

# THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 14.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

Nearly three times as many individuals are employed in "industry" in once-great Britain in 1949 as were so employed forty years ago. The horse-power per "worker" is nearly four times greater. Excluding a few industries which were the focus of alien agitation, the general satisfaction and the opportunities for advancement were greater, the standard of living in comparison with other countries was incomparably higher, restrictions on personal expenditure were solely conditioned by the possession of the much smaller amount of money required to pay for it, and the prestige of British citizenship excelled that of any other before or since.

We notice with interest that Sunday, to the "B".B.C. has become the *first* day of the week. The Sabbath is now Saturday, of course.

We are informed that the designation "forename" is now replacing "Christian Name" on Government Forms.

"Cripps wants Politics based on Christianity." (Headline in *New York Herald Tribune*). Messrs. Attlee, Shinwell, Strachey, Strauss, Silkin and Israel Moses Sieff-Bevan permit themselves a polite smile.

"Thus M. de Jouvenel concludes that the sources of political liberty are aristocratic rather than democratic. Aristocracies are incapable of conducting war efficiently or of organising whole nations upon a militaristic basis. By their existence they afford a limitation upon the central power, and encourage the growth of local autonomies and institutions, a multiplicity of rights, customs, usages and privileges that power itself is obliged to acknowledge. Thus is made possible the supremacy of law to power—not of law conceived as the arbitrary will of the State, but of law as an eternal and unalterable justice, in short a natural law of universal rights and responsibilities as expounded by the Stoics and Schoolmen."—*On Power: The Nature and History of Its Growth*, by Bertrand de Jouvenel; translation by J. F. Huntington; preface by D. W. Brogan. New York. The Viking Press. \$5.00. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

Mr. Emanuel (God-with-us) Shinwell is wintering in the Mediterranean at the expense of the Hebrew-loving British public. God be with the Mediterranean.

In the Dean of Canterbury's Socialist Paradise, where the Cahmon Man is King, eggs are rationed according to the importance (to the representative of the Cahmon Man, Mr. Stalin) of the rationee. If a person of no importance

needs an egg, that is just too bad.

For instance, an important Ambassador is allowed eighteen eggs, condition not guaranteed, per month, for which he pays 1/8d. each. But by applying to various Ministries he may obtain permission to buy from other Ministries a small number of hens, which may be kept in the spare bedroom, if he is sufficiently V.I.P. to have a bedroom.

By judicious use of this technique, and arranging to dine at each other's flat when the laying is good, foreigners in Moscow have an omelette not infrequently.

There are of course plenty of eggs in Russia. but all the Kommissars like eggs, and it is wiser to see that they get them in profusion.

The practice of judging the political wind by the gyrations of occasional straws is obviously open to qualification by such circumstances as the ability to know a straw when you see it, and not less, a certain discrimination as to the extent of the region affected by the wind.

But, for reasons not simple, but possibly predominantly financial, the fortunes of certain individuals either Jewish, or more often perhaps bound up with Jewish patronage and policies, are more reliable indications of the fate of the world than the news items which are brought to our attention with that emphasis which experience should teach us is the patter of the conjuror engaged in putting the rabbit into the hat.

The "resignation" of Mr. David Lilienthal and the appearance in London of General Smuts at a dinner in honour of Dr. Chaim Weizmann are authentic straws in a more than regional wind. The former is an assurance that the Jewish bid for world dominion is not a walk-over; the second has the appearance of a declaration of war on Mr. Malan's South African Government by all the Jewish Gold interests.

A fight to a finish is certain.

### Artist and Subsidised Councils

"The individual is taxed so much that he has no money to spend on art that he likes, while the State spends millions on Arts and British Councils in order to tell him what art, whether he likes it or not, he should like."—Mr. E. I. Halliday, at Liverpool on November 23.

### Einstein and Atomic

"Einstein's claim that atomic energy outmoded nationalism got this reply today from Rear-Admiral James Fife, submarine chief of the U.S. Fleet: 'If he does not like our nationalism, then he should go back where he came from and try Mr. Hitler again.'—*Daily Express*, November 19.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: November 14, 1949.*

### Sugar Ration

*Mr. Lipson* asked the Minister of Food if he will now increase the sugar ration.

*Mr. Strachey*: Much as I would like to do this, I regret that it is not possible at present. We buy the entire exports of the Commonwealth and the only extra sugar we could buy would cost dollars, which we cannot afford.

*Mr. Lipson*: Will the Minister bear in mind the possibility of a bonus ration even when the circumstances do not justify an increase in the ration, because many housewives are finding it very difficult to manage on the present ration?

### Parliament Bill

Considered in Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the Third time."—[*Mr. Ede.*]

*Major Sir David Maxwell Fyfe* (Liverpool, West Derby): . . . Fortunately, as it is the Third Reading, the contents of the Bill are themselves sufficient to indicate and illustrate the line of cleavage between hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite and ourselves. The difference between our two parties is crystallised in the period of one year from the first Second Reading to the second Third Reading, which the Government wish to insert. We say—and we retract nothing of the force with which we say it—that that period does not allow sufficient time for public opinion to form and express itself, and we reiterate that it is in the dynamic expression of an educated public opinion that we on this side of the House are interested as the kernel of our political life. Our Second Chamber, if it exists, must use that public opinion as its criterion and guide.

The Government say—and it is this argument on the contents of the Bill which I wish to examine—that this Bill allows time for the Lords to perform their function of revising, in that it ensures that their objections if not agreed to will, at any rate be considered. Secondly, they say that it is not for a Second Chamber to interpret public opinion. Thirdly, they say that Conservatives are trying to maintain a privileged and irresponsible body. [HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear."] I am much obliged. I am glad that I have got correctly the arguments which I shall proceed to demolish. Fourthly, the Government say that they are trying to wreck the fourth and fifth Sessions of Parliament when a Labour Government is in power. [HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear."] I am so glad that hon. Gentlemen opposite do me the justice of saying that I have quoted correctly the few arguments which have been advanced in favour of the Bill.

I want to make it quite clear that the reply to the argument that the Government's proposal permits sufficient time for a Second Chamber to perform their function is one that has been made repeatedly and never answered. It is that a revising Chamber must be in a position not only to deal with points of correction and clarification of unimportant detail but to deal with points of secondary policy. That is, when the principal of the Bill is accepted—as the House of Lords have accepted, for reasons which my noble Friend Lord Salisbury has stated, certain of the nationalisation Bills—they

have yet disagreed as to the method in which that principle is to be put into effect. When they have disagreed and when they have suggested alterations the Amendments have been accepted and Members of the Government have been the first to say that the action of the House of Lords has improved the Bill.

The point that we make is that unless a Second Chamber has a substantial power of delay, its suggestions on points of secondary policy, which have admittedly proved so valuable to the Government, will not be considered by an overweening Government for an instant. That point has been made every time when this Bill has come up and we have looked in vain for any answer from the Government benches to our reply to their criticism. We have now dealt with this Bill six times, apart from Committee stages and the like, and that point has never been answered.

The next point that is sought to be raised is that it is not for a Second Chamber to interpret public opinion. I put it to hon. Members opposite that they should face up to the position which even their own Bill contemplates, and that is that the Second Chamber is to have some power of delay. As soon as a Second Chamber is given some power of delay, one postulates that that Second Chamber will use its discretion and initiative to act when it thinks proper. The Government cannot get back to the old dilemma of the refined sophists at the time of the French Revolution that "If our second Chamber disagrees with the first Chamber it is mischievous, and if it does not disagree it is superfluous." That dilemma is an absurdity.

Therefore, one must postulate that if one gives any power at all—if a Second Chamber is placed in the constitution—that Second Chamber will choose for itself the time when it will act. We ask what is the correct criterion for a Second Chamber to choose, and we say—and again we stand by what we have said—that the correct criterion and guide is its view of public opinion considered and found to the best of its ability. That is the inevitable answer to the suggestion that a Second Chamber cannot or must not interpret public opinion.

The alternative argument, slightly contradictory but requiring attention nevertheless, is that, in any case, there is enough time for it to perform the function of delay. That, of course, means that sufficient time in the view of those who advance this argument is the holiday months of August and September and perhaps October as well. I think that even hon. Gentlemen opposite, if they consider the ordinary occasion apart from times of international crisis and the like to which we are so used, would agree that that is putting an undue strain on the powers of holiday making of the people of this island.

I come next to the suggestion that has been put forward that we on these benches desire the maintenance of a irresponsible body. I ask hon. Members to look at what we are doing by this Bill. It is:

"A Bill to Amend the Parliament Act, 1911"

and the first words are:

"The Parliament Act, 1911, shall have effect, and shall be deemed to have had effect from the beginning of the session in which the Bill for this Act originated"—and then certain Amendments are made. I substitute for the words:

" . . . from the beginning of the session in which the Bill for this Act originated . . . "

the date "October, 1947," so that we have the time in mind.

Certain Amendments are made, but the first enacting words of this Bill are to reinforce the Parliament Act, 1911. One cannot re-enact and reinforce the Parliament Act, 1911, without re-enacting and reinforcing and making one's action dependent on the Preamble which conditions that Act. I venture to remind the House how that Preamble runs:

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

There may well have been some arguments—I do not see them, but I acknowledge my limitations—for not proceeding with that Preamble which was being re-enacted and reinforced in November, 1947, but today we are in November, 1949. . . .

The point I make is that the only reasonable inference which we can make on the conduct of the Government is that, having reinforced the Preamble two years ago and taken no advantage of the provisional agreement on composition, it is the party opposite—and let us get down to the truth—which does not want an alteration in composition. They want a grievance, and they want to be able to talk about the hereditary chamber. . . .

. . . On the general point, as to giving a reasonable time for opinion to form, I was criticised by the Lord President for not paying sufficient attention to antiquated quotations with regard to the struggles of 38 years ago. As I am always willing to try to fit in with the views of the Lord President when he endeavours to make my speeches for me in advance, I looked up a quotation of Mr. Asquith. We had from the right hon. and learned Attorney-General an hour or two ago a glowing testimony to Mr. Asquith. Therefore, he is a particularly suitable person to quote. Mr. Asquith said:

"A delay of three Sessions or of two years when the suspensory veto of the House of Lords is interposed precludes the possibility—and I will say this with assurance—of covertly or arbitrarily smuggling into law Measures which are condemned by popular opinion."

We were prepared, as the Home Secretary said, to compromise on that period in order to try to reach agreement. But what is absolutely certain is that the principle still stands, that we still stand by that principle, and that the arguments that have been made against it by right hon. Gentlemen opposite have fallen as flat as arguments can possibly fall.

I want to deal with the other aspects of the Bill, namely, the retroactive provisions in constitutional matters. I am glad the hon. Member for East Islington is here, because he has told us that there are precedents for these retroactive provisions. The only answer I can make is in the forbidding words of a great judge before whom I used to appear; when one put forward a doubtful argument he used to look at one severely and say, "I hear you say so." . . .

. . . We are dealing with retroactive provisions in constitutional matters—not with the ordinary regrettable but necessary retroactive provision that one gets after a Chancellor of the Exchequer has warned incipient tax dodgers that if they pursue a certain line of country he will introduce retroactive legislation. That is done after warning, to meet a specific evil which has been discussed. But for a precedent of retroactive legislation in constitutional matters I defy any constitutional lawyer to search our Statute Book with success. The Home Secretary was much more forthright in the matter. He said he did not care whether there were precedents or not, and that is really the attitude with

which we have to meet the point.

Our objection here is really deep-rooted. We have in this country a constitution under which Parliament is omniscient. That is, under our constitution, unlike many democratic constitutions, there is the same machinery for changes in the constitution as for any other public Bill. We have made this work in this country for one reason only; there has always been up to now the deep-seated agreement which our common experience, the suffering of war, the tradition of victory and our way of life have produced—an agreement which is much deeper and which unites us far more than political differences have divided us. Whether we are right or wrong, that is the kernel of the creed which my hon. Friends and I hold. Because that is our creed and because we believe in that unity, we are completely unable even to understand phrases which come from hon. Gentlemen opposite like "We are going to see that the right people squeal now," or "Anyone who does not pay the political levy does not matter a tinker's cuss," or even the phrase of the Attorney-General, "We are the masters now." That does not mean anything to us. [*Laughter.*] Really it does not.

*Mr. W. R. Williams* (Heston and Isleworth): What is all the fuss about then?

*Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe*: The hon. Gentleman does not see that the unity of which I have spoken, that British quality, is much more important than the class strife which remarks like that are designed to rouse. . . . It has been that feeling [of deep-seated agreement] which everyone except those who think like the hon. Gentleman have hitherto accepted in this country. It has been that feeling which has made our constitution work. If hon. Members opposite substitute for that an ability only to take a sectional view and to alter the rules of the game for his advantage while the game is being played, if they are prepared to withdraw from the ordinary man the stability and the certainty that his constitutional basis will stay—if hon. Members opposite withdraw the idea of common agreement and adopt the idea of sectional hate, then they may be able to get a temporary advantage. I do not deny that.

*Mr. W. Ross*: Go and read the "Address to the unco guid."

*Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe*: The hon. Member for Kilmarnock (Mr. Ross) may be able to make a few speeches from the appropriate tub, which will sound louder and may even have a much more increased popularity as his vocal powers decrease. Fundamentally hon. Members have made a constitution which has been the envy of every other country cease to work because this fundamental agreement has been withdrawn. [*Interruption.*] . . .

*The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster* (Mr. Dalton): I should like to begin by thanking the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Leader of the Liberal Party for promising us tonight the support of his cohorts in the Division Lobby. We are not always sure of them but we are very happy to have them when they come. Tonight, with the aid of the Liberal Party, this Bill will be read the Third time, for the third time in two years; it will then go to the other House and either the other House will pass it or it will by-pass the other House, as they prefer, and be presented for the Royal Assent even against their will.

(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. 23. No. 14. Saturday, December 3, 1949.

### About "Votes"

A number of letters reach us from readers who are anxious to know what we think they ought to do with their "votes" at the next "election". An election is a choice, and if the choice is a free choice, the election is a free election. That is the only kind of "election" which has any real interest for us, and, if we saw any likelihood of there being anything resembling it in the offing, we might go to some trouble to elaborate advice even if the people who paid heed to it were few. Nothing of the sort seems at present to be in view. All that seems to be in view is a chance once more to go and fetch another bottle of the same medicine as before, a more concentrated solution perhaps, but, in any case, a bottle which will be brought as well as forced down the throat even if it is not fetched. To say so does not carry us very far; but it does at least call in question, and may to some extent help to destroy the illusion underlying the notion that the blessed word 'majority' has anything much in it besides eight letters of the alphabet.

These remarks do not preclude us from trying to disseminate sound advice if and when the occasion should present itself; but, in the meantime, there seems to be one aspect of the discussion which deserves further mention. It cannot be very clear to our correspondents, and we think that, if it were, their lives would be happier in consequence.

"Every policy is the policy of a philosophy." Schemes, plans, of all kinds are related to policies as means to ends: the policy is the end, the plan is the means of attaining it. In each and every rationally constructed mechanism, a policy is inherent: the policy inherent in watches is time-keeping, in petrol engines conversion of energy from a potential to a kinetic form, in thermometers temperature indicating, and so on. Political mechanisms are no exception. We leave our readers to define for themselves what is the policy inherent in the manipulation of majorities, to point out that whatever it is it stems from a philosophy. Both plan and policy stem from the same philosophy, and it is this fact which explains why it is that the resistance which is met with when we present a plan, a scheme, in its true light is matched by a similar resistance when we combat a policy: the *fons et origo* of both, and of each separate example of both, lies in the concept of reality behind. It may be, and we think it is, a false concept; but it is all but universal, if we are to judge by the conscious reactions and conscious and unconscious actions of people, at the present moment. The only real answer to a world which largely is possessed of the Devil, is to resist possession by the Devil, and so long as the individual escapes demonic possession himself the world as a whole escapes it.

We feel very sympathetically towards one correspondent who puts to us the question which received, so far as we

are concerned, its only possible and final answer in the verses following the fourteenth of Matthew, Chapter VII. The problem of the man who goes so in fear of thistles that he won't touch any food is not one for our solution—it carries its own natural solution with it; but, if it oppresses anyone, let him consider whether fear too is not a fruit.

### Christian Names on Government Forms

In the House of Lords on November 23, Lord Broughshane asked His Majesty's Government "in what circumstances and at whose initiative the words 'Christian name' as opposed to 'Surname' have been omitted from Government forms and replaced by the words 'Forename' and 'Surname'; and whether, in a Christian country such as Britain with an Established Church, there is any justification for abandoning the well-established custom of the names of individuals to be inserted on official forms being described as hitherto 'Christian name' and 'Surname.'"

Lord Chorley: "My Lords, I assume that the noble Lord has in mind the form used in the preparation of the Spring, 1950, Register of Electors, which has been the subject of comment on this point in the correspondence columns of some newspapers. As my right honourable friend the Home Secretary explained recently in another place, in the forms relating to the 1949 Register (as in those in use before the war) the expression used was 'other names'. Some people took this to mean the names of persons other than themselves. It was to remove this misunderstanding that 'forenames' was substituted. The expression 'Christian names' is not used because of its restricted connotation, since not all forenames are Christian names. My right honourable friend is, however, arranging that when the form is reprinted it will contain a reference to 'Christian names or other forenames.'"

Lord Broughshane: "My Lords, while thanking the noble Lord for the last sentence of his reply, I am still at a loss to understand why the old-established use of the words 'Christian names,' as distinguished from 'surname,' should not be maintained. Everybody knows what a person's Christian name is in this Christian country of ours. It does not mean that they are subscribers to any particular form of belief. It seems to me inappropriate that a public form which has to be signed by everyone who claims to vote and to elect Parliament should have the common phraseology of 'Christian names,' taken away."

Lord Chorley: "My Lords, the noble Lord hardly seems to have appreciated that the reference to 'Christian names' is to be restored."

Lord Broughshane: "Then that is all right."

### The Social Credit Secretariat

Will those who have responded to the recently issued Statement of the Secretariat, please note that all remittances, whether by Bankers Orders, or direct to 7, Victoria Street Liverpool, will be acknowledged in due course. Should any receipts for remittances be outstanding, please communicate with the Secretary, Social Credit Secretariat, 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2, from whom, also, extra copies of this Statement may be obtained by readers who want them?



## David and Goliath

*An Essay in analysis of the psychological background of what is known as the Export Drive.*

By NORMAN F. WEBB

### Part I.

Viewed in its positive aspect, the urge towards what is popularly understood as Internationalism—its claim to support among well-intentioned enthusiasts—is the desire to achieve satisfactory group co-operation. The ideal of One World in this sense; of unity and harmony in the relationships of nations and states, is a healthy and natural and creditable one, to be pursued even in face of opposition by every reasonable means. The only thing in face of which it should not be supported is common sense, which unfortunately is conspicuously lacking in all idealistic Internationalism. This lack would seem to rise from the fact that the objectives implicit in international operations appear so large and far-removed from ordinary matters that the average citizen is only too easily persuaded that they actually transcend his mundane experience, and therefore must be left to the experts and their hangers-on, who troup round from one "Conference" to another, a depressingly expensive caravan, almost entirely removed from the controlling pressure of public opinion.

It must be this that accounts for the fact that Internationalism—international affairs as we experience them—appears to be such an evil and blighting influence in society in general, attracting and bending to its almost wholly perverted will, all the impractical and impatient, and wishful, and so-called detached thought, of which there is bound to be such a super-abundance in an age that regards itself as having escaped from the narrow and localizing trammels of what are known as religious beliefs. And again, this must be why we find individuals who, in their daily experience, if a strange voice rang them up on the telephone telling them of proposals to their great advantage to be imparted at a meeting in some lonely and unfrequented place, and suggesting their attendance, unarmed, but accompanied by all their liquid assets, would clap on the receiver with a smile—that same man, when a parallel proposition is made to his country's representatives on the wider, and even lonelier, and less frequented field of international politics, gives his enthusiastic sanction to the proposition.

Yet such are the facts today that the careful citizen everywhere, but in Great Britain more especially, who expects anything to his practical advantage to accrue from the present type of international negotiation, which invariably involves a further degree of disarmament on his part, both financial and military, in the interests of World Security, *i.e.* centralised control, is fooling himself, or allowing the internationalists to fool him. Until the average voter can get more reassurance than he possesses today from his own practical experience—the equivalent in the analogy of knowing the owner of the voice on the telephone and something of his antecedents and motives—he would be much wiser to set the seal of his disapproval on all international negotiations, holus-bolus, as at their best a waste of time and money, and at their worst, a most dangerous and useless game, as far as the interests of the individual are concerned.

The conclusions of the previous essays on this subject of the Export Drive, which represents the most immediate experience the individual has of international policy, was that it was made possible by the secret expropriation on the

part of a comparatively small group of international politicians, the Global Planners, of the economic function of commodity exchange between nations through the big export-import banks. It was further demonstrated that its prolongation past all bounds of common sense and reason, depended on the continued ignorance of the various national communities concerned as to the real cause of their economic distresses and the identity of those individuals who were deliberately abusing the system of international exchange for their own political ends. From all of which it emerged that we need not expect any economic betterment, rather the reverse, until these individuals and the direct results of their political activities, constituting the root cause, were understood and exposed. One result of this confusion, or identification, of politics and economics, which has become such a feature of these times, is that the actions and interactions of these unidentified Planners have become, as it were, history, as never before. And since the point of identity, the physical, or space-time *body*, both geographical and human as well as functional, remains a jealously-guarded secret, the trend of contemporary affairs, appears irrational and uncontrollable, and without clues, unless we accept the persistently and laboriously trailed red-herring of "national ambition."

For long enough now individual national sovereignty, represented at its apex by the Imperialism of England and the English-speaking communities, and basically by the Christian culture and variety of European nationality, has been pilloried as a crime against humanity. So confusing and subtle has been this dialectical attack on Western civilisation, particularly over the last hundred and fifty years, that, though there may have been a certain amount of instinctive opposition to "events," there has been literally no conscious, constructive stand made, or reasonable explanation forthcoming almost, it might be said, since the Reformation; with one exception. The advent of that exception was signalled by the publication in 1920 of the book *Economic Democracy* and others on the same subject which followed, and embodied in what is known as the Social Credit Movement, which stemmed from that event. It is not, therefore, merely exaggerated self-importance that enables us to see the last thirty years of this tremendous world-struggle—at least one coherent aspect of it—as a duel between the enlightening philosophical and economic statements of this book and the efforts made to suppress them and neutralise their effect by those in supreme but hidden control of this vast and sinister combine of politics and economics which we call internationalism. Some even of our well-wishers may smile at the idea of a group of individuals so numerically small and confined and lacking in material resources as the Social Credit Movement, being presented as directly confronting anything so huge and extended and securely entrenched, or as representing a factor of any weight in the gigantic collisions of the last twenty five years. There is even a temptation to succumb to that feeling oneself. But we must not forget that the vast and apparently triumphant forces of what is called Internationalism today, with its horrid travesty of the fine, and natural, and Christian edifice of Political Economy constructed in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, chiefly by the Social Philosophers of England, is almost entirely a quantitative phenomenon and, moreover, based, as we know, on a mathematical lie, which has been, and is being deliberately and elaborately concealed. And that though, superficially, the suggestion may seem far-fetched and even amusing to the outsider, it is not so, since the position taken up by Social Credit is purely

qualitative and based on realism, and to be promoted only as such.

It is suggested, then, that in this attempt to dissect the body and arguments of the Export Drive, we should follow the general course of world events since the 1914-18 War from the comparatively simple aspect suggested above, and without undue self-consciousness; regarding it, not as in any sense a series of unfortunate, and for the individual, disastrous "accidents," but as the inevitable outcome of a deliberate struggle on the part of a political group to get into their hands the supreme control of world affairs, *i.e.* the direction of the daily activities of individuals everywhere all the time, through the hold they already possess on the sources of information of all kinds, as well as the faculty and technique of Foreign Exchange. To this evil and active ambition there is opposed, apart from the naturally violent, but almost entirely instinctive and mainly misdirected reflex action of individuals, only the Social Credit Movement—that is, in conscious, informed opposition—because its members alone know who the hidden enemy is, and the nature of the weapons they use, and the fundamental falsity of their argument; based negatively on a mathematical lie or, to put it positively, on the continued public ignorance of the economic truth which Social Credit uncovers. As a recognisable and unbroken road clear through the jungle of current world events, no one can refute that argument. The criticism may be urged that it is too simplified. On the other hand, it is contested that sooner or later Western civilisation must come down to a realistic and simple view of its position, or perish.

## II.

The initial precautionary moves taken by the International Bankers to discourage any enthusiasm which the suggestions outlined in the book *Economic Democracy* had raised in its first appearance in 1920 were, as we saw, immediately successful, at least at surface level; as apparently successful and complete as were the deflationary moves instituted on the basis of the Cunliffe Committee Report, in choking at its source the threatened overflow of goods and services made possible by the great technical advances stimulated by four years of war, and unrestricted credit for the purpose of waging it. By no means least among these moves, and the one that has had perhaps the widest and most unfortunate results, for the so-called "workers" especially, was the committee set up in January 1921 at the request of the Scottish Labour Advisory Committee to the Central Executive of the Miners' Federation, to investigate the Draft Scheme for the Mining Industry produced by Major Douglas on the basis of his original findings.\* The Labour Executive, then, as now, was entirely under the influence of Sir Ernest Cassel's foundation, the London School of Economics, and the Fabian Society, which last can be regarded as the nursery of Mr. Attlee's Labour Government. This Report, which definitely turned down the Draft Mining Scheme, and by implication the whole Social Credit analysis and proposals,

\*The composition of the Committee, to which Arthur Greenwood (later, Lord Greenwood, Minister in the War and Labour Cabinets) acted as secretary, was as follows:—Sidney Webb, (later Lord Passfield), R. J. Davies, M.P., Frank Hodges, F. B. Warley, G. D. H. Cole, Hugh Dalton (at that time Cassel Reader in Economics at the London School of Economics, now after resigning as Chancellor of the Exchequer, Minister without Portfolio in the Labour Cabinet), J. A. Hobson, C. M. Lloyd, Sir Leo Chiozza Money, and R. H. Tawney.

The Committee had in an advisory capacity an un-named, but "eminent banker," Mr. Emil Davies, one time Chairman of the L.C.C., as it has transpired.

as holding out nothing of value or interest to the country as a whole, or to the "workers" in particular, was issued in the Spring of 1922, and with its publication the official Labour executive may be said to have definitely turned its back (whether knowingly or not, does not make the least difference) on the opportunity of once and for all ridding the average, self-respecting "working-man," who was paying it to look after his interests, of the ever-present threat of reduction to a hopelessly proletarian class.

That may be said, from a world point of view as well as national, to have constituted a major event, as well as a considerable initial success for the Planners. And when it was followed by another of equal importance in 1925, with the reimposition of an almost unrecognisable and considerably war-damaged Gold Standard under the influence of the same expert advice which had decided the Labour Report of 1922—given this time to our present Tory leader in his capacity as Chancellor of the Exchequer.—the threatened disclosures of Social Credit, and any danger of a break-away on the part of individuals or individual governments, seemed to be definitely over. Social Credit as an issue was destined not to be heard of for the next five years, and the Planners might concentrate on the work in hand without distraction, on that head at least. Then it was that the economic One World of the Fabians, and in particular that part of it known as the United States, was subjected to a deliberately inflationary build-up, doubtless with the same object behind it in a general sense, as the German inflation of 1922. This culminated in the disastrous financial crash of 1929, and the shocking figures of unemployment all over the world.

(To be continued)

## Lord Orr

"The Nobel Prize for peace has been bestowed on Lord Boyd Orr, and there have been many expressions of praise, on the ground that Orr has done much for the cause of world nutrition. Lord Boyd Orr, it should be explained, is the former Sir John Boyd Orr who published an epoch-making book, *Food, Health and Income* in 1935. There are some, however, who do not join in the general chorus of approval for this year's Nobel peace prize winner. They recall Orr's performance following the war, in the matter of the international food problem, when he headed the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the UN(FAO). At that time, an unprecedented famine threatened the world, and various international agencies were already at work to try to mitigate it. Sir John (as he was then), however, did not leave the matter in their hands—the obvious course—and concentrated his agency's efforts on carving a practical programme out of a wealth of recommendations; on constructing a sound, economical and efficient organisation; and on recruiting a competent international staff. He leaped into the spotlight, demanded a master global food organisation and modestly put in a bid for the post of what amounted to 'world food dictator.' In this effort, he ignored the Executive Committee of the FAO which would have undoubtedly warned him that his proposal constituted a demand for an economic super-State, and that no country would care to place its economic life under the dictatorship of an international board and put up billions of dollars for this purpose. The scheme crumbled before the opposition of the United States.

"The Food and Agriculture Organisation, we gather, still bears the mark of Sir John's dictatorship. We have

received a letter from a correspondent who has had intimate knowledge of the organisation and its workings. He claims that many in the outfit are fellow travellers of long standing and that the size of the personnel is large and wasteful of funds. He fears the possible use of the FAO as an instrument for carrying out the famous Point Four Programme . . . [and the] further strengthening of Communist influence throughout the world. In view of the above history, it behoves Congress to investigate this organisation with as searching and sceptical an eye as it has recently given the International Refugee Organisation."—*Human Events* (Washington, D.C.).

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

*Air-Commodore Harvey* (Macclesfield): With a song in the right hon. Gentleman's heart?

*Mr. Dalton*: Why not? This is quite a suitable season for the quotation from my right hon. Friend's speech regarding Christmas gifts soon to be distributed. . . .

### Legal Aid Act (Operation)

*Mr. Manningham-Buller* asked the Attorney-General what saving of expenditure in this financial year and in the next financial year is expected to result from the postponement of the full operation of the Legal Aid and Advice Act.

*The Attorney-General*: No great saving of expenditure is to be expected in this financial year during which only expenses preparatory to operating the whole Act in the forthcoming year would have been incurred and this preparatory work will still, in the main, be necessary to provide the service which is not to be deferred.

The Law Society are amending their Scheme so as to carry out only that part of the Act which is not deferred, namely, that relating to proceedings in Supreme Court. The estimated saving in a full year after the amended Scheme comes into operation is £1,000,000 out of £2,000,000, but if this Scheme does not come into operation till the 1st July, 1950, the estimate for the remaining nine months of that year is £750,000 out of £1,500,000.

The annual cost to the Exchequer of those parts of the Act dealing with criminal cases and the provision of legal advice was estimated to be £550,000 when the scheme was in full operation. The estimated saving in the next financial year through not bringing these parts into operation is estimated to be about £400,000.

With regard to legal aid in civil cases, the saving through only bringing into operation those parts of the Act dealing with the provision of aid in proceedings commenced in the Supreme Court depends upon and must await the plan of the Law Society as to how best to administer this service in isolation from the other services now deferred.

House of Commons: November 16, 1949.

### Iron and Steel Bill

Lords Reason for insisting on certain of their Amendments to which the Commons have disagreed, considered.

*The Lords insisted on their Amendments in*

Page 10, line 21, leave out "May" and insert "July";  
Page 10, line 22, leave out "fifty" and insert "fifty-one";  
Page 10, line 23, leave out "passing" and insert "coming into force";

Page 11, line 11, leave out "May" and insert "July";

Page 11, line 12, leave out "fifty" and insert "fifty-one", and

Page 62, line 10, at end insert:

"( ) This Act shall come into force on the first day of October, nineteen hundred and fifty."

for the following Reason—

Because they consider that the Bill should not come into operation until the electors have had an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it.

*The Minister of Supply* (Mr. G. R. Strauss): I beg to move, "That this House doth insist on its disagreement with the Lords in the said Amendments."

As the House is aware, there are on the Order Paper certain Amendments which the Government propose to move in lieu. I think it would be for the general convenience if, in dealing with this Motion, I explained the reasons and the effects of the Amendments which the Government propose to move, as they are linked with this Motion and form one pattern which must be considered as a whole.

To enable the House to appreciate the purport of the proposals which the Government are now putting forward it is necessary to look at the position when the Bill was first brought before the House more than a year ago. It was then reasonable and proper to assume that the passage of this Bill through the two Houses of Parliament would be similar to the passage of the previous nationalisation Measures set out in "Let Us Face the Future" at the 1945 election.

. . . The House knows what actually happened. When the Bill went to the Lords a series of Amendments was moved by the Opposition, most of which were rejected by this House when they came here for consideration. On the return of the Bill to the Lords, the Opposition accepted our rejections, save for two groups of Amendments. One of these made the whole Bill inoperative until 1st October, 1950, and the other made the date of transfer not before 1st July 1951. Opposition spokesmen made it quite clear that they are determined to stand by the principle embodied in these Amendments, and the formal reason given by the Lords for their action is:

"Because they consider that the Bill should not come into operation until the electors have had an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it."

. . . I do not intend on this occasion to repeat at any length the arguments used by myself and my colleagues on a previous occasion denouncing the action taken by their Lordships' House. I will only say that in our opinion it is contrary to all principles of democratic government—

*Mr. Churchill* (Woodford): To allow other people to say what they think?

*Mr. Strauss*: It is contrary to all principles of democratic government that an hereditary and unrepresentative House of Lords should use its powers to prevent a Measure already approved by the electorate and passed by the Commons, and—which the Government of the day considers essential for the fulfilment of its policy of full employment and industrial prosperity, being carried into effect until the electorate have pronounced upon it a second time. This attitude is, in our opinion, all the more indefensible in that every by-election result, without exception, shows that those who elected the Government, that is the majority of our people, continue to endorse its economic and social record. As the House is aware, the Government have taken the necessary steps to lessen the opportunities of the House of Lords repeating this conduct in any future Parliament.

But, however much we believe that the present behaviour of the House of Lords violates the democratic principles of our country, we now are forced to face realistically the effects of their action, however much we may deplore that action. The main effect is that, whatever happens, 1st May 1950, can no longer be the date of transfer, for if this Bill becomes law early next year under the new Parliament Act, we would so have to rush the preliminary steps required to make 1st May the take-over date, as seriously to jeopardise the successful launching of our scheme of public ownership. That we will not do, as we are determined to make a success of this operation. The Government, therefore, consider that it would be misleading to retain 1st May in the Bill, and we therefore propose to delete it.

We cannot, however, advise this House to accept either of the groups of Amendments on which the Lords are standing. Our Amendments on the Order Paper are alternatives, which, while going a long way to meet the Lords objective of delay, do preserve certain features of the Bill to which we attach importance. Foremost among these is that the Bill would immediately become an Act, and the various provisions dealing with the disposal of iron and steel works and the dissipation of assets prior to the date of transfer would become law forthwith. These provisions, although difficult and complicated, have been well understood by the steel companies concerned, and we want to avoid the uncertainty and confusion which might ensue if these provisions did not become operative for another 10 or 11 months.

... Now I come to the Lords Amendment which makes the general date of transfer 1st July, 1951. We are not prepared to accept this, as we consider a delay of this length is wholly undesirable and, indeed, pointless. Our alternative proposal is 1st January, 1951, or such a date within the following 12 months as the Minister may determine.

The other Amendment carried by the Lords, that the Bill shall not operate before 1st October, 1950, not only goes beyond what is necessary to meet the House of Lords' purpose, but is technically defective. . . .

The main point, however, is that under the Lords Amendment 1st October, 1950, would be the first permissive operative date for all the provisions of the Bill. According to the alternative Amendment which the Government propose, 1st October, 1950, would be the first permitted date only of the formal establishment of the Corporation, while the other provisions would come into effect the moment the Royal Assent is obtained. In point of fact, the time required in taking the necessary preliminary steps for setting up the Corporation would, in any event, make this difficult much before that date. . . .

*Mr. Gallacher* (Fife, West): I am opposed to this Motion and my colleague and I will divide the House on it. It is about time there was some plain speaking on this question because the Steel Bill is now finished. The hon. Member for Wednesbury (*Mr. S. N. Evans*) said that this compromise was in the best traditions of British democracy. How did it take him so long to find that out? How is it that month after month those who were sponsoring the Steel Bill maintained that it had already received a mandate from the electorate and that nothing would change their attitude on it? How did it come about that this change now represents the best traditions of British democracy? . . . What is really going on? What is happening in Debate after Debate in this House? We find more and more agreement between the two sides on important issues or, if there is disagreement,

it is on a minor matter. If it is in Order, let me illustrate my meaning by quoting what happened on devaluation. The Government had down a Motion:

"That this House approves the action taken . . . at Washington. . . ."

"blah, blah, blah," and that there was confidence in the Government. The Opposition Motion said that the House while approving the decisions taken at Washington, "blah, blah, blah," had no confidence in the Government. On the principle, they are agreed; on the "blah, blah," they disagree. It was the same with the economy cuts. One lot went into this Lobby, and the other lot went into the other Lobby, but they were all agreed on the cuts. In the present case, both sides are agreed on the Lords Amendment—such beautiful amity.

. . . I remember, in the early days of this Parliament, hon. Members standing up here and boldly singing The Red Flag. Why should they today be coming with the White Flag before the House of Lords and before the other side? . . .

*Mr. Oliver Lyttelton* (Aldershot): I will pick up a little later one or two of the points that have been made by the hon. Member for Stockton-on-Tees (*Mr. Chetwynd*), but I will not detain the House for more than a few minutes.

It falls to me to make a few valedictory remarks about this Bill. We shall not divide the House upon the Motion before us, because, in spite of all the Minister's sophistries—and he tried for some time to make out that there was some difference between the Government's Motion and the Lords Amendments and failed to do so—we feel that the Government's Motion, in effect, meets all the major points which the Lords had in mind when they made their Amendments, and the differences are merely the ordinary face-saving which we expect from the Government and for which I do not blame them. . . .

*The Lord President of the Council* (*Mr. Herbert Morrison*): We have had quite a pleasant and quiet afternoon on what may be—I do not know—the last stage of the effective consideration by this House of the Iron and Steel Bill. Even now, we are for the greater part discussing the question of the timing of the operation and commencement rather than the substance of the Bill. . . .

## THE OLD TESTAMENT

(Translated by *Ronald A. Knox*)

Two Vols.

42/- net.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

## SOCIAL CREDIT and CATHOLICISM

by *GEORGES-HENRI LEVESQUE, O.P.*,

Professor of Economics, Laval and Montreal  
Universities. (Published in Australia)

PRICE 1/-

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