

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 12.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

We notice that the Marchioness Townshend has joined the ranks of those who are calling a spade a spade, and the Socialist Savings Campaign a fraud.

There has always been an element of fraud about monetary saving as an organised feature of the economic structure, not because interest bearing savings are unsound in themselves, but because they are conditioned by a price structure which, besides being defective, is a perfect instrument for concealed taxation in the interests of organised swindlers. The current price structure cannot be termed defective, any more than burglary is defective.

But while this is so, there is an important distinction which is unique in its application to this present Finance-Socialist Administration. Unlike the Governments of the nineteenth century, which rightly or wrongly were *political* Governments, and went some distance to disclaim knowledge of, or interference with, financial and economic techniques, this affliction of God or the Devil (including "God with us") claims to be, and quite probably is an Administration of experts with a long training of a specialist description at the London School of Economics. It is not merely penetrating and propagandising a fraud on a scale and of a fraudulency which transcends anything previously experienced *but it claims expressly to know what it is doing.* The policy of "Full Employment"—the Slave State of Big Business—involves so many fraudulent practices that it could only be, as it is, based on a completely a-moral philosophy; but many of these practices are difficult to expose to an apathetic public. Coin-clipping and sweating, however, in their modern form of monetary inflation and depreciation, are not merely of the essence of the policy; we have thought for some time that they uncover the Achilles heel of the Planners.

If the Housewives Associations can make it clear to all their members and friends that they have been consciously swindled out of their savings, the Plotters are in for a rough ride.

Let us not be misunderstood; the fraud of Government Savings policy is not that savings bear interest—it is that they pretend to bear interest, and don't. It is daily becoming clearer that any conceivable civilisation depends for its existence on a metaphysical structure, and stands or falls by the validity of that structure.

For instance, there is either such a thing as honesty or there isn't. If the Cahmon Man gets it into his head that there isn't (he is rapidly acquiring that idea) he will require so much policing that the police will become the chief industry. And then someone is required to police the policeman. How far are we from that situation now, with our snoopers, and our red petrol testers, and our income tax spies?

The official instruction to "play down the Nelson tradition" in the "Royal" Canadian Navy, and to Americanise

it by sending young officers to the U.S. Navy for training, which has just been issued by a Civil Commission in Ottawa, coincides with, and is reinforced by the abolition of Judicial Appeals to the Privy Council. Both are more or less polite intimations that the day of the British is done, and that the glory and power are now centred in Washington and Wall Street. There is nothing new about this "trend" except that it has become overt. Mr. Mackenzie King, no doubt under instructions from those who facilitated his election to the Prime Ministership in the early twenties, has worked steadily and faithfully for the detachment of Canada from the Empire, and evidently M. Lapointe, his Liberal successor pleads from the same brief. We date it from the Isaacs Mission to Washington in 1916.

If this shift of allegiance represented a genuine popular change of sentiment, it would be a matter for regret (since English-speaking Canada has its roots in the United Empire Loyalists) but perhaps not for complaint. French Canada, Quebec, is definitely anti-British, for reasons which are irrational but understandable. M. Lapointe, the present Prime Minister in succession to Mr. Mackenzie King, is of course a French Canadian, and almost certainly, a high Freemason.

The factor in the situation which is so ominous is the ease with which populations are being transferred from one allegiance to another in the service of interests to whom they are merely cannon fodder.

The selection of Mr. Lionel Daiches, whom we understand to be the son of the late Rabbi, as Liberal candidate for the Parliamentary Division of Edinburgh, in opposition to the sitting Member, Sir William Darling (with the almost certain result of electing a "Labour" candidate probably also a Jew, by splitting the anti-Socialist vote) seems to suggest one of the main objectives of the resuscitated Liberal Party.

It would be easy to elaborate the examination of electoral tricks with the mechanism of the secret ballot, but it ought to be clear to anyone who will take the subject seriously that the time for that kind of thing is long past. It is the *forces* of politics with which we must deal, not the mechanisms, and that right soon, of we are *spurlos versankt*: sunk without trace. The enemy is inside our defences; he must be thrown out.

Now the most widely operative force—the force of the majority, because the majority is the home of the aboriginal—is cupidity, covetousness, and it is with cupidity, envy, hatred and malice, that we deal. Altruism, a genuine concern for the common good, as distinct from the very widespread desire to quote the common good as an excuse for predatory brigandage, is only found in a cultured class, a permanent minority, which has only a tenuous connection with an economically favoured group. It is a mathematical certainty, then, that if you enfranchise a majority in such a manner that its cupidity is identified with the Divine Right

of the Jungle, you will in no long space of time get a jungle.

But if you give the injunction, "Judge not, that ye be not judged; for with whatever measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you again," its true significance, as a warning, not a prohibition, and base your political mechanisms on the incarnation of it, you are applying at least elementary intelligence to the solution of political problems, which is much more than can be said at present.

In this connection there is no more practical starting point than the military axiom; "Find out what your enemy wants you to do, and don't do it." There has been for years a spate of propaganda for "positive action" ("don't be negative"). That ought to teach us that the negative contains a dangerous threat to the enemy. Contracting-out, for instance, is a negative policy. A strike is organised negativism. A large measure of power to contract-out is the first essential of genuine freedom and genuine democracy. "Full Employment" is expressly designed to abolish the power to contract-out.

The over-all tactic of the Enemy is to play both ends against the middle.

We notice that New South Club, an institution for Jewish adolescents at the Adolph Tuck Hall, Woburn House, was inaugurated by a demonstration of hypnotism by a 17½ year-old Jew. It would be easy to be humourous over this rather odd occurrence; we are inclined to regard it as a warning that Armageddon will include the use of every malleable force in the universe.

The King is travelling down to Portsmouth to call upon a visiting U.S. Admiral.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: October 26, 1949.

Economic Situation (Government Proposals)

[A further extract from Colonel Crosthwaite-Eyre's speech is as follows:—]

Perhaps the most illustrating point is that, as I understood it, the Government said that by devaluation to two dollars 80 cents a final step had been taken and no further devaluation was possible. In their statements in this House the Government said that they were satisfied that, if anything, they had over-devalued and that sterling would tend to rise. Yet, if one takes the dollar premium stocks in America, sterling is already again at a discount. I am very happy to tell the House that, whereas before the Prime Minister made his statement about cuts, sterling had fallen on these dollar stocks to two dollars 47 cents, since that statement it has risen to two dollars 65 cents. It has made up about one-half of what it had fallen below the official rate. But even if we can take some comfort from that, it is equally a measure of what the Americans think of the effectiveness of these cuts and the trust that they think can be put in sterling, that even after these few weeks sterling should be at a 5 per cent. discount over there already.

I should also like to draw the attention of the House to the value of the pound at home. We have heard a lot of arguments this afternoon about what is its real value, but in fact there is no value to the pound at home. There is hardly any single transaction in which anybody indulges

from day to day in which subsidies, Purchase Tax, levies or some other consideration do not make the value of the pound in relation to that transaction completely spurious. I think that is shown very well by the present overall situation. Never have there been so many inflationary deposits in the banks. Never have Government securities fallen so far. Never has the Government rate of interest, set arbitrarily, differed so widely from the real rate as shown by market quotations. Wherever one looks, one can see that the pound, instead of being the proper and natural basis on which life can be led and transactions conducted, is now looked upon as a purely arbitrary symbol in the arbitrary hands of the Government.

Much has been said about food subsidies and incentives, but surely until the Government release the pound to the extent of doing away with what I call all these phoney commitments of trying to erect a false economy, and until they bring back the pound to mean something in the hands of the wage earner and every other section of the community, we will never get any further in building up confidence and defeating inflation. . . .

House of Commons: October 31, 1949.

PARLIAMENT BILL

Order for Second Reading read.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede): I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

I noticed from the reviews in the Press yesterday and today that it is not anticipated that anything very new will be said in the course of this Debate, but it is essential that we should thoroughly review the circumstances in which the Bill comes before us and consider again the arguments in its favour, as we are required to do by the Act which it seeks to amend.

The present Bill had its Second Reading after a two-day Debate on 11th November, 1947, and the Third Reading on 10th December of that year. It then went to another place. The Second Reading Debate began on 27th January, 1948, and was continued on 2nd, 3rd and 4th February. It was then interrupted for a conference of the party leaders, which took place in February and April of that year. That conference was concerned with both the composition of the other place and the powers that should be assigned to it.

The view of my noble and right hon. Friends who took part in the discussions there was that the appropriate decision to be reached on the question of the time to be taken after a Bill had first been read a Second time in this House was that it should not become law unless one year had elapsed from the first Second Reading or nine months from the first Third Reading. In the course of the resumed Debate on the Bill that was offered to the present unreformed House of Lords as well as to any reformed House of Lords that might be constituted in the future.

The representatives of the party opposite were prepared to agree to one year from the first Third Reading. The Liberals were prepared to accept the Government proposal, and expressed their regret that a difference of three months should have resulted in the abandonment of the proposals. We were bound to reject the Conservative proposal because that would still involve us in the wrecking of the fourth Session of Parliament if controversial legislation were intro-

duced during that time. I shall try to paraphrase fairly what was said by the representatives of the party opposite. I understand that they take the view that the Lords should be able not only to ensure due consideration of their Amendments, which we believe that our proposal would have afforded them, but they think it also right to impose a period for reflection and for the mobilisation of public opinion between the completion of Parliamentary discussion on the first passage of a Bill through this House and its enactment against the will of another place. I hope that in an effort to summarise briefly I have not unfairly paraphrased what was then stated.

The result of these deliberations was that no agreement was reached, and the Debate on the Second Reading of the Bill was resumed in another place on 8th June, 1948, when the Bill was rejected. I think there is this comment to make upon those proceedings as compared with the proceedings in 1911. Whereas in 1911 the members of another place were quite confident that they were competent, unreformed, to participate in the legislative business of the country, that claim has now been completely abandoned, and I understand that no one who speaks with any responsibility believes it is right that another place, as at present constituted, should enjoy the powers which it even now retains, and that the reform of another place must be regarded as something which may prevent controversy but which we may assume all parties now desire to see.

In the second Session, on the second occasion that this Bill was brought forward, it had a Second Reading in this House on 20th September, 1948, and the Third Reading on 21st September, and it was rejected by the Lords on 23rd September, so that at any rate on that occasion its life was not long. Now it comes up for the third time, and it will be sent to the Lords on some date after 11th November—the second anniversary of its first Second Reading in this House. The requirement of the Parliament Act, 1911, will then have been fully met and the Bill will, if again rejected by another place, be presented to His Majesty as provided by the Act of 1911 and will become the law of the land whether another place desires to see it so or not. . . .

The Parliament Act, 1911—the major Act for this purpose—requires a Bill, other than a money Bill, which has to be passed under its provisions first to be passed in three successive Sessions by this House and, secondly, to be passed on the third occasion in this House after an interval of two years between its first Second Reading here, and its Third Reading on the third occasion. The effect of this Bill is to reduce from three to two the number of successive Sessions in which the Bill, enjoying the procedure of the Parliament Act, must be passed by this House and declares that the interval between its first Second Reading and its final passage to qualify shall be one year instead of the two now required.

There is also a provision—and this is a matter that has caused some controversy during the consideration of the Bill—by which this new procedure can be applied to a Bill which, having been rejected by the Lords in this Session, is again passed by this House next Session. That is a proposal which may become operative or may not, because no final decision has yet been reached on a Bill which it was thought by hon. Gentlemen opposite might have to be passed into law under this procedure. What the final result of those discussions will be, no one can yet say, but at any rate the Government will be forearmed to deal with any trouble that may arise. . . .

Major Sir David Maxwell Fyfe (Liverpool, West Derby): . . . I want to make it quite clear that we on this side of the House do not retract one iota from the position which we have taken up. We have three objections to this Bill. In the first place, we say it is unnecessary and undesired; secondly, that it weakens the formation, expression and influence of public opinion between elections, and, thirdly, introduced and continued in two periods of unequalled economic difficulty, its deliberate purpose is to dislocate and disturb production—[*Interruption*—]—let hon. Members wait—by facilitating the nationalisation of iron and steel. Let them take that. . . .

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter (Kingston-upon-Thames): . . . It is the astonishing irrelevance of this Measure to the background of our national affairs that is, perhaps, its gravest condemnation. There has been one change in the method of its presentation.

We have heard nothing whatsoever from the other side about the famous mandate. Apparently the idea, so sedulously put about last year, that there was a mandate for this Measure is now thought to be a tactless argument or an invalid one. It is perhaps wise of Members opposite to abandon this doctrine of a mandate, the doctrine that what is in "Let us Face the Future" must be enacted regardless of circumstances. That is what they put forward with so much emphasis last year. If that argument were to be applied in favour of this Bill, it would have to be applied in favour of other proposals put forward in "Let us Face the Future." For instance, it would have to embrace the words used on page 8.

"Labour's pledge is firm and direct. It will proceed with the housing programme with the maximum practicable speed until every family in these islands has a good standard of accommodation."

It would require great intellectual subtleness to reconcile a literal carrying out of that mandate with the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer last week. Equally, some inquisitive person might inquire when the Bill to create a Ministry of Housing is coming forward.

In fact, there is not only no popular demand but no excuse for this Measure. There are only two occasions on which the Upper House has, in the course of the whole of this Parliament, come into any disagreement with this House on a matter of any importance, namely, the question of capital punishment, on which by happy coincidence both the Government and public opinion were found to be on the same side and on the side of the Upper House, and steel nationalisation. On the latter occasion, the only question which arose was whether or not the public should have an opportunity of pronouncing on such a Measure before it became law. It cannot be regarded as flouting public opinion merely to give an opportunity for that opinion to express itself. Then there is the extraordinary fact, that if there were any sincerity in the suggestion that the Upper House has obstructed the Government, that no step is taken in this Bill to deal with a very serious possible cause of obstruction.

By the Supplies and Services (Extended Purposes) Act, 1947, passed by this Government, the Upper House is given power to annul statutory instruments. In fact, not one statutory instrument has been so annulled, and if there were any fear of obstruction by the Upper House there would be some Clause in this Bill putting some limitation on the powers of the Upper House, to annul such an instrument. No one knows better than the Solicitor-General that a large-

(continued in col. 2, page 4)

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. 23. No. 12.

Saturday, November 19, 1949.

T.V.A. Under Fire

How much of what is being said and written in (for example) France and the United States of America bearing upon political realities, or any other realities for that matter, is being suppressed in this country, which was in the past a vortex in the stream of ideas? France, we are told, having touched bottom, is a country where something which deserves to be dignified as thought is again active, and we have evidence of the publication in America of books and papers which should be more widely distributed over here than they are. The Washington (D.C.) journal *Human Events* does a service in reviewing some of these; but we have no means of knowing with certainty how far they spread among Americans, or what effect, if any, they have leading to the deployment of sanctions.

A case in point is a hundred-page study of *The T.V.A. Idea* by Dean Russell.

After saying that T.V.A. made its way into the American 'way of life' by way of the sort of vote-catching promises upon which, as we know, mass-manipulative practises are based, the reviewer says:—

"Experience has denied every one of the promises. Unless, as T.V.A. apologists do, you substitute bureaucratic metaphysics for sound accountancy, dumping known losses and hidden costs into an amorphous 'public good' account, whence it is absorbed by the taxpayer, you must declare the business a flat failure. . . . T.V.A. . . . is not an instrument for the economic betterment of the country or any part of it (save the bureaucratic part), and is only an 'idea.' What is that 'idea'? Just Socialism. . . ."

"Me Too" Programme of "Conservatives"

The dynamic figure of Left Wing "Ny" Bevan dominates the British scene. Whatever the results of the general election, this fighting Socialist will remain as a top figure in the country. Ernest Bevin, Attlee and Morrison are definitely ill men; Dalton has virtually retired from the picture; Cripps's prestige is sinking. Theoretically, the Tories have a good chance, for even Labourites admit that Attlee's delay in holding the election is a mistake, from the standpoint of Labour's chances as well as for other reasons. But, it is significant to note, the Tories are haunted by memories of the American election of 1948. They recall that Dewey seemed to have a certain chance of winning, yet was defeated because he was "me too." The Tories look at their Party programme, admit that it is also "me too," and fear that they will "miss the boat" like the G.O.P.—Felix Morley in *Not Merely Gossip*, U.S.A.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

scale annulment of statutory instruments could bring the machinery of Government to a standstill within a week. That the Government are prepared to leave this power in the hands of the House of Lords, shows that in their heart of hearts they have complete confidence in their statesmanship. Does that not make absolute nonsense of the protestations of the Home Secretary about obstruction by the Lords?

Again we have heard the old argument about the fourth Session, and how unless this Bill is passed Government legislation cannot be carried into a fourth Session. The Home Secretary did not make it clear that such legislation can be passed in a fourth Session, or in a fifth Session, subject to one condition, that the Government win the coming General Election. *Ex hypothesi*, the only Measures which can be prevented from coming into law by the operation of the 1911 Act are those which the public do not want, because they reject the Government which brings them forward. I hope we shall not hear any more about the importance of legislation in the fourth and fifth Sessions. Let us remember that the ban lies only on a doomed Government, and the more Members opposite emphasise the significance and importance of that ban the more they will convince Members on this side that they know they are such a doomed Government.

It is a regrettable feature that no attempt is made to secure some necessary improvements in the composition of the Upper House. I do not believe that the House of Lords should be wholly hereditary, nor do I believe it to be right wholly to remove the hereditary element. When my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Ayr Burghs (Sir T. Moore) referred to the hereditary principle, a number of sneers came from the other side, but I would remind Members opposite who sneer, that when their constituents come to assess the speed or stamina of the quadruped on which they wish to place a weekly half-crown, they do not exclude the heredity of the animal in question from their calculations; at least, I am so advised by those who are more skilled in this occupation than myself. It is of course a fact that on both sides of this House there are a good many Members who know that their forebears have in this House and elsewhere rendered in their time and generation some service to the State, and who are the better for knowing it.

Mr. Bing: Will the hon. Member say on what grounds he excludes the younger sons of peers?

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: Because, as the hon. Member will appreciate, there must be a limit to a good thing. . . . I should like to see this question of composition tackled. I should like to see the Scottish principle followed. I should like to see a certain number of Peers elected by the other Peers to represent their order. I should like to see an increase in the number of life Peers. The principle of Lords of Appeal in Ordinary is a principle that might be extended. There are a number of valuable people who do not wish to take an ordinary peerage because their lack of means might make them feel that they did not want to saddle their sons with the encumbrance of an hereditary peerage. . . .

Mr. Asterley Jones (Hitchin): . . . bodies which have political power conferred upon them, whether we call them Second Chambers, whether we call them Supreme Courts, or whatever we call them, tend to be actuated—consciously or unconsciously and always honestly—by political arguments and by political considerations. Therefore, whatever Second

(continued on page 7)

"Conservatism" and the Constitution

We have been asked to publish the following copies of correspondence between Mr. W. Wilson, 4, Lawrence Street, N.W.7 and Mr. C. Ian Orr-Ewing, prospective Conservative Candidate for North Hendon:—

To C. Ian Orr-Ewing, Esq., O.B.E.,
Per Mr. G. I. Petty,
2, Sunbury Avenue, N.W.7.
September 28, 1949.

Dear Sir,

It is my sincere belief that conservatism (with a small c) is the only effective antidote to our present tyrannies; but I am not so confident when it comes to Conservatism (with the big C).

As I see it, genuine conservatism has a biological, and therefore, indissoluble, relationship to our native Constitution. It resists, to the last ditch, any attempt to liquidate the Constitution which (as you know) is a trinitarian structure that has grown naturally out of a Christian philosophy of life. It depends upon the nice balancing of sovereignties within the Realm.

Now, judging from their statements, both in and out of Parliament, Party Conservatives seem to be, almost to a man, either ignorant of or antagonistic to this traditional concept of conservatism—indeed, they vie with their supposed opponents as to which side has influenced the greatest quantity of anti-Constitutional legislation. (Remember Churchill's sickening boasts before the 1945 election: judging from his statements then one would have thought he wanted to be regarded as the only genuine Socialist. Perhaps he is!).

I understand that you may shortly be soliciting the Conservative vote in my constituency. On this score, you may be certain of getting my vote *provided your reaction to this letter reflects the quality of conservatism I have hinted at*. Moreover, I am in touch with sufficient people of like mind to myself to be reasonably certain that such a reaction from you can be utilised to bring in other electors on your side.

By pure coincidence, the enclosed document arrived on my doorstep by the same post as that which brought a bunch of your own campaigning literature. How do you react to that?

Yours truly, W. WILSON.

(Enclosed: a statement to the effect that the act of devaluing the pound is High Treason).

To W. Wilson, Esq.
October 2, 1949.

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter which reached me this evening.

I am interested in what you say because one of Disraeli's principles was "the upholding of the British Constitution,"

REALISTIC CONSTITUTIONALISM

(Notes for an Address to the Constitutional Research Association at Brown's Hotel, Mayfair, May 8, 1947)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

K.R.P. Publications

SIXPENCE (Postage 1d.)

and I have always thought that Mr. Winston Churchill has been completely loyal to this principle.

Perhaps you would be good enough to supply instances where Conservatives have spoken or acted against the Constitution, and I will then be in a position to reply to your letter in full.

Yours truly, C. IAN ORR-EWING.

To C. Ian Orr-Ewing, Esq., O.B.E.,
Waverley, The Close,
Totteridge, Herts., N.20.
October 8, 1949.

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of October 2, in which you suggest that I supply instances where Conservatives have spoken or acted against the Constitution. The very fact of your asking me to do this seems to show that you have not grasped my reference to Mr. Churchill's pre-election broadcast of 1945. Why seek further for an instance? Unfortunately, I have not a copy of the speech before me, but I carry a vivid recollection of the substance of that speech, and, as a direct supporter of his, no doubt you will have easy access to it.

The part that stood out was his reference (apparently with pride!) to his activities before, and shortly after the first world war. He was working with Lloyd-George *as a Liberal* on the Unemployment Acts; he was introduced—apparently without dissent—to 'that bright young man Beveridge.' After the war he was, of course, a prime mover in putting through the Labour Acts which, taken in conjunction with Lloyd-George's compulsory insurance legislation, instituted the framework of the greatest single communist-totalitarian imposture that has yet been suffered by the British people.

Are you aware, Sir, that legislation almost identical in substance was operating progressively in Germany from those fateful 1870's when Bismarck and Mordecai (Marx) were working 'in parallel' plans to be developed respectively in Germany and Russia, and destined in time to be known respectively as Naziism and Communism? Churchill must surely have known this; and if he did not, his British instinct ought to have been sufficient to deter him from taking part in the machinations.

Then came Stanley Baldwin, another so-called Conservative, who took his instructions from Wall Street from the word go, and who lent himself to the Plan so wholeheartedly that this country sank from being a first to a fifth rate power within a few years. (You will no doubt remember the connection between the Wall Street bankers and the Russian revolution).

The removal of the King's head from our bank notes in 1929 was overt evidence that the centre of allegiance had moved from the Royal Person to Wall Street. I do not remember Mr. Churchill or any other Conservative making any notable protest.

But all this is not likely to mean much to you unless you have a clear understanding of what you mean by 'The Constitution.' The fact that stands out as of paramount importance to-day is that there are two incompatible constitutions at war with one another. You will please forgive me for 'running long' by trying to define them. I will quote from authorities in the opposing camps.

First, Mr. Hewlett Edwards of the Social Credit Secret-

ariat, writing on the British Constitution: "If it had to be described in one word that word would be *balance*: Authority (The King) unable to usurp power; Power (the Commons) unable to usurp authority; and Administration (the Lords in their maintenance of the Common Law) providing a framework for the use of both, which neither is able to infringe. It is the interlocking of these three functions from which tyranny cannot spring—as it must where any one of these usurps the function of the others." Mr. Edwards's following remarks are also germane to this discussion: "Conservatives will be wise to recognise the danger of that absolute power which Cabinet supremacy has built up and is building up with such determination; to make outspoken assurance that to reverse this process is the primary aim of conservatives; and to give consideration to the manner in which constitutional balance may be grafted on to the present political system."

Now for the anti-British Constitution. I quote from the Most Hon. The Marquess of Linlithgow, K.G., K.T., speaking at the most recent annual meeting of the Midland Bank, of which he is Chairman:

"What, then is the new pattern of international relations towards which we, in common with many other countries, are striving? I suggest it is a unity far different from that which prevailed under the *laissez-faire* conditions of 1914. It is rather a unity based upon a universally accepted discipline in monetary affairs, a system worked out by democratic collaboration among representatives of governments and policed by an international administration. That is the significance of the establishment and operation of the International Monetary Fund."

You will observe that these two constitutions are diametrically opposed. Loyalty to A means treason to B, and *vice versa*. A is trinitarian: B is totalitarian. A directs allegiance to H.M. The King: B to an abstract alien Fund. A is kept in bounds by the natural laws of equity—the Common Law: B depends upon an international, unknown, inaccessible junta "with teeth."

Has Mr. Churchill ever shown any marked disinclination to working with and for the International Monetary Fund? Has the Conservative Party said a word against it in its recent pronouncements?

From all this you will see that I take this matter in deadly seriousness. I am anxious to know, without equivocation, whether your allegiance is to A or to B.

Yours truly, W. WILSON.

To C. Ian Orr-Ewing, Esq., O.B.E.,
Waverley, The Close,
Totteridge, Herts, N.20.
October 22, 1949.

Dear Sir,

It is a fortnight since I last wrote to you—fair time, I feel, for a reply to have been made. I want you to know that I do not intend to allow this correspondence to go by default.

Throughout my mature lifetime I have observed the arrogant disregard paid by Members of Parliament, including Cabinet Ministers, to the Oath of Allegiance taken at the time of their entering office. Although it is unfortunately true that most of these individuals err from ignorance as much as from any traitorous intent, the fact remains that, both technically and actually, they have consistently lent their hands to the undermining of the British Crown, Con-

stitution and Empire—and that is high treason.

This applies to Parliaments operating under all Party labels.

The alternative forms of Constitution defined in my last letter are, I believe, as accurate as short definitions could well be. The authorities quoted are both eminent spokesmen in their chosen fields. As an elector, I surely have the right to seek from you some sort of assurance that, if returned, you will not behave like those before you. If you are a true conservative, you are as desirous as I am that evil men and their policies be brought to the bar of public judgment. It is one of the sad facts of our day, however, that no Party man can be regarded as above suspicion unless and until he shows himself ready to proclaim his allegiance openly and in unequivocal terms. How many such men can you find?

Nothing would make me happier than such a statement from you, and I do not yet despair. Nevertheless, since I have voluntarily assumed the role of 'vigilante' in regard to your candidature, I propose, at this stage, to send copies of this correspondence to date to certain significant witnesses, for them to hold against your reply.

Yours truly, W. WILSON.

Continuation of correspondence between W. Wilson, of 4, Lawrence Street, Mill Hill, N.W.7., and C. Ian Orr-Ewing, O.B.E., prospective Conservative Candidate for North Hendon:

Waverley,
The Close,
Totteridge, Herts., N.20.
October 26, 1949.

W. Wilson, Esq.

Dear Sir,

I apologise for not having answered your letter more promptly, but I received it on Monday, October 10, which was the day preceding our Annual Conservative Conference. As a student of politics I feel sure you will appreciate that I was very occupied in preparing speeches to cover the motions which North Hendon had submitted and which, for the third year in succession had been selected as worthy of debate.

Last week I went to Sweden and Denmark for a few days in a further effort to boost our exports and I received your letter of October 22 on my return late last night.

I have pleasure in enclosing a statement which bears out my previous affirmation of my loyalty to the Constitution.

Yours truly, C. IAN ORR-EWING.

(ENCLOSURE):—

I pledge unswerving loyalty to the Monarchy, to the principle of Parliamentary Democracy and to the Rule of Law. I should support the calling of an all-Party

THE OLD TESTAMENT

(Translated by Ronald A. Knox)

Two Vols.

42/- net.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

Conference to reform the powers and composition of the House of Lords and all measures calculated to ensure to the House of Commons full powers of debate and control over the Executive. I am in favour of the maintenance of the existing relations of Church and State and the equality of all regardless of race or religion, before the Law.

C. IAN ORR-EWING.

4, Lawrence Street,
Mill Hill, N.W.7.

October 29, 1949.

C. Ian Orr-Ewing, Esq.

Dear Sir,

I appreciate the prompt attention you have given to my letter of October 22. As I proposed in that letter, copies of the correspondence to date were sent to certain witnesses. The witnesses chosen were the editors respectively of

The Hendon Times & Guardian
Housewives To-day
London Views and Tidings
The Social Crediter

As these editors might be inclined to publish comments, either specific or general, on the content of my letters and/or your statement, I am reluctant to distribute the latter without first offering you an opportunity of revising it.

My reason for suggesting a revision is that analysis reveals in your pledge the very shortcomings which I went to such lengths to define in my letter of October 8. To a technician in these matters it is obvious—if the words you use are to be interpreted as having any meaning in reality—either that you are not master of your subject, or that you admit allegiance to the international-leftist monocacy.

Of these two alternatives, I much prefer to believe that the former is the true case. Consequently I propose holding up the circulation of your latest communication for another week so that you may, if you so wish, replace the statement.

For your guidance, may I point out that Great Britain has never had a Monarchy (one-man government); that the Rule of Law may or may not be construed as a reversal to Common Law; that the British legal system, if it is to survive, depends upon the sovereignty of a second House; that the existing relations between Church and State are, to put it mildly, anomalous, and that equality and equity cannot exist together in fact.

If I have not heard from you by Monday, November 7, I shall assume that you are prepared to stand by your first statement, which I will then circulate, together with copies of this letter.

Yours truly, W. WILSON.

Waverley,
The Close,
Totteridge, Herts., N.20.

October 31, 1949.

W. Wilson, Esq.

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of October 29. You have my permission to publish the statement enclosed with my letter of the 26th.

Yours truly, C. IAN ORR-EWING.

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 4)

Chamber we may evolve for this country it will undoubtedly be actuated by political reasons. That being so, if we have a Second Chamber composed politically the same as this Chamber then in the words of the old adage it will be superfluous. If it is different from this Chamber then, quite clearly, it will be vicious. Therefore, the obvious solution is that if the Second Chamber in our future Constitution is to have influence its political power should be reduced as low as possible. . . .

Mr. Hollis (Devizes): . . . I turn to the general historical question about what have been the relationships between the will of the people and the House of Lords when the House of Lords has seen fit to interfere and to take a stand against the House of Commons. In an interesting speech the Home Secretary speculated upon the reasons why anybody might allege that there was some way in which the House of Lords could interpret the will of the people better than could the House of Commons. Whatever may be the reasons, the facts of history remain. I do not suggest that the House of Lords has been generally wiser than the House of Commons—I would not maintain that for a moment—but the facts are that on the particular occasions where there has been conflict between the House for Lords and the House of Commons, almost without exception, there is very great reason to believe, the will of the people has been on the side of the House of Lords rather than that of the House of Commons.

The first instance was one which my hon. Friend the Member for Queen's University of Belfast (Professor Savory) took in great detail. I shall not repeat what he said, but at the time of the Second Home Rule Bill—and I am a home ruler and greatly regret that the Bill was rejected—the House of Lords reversed the verdict of the House of Commons and the electorate upheld the verdict of the House of Lords.

As the Home Secretary himself showed, there was the question of the legislation before the 1914 war, when there was a Liberal Government; and whether it was good legislation or bad legislation is neither here nor there and I shall not argue it. The Conservative Party was, in fact, as strong and after a time stronger than the Liberal Party in those years immediately before the war, and those Bills were carried by the votes of the Irish Nationalists who frankly admitted that they were opposed to the legislation itself but that, as part of the bargain on Irish Home rule, they were willing to support it.

Now to come to the instances in the history of this Parliament. The only instance where the House of Lords has seen fit to reverse the verdict of the House of Commons is the instance of the death penalty. As some hon. Members may remember, I was one of those who were supporting the abolition of the death penalty. We are not concerned with whether that measure should have been abolished or should not have been abolished, but undoubtedly the fact was that on that occasion, as I have better reason to know than anybody else, public opinion did support the upholding of the death penalty and was opposed to the abolition of it. It may be right or wrong; that is not to be argued at the moment; and, as I say, I am not arguing for a moment that the House of Lords is generally, inevitably, a wiser body than the House of Commons; that argument is obviously a quite different one. The House of Lords resists the House of Commons only in exceptional circumstances, and over a very large number of years has never done so except where it

has been quite certain that public opinion has been on its side. Therefore, on those particular instances the House of Lords quite certainly, has been the interpreter of public opinion more than the House of Commons.

. . . I perfectly admit that if I were on the Socialist benches I should urge the argument, as one or two hon. Members have perfectly fairly urged the argument, that there might be occasions when a Conservative Government mis-interpreted public opinion and the House of Lords would not, as at present composed, challenge a predominantly Conservative House of Commons. If I were in the position of a Liberal or a Socialist I would urge that argument, which is a perfectly fair argument about the composition, as some hon. Members have done.

But this Bill does nothing whatever to remedy that. It is not a Bill for the reform of the House of Lords—a Bill to abolish party inequality in the House of Lords. That would be something we are supporting. Not only the present distinguished Lord Salisbury and his father, but his grandfather, the great Prime Minister, himself described it as an evil that the House of Lords was of this unbalanced nature. But this Bill does nothing whatsoever to remedy that.

Now about the House of Commons and the will of the people. The hon. Member for Hitchin argued that the House of Lords must inevitably be a political body; and, of course, to a large extent he is right in that. It is inevitable also that a large number of Members of the House of Lords, if not all of them, will obviously have party preferences, because those are things human beings do have; but there is a great distinction, which, on the whole, has been observed, and surely should be observed, between the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and that is that although Members of the House of Lords have party preferences there is no reason why there should be strict party discipline in the House of Lords as in the House of Commons. Surely the right division of functions is that this House of Commons ought to be a House *table d'hôte* and the House of Lords should be a House *à la carte*—a House in which people much more freely choose their political opinions; and that, in point of fact, is what has already happened.

Surely the point is this about the representation of the will of the people. As my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for the West Derby Division of Liverpool (Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe) said, a very new and evil thing has grown up by which it is assumed that whatever is voted by the majority—the temporary majority—in this House is *ipso facto* in a high and mystical sense the will of the people—even if it happens to be something quite different from what the people want. Surely, the truth of the matter is that all our representative devices are necessarily imperfect. It may well be—I am not arguing this—that the two-party system is better than a no-party system or a multi-party system, and that our system of elections is better than the alternative vote or proportional representation; but these are all devices, and they are not perfect machinery, and cannot be. But they are more or less good devices and they have worked, and 99 times out of 100 this House does represent the people of England. But sometimes it does not.

Sometimes, with all the best will in the world, we make a mistake. Whatever party may be in power, and whatever may be the constitution of the House of Commons, that is apt to happen; and that is the reason why it is so important to have a Second Chamber with reasonable powers. This is not an attack upon this House of Commons at all, but it is an

essential condition of the true freedom of the House of Commons. We are continually telling our constituents and the people of this country, very rightly, that we are not as delegates. We quote Burke to them, and rightly, that we owe them our judgment. It is our duty to come here and vote, not on the instructions of somebody outside, not even of our constituents, or anybody else, but as our conscience and judgment bid us vote. We are continually telling our people that, and we are right to do so.

This country would be in a very poor way indeed if we could not get hon. Members here to vote in that way, and we must vote according to conscience and judgment. Nevertheless, we are fallible beings and sometimes make a mistake, and, therefore, it is vitally important that there should be a revising Chamber with reasonable powers which can save us from ourselves. If there were not a revising Chamber, one of two things would be bound to happen: either we should make mistakes and there would be no remedy for these mistakes, and the country would collapse in chaos, or we should have to abandon freedom of judgment. . . .

The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison): . . . The party opposite is the party of selfishness, of efforts to retain economic and political privileges for their class. They seek to get permanent political ascendancy, whether in majority or minority both for their party and their class. Even if those methods are exhausted they have always the power tonight to try to shout their political opponents down. I think that a case has been made out for this Bill. I ask the House to pass it in the light of the best developing democratic constitutional traditions of our country. I ask the House to give it a majority that will pass it with strength and with the authority of the House of Commons behind it, so that by the end of the year this Bill will be on the Statute Book, whether their Lordships like it or whether they do not.

Question put, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

The House divided: Ayes, 333; Noes, 196.

By Any Other Name

"Now is the time, as Professor Izzard would be the last to tell you, to plant a selection of the glorious new Socialist roses for limited blooming in the spring. . . . Sir Stafford, a poor doer on a stiff stem, with tiny white blossoms, thorny, and inclined to mildew. The tip of the growth has a mealy look. Subsists best on barren soil and is very difficult to transplant. Scentless."—Lane Norcott.

KNOW YOUR ENEMY:

(III)

THE UNITED-STATES-OF-EUROPE CONSPIRATORS

The third of this series of documentary broadsheets presents the chronology of the Judæo-Masonic plot to "unite" Europe, from 1650 until the formation of the Council of Europe, 1948 (Autumn).

Price: 1/- (post inclusive)

Obtainable from:

W. L. RICHARDSON, LAWERS, by ABERFELDY, SCOTLAND.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.