

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 6. No. 9.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 10, 1941.

6d. Weekly.

## NOTICE

Apology is made to about fifty readers of the *Social Crediter* who will not receive the current issue when they expect to do so.

Also to all our readers for delay in the distribution of this issue which is due entirely, in difficult circumstances, to errors inherent in centralisation. These are beyond our control.

All readers are requested to confirm by post-card the date of expiry of their subscriptions to *The Social Crediter*, so as to ensure that they receive the paper continuously.

Social Credit Secretariat

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

Temporary Address:—

49 PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,  
LIVERPOOL, 15.

Telephone: Wavertree 435.

## LIVERPOOL SOCIAL CREDIT ASSOCIATION

The Annual Meeting of the Liverpool Social Credit Association will be held at 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool 15, on Sunday, May 18, at 2-30, when the balance sheet for the past year will be presented to members. Members of the association are requested to communicate their present addresses to the Secretary at the address given above.

## “That Collection of Individuals...”

By B. M. PALMER

According to the *Daily Express* of April 24, the Food Ministry is no longer so interested as it was in community feeding, instructions have been issued to lay off publicity for it: “The new era will, no doubt, pass peacefully to its close,” says William Hickey, the gossip writer.

The paragraph is written in the light sarcastic vein reserved for projects which are unpleasing or no longer useful to our Socialist and Banker oligarchy. It is an interesting admission that “instructions have been issued” to the press. How can journalists boast of being free when they are little more than publicity agents, employing the advertiser’s psychological technique?

But that is by the way. We know that instructions are often issued, and it comes as no surprise.

If it is true that community feeding is to be quietly shelved it must be because those persons known as the public dislike it. The reasons for their dislike are obscure and probably vary widely from place to place. I think it probable that the mental association between the blitz and the feeding centres has been too much for them, despite the photographs of big shots eating lunch at sixpence a head, as powders disguised in jam will produce a loathing to last a lifetime.

There are many things which the public dislike, but they endure them because, like the man whose houeroof had been blown off three times, they would rather die than lose the war.

The headmistress of a school in North London told me that the government evacuation scheme was dead—the parents had killed it, she said. They dislike everything connected with it, and only submit to it as a purely temporary measure; any attempt that may have

been made to apply compulsion has had to be dropped. As one man said, “I send my boy, who means more to me than my own life, down to the country and the first thing that happens is that some narrow religious sect converts him, and he writes me long letters asking whether I am saved.” It was suggested that these ideas might be quite ephemeral, but this gave him no comfort. He was terribly hurt by the barrier that had been erected between them, and felt he had lost his son.

I feel that one of the *Times*’s leader-writers has been slightly indiscreet today. He says, “The truth is that precious few people believe now that any place is safe and not many continue to care whether it is or not. ‘Safety first’ has had its day.” Fancy saying that in the hearing of Mr. Ernest Brown! And moreover, the same article contains these words. “In the country towns every hotel and all the lodgings are full of strangers comfortably tucked in for the duration. Not all of them bear names familiar in our rough island story; but all are doubtless prompt and dutiful patriots who complied at the first hint with the Government’s wish that none should stay in London or any large town who was free to leave it.”

Well, well.

The butchers are on strike. “The Government should keep their promises,” said the roundsman, as he hurried off.

“He won’t say much more about it,” said the builder’s labourer, “You have to be very careful what you say nowadays.”

“Fancy being afraid to say what you think in England!”

This was encouraging, so he said what he thought about working overtime till seven on air raid repairs and having

ten shillings in the pound taken off him.

"Why, we don't even see it first!" he added, though what difference this could make it was at first difficult to see. But there seemed to be some inarticulate grievance about the deduction at the source, probably because it was felt to be a further encroachment on freedom. You didn't even have the option of refusing to pay and going to jail for it. Another sanction gone.

"But they'll never get the men to do it. Better be working on their allotments."

No illusion concerning the profit motive here.

He further expressed his opinion that the compulsory savings might never materialise.

Asked why he thought people put up with these things, he said it was because they didn't stand together.

General conclusion of meeting was that of course the war had got to be won, and we were going to win it, but Messrs. Bevin and Morrison were going the wrong way about it.

People are united as never before

in their determination to win the war. They detest the present socialist regime which daily increases their difficulties. But they feel that any failure to back up this government would immediately give the Germans such an advantage that they daren't risk it. Thus the government has the whip hand. "It will take four years to accustom the English to control." But not unless another desire, as strong as the desire to defeat Germany, can be devised by this government as a peace aim.

That is their problem.

April 28.

## In 850 Words

'Basic English' is a simplified form of English employing a vocabulary of only 850 words, said to be the vocabulary of the 'average' man. Its use is urged (1) as an international language and (2) as a first step for foreigners and children who wish to learn English.

Any language is of value in proportion to its capacity to express the meaning of the person using it, and the proper number of words for use is that which will precisely convey that meaning, without blurring and certainly without distortion. Can we confine within the compass of 850 words all that a Chinaman would wish to say to an Englishman? Can we rarify within this limit all the intra-national intolrances and prejudices that are the result of different ways of living?

In the journal *Progress* of 1933 President Roosevelt's broadcast talk after the closing of the banks in the United States was put into basic English:

"...In other words, the amount of all the ready money in the country taken together is only a small part of what has been put into all the banks.

"What, then, took place in the last days of February and the first days of March? Because the belief of the public had been determined, there was a general move by a great number of persons to get their credits at the banks turned into ready money or gold—and the run on the banks became so great that even the safest of them were not able to get enough for current needs.

"The reason for this was that, naturally, it was not possible so suddenly to put the quite good credits of a bank on the market and get them turned into

money at any price—a price which would have been far lower than their true value, as the outcome of fear."

What superb woolliness! Imagine the highly civilised Chinaman trying to grapple with vagaries of the money system, the vagaries of President Roosevelt and the vagaries of a language inadequate to distinguish the terms employed! I have not President Roosevelt's authentic speech to translate his meaning (if he had any); but then nor has the Chinaman.

"This stopping of bank business has frequently been a cause of great trouble, but it is giving us a chance to get ready the necessary money. Keep in mind the fact that no good bank is a dollar poorer than it was when its doors were shut last Monday. And the same is true of any bank which may not be in a position for opening when the others do."

Lewis Carrol puts it another way, "They all returned from him to you, Though, they were mine before."

"Keep in mind," says President Roosevelt, "that the chief value of the new laws is that they make it possible for the credits of the banks to be turned more readily into money than before. Wider powers have been given to them to get money for these credits at the Reserve Banks, and for printing new money for amounts backed by these credits."

Even President Roosevelt would avoid that, for politicians have a habit of sounding convincing: it is part of their profession. Basic English would be welcome if it could be used as a sort of touchstone: translate one of Mr. Churchill's flights of oratory and it would taste

like tepid tea instead of a fiery draught of rum. But it does not act that way, *Economic Democracy* would simply fall to pieces: 850 words could not carry the meaning.

The publication of the Bible in Basic English evoked from the *News Chronicle* a half-page article commending it highly. Its objects are said to be to elucidate the Authorised Version for the many from whom "the rich Elizabethan phraseology may conceal the original writers' meaning," and to provide a really understandable Bible for a public not acquainted with it, including foreign students.

As for the prospects of such a Bible teaching people Christianity, I cannot judge them; for teaching people English its efficiency must rest on experiment, but to deprive the explorer of the rich excitement of "Elizabethan phraseology" seems, to say the least, a scurvy trick. It is worse: it is a levelling trick, one to reduce the richness of difference between peoples—a trick only suitable for the dying culture of some huge unwieldy Federal Union. Meeting a co-unionist from Patagonia one will burst into a spate of Basic, and be unable to get across the interesting, subtle differences of experience (if there are any by then) that one has to communicate.

Ration our sugar and our butter and our petrol, but words do not occupy shipping space and it is as yet unnecessary to sabotage our language. Fortunately it does not depend on Mr. Ogden with his hankering after meretricious simplicity, it depends on the average Englishman, who may be relied on to know at least a swear word or two beyond the ration—"the bird-voice and the blast of our omniloquent tongue."

E.S.E.

## Freemasonry and the Russian Revolution

A French freemason once said (and published in a journal that was not expected to penetrate to the profane):

"The French Revolution was no more than a single moment of history prepared with slow elaboration, it was no more than a rung in the ladder of progress; it did not finish anything; it was not an end point; it cannot, for a modern society, be other than a starting point. With legitimate pride Freemasonry can consider Revolution as its work."

The evidence that the French Revolution was engineered by Freemasons is so copious that even orthodox historians cannot escape reference to it. But the French Revolution was neither the first nor the last such revolution to be organized in this way. As the same writer boasts: "An enemy of our order has rightly said: 'The masonic spirit gave birth to the revolutionary spirit.' That is the best tribute that could be given to the past activity of masonry. . . ."

One of the more recent activities of this spirit concerned the Russian Revolution. Of a list of 27 contemporary Russian freemasons published in 1919 by the Abbé Tourmentin,\* and not denied by one of them at least who was himself vocal on the subject of freemasonry, 21

\*According to A. Vetchvolodow, Lieutenant-General of the Imperial Russian Army, in *L'Empereur Nicholas II et les Juifs* (1929).

were prominent politicians and statesmen who had some hand in the course of events that developed after the revolution of February 1917.

These included:

SERGE SAZONOW, minister of foreign affairs in the Imperial government at the time of the declaration of war in 1914; later he represented Admiral Koltchak in Paris.

BASILE MAKRAKOW, Ambassador of the Kerensky government in Paris.

NICHOLAS BASILI, one-time official of the diplomatic chancellery at army headquarters, who was concerned, in collaboration with the quarter-master general, with the abdication manifesto of the Emperor.

COUNT ALEXIS IGNATIEV, military agent at Paris of the Imperial government. After the February revolution he remained in his post.

PRINCE GEORGE LWOW, chief of the provisional government after the revolution of 1917.

BASILE WYROUBOW, vice-president of the General Union of Ziemstvos, who played an important part under Prince Lwow and under Kerensky.

BORIS SAWINKOW, notorious organizer of political assassinations. He is reported as giving an address on the 'Socialist Workers of France' in the French Lodge. "Effort." Under Kerensky

he became Minister of war.

ALEXANDER KERENSKY, one-time lawyer, Member of the Douma, Minister of Justice after the February revolution, later Minister of war, Chief of the provisional government, and supreme head of the armed forces.

PAUL MILIOUKOW, leader of the popular 'Liberty' party and after the February revolution, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

CHARLES JAROCHINSKY, financier, who made a large fortune in the war and bought several Russian banks.

ARGUNOW, a prominent member of the previous government of Siberia.

LENIN (Oulianov), president of the Council of Commissars of the People in Soviet Russia.

TROTSKY (Bronstein), a Jew, who became supreme head of the Red Army in Soviet Russia.

ZINOVIEV, a Jew, who was chief of the Commune of Petrograd, and President of the Executive Committee of the Third International.

LOUNATCHARSKY, Commissar for Public Education in Soviet Russia.

JOFFE, a Jew, who was Soviet Ambassador in Berlin.

PARVUS (Helpfand), a Jew, who was the agent of the German government who, in 1914, introduced Lenin to the German Minister of Foreign Affairs.

### U.S.A. EXPORTS MACHINE TOOLS TO RUSSIA

"...An article in the *New York Sun* of the same date gave details of heavy exports of machine tools to Soviet Russia, and the writer added:—

"It is . . . known that the Soviet Union is in the same position as the United States in that it now is all out in preparation for a war emergency. The type of tools being exported shows that Moscow is engaged in manufacturing heavy guns, rifles and ammunition of all types. . . .

"The crux of the entire situation seems to be a reluctance on the part of the Washington administration to do anything to cause disfavour with Moscow. There may be something in the fact that the Soviet is supplying aircraft engines to the Chinese to keep Japan so actively engaged in the Far East that Tokio will not have the time to lend any

assistance to the Nazis . . . .

"Whatever the reason, no one outside the inner circle in Washington, and Soviet officials, who will not talk, knows anything about it. Meanwhile, vitally needed tools are going out of the country. These include bending, boring, broaching, drilling, jig boring, cutoff, forging, swaging, gear cutting, grinding, honing, profiling, ternal, surface and external types, commonly used for the manufacture of shells and aerial bombs.

"Other machine tools purchased by the Soviet and now being exported include heavy presses, lathes of various sizes from those capable of handling a cannon rifle to those designed for small arms, shapers, slotters and electric furnaces."

"At a time when America is officially doing her utmost to help the Allies, it is disquieting to know that war materials are also being made available for

Germany by the U.S.A. through Russia.

"Turning now to another American paper, *The Individualist*, published in Nebraska, and dated 20 January, we find a strong attack on those who are called 'the international business men' . . . The following extract from this paper is of interest:—

"On 3 January, 1941, Representative Dies made the statement that money is being transferred directly from the Central Bank of the U.S.S.R. to Germany. In the face of all this, we are still trying to form more friendly and closer relations with Soviet Russia, which is a financial agent for the Axis Powers. If our Export-Import Bank should at some future date seek to make a loan available to Russia, it would remove the last vestige of doubt regarding the ability of the international business men to control the destiny of our country."

—From *"The Patriot,"* March 20, 1941.

## THE FALL OF POLAND

*My Name is Million.* The Experiences of an Englishwoman in Poland. Faber and Faber, London.

In a time when danger and courage and tiredness are common companions of the ordinary man and woman, and when the exploitation of them in writing has led to a deep disgust with the press it is a strange experience to read an account of them which is profoundly moving.

The author is an Englishwoman married to a Pole, and her book is a description of her retreat eastwards from the advancing German forces to be caught in the Russian invasion, and of her escape from Poland. She relates simply what occurred to her, and if the quotations given are from the part dealing with Russia, it is because we are more familiar with German methods.

She gives an interesting description of the effect of Communist propaganda on the peasants and of their disillusion in practice:

"... The peasants of Polesie were among the poorest of all. But they were not nearly so poor as the Russians who had told them that they were living in slavery under a capitalist government. When the villages, convoked to mass councils, innocently turned up in their holiday clothes, the Russians were first stupefied and then furious. The wearers of embroidery were told that they were not workers, but bourgeois."

"At a performance of a propaganda play commanded at the theatre [at Wilno] women Commissars turned up in nightdresses of artificial silk tricotee, bought in the town, which they had supposed to be evening gowns. The audience was quite unable to control its laughter. A police charge could not have

stopped it."

A description is given of the systematic deportation of Poles from Russian-occupied territory, political suspects, patriots, members of the professions and the skilled trades, doctors, dentists, engineers, mechanics and artisans. She and her husband lodged with a Jew, a good sort of man who "hated the upstart type of Jew as only Jews can. We were fairly secure from a surprise so long as we lodged with him. No Jewish houses were searched... Four or five long trains of prisoners left every day for Russia. Others remained on the railway sidings indefinitely, until it was almost impossible to distinguish between the living and the dead."

The history of Poland has for centuries been complicated with the problem of the Jews, and the present time is no exception. The author of *My Name is Million*, who is chronicling what she saw, has a single paragraph on the Jews, in the 284 pages:

"As a class, the Jews went over wholesale to the Bolsheviks. In Wilno and elsewhere the worst type of Jew turned informer overnight. Thousands of the same Jews who had counted on the Polish Army to save them from Hitler arrived as refugees from the German Occupation and proceeded to sell the Poles in the Russian Occupation like hot cakes. Even the G.P.U. agents whom they guided from house to house expressed contempt for these self-appointed jackals. Many Jewish individuals must have felt the same, only painfully and deeply. Nevertheless, the truth remains that within the Russian Occupation the patriot's worst enemy at this time was his Jewish fellow-citizen. The

Bolshevik regime, the Jews thought, meant power for themselves. In the towns and even in the villages... the local Committee and the militia, supposed to represent the entire community, began to be made up from this renegade and revolutionary Jewish element. How it has been since, I do not know. I think it likely that their day is already over."

She draws no conclusions; but there perhaps, is the explanation of the defiant title *Jestem Polakiem* (I am a Pole) of a Polish paper published in England. Its attitude is anti-Judaic. "What is the Jewish position in Poland?" one leading article asks. "It is easy to tell the English that there is no Jewish problem in Poland; they would not believe it in any case. Of course we could follow in the steps of our official propaganda and say that there is to be an ideal collaboration between Poles and Jews after the downfall of Hitler. But no intelligent Scotsman will believe this, because he had heard about the Polish Jews who compose our middle class... we should even ask the help of American Jewry in the emigration of Jews from Poland."

Poland will not be herself again until she has solved, and not merely disregarded, the problem of the Jews, and solved it for the Jews no less than for the Poles.

The author of *My Name is Million* is sure of Poland's ultimate revival and much can be assured to the builders of Warsaw, of which she says:

"In my memory the city was always foaming with white and purple lilac. When you sat in a tramcar with the window down and it was still morning, your whole coat-sleeve or your face might be brushed by a great scented branch of it, still soaked in dew."

### BUDGET

In an interesting series of notes on the events of April, the "National Review" for May 1941 included the following comment on Sir Kingsley Wood's recent Budget:

"The authors of the Budget—some socialist or communist group, no doubt—designed this general ruin of our system, but the House of Commons and the Press would have shown a better understanding of our needs had they pointed out that the object was not the strengthening of Britain but the destruction of the present basis of our society. The gentlemen of England have shown by their submission to this plan that their hearts are sound, but they have also demonstrated the fact that their heads are weak. They would

have served their country better had they been more critical. In the long run the whole nation will suffer from the Budget of 1941.

"The design of the Budget is to destroy the present structure of society and to impose one in which the Government will be the sole owner of all wealth and will be the only maker and distributor of goods. Some such system obtains both in Russia and Germany. The Socialists in Britain desire that we should follow in the footsteps of those totalitarian countries. The 1941 Budget is the first big step towards general confiscation. There have been smaller steps before now. We have seen how taxation and death duties have destroyed the beauty and dignity of London, doing

far more harm than Hitler's bombs have hitherto accomplished. The noble houses, the fine gardens, the private parks have gone from our capital. Who has benefitted by this? Not the inhabitants of London... In the country we have also seen the ravages performed by death duties, when 'building estates' have been created round every town... Now we are to see an avalanche of vandalism obliterate yet more beauties. Let us think what this all means, and let us realise what we are throwing away.

"... We hope that some more critical spirit of the proposals of the Government will develop. It is no act of patriotism which dictates silent acquiescence in measures that must ultimately harm the country."

# PARLIAMENT

## TRADE AND COMMERCE:

April 22.

Oral Answers (28 columns)

### TRADE AND COMMERCE

#### LIMITATION OF SUPPLIES (MESSRS. LEWIS, LIMITED).

*Mr. Stokes* asked the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the stock-in-trade of Messrs. Lewis's, Limited, which in February, 1939, stood at £497,710, in February, 1940, had risen to £696,740, and a year later to £878,721; and whether he is satisfied that no evasion of the limitation of supplies imposed upon traders as a whole has been permitted in this case?

*The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lyttelton)*: Yes, Sir. The obligation to limit supplies is not imposed upon traders as a whole but upon manufacturers and wholesalers. I have no evidence to suggest that there has been any evasion of the Limitation of Supplies Orders by any of Messrs. Lewis's suppliers. I understand that the increase in the value of Messrs. Lewis's stocks to which the hon. Member calls attention is due chiefly to the rise in prices of dry goods and to the Purchase Tax.

*Mr. Stokes*: Does my right hon. Friend really expect us to believe that a 100 per cent. increase in the value of stocks is due to the rise in prices? Further, does he think it fair that firms of this kind should get these stocks while the small traders are unable to get their legal requirements?

*Sir Herbert Williams*: Do I understand that it is the modern version of 9d. for 4d.?

#### MANUFACTURED FOODSTUFFS (EXPORT).

*Mr. De la Bère* asked the President of the Board of Trade whether, in connection with the aid which is to be given to traders to maintain and increase their sales to the United States of America, the Government will give an assurance that this will exclude all manufactured foodstuffs, such as biscuits and slab chocolate, in view of their vital importance for home consumption?

*Mr. Lyttelton*: In present shipping conditions, it is not the policy of His Majesty's Government to encourage the

## NATIONAL LOANS BILL:

export of manufactured foodstuffs of which the raw materials are mainly imported.

*Mr. De la Bère*: Can my right hon. Friend give us some assurance that there will be no further continuation of this policy? Is he not aware that the Americans do not need biscuits and that we do? Is he not aware that in a previous answer it was disclosed that a substantial amount of biscuits had been imported, and that the continuation of this practice is nothing more nor less than criminal folly?

*Mr. Lyttelton*: I understand that when circumstances were different limited facilities were given in order to implement engagements, and these facilities are being withdrawn shortly.

#### AGRICULTURE (BANK LOANS, INTEREST).

*Mr. De la Bère* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what are the highest and lowest interest rates charged by the clearing banks to the agricultural borrowers for loans since the outbreak of hostilities?

*The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Kingsley Wood)*: I regret that this information is not available.

*Mr. De la Bère*: Does the Chancellor of the Exchequer really mean to tell the House that the Treasury are not sufficiently interested to obtain from the banks these very vital figures, in view of the importance of the national larder? Is it not really a confession of complacency that he has no real answer to give, and will he try again?

*Sir Kingsley Wood*: No, Sir. I gave my hon. Friend certain information a little while ago as regards the average rate of interest, and I have also noted, as I dare say my hon. Friend has done, that in the Sixth Report of the Select Committee on National Expenditure it is stated that:

"the evidence we have received does not support the conclusion that the lack of adequate credit facilities has been a substantial factor in hampering agricultural credits."

*Mr. De la Bère*: Is my right hon. Friend aware that it is not a question of lack of credit but a question of too high charges in bank interest to agricultural borrowers? That is the point.

## WAR AND PEACE AIMS

Written Answers (15 columns)

#### WAR WEAPONS WEEKS.

*Commander King-Hall* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has any means of ascertaining what percentage of the contribution to the results of a War Weapons Week made by institutions, such as banks and insurance companies, is due to the institution making an investment in Government securities through the medium of the branch office in the area holding a War Weapons Week which it would normally make through its head office?

*Sir K. Wood*: I am afraid that the information for which my hon. and gallant Friend asks is not available.

April 23.

Oral Answers (35 columns)

#### CONCENTRATION OF PRODUCTION.

*Mr. Lyons* asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he will give an assurance that in any proposals for the telescoping of industry and the consequent closing of business concerns that will be entailed, he will safeguard the position of the small proprietor in that the multiple stores and co-operative society branches are not allowed privilege against him to his complete commercial annihilation?

*The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Captain Waterhouse)*: Yes, Sir. I can assure my hon. and learned Friend that, in approving proposals made by manufacturers for concentration of production, no advantage is given to the suppliers of large concerns that is not also available to the suppliers of the small retailers.

*Mr. Lyons*: Would my hon. and gallant Friend say whether, in view of the great apprehension on this matter, he would cause some public announcement to be made of the safeguards and their nature, so as to prevent hundreds of thousands of people being put into a pitiful position?

*Captain Waterhouse*: My right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade has made clear that his aim and object are to safeguard the position of the smaller men, and he will do nothing to their disadvantage at all. I

(continued on page nine)

## 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 (Temporary):  
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,  
LIVERPOOL, 15.  
Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 6. No. 9.

Saturday, May 10, 1941.

## P. M.

Mr. Churchill's broadcast on the end of the Grecian episode was adroitly timed to stem a tide of suspicion which may still assume proportions in Parliament unreflected in the Press. In his address to the Poles, the Prime Minister expressed the (romantic) idea of nationalism without necessarily asserting, or even assenting to, the political idea.

The Prime Minister has been worshipped at Liverpool (in Lord Derby's escort) and hissed at Bristol. Misfortune should not, of course, in itself detach a people from its leaders; and the English are the last to countenance such a separation. It remains to be seen whether they are likely permanently to relinquish the right of judgment on the more personal issue of responsibility.

Up to the present the plea of 'no post mortems' has had almost universal assent. It rests, however, upon a wholly false notion of the meaning of responsibility, reinforced by mis-assessment of the scope which responsibility covers at least as false and many times as dangerous. Just how much of what is coming to us in May and June—and perhaps in May and June next year—is "according to plan" and just how much of it to the sheer momentum of events?

"No post-mortems" is not the cry of one, however involved, faced with issues in which momenta are the chief ingredient. It is, and has always been, the cry of one conscious of his power of control, determined to retain it, and to use it—and, indeed, about to use it, or even in the act of using it—who does not wish this determination to be suspected, knowing that suspicion would be the end of it, perhaps of *him*. The right answer to 'Look the other way' is 'Why, what are you going to do?' And, if the answer to this all important question is not instantly forthcoming and completely

satisfactory, arm's length is the shortest distance that is safe.

It is with these considerations in mind that the *May Review of World Affairs* written by Mr. Kenneth de Courcy for the Imperial Policy Group may profitably be read.

"As soon," says the Review, "as we won our first successes in Africa and at sea against the Italians, everyone with a knowledge of strategy at once realised that it was of vital importance to bring the Anglo-Italian conflict to a decision before fresh events should intervene and the Germans could prepare a general counter-offensive. There is every reason to believe that during the first weeks of the New Year the internal situation of Italy was fast deteriorating, and that Signor Mussolini was distraught with anxiety. His government showed every sign of crisis. In the High Command there was dissension and inquietude, and amongst the people widespread defeatism.

"If immediately following upon our great military successes in Africa, and the Mediterranean, we had offered the Italians a reasonably attractive and practical alternative to a continuance of the war on the side of Germany, we might at the best have got them out of the war altogether or, at the worst, have forced Germany to take over control of Italy in a manner far more odious than that she in fact employed, thus creating for her another European problem of the first magnitude, and arousing the bitter resentment of the Vatican, the Italian Royal Family, many of the powerful politicians, and almost the whole Italian people."

Whether rightly or wrongly Mr. Churchill instead treated his opposite numbers to a diatribe which would have been insulting to an ice-cream vendor in

a slum, thus combining the means by which our Prime Minister is wont to endear himself to what he is pleased to regard as 'the public' with those in which he is adept for disguising the presence of a point of major policy.

"This war has taught that it is quite impossible to expect any army, however highly equipped, to succeed in its task unless it possesses complete air superiority in its own theatre of operation. Without this it is quite impossible to maintain a successful defensive action, let alone launch an offensive. Despite the disaster of Yugoslavia's collapse, if we had had complete, unquestioned, local superiority in the air, both of bombers and fighters, it is even possible that we might have been able to build up and maintain a defensive position upon the Greek mainland, and if we had been able to do this, Germany would have suffered a severe reverse from which she would have found it extremely difficult (and perhaps impossible) to recover. . . ."

The Battle of London of eight months ago was won by us (no apologies to Lord Beaverbrook) through "complete unquestioned, local superiority in the air."

If, as stated, it is *impossible* to succeed without complete local air superiority, (1) Why did we not have it in Greece, or, (2) Why did we go to Greece?

T. J.

## "BOMB BERLIN"

A "Bomb Berlin" candidate has put up for the King's Norton (Birmingham) bye-election.

He is Dr. Alfred William Lumsden Smith, of Woodhouse-lane, Sharston, Manchester, who described himself as "independent Reprisal Candidate."

## CIGARETTES AND M.P.S

Mr. Dan Tobey, chairman of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, said at a recent meeting that the shortage of cigarettes was due either to bad distribution or "fat-headed incompetence."

There were plenty of cigarettes in London and some other cities.

"This is where our local M.P.'s ought to get busy," said Mr. Tobey, "but Liverpool has, with one or two exceptions, the slackest lot of M.P.'s in the world."

## An M.P. and Union Now

*Correspondence with an M.P. on the consequences of Union with the United States.*

W. Craven-Ellis Esq., M.P.,  
House of Commons,  
Westminster.

Dear Sir,

According to *The Social Crediter* of April 5, the Prime Minister is to be asked by you to suggest to President Roosevelt an act of Union between the United States and Great Britain.

As the carrying into effect of your proposition would determine for centuries to come conditions of life in these islands, I may perhaps be entitled to ask whether it is your constituents, or somebody else, who have given you the mandate for putting forward your proposal for Union.

I would ask you to consider the following points:

Union with the United States, as suggested, constitutes an actual surrender of the sovereignty of the people of these islands. To the financial supremacy exercised by Wall Street over this country since the last war with catastrophic results would be added political domination from Washington and New York.

The fate in store for us if we are prepared to pay for our victory over Hitler with a surrender to American-German-Jew financiers (Wall Street) is fairly obvious to anyone conversant with modern American history. The Civil War disposed once and for all of the right of the individual state to secede from the Federal Government. After that war a circular was issued to the Bankers of the United States:

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 care of the slave. The same result can be obtained by controlling money.

The same result was obtained by controlling the money. You are well aware of the amount of the world's gold which is at the moment deposited in the U.S.A., but you may not be aware that the steady flow of gold into the U.S.A. from the outside world ever since the Civil War has coincided with an equally steady stream of (mostly Russo-Polish) Jews into the American States so that at the moment President Roosevelt is the 'ruler' of the largest repository of Jews in the world. Gold and Jews may, or may not, have anything to do with the changes brought about in the social life of the States after the Civil War. These were: suppression of regional culture, centralisation of industries into trusts, pauperisation of the farming community, prostitution of all human values on the altar of Mammon ('commercialism'), universal corruption of political life *via* Freemasonry and Finance, and the moral collapse of the citizens.

Yours faithfully,

(signed) P. R. MASSON.

April 6, 1941.

P. R. Masson, Esq., A.M.I. Mech. E., M.I. Mar. E.,  
c/o J. Sanders, Esq.,  
20, Sunny Bank,  
Boldmere,  
Sutton Coldfield.

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of the 6th instant.

I have had a letter from another source who apparently thinks like yourself, belonging to the Douglas Social Credit Movement. All I need say is that you are incorrect in your assumptions.

Yours faithfully,

W. CRAVEN-ELLIS, M.P.

(Dictated by Mr. Craven-Ellis, M.P.,  
and signed in his absence).

31, Dover Street, London W.1; April 10, 1941.

W. Craven-Ellis, Esq., M.P.,  
31, Dover Street,  
London, W.1.

Dear Sir,

I have to thank you for your letter of April 10. I should be grateful if you would kindly state which of my assumptions you consider 'incorrect.'

Yours faithfully,

(signed) P. R. MASSON.

P.S. I have not overlooked the possibility that you may be mis-reported.

P. R. Masson, Esq., A.M.I. Mech. E.,  
Midland Douglas Social Credit Association.

Dear Sir,

I beg to thank you for your letter, which is undated, and in reply wish to say that the questions in your letter of the 6th instant are based on the assumption that in consequence of an active union between the British Commonwealth of Nations—the population of which is several times greater than that of the U.S.A.—and the U.S.A. the interests of Great Britain—which is only one unit of the British Commonwealth of Nations—would be subservient to foreign

rule. Such an assumption is incorrect, therefore, the questions do not arise.

I have no objection to the publication of the correspondence which has passed between us.

Yours faithfully,

W. CRAVEN-ELLIS

31, Dover Street, London W.1; April 23, 1941.

W. Craven-Ellis, Esq., M.P.

Dear Sir,

Mr. P. R. Masson has directed me to thank you for your letter of April 23. He notes that you are of opinion that an active union of the British Commonwealth of Nations

with the U.S.A. will not result in the subservience of British interests to those of the U.S.A.

Seeing that the numerical preponderance of our Empire over the U.S.A., which you mention, has not prevented the powers behind the U.S. Federal Reserve Board from exercising a complete dictatorship over the financial policy of this country since the last war, if not longer, with dire consequences to more than 99% of our people, I am afraid that I cannot derive much consolation from your statement, and I shall therefore send the enclosed letter to most M.P.'s, Planners and Federal Unionists of importance.

Yours faithfully,

(signed) J. SANDERS.

20, Sunny Bank, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield; April 27, 1941.

[The enclosed letter was similar to Mr. Masson's first letter.]

## Social Credit and Fascism

A recently published pamphlet compiled by Miss Helen Corke entitled *Social Credit versus British Union Fascism* collates quotations from Major Douglas's *Economic Democracy* and *Social Credit* with Sir Oswald Mosley's *Tomorrow We Live*. The fundamental opposition between the two movements is clearly and neatly brought out, and it is therefore the more necessary to point out the error of the editorial summary that social credit postulates "A National Credit Office—to administer the issue and control of Credit, not upon loan but as the communal property of the Nation." Such a statement has no foundation whatever in any of Major Douglas's books or speeches, which it would appear to summarise. Social Credit specifies no technical methods but is concerned to secure for electors and others control of their own institutions in order that their own policies may be put into operation. When they have the power to assert broadly the results which financial policy shall be directed to attain, then whether their credit be administered by professional bankers or glorified civil servants is a matter not for theory but for experiment in efficiency.

It seems a pity that some of Major Douglas's more recent speeches were not quoted, as some of the antitheses could be pointed even more pungently. Put over against Sir Oswald Mosley's: "Local authority areas will be enlarged . . . Again the leadership principle will be employed, and the executive leader of the local authority will be an M.P. of the majority part in Parliament, elected from the area over whose local authority he presides. . . local leaders will be given power to act" the following passage from Major Douglas's Buxton speech:

"It is not the business of the Parlia-

mentary machine to reform, for instance, the financial system. It is the business of the Parliamentary machine to transmit the desires of the people for results (which at present the financial system is not producing) out of the financial system and to transmit to the people the names of individuals who are responsible for the financial system, so that, by the exercise of the right of Eminent Domain, which has undoubtedly been established as vested in the representatives of the people, they may, if necessary, take steps to remove those responsible for impeding the will of the people. If it is pleaded in extenuation that those in charge of any particular function of the State, such as finance, do not know how to produce the results desired, then it is the business of Parliament to provide them with all the advice available, but if they will neither take action within a reasonable period of time, and will not accept advice if provided, then it is the business of the representatives of the people to remove them, whether they are alleged to be operating under a system of private enterprise or as public departments."

E. S. E.

## THE VACUUM

"The one living political belief which inspires the contemporary young is Communism, which holds that it is only by a violent break with the existing system that a new order of society can be introduced and that this violent break—Communists have Lenin's authority for saying so—may well extend over a whole epoch of external and civil war. A few years ago, this belief was held with passionate intensity and filled for many young men and women at the universities the vacuum which religion had left. Moreover it was exceedingly

wide-spread. It was ten chances to one that the intelligent and politically-conscious young man with whom one bandied opinions, the informed and aggressive speaker who rose at one's meetings was a Communist. Here, then, it seemed was a repository into which the accumulating fund of unexpended seriousness by which the young people of this generation are plainly embarrassed might be poured. But even over the Communist sky there is cloud of spreading discouragement. It may be the spots that have appeared on the Russian sun—the Russia of Poland's partition is no longer a channel to catch the waters of youthful idealism—it may be the conviction of the hopelessness of any attempt to introduce Communism in this country except as a result of breakdown through war—and, though logic may accordingly demand that one plans for war, who, knowing modern war for what it is, would have the hardihood to practise such logic?—or may be merely the fact of war itself which, like a drawn shutter, cuts off the prospect of the future. Whatever the reason, Communism no longer seems to me to exert its hold of a few years ago upon the allegiance of politically minded young people. The Labour Clubs at Oxford and Cambridge still exhibit the same parade of Left Wing speakers; the shelves of their members are still arrayed with the products of the Left Book Club writers; and, like proselytes reciting the articles of their newly learnt creed, they still treat the most casual conversation as a disc upon which to play the well-worn records of Marxist philosophy. Yet the old excitement is missing. Communism has become a convention, where it used to be a revelation; it is to-day a fashion to be followed rather than a truth to be fought for."

—from "Philosophy for Our Times" by C. E. M. Joad, M.A. D.Litt.

**Parliament** (continued from page five).

hope that that will meet the point of view of my hon. and learned Friend.

*Mr. Lyons:* While I am grateful for that, would my hon. and gallant Friend take steps to see that some statement is made of what these safeguards are to be, because the word "safeguard" used by a Government Department is not trusted in the minds of the people? They would like to know concretely the proposals that are to bring about what my hon. and gallant Friend suggests.

*Captain Waterhouse:* My hon. and learned Friend will realise that these schemes are arranged between the firms concerned, and that it is therefore impossible for the Board of Trade to lay down any specific safeguards. What they have undertaken to do is to bear the interest of the small men specially in mind when schemes are submitted for approval.

*Mr. Lyons:* In the meantime will not the small man himself be put out of business because of the complete lack of policy of the Department in this matter?

*Sir Joseph Lamb:* Will my hon. and gallant Friend ascertain what stores these large firms have acquired and are now holding for their own purposes?

*Mr. Rhys Davies:* Will the hon. and gallant Gentleman undertake that when any schemes come before him to close the premises of small business men he will see that a proportionate number of branches of the big firms are closed in the same way?

*Captain Waterhouse:* There is no scheme at all at present for the retail shopkeepers. The retail shopkeepers are not at present being asked to concentrate. If they find that it is necessary owing to the reduction of business to concentrate, they will do it of their own free will, and in so doing they will not in any way be forced by the Government. The Government are generally sympathetic to their difficulties, and will do all they can to see that they get a square deal. Perhaps my hon. Friend the Member for Stone (Sir J. Lamb) will put his question down.

*Mr. Lyons:* Arising out of the very unsatisfactory nature of the position that has been disclosed, I shall take an early opportunity of raising the matter on the Adjournment.

**WAYS AND MEANS—REPORT****BUDGET RESOLUTIONS**

*Major Sir George Davies (Yeovil):* ...Then we come down to those of

whom I very often think, those with incomes ranging between £500 and £1000. The man with an earned income of £500, who spends £490 and is £10 to the good, has no cushion to fall back upon. He has commitments of rent, insurance and education, and I think he will find he will have great difficulty. With regard to those who have a cushion to fall back on, these provisions will be tantamount to an elastically applied capital levy, so that two of the great cries that we have often heard from hon. Members opposite, one about the conscription of wealth and the other about the capital levy, are taking place before our eyes. I mention these considerations, because it seems well to bear in mind the position in which we are finding ourselves. . . .

*Mr. Benson (Chesterfield):* . . . The present 19s. 6d. is not the only impost which is placed by the Government on income. There is the War Damage Act levy, and on some forms of income 2s. is imposed for Mineral Rights Duty and mineral welfare levy. Imposts by the Government on certain ranges of income are now more than 20s. in the £, and every increase in a man's income makes him poorer. That is, I will not say a ridiculous situation, but an anomalous situation, and a situation in which we cannot rely upon steady patriotism to carry us through. I am not objecting to this exceptionally high taxation. I am merely querying whether our machinery as it is now constituted is likely to be effective, in collecting it. The man with £150,000 a year from bricks and mortar can give away £110,000 and be better off from the net income point of view with £40,000 a year than with £150,000 a year. . . .

I am not suggesting that taxation should be reduced, but I feel that we ought to realise where taxation has got us to, and I think we shall have to introduce certain safeguards. . . .

*Mr. Woodburn:* . . . If you abolished the profits of dividend-drawers it would not necessarily produce one extra screw, because people drawing dividends are not taking any part in the productive work of the country. Workers have been given piece-work and bonuses and while people might think that some other methods should be adopted to increase production I, and others who have had long experience of industry, think that no other method could produce such an intensity of production and such care-

fulness as this method. If a man is paid for producing goods in the proper fashion and with proper accuracy, and by some inducement he produces more, then there is no question of the efficacy of the method. But in many cases there is no inducement at all to the people who run businesses and to draftsmen, technicians and those responsible for improvements in design and methods. The 100 per cent. duty may mean that owners of businesses will discourage managements from taking any steps to improve the efficiency of war production if such is likely to reduce the potentiality of that firm for profits after the war.

If extra profits are not to improve production the Chancellor might consider some method of allowing, as part of the expenses of industry, bonuses to men who are running the management side and in many cases are working 18 to 20 hours a day. I gave an example in an earlier Debate of one such man who is now in the service of the Government in a voluntary capacity. By his ingenuity he actually made it possible to produce, during this war, shells at a rate that would not have seemed conceivable during the last war. Less than one-tenth of the time taken during the last war is now spent on machining and fitting. If a person is doing that kind of work, there should be some recognition of it in some form or other, although I am perfectly certain that this man did not do it for personal gain. Some people, however, sit back because they are getting no inducement. The Ministry of Supply has the responsibility of maintaining the efficiency of industry and it can only do that by recruiting a sufficient number of inspectors to check industry throughout the country. . . .

**NATIONAL LOANS BILL**

(6 columns).

Considered in Committee.

CLAUSE 1.—(Further provision for raising money. 2 and 3 Geo. 6. c. 117.)

Motion made and Question proposed "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. Ellis Smith (Stoke):* May I ask for your guidance, Colonel Clifton Brown, on this point? My hon. Friends and I have two Amendments down, and it will facilitate discussion if we are allowed to take them together.

*The Deputy-Chairman:* I am afraid both Amendments are out of Order, being outside the Money Resolution which we have passed.

*Mr. E. Smith:* The Amendments raise a point which, as far as I have been able to find, has not been raised before. In view of your Ruling, Colonel Clifton Brown, I propose to speak on the Question, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill." I shall divide the Committee on this, because it is an important matter. I understand that the 1930 Act is the Act upon which this Bill is based, and I want to draw attention to the 1919 Act upon which in turn the 1930 Act was based. It gives the Treasury powers for borrowing similar to those which applied in 1900, 1902 and 1914-18. Great changes have been brought about since that period. We have mechanised and modernised the Army, and, in our view, it is time that our methods of raising finance were modernised. It is for that purpose that we put down the Amendments which have been ruled out of order, and for that reason we intend to oppose Clause 1. Section 1 of the principle Act states that the Treasury may borrow as they think fit on the security of the Consolidated Fund. We contend that it is the duty of this Committee as representing the nation to see that the Treasury carry out the powers which the principle Act gives to them. That is not being done now.

Why should the Government which represents a nation, pay the banks to lend them the nation's own credit? Why cannot the Government raise their own credit in the security of the Consolidated Fund as the Act lays down? Because of what has taken place in the past we on this side feel strongly upon the matter, and many Members on the other side, had they known this question was coming on, would have shown that they felt strongly too. In war time, in order to encourage people to save and to reduce unnecessary consumption, it is sound policy to secure the maximum sale of National Savings Certificates. In that case the payment of interest is justifiable, but there is no justification in these days for the continued payment of interest to the extent of millions of pounds on bank-created credit. Had our Amendments been adopted the nation would have been able to save millions of pounds which are now being paid out in unnecessary interest on bank-created credit. In his Budget statement the Chancellor made reference to the work of the Select Committee on National Expenditure. I have read every report of that Committee and I want to join in paying tribute to the great contribution the Committee has made to the war effort. At the same time, however, we continue to adopt Victorian methods of obtaining our own

credit. We say that we ought to obtain it on the security of the Consolidated Fund. The time has arrived when the Government ought to grant themselves credit by vote of Parliament and on the nation's security.

The Lease and Lend Bill is a new idea, and wherever I have gone I have found that people in all walks of life have welcomed it. Surely it is a logical step to take for us to adopt similar unorthodox methods in this country. The situation is so serious that we cannot continue Victorian methods of raising credit. The National Debt is now £11,394,000,000, according to the final statement presented to us in the Budget Debate. The interest alone on that debt will cost the nation £250,000,000 a year. I suggest that as a result of the last Resolution we have passed we shall not be able to ascertain in future what we are really paying out in interest on the National Debt. If I understand the Resolution correctly, it will mean that in future when blue papers are placed before us on Budget Day, we shall not be able to ascertain, to the same extent as in the past, what interest we are paying on the National Debt. The creation of our own credit, would be an unorthodox step of a progressive character.

The Government are very gradually mobilising the whole resources of the country, and that provides support for my next point. The minutes of the Macmillan Committee stated that the creation of credit or loans by banks is the creation of power to employ labour, and that, therefore the only limit is the amount and quality of unemployed labour. As a result of the great effort which is being made by the Ministry of Labour hardly any unemployed are left, and there was never a more opportune moment for introducing the unorthodox progressive step that we suggest, which is of the same kind as that which has been introduced in America. Section 3 (a) of the principal Act contains the words,

"charging on the Consolidated Fund any remuneration payable to the Bank of England in respect of the management of securities under the Act."

I would like to ask what is the total amount that has been paid to the Bank of England for managing these securities since 1939. Why cannot the Treasury themselves manage the securities which have been taken over in order to assist us in financing the war? To borrow the genuine savings of the people is sound in war time, but to pay others to grant us our own credit is out of date and mid-Victorian. We were desirous of moving

the Amendments which have been ruled out of order in order to alter that and to save the nation millions of pounds. As a result of the trade union movement spending thousands of pounds in educating young men, more and more of them are getting a grasp of economic and financial questions. Too long have the people of this country been exploited in this way and too long have we been prepared to accept Victorian ideas. Everything in life is being speeded up and modernised. The Army, Navy and Air Force have been modernised, and we should take the logical step of modernising the methods of raising our own credit. In these serious times the committee should be prepared to consider a reasonable step of this kind.

*The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Capt Crookshank):*... On this Clause the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Ellis Smith) seems to be raising the whole question of our financial policy and our borrowings both now and in the years since the last war. If I may respectfully say so, it is a very interesting topic, but the Clause itself is a narrower one. It is the one by which we are taking power for borrowing this year.

... If at any time hon. Members wish to bring before us various conditions which they think ought to be inserted in our borrowing powers, they can find opportunities for calling attention to their suggestions by means of Questions, or Debates devoted to that purpose, but this Clause merely enables the Government to borrow this maximum.

*Mr. Ellis Smith:*... may I draw attention to the fact that Clause 1 of the principal Act speaks of the power of the Treasury to raise money, and states that it shall include the power to raise any money required for any Supply, and later it adds:

"and in addition a sum not exceeding £250,000,000."

Now surely upon that Clause the question of raising money under the principal Act arises, because you cannot construe this Clause without reading the principal Act. I have read the principal Act, and if I understand it correctly it is the principal Act that gives the Treasury power to borrow in the way they are doing; and in my view it is time they borrowed on the basis of the principal Act, that is, on the Consolidated Fund.

*Mr. Pethick-Lawrence:*... With regard to his reference to the principal Act, my hon. Friend is not seeking to repeal the original Act and to substitute something else. I do not know whether

he could have framed an Amendment that would have conveyed his meaning, but the particular Amendment which he did frame, which no doubt conveys meaning as far as it could, has not passed the Chair, and for that, of course, none of us is responsible. . . . But, those Amendments being out of order, to propose to vote against the Clause itself, in which the point really does not arise, would be rather unfortunate, and I hope he will not do it, because—he did not bring the matter to the attention of myself or any of my hon. Friends who are likely to take part in this Debate—I should have to ask those who sit on these benches to vote against him and to ask for the Whips to be put on. I hope my hon. Friends will not put me into that awkward position, because I do not want to quarrel with him on this matter. It would, however, be very unfortunate if any large body of Members were to be counted in the Lobby against the Clause, which simply says that the Treasury shall have power to borrow for the prosecution of the war such sums as may be required plus the extra £250,000,000. Therefore I do hope that this Clause may be carried without our having to go to a Division.

*Mr. Gordon Macdonald (Ince):* There is no intention to divide the Committee on the question of this Clause standing part, that is certain, but my hon. Friend the Member for Stoke (Mr. Ellis Smith) has felt ever since this Budget was introduced that the question which he has brought forward ought in some way to be raised. He himself was advised that it could be raised on this Clause. . . . However, if this is the wrong occasion we shall seek some other occasion.

Question, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

April 29

Oral Answers (31 columns)

#### DEER FORESTS, SCOTLAND

*Mr. Leslie* asked the Secretary of State for Scotland (1) whether he has any information as to what proportion of the deer in the deer forests have been killed to make way for sheep and cattle;

(2) to what extent each deer forest is now stocked with cattle and sheep, or cultivated, relative to its capacity, when cleared of deer?

*The Joint Under-Secretary of State for Scotland (Mr. Westwood):* From the returns received, it appears that over 22,000 stags and hinds were killed during the winter which has just passed. This is estimated to be about 9,000 more than

in a pre-war year, but, as any accurate census of the deer population is impracticable, I am unable to say what proportion it represents. Up-to-date information as to the stocking of deer forests will not be available until the 4th June returns have been examined, and no assessment has been made of the stocks which could be carried if the forests were entirely cleared of deer. Steps have, however, been taken to secure that the grazing capacities of deer forests for cattle and sheep will be utilised this summer to the extent to which suitable stock is available.

*Mr. Leslie:* What became of the venison from the 22,000 deer?

*Mr. Westwood:* That is an entirely different Question.

#### BRITISH WAR AND PEACE AIMS

*Mr. Mander* asked the Prime Minister whether he will provide facilities for discussing the Motion in the name of the hon. Member for East Wolverhampton approving the declarations of British war and peace aims, made in March by His Majesty's Ambassador to the United States in New York, since published as a White Paper?

*[That this House wholeheartedly approves the declarations of British war and peace aims made in March by His Majesty's Ambassador to the United States of America, in New York, including as they did co-operation between nations for mutual defence; the establishment of an international order, admitting ordered change in the relations between States; a willingness to join hands with any State which genuinely seeks the peace and prosperity of the world by loyally observing its engagements, and by ensuring individual liberty within its borders; the possibility of utilising the British Commonwealth, by reason of the geographical dispersion as the bridge of greater world unity; the necessity for treating in many respects the world in future as a single whole; the promotion of the common interest in the greatest possible interchange of goods and services; the maintenance after the war of sufficient armed strength to make effective the will of the nations resolved to preserve peace and freedom; a refusal to negotiate for peace with Hitler, and a declaration that we desire neither a vindictive peace nor territorial gains, but are going to see that steps are taken to ensure the world against the repetition of a war at the hands of Germany.]*

*The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill):* No, Sir.

*Mr. Mander:* In view of the excellent reception with which this admirable declaration has met, will not the Prime Minister be good enough, in due course, to consider the possibility of going still further?

#### WAR CABINET

*Mr. Granville* asked the Prime Minister whether, in view of the enormous responsibilities involved in decisions on policy in the prosecution of the war, he will consider appointing a small supreme War Cabinet of Ministers without Departmental responsibility and irrespective of party considerations; and whether he will consider inviting statesmen of the calibre of Mr. Menzies to join such a War Cabinet?

*The Prime Minister:* No, Sir.

*Mr. Granville:* Is the Prime Minister satisfied that it is still possible for busy and overworked Ministers to run great Departments of State and attend War Cabinet meetings for the purpose of giving vital decisions on war policy? Further, as the whole British Empire is involved in this war, does he not think the time has come to invite Empire statesmen to join an Empire war Cabinet or an Imperial War Cabinet similar to that established in the last war?

*The Prime Minister:* We had a Debate about this some time ago, when it was very fully discussed and when I gave a very full explanation to the House. I have nothing to add to that.

*Sir Henry Morris-Jones:* Is the Prime Minister himself alone responsible for strategy to the country and to the House?

*The Prime Minister:* In the statement which I made—I think it was 2½ months ago—I gave a very full account of how the machinery of government was run.

*Mr. Granville:* Is it the intention to call a meeting of the Imperial War Conference?

*The Prime Minister:* At the present time there is no such intention.

#### AGAINST TYRANNY

"The sole check to the encroachments of power, and the oppressions of inceptive tyranny, is the spirit, the intelligence, the vigilance and the prepared resistance of the people."

—*Edinburgh Review*, July 1809.

**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:** Correspondence to the Hon. Secretary, 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 May 15.

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,  
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.**

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.)

This list is reprinted for reference. Owing to enemy action only the starred books can at present be supplied.

**Books to Read**

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy ..... (edition exhausted)
- \*Social Credit ..... 3/6
- Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
- \*The Monopoly of Credit ..... 3/6
- Warning Democracy ..... (edition exhausted)
- The Tragedy of Human Effort... 6d.
- \*The Use of Money ..... 6d.
- Approach to Reality ..... 3d.
- Money and the Price System ... 3d.
- Nature of Democracy ..... 2d.
- Social Credit Principles ..... 1d.
- Tyranny ..... 1d.
- and
- \*‘This American Business’ 3d. each  
12 for 2/-

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster ..... 4d.
- Debt and Taxation ..... 2d.

**ALSO**

- \*The Bankers of London  
by Percy Arnold ..... 4/6
- Economics for Everybody  
by Elles Dee ..... 3d.
- The Power of Money  
by J. B. Galway ..... 3d.
- The Purpose of Politics  
by H. E. .... 3d.
- Tax-Bonds or Bondage and the  
Answer to Federal Union  
by John Mitchell ..... 1/-
- Barrier to Health  
by Dr. Douglas Boyd..... 6d.
- Lower Rates (pamphlet) ..... 3d.
- The Press Ban on Parliament  
by John Mitchell..... 1/6
- Hitler's Policy is a Jewish.....
- Policy by Borge Jensen and....
- P. R. Masson.....6d.
- (All the above postage extra.)

**Leaflets**

- Invincible Britain  
by John Mitchell .....2d. each,  
1/6 doz.
- What we are about  
by H. E. ....50 for 1/6
- Hitler and Churchill Finance  
by John Mitchell .....50 for 1/9
- What ‘Capital Levy’ Means to You  
by C. H. Douglas.....100 for 2/6
- Beware of Federal Union  
by R. L. Northridge.....50 for 1/9
- This Plan would Enslave Britain  
by John Mitchell .....9d. doz.  
50 for 2/6

(The above are post free).

Temporary Address:—

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,  
LIVERPOOL, 15.