

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 22. No. 6.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

Mr. Baruch's Salesman

Winston Churchill delivered another 'great oration' at Boston, U.S.A. on March 31, and the world which still reads newspapers read him on April 1, the day which above all others has become identified with imposture and unreality.

We do not suppose that "a spark coming from God knows where" is at all likely to awaken Churchill's mind, whatever else it may do. It is chiefly his purple patches which have earned for him the reputation that he is a master of words. If he ever has been in any other sense than that he can use words to disarm as well as to dazzle the mind, and to disarm it by dazzling it, his latest purple patch suggests that at last his friend, Mr. Baruch's, overconfidence may have enveloped him. We draw attention to the passage because we would not have it forgotten that it is the same 'dreadnaught' Churchill who is speaking as said before that he would not preside over the dissolution of the British Empire. In this case he is saying that he will be content if his task (what is it, and who entrusted it to him?) in this world is done before "scientific ability to control men's thoughts with precision" arrives. "Laws," he says, "just or unjust, may govern men's actions. Tyrannies may restrain or regulate their words. The machinery of propaganda may pack their minds with falsehood and deny them truth for many generations of time. But the soul of man thus held in trance, or frozen in a long night, can be awakened by a spark coming from God knows where; and in a moment the whole structure of lies and oppression is on trial for its life. Peoples in bondage should never despair. Science no doubt could, if sufficiently perverted, exterminate us all, but it is not in the power of material forces in any period which the youngest here to-night need take into practical account to alter the main elements in human nature or restrict the infinite variety of forms in which the soul and genius of the human race can and will express itself."

Unjust laws do not *govern* men's actions. Tyrannies may restrain but they do not *regulate* their words. It is not the *machinery* of propaganda that packs their minds. The structure of lies is a lifeless structure—The rest may be true; but we doubt whether Mr. Churchill knows or cares whether it is so or not. Mr. Baruch must, nevertheless, be pleased with his salesman of war.

Forthcoming London Meeting

(FINAL NOTICE)

A meeting for subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been arranged by the Social Credit Secretariat to take place on the morning of Saturday, April 23, at the Cora Hotel, Upper Woburn Place, W.C.1. The chair will be taken at 10-15 a.m., by the Deputy Chairman of the Secretariat, Dr. Tudor Jones. Subscribers who have not yet done so and who desire to be present are requested to apply for tickets *immediately* to the Social Credit Secretariat, 7, Victoria

Street, Liverpool, 2, marking the envelope "London Meeting." It is desired that the number of those attending the meeting who wish to lunch at the hotel afterwards be ascertained.

The British Housewives' League

At a meeting in London of the Housewives' League on March 29 a report on the "Bacon and Eggs Campaign" was read by the vice-president, Mrs Palmer. Mr. A. Wilson, M.P., in the Northern Ireland Parliament, and Mr. V. R. Kimmitt addressed the meeting. The newspapers appear to have ignored the meeting—doubtless an indication of their assessment of the potentialities of the League rather than an uncomplicated reflection on its present success. For this reason we give below the greater part of the report. We have received no account of the other speeches.

The report stated that although four years had passed since the end of hostilities, the weekly rations for the British adult were in many respects lower than when fighting stopped in 1945.

"It is our considered opinion," the report went on, "that improvement in food supply is the first step towards national recovery, and we are devoting the whole of our energies to this matter. In November, 1948, the Minister of Food announced the Christmas bacon cut. The reason given was that Canadian farmers were unable to supply the bacon. News from Canadian correspondents indicated that Canadians were disappointed that the contracts had been cancelled, and had sold the bacon elsewhere. At the same time we received a Canadian advertisement, sponsored by the British Ministry of Food, appealing to the Canadians to give dollars to buy food for the United Emergency Fund for Britain, because 'we are living on marginal nutrition standards, and there is cause for anxiety lest this should be having adverse effects on health and physique. Everything you can send us is wanted and urgently needed.' The advertisement went on to explain that the dollars given by the Canadians would be used to buy food in bulk, which would be sent to England for distribution 'to those who need it most.' Unfortunately, we have not the means to distribute such items of news as quickly as we could wish. A fortnight after we received news of this advertisement it was reproduced in a London daily paper.

"The reduction in the bacon ration was duly made, but not without some protests. On December 13 a Debate on Food Supplies was held in the House.

"An observer, on behalf of the League was present at this debate, and an impression of what took place has been published in the January number of *Housewives To-Day*. During the major part of the evening less than thirty Members were present in the Chamber. The Members of the British Housewives' League Council studied their speeches with the greatest care. Our first intention was to discover,

if possible, the truth about the cancelled Canadian bacon orders. We advise everyone to read *Hansard* for themselves. They will agree with our conclusions we believe, that no clear explanation was given, nor did the Opposition press for one. Major Turton, (Thirsk and Malton), did indeed ask for an explanation but did not follow up by insisting upon getting one. He said:—(Col. 249):

“I find it extremely hard to understand why the Minister has failed over bacon to the extent that he has done. Up to now he has not made his position very clear. He told us on November 8 that the level of the bacon ration largely depended on the rate of Canadian shipments. Two days later Mr. Gardiner, the Canadian Minister of Agriculture, said: “We wanted to supply Britain with 250 million pounds of bacon this year. Britain agreed to take wheat, eggs, beef, cheese and bacon, provided that we would keep every product other than wheat down to a minimum. We therefore agreed to reduce our sights in bacon to 195 million pounds.” I think that the Minister owes the House and the country an explanation of why he dissuaded Canada from sending us 250 million pounds of bacon. I also think that he owes Canada an apology in that when the consequences of his policy have resulted in an outcry from this country, he has sought to put the blame upon our good friends in Canada, instead of taking the blame himself.”

“No one insisted on a complete explanation from the Minister. Reading the debate over and over again as we did, we found no answer. Certain key phrases, however, stood out from among the others.

“Col. 858. Dr. Summerskill. ‘It is well known that about a year ago we had to tell our Canadian friends with the greatest regret that we could not continue to buy bacon from Canada upon the scale of recent years. It will be remembered that during the war there was one year when Canada sent us three times as much as she had sent in pre-war years.’

“Col. 862. Dr. Summerskill. ‘I regret that our dollar position compelled us about a year ago to tell the Canadians that we were unable to afford the purchase of meat we had had from them hitherto; that is, apart from bacon. As far as we can see, in the future, I am afraid that we need so many other things from Canada that we shall be precluded from obtaining any meat supplies from that quarter.’

“So many other things? What things?”

“Col. 867. Dr. Summerskill. ‘It is not easy for us to have to refuse food from Canada, but the House must realise that we have no option.’

“No one asked an explanation of these words.

“Col. 956. Mr. Strachey. ‘As a matter of fact, the

first warning which was given to the Canadian authorities that it would be inevitable that we should have difficulty in buying Canadian bacon and other Canadian produce was given as early as 1943, long before the present Government came into office. The position between us and the Canadian producers has, therefore, been perfectly open and frank from the beginning. We, of course, bitterly regret that we cannot get all the bacon we would like to have, and which they undoubtedly would like to produce for us, but the facts of the dollar stringency and their inability to accept anything except payment in dollars makes the arrangements which have now been concluded quite inevitable.’

“We have written twice to Mr. Strachey to ask who gave the warning in 1943. No reply. The only conclusion we can draw from the statements by the Ministers is that it has been known for years—in certain quarters—that imports of Canadian food would steadily diminish.

“But on December 13, no member of Parliament insisted on an explanation.

“The Council decided that immediately after Christmas we would run an ‘Egg and Bacon’ campaign. The purpose of the campaign was as follows:—

1. If possible, to force the Government, by means of publicity, to bring more food and feeding stuffs into the country from the Dominions; pointing more particularly to the fact that trade with Canada is capable of great expansion almost immediately.
2. To awaken the public to the fact that there is no need for Great Britain to go short, that the Empire is an abundant source of supply, but that the present policy of the Government is actually discouraging production of food, particularly in Canada, as well as all over the Empire.
3. To show that there is no strong opposition to this policy from any political party.

“First of all we let all our friends know that we were in need of press cuttings on this subject, and among the first that came in was the famous cutting from the *Dundee Courier*; this was admirable for our purpose because it drew attention to a point which had received no mention whatever at the Food Debate. We asked all our members to inquire from their own Members of Parliament the truth of the matter. Most of them wrote as follows:—

Dear Sir,

The *Dundee Courier* of December 1 contained the following information:—

Marshall Aid funds of £2,625,000 for Britain to buy Canadian meat were cancelled by the Economic Co-operation Administration yesterday, says a Washington message. The cancelled dollars for meat covered £1,625,000 for fresh, frozen, cured or dried beef, veal, pork, lamb and mutton; and £1,000,000 for Bacon.

Will you be good enough to inform me whether this report is correct; and if it is, what are the names of the persons sitting upon the Economic Co-operation Administration Board, what are their nationalities, who appointed them, what are their duties and what are their powers?

I trust that you will give this matter your immediate and serious attention.

“We were taking the report in the *Courier* at its face value. This was the first intimation we had received that funds allocated to bacon were actually being cancelled. We had a right to a full explanation.

“Our members responded with a will, and letters poured

STATES ACTUAL, REAL & POTENTIAL

by

TUDOR JONES, Sc.D., M.D., F.R.S.E.

(The substance of an Address to the Speke Discussion Group
on 7th December, 1948).

PRICE 6d.

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

steadily into the office. The earlier replies were from Members of Parliament who were evidently taken unawares."

Mrs. Palmer read some of their letters and emphasised that Members of Parliament were completely unaware of their duties as representatives. She said that later there was an improvement. The remainder of the letters fell into three main classes:—

- (1) Those who considered the British Nation was having a poor deal.
- (2) Those who thought the U.S.A. were the donors, and we could only accept gratefully what they were willing to give.
- (3) Those who obtained an official reply from the Ministry of Food or a Government department or the Treasury, by far the largest class.

"Several," the report proceeded, "seemed to think it quite in the nature of things that the Americans should 'have the last word' (*sic.*) One says:—

"The Economic Co-operation Administration is a Department of the American Government set up in 1948, which comes under the Foreign Assistance Act to administer Marshall Aid. F.C.A. is headed by Paul Hoffman, who is known as the Administrator and is appointed by the President. Paul Hoffman is assisted by a Council composed of the heads of various Government Departments. The Administrator has power to obtain commodities from any American source and he is empowered to increase, where practicable, production in those countries which participate in Marshall Aid. It is also within his power to terminate the assistance granted under Marshall Aid when he considers that:—

- (a) It is no longer necessary.
- (b) It is not in the interests of the United States to continue such aid.

"I have verified the figures you quote from the *Dundee Courier* and they appear to be correct."

"The shortest reply of all was as follows:—

'Dear Madam—The report in the *Dundee Courier* of December 1, is quite incorrect. Yours, etc.'

"By the beginning of February a slight tone of irritability appeared in some of the answers. 'Strange though it may seem to you, a number of M.P.'s have received from their constituents exactly similar letters to that sent by you to me. Apparently a number of local papers which are hostile to the Government have been re-publishing this extract from the *Dundee Courier*. It seems reasonable to deduce that the object is to suggest to the housewife that some sinister influence is at work to prevent Britain from getting more meat.'

"The Conservative Central Office had apparently so many queries that they had the official reply duplicated.

"And again:—'Recently many people have had their attention drawn to this extract from the *Dundee Courier*, and have been asked to write to their M.P.'s about it. If the person responsible for this suggestion had only taken the trouble to find out the facts for himself, or herself, we should all have been better off.'

"Both these writers go on to give a more or less official explanation with a strong bias to British dependence on the

U.S.A. We ought to be 'grateful,' etc.

"We now come to the official letters. Over a hundred Members asked the Ministry of Food or the Treasury for a reply. This number was equally divided between members of the two major Parties. From this follows our contention that no Party as such, is really trying to get to the bottom of the matter.

"All this time press cuttings from all over the world were coming in, and it became one person's work to classify them. They threw much light on the situation. The following is the Government letter:—

" Treasury Chambers,
" Great George Street,
" S.W.1.

" My dear——

" You wrote to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on January 19 enclosing an inquiry from one of your constituents about the expenditure of Marshall Aid Funds, as reported in the *Dundee Courier* of December 1, 1948. We have received a number of inquiries on this subject couched in identical terms to those used by Mrs.—— whose letter I now return.

" The Washington message in question is incorrect. It apparently refers to a reduction towards the end of 1948 by the American Economic Co-operation Administration in the amount of Marshall Aid funds authorised for the purchase of Canadian bacon. This reduction was made at our request since the full amount of Canadian bacon which we had originally hoped to buy proved eventually not to be available. The funds resulting from this reduction are of course, being used for the purchase of other commodities under the European Recovery programme. In 1948 we imported all the Canadian bacon that could be obtained and in that year these imports were financed with E.R.P. funds to the extent of £11,225,000.

" There was no cancellation of E.R.P. funds for any other kind of meat.

" The Economic Co-operation Administration is an American authority established by American legislation for the administration of Marshall Aid funds.

" Yours sincerely,
" (signed) W. GLENVIL HALL."

" It would be as well to remind my readers at this point that Mrs. Lovelock stated in 1946, as our immediate aims, that we united to abolish bread units, and coupons, and extra-national control, *i.e.*, being told what we are to eat, by other countries. This complete failure by so many Members, to inquire whether outside control was indeed being exerted over our food supply, gave us much concern. It is with relief that we turn to letters from three M.P.'s who appeared to see further into the situation.

- (1) 'Dear Madam, I enclose a letter from the Ministry of Food. It answers some of your questions, but I do not believe it is a true statement, as I understand Canada has denied that she had not sufficient bacon. My colleagues and I are looking further into the matter. Thank you for drawing my attention to it.'

- (2) 'In reply to your letter, the Economic Co-operation Administration Board is naturally presided over by the

(continued on page 7.)

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. 22. No. 6.

Saturday, April 9, 1949.

From Week to Week

"American Aid Repaying Debt to Britain"

"MR. WOODBURN'S VIEWS"

"There is no doubt that agriculture is a little bit apprehensive, and not without reason, because we are already seeing signs of the working of the normal economic world coming back," said Mr. Arthur Woodburn, Secretary of State for Scotland, speaking last night at a dinner of the Council of the National Farmers' Union of Scotland in the Albany Rooms, Edinburgh.

"It was extremely difficult to keep normal economic laws from working, and the farming world would be wise to recognise this. To-day, the Government's plan was to suppress the normal economic activities of mankind where they were going to be hurtful."—*The Scotsman*, March 25, 1949.

We feel that any comment on the statesmanship which now guides our realm, would be to gild the lily.

Mr. Winston Churchill has gone to stay with his friend Mr. Bernard Baruch in New York. Accompanying him on the *Queen Elizabeth* (possibly by a coincidence) was Professor Harold Laski. It will be remembered that the Laski family procured the solid Jewish vote for Mr. Churchill in his capture of a Manchester constituency at the beginning of his political career.

Taking one thing with another, it looks as though the next war isn't far away.

When "P.E.P.", ostensibly run by Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, but probably proceeding from a much more formidable source, bracketed "War, or the threat of War" as being, for its purpose, equally effective, it betrayed its connection with the age-long scourge of mankind, Black Magic. For Black Magic, which the police know to be practiced in London to a greater extent than for many centuries, consists essentially in the materialisation of emotion, and the organised emotional threat of war inevitably merges into war itself.

The more this situation is examined the more Satanic it appears. We are convinced that the primary objective of the Devil is to keep men's attention engrossed with the material aspect of things; and there is nothing which so elevates materialism, and degrades spirituality, as does war—modern war above all.

Quite a trivial, but nevertheless illuminating instance of the insanity of our current ideology is furnished by the argu-

ments advanced by the whisky monopoly as to why the tax on whisky should be reduced. Whatever one's views on whisky or the demon drink may be, it would surely be difficult (one would have thought) to argue that there is any ground for its manufacture other than the desire to consume it. But in the recent approach to the Chancellor, so far as we are aware, the consumer was not even mentioned. Dollars, "the interlocking of distilling with the farmers' programme," etc.,—yes. But what happened to the whisky if these needs were satisfied at a handsome profit—well, we should worry.

Writing, not without some technical knowledge of the subject, we are suspicious of the unrestrained ballyhoo in regard to "American manufacturing know-how." The connection with ultra-materialism may not be immediately obvious, but it is there. Tool-power politics, which can almost be termed the vertebral column of modern war, is in the main based on a special kind of tool, power-repetition-production tools. We are sceptical of any unique ability in the American engineer or craftsman. This country produced the first great engineers and still produces the finest craftsmen. Taken as a whole, the propaganda for American methods suggests the ancient device, well-known to Jewish art dealers, of making a market, not for the best pictures, but for the pictures they have cornered.

Opinions might differ as to the benefits to be derived from the activities of Professor Harold Laski, and it would therefore be unfortunate to omit anything which could be said in his favour. It ought not to be overlooked, we think, that as a human mine-detector he ranks high. If Professor Laski can be quoted in support, there is danger in that direction.

His latest service of this nature is to put forward General Eisenhower, Lord Mountbatten, M. Leon Blum, and Herr Halvard Lange of Norway as negotiators with "Stalin," or whatever is agreed as the focal point of Russia.

Whether his proposal is accepted or not, it affords confirmation of his nominees' affiliations, and his desire that they should be "built up" for further promotion.

The *de facto* State of Israel has appointed Elias Sassoon as head of its Foreign Office.

"In a Senate corridor, recently, we heard a visiting Englishman, with something to sell in the line of foreign policy, remark that he had spent an hour with Justice Frankfurter . . . Later, one of the Senators remarked, 'Why is the Englishman wasting his time on us?'"

" . . . Justice Frankfurter's sister has gone to Palestine to live, and (gossip says) to become a citizen of Israel."—*Not Merely Gossip*, Washington, U.S.A.

"I think," said Scott-King, "it would be very wicked indeed to do anything to fit a boy for the modern world." *Scott-King's Modern Europe*, Evelyn Waugh.

Whether by nature or education, it appears to be generally true that the human mind has lost the capacity to consider the unfamiliar. The introduction of the Spence Bill, which if passed by Congress, will give the President the same powers in U.S.A. as have been sought in the various

"enabling" measures passed by the "British" Administration, and is worded very noticeably on a Russian Act of the Supreme Soviet's, ought, in itself, to arouse suspicion of collusion. But not more than a small fraction of the population of these islands will either believe in a world conspiracy, or admit that it would be of much importance if it existed. We are witnessing the technique of history, but few can see it.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 23, 1949.

Consolidated Fund Bill—Germany and Eastern Europe

Mr. Henry Strauss (Combined English Universities): Some interesting speeches have been made on both sides of the House on this great subject. I think it is important for those of us who sincerely believe that it is a question of our survival, and the survival of European civilisation, neither to exaggerate nor to minimise the points on which we differ from the Government. There is a good deal in the speeches from time to time made by the Minister of State and by the Foreign Secretary with which I agree. I hope that they will not think the sincerity of that statement less if I make it clear that there are some points on which I disagree.

The "cold war" is an expression that comes from the other side of the Atlantic, and, like many expressions that come from the other side of the Atlantic, it has come into general use without being, perhaps, a very happy expression. There are three things which I would say about the cold war. The first is that very definitely it is a war. . . .

The second point I want to bring home is that it is by no means cold. Our planters who are being murdered in Malaya do not find it a very cold war. The Greek peasants whose villages are being burned and whose children are being carried into captivity do not find it very cold. The third proposition that I would make about the cold war is, I think, the only one on which there can be controversy. I only give my own sincere opinion. It is that at the present stage all the evidence is that civilisation is losing the cold war. . . . I believe it to be of vital importance for all who care for our civilisation to try to make the facts clear and to do everything possible to diminish public misunderstanding.

Let me give an example of public misunderstanding. One would think from reading many newspapers and from hearing many utterances by the B.B.C. that the great air lift represented an Anglo-American triumph and a Russian failure. I believe that nothing could be further from the truth. Let me say at once that I agree with what I believe to be the sentiment of every other Member of this House, that we should pay tribute to the magnificent achievement of the airmen who are making that great enterprise possible; but do not let us forget for one moment that the Russians, without a shadow of legality, and without spending one penny, are putting civilisation to a constant and enormous economic loss. Let me quote, to express my agreement with it, the description of this air lift made by the Leader of the Opposition in a speech outside this House, when he said this:

"It is like a contest in endurance between two men, one of whom sits quietly grinning in his armchair, while the other stands on his head hour after hour in order to show him how much he is in earnest."

Another misunderstanding which I believe to be a great misunderstanding is that the risk generally spoken of, when

people talk of the cold war, is the risk that it may one day turn into what the Americans call a "shooting war." That is, indeed, a risk; that is a great risk; but it is not the only risk, and it is not, perhaps, the most probable risk. The other risk is that European civilisation may go down without the enemies of that civilisation even having to fight.

. . . I now come to the first point on which I differ from His Majesty's Government. In the speech of the Foreign Secretary of last September, to which I have alluded, the Foreign Secretary made it perfectly clear that he had known all along that in one place after another the Soviet Government were stirring up civil war as an instrument of policy. That act of stirring up civil war in other countries as an instrument of policy is a direct breach of an express term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Alliance. I suggest that when the Foreign Secretary knew that that treaty was being broken constantly in this way, it would have been better if he had complained of the breach, instead of doing as he did, namely, offering an extension of the life of the treaty which was being broken. I think that it is very difficult to hope that the Kremlin will treat this country seriously when the reward which they get for breaking a treaty is an offer to extend its life.

I think that if our civilisation is to be saved, we must study Communism and know what it is after. Let me give an example of the attitude of "Let's pretend," which I think is very significant. I think that perhaps some hon. Members opposite, when I have given the example, may agree with me. Many will have studied some of the documents which in the last few months have been put out by the T.U.C. on this subject. In one of the earliest of these statements, they said that "the pretended dissolution"—that, is the dissolution of the Comintern—"is now known to have been a mere device." The pretended dissolution took place in May, 1943, and the Cominform was established in October, 1947. The T.U.C. say that the pretended dissolution is now known to have been a mere device. I say that it was always known to be a mere device by every student of Communism.

If the House will allow me, I should like to remind them of the signatories of the resolution of dissolution, and then remind them of what happened to the gentlemen afterwards and their subsequent or present position: Togliatti, the chairman of the Italian Communist Party; Dimitrov, the tyrant of Bulgaria; Gottwald, the President of Czechoslovakia; Zhdanov, recently deceased, the Secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party and a member of the Supreme Soviet; Thorez and Marty, of the French Communist Party; Pieck, Secretary-General of the German Communist Party and unofficial President of the Soviet zone of Germany; Anna Pauker, the tyrant of Roumania; and Rakosi, Secretary-General of the Hungarian Communist Party. I ask hon. and right hon. Gentlemen in all quarters: is it not absolutely obvious that what these gentlemen and this lady were doing in 1943 was proceeding or preparing to proceed to their action stations?

I say that there is no excuse whatever for pretending that we did not know what the Communists are after, because we can discover what they are after by two independent methods, both of which give us the same result. The first method of finding out what they are after is by reading the sacred books of this dogmatic, secular religion and seeing what it is that they say that they are after, and then doing them the honour of believing that they are sincere. The quotations

which I shall give will not be many. They are all from Stalin's "Problems of Leninism," not an English translation made in England or America, but the English translation published in Moscow, and dated 1947. There are three propositions which I would ask the House to bear in mind, each of which I will prove with a single quotation, as I know that there are many other hon. Members who wish to speak.

The first is the well-known fact that in the view of the Communists—a view no doubt sincerely held—every State not yet captured by Communism and, therefore, in their view a capitalist State, is destined to collapse in violence and in prolonged violence. In some of these quotations, Stalin is quoting statements already made by either Marx or Lenin, and the one which I am now about to give is one from Lenin, which Stalin has frequently quoted with approval:

"We are living not merely in a State but in a system of States, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist States for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois States will be inevitable."

The second proposition is that Russia constitutes the base for revolution in all other countries:

"The world significance of the October Revolution lies not only in that it constitutes a great start made by one country in causing a breach in the system of imperialism and that it is the first centre of Socialism in the ocean of imperialist countries, but also in that it constitutes the first stage of the world revolution and a mighty base for its further development."

The third proposition is the fundamental importance of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In case any Member should be in any doubt whatever as to what is meant by this, let me give this final quotation from the sacred writings:

"The scientific concept of dictatorship means nothing more nor less than unrestricted power, absolutely unimpeded by laws or regulations and resting directly upon force . . . Dictatorship means . . . unlimited power, based on force and not on law."

These are a few of the bloodthirsty doctrines that the Bishop of Birmingham apparently believes to have been held by our Lord's disciples. That is the first method of finding out what the Communists are after—by reading what they say they are after and believing them. I say further that it is quite as dangerous to suppose that Stalin does not mean what he has written as it was to make the same mistake about Hitler.

Earl Winterton: And his friends in this country.

Mr. Strauss: But there is a second and independent method of finding out what the Communists are after, and that is by observing what for years they have been doing, and then applying the simple but wise doctrine of the English common law, that men are presumed to intend the natural and probable consequences of their actions. If throughout the world, in every country not yet under Communist domination, we find the Communists working against established authority, working to prevent economic recovery, and working to produce economic chaos, and, where possible, starvation, if that is found to be the effect of their action, we may be quite certain that it is also their purpose.

Now, if these things are true, what is the reason why this menace is not universally recognised? The reason is the continuing prevalence of three or four quite simple errors. The first error is this: that Communist success has anything whatever to do with its winning popular support. It has nothing to do with it. The hon. Member for Edmonton

(Mr. Albu) said that not more than 5 per cent. of the Germans are Communists, and that therefore they are no danger. I do not suppose they are more than 5 per cent. in many of the countries they now rule. Why is it that Comrade Pollit and Comrade Horner are not members of this House? There is one reason and one reason only: Whenever either of them has stood for election the electors were allowed to vote for somebody else. They, of course, would do away with all that nonsense and establish the principle that they have in Russia and Eastern Europe, where no one is allowed to stand unless he is a member of the Communist Party or belongs to a party of fellow-travellers agreed with the Communists in advance.

I wonder if hon. and right hon. Gentlemen have read the interesting correspondence that recently passed between Stalin and Tito? If so, I recommend to them either the last or the penultimate letter from Stalin. I have not got the exact words, but I think I am summarising it fairly—and if I am not I can do doubt be corrected. He said: "The Yugoslav Communists are really intolerably conceited. They seem to think that because they have been successful that means they have some merit. They seem to think that they are more meritorious than the Italian Communists and the French Communists. "On the contrary," says Stalin, "they are not nearly so good; they have merely had more luck. The Red Army was able to operate in Yugoslavia, but had not been able to operate so far in France and Italy." I am bound to say that I thought Mr. Stalin put the point very fairly.

The second of the great errors is this: that people who matter are those who call themselves Communists. Let me assure the House of what is indeed obvious to it already, that those who call themselves Communists are very often those who could not be a danger to any body, with the possible exception of their friends. They, let me assure the House, are not the danger. Those who are dangerous are those who are Communists but call themselves something else. If any hon. Members want support for that, let them study the Blue Book of the Canadian Royal Commission of 1946, where they will find, in passage after passage, the director writing from Moscow saying to his agent in Canada: "So-and-so proposed as an agent is useless for our purpose because he is already known to be 'a Red.'"

The third of the great errors is that political action is more important than economic sabotage. It is not. In this country the Communists are not even seeking to enter this House or local councils in great numbers. What they are seeking, and what they are obtaining, is the capture of key positions. I wonder how many hon. Members have thought what an extraordinary position it is in which the Foreign Secretary says, again and again, to the miners, "If you will increase the output of coal you will greatly strengthen my foreign policy," while the chief miners' leader is a member of the Communist Party whose daily organ says, with perfect truth, that its principal object is to smash the Foreign Secretary's foreign policy?

. . . I must now come, if I may, to what I consider a very important point indeed, and one on which, although abroad the truth is generally recognised, in England and the United States there is still wide-spread error. It is still supposed, quite erroneously, that Communism is a sort of disease of poor, uneducated men. It is nothing of the sort. I do not believe there is any hon. Member in any quarter

of the House who has the least difficulty in forgiving an honest trade union worker attracted by a man whom he believes to be an efficient trade union leader into taking a view of Communism which is not the true view. It is not those men or their appetites which are threatening our civilisation.

The formidable Communists in this country, as elsewhere, are the educated, the well off, the prosperous. Not very long ago, last year, there was a Congress of Intellectuals held in a Communist country. It is difficult to imagine self-respecting men going to a congress with such a label. Perhaps as a university Member and one concerned with education I may give a short definition of an intellectual. An intellectual is a man educated beyond his intelligence; and the intellectuals who flock to these conferences of intellectuals in Communist countries are men who entertain a view of their intelligence which is shared by nobody else, with the possible exception of the B.B.C. If our civilisation goes down it will go down through the treason of the learned—to give the famous name of a book published in 1927 by Julien Benda, "*La trahison des clercs.*" It is that which is threatening the survival of our civilisation.

I want to point out to the House that there is no reason for believing that time is on our side. I am not going into any discussion of weapons or anything of that kind in making that statement. I ask the House to consider two things. The first is what is happening on our side of the Iron Curtain, where the Communists have the much easier job of destruction compared with their opponents' job of construction. More important even than that is what is happening on the other side of the Iron Curtain. There something is happening without any precedent in history, and that is the second consideration. The Communists have discovered how it is possible to murder whole nations by liquidating, in their elegant phrase, all those whom they consider capable of leadership; by indulging in what they call "social engineering," they can wipe out independent nations as they have already wiped out the Baltic States.

I believe that today there is a good deal of agreement outside the ranks of the Communists and fellow-travellers about the nature of this menace. Let us have a little realism. I was sorry to see that the Foreign Secretary, in a speech in his new constituency, said:

"I have no quarrel at all with the Communist system in Russia. If that is what they like it is their business, not mine."

I regret to say that those seemed to me rather heartless words. Of course, if he had said that we could do nothing about it everyone would agree, but he was speaking of a system which dooms millions of men to slavery in which their lives are nasty, brutish and short. The Minister of State quoted what a Russian lady had recently said in this country, when she spoke of the threatened fate of the minority. But the greatest error in the whole statement was the supposition that the Communists were a majority. They are a tiny minority even in Russia. The greatest error of all, as great an error in morals as it is an error in intelligence, is to suppose that the Russians will stand on their present lines. They will certainly either advance or retreat. We have no right whatever to consider as permanent every advance the Communists have hitherto made.

The last point I wish to put to the House—and I thank Members for the patience with which they have listened to what I hope they realise is a serious speech—is the implications of some of the arguments that hon. Members oppose

are sometimes tempted to put forward. I notice that in the fairly recent past, not less than three Ministers, the Leader of the House, the Minister of State speaking at the United Nations, and the Minister of National Insurance, the present Chairman of the Labour Party, have all used the same argument. They have said how badly the Russians are behaving and how ungrateful it is of them considering what the present Foreign Secretary did for them in the 1920's.

I beg the House to examine the implications of that argument. If it is a true claim, it means they are asserting that the present Foreign Secretary was able by industrial action in the 1920's to thwart the will of a Government responsible to an elected House of Commons. If that was right in the 1920's, on what principle do they complain when Comrade Horner and Comrade Pollitt propose to do the same thing today? It is not an argument that can be put by democratic leaders to a democracy. It is the argument that says: "If we win the General Election we will govern through Parliament more or less, but if you elect the wicked Tories then we shall seek by industrial action to see that your votes are rendered useless." I ask Members, if they are opposed to Communism, to beware of this argument that strengthens the Communist case.

I say that two things are absolutely vital if European civilisation is to survive. The first is that the armed strength of the Communists must be matched by the armed strength of the free, and the second is that the faith of Communism must be matched by belief in the free society.

(*Extracts to be continued.*)

HOUSEWIVES' LEAGUE (continued from page 3.)

Americans.....We are, of course, in the hands of the Americans. It is their money which is being distributed, and one of the reasons that I was against Marshall Aid was that it robs us of the necessary control over our own affairs.'

"We conclude with a letter from a Member of Parliament who took part in the food debate, and who appears to have the most realistic approach, *i.e.*, if the food is there why cannot we have it?

"It is reassuring to know that some Members are inquiring into the official statement of the Ministry of Food.

"House of Commons,

"January 25, 1949.

"Dear Mrs.

"Thank you for your letter enclosing an extract from the *Dundee Courier*.

"To the best of my knowledge and belief this report is not correct, but it does refer to the cancellation of contracts made by the Ministry of Food and the Treasury, owing to our shortage of dollars. This, I think, is quite clear from what we have found out from the speeches made in this country by Mr. Gardiner, the Canadian Minister of Agriculture.

"He said on December 17, 1948, that Canada was aiming at being able to provide the United Kingdom with 350 million lbs. of bacon, 125 million lbs. of cheese, 75 million dozen of eggs, and having 400,000 head of cattle which we could dispose of either to the United States or the United Kingdom. Owing to the British Government saying

that they were without the necessary dollars, they entered into agreement to deliver to the United Kingdom 195 million lbs. of bacon, 50 million lbs. of cheese, 80 million dozen eggs, and sent the beef and cattle to the United States.

"This is a very unsatisfactory position and it is the direct result of the British Government's attitude in making their whole economy depend upon the United States loan and their dollar holdings. I am hoping to press this point in the House of Commons next Thursday.

"Yours truly."

"This constant repetition that 'the bacon was not available' or 'the meat was not available' does not mean that Canada has become infertile and is unable to provide the meat. There is not the slightest doubt from the information we have received that Canada could produce the food if we would take it. There is no space to give all the evidence we have, but to summarise the position, during the war Canadian farmers raised their production of food to a higher level than it had ever reached, and at one time were exporting three times more bacon to Great Britain than in pre-war days. They thought this market would continue, when in 1946 Mr. Herbert Morrison paid them a visit and urged them to even greater food exports in a 'battle against famine.' They were told that we wanted from them all the bacon, beef, cheese and eggs which could be got. Less than two years later they were informed that buying of farm (note, not mineral) products had to be cut down. This was the major factor in the relative failure of Canada to fill its 1948 bacon contract. The Canadians had sold their bacon elsewhere. And when farmers are not sure of a market, they turn as quickly as they can to the production of something else for which a market is more assured. The Canadians have cut down their production of food for Britain to well below their war-time output.

"An official statement from the Canadian Ministry of Agriculture's private Secretary makes it clear that when the British contract for beef was cancelled, the Canadians immediately opened a market to sell their live beef in the United States.

"It is also abundantly clear that agricultural produce is actually declining in Canada as a result of the loss of British markets. Small producers of eggs and honey are cutting down output, apple trees are being uprooted in Nova Scotia, apples are rotting for lack of a market in British Columbia, and the salmon canners are looking elsewhere than to Great Britain for customers.

"We can only conclude that it is a determined policy that we shall buy less food from Canada. . . .

"The British Housewives' League's interpretation of the situation is as follows, and we challenge the Government or any political party in this country to deny it.

"America is a very rich continent, flowing with food and manufactured articles which her own citizens are not always able to buy, owing to shortage of cash. That should be a problem for the American Government to settle within their own borders.

"The American Government appears to fear two things, first a slump period, during which the vast quantities of goods being made in the U.S.A. would find no market; and secondly, they fear that Western Europe would be unable to resist as a first line defence in a coming struggle between East

and West. They think both these difficulties may be overcome by making millions of dollars available to Europe. *The People* of March 13 states:—"Wall Street fears that a slump is on the way, and wants to keep the European market open as a dumping ground for luxury goods which the American Housewife may soon not be able to afford."

The Government was taking from North America, including Canada, whose economy depended on the American dollar, about 1,200 million dollars worth of goods a year, and this deficit was covered by the E.C.A. subsidy. A good deal of this could be in feeding stuffs for animals, and food from Canada, but instead, a lot of it was raw materials. We worked very hard in the export drive, making large quantities of textiles, china, glass, motor-cars, rubber tyres, typewriters, boots and shoes, almost everything imaginable. These things were exported, in large quantities, to non-dollar areas, who could not pay for them in sterling. We exported 150 per cent. more than immediately before the war. Thus a large part of what America was exporting to Great Britain was being passed on to other countries in the form of manufactured goods, and we got no goods in return. We were running a Marshall plan as agents.

Three hundred million dollars of British made goods were being sent abroad as new investments, and for this we got no goods or services in return. Many more millions of goods were being sent overseas to pay war debts. As the nation who contributed most to victory we must pay the highest bill.

"If one could forget about money, and think only of goods, it could be said, broadly speaking, that a large part of what America is exporting free to Britain is being passed on by Britain to other countries."

Who was benefitting from this arrangement? Certainly not the homes of this country, or the women who run them.

We were trying once again to make ourselves the workshop of the world, but we were getting nothing but a pittance in return.

"The women's reply is as follows," the report concluded:

"We intend henceforth to forget about money, and think only of food—and secondly—We intend to devote ourselves to the reversal of the policy that is sacrificing the health and happiness of the nation to a currency manipulation, ruining agriculture in this country and in Canada too. We know that Members of Parliament of all parties are to be found who support Sir Stafford Cripps in this policy, and that there are only a few who realise that all real wealth is being drained from the country, and still fewer who have the courage of their convictions.

"We were told by one of our correspondents that even if there were a change of government there would be no change of policy in respect of the export drive. Everything we have discovered leads us to fear that this is true, that no political party has the real interests of this nation at heart.

"Our first task is to tell the nation the truth. And our second to develop power to reverse the policy.

"You will remember that Attlee said in 1934—"We have renounced all allegiance to our own country."

"There used to be a word for it."