of isolation, an active element of collaboration is present. In planning for the future, this element of collaboration is regarded as essential by all parties, not least in the field of economic and monetary relationships. This is not surprising: little demonstration is needed—indeed, war conditions provide the evidence—that no single country can become wholly self-sufficient, each being of necessity part of a wider economy. But a difference in conception exists whether this wider economy should be on a world basis or whether collaboration should, in the first place, be worked out in separate, politically defined areas, with arrangements for trade between these areas as larger entities. Nevertheless, it is common ground that a greater degree of economic collaboration must be achieved than, for instance, was realised in the period between the two wars, marked as it was by so many measures taken for the sake of narrow national ends, irrespective of their repercussions on the general welfare.

The conception that better economic collaboration is a necessity in the modern world, so often stressed in official declarations, has unmistakably taken root in the minds of a wider public, in spite of the nationalism engendered by the war. This same public is certainly aware that difficulties beset the creation of a system based on collaboration, but it feels instinctively that a way can and must be found to establish effective cooperation without impairing the vital interests of individual countries.

The problems are many and various. It is not easy to define the monetary and commercial obligations to which a country should subscribe in order to fit its policy into the general economic scheme. Institutions competent to deal with particular sets of problems will be needed, but undertakings must also be given by the various countries setting some limit to their power to alter, unilaterally and without regard to their interests of their neighbours, the exchange value of their currencies or the main lines of their commercial practice. Collaboration, if it is to be real, must mean some adaptation of national policies to the requirements of a common development, and this implies readiness to make not only adjustments but positive contributions to joint endeavours. Merely to subscribe to general principles or to concentrate on concessions to be made by others will be of little avail. An individual country may feel keenly the sacrifice involved in some of the measures to be adopted, but the result of the alignment should be to ensure a higher degree of lasting welfare for each country than it would be able to attain by itself. Experience has proved that the policy, only too often adopted before the war, of protecting the immediate interests of a particular economy by creating hindrances to trade, leads to such disturbances in the world generally that even the country applying the policy fails to attain the ends envisaged. During the war, with the growing scarcity of supplies, each country is naturally anxious to encourage imports, but the methods employed are largely unsuited to conditions of normal peaceful intercourse. The new lines to be struck—different in so many respects both from those tried before and from those applied during the war—must be inspired by the belief that, with modern potentialities of production, the prosperity of a single nation need not and, indeed, cannot be won at the expense of others, and that it is therefore short-sighted to embark upon a policy without regard to the effects it will produce in other countries.

Points from Parliament

HOUSE OF COMMONS: NOVEMBER 10 SCOTLAND

Small Burghs (Post-War Powers and Duties)

Mr. Henderson Stewart asked the Secretary of State for Scotland whether he is aware of the concern felt by small burghs in Scotland regarding the discussions now proceeding on changes in their powers and duties in the post-war reconstruction; and whether he will make a statement indicating exactly what action the Government are taking in the matter and what official inquiries are contemplated?

Mr. Johnston: I have had no representation from small burghs on the matter to which my hon. Friend refers, and it is not clear what discussions he has in mind. I have, after consultation with the Council of ex-Secretaries of State for Scotland, instituted a number of inquiries into Scottish post-war reconstruction problems; but no inquiry into the question of the powers of the small burghs has been set up.

Mr. Stewart: In order to reassure those concerned, will my right hon. Friend indicate whether he has in mind any inquiries into this particular problem of the powers and duties of small burghs?

Mr. Johnston: No, Sir, not immediately.

RATING (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES' REPORT)

Mr. N. Bower asked the Minister of Health whether, in view of the recent publication of the reports of the Scott and Uthwatt Committees, which must have a considerable influence on any proposals for the reorganisation of local government, he will now implement the promise made by his predecessor on the 4th April, 1940, and publish the report of the Departmental Committee on Valuation for Rating at an early date?

Mr. E. Brown: The terms of reference to the Committee were limited to the investigation of a particular issue relating to the assessment of small houses, and had no bearing on the machinery of valuation for rates or of other local government functions. Many material factors affecting the issue investigated by the committee have substantially changed under war conditions, and I am not convinced that in present circumstances the publication of the report would serve a useful purpose.

POST-WAR REORGANISATION, SCOTLAND

Captain Ramsay asked the Secretary of State for Scotland whether he will give an assurance that in any temporary or post-war reorganisation none of the Scottish institutions and services, such as the police and judiciary, specifically safe-guarded in the Act of Union, will be permitted to be subordinated to any non-Scottish Department?

Mr. Johnston: There is no mention of police in the Act of Union. The subordination of the judiciary to a Government Department does not, of course, arise; and the hon. and gallant Member can be assured that the importance of safeguarding Scottish institutions is fully realised.

Income Tax (Lands and Buildings)

Mr. Douglas asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what were the approximate annual values of all the landed

properties in England and Wales and in Scotland assessable to Income Tax under Schedule A for the financial year 1941-42; and what were the estimated net yields under this schedule for that financial year?

Sir K. Wood: The gross annual value of lands and buildings assessed under Schedule A in 1941-42 is estimated at £545,000,000 in England and Wales, and £45,000,000 in Scotland. I regret that I am unable to state the amount of tax, as the receipts under the different schedules of the tax are not distinguished in the collection accounts.

NOVEMBER 12

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS

The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Richard Law): . . . I am going to give the House some figures, covering the 12 months period, the last available period of which we have a complete record of the goods which have been despatched [to Russia]. I am not sure of the exact date but I think it is to the end of September or October. These figures apply to the Northern route only and not to any other. They represent the joint despatches, not deliveries, of ourselves, and the United States. Not all of those despatches, of course, have reached their destination, but the great bulk of them have, and these are the figures I give to the House. They cover aircraft, tanks, bulk cargo, like shells and small arms and ammunition, field products and machinery, machine tools, quantities of non-ferrous metals comprising nickel, aluminium, and food-stuffs and medical supplies. The figure for aircraft in this 12 months period is that 3,052 aircraft have been despatched. The figure for tanks is that 4,084 have been despatched, and the figure for vehicles is 30,031. The figure for miscellaneous cargo, machine tools, the metals, aluminium and so on to which I have referred is 831,000 dead-weight tons. In addition there were 42,000 tons of aviation spirit and petrol and 66,000 tons of fuel oil. . . .

I have spoken in the main of four Powers, the British Commonwealth, the United States, the Soviet Union, and China; but, of course, those do not exhaust the roll of the United Nations. The same spirit of co-operation which exists between those four Powers, and which I have tried to describe, also exists within the United Nations as a whole. The United Nations are nearly completely integrated now. They are pooling their resources, they are pooling their valour, some of them are contributing their shipping, some are contributing their colonial resources. They are now very nearly an integrated whole. We must hope that this development of United Nations action, among the great Powers and among the smaller Powers alike, will be continued after the war. I should like to read to the House a quotation from a speech that was made on October 15 by Mr. Adolph Berle, United States Assistant Secretary of State. Mr. Berle said:

"We shall have the problem, when the peace is won, of keeping and holding that peace through an extremely difficult period. You cannot expect order in a hungry world, and the world will be very hungry indeed. The machinery which has been built up to supply us in war time will have to be used to keep us supplied until the commerce of peace is re-established."

That is an American view, and it seems to show that the Americans as well as ourselves are thinking in terms of United Nations, of a structure which will be developed through the war and which will in some way, in some form, be continued after the war. . . .

MR. DREISER IN TORONTO

Toronto Saturday Night says that Canadians have been subjected to a barrage of meetings organised by the more extreme Leftists for the purpose of cashing in on the present popularity of Russia: "Most of these meetings, we are strongly convinced, are intended much more for the future political advantage of the Communist party in Canada than for any immediate benefit to the Russians."

"It was extremely fortunate for all those associated with the visit to Toronto of Mr. Theodore Dreiser that Mr. Dreiser relieved his mind of his views about the British nation, people and government in an interview the day before his lecture, instead of saving them for the public platform. . . .

"The advantage of a man like Mr. Dreiser is that he blurts out frankly what is in his mind, while people like Professor Frank Scott say the same things in subtle and polished phrases which do far more damage and which cannot be dealt with by the Toronto police commissioners or the minister of justice. It is just as well that it should be brought to public attention that the motive behind a great deal of the present campaigning for a second front and for an unmitigated and indiscriminating adulation of Russia is a deep-seated hostility to the British people and the whole political system which they developed and by which they stand, including their adherence to the tenets of the Christian religion. Mr. Dreiser's mentality is not widely different from that of our own more extreme Leftists; the amazing thing is that he should have wanted to talk to them, and they should have wanted to hear him, on the subject of *Democracy on the Offensive*, since neither he nor they have the slightest interest in democracy whether it is on the offensive or the defensive."

To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

Affiliation to the Social Credit Secretariat, which was accorded to Groups of Social Crediters, has been replaced by a new relationship and all previously existing affiliations were terminated as from January 1, 1942. This new relationship is expressed in the following Form which Associations* desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members of Association

.....

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat†.

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy to every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Signature.....

A brief statement is also requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,
Director of Organisation
and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

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 Big Idea	2/6
The Tragedy of Human Effort	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy	7d.
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.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	2d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Rulers of Russia by Rev Denis Fahey.....	1/-

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.

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.
 BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 73 Manor Rd., Blackpool.
 BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
 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 December 3.
 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.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is now in regular use. The Library 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 social science.

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

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.