THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 6. No. 4. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1941. 6d. Weekly.

"WHERESOEVER THE CARCASE IS---" (III)

By C. H. Douglas

It is clear, I think, that it is exactly in the realm to which Socialism has contributed nothing, the realm of individual initiative, invention, and scientific discovery, that we have made our progress towards a leisure civilisation, security, and culture. And exactly in the realm in which Socialism operates exclusively, that of Law and the infringement upon the liberty of the individual, that the major and increasing frictions of Society occur, and the stultification of Science is accomplished. It is not the concern of Science to deal with Distribution. And with regard to Finance, which is the mechanism of Distribution, Socialists and the Financier have always been of like mind.

In this, we approach the answer to our original question—why does Socialism receive support from International Finance and specifically German-American-Jew Finance? That answer is that Law places the sanctions of the State behind the collection of taxes. Socialism with its slavish adulation of the State, aims continually at the transfer of Property to the State. This property then becomes available as security for State Loans created by the Financiers out of paper credits—i.e., the monetisation of the collective credit of the community concerned. The Bond-holders are exactly what their title would imply—they are the slave holders of the "New Order."* Just enough of the Bonds are distributed to the Public to obscure the real nature of the transaction and to create a vested interest in the protection of the Financier.

Now, up to this point, it should be clear that there is really no room for discussion. There is not a single Socialist measure which has not involved increased taxation —taxation which is unnecessary but which increases the power of the Financier. At the date at which these words are written, the expenditure of the British Government has reached the colossal figure of £14,000,000 *per day*. No one in their senses believes that this sum is being raised, either by taxation or "saving." It is, as to its major part, a book-keeping device to transfer Public Credit to Financiers. When the war has gone on long enough to ensure that the necessary arrangements have been made under the plea of military necessity ("Only in time of war, or under threat of war, will the British Government engage in long range Planning," as Mr. Israel Sieff's P.E.P. journal remarked) the maximum amount of taxes, although not all that are "due" as interest on these paper loans, can be extracted from the individual, so that he can never become his own master. Since inability to pay all will be admitted, the interest will be scaled down. The genuine subscriber, as distinct from the creators of large credits, will thus in effect lose his money. And it should be remembered that these colossal credits are based on destruction not construction.

Such a situation requires the elimination of autonomous States. One centralised Police Force ("As easy as A.B.C.") will provide the Sanction for the Tax Collector. Herr Hitler is eliminating European States, the United States is eliminating the British Empire, Japan proclaims a "New Order" in Asia, and, through National Socialism, the New Deal, Communism, or funeral Reithism, Utopia arrives with the day on which Hitler (if you live in England) Churchill (if you live in Germany) or Mussolini, are "beaten." Stalin, Roosevelt, Taxes and Banks will accompany Mr. Benjamin Cohen, *et al.*, into the Dawn of the New Day.

Perhaps.

I have already suggested that an illusion has been systematically and consciously fostered both by the corrupt Press, and by political propaganda covertly paid for by international financiers, that the world's populations must maintain themselves by persistent and increasing "work" and competition for export markets; that this illusion can only be maintained by every kind of waste, and that the periodical wars which are a necessary agency of this waste are used to rivet fresh bonds, in every sense of the word, on the deluded public. But there are certain other aspects of the matter which are both significant, and curious. One of these is the success with which Old Testament "religion" is used to recommend Socialist doctrines, in much the same

* Slavery will be abolished by the War. This we and our European friends are in favour of. For slavery is but the owning of labour, and involves the care of the slave. The same result can be obtained by controlling the money." Circular issued to Bankers in the United States at the end of the American Civil War.

way that Cromwell's illiterate and half-crazed bible-thumpers prepared the way for the victory of the City of London Whigs, and their shadowy Continental backers, the re-admission of the Jews to England, the foundation of the Bank "of England," the loss of the American Colonies by taxation, and the black era of child-labour and unbridled industrialism which characterised the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. No one who has any familiarity with the subject can fail to recognise the revival of the same technique, modernised, in the Dispatches from Our Own Correspondent on Mount Sinai which are broadcast by the "British" Broadcasting Corporation before the more secular news which follows at 8 o'clock. The frenetic adjurations to "sacrifice," i. e. to pay more taxation ("which with proper psychological preparation can be greatly increased") which were a feature of Lord Stamp (of the Bank "of England")'s pre-war speeches, also bore the same suggestion that we hearken unto the Chosen Messenger of the Lord—invariably bringing bad news.

I am quite willing to accept any alternative explanation which fits the facts. But I find it difficult to understand the traitorous mismanagement of the affairs of this country for the last twenty years, in the face of the warning of 1914-1918, to go no further back, and the rewards and honour which has fallen to those who have been responsible, on any other assumption than that the situation in which we find ourselves to-day was consciously designed by much cleverer men than any of the well-known political shop-window ornaments who did their bidding. And further, that the arrangements to sell the British Empire required an organisation much older than twenty years, and included the sale, at one and the same time, of exactly those conceptions of individual liberty which, with some justice, w consider flourish best in these islands.

While, therefore, I have no doubt that Pan-Germanism, at the moment represented by Hitler, is the immediate enemy, and, as the result of the skilful planning of the real Enemy can only be crushed and must be crushed, as the outcome of a long and devastating war, I am equally confident that victory over Germany is only valuable if it is accompanied by victory over those who at one and the same time helped Germany to re-arm, and prevented Great Britain from re-arming until re-arming inevitably meant a long war. I mean that mysterious international Power which at one end of the scale crosses all frontiers, dictates every Budget, and imposes the policy which maintains its own strength, and at the other, uses its Socialist dupes to fortify those sanctions of the State which render revolt impossible.

The solution of the problem is not a light matter, and is more difficult with every day's delay. For my own part I am convinced that, having in view the devastation which these men have let loose for their own ends, no action is too drastic which renders them and their Organisations, incapable of further harm.

Once they are out of the way, with their powers of Bribery and Blackmail, there is plenty of goodwill and ability in the world to guide "the forces of nature to the service and well-being of Man."

(Concluded)

C. H. Douglas

PARLIAMENT

LEASING OF BASES TO UNITED STATES: ECONOMIC WARFARE

[Official Report of March 18, contained oral answers to questions on obstruction to efficient conduct of the war by restrictions on spending powers of senior army officers, and Major Reid-Kellett's changes and other matters concerning the Select Committee on National Expenditure; written answers on Agricultural Credit Facilities and Members of Parliament (War Work, Pay) and discussions of private soldiers' pay, amounts paid to housewives on whom soldiers are billeted and other topics arriving on Supply, among them:—]

Mr. Martin (Southwark, Central): ....As my right hon. and gallant Friend reminded us last week, the Army of to-day and to-morrow depends enormously upon the individual efficiency, initiative, common sense and capacity of the ordinary man. When an army goes into action an officer has, of necessity, to abrogate a great part of the responsibility of leadership which he played in the past. He can no longer inspire and lead his men in battle for the simple reason that he may become a casualty himself, and the men cannot depend on the type of leadership on which the Army depended in the past. To-day we have to face a situation in which an officer's function is to call out those qualities in his men which will make them the most useful soldiers in the hour of emergency and battle. If we get that type of officer, we shall have something which will be of enormous value to us, when we find ourselves face to face with the emergency of a serious engagement. There are many other important elements in the equipment of an officer: he must be able to stand up to the enemy, he should know something about the civil background of the men he commands, and he should be able to stand up to the generals. If you include the higher command and general staff, that is an important part of the functions of an officer at the present day. I heard of a case of a divisional commander being fetched out of bed by a junior officer at 3 o'clock in the morning because his men had had no food for 24 hours and had been called upon to unload a train before they were fed. The officer went to the village where the divisional commander was, got him out of bed and told him what the situation was. That is the type of man we want. I would suggest to the Prime Minister, who is interested in the moral factor in war, that he should consider the introduction of a new decoration —perhaps the Churchill Cross—to be given as a reward for gallantry in the face of the higher command. A great deal of encouragement is required for the young officer to-day which he does not get, but more important than giving encouragement is to get the right type of man.

[Report of proceedings of March 19, contained:—]

GREAT BRITAIN AND UNITED STATES (WARSHIPS).

Mr. Naylor asked the Prime Min ter whether, with a view to easing t dollar exchange, providing extra employment in the British shipbuilding

industry when the war is over, and assisting the United States of America to increase her naval effectives immediately after the war, he has considered the possibility of inducing the United States of America to purchase at once a certain number of warships now in commission or in process of building, or their counterparts if lost or damaged in action, for delivery after the war, subject to whatever final adjustments of price may be necessary after delivery?

The Prime Minister: No, Sir.

On motion for Second Reading, Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill:

Mr. Hubert Beaumont (Batley and Morley):....We want this Ministry [Works and Buildings] to state its functions and duties so that at some later stage we can definitely assess its success or failure, and to be able either to approve or to condemn what the Ministry does. We are in somewhat of a difficulty at the present time, because we cannot place our fingers upon any definite powers that the Ministry possesses. In fact, their powers seem to be "wrapt in mystery." The Parliamentary Secretary said that the one thing which the Ministry has is a genius for picking other people's brains. I hope the Ministry will develop a genius for stopping other people from picking the nation's pockets. The powers of the Ministry should be such that they can prevent the further exploitation of the people. I believe that it was Edison who once said that genius was 10 per cent. inspiration and 90 per cent. perspiration, and we believe that it is that kind of genius that the Ministry must exercise if they are to carry out their tasks.

There are two aspects of planning. One aspect is of planning during the war, and the other is of planning after the war. We want to be sure that the planning which is done during the war shall have some relationship to that which will follow after the war.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (LEASING OF BASES, DEBATE)

(9¾ columns).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—[*Major Dugdale.*]

Commander Sir Archibald Southby (Epsom): I wish to raise a point of which I have given considerable notice to the Government and about which there has been considerable discussion, namely, the refusal of the Government to allow this House an opportunity of knowing something about the administration of the bases which it is proposed—and in my opinion quite rightly proposed—to hand over to the United States of America. In my opinion, not only is the future of the struggle in which we are engaged bound up in the friendship between the United States of America and ourselves, but the future happiness of the world, and of mankind, will depend on the closest co-operation and friendship, which I hope will exist for all time, between the two nations. Nobody is a stauncher or more convinced believer in the utmost friendship and co-operation with that great country than I am. We are proposing for our mutual benefit and security, to hand over to the United States of America certain portions of British possessions, so that they may be used as bases. It is quite right that that should be done.

It being the hour appointed for the interruption of Business, the Motion for the Adjournment of the House lapsed, without Question put.

Question again proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—[*Major Dugdale.*]

Sir A. Southby: But this House of Commons is concerned with those portions of the British Empire which are not self-governing. Therefore, we have not only a privilege, but a duty to perform. In my opinion it would not be right that agreement should be finally reached concerning the future of the peoples who inhabit these areas without this House of Commons having an opportunity to express its opinions, its wishes, and its hopes to the Prime Minister and those who are guiding the destinies of the country and the British Empire at the present time. I cannot see any reason why the Prime Minister should not, in Secret Session, take this House, as may be possible, into his confidence, so that he might hear what responsible Members of this House have to say upon the subject. I cannot for a moment imagine that any harm could possibly be done to the excellent relations which exist between the two peoples at the present time. After all, our counterpart on the other side of the Atlantic, the Foreign Relations Committee, has a function to perform—and performs it most excellently—and no doubt, has had an opportunity of discussing this very subject. I cannot see, therefore, why the House of Commons should not have equal facilities. There is no question of discussing the policy of handing over the Bases, because I do not think there is a soul in the country who is not agreed upon that. There is no question of discussing anything which could in the least create doubts and difficulties at a time when everybody should be doing his best to help the ship of State along, in the prosecution of the war. At this moment I am not concerned with the details, or even with the broad outlines, of the Agreement. All I am concerned with is the fact that the Executive have stubbornly refused to allow this House of Commons to express any views at all. In my humble submission, the Prime Minister, who has the support of all of us, might well be fortified in his task by hearing what some Members have to say. So short a time ago as on 6th March, my right hon. Friend the Lord Privy Seal, in reply to a Question, said:

> "It is impossible to stop Government business in the middle of a war so that everything can be brought up for discussion by this House"—

everybody will agree with that.

> "But an opportunity will be given to this House for discussing all major matters."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 6th March 1941; col. 1026, Vol. 369.]

There could hardly be anything more major than this. We are doing something which has never been done before. We are parting with portions of the British Empire, and with the people in them. As those people have only us as their guardians, I think it is right that we should know in broad detail what it is proposed should be the future of those people, and what rights they are going to possess. At present, they are citizens of the British Empire. It cannot be right, when we are fighting for democracy and the right of free peoples to express their views, for the Government to come to a major decision of this kind, which will have most far-reaching effects, without giving the House of Comons the opportunity, which is their right, of expressing their views. It is not a bit of good coming to the House when everything is signed, sealed and delivered, and saying, "Here it is; take it or leave it." We are a council of State. Of course, we shall support the Executive in anything they do; but they also have a duty towards us and that is to allow us, as far as in their power lies, to express our views, and to make helpful suggestions. I suggest that a Secret Session is the proper time and the proper way in which this matter can be discussed

before a final and irrevocable settlement is come to. I would not for one moment advocate that necessarily every detail should be disclosed by the Prime Minister—obviously, when a momentous decision of this kind is being come to, it is not right that every detail should be discussed—but what I do say is that the Prime Minister might well hear what we had to say, even if he did not speak himself in the Debate. If he heard what Members had to say and learned of their doubts and fears, he could then go away fortified for futher negotiations. I think I can stand before my fellow Members of the House absolved from any question of having raised this matter precipitately. I raise it, I hope, with as much courtesy and consideration for the difficulties of the time as any responsible Member of Parliament could do. But I cannot square it with my conscience to stand in this House and not raise my voice in protest that before anything so big is done, this House of Commons shall be denied any opportunity whatever of expressing its views. . . . .

Sir Stanley Reed (Aylesbury): I would not like it to go forth from this House that the point of view held by my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Epsom (Sir A. Southby) is the only point of view that is held by Members on this side of the House. I am sorry to say that I must differ entirely from the argument he has put before the House, and I must do so on what I suggest are grounds of history, Constitutional practice and the present state of the world, particularly in the Western Atlantic. I would point out in the first place that Treaty-making rights are vested in the Crown and the function of Parliament is to accept or reject a Treaty when it is concluded. I might have joined my hon. and gallant Friend if he had taken the ground that this agreement is bad in itself and should not, therefore, be carried out; but I understand that he entirely approves the Treaty. Well, to accept the major and substantial element, and then to desire that this House shall discuss, now and at this stage, the technical details, of which it cannot be fully cognisant, and on which only the Government can be fully cognisant, is a point of view that I cannot, with all respect, support.

Sir A. Southby: That is not what I said. I did not say that we should discuss the technical details. I said that we should be allowed to express our views before a decision is come to by the Executive.

Mr. Stokes (Ipswich): I wish to make it clear that I do not dispute in any way the advisability or wisdom of the Treaties which are now contemplated, but I join with the hon. and gallant Member for Epsom (Sir A. Southby) in submitting that it would be to the advantage of the people concerned and the advantage of the Government, and would be in accordance with the historic importance of this House, that we should be given an opportunity of discussing what is to take place and stating to the Government our views on the terms proposed before the documents are actually signed. In listening to the speech of the hon. Member for Aylesbury (Sir S. Reed), I thought he was in a contradictory state of mind. First, he cavilled at the suggestion of the hon. and gallant Member for Epsom that a Debate should take place in Secret Session, meaning therefore that any Debate should be in public; and then he went on to say "that he did not want any public Debate either." I am not prepared to accept that supine state of mind. We have our responsibilities to the people who inhabit these Colonial possessions, and I think it would both stimulate and reinforce the powers of the Government to know what are the views of the House.

Personally, I take the view, which is not necessarily shared by the majority of hon. Members, that no harm whatever would be done by having a public Debate on the points I would like to raise. I have for a long time taken the view that the Treaty-making rights of the Crown should be abrogated. That may not be the general view. However, I suggest that we are really on the point of undertaking a commercial transaction. We are about to sell part of our Colonial possessions in exchange for certain goods that we require. It comes to that. We had better face the terms and not pretend that we are indulging in any high and mighty moral issue. We are not doing anything of the sort. In exchange for certain facilities which are to be provided for us, we propose to sell up part of the British Empire. I do not contest that point at all. Probably it is a prudent and wise thing to do, but we have accepted our responsibilities towards the people who live in those territories, and I am particularly concerned——

Mr. Lipson (Cheltenham): Does the hon. Member realise that in the opinion of the United States these bases are vital for their own safety, and does he not consider their safety is a matter of great concern to us?

Mr. Stokes: I am not disputing that for a single moment. I say that there are certain aspects—an attitude of mind of our friends across the Atlantic towards these inhabitants—which ought to be safeguarded in this House. I am thinking of the colour bar, and I should like to satisfy myself that proper protection has been afforded to these people, when this Treaty is signed. Another matter which has been discussed in the islands, and which has been referred to in the newspapers—I say it at the risk of being accused of King Charles's head—is that as a result of all this work there is going to be a very great change in the value of possessions in the islands. I should like to know what will be the effect, and who will derive the benefit as the result of this work. My hon. and gallant Friend and myself, have been interested in this subject for some time, and we have sought for assurances and have had half assurances and have been put off—we agree that when the Lease and Lend Bill was not through it was difficult to raise the point. My submission to the Government is that unless an opportunity is given to discuss this question, it is yet another example of the Gestapo methods of the present Government. [*Interruption.*] Whenever we raise anything which is inconvenient it is always termed as not in the public interest or we are told that there is a war on. I personally protest against the idea that we should allow the Executive to give chunks of our Colonial possessions away without first coming to this House, and I support what my hon. and gallant Friend has said in opening this Debate.

Mr. Beverley Baxter (Wood Green): There is one unfailing guide in this House of how to make up one's mind if one needs assistance, and that is my hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Stokes), for whom I have the greatest personal regard, because he is always wrong. Never was he more wrong, to my mind, than at this moment. His perfectly audible speech was a perfect example of the unfortunate nature of the Debate which would take place if this matter was discussed. His statement that we are buying with territories in the Empire what we need is a pettifogging attorney's attitude at one of the greatest and most inspiring moments in our history. Had my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Epsom

(Sir A. Southby) attended the lunch yesterday——

Sir A. Southby: I was not asked.

Mr. Baxter: Had he attended the lunch for the new American Ambassador, he would have realised that the speeches showed that at last the great Continent of America—a Continent slow to come to a decision, but moving with irresistible power when it does so come—is now in this war and is coming to our rescue. We need her help, and this is the birth of this Anglo-Saxon understanding—the future of the world is embodied in it. At such a moment are we going to say to America, "Wait a minute, the Parliament of Great Britain wants to talk about terms and colour bans, and nigger problems, and who gets the contracts"? All these wealthy Socialists always have contracts. And so I deplore the attitude of my hon. and gallant Friend. He has fought his case well, but it is a wretched case and should never have been raised.

[Owing to desirability of representing it at some length matter from the debate of March 20, (WOMEN POWER) is held over till next week.]

March 25.

Oral Answers to Questions.

(32 columns).

COMMODITY PRICES (PROPOSED LEGISLATION).

Mr. Cary asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he can make any announcement about the intention of the Government to strengthen the machinery for controlling prices?

The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lyttelton): Yes, Sir. Conditions have changed greatly since the Prices of Goods Act was passed in the autumn of 1939, and in particular the supplies of goods available to the public have had to be sharply curtailed. The Prices of Goods Act has worked satisfactorily up to the present in keeping prices generally at a reasonable level in relation to costs, but I am satisfied that in the altered circumstances a further measure of price regulation is needed. I hope soon to introduce a Bill to give the Board of Trade greater powers of control over prices, other than food prices, than are provided in the existing Act, and to effect a number of improvements in the system of price regulation set up by that Act. In particular, I propose to ask in the new legislation for power to fix maximum prices for specified goods and maximum wholesale and retail percentage margins. There will also be power to deal with manufacturers' prices and margins and with the charges made for services, such as the storage of furniture. Provision will be made to prevent increases in the price of articles which are controlled under the Limitation of Supplies Orders owing to commissions on transactions between registered persons and others, or to the intervention of unnecessary intermediaries in such transactions, and it is hoped by similar means to check speculative dealing in goods which are not controlled under these Orders. ....

ECONOMIC WARFARE.

UNOCCUPIED FRANCE (IMPORTS).

Commander Sir Archibald Southby: Will the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind that the weapon of blockade is only useful if it is applied ruthlessly?

Mr. Dalton: Yes, Sir. ....

Sir William Davidson: Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the facts he mentioned a few moments ago, namely, as to the food from the French Colonies going to Germany instead of going to France to relieve the situation there?

Mr. Dalton: The Government are well aware and have information to show that a certain proportion of these imports does reach the enemy.

Sir A. Southby: If the Vichy Government have any exportable surplus coming in from Northern Africa, why is there any reason why we should allow other goods to go in from America?

Mr. Dalton: The exportable surplus is strictly to be used in regard to French North Africa. ....

Sir J. Lamb: Can the right hon. Gentleman explain how it is that British sailors lose their lives only for politicians to break the blockade they have made?

RUSSIAN IMPORTS.

Dr. Russell Thomas asked the Minister of Economic Warfare whether he has anything further to report in regard to Russian imports through Vladivostock for re-export to Germany; and whether these are now diminishing?

Mr. Dalton: Sales to Germany of goods imported by the U.S.S.R. on their own account are very small. Direct transit trade to Germany by the Trans-Siberian Railway remains, however, I regret to say, substantial. Moreover, as I informed the hon. and gallant Member for Lewes (Rear-Admiral Beamish) on 28th January, there is a constant danger that abnormal Soviet imports, even though not themselves re-exported, may release for export to Germany corresponding quantities of Soviet products.

CANADA'S WAR EFFORT

"I make this charge, that No. 1 saboter in Canada since the beginning of the war is the *Financial Post*," the Federal Munitions Minister is said to have declared in the Commons. The *Edmonton Journal* says Mr. Howe, the Minister, threw the House into excitement as he shouted out the charge at the end of a speech on aircraft and other war production. He complained of a tendency in the press to publish all sorts of rumours about his department and to attack it. In this, he said, the *Financial Post* was prominent.

"The *Financial Post* attempted to stop Bren Gun production in Canada," said Mr. Howe.

"What the *Financial Post* publishes in its own paper is perhaps its own business but when it steps out and pays money, as apparently it is doing, to buy space in other papers to make untrue and damaging statements, it is not doing it for philanthropy."

Mr. Howe also said H. R. MacMillan, of Vancouver, before leaving recently for the Pacific coast "told me he was being sabotaged and I agreed with him."

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

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

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

Vol. 6. No. 4. *Saturday, April 5, 1941.*

"Union Now"

or

"WEDLOCK BEFORE WAR"!

"There is no such thing as sovereignty of government separate from the free will of people," says the *Saturday Evening Post.* "And if the people, from whom the government derives its powers, may not debate whether or not they shall go to war, what their government shall be and what it shall do, and impose their will upon it, then we are coming to the end of a long delusion."

"Prave 'orts" as Parson Hugh says. Even "praver 'orts" are the following from the same page:—"At a 'Union Now' dinner in New York a member of the British House of Lords, a distinguished German novelist and a famous French publicist defined the Americanism of those Americans who so love the world that they would give their own country to save it; and at the end an actor read Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. On the whole, we prefer the foreign interpretation of that kind of Americanism. We do not dispute the right of American citizens who would prefer Anglo-American citizenship to say so. Let them regret the War of Independence and all American history. Let them erase the word 'America' from their hearts and propose, as they did at this dinner, the immediate union of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Ireland, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand, in order that we shall have a better reason for embracing the European war, having married the British Empire. But, please, will they let the dead patriots rest?"

Below the paragraph is a drawing of Uncle Sam out of "A Yankee at the Court of King Arthur" pulling on his gauntlet before mounting the American donkey, very up-stage, grinning and cross-legged. His "Saxon" shield bears the legend 'Saviour of the World.'

This is all very interesting; but actually it is only 'debate'—the form in which the illusion of will is imposed upon the people. You can't have a 'victory' without a fight; and you can't have a 'resounding victory' without a big fight; and you can't have a fight of any size at all without at least two nearly equal sides.

Until fairly recently, the planners of world hegemony have been content to forego claiming their ceaseless progress as 'victory.' Events are forcing them into the open and are even forcing their identity into the open. It is at this point that 'victory' is more likely to be snatched from them than at any other. The flatfish displaying its powers of mimicry at the bottom of a tank lined by check-board linoleum is hard to see *until it moves.* But you can't have a piece of the floor moving about without exciting curiosity concerning the cause. The enemy is on the move.

The caution (at last) of Mr. Churchill in the House of Commons and of Lord Halifax before the Pilgrims points the same way. And it is not insignificant that this is the moment chosen by the Imperial Policy Group to publish the well-kept secret of its "Imperial" policy. Its Empire is the Anglo-American Empire that is to be with its "common economic, defence and foreign policy."

Despite the "two experienced philosophers" (Halifax and Winant) with their "temperamental aversion to the glaring publicity which must attend their doings" (now isn't that a pity!) the group's prognostications may be as wide of the mark in this matter as they have been in regard to Yugoslavia. Whether that country has or has not "found its soul" it is increasingly apparent that the souls of the two *most* "experienced philosophers" now living will not suffice to provide souls for everybody, and it quite unnecessary that they should. National soul-finding is still "in its infancy."

T. J.

AUTHORSHIP OF "MEIN KAMPF"

The late Ambassador Dodd in *My Secret Diary* makes an addition to the number of those who "assisted" Hitler to write *Mein Kampf.* He is Ernst Hanfstaengl, who in March, 1937 "has not been seen by Hitler for two years or more." According to *The Sunday Dispatch,* the diary proceeds:—"Since he gave much money to Hitler in 1923, helped him to write *Mein Kampf,* and was in every way familiar with Hitler's motives, he would be an unreliable man out of Germany. What a book he could write!" The last mention of a claimant to the honour of authorship of *Mein Kampf* was a Jew refugee in South America. What a book the authors of *Mein Kampf* could write!

BOWLING US OUT?

"Mr. J. B. Priestley, the novelist, will not give the Postscript to the nine o'clock news next Sunday evening. On that day and on the three following Sundays it will be given by Mr. A. P. Herbert, M.P.

"Mr. A. P. Ryan, Advisor to the B.B.C. on Home Affairs, stated last night that Mr. Priestley would probably return to the microphone after a short interval of six or eight Sundays. There was no question of "sacking" Mr. Priestley; it was merely a case of "changing the bowling."

"Mr. Priestley's second series of broadcasts was to have consisted of six Postscripts, but it has already extended to eight."

—*From "The Daily Telegraph" of March* 26, 1941.

Mr. Sieff's Plan for Britain

By John Mitchell

The leader writer in *The Times* of March 13 stated that Mr. Roosevelt in his first inaugural address to Congress eight years ago "attributed the distress of economic crisis then at its height to the failure of 'the rulers of the exchange of mankind's goods.'" *The Times* and Mr. Roosevelt would no doubt like people to believe that the Economic Crisis was the result of *failure* by "the rulers," but there is too much in the happenings of recent history to support an accusation that the Economic Crisis was a *success* for "the rulers" for this theory to be acceptable as genuine. On December 15, 1931, Mr. Louis T. McFadden, ex-President of the Pensylvania Bankers' Association and for twelve years Chairman of the U.S.A. House of Representatives' Banking and Currency Committee said in reference to this Crisis:

"It was not accidental. It was a carefully contrived occurrence—the International Bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so that they could emerge as the rulers of us all."

Among the things that the Economic Crisis "succeeded" in doing were (1) The defeat of Mr. Hoover and the election of Mr. Roosevelt as President of the U.S.A. (2) To increase immensely the discontent in Germany with the result that the Nazi Party gained mass support and Hitler became Chancellor of the Reich (3) To lead to the formation in 1931 of the organisation known as P.E.P. in this country so that Planning became a feature of Government legislation in subsequent years.

And what is the outcome of these successes? In 1938 the statement appeared in P.E.P.'s journal that "we have started from the position that only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large scale planning." In 1939 the Nazis were successful in bringing about war in Europe. In 1940 Britain was brought near to complete disaster and Great Britain became largely dependent on the U.S.A. In 1941 the U.S. Government forges the machinery of the Lease and Lend Act and Great Britain's policy is dictated from America.

Now, with the arrival in Great Britain of Mr. Benjamin Cohen, described by *The Economist* as "one of the acutest minds in the New Deal [America's P.E.P.] and a very close associate of Mr. Roosevelt," P.E.P., of which Mr. Israel Moses Sieff is Chairman, gets busy on a further development of its PLAN. Lord Reith is authorised to announce that "the principle of planning will be accepted as national policy and that a central planning authority will be set up." On March 24 and 25 Mr. Kenneth Lindsay, M.P., who was for some years Secretary of P.E.P., contributed two articles to *The Times* on Regional Government. He was supported by the leader writer of *The Times* on March 24. This leader writer makes it clear that the Regional Governments which are planned are to be suspended between the Devil of Whitehall and the Deep Sea of the electorate so that Whitehall can pass the buck of responsibility and the electorate can have no effective sanctions over Government. In the words of *The Times*'s leader writer, "it may well be that some such organisation of regional administration as has already been established under the Regional Commissioners, modified to meet the different conditions of peace, will provide the right meeting-place for an administrative authority *delegated from above* [my italics] and a new democratic initiative in local affairs thrown up from below."

It will be recalled that the Government announced its intention to appoint Regional Commissioners after the ratepayers of this country had demonstrated, with the assistance of Social Crediters, that they were learning how to control their local governments and get the results from them that they required. The war suspended this development. The progress of this campaign was opposed tooth and nail by Whitehall, which, through the Ministry of Health and its hold over the Finance Committees was in a position to exercise powerful pressure over Local Authorities. *The Times*, which was never backward in supporting the Ministry of Health in its activities, now advocates "giving a greater reality to our system of local government .... by increasing its responsibilities and powers." Lest it should be thought that *The Times* is advocating that more power should be given to the electorate of local governments we should add that *The Times* continues by saying: "This must necessarily entail the setting up of larger effective units." As everyone knows, the elector has far less control over his County Council than he has over his Borough Council.

As well as their memory of irate ratepayers the Planners have another spur which encourages them to bring their bureaucracy into closer personal touch with the people whilst at the same time weakening the sanctions of the electorate over themselves. This is the growing discontent of the public with the bureaucratic Socialism which is being imposed on the people of this country under cover of the war and which it is intended to continue after the war. "Congestion in Whitehall has been a serious and growing evil," says *The Times* and, "Bureaucrats are always fair game. . . .Regional devolution is one of the most obvious and most essential remedies for the unavoidable evils of that system of governmental control and governmental planning which is being forced on us by the complexities of modern civilisation." Therefore "there is everything to be said for a decentralisation of the work of. . .Ministries whose work is closely linked with that of Local Authorities."

With a complacency and insolence which it would be difficult to match, *The Times* explains away this plot to dispossess Local Government of what powers it now has in the following words:

"The whole issue is one of the growing pains of the evolution, through which we are still passing, from the theory, never fully realised in practice, of the *laissez-faire* State, impinging as little as possible on the ordinary business of life, to open recognition of a twentieth-century State which is called upon by common consent to protect, to adjust, and to regulate the interests of its citizens at almost every point."

Under the spur of the situation in Alberta, where the people are winning and the Money Monopolists are losing,

the Canadian Planners have just endeavoured to destroy the power of local government by browbeating the Provincial Governments into acceptance of the Sirois Report. This attempt not only failed but called forth a forceful counter attack against the Money Monopoly from people who had not previously demonstrated opposition, notably from the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Sieff's Plan is as likely as not to meet with results in this country similar to those which Mr. Sirois's Plan suffered in Canada.

Mr. Sieff and Mr. Cohen may plan to build a New Jerusalem in Great Britain and *The Times* may theorise about its euphemism "a twentieth-century State," but neither will be "fully realised in practice," because English people who have the guts and ability to defeat the Nazis will know how to deal with Jew-boys and their dishonest back-hand schemes for imposing their own New World Order. There is nothing 'tolerant' about the English when they are roused and no specious prejudices against anti-semitism will protect any Jew who tries to "put one over" on them behind their backs.

The Government has no mandate from the electorate to introduce Socialism in this country and if the evils of this "system of governmental control and governmental planning which is being forced upon us" are unavoidable then that is a sufficient reason for the abolition of Government control and planning, not for extending it regionally.

That the object of this "devolution of Government" is not to give, for instance, the people of Scotland and the people of Wales control over their own affairs is manifest from the fact that there is no intention to allow self-government to either Scotland or Wales. The Planners at Whitehall are going to send their own bureaucrats under their own *Gauleiters* to Scotland and Wales and delegate to them power to govern Scotland and Wales. The Scottish and the Welsh people may be permitted to elect representatives to a regional "Parliament," or Council, but this Council will be subordinate to the local Whitehall and will have no power over it, but will merely be given the authority exercised now by various Local Authorities in its region, which it is intended to steal from them. Neither Rural, nor Urban or Borough Councils will be allowed to retain their present powers to manage their own affairs.

This Totalitarian plan of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff and his fellow Jews is being pushed upon the country at the same time as the Government is taking to itself greater powers of patronage which it is using to entice M.P.'s away from their rightful function of representing the wishes of their electors in Parliament, for which purpose they were elected and for which they are paid £600 per year; and at the same time as members of the Government are declaring their intention of extending the life of the Government after the war for at least another three years without reference to the wishes of the electorate and although it is already six years since there was was a General Election.

In the year preceding the war Social Crediters were active in making it known to ratepayers and their representatives that municipal services could be financed with credits created by the banks, thus making possible a reduction in rates. It was then flatly denied by the Press, by many so-called economists and many councillors that banks could create credit or that if they could that it would be possible to use such credits to pay for work done. But the war has proved how sound was our advice. It is now generally admitted that the banks *are* creating credit and that the Government is using this credit to pay for work done in the war effort, and recognised that without the aid of such additional purchasing power we could not put out our maximum effort. *The Times's* leader writer of March 18 wrote: "The astronomical figures of war-time expenditure will help to put in perspective the extent of that productive capacity which we can, if we choose, place at the disposal of our peace time needs." This leader writer continued: "Then as now the basic issue will be one of priorities—to determine those necessary social ends which must have the first claim on our resources and to direct our productive capacity to those ends." It is in regard to this matter of ends that the British people will not see eye to eye with *The Times,* Mr. Sieff and Mr. Cohen.

The latter regard government as THE end, in war or peace; and government is only possible when the people can be kept working to a social end. War provides a single overriding social end to which people are willing to be united and which consumes all the energy they can put to its service. But in time of peace the British people want to put this energy to the service of their own individual ends, which are diverse. The Planners who want to govern, however, see it differently. They see it as Mr. Kenneth Lindsay sees it: "The war has penetrated vast previously untapped levels of service, especially for civil defence regarded in its widest sense; at times, as in the Bermondsey shelters, it has re-discovered the community. Like Edmund Blunden's almswomen 'they had all things in common, being so poor.' How is this to be harnessed and allied to better government?"

The British people do not want better government, they want less government. That is THE issue. The advice of Social Crediters to ratepayers and their Local Authorities is as it was before the war, with the added injunction that they should have nothing to do with Regional Government. Bank credit can be used to pay for municipal services as well as Central Government services, instead of rates and taxes, whilst the people retain all of their incomes to command the services of that productive capacity which *The Times* admits can be so fruitful. Industry will then serve the diverse needs and desires of all the individuals who make up the people of this country and not the Planners pulling strings in New York and Whitehall. There is no doubt where the people stand in regard to this question. They are for democracy, not for any brand of totalitarianism, whether of the Nazis or the Jews.

M.P. WANTS "ACT OF UNION" WITH U.S.A.

The Prime Minister is to be asked by Mr. W. Craven-Ellis, Conservative M.P. for Southampton, to suggest to President Roosevelt an Act of Union between the United States and the British Commonwealth. This would provide for their becoming one nation with joint organs of foreign, financial, and economic policies.

It is also suggested that Britons and Americans should have citizenship of each other's countries.

Mr. Churchill offered a "solemn Act of Union" to France after the German break through, but the offer was thwarted by the French capitulation.

QUERY

By B. M. PALMER

"Historians have noticed, all down the centuries, one peculiarity of the English people which has cost them dear. We have always thrown away after a victory the greater part of the advantages we gained in the struggle. The worst difficulties which we suffer do not come from without. They come from within. They do not come from the cottages of the wage earners. They come from a peculiar type of brainy people always found in our country, who, if they add something to its culture, take much from its strength. Our difficulties come from the mood of unwarrantable self-abasement into which we have been cast by a powerful section of our own intellectuals. They come from the acceptance of defeatist doctrines by a large proportion of our politicians. But what have they to offer but a vague internationalism, a squalid materialism, and the promise of impossible Utopias. .... Nothing can save England if she will not save herself. .....

"Why should we break up the solid structure of British power based upon so much health, kindliness and freedom, for dreams which may some day come true, but are only dreams and some of them nightmares."

—*Mr. Winston Churchill addressing the Royal Society of St. George in* 1933.

Mr. Randolph Churchill has published a volume of speeches made by his father during the last ten years. During this decade it became plain that war was almost inevitable, and the bulk of the speeches deal with the urgency of re-armament.

It is not within the scope of this article to assess this brilliant but elusive personality, some of whose more recent utterances in Parliament seem intentionally to be worded with the ambiguity of an oracle. Considering that, in all probability, war was envisaged as early as 1923, when one of the world's most powerful bankers announced that they 'had the situation well in hand,' we should need a record of Winston Churchill's part played during the twenties, particularly when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, before beginning to understand the historical background of his more recent speeches.

On March 27, he made the following statement to the Central Council of the National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations: —

"I know it is provoking when speeches are made which seem to suggest that the whole structure of our decent British life and society we have built up so slowly and patiently across the centuries will be swept away for some new order or other, details of which are usually unannounced. My combative spirit sometimes tempts me to a rejoinder, and I have no doubt others here have experienced similar passing sensations at the present time. But we must restrain these emotions. We must see things in their true proportion. We must put aside everything which hampers the speedy accomplishment of our common purpose."

One fact emerges. This man grasps the situation in its entirety. But to the discerning strange inconsistencies between word and deed, between word and word, are apparent. Those who have memories expect it will be increasingly so. For this reason the passage with which this article opens seems to me to deserve the widest publicity. It is a statement of fact, not of opinion. What are we to think if we find that the man who has seen this fact, and expressed it so clearly, does not raise his voice to more effect when "a powerful section of our own intellectuals" casts us into "the unwarrantable self-abasement" of a vague internationalism?

"Unwarrantable self-abasement" is the right expression. It is a splendid expression for the awe and wonder with which the respectable citizen, a man of great common sense in every day problems and of even greater courage and endurance night after night, listens to the crude vapourings of our band of "peculiar brainy people." Here is Beverley Nichols, who, so far as I know, has never done anything more real than cultivate a cottage garden (not for profit, of course—do these people ever stop for one second to ask themselves what the word "profit" means?) Beverley Nichols, writing in the *Sunday Chronicle* of February 9, says that he told a group of soldiers in a converted cottage near a wind-swept Scottish coast—this is the sort of epithet intellectuals like—told them that although the war could not be paid for they must all stick on to their savings—they would not lose them. Save as much as possible. Some new system of finance would be evolved. And to continue in his own words: —

"*What will this new system be?* Don't ask me. It may be a combination of many things.

"It is *conceivable* that any form of inheritance may be wiped out altogether. It is *possible* that inflation (a much abused word, in my opinion) may lessen the weight of that "dead" money.

"It is *certain* that all property—yours, mine, and the man next door—will be regarded as something that we hold in trust for the general good, not something which is ours by absolute right, even if we *have* earned it by the sweat of our brows.

"Any complaints? Not from me, at any rate.

"The next question .... which was asked simultaneously by three men at once, was:

"*Q. Do you think there will ever be an attempt to revive the League of Nations?*

"*A. Yes.*

"*Q. Do you think the attempt will succeed?*

"*A. It must.*"

Question (from B.M.P.): And what shall we do with our savings when this happy time arrives?

• • •

This is one sample of the treasonable tosh which is filling our popular press, without, so far as is known, any effective protest from the man who is now Prime Minister, the man who knows as well as anyone now living, the significance of the present titanic struggle.

The object of this article is to place the facts on record.

'Agitation is not Action'---*FOCH*

The following are extracts from "Foch Talks" a book by Commander Bugnet published by Gollancz in 1929:-

". . . .Draw up for me a memorandum: on the necessity for an object, a plan, and a method." General purport: "The War has taught me the necessity, with a view to success, for an object, a plan, and a method. To have an object one must know what one wills; to form a plan, one must know the extent of one's powers; and, to carry it out, one must watch closely the application of one's resources."

One can well understand that he becomes annoyed with people who spend their lives "in splitting hairs."

"You must not be too subtle," he frequently says.

In action, too, questions of study, of preparation, and of weighing pros and cons go by the board.

". . . .You must have knowledge; it is the foundation with which you cannot dispense. You must have the power of accomplishment, and to that end you must develop your faculties of thought, of judgement, of analysis, and of synthesis. But what is the use of all these things, if they function in a vacuum? You must make up your mind with determination, and work towards your object, without swerving. Most important of all is action, if you are to bring your theories to fruition, to produce results. Work; set stone upon stone, keep on building. You must do something, you must act, you must obtain results. Results!—that is all I consider."

". . . .The major problems? I handle them as if they were minor. It is not difficult. The method is always the same."

". . . .I do not say a word about the Emperor. It was Moltke who was the great master, the god! He is the finest historical type that one can possibly study, because he had the sense of discipline, an unqualified absorption in work, and a horror of words, of the idle phrase-making which destroys the power of action."

"Don't listen to him. What does the opinion of others matter? I pay no attention to it!"

"One must will of course, but first one must know how to will."

". . . .Intelligent? Yes, yes! But no character. Wastes all his time criticising. Nothing will stop him from making an epigram. As a proof of my point, he never gets anywhere. Why, of course! Character is the chief thing. Intellect, criticism—pah! A donkey who has character is more useful."

". . . .To break the will of the enemy, that is the first principle; and to break it by an unexpected blow, delivered with immense energy, is the first outcome of this principle. To defeat an opponent, a sword-thrust through the heart or a blow on the head with a club guarantees the result!"

". . . .The qualities of the character are undoubtedly the most important with a soldier, but to what point can such moral energy lead if one is not well enough trained to know what object should be pursued and the paths which lead to it?"

". . . .Yes! One has to lead them with a cudgel. They were superb generals in peace-time, fine soldiers and knew everything except war. . . .The war they had prepared for, in manoeuvres, was a perfectly conventional war. But what they were called upon to do wasn't in the regulations. Poor old regulations! They're all very well for purposes of drill, but in the hour of danger they are no more use. . . .You see, it is not enough to learn the regulations; you have to learn to think."

". . . .You see, that is the rock on which the analytical mind founders . . . . .one must produce. . . . .Produce! Begin at first on a small scale, little by little on a larger scale, and you will get somewhere. . . .but produce. . . .do not be content with doing nothing. One must build, put stone upon stone; one must achieve! One must develop one's powers of construction, synthesis, and method. You fall prostrate in adoration before all these demolishers, but it is the builders you should admire."

That is why one must beware of taking mere agitation on action.

". . . .One must do something. That is understood. But with an aim, a plan a method. At first reflect, study the problems. . . .but do not start off at that stage without knowing what you are going to do. . . .know what it is you *will*, and do it. . . .In action one does not study; one simply does what one can, to apply what one knows. From that stage to provide some basis for that application one must know much, and know it well. . . .Know why and with what material you are acting, and you will know how you must act."

". . . .One's value consists only in what one does." *Then,* "one must do something."

". . . .People only carry out orders which they understand perfectly, and decisions which they have made themselves, or which they have seen made."

". . . .Do as I have done. When a man of ordinary capacity—yes, I repeat, of ordinary capacity—concentrates all his faculties and all his means on the attainment of a single purpose, by working hard and without being diverted from his goal, he is bound to attain it. To do that, certain conditions are essential. To be strong, he must be objective, and when I say that, I mean that if he would act he must not turn his gaze inwards and lose himself in his imagination. It is only deeds which count, and one must concentrate on their accomplishment. As for methods of ensuring success, I know none which are absolute. I have acted in such and such a manner; if I had it to do again, I might perhaps act differently. The important thing is to have an object, a plan, and a method; it is to know one *wills* and to do it; it is to act in such a way as to obtain results. But it is necessary to have learned how to think, by work and reflection. It is essential to be prepared and to continue to the end: it is necessary to reach one's goal."

BOYCOTT OF TREASURY BRANCHES FAILS.

Although the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce through its wholesalers' and manufacturers' section is obstructing the provincial credit houses, the provincial treasurer says 90 manufacturers and wholesalers have signed up new agreements. Earlier attempts to boycott the system failed, since retailers have their own sanctions and have been assured help in replacing stocks.

Oh, Mr. Menzies!

Further information is now available concerning the desperate edict of the Menzies Government to stifle criticism in Australia of the financial system.

Loyal Australians are quite willing to concede to the Federal Government all the powers necessary to thwart sabotage of their war effort. It is pointed out, however, that this concession is in the public interest and not for the protection of the vilest of private interests *against* public interest. The Menzies Government is guilty of this betrayal when it declares subversive

> any statement intended or likely to undermine public confidence in banking or the currency, or to prejudice the success of any financial measures taken or to be taken by the Commonwealth for the purpose of the more effective prosecution of the war.

Australians have discerned that panic has descended upon the defenders of the money monopoly which invites the odium of ridicule as well as confident opposition.

The new regulations were gazetted under the National Security Act.

The very next day two members of the Australian Women's Party, dressed up in early Victorian crinolines, donned powdered wigs and sallied forth waving large fans with the words:

OUT OF DATE,
LIKE THE MONEY SYSTEM!

With newspaper reporters and photographers in the offing, the ladies chartered a taxi and set off for Parliament House where a Federal Cabinet meeting was in progress,

The policeman at the gates looked the other way and the two parodies of our 'Sound' financial system entered, only to be told that Mr. Menzies had gone back to the Commonwealth offices to confront a deputation of trade unionists.

So after him the ladies sped with a letter asking the Prime Minister to reconcile his statement that the new regulation was merely the Australian counterpart of one in force in England with information they had received from a monetary reform organisation at home.

The letter, says *The New Era,* gave proof that no such regulation had been imposed in England and that "British critics of the Government's financial policy were still free men."

[If this means that Mr. Geoffrey Crowther is still a free man, we're glad to hear it!]

The result of this good-humoured escapade was main-page news in Australia's *Daily Telegraph* under the heading

WOMEN DRESS UP
TO DRESS MENZIES DOWN!

Mistresses Budge and Jockel in their financial disguises, with the legend on their fans for all to see, appeared, seven inches double column, in a photograph.

That's the humorous (but not too humorous) side.

According to the Melbourne *New Times,* Mr. King O'Malley, founder of the Commonwealth Bank, was present at a public meeting where criticism of the Government's financial policy went shares with criticism of the new panic rule against it, *and supported the vote of thanks to the speakers*!

The strictly serious note is struck in the wording of an electors' protest with which M.P.s are being flooded:—

"My forefathers fought and died to give us British democracy. The recent increase in unjust and unnecessary taxation has added to the growing body of responsible public opinion which believes the present financial policy is not only hampering the war effort, but will undermine the victory, as was the case after the last war.

"The recent regulation gazetted preventing criticism of the Government's financial policy outrageously violates the right of the taxpayer, who will not be allowed to protest. This regulation is a negation of British democracy, and, in my opinion, is designed to protect the financial interests who are drawing such a heavy toll of interest through taxation from the people. Furthermore, it is the introduction of 'Hitlerism,' which the youth of Australia is fighting and dying to destroy.

"Along with many fellow-electors, I desire you to exercise your responsibility to have this regulation repealed without delay. This matter is of such vital national importance that I demand that you take steps to have Parliament assembled immediately to have this undemocratic and unpatriotic regulation repealed.

"Yours faithfully, ..."

The opportunity is not being lost of pointing out that the great New Zealand Labour Party has already had a regulation gazetted preventing public criticism of their own financial policy! Admirers in Australia of the N. Z. party are thus placed in an awkward position and the rank and file of "Labour" in the Commonwealth are beginning to realise not only that the financial system is their enemy but that their party which befriends it is the same!

THE PIP SQUEAKS

"Surely it is more than a little short-sighted to destroy Britain's economic health while giving all-out support to her battle for Democracy."

This is an American columnist's comment on the Courtauld subsidiary rayon deal published by the New York *Herald-Tribune* and quoted by the *Daily Telegraph* on March 20.

The writer declares that pressure was brought to bear to bring about the quick sale of the Courtauld subsidiary, the American Viscose Corporation, to American interests over the week-end.

President Roosevelt and Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, they say, sent a warning to London that because of the Congressional line-up at least one important sale had to be made before the debate began on the £1,750,000,000 appropriation for aid to Britain.

"Peremptory orders," they add, "appear to have been sent from London to Sir Edward Peacock, the Bank of England director and financial expert acting in the United States on behalf of the British Government.

"The prospective sale was announced in time to make the dead-line, and the authorities here were filled with satisfaction," add the writers.

• • •

"The fact that it was politically necessary to insist on such a sale cast a dubious light on our own relations to Britain's war effort. For Britain's direct investments here and abroad are essential to our economic health. If she liquidates all her direct investments, her post-war economic position will be infinitely difficult."

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

BELFAST D.S.C. GROUP

Public Meeting on April 16, 1941

In the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at 8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon Sec., 17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Association: All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow Blackburn.

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

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER is obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Meets regularly on the first and third Sundays in the month. Time 2-30 p.m. Enquiries to Wavertree 435.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP.

Lunch-hour reunion on the first and third Thursday in each month at 12-30, at the Plane Tree, Great Russell Street. Next reunion on April 17.

Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association. It is important that all Social Crediters on Tyneside should maintain contact. Write Hon. Secretary, R. Thomson, 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

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

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

The Social Crediter

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

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

Please send *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* to me

Name .....

Address .....

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

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

EXPANSION FUND

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

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

Name .....

Address .....

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

Name.....

Address.....

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

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

I will, until further notice, contribute

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

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

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

Signature.....

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

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