

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 13. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

It is evident that the Liberal Party proposes to revert to the business of a fly trap, in which it so successfully aided international finance in the latter half of the nineteenth century by canalising liberal ideas into predatory channels. Professing horror of the "straight-jacket of socialism" it nevertheless rejected an amendment, at its annual meeting on February 2, protesting against controls, and passed by an overwhelming majority a resolution calling for a "revolutionary" housing programme to "sweep away vested interests." It is perhaps not remarkable that our political parties bear a strong resemblance to branches of a chain store—they all sell the same mass-produced goods of inferior quality.

Sir William Beveridge ran true to form, but was not the *succès fou* that he no doubt expected to be.

The broadcast debate between Sir William and Mr. Austin Hopkinson, M.P. reinforced the picture. Mr. Hopkinson was provided with several sitting birds which nothing would induce him to shoot. Who so valiant a champion of Freedom as Sir William? But of course we must have "control of investment." By the lightest of asides, we gather that building a house is investment, so of course you mustn't build a house. Just where "control of investment" stops before it prevents you from buying a box of matches, Mr. Hopkinson did not enquire. And at what point "the Government" (obligingly personified as himself) would refrain from taking your money off you, and "directing" its expenditure, Sir William did not say. But it was all very Free and Liberal. And, of course "Full Employment" on things you can export, but can't buy. How Bismarck would have laughed!

It is perhaps inevitable that an organisation deriving from Marconi Scandal out of Post-Office, by a sire variously attributed to the financial district of New York and the Old Kent Road, should exhibit marked preference for the barricades. But there are limits, and we think that the "B."B.C. is widely overstepping them. It is unfortunately difficult to obtain the latest news of the doings of our Allies at eight a.m. while avoiding in its entirety the uplift of hearts provided in the preceding item. On January 23 a frenetic voice informed us, "They'd better give us a square deal when we get back, or else..." The inference is that "they" are on the opposite side of the barricades. "They," on the contrary, are most desirous that when "we" get back, we shall demand that everything be given to "the people" and that the Russian hell shall be duplicated by request. And the "B."B.C. either knows that it is doing its best to assist that consummation, or it is even more incompetent than it is nauseating.

It is with regret that we learn from our esteemed contemporary *Vers Demain* that it has given support to the

anti-conscription movement in Quebec, because there is nothing which will do the Canadian Social Credit movement more harm. We are not concerned to discuss further the special circumstances of Quebec in this connection. The plain, inescapable fact is that Quebec is a contractual member of the Canadian Federal Dominion, and has committed Foreign Policy to Ottawa. As we have emphasised in these columns, policy is, and can only be, "democratic" on the subject of war, or no war. Once that decision is taken, war becomes functional, and conscription is logical and inevitable. The profound dislike we, in common with our Quebec friends, entertain for conscription is for the policy which makes conscription logical—a situation thoroughly understood by P.E.P. and the Planners. The attitude taken up by certain Quebec politicians, and apparently supported by French-Canadian Social Crediters, gives immense weight to the complaint of many English-speaking Canadians, that French Canada wants always to have the benefits without taking any of the responsibility, and will greatly increase the difficulties of M. Grégoire, the Vice-President of the Canadian Social Credit Association.

As might have been predicted with every feeling of confidence, the C.C.F. (Socialist) Party, and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation joined in a vicious attack on Mr. Churchill over the Greek situation. Nothing is more remarkable in recorded history than the mass of evidence demonstrating careful preparation the world over, of a Fifth Column of Socialist employes in key positions quietly placed in readiness for the equally carefully-arranged war, and trained to attack any resistance to the coming of the Socialist State for which the London School of Economics was founded and staffed by the multi-millionaire Sir Ernest Cassel. We congratulate the Hon. Solon Low, the President of the Canadian Social Credit Association for his outspoken condemnation of the "C."B.C., and, as he may not otherwise see it, we attach the following information for which we are indebted to *The Patriot* of January 13, 1945:

The master mind behind the mutiny of E.L.A.S. is not General Sarapis, who is a mere figurehead, but a man calling himself Ares Veloukhiotis, whose crime record lies before me. 1925, theft two years; 1929, theft 20 days; conspiracy against the state, 45 days; 1930, armed resistance to the police, two months; conspiracy, two years; perjury ten months; forgery, four months; forgery, one month; perjury, six weeks. 1937, forgery, three months. 1938, conspiracy, four months... The present Navy Minister, M. Canelloupoulis, holds him responsible for the massacre of over 10,000 persons in the Peloponnesus. He boasts of having killed 420 of them himself.

A very suitable protégé for the "C."B.C.

The National Secretary of the C.C.F. (Socialist) Party

is David Lewis, a Russian Jew whose real name is Levinstein. The Chairman of the Party is Professor Frank Scott, a member of McGill University with anti-British ideas.

The Chairman of the British Socialist (Labour Party) Conference is Professor Laski, a Manchester Jew of Russian descent. "The most powerful Socialist in France" is Daniel Mayer, a Jew. "Many astute observers are already classing him in influence with the late great Leon Blum" a Jew. The eulogy on Monsieur Mayer is quoted from a publication issued by Odhams Press (Julius Elias). Sidney Hillman, the "American" Socialist-labour boss, is a Lithuanian Jew. As President Roosevelt says, "Fix it with Sidney."

Cartel is derived from the German word "Kartell," and means a manufacturers' union to keep up prices.

We gather from the *New Era* of December 1, 1944, that in Australia some banking racket of the first magnitude is to be put over at an early date. Hence, no doubt, the Bank "of England's" recall of its notes. Monopoly is always a step to confiscation.

During the Provincial Elections in Saskatchewan, Mr. Coldwell, the Socialist (C.C.F.) leader besought the electors to accept "the New Zealand Economic System." For the most part, the electorate didn't know what he was talking about, and, as the *Bulletin* (Edmonton) dryly remarks, perhaps Mr. Coldwell didn't either. But in view of the access to power in Saskatchewan of the C.C.F., as a result of dissatisfaction with the Liberal Party, the Liberal M.P. for Moose Jaw decided to visit New Zealand, and to see the New Jerusalem for himself. His findings have been published, and are highly instructive.

Both the New Zealander and the Australian farmer receive far less for their labour than the Canadian, and it must be remembered that they have a twelve-month working year against the Canadian's six months. The New Zealander is rather worse off than the Australian. Mr. Ross gives specific figures to eliminate arguments on exchange questions.

A standard six foot mower costs the Australian 597 pounds of butter, the New Zealander slightly more, but the Canadian 279 pounds. A tractor costs the Australian 3,037 bushels of wheat, the Canadian, 1,352. A Junior tractor costs the Australian thirty steers (beef cattle), the Canadian, eight. To secure the privilege of paying twice as much for everything he buys, the Australian and New Zealander have to submit to a bureaucratic system unequalled in its oppression elsewhere in the Anglo-Saxon world.

We propose to return to Mr. Ross's findings on a future occasion.

### BOOKS TO READ

Pressure on our space is responsible for the frequent omission of the list of "Books to Read" on Social Credit. A list will be sent to enquirers on request.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

Liverpool.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Lords: January 25, 1945.*

### WAR SITUATION

*Viscount Templewood:* . . . I share completely the opinions just expressed by the noble Lord as to the great achievements of our Russian Allies during the last two or three weeks. Nothing could be more magnificent. Nothing could show better the contrast between the high standards of efficiency that one finds in the Russian Army to-day and the state of affairs when I and some other members of this House were attached to the Russian Army during the last war. But whilst I am behind no member of your Lordships' House in my admiration of the course of military events, I am none the less somewhat disturbed by certain of the recent political developments. It seems to me that under our eyes has been gradually taking shape the new pattern of Europe. It seems to me that it is a new pattern, very different from the pattern that some of us had contemplated two or three years ago. It seems to be a pattern that is differing in certain material respects from the principles of the Atlantic Charter. One by one the difficult issues of Europe are in process of being settled, but they are being settled, for the most part, piecemeal, unilaterally and without the consultation or the full approval of the populations concerned.

I am not so foolish as to think that in the course of a great war lasting many years, it can be expected that events will always go according to some neat pre-conceived plan. What the Prime Minister the other day rightly called the march of events is bound to have a great influence upon the political developments that take place. Nor, still less, do I fail to realise the gigantic achievements of the Prime Minister and the other two great leaders of the Alliance in keeping together the Coalition, always a very difficult task in the course of a long war, and in concentrating its full efforts upon the defeat of Germany. None the less I do think that at the impending conference that is so soon to take place, the time has come to revise some of the decisions that have been taken piecemeal and unilaterally in the course of the war and to make an attempt to fit them into a system for Europe that would last not a few days or a few months, but a system that may be regarded as a permanent foundation for the Continent for the future.

I have in mind a whole list of definite questions to which such an attempt might be applied. I do not weary your Lordships with them this afternoon; they will probably occur to every noble Lord who is present. I take from the list two of them as examples of what is in my mind. They are two examples, it is interesting to note, that the noble Lord who preceded me has selected. I take first of all the question of the attitude of the Allies to the liberated territories. I take secondly the attitude of the Allies to Germany. I am going to be somewhat more ambitious, perhaps somewhat more indiscreet than the noble Lord who has just spoken, and attempt to put my argument into a more concrete form. Take first of all the question of the treatment of the liberated areas. It seems to me that we have been witnessing a series of acts which are essentially unilateral acts. They have been tending to create what I believe many people wish to avoid, unilateral spheres of influence in Europe. I am quite aware that very often what

has happened has been that the great Allies have given some kind of general approval to what has happened. Now, I would venture to suggest to the noble Viscount, the time has come to go beyond the generalities and for the Allies to have a common programme for dealing with liberated areas, to make their programme public and to have an organisation for carrying out the executive part of the programme.

We have seen what has been happening in Greece. In Greece it seems to have been assumed that we alone were responsible for the course of events. As a result, a large measure of odium was placed upon our shoulders and we have seen a large amount of criticism, very often ignorant criticism of what we have done, in the columns of overseas papers. I would suggest to the Government that the attitude of the Allies in liberated territories ought to be collective action, and that there ought to be somebody upon a higher level than what is called the European Advisory Commission. I say not a word of criticism against the European Advisory Commission. The British representative upon the Commission is one of the ablest of our younger diplomats and I feel sure that within their limitations the European Advisory Commission have played a very useful part. I believe, however, that the time has now come when there is needed an organisation upon a higher level. Noble Lords will remember that at the end of the last war what was called the Ambassadors' Conference in Paris played a very useful part and was effective in settling a number of difficult questions during the period of its existence. I do not say that an exact repetition of that organisation is necessarily suitable to present conditions. It may be that better methods can be discovered. It may be, for instance, that regular meetings between the Foreign Ministers might be preferable, provided, that is, that those meetings are regular, that they are constant and that they have an organisation behind them.

But the point I wish to make to your Lordships this afternoon is that the treatment of liberated areas should be a collective and not a unilateral treatment, in which all three, indeed I should say all four, of the great Powers are involved, for I would include the French as one of those four Powers. I feel that it is essential to bring the French Government into the active consideration of these questions and to make the French Government and the French people share responsibility for the decisions taken. My second point is that at the ensuing conference an organ of some kind should be set up upon a higher level than the European Advisory Committee which should deal from day to day with the many questions that are bound to come to the front—questions which, if they are left as they are to-day, will only end in the kind of bitter, ignorant controversy of which we have had so flagrant an example in the case of Greece.

I come to my other concrete proposal. I believe myself that, now that we are entering upon what appears to be the last stages of the last chapter of military operations, the time has come for the Allies collectively and not unilaterally to make their attitude towards Germany far clearer than it is to-day. I have tried to follow as best I could the announcements that have been made from time to time by the Allied leaders on the subject of Germany. I think I am right in saying that almost without exception these statements have been unilateral statements. There has never been a joint and considered pronouncement by all the great Allies, including France. I think it is essential that upon

the issue of Germany any declaration of the Allies should be shared by the French Government.

So far the very comprehensive phrase "unconditional surrender" has held the ground. I would not for a moment suggest going back on the phrase "unconditional surrender"... I should like to see the Allies set out clearly the essential conditions upon which they insist and upon which I believe there is a great body of general agreement amongst the Allied peoples—the total disarmament of Germany, military occupation, industrial control, the readjustment of frontiers on military grounds, punishment of war criminals, the provision of German labour and German materials for the rehabilitation of devastated areas...

It would be very useful from the point of view of hastening the end of the war that these terms should now be stated. But suppose agreement could not be reached upon a statement of that kind. I should like to see the great Allies collectively make a statement—if they cannot make a statement upon what we are going to do with Germany, a statement upon what we are not going to do with Germany. The Prime Minister in the debate in another place made an admirable statement upon that subject. He made it quite clear that there was no question of withdrawing the provision of unconditional surrender, but he made it quite clear, also, that that did not mean that in our treatment of individual Germans we were going to behave as the Germans themselves have behaved towards the inhabitants of occupied territories. He made it quite plain that we should act within the limits of the traditions and principles upon which we have always conducted our dealings with individuals of our own and other countries. It was an excellent statement, but it was a unilateral statement made by only one of the great Allies. I would ask the noble Viscount if he would consider very seriously the wisdom of our representatives at the conference doing their utmost to obtain a united statement of this kind, supported by all the Allies, and publicly announced with all the force at the disposal of the various organisations of political warfare. By this statement, I suggest, it should be made quite clear to individual Germans that all the horrors out of which Goebbels is making such capital at the present moment were features of German propaganda, and that whilst we were going to insist upon the most drastic measures for the prevention of any future war of aggression by Germany none the less we were going to treat individual Germans as human beings. It should further be stated that we contemplated that—to use the phraseology of the Atlantic Charter—"after the final destruction of Nazi tyranny" the Germans would play their part in the Europe of the future, and that, Germany being a country of 60,000,000 inhabitants, the part they would play would be an important one, provided that Nazism was for ever destroyed and that they lived as civilised neighbours with the rest of the countries of Europe.

Let me epitomise in a sentence or two what I have been trying to say. I want to see this great conference—much the most important conference that has been held since the war started—get back to the Atlantic Charter. It is four years since the Atlantic Charter was accepted by the great Allies. It has been accepted by the great Allies; it has been accepted by the smaller Powers. Here is a statement of policy agreed by the President of the United States, by our own Prime Minister and by Marshal Stalin, and I am anxious to see that we get back to the principles that

(Continued on page 6)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*  
*One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.*  
 Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,  
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 13. No. 23. Saturday, February 10, 1945.

### Russia's Ultimate Aims

The Comte de St. Aulaire, from whose remarkable book, *Geneva versus Peace* we quoted recently, remarks "The League of Nations was conceived in Berlin... We learn this fact from Von Bulow... it is at Berlin that the ring is completed, after traversing Washington, Paris, London, Budapesth and Petrograd. The mutual affinities of its ancestry, plutocracy, revolution, Freemasonry and Pan-Germanism, are so close that it may be wondered if there is not, beneath them all, another identity."

In this, the gravest crisis of the world's history, it is essential to realise that the stakes which are being played for are so high that the players on one side, at least, care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow.

They have no nationality, no morals, no scruples and no regrets. The League of Nations was conceived in Berlin, yes. But it was proposed and pressed by Wilson, the representative of men who had fought (well, a little anyway) to defeat the country in which it was conceived. It is not accidental that a film, and we know who controls the films, has appeared at this time which presents Wilson as a giant among statesmen, instead of, as he was, a second-rate schoolmaster completely dominated by Schiff, Strauss, House, Baruch and Brandeis.

To a world not distracted by rocket-bombs and Ministries of Fuel and Power, it would be uniformly obvious that a manipulated clamour is being raised in favour of the scum of the underworld in each country as it is "liberated." This scum has obtained arms in large quantities under the pretext of resistance to the Germans during the occupation. How much resistance was actually offered, we may, or may not, learn at a future date. We may, or may not, also learn the principles on which the arms of the resistance movements were distributed. But we already have sufficient experience of what happened in Greece, Belgium, and parts of France (always backed by a prepared clamour from the "British" Socialist Party) to be assured that a massacre of the Right has been prepared. The text-book is available to anyone who supposes that we are alarmists. It is written by Stalin, and its title is *Problems of Leninism*. In a valuable commentary which should be read by everyone, ("What are Russia's Ultimate Aims?" Price fourpence, 9, Hazlewood Road, Glasgow.), Mr. H. W. Henderson remarks "No one acquainted with Communist tactics in Germany before the advent to power of Hitler, can fail to be impressed with the fact that unity between the Communist and Socialist Parties could have kept the Nazis out. This was however rendered impossible by the actions of the Communist Party, acting under instructions from Moscow." Now, the Russian Revolution, and its spate of murder, was

financed from New York with the assistance of Germany by some of the richest men in the world. And these same men are those who have persistently opposed effective monetary reform with the obvious intention of retaining an army of discontent for use against the Right. That is to say, there is a working coalition between the scum of the underworld and the richest men in the world to murder those from whom alone redemption for the underworld can come, in order that any threat to the power of the financier may be removed. The underworld will be dealt with just as easily as Stalin deals with any opposition, when the underworld has done its job.

### "This King Business"

The artificial nature of current political sentiment, to which the "B."B.C. panders as far as it dares, is nowhere more evident than in the accusations levelled at Mr. Churchill that he is supporting monarchist interests in "liberated" countries. That he is not, is not the point, which is, why shouldn't he? Is there a single fact to set against the array of evidence that monarchical Europe of the Nineteenth century was immeasurably more attractive to every class than a Europe run by thugs like "Marshal" Tito, *et al*? We have always repudiated the false antithesis of "Monarchy or Money Power," much as we agreed with the author of the book of that name, because this country is a monarchy, and is being ruined by money-power plotting. But we are inclined to place the locus of this anti-monarchist sentiment in New York. It may be remembered that the U.S. Ambassador to Germany in 1915, James W. Gerard, wishing to carry favour with President Wilson, gave as the cause of the European War, "This King business." Anything more grotesquely incompetent it would be difficult to find. Kaiser Wilhelm II was an undesirable monarch, and not an attractive individual; but comparison of the Kaiser's War and the Paperhanger's War does not incline us to adulation of the Millenium of Paperhangers.

As we have said previously, this is a cultural war. Perhaps the best feature of the Kaiser's Germany was that, to quite a considerable extent, it kept "money" where it belonged.

For the greater part of the nineteenth century the dominant note of American culture was "money" (we do not overlook the considerable, but not dominant exceptions). The money culture resented the credit-power of Courts. Ultimately, this credit-power succumbed largely to money, and lost its attraction. But it was a menace to money, and it had to go. "The King is the fountain of Honour" had to be, and largely has been, replaced by "The cheque-book is the sludge-pump of titles."

At bottom, the argument simply boils down to a decision as to whether or not there is anything in hereditary aptitude reinforced by specialised training from birth. If there isn't, then there's nothing in the king business.

"Russia's objections to King Peter are not primarily based upon dislike of monarchs, but... Soviet foreign policy... more than one Soviet high lady has enjoyed the thrill of fine frocks, splendid jewels and a Balkan Court function... Will all this continue? The fundamentalist revolutionary is asking this question with ever growing anxiety."

— *Review of World Affairs*, January 30.

## Improving on R.L.S.

December 3, 1944, was the fiftieth anniversary of Robert Louis Stevenson's death at Vailima, and was commemorated by the B.B.C. with several programmes.

Something will have to be done about the B.B.C. Unless, of course, it is generally agreed that, in the interests of the Totalitarian State, all classics must be revised, cut or added to, to bring them in line with the accepted ideology, and those that cannot be so dealt with be destroyed. This, as we all know, has been done in Germany.

During November a series of dramatised broadcasts of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* was given. It opened with a fine description of a London fog. Now there are one or two descriptions of fogs in this thriller, but no trace of the pi-jaw interpolated by the B.B.C., who, not satisfied with the story as it stood, added something like this (I wish that shorthand reports of such points were available: the B.B.C. escapes from much heavy criticism because no record is available to convict it.):—

"Yes, there was a fog in the street; but there was also a fog in the doctor's house, a fog produced by the over-accumulation of wealth. . ." and so on, for a few lines, the general intention plainly being to cast contumely on the Victorian way of life, in order that we shall be quite sure that we have never "progressed" so far as we have at the present stage of history. You see, we cannot afford to leave the Victorians exactly as they are, with all their faults and all their virtues, or it might be discovered there was something in their age after all.

In order to be certain the passage was not there, I re-read the story; there was not a sign of it, nor of the rest of the B.B.C. picture of the doctors at dinner surrounded by every extravagant luxury and expensive wine in the style, not of connoisseurs, (as R.L.S. certainly was with wines) but in the style of weary hedonists, so bored that they did not know what to do with themselves. As an added touch of local colour, the cook was made to send the kitchenmaid to buy *four pounds* of cooking butter, an absurd extravagance in a household run for one man only. Good living was properly understood in Victorian households, but so was household management.

I did not have time or patience to listen to the rest of the series, but I thought it was a good crop of intentional error for two occasions. Intentional, of course; whoever prepared the script must have known the passage was not there. Major Eric Linklater's *New Judgment* I did listen to; so far as I remember, he confined himself to a small canvas, and said practically nothing about Stevenson as an essayist. He spent most of his time over *Kidnapped* and *Catriona*, but what he said was well-said.

There is something else about the tricks played by the B.B.C.—they are stupid. No writer can write or think in the style and fashion of a period fifty years on, and it is only the illiterate who are taken in by such antics. The B.B.C. is misinforming the uneducated.

The volume which includes *Virginibus Puerisque* contains some of the best essays in the language. But it seems impertinent to make such a statement to readers of this paper, who surely must have read them all long ago with delight. Instead of writing *about* Stevenson, which I feel ill-qualified to do, will you bear with me while I turn the pages for the marked passages:—

"The difficulty of literature is not to write, but to write what you mean."

"Never to forget your umbrella through a long life would seem a higher and wiser flight of achievement than to go smiling to the stake; and so long as you are a bit of a coward and inflexible in money matters, you fulfil the whole duty of man."

"I do not greatly pride myself on having outlived my belief in the fairy tales of Socialism." (Written before 1881.)

"People may lay down their lives with cheerfulness in the sure expectation of a blessed immortality; but that is a different affair from giving up youth with all its admirable pleasures, in the hope of a better quality of gruel in a more problematical, nay, more than improbable, old age."

"To be quite honest, the weak brother is the worst of mankind."

"When the torrent sweeps the man against a boulder, you must expect him to scream, and you need not be surprised if the scream is sometimes a theory."

Most of these aphorisms are from the essay *Crabbed Age and Youth*, wherein Stevenson deals with the problem of apparently irreconcilable ways of life. If part of the world wish to live as Roundheads, and part as Cavaliers, it does not necessarily mean that they must fight to the death; there is one way to find the balance—do we not endorse its truth with all our hearts?

"Here have I fairly talked myself into thinking that we have the whole thing before us at last: that there is no answer to the mystery, except that there are as many as you please; that there is no centre to the maze because, like the famous sphere, its centre is everywhere; and that agreeing to differ with every ceremony of politeness, is the only 'one undisturbed song of pure consent' to which we are ever likely to lend our musical voices."

But when we come to the *Apology for Idlers*, perhaps it is still easier to understand why R.L.S. as an essayist is unfashionable with the B.B.C.

"Idleness, so-called, which does not consist in doing nothing, but in doing a great deal not recognised in the dogmatic formularies of the ruling class, has as good a right to state its position as industry itself. It is admitted that the presence of people who refuse to enter in the great handicap race for sixpenny pieces, is at once an insult and disenchantment for those who do. A fine fellow (as we see so many), takes his determination, votes for sixpences, and in the emphatic Americanism 'goes for' them. And while such an one is ploughing distressfully up the road, it is not hard to understand his resentment, when he perceives cool persons in the meadows by the wayside, lying with a handkerchief over their ears and a glass at their elbow."

Unanswerable. The humourist always is. Except by boycott.

It is the idler, says R.L.S., who is the more likely to know something of the Art of Living; and adds:—"While others behold the East and the West, the Devil and the Sunrise, he will be contentedly aware of a sort of morning hour upon all sublunary things, with an army of shadows running speedily and in many different directions into the great daylight of Eternity."

Thus breaking into pure poetry, comes the ultimate justification.

And as for *The Dynamiter*, published in 1885, and dedicated to Messrs. Cole and Cox, Police Officers, how could we expect the B.B.C. to mention that, since, of course, if it were not for Hitler, the world would be an example of great souls serving noble ends? "Horror is due to ourselves, in that we have so long coquetted with political crime," says Stevenson; but adds that it were a waste of ink to deal with it in a serious spirit. So he wrote the *New Arabian Nights*—hoping to do what Dargon, (Sir George Makfee) tried to do forty years later, in *The Nameless Order*. And who shall estimate with what success? "I bound myself by an irrevocable oath," says one of the conspirators, . . . "an oath that was once the very utterance of the truth of God, but that falls to be the symbol of a meaningless and empty slavery. . ." I think the writer found it impossible to keep the light tone of romance throughout—here and there it breaks into drama when the characters take charge of the story; the wine was too strong for the bottle.

The *Wrecker*, according to the *Times* of December 2, alienated some of Stevenson's admirers because it dealt with the "superficially sordid" surroundings of the American dollar hunt. But to me this book is priceless, (using the word with deliberation) from the skit on a "sound commercial education" right through to the *tour de force* that can manoeuvre five men into the position of being compelled to commit five murders, and still maintain the illusion red-hot.

This article is not intended to be in any sense complete—it is merely an attempt to deal with the B.B.C.'s omissions and falsifications, to redress the balance. Little or no mention seems to have been made of the poems. All that can be said of them here and now is that they are *poems*.

— B. M. Palmer.

## PARLIAMENT

*Continued from page 3*

were so admirably stated in it. Let me, in conclusion, read to you the principal clauses. I think that you will say that, if they could be carried out, we should find in them a real and permanent basis for a better Europe for the future, and that where we have been diverted from them—it may be under the hard pressure of military events—we have been pushed off the right track.

Listen to this. The Signatories state:

"First, their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or other.

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

"Sixth, after the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

My Lords, there is a fine statement of agreed and united policy. There is a programme upon which we can build. There is a line to which I hope we shall see the representatives of all the Great Powers devote their full attention when they meet in the near future in this all-important international conference.

*Viscount Samuel*: . . . I think occasion should be taken here in this Chamber to make a protest against a speech re-

cently made by Commander Bower, a little-known Member of Parliament, which was a sweeping attack on Russia and the Russians. That speech, having evidently been telegraphed to Russia, has recently met with strong condemnation in *Pravda*, the official journal. I sincerely trust that our friends in Russia will realise the complete unimportance of that speaker, who is known, I think, only for his prominence as being one of the most reactionary and irresponsible of our Members of Parliament. . . .

It has frequently been thought that power and peace were opposites, and no doubt often that has been so. But it need not be so and we recognise—we have had to recognise from hard lessons—that in our present state of civilisation there certainly will be power in the world. If it is in wrong hands wrongly used it brings disaster to mankind, as we know only too well at this moment; but if it is in the right hands and rightly used power may be a guarantee for peace. . . .

And here I would draw your Lordships' attention to what would seem to be a most important observation made by the Prime Minister in the very last sentence of his remarkable speech in the House of Commons a week ago. He was referring to the forthcoming conference between himself and President Roosevelt and Marshal Stalin, and he said that he had great hopes of that conference, and he added that we were (I quote his words):

" . . . at a moment when direct advance may be made towards the larger problems which will confront the victors and, above all, advance towards that world organisation upon which, as we all know, the salvation of our harassed generation and the immediate future of the world depend."

There the words of great importance perhaps are the words "above all." That is of the greatest interest to mankind at this moment. . . what really matters is the spirit of friendship among peoples and the will to peace among the masses of mankind. Therefore it is in continuously emphasising that fundamental principle that I believe this House of Parliament can most usefully influence the opinions and the actions of our people.

\* *The Marquess of Londonderry*: . . . But when I say that, I am not at all so convinced—and I speak with great respect of these two institutions—that either the Press or the B.B.C. present very correct pictures of the real meaning of the debates here and in another place. We in this country are an enigma to the rest of the world, and I am quite sure we shall always remain an enigma, because, through various circumstances, we are more fortunate than any other country, and we have opportunities and responsibilities which it is very difficult for other people to understand. They certainly do not understand our habits, our customs or our procedure. In fact, those things are quite incomprehensible to the ordinary person in any other country, and we find that when violent attacks are made on the Prime Minister they assume a grave significance in the minds of those people and are used as propaganda by the enemy against this country. Your Lordships will remember that there was a debate in another place in which the Prime Minister was personally attacked by one or two speakers. I think the minority vote was seven and the chief attacker did not vote at all; yet that chief attacker received a column of report in one of our leading newspapers, which shall be nameless but which I expect your Lordships will recognise. That naturally has been used, and will be used, as propaganda against this country in other parts of the world. . . .

It is the concern we feel in relation to the foreign

policy of this country that prompts us to raise these matters in your Lordships' House and to venture for a few moments to trespass on your attention. The noble Viscount spoke of the conference which is to take place. At the present moment it would be folly to say that the war is over and we do not say so, nor do we wish, by wishful thinking, to assume that the war will be over before it is; but that conference will take place and a tremendous responsibility will be placed in the hands of all those who are called upon to carry out its decisions.

Now the record of foreign policy in this country between the wars was a very bad one indeed. I would say that in the later years before the war this country had no foreign policy at all. My noble friend Lord Perth, who I am sorry to see is not here to-day, has on more than one occasion raised debates in your Lordships' House, and I regret to say that those debates have not interested the Press very much because there was nothing in them that was particularly striking to attract public attention, which is the standard which the Press follows to perhaps an extent which is rather unfortunate. But the noble Earl, Lord Perth, has touched the real issue. He has spoken of the structure of the Foreign Office and of the changes which are in contemplation and, I hope, in being. We very often hear from the Front Bench, and anxieties are allayed by the information, that there is a Cabinet Committee sitting which will shortly report. Then all our anxieties will disappear. . .

I think we can all of us regret that in the pre-war years the Foreign Office did not occupy the position which it should have occupied as the pivot around which the whole policy of this country and Empire should revolve. It is within your Lordships' recollection that for one hundred years the statesmen who occupied the foremost position in the Government after the Prime Minister were—to mention only a few—Castlereagh, Palmerston and, to come to later years, Salisbury, Lansdowne and Grey. And I think they all were Foreign Secretaries. . .

If we go back to a few years before the war we can remember that there was no foreign policy in this country at all and that on every occasion Great Britain always gave way, for reasons which I need not go into now. . .

Unless we have these changes in the Foreign Office which I believe are likely to take place, unless we have a Department which can express a definite and an overriding opinion on all these great matters, we shall relapse into exactly the same position in which we were before the war, and we shall find policies being enacted that are in conflict with the foreign policy that this country ought to have.

*Lord Derwent*: . . . My third point, which is slightly more involved, is connected with the whole question of what are commonly known as the Resistance Movements in Europe. It is obvious that reasonable demands of security and the wish to avoid reprisals frequently prevent the detailed truth being known about the exact nature of these movements when they are in operation; but I do suggest that not only in the case of Greece—where it has now been done to a certain extent—but in the case of all of them, the public could, during all this period, have been better informed up to a certain point. The appalling amount of loose thinking which has prevailed on this matter would then have been avoided, and the arrows of a doctrinaire and prejudiced criticism of Government policy, based on one-sided interpretation, would not have been launched or might in any case have been considerably blunted.

It seems to me that there are two prevalent interpretations. The first is that although all of them were originally what their name implies—namely, underground movements organised against the Germans—they were also *per se* and entirely, Communist or extreme Left Wing movements, representing the uprising of all that was both most downtrodden and therefore noblest in the different countries against so-called oppressors within the country themselves—so-called Fascists or so-called capitalists or both. The second, which arises out of the first, and which is even more pernicious, is that of which I have an excellent example in the shape of headlines and an article in a little American paper called *Newsweek*. I do not suggest that this is an important paper, but it certainly provides a significant manifestation of the sort of thing to which I am anxious to call attention. I have no intention whatever of suggesting that the statements made are typical of the American Press as a whole; this is merely a leaf blown towards me on that journalistic breeze mentioned by my noble friend Lord Samuel.

Perhaps I may read the headlines and one or two lines from the article itself:

"Right-Left Quarrels Cast Shadow Over Britain's Plans for Europe.

"Aid-the-Conservative Idea, Challenged by Soviet Influence in Belgium, Greece, Italy.

"The two realities of power began to emerge more clearly in Europe last week than at any time since the Allied Armies began the work of liberation.

"One of those realities was the deep schism between right and left in the liberated countries—a gulf so deep as to appear unbridgeable for the present. The Radicals accused the Conservatives of being Fascists or collaborationists at heart. The Conservatives in turn suspected that the Left, as exemplified in the more violent form of the Resistance Movement, was out to proletarianise the Continent by force.

"The second reality was the power of the three great Allies, the United States, Russia and Britain, to influence political developments in Europe. The United States appeared strangely reluctant to exercise a political influence commensurate with its armed might. Russian policy was straightforward in Eastern Europe, where Moscow insisted on 'friendly' Governments. But in the Western States it appeared to be working through the local Communist Parties in devious fashion."

I am sure your Lordships will be able to arrive at your own conclusions on this astonishing document. At any rate, as far as I am concerned it is my considered opinion that these two dangerous—I might even say poisonous—misconceptions could well be dispelled, or at least have their danger neutralised, by His Majesty's Government enabling the public to have as much clearer a notion of the real nature of the Resistance Movements as a whole as they now have of the Greek one. . .

*The Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs. (Viscount Cranborne) (Lord Cecil)*: . . . I must say that the reaction of certain sections of opinion here, and in particular of the Press, to events in Greece have come as a rather severe shock to many of us. I would not have believed that in this extremely experienced and civilised country people could be so wrong-headed or so unwilling to face simple, evident facts. The Prime Minister dealt with this aspect of the question in the Commons last week, and he seems to have stung *The Times* to a reply. I understood the noble Marquess, Lord Londonderry, to say that he did not wish to mention *The Times* by name but I shall be bold enough to do so. I read the leading article in question, and I hardly think that it will relieve the minds of the many warm admirers of that newspaper to whom, as I have said, its

recent attitude has come as a severe shock. For the article to which I refer only proves once again, in my view, that *The Times* has completely missed the point. It stated, quite accurately, referring to the Prime Minister's plea for unity, that

"the unity that the Coalition represents has never been, and never should be, construed as inhibiting the right of independent judgment and criticism."

That is, of course, absolutely correct, and no one would dispute it. But that is not the criticism which has been levelled against *The Times* and certain other newspapers. The complaint was not that they spoke out, which they had an absolute right to do, but that they misapprehended and therefore entirely misrepresented the situation.

Throughout, these newspapers referred to the issue as a struggle between the Right and the Left. That in fact was not the issue. . .

*House of Commons: January 30, 1945.*

### DEBATE ON THE ADJOURNMENT: FOREIGN POLICY

*Mr. Stokes (Ipswich):* . . . I want to say a few words about the Baltic Provinces. I do not pretend to be well informed on the history of those Provinces, but I protest—and I would be a coward if I did not—against the terrible treatment which is being meted out to the people there, if the reports we receive are correct. If the reports are not correct, let us have them contradicted and proved futile. What are we told by the Lithuanian representatives in this country? They say that designated families are selected, are visited suddenly and, without notice, are given an hour to collect a few possessions; that they are carried in lorries to the point of entrainment and that the heads of the families separated from the others, this being kept secret so as not to provoke scenes; that these ruthless separations are enforced upon tens of thousands of private families for no other reason than that they are judged to be unlikely docilely to accept the Bolshevik formation. . .

*Mr. Loftus (Lowestoft):* . . . Now we have entered Europe we shall be met by all the spectres that haunted the entrance to Hades as described by Virgil in Book 6 of the *Æneid*. Have we any guide posts to help us, when we thread our way through the labyrinth of Europe which is blazing with hates, with fires ready to burst out, and full of appalling unhappiness? Have we any indications to help us, any principles? I suggest—and here I agree with the hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Lindsay)—that the Atlantic Charter does provide us with such principles. I know it is the fashion in some quarters to deride it, but when it was promulgated to the world in 1941 it embodied the hopes and commanded the enthusiastic support of millions of people in this country and throughout the world. That Charter has been flagrantly broken in some instances, and certainly with regard to Poland.

We talk at Dumbarton Oaks and elsewhere of building the peace structure after the war, but treaties broken with the ink scarce dry upon them will be an ill foundation for any enduring peace structure. The Atlantic Charter was not signed in 1941, but it was signed by all the Allied nations on January 1, 1942, and that ratification had the signatures of the President of the United States, our Prime Minister and that of Mr. Litvinov on behalf of the U.S.S.R.

Have we any other guidance? I suggest that we have. The Prime Minister gave an admirable farewell message to the Italian people. He put forward there certain tests of freedom. Hon. Members will probably remember that they included freedom of the Press, of criticism of the Government, freedom to form opposition parties, Constitutional means of changing the Government. Fair play for all citizens and not only for Government officials. He went on to point out that courts of justice should administer known laws, not under pressure from any one party or from the Executive.

The final point, which is enormously important, was freedom from the secret police, from arrest, from imprisonment without trial and from the concentration camp. It is a melancholy fact that in some of the liberated countries, such as Poland and Yugoslavia, if the facts are as they are reported, the secret police are as numerous and the concentration camps as full as before those countries were liberated. I hope that that is not true; but reports come in to that effect. I believe that the ordinary man and woman in Europe to-day requires, first of all, to be a free citizen, that is, to be able to stand and speak without having to look over his shoulder for fear that anyone may overhear what he says. He wants freedom from the secret police, freedom from the concentration camp. He does not want perpetually violent politics and threats of civil war. He wants stability and freedom, and a chance to rebuild his family life, reconstruct his home, reconstruct his business or occupation. He wants two or three years for recuperation and rebuilding. . . .

The hon. Member for Westhoughton (Mr. Rhys Davies) talked about monarchies with a certain depreciation of the monarchial idea. Let us look at the facts. If a would-be government to-day, basing itself on the concentration camps and on one party, blares forth to the world that it is democratic, we do not look at the facts; we swallow the label. Take two democratic States in Europe, equally happy, equally prosperous, equally free and democratic. One is Switzerland, a republic, highly decentralised; I suppose the freest nation in the world. Then take a monarchy, Denmark. I have lived there. It is free, happy, extremely democratic. It has had a Socialist Government for the past ten years; a very free people, and yet a monarchy. Do not let us be misled by the labels; let us look at the tests of freedom. Those tests of freedom such as were set out by the Prime Minister in that farewell message to the Italian people. . .

### DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT BELFAST GROUP

#### Public Address

in GRAND CENTRAL HOTEL

on THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, at 7-30 p.m.

Subject: National Health-  
Insurance—Totalitarian or Democratic?

Questions and Discussion.