

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 19 No. 11.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

### The Realistic Position of the Church of England

By C. H. DOUGLAS

#### IV

The able Jew, Lord Samuel, who leads the Liberal Party in the House of Lords, commenting on the reform of that body, said, "It is indefensible that a man should sit in the House of Lords because his father sat there before him." It is one step, and not a very long step from this to the position that it is indefensible that an Englishman should sit in the House of Lords (or Commons) just because an Englishman sat there before him. We have, of course, taken that step a hundred years ago, but we camouflage it by "naturalisation" and a careful suggestion that it is enlightened to ridicule heredity, except in racehorses. We are all citizens of the world, nowadays. Family is a myth; the zoo is the unit. There is no race on earth which attaches more importance to heredity than the Jew, *for Jews*. I am not at the moment concerned with the heredity principle—the point at issue is that Lord Samuel, by dismissing it lightly as indefensible, was employing the same tactic as that employed against the Christian Church—to deny the validity of its origins. Just a little at a time of course; but the direction is unmistakable.

Before the Church of England can become what it should be, an integral, primary, and effective part of the Constitution, so that the phrase "Christianity is part of the Law of England" may have real meaning, it is faced with the problem of restoring its *locus standi*. It must be insisted that Christianity is either something inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe, or it is just a set of interesting opinions, largely discredited, and thus doubtfully on a par with many other sets of opinions, and having neither more nor less claim to consideration.

The Roman Catholic Church has always recognised this, and has never wavered in its claims. It may be (and here I write with diffidence and proper humility) that the most direct path to an effective Church, is at the least, close *rapprochement*, and at the most re-union of all the Churches making claims to Catholicity. But on the matter of the appointment of its high officials, Archbishops, Bishops, and Deans, I do not feel so diffident, because that is a principle of organisation, in respect of general experience in which I have at least average experience. Whether disestablishment is consequential or not, it appears to be beyond question that Church officers should be free from outside patronage, *Quod Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit, et habeat sua jura integra*. In this connection, the Houses of Convocation, which are part of the Constitution, advise the King, and sit contemporaneously with, but separately from, the Houses of Parliament, might have an important part to play.

During the current local government elections, the Scottish Catholic Bishops have circulated a letter to their members, "To be read at all public Masses on any one Sunday before the municipal elections in 1947." After remarking that: "A few years at most, will decide whether the Christian tradition which has made Europe is to survive, or atheistic materialism is, for a time at least, to triumph . . .", it offers three considerations to govern the exercise of the vote, of which the last is: "No Catholic can in conscience vote for the representative of a party which denies the fundamental truths of Christian philosophy."

Have the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England issued any similar advice? And, supposing that they had, and their perplexed flock had appealed to the Dean of Canterbury and the Bishop of Birmingham (both, incidentally, nominees of Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald) for a statement of the "fundamental truths of Christian philosophy", what answer would they have received?

The great difficulty which besets this subject is that "the Mills of God grind very slowly, though they grind exceeding small" . . . It is in this that, by itself, pragmatism fails, as it is failing in "Britain", and most of all in politics. A given line of action, dictated by immediate expediency, may appear to be beneficial; but the subsequent result may be found to have intensified the evil. A severe pain may be alleviated by opium; but an opium habit is almost certainly deadly. The philosophy of Christianity, as I apprehend it, contends for certain immutable principles which may have many permutations ("Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but my Word shall not pass away.")

The business of the Church in politics is to be the Authority on the Mills of God, which are, of course, *inter alia* Political Principles which can be checked like any other genuine Laws, by their observed operation *over a sufficient period of time*. It is this latter fact which has inspired the falsification of history, the attack upon tradition and hereditary instinct (probably subconscious memory) and the other defensive and offensive measures outlined in the Protocols. The first recorded, anonymous election of which we have knowledge, resulted in a victory for Barabbas, who was a robber, and the murder of the Founder of Christianity. What has the Church to say of the spread of secret, anonymous balloting as a principle on which to rest civilisation?

Speaking for myself, I should reject the so-called old testament as containing little which, for the purposes of contemporary religion, is not purely negative—a warning. Its connotation with "the Chosen People" myth has distorted any usefulness it might have, and if it is to be retained, it requires treatment in a highly critical spirit, completely divorced from reverence. It is only necessary to observe the extent to which the world tragedy is complicated by Zionism to recognise its vicious effects. The Jewish question is a mass

of untruths, half-truths, and false materialism, and one of the essentials of any solution is to strip it of the occultism which is its chief ally. What has the Church of England to say of Secret Societies?

(To be continued).

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: October 27, 1947.

### Peace Treaties (Definition of "Fascist")

Major Tufton Beamish asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state His Majesty's Government's interpretation of the word "Fascist" which occurs more than once in the five peace treaties that recently came into force.

Mr. Mayhew: In the Treaty with Italy, the word "Fascist" is used to designate the authoritarian regime which exercised power in Italy from 1922 to 1943, and its practices. In the other Treaties the terms "Fascist" and "of a Fascist type" were used, by an extension of the original Italian meaning of the word, to describe those regimes or organisations in the countries concerned which had collaborated with the Axis Powers. The use of the term to designate His Majesty's Government and their friends had not at that time come into fashion.

Sir Waldron Smithers: Will the Under-Secretary of State also give a definition of what is the difference between "Fascist" and "Communist" in the opinion of the Government?

### Sugar (Jam-making)

Mr. Vernon Bartlett asked the Minister of Food why his Department allows to jam manufacturers more than 3 lb. of sugar to 1 lb. of fruit.

Mr. Granville Sharp asked the Minister of Food why, in view of the fact that the jam-making housewife normally uses 1 lb. of sugar for 1 lb. of fruit, factory jams made to the specifications of his Department use 3 lb. of sugar for every 1 lb. of fruit.

Mr. Strachey: The average amount of sugar allowed to jam manufacturers is 2 lb. to each lb. of fruit. They used about 1½ lb. before the war, and still do where the particular fruit is plentiful, but with scarce fruit such as strawberries and raspberries they are allowed to use more. Otherwise, there would not be nearly enough of these kinds of jam to satisfy the public.

Mr. Bartlett: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that even in the spacious days of Mrs. Beeton a housewife made jam on the maximum basis of 1 lb. of sugar to 1 lb. of fruit, and why should there be this extraordinary discrepancy?

Mr. Strachey: I have endeavoured to indicate that it is to eke out the quantities of fruit, such as strawberries and raspberries, which are scarce.

Mr. Bartlett: Would it not have been wiser both from the Government and the national point of view to give those householders prepared to make jam this extra allowance of sugar?

Mr. Strachey: There have been no fewer than three bonus issues of 1 lb. of sugar each.

Mrs. Corbet: Can my right hon. Friend say in what way

it is eked out—with marrow or with turnips?

Mr. Strachey: It is eked out in this case with sugar.

Mrs. Corbet: It cannot be.

### Bread Subsidy

Mr. Blackburn asked the Minister of Food what is the cost of the Government subsidy for each 4 lb. loaf of bread.

Mr. Strachey: The weight of the quarter loaf was reduced from 4 lb. to 3½ lb. in May, 1946. The subsidy on this loaf is approximately 5d. of which ¼d. represents the wheat acreage subsidy paid by the Ministry of Agriculture.

House of Commons: October 28, 1947.

### King's Speech

#### DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS

[SIXTH DAY]

#### GOVERNMENT POLICY.

Mr. Churchill (Woodford): . . . We consider that this Government, except in the field of foreign affairs, have forfeited all claim to be the faithful guardians of the national interest, and that they are just playing a low down party game from start to finish. Nothing could prove this more clearly than the behaviour of the Prime Minister about steel nationalisation and the Parliament Act. According to common report, widespread division arose in the Cabinet about the nationalisation of steel. Those Ministers who are opposed to it at this juncture, on the grounds that it will hamper production, claimed that there should be a year's delay. As the purchase price of this year's delay in doing a wrong and foolish thing, the extremists in the Cabinet were offered a corresponding diminution of one year in the powers left to the Second Chamber by the Parliament Act. On this petty and unworthy ground, the Prime Minister thought it right to reopen the Constitutional settlement which was reached in the Parliament Act of 1911, and which has formed the basis of our Constitution for the last 36 years.

The Prime Minister has admitted that he has no complaint against the conduct and behaviour of the House of Lords. All this disturbance is to be raised for the sake of some political deal inside the Cabinet to enable them to carry on from month to month. The levity of these proceedings, which even in quiet times would be grossly culpable, is at this moment, when frantic appeals are made simultaneously to us for national unity for the sake of the economic survival of our country, base and shameful to the last degree. I had as much to do with the Parliament Act, 1911, as anybody. For nearly a fortnight, in the absence of Mr. Asquith, that great Prime Minister of former times, I conducted the Bill through the House of Commons. They were stormy days and nights, and early mornings. I shall always be proud of my association with that Measure. I was in favour of it then, and I am in favour of it now. It resulted from fierce political battles and two General Elections in a single year. The second General Election was necessary because the Crown refused an extraordinary creation of peers without a renewed appeal to the electorate. On this subject I presume this is the ruling precedent.

The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison): Would the right hon. Gentleman forgive me?

He has made a reference to the Crown, and said that this was the ruling precedent. I wonder if he would develop that point, because we ought to be clear what he means.

*Mr. Churchill:* I merely recited the history of those days, and that is the latest precedent which is available upon the subject.

*Mr. Morrison:* Why drag the Crown in?

*Mr. Churchill:* It must be clear—almost clear enough for the right hon. Gentleman, even in his most comprehending moments. The object and spirit of the Parliament Act was not to enable the House of Lords to veto the will of the people, but to make sure that the will of the people was, in fact, made effective. For this purpose the life of a House of Commons was reduced from seven to five years, and a provision was inserted to enable a Bill to be carried forward under the Parliament Act procedure across a General Election. The dissolution of Parliament in no way affects the efficacy of the Parliament Act. No Government are hampered by it in carrying through their legislation unless they are afraid that the people will not support them at the polls. The fact that the Government now wish to shorten the term of the suspensory powers of the second Chamber proves conclusively that they fear they would be defeated at a General Election. What they are, therefore, trying to do is not to give effect to the will of the people, but to carry through their party legislation irrespective of the will of the people. This is not democracy. It is authoritarianism. [AN HON. MEMBER: "What an incredible muddle."] I quite understand that may be the hon. Member's condition. Total powers are to be given to any Government obtaining power at a General Election, no matter how abnormal the conditions of that election, to carry whatever legislation they choose during their five years spell, irrespective of whether the people wish for that legislation, and irrespective of whether the Government still have their confidence or not.

*Mr. George Hicks (Woolwich, East):* Hereditary powers.

*Mr. Churchill:* We will come to that in a minute. What is now proposed is virtually single Chamber Government, and the granting to the Cabinet—which already has taken it in time of peace—the whole of the arbitrary wartime powers and regulations—a monstrous invasion of our liberties and a vile breach of faith between man and man who have to work together. What they are now proposing to do is to obtain for the Cabinet irresistible power to pass any Measures they may wish to bring forward, without regard to the will of the people or to their own foundation in public confidence. This is a formidable issue to fling out at this time of economic crisis—at this time when, in full peace, despotic wartime powers are ruling—and to be flung out, not as a result of grave historic and prolonged constitutional controversies, but as a cheap, paltry, disreputable deal between jarring nonentities in a divided Administration.

Since the matter has been raised, it is my duty to point to the Preamble of the Parliament Act. This makes it perfectly clear that its authors contemplated the abolition of the hereditary principle. Let me read the paragraph:

"And whereas it is intended to substitute for the House of Lords as it at present exists a Second Chamber constituted on a popular instead of a hereditary basis, but such substitution cannot be immediately brought into operation..."

On this we have lived for 36 years. In the face of this unprovoked aggression against the constitutional settlement of 1911, the House of Lords is evidently free to propose any

alterations in its own composition which it may consider necessary for the stability of the State, and to use the powers reserved to them by the Parliament Act, which is a modern Parliamentary title, as they may think fit.

Now let us take the case of steel, for the sake of which this further assumption of dictatorial power is demanded by the present Cabinet. There is no doubt that the ruling forces for the time being in the Cabinet have lost faith in the nationalisation of the steel industry as one of the remedies for our immediate troubles. By a handful of votes, freely published in the Press, the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House managed to obtain from their party meeting permission to put this Measure off until a more opportune season. . . .

. . . In order to placate those who complain of the delay he throws this serious constitutional issue of the House of Lords as a sop into the political stewpan. It was just in order to prevent such discreditable party and Ministerial manoeuvres gravely affecting the life of our country that the authors of the Parliament Act made provision for the people being consulted and for their will to prevail.

*The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison):* . . . The right hon Gentleman has picked up a lot of newspaper stories. He says that the proposal to amend the Parliament Act, 1911, is a nasty, horrible, unclean deed within the Cabinet about the Iron and Steel Bill. He is absolutely wrong. This is not a new subject to be discussed in the Government. We seriously considered putting this into the Sessional programme of the last Parliamentary Session over 12 months ago. . . .

. . . Supposing the Government does nothing about this, we run the very material risk in these remaining years of Parliament that the House of Lords may amend a Measure in ways which are not acceptable to us or may reject important Measures passed by the House of Commons. That is the risk we run even though those Measures are within the mandate we received from the electorate of the country in 1945. If that happens then we immediately drift into a constitutional crisis. If, however, by a moderate Bill—and this is a moderate Bill—we can reduce the period of the veto within what I think is a reasonable, fair and practical limit, then we shall avoid drifting into the very constitutional crisis that I do not want, the Government do not want and I do not think any fair-minded or good citizen wants, if they can avoid it. Therefore, this Bill is to avoid a constitutional crisis and not to make one.

Let us remember the experience of the Liberal Government of 1906. That Government and that Parliament became almost impotent in many respects because of the interference of another place, and we are liable to drift into the same situation unless we pass suitable legislation under the Parliament Act, which we are perfectly entitled to do, that is why I could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman mentioned the Crown. Under the Parliament Act we are perfectly entitled to pass this Bill, and either their Lordships will pass it in one Session or pass it in due course and it will get the Royal Assent in three Sessions within two years. Personally I hope they will pass it in one Session and it may be they will. . . .

*Mr. H. Strauss:* The right hon. Gentleman says that the Government are going to put through a material Measure of reform of another place under the Parliament Act. They are going to reduce the suspensory veto from two years to

(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: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 19. No. 11.

Saturday, November 15, 1947.

### From Week to Week

While there are factors of importance which make it unsafe to assume that the result of the municipal elections is an indication of the result which would follow an appeal to the Parliamentary Electorate (such as the resentment widely felt at increasing centralisation) it is probably true that there is a decisive swing away from Socialism in action. It has always been clear that Socialism was based on semantics, or the absence of it—"a just relationship between the mind and" the words we use to express the things we mean. "Equality", "Public ownership", "the people", "the common man", "the profit motive", "production for use" and so forth only had to be tried as working formulae, to expose the discrepancy between the goods and the advertisement. So far, so good.

But to suppose that semantics do not apply to the Conservative Party is quite a fatal delusion. Perhaps the most recent indication of the danger in which we stand is contained in the almost complete suppression of the revolt of the rank and file at the Conference at Brighton. We print the report as evidently circulated overseas; and so far as we are concerned, we have seen nothing so explicit in the Home press. The item is taken from the *Edmonton [Alberta] Bulletin* of October 4:—

WARNS RED GROUP GROWS IN EMPIRE.

By James McCook

BRIGHTON, England, October 3.—(CP)—A charge that within the British Commonwealth there "is growing an ever-increasing Communist, Red-Socialist organisation, anti-King, anti-British and anti-Empire," today highlighted the debate on Empire affairs during the Conservative party annual convention.

The allegation was levelled by Andrew Fountaine, member of parliament for Norfolk, [\*] during the morning session of the second day of the convention. He told delegates:

"Behind the iron curtain is a highly-trained, highly-organised army of 2,000,000 men and women who are trained in three things—sabotage, espionage and as agents and provocateurs. They exist today in every country and in the dominions overseas.

"You've heard . . . what happened in the Canadian spy trials—how highly-placed Canadians had been subverted.

"These matters . . . have eventually culminated in a Socialist government in this country with all its attendant foulness . . . within the Empire today there is growing an ever-increasing Communist, Red Socialist organisation, anti-King, anti-British and anti-Empire."

[\*] Mr. Fountaine was, we understand, a delegate from East Essex. He is not yet in the House of Commons.

No emphasis is required to indicate the evidence of collusion between the extreme Right (not the genuine Conservative) and the extreme Left.

We need—God wot, how badly we need—a genuine Conservative Government. What we shall get unless we show more determination, is an Administration of the extreme "Right" supported by the worst elements of the Black International. We are to be offered the alternative of being shot, or boiled in oil.

Our attention has been drawn to a little known, but important, paper in the Transactions of the Royal Historical Society for 1891, entitled "The expulsion of the Jews by Edward I" (George Leonard Hare, M.A., F.R.H.S.) which throws an interesting light on the myth of the oppressed Jew of the Middle Ages. Quoting from "Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition" Papers the author remarks "There was not much 'whispered humbleness' in the amazing (Jewish) petition of 1270 in which they asked to have the custody of Christian heirs, and the advowson of Christian livings, nor much suavity in their general intercourse with Christians. In 1279 a serving-man, going down from Broad Street to the Jewry, was set upon by Jews, flung into the mud, and so injured that he died. Their usuries, their frauds, their grinding tyranny, their merciless bullying, might alone account for that cry of the people that could only be satisfied by their expulsion. But they do not stand alone."

It appears that the expulsion was the result of a condition made by Parliament to the granting of a heavy tax for the King's use.

The state of public opinion is indicated by a remark of William of Newborough "An agreeable rumour that the King had ordered all the Jews to be exterminated pervaded the whole of London with incredible rapidity."

Mr. Hare comments "The religious feeling of the day evidently influenced the King as it influenced his people, but it can not be considered paramount. 'The better sense of the country coincided with the religious prejudice in urging their banishment' (Stubbs, Constitutional History. II P. 530)."

The whole paper is well worth attention.

### The Unopposing 'Opposition'

Extracts quoted by *The Railway Gazette* from its United States contemporary, *The Railway Age* of September 27 indicate that the opposition of 'Conservative' to 'Labour' policies is not universally accepted in America. "The [British] Conservative Party has practically the same programme, except for the nationalisation of basic industries. One might well ask, however, what essential difference there is between nationalised and 'Private' business, so-called, if all prices, wages, and material supplies are subject to strict Government control, and virtually all profits and incomes beyond a low maximum are taxed away . . . the opposition party in neither country is much more dependable for soundness of doctrine and performance than the party holding the reins of government. The most powerful exponent of socialised housing in this country is not a proclaimed New Dealer, but a staunch Republican. With us the principal protagonists for the extension of socialism in transportation are not our forthright professing Socialists, but business leaders who would feel themselves slandered if called New Dealers."



### In the Shadow of the Red Cross

Ever since one came upon the statement that the "Red Cross was the type of organisation which naturally appealed to Schiff's imagination, international in scope, with the sanction of treaties behind it . . ." (Cyrus Adler, *Jacob H. Schiff: Life and Letters*) one has rather suspected that some of the things which took place in the shadow of the modern Rose Cross would be interesting to investigate. This feeling was strengthened when, during the Second World War, one had personal experience of the way in which the International Red Cross dealt with personal correspondence between individuals on either side of the fighting line, a vital task which, automatically, it seemed, devolved on this semi-official institution. When Mrs. Churchill, towards the end of the war, was invited to visit Russia under the auspices of the Soviet Red Cross, a visit which was so obviously designed to re-inforce the Soviet Myth in danger of being exploded from the moment the Soviet armies crossed the frontiers of Europe, and on her return obligingly painted the sort of propaganda picture which was expected of the wife of Generalissimo Stalin's 'British' counterpart, the Red Cross aspect of the International Political scene would certainly have been dealt with but for the fact that it was momentarily eclipsed by a 'new' International politico-charitable organisation named U.N.R.R.A., latterly referred to as I.R.O., which was launched with all the publicity ballyhoo of which our International Press is past master. But there are indications that when the various vigorous nationalist organisations in the U.S.A., and elsewhere, have carried out their declared intentions of "taking the lid off" U.N.R.R.A. and her successor(s), we shall have the Red Cross Folk with us still.

In the October 23rd issue of *East Europe* (published in London by the Countess of Listowel and J. Kowalewski) there appears an illuminating article entitled *Red Cross Police*.

According to this periodical there took place at Belgrade towards the end of September, 1947, a Regional Conference of the European Red Cross Societies. The Soviet Red Cross delegate, Petrowski, complained that Western delegates "prevented the adoption of important measures under the guise of humanitarianism which allowed for assistance to the enemy." The proposal of the Yugoslav delegate that the Red Cross Societies and Leagues should "undertake concrete measures in the struggle for peace" by restricting humanitarian actions to one side, was backed by "strong, young Red Cross Societies which have been formed in Yugoslavia and other democratic countries." (Inverted commas in original).

What is meant by "concrete measures in the struggle for peace" by 'Soviet' delegates to International Conferences the world is beginning to realize. There is a long way from Belgrade to Chile and little connection, on the surface, between the charitable activities of the officials of the Red Cross and the subversive doings of strike-directing Communists in the coal-fields of a South-American republic and it is no doubt a case of the purest co-incidence that a few weeks after the conclusion of the Red Cross Conference at Belgrade and a few days after the announcement of the birth of a second Comintern, with headquarters in that city, the Chilean Government should announce officially that two Yugoslav diplomats, Andre Cunja, Chargé d'Affaires in Chile, and Dalikor Yakas, secretary of the Yugoslav Embassy in Argentina, had been expelled from Chile in order "to safeguard national sovereignty and to denounce a vast international plot, directed from Belgrade, which has as its aim to upset the planned

defence of policy of the American Continent by paralysing its industrial production." This was on October 9. On the following day the Chilean Government published facsimiles of the documents found in possession of the Yugoslav diplomats, proving the existence of a conspiracy against Chile: "from these documents it became plain that the strike in Chilean coal-mines was but the first step in the execution of the subversive plan hatched by the Communists. The Yugoslav diplomats were expelled from Chile . . . and on October 11 the Yugoslav government retaliated by breaking off diplomatic relations with Chile, on the grounds that the expulsions . . . constituted part of a 'premeditated plan' in the interest of American expansionism which dominates the domestic and foreign policy of Chile." (*East Europe*, October 16).

These events all conform very nicely to the pattern adumbrated in Churchill's Baruch-inspired Fulton speech of two years ago (which make some of us realize that it would only be a question of time when we should once again 'be fighting 'em on the beaches, fighting 'em in the streets, etc.') and they bring appreciably nearer the outbreak, if that is the word, of that Third World War which will no doubt confer on the Churchills and their connections in Wall Street and the Red Cross the power and authority to which former global catastrophies have accustomed them. There may just be time—before we again surrender what little remains of our liberties to a 'National' Government à la Marks and Spencer and, our cash to a Treasury 'advised' by the Schuster-Rothschild-Warburg-Harriman clan, gentlemen whose imaginations are so greatly stirred by the 'international scope of organisations like the Red Cross'—to recount the following little tale of Baltic refugees sheltering in the shadow of the Danish Red Cross. (*East Europe*, October 23: the quotations are by *East Europe* from *Baltic Review*, Stockholm):—

"The Baltic refugees in Denmark are in the care of the Danish Red Cross, which took them over from the British administration and engaged itself to provide for them until the final solution of the refugee problem. However the Danish Red Cross has managed its tasks in a way which leaves no doubt of its great misunderstanding of its duties and which has made the conditions under which the refugees have to exist well-nigh unbearable."

The Danish Government has never recognised the forcible absorption of the three Baltic Republics by the Soviet Union. Therefore the Baltic refugees have made every effort to get to Denmark, where now there are some 4,000 of them. Although according to the I.R.O. Statute they ought to be regarded as political refugees, they have received only D.P. cards. The Danish Red Cross does not, however, recognise even the few rights accorded to the D.P.'s by U.N.O., and insists on regarding them as — Prisoners of War! The section of the Danish Red Cross dealing with the Baltic refugees is "The Office for Allied Prisoners of War."

All Baltic refugees have to work. They do not object to this. But no Balt can accept a job without the approval of the Danish Red Cross, against whose decisions there is no appeal. The refugees are forbidden to reside outside the Red Cross camps; they cannot obtain ordinary ration books, and have to feed inside the camps. They are not allowed textile coupons; if they accept clothing as payment for their work, this is confiscated by the Red Cross personnel, who send the "culprits" to correction camps.

Every refugee has to pay daily for himself and for every

member of his family 1.75 croner for food and 1.75 croner for lodging, and a weekly "cultural tax" of 2 croner. The Danish newspapers call the refugee camps "the most expensive hotels in Denmark."

"The Danish Red Cross has unprecedented authority over the refugees. Paragraph 14 of the Danish Law for Administration of Refugees authorises the arrest and detention of undesirable aliens up to ten years without indictment. Applied to the Baltic refugees this has developed into political discrimination. A special refugee police has been created under the control of the Communist director of the 'Refugee Office' of the Danish Red Cross, Dr. Esther Ammundsen, who in many cases is personally selecting the staff of this police. This Red Cross police is functioning independently of the ordinary Danish police. The refugees are arrested without any legal warrant, and are confined to correction camps. (The two largest are at Dallun and Esbjerg.) They are surrounded by barbed wire, watched by armed guards and special prisons have been organised . . . People are kept in these camps indefinitely, without being heard or sentenced by any court of law, at the arbitrary decision of the Red Cross police. The refugees are convinced that the Red Cross police is partial for political reasons, being recruited from Communists, or their adherents . . . The Danish Red Cross has done everything in its power to force the repatriation of the Baltic refugees to their Soviet occupied countries. Soviet representatives are visiting them, which is legally admissible, although their propaganda is one-sided. The police interrogate the refugees only in the presence of Soviet representatives. The refugees are often forcibly brought for interrogation by Soviet officials. Some have been forcibly detained and delivered to Soviet repatriation officers, and disappeared without any trace.

"Until the beginning of 1946 the Baltic refugees were allowed to elect committees for cultural work and social activities in the camps. But in February, 1946, Dr. Ammundsen liquidated these committees . . .

"The conditions described above have arisen because the Red Cross staff looking after the Baltic refugees in Denmark consists of people with pronounced Communist views. . . . The Danish Red Cross is a typical instance of the infiltration tactics of social and humanitarian institutions by a Communist minority." Therefore the Baltic refugees would like to leave Denmark. But the Red Cross authorities have forbidden them to apply for visas to any country except Soviet Russia.

Communist persecution of the Baltic refugees is not limited to the Danish Red Cross. In one of its September issues the Stockholm bi-weekly, *Eesti Teataja*, announced that Red Cross parcels had been sent from Switzerland to various Estonian D.P. camps in the British and American Zone of Germany. The Estonian Consul in New York, Mr. Kaiv, offered the 200,000 dollars interest on the Estonian State gold fund, deposited in New York since the first occupation of Estonia by the Russians, for this purpose.

Last July when the parcels bought with this money began to arrive in the D.P. camps, they were found to contain enormous quantities of horse shoe nails, in fact sufficient nails to shoe all the horses of Estonia for twenty years; sewing machines of a pre-historic type, with essential parts missing; old and rusty hair clippers; curling irons fashionable 50 years ago; tooth paste and brilliantine; rotten clothing material, which fell to pieces while being unpacked, and other oddities. The

camps held mock exhibitions of their "unsolicited gifts."

This obvious sabotage of Red Cross parcels paid for with Estonian money caused such a scandal that the Swiss Red Cross has instituted a severe enquiry. "Its outcome is awaited with much interest not only by the Baltic refugees."

B. J.

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

one year. The question I wish to put to the right hon. Gentleman is, does he say it will be equally in order and constitutionally right if the Government use the Parliament Act to reduce the period of veto to two days instead of one year; and, secondly, does he say that, if he does carry through the Government's present intention, there will be any security at all and that another Measure will not follow in due course?

*Mr. Morrison:* On the merits of the alternative that the hon. Gentleman has put into the heads of my hon. Friends I personally would not agree with it. I do not think that my hon. Friends would agree with it. As to its constitutional and lawful Parliamentary possibilities, Parliament could do it, if it wished, either under the Parliament Act as it is, or under the Parliament Act as amended. Parliament is supreme. It is one of the virtues of our system that Parliament can do anything it likes. Therefore, the answer is "Yes," but I think that on the merits I would say "No."

That is the reason for the Government's action. I say that we discussed it most seriously the year before. We gave grave consideration as to whether it should go into the King's Speech at that time. We found that, owing to the nature of the programme then, we ought to postpone it for a year and then to consider it again. We have considered it again, and we have decided to go forward with it. I submit to the House that the proposed Bill is a moderate, rational and fair reform, unless it is to be the case that we are to get something like single Chamber Government when there is a Conservative majority in this House, or else to get a Conservative veto in the last two or three Sessions of Parliament, when there is a Labour or Liberal majority in the House of Commons. . . .

*House of Commons: October 29, 1947.*

#### Cominform

*Mr. Blackburn* asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether in view of the agreement reached during the war for the abolition of the Comintern he has received any official notification from the Government of the U.S.S.R. with relation to the formation of the Cominform.

*Mr. Bevin:* No, Sir. The announced dissolution of the Comintern was the act of those who comprised it. With reference to the latter part of the Question, obviously we have had no notification.

*Mr. Blackburn:* Is the Foreign Secretary aware that the Deputy Prime Minister of the Soviet Union signed the Official Cominform manifesto describing the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary as traitors, and whether it is not clear that this is the reconstitution of the Comintern in an aggravated form with advance headquarters in Belgrade and rear headquarters in Moscow?

*Mr. Bevin:* I should be very surprised if they ever describe me as anything else.

House of Commons: October 30, 1947.

**Petrol Ration Withdrawal (Effect)**

*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Thomas Moore* asked the Minister of Labour what is the number of people he estimates will be put out of employment as a result of the termination of the basic petrol ration.

*Mr. Isaacs*: I am unable to make such an estimate.

*Sir T. Moore*: This is extraordinary. Are we to gather from that answer that the Government took this grave step so casually and so lightheartedly that they did not even examine what its repercussions were to be on our industrial economy?

*Mr. Isaacs*: I am not quite sure whether the running of petrol garages is a part of our industrial economy—[HON. MEMBERS: "Oh."]—I adhere to that statement—but so many of these places have been opened all over the country by individuals who are not registered at the Ministry of Labour that I have no information about them, and cannot get the information.

*Mr. Assheton*: Is the Minister serious in the statement he has just made that he is not certain that the running of garages has anything to do with the industrial economy of this country? Is he serious?

*Mr. Isaacs*: I am serious in what I tried to convey to the House. I am asked about a lot of garages all over the country. We will get it right down to its basic principle. I am not satisfied that a little garage somewhere in some part of the country is essential to our industrial economy.

*Sir Frank Sanderson*: Is it not a fact that it is estimated that an amount of £300 million of business will be sacrificed due to the withdrawal of the basic ration?

*Mr. Isaacs*: I was asked a specific Question whether I could estimate the number of people unemployed. I have said that I am unable to answer that Question, and make that estimate, and I cannot be expected to answer questions outside that.

**Coal-Oil Conversion**

*Mr. Sutcliffe* asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether he will give an assurance that all those individual firms who have been permitted to convert their plant from coal burning to oil firing will receive adequate supplies of oil fuel during the forthcoming winter; and what steps have been taken to overcome distribution difficulties.

*Mr. Gaitskall*: Arrangements have been made for adequate supplies of oil to firms that have completed their conversion from coal, but in view of the rapid increase in the rate of conversion it has been necessary for the Petroleum Board to warn certain firms whose conversion was due to take effect this winter to continue to use coal until oil supplies can be guaranteed. Oil distribution facilities are being expanded so that the period of waiting can be reduced as much as possible.

**Public Meetings, Hackney**

*Mr. H. Hynd* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the public announcement that Sir Oswald Mosley will speak at

an early date in Ridley Road, in the Central Hackney Division; and what steps he proposes to take to prevent this.

*Mr. Ede*: I have seen Press reports to this effect. I have no power to decide who shall or shall not be allowed to speak at a public meeting. It will be the duty of the police to preserve order and to maintain the peace.

**"The Austerity Principle"**

A correspondent draws our attention to an article in *The Times* for November 6, contributed by its Paris correspondent, reporting an official announcement on the work of the Anglo-French economic committee, which met under the chairmanship of M. Drouin, director of economic affairs at the French Foreign Office. Quoting from the announcement the correspondent said that "arrangements were agreed whereby restrictions in the procedure for the granting of French import licences for machinery from the United Kingdom will be lifted. The United Kingdom delegation took note of proposals by the French delegation for the resumption of tourism between the two countries, but regretted to be unable for the present to modify the recent decision to suspend tourist traffic to France. They undertook, however, to give careful consideration to the proposals of the French delegation. Various other outstanding questions were settled to the satisfaction of both sides."

The article went on to say that "with regard to the restriction of British tourist traffic it was explained that the British Government felt bound, morally as well as by treaty, not to show discrimination in this matter, in which Switzerland and other hard currency countries are concerned. Questions of internal policy were also entailed, the British Government taking the view that foreign travel by the wealthy and leisured classes was an infringement of the austerity principle."

Commenting on this, our correspondent writes:—

"France is in *our* debt, yet we are trying to export more to her against her own production. Last year our Export Surplus to Europe was £115,000,000 and we lent France £100,000,000 at  $\frac{1}{2}\%$  in December, 1946.

"Our (Great Britain's) grants to Europe since the end of the war to March 31, 1947, were £640,000,000 and of this:—

	£
"Gift (including £155,000,000 to U.N.R.R.A.)	325,000,000
"Repayable! (including £100,000,000 to France)	175,000,000
"Germany	140,000,000
	640,000,000

"France wishing to repay by accepting British Tourists (as one means) is told that would never do for it would interfere with 'the austerity principle' and it would be 'morally wrong' as travel to Switzerland has been banned! Yet Lord Nathan, for example, (doubtless in strict accord with the 'austerity principle') flew half round the world at a cost of tens of thousands of pounds. Doubtless also the removal of the basic ration is really in accordance with this principle. The principle is also extended to sight-seeing of the Royal Wedding when a certain London Club which has provided 350 places for members and friends overlooking the Mall

was ordered to withdraw 250 tickets on instructions from a certain Ministry.

"How much longer are we going to allow this kind of thing?"

### The Library

The Librarian asks members of the Library to add the following to the list circulated to them:—

- E 18 Elements of Social Credit.  
 P 86 Realistic Constitutionalism, C. H. Douglas.  
 A 77 The Passing of the European Age, Eric Fischer.  
 A 78 America's Role in Asia, Harry Paxton Howard.  
 A 79 Solution in Asia, Owen Lattimore.  
 A 80 Nisi Dominus, Nevill Barbour.  
 A 81 The Life of Neville Chamberlain, Keith Feiling.  
 A 82 Bevin, Trevor Evans.  
 A 83 The Palestine Problem,  
 Lt.Col. R. B. Williams-Thompson.  
 A 84 The Great Globe Itself, William C. Bullitt.  
 A 85 We Planned It That Way, Frank Knox.  
 A 86 Our Money, Peta.  
 C 63 Confessions of a Capitalist.  
 F 11 The Democrat at the Supper Table.  
 F 12 The Secret of the Zodiac, Julian Sterne.  
 F 13 Galanty Show, Douglas Reed.

### The Antiquarian

"A Message from the President of the Antiquarian Booksellers Association", signed Percy H. Muir, has reached us stating that "we, as antiquarian booksellers, have a part to play in helping to raise the state of siege in which the country finds itself."

Further passages are:—

"We, however, are in the very front line of effort. Our duty is so clear and unmistakable that perhaps it is hardly necessary for me to send this message to you at all. We have to strain every nerve and sinew to export all that we possibly can. This is especially true because, whereas there are comparatively few British goods that are needed in the United States, we have the immense advantage that our exports are welcomed and eagerly sought for over there.

"All too often to make it attractive virtue has to be content with being its own reward. In our case it happens also to be profitable. I know very well that it has been easy to sell books at home during these latter years. I know that you get your money more easily and quickly from British customers than you do from America. I know that there are some irksome forms and formalities to comply with in exporting. I will not, therefore, rely on simple exhortation to persuade you to further effort . . ."

### Victoria Election: Labour Landslide

Advices from Australia have prepared us for the Victoria election landslide, leading to an absolute majority of the Liberals over all other parties. The election was fought on a "national" basis, the Federal Labour Government's plan to nationalise the banks being the focus of resentment against progressive centralisation of power. Mr. Butler and his *New Times*, cited from time to time in *The Social Crediter*, have played a not inconsiderable part in enlightening the electorate on the fundamental issues.

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution .....	8/6
Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy .....	6/6
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea .....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War .....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket .....	2/-
Money and the Price System .....	7d.
The Use of Money .....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort .....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy .....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism .....	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal .....	6d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A. ....	1d.

ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart ..	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster .....	20/-
The French Revolution by Nesta H. Webster .....	10/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even .....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster .....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit .....	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage ..	7/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster .....	5/-
Odlum v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceedings) .....	2/6

Does it Fit the Facts? .....

Communism in Action U.S.A. House Document No. 754 .....	2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson .....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp. ..	1/6
Protocols of Zion .....	1/6
The Smear Terror .....	1/3
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W. ....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S. ....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning .....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee .....	9d.
This Freedom .....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards ..	8d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt .....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance .....	4d.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson .....	4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson ..	6d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson .....	4d.
The Beveridge Plot .....	3d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate .....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus .....	3d.
Social Credit: An Explanation for New Readers 1½d. each, or 50 copies for 5/-.	
"Pages from <i>The Social Crediter</i> " .....	1½d.
"Private View" for Industrialists .....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

A selection of K.R.P. Publications is obtainable from:—

Mr. KEITH G. CATMUR, 2, STEPHNEY GREEN,  
Phone: STE 3025. LONDON, E.1.