

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 21.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"The immediate necessity as to which all political parties are agreed is improved housing. The financier says 'Yes, you shall have money for housing as a result of building gunboats for Chile,' thereby implying that there is a chain of causation between gunboats for Chile, and cottages for Camberwell. Not only is there no such real chain of causation, but the building of gunboats for Chile, or elsewhere, decreases the energy available to build those houses, and where the total available energy is utilised, as has been approximately the case during the war [1914-18.—*Ed.*] and may easily be so again, not all the gunboats ever sold, no matter what the accounting figures attached to the transaction may indicate in added wealth to this country, will produce one house at Camberwell, or anywhere else."—*Control and Distribution of Production*, C. H. Douglas, first printing, 1918.

An intelligent schoolboy put in possession of a few salient facts, would have little difficulty in diagnosing the increasing gravity of the situation in this country as aggravated misdirection of effort. While a good deal of the collectivisation of "production" as "homogenous" wealth is just mental laziness or defective education, there is no reasonable ground on which to assume that no body of opinion exists which does not see through the fallacy involved. The focus of this conscious understanding of the nature of "full employment" is, roughly, the body of three or four hundred men to whom reference was made by Walther Rathenau. Their ultimate policy is MONOPOLY because Monopoly is POWER. The ultimate sanction of this policy is War, because War is the last term of tool-power. These men dispose of patronage in high places either directly or through their local sympathisers, the members of the Mond Turner Conference being typical; and while no doubt some of our Cabinet Ministers begin by thinking that they can beat the Devil at his own game history and evidence make it fairly clear that the delusion soon gives way to a wish to be received into eternal habitations.

The importance of a clear grasp of this situation cannot be over-rated. What this country needs is not brains; it is honesty in the right place, supported by sanctions sufficient to keep it there and keep it honest. Nothing amuses the Devil more than watching honest men break their hearts in unsupported attacks on wickedness in High Places.

Dr. T. T. Shields is a Baptist Minister who wields considerable influence in Toronto and the English-speaking portion of Eastern Canada. With his attacks on the Church of Rome we must disagree, but his energy and sincerity in many sound causes warm our hearts. At the moment he is travelling through India, and in a letter to his paper, *The Gospel Witness*, in Toronto he remarks:

"I am increasingly convinced that it will not be long before it will appear that the British withdrawal from India,

as from Egypt, is one of the greatest tragedies of modern times . . . Already graft and injustice appear on every hand. I fear British withdrawal marks the beginning of the end of religious liberty. The [Indian] Secretary of Home Affairs admitted [to me] that religious liberty would be conceded 'with limitations.'"

"IFSKY"

(With acknowledgements to *The New Times*, Melbourne)

If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and being strung up, too,
If you can dodge the purge when all men doubt you
And see that they are purged instead of you,
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting
And hear the truth, but twist it into lies,
And being hated, don't give way to hating
But bump them off with friendship in your eyes.
If you can talk to crowds with seeming virtue
Despising what is called the common touch,
If neither higher ups nor lower downs can hurt you
Unless you let them know just overmuch.
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With every dirty trick beneath the sun,
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,
And which is more—you'll be a commissar, my son.

Only "The Eccentricities?"

" . . . the Dominion executive has the power to disallow the legislation of a province even within the provincial sphere, though the Dominion Parliament cannot go on to legislate in that sphere itself, as can the Union Parliament in South Africa. This power is not a dead letter; it was used, for instance, in 1937 to check the eccentricities of Social Credit in Alberta . . ."—*The Times*, January, 12.

The Patriot comes to an End

The Patriot, founded in February 1922 by the late Duke of Northumberland, comes to an end with the January issue just published. The announcement containing this melancholy news claims that the journal "has offered all material available to the Conservative Party for fighting the evil forces assailing this country but the Conservative Central Office scorned all warnings preferring to go its own gait which ended in the resounding defeat of 1945." We have said before, when we knew *The Patriot's* position was threatened, that we believed it would have been more secure, and that the country and the world would be more secure, if such exceptional and ably-run journals could bring themselves to question the axioms as well as the propositions of its enemies. They have only to be questioned and to go on being questioned, for the questioner to find a rock of certainty instead of the bog of opinion under his feet. The list of "free" newspapers is becoming distressingly small.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 14, 1949.

Gambia (Poultry Project)

Mr. Hurd asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state the total sum which has now been advanced to the Colonial Development Corporation for the poultry project in the Gambia.

Mr. Creech Jones: The advances approved total £810,000.

Mr. Hurd: Can the right hon. Gentleman tell us when the British housewife may expect to see some dividend in eggs and poultry for this £800,000 investment?

Mr. Creech Jones: I am rather hopeful that something will happen next year.

Food Subsidies

Mr. T. Reid asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies what food subsidies were paid, or promised, to Colonies in 1949-50 at the expense of the British taxpayer.

Mr. Creech Jones: Twenty-eight thousand pounds has been paid to the Turks and Caicos Islands to meet the cost of food subsidies incurred during 1947-48 and 1948-49. No other food subsidies have been paid or promised at the expense of the British taxpayer.

Mr. Reid: Do I understand that the Vote which was in the Estimates is not going to be expended on these items? Would my right hon. Friend agree that it is a very dangerous practice for the British taxpayer to give foodstuffs to Colonies? If they need assistance and must get it, surely it should be done in some other way?

Mr. Creech Jones: Yes, but only in the Turks Islands is this subsidy now paid. In other cases where assistance is required it is given through the grants-in-aid.

Mr. Harrison: Is my right hon. Friend fully satisfied that within the Colonies themselves everything is being done to develop the food resources which exist there to a large extent?

Mr. Creech Jones: That is quite a different question, but the answer is in the affirmative.

Leeward Islands (Constitutional Reform)

Mr. Skinnard asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies how far the wider terms of reference now to be given to the Constitutional Reform Committee of the Leeward Islands cover the examination of the possibility of a fully-elected Legislative Council and election of some members from that body to the Executive Council.

Mr. Creech Jones: It is not proposed to give wider terms of reference to the Committee.

Food Supplies (Carrots)

Mr. Gerald Williams asked the Minister of Food if he is aware that the Carrots Order, 1949, provides a price incentive for growers to sell their carrots to canners, with the result that the public is being deprived of fresh carrots; and what steps he proposes to take by way of removal of price control or other means to divert larger quantities to the fresh vegetable market, having regard to the present general shortage of fresh vegetables.

Dr. Summerskill: A farmer can get a higher price for his carrots from a canner than from a wholesaler, but he can get as much if he sells to a retailer and more if he sells direct to the public. However, the quantities used by canners at this time of year are relatively so small that I do not consider that there is any need to interfere with sales to them.

Mr. Williams: Is the Minister aware that it certainly is having this effect, and that I have had complaints from more than one quarter about it? Is it not very important to have more fresh vegetables, and cannot the right hon. Lady consider decreasing the difference in price?

Dr. Summerskill: I think the hon. Gentleman has been misinformed, and I should like to remind him that of the last crop, I think 37,000 tons of carrots were sold to the canners out of a total of 322,800 tons.

Offences (Informers)

Colonel Gomme-Duncan asked the Minister of Food if he will instruct food officers to give, when required, the names of informers through whom investigation into alleged food offences has been made, and in cases where the allegations have been found subsequently to be without foundation.

Dr. Summerskill: I cannot lay down any general rule binding my Department to a particular course of action in hypothetical circumstances. Any such case would be considered on its merits.

Colonel Gomme-Duncan: If any hon. Member gives a definite case where this has occurred, can the right hon. Lady assure the House that she will allow her officers to give the name where the honesty and integrity of the citizen has been wrongly questioned.

Dr. Summerskill: I should not like to make any categorical statement. I am sure the hon. and gallant Gentleman realises that if we discover that information which has been given to us is unfounded or has been given for malicious reasons we should give special consideration to what our action should be.

Colonel Gomme-Duncan: As the effect on the citizen is the same whether it be unfounded or malicious, can the right hon. Lady say whether any difference is going to be made between the malicious and ordinary informers who do it by mistake? Is the attitude of the Ministry that this should not be done?

Dr. Summerskill: I think that every case must be considered on its merits.

Advertisement (Cost)

Major Lloyd asked the Minister of Food what is the total cost of advertising Food Facts No. 495 entitled "Christmas Extras and Ration Increases."

Dr. Summerskill: The cost of space for this advertisement was approximately £5,400.

Sweet Ration (Old Age Pensioners)

Mr. Janner asked the Minister of Food whether, in view of the fact that many old age pensioners do not take advantage of the tobacco voucher scheme, he will, in the case of those who do not apply for such vouchers, grant them a small extra sweet ration.

Dr. Summerskill: No.

Atomic Energy Research

Mr. Ellis Smith asked the Minister of Supply if he will make a statement on the progress made or the prospect of the use of atomic energy for industrial, medical and other non-military uses; what are the prospects of the utilisation of atomic energy or resources of atomic materials for power purposes; and if he will consider the need for the publication of a White Paper so that the progress made in four years can be studied, and include Sir John Cockcroft's description of the results of British atomic research made at the World Power Conference.

Mr. J. Freeman: The development of atomic energy for power production is still in its early stages and, although much knowledge has already been gained, it would be premature to make a detailed statement about the prospects. Research on the fundamental scientific problems involved is being carried out at Harwell and special proposals for the construction of new types of experimental nuclear reactors for power production, from which experience will be gained, are now being prepared, but my right hon. Friend does not think that the issue of a White Paper would be appropriate at the present stage.

Substantial progress has been made in the use of radio-isotopes for industrial, medical and research purposes. Production at Harwell is increasing steadily and the number of deliveries made in November was 273, 43 more than the previous highest monthly figure. New uses for radio-isotopes are being constantly explored.

House of Commons: December 15, 1949.

Control of Engagement Order

Major Sir David Maxwell Fyfe (Liverpool, West Derby): I beg to move,

"That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying that the Order, dated 5th December, 1949, entitled the Control of Engagement (Amendment) Order (S.I. 1949, No. 2251), a copy of which was laid before this House on 5th December, be annulled."

. . . The slow ooze of Socialism is seeping in. The unending series of crises grows steadily worse, and will continue to do so while Socialism is in power and more drastic measures must be taken to deal with these crises. Therefore, I feel that this is the occasion when, in view of this steady encroachment, we are entitled to demand from the right hon. Gentleman an assurance whether or not it is proposed to make permanent the Control of Engagement Order under the Act which it is now stated will be a permanent Measure. Even the unlikely possibility of the last words of the right hon. Gentleman, "if we are returned to power," do not take away from this point because the country is entitled to know before it goes to the poll and votes whether the Control of Engagement Order—that is, compulsory direction of labour applied to the working people of this country—is part of the permanent policy of the Government or not.

If we cannot get that assurance we on this side of the House are entitled to assume, and we shall certainly make the assumption and act upon it, that the control of engagements will be a permanent feature of the Socialist Utopia, towards which we have so notably retrogressed during the last four-and-a-half years. That is obviously a serious point affecting not only those covered by the order in question, but the election which must come very soon. And we shall want an answer on it.

. . . The argument for this order on the part of the Government comes to this: No one wants this order, and if we could do the job which has to be done without it we should not have to come here and ask for it. These, in fact, were the Minister's own words—in the OFFICIAL REPORT of 3rd November, 1947. This "painful necessity" argument reminds me of the very overworked phrase, "This is going to hurt me more than it will hurt you." That really is a little out of date. It is, in my respectful submission, complete nonsense because there is an alternative, which, I will show in a moment, has not only been put forward by my hon. Friends but is also, apparently, part of the policy of the Government put forward by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In view of the quotations of which I have reminded the House, it is not difficult to realise why on one occasion the Government majority of 200 dropped to 45 when hon. Gentlemen opposite were not ready to support this monstrous order. . . .

. . . We are left in this position. The re-introduction of this order is a confession that under Socialism there will be a permanent inflation, a permanent crisis which can only be dealt with by restriction. We say that that is a confession which this country ought to refuse to make. . . .

. . . No serious attempt has been made by the Government to deal with the problem of disinflation, which they themselves announced must be dealt with. The alternative is restrictive measures of this kind. We on this side of the House shall be voting for a real chance being given to the policy of the right hon. Gentleman, a policy which he knows is necessary for us if we are to have any hope, but which Socialism will never allow him to put into effect. It is for that reason that once again we have brought before the House this Motion to annul this order, and we shall vote for the policy of freedom for the workers to select the work to which they wish to go, and for the policy which my right hon. Friend the Member for Woodford (Mr. Churchill) has put forward. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members can laugh at freedom now. In the great days when their party was starting they would not have dared to laugh at freedom. I prophesy that in two months they will not laugh at freedom again.

Viscount Hinchinbrooke (Dorset, Southern): Both the hon. Gentlemen who spoke last and the hon. Member for Houghton-le-Spring (Mr. Blyton) used the tit-for-tat argument. They said that because between the wars there had been some unemployment and that had resulted in an economic direction of labour, the Government of the day were justified in using this control to enforce a parallel servitude in industry. The hon. Gentleman the Member for South Hammersmith (Mr. W. T. Williams) went further and implied that it was right to turn some men in a so-called essential industry into machines so that they should obey automatically the will of their superiors in Government and that somehow through that process the economy of the country was going to be raised. If he thinks that by applying the principle which he so much admires to cover the whole of the industries of this country, then by some miracle we are going to get a resourceful nation that will be an effective competitor in world trade, I am amazed at his simplicity.

I wish to raise only two points, one affecting liberty and the other technical progress, which so far has not been mentioned in this Debate. On the point affecting liberty, I may go straight on from what I have been saying about the speech of the hon. Gentleman. There is no doubt at all that of

(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. 21.

Saturday, January 21, 1950.

Real Politics

If individual freedom is to be secured or maintained, what *must* occur, in any community committed to virtually unrestricted improvement of process, involving energy conversion on the scale of modern power production, is a progressive substitution for the wage in industry of a dividend.

We are living in a world in which economic processes are carried out by two agencies, one "the agency of individual effort . . . from an economic point of view of decreasing importance, and the other, . . . the result of the plant, organisation and knowledge which are the cumulative result of the effort not only of the present generation, but of the pioneers and inventors of the past. This second agency can, of course, be collectively described as real (as distinct from financial) capital." (Douglas: *The Monopoly of Credit*). ". . . remembering that a satisfactory financial system is simply a reflection in figures of a state of affairs alleged to exist in fact . . . , it is not difficult to understand that wages and salaries in relation to dividends ought to become increasingly unimportant." (*The Monopoly of Credit*).

This conception heavily underlines the admirable discussion of the importance of the coming general election from which extracts appear on this page, and it is to be considered bearing constantly in mind the growing disagreement of the trade union rank and file with the wages policy which the T.U.C. desires, as instruments of the Mond-Turner agreement, to impose, and, at the same time giving due weight to the wise observations of our contemporary (not quoted) hinting at the present collectivist preconceptions of the Conservative Party itself.

Certainly, the best that can occur next month is the return of a government with as small a majority as possible, since thereby greatest encouragement and least obstruction would be given towards the development and correct expression of "the real movement of opinion." Neither the Roman Catholic Church nor the Social Credit movement can bring this result to pass. But conscious opponents of collectivism will regain hope in proportion as they see that a realistic estimate of the importance of the election must be one which heavily discounts the pretensions of party campaigners.

"How Important Is The Election?"

" . . . The British electorate today is so huge, with over 34 million voters, that a very small movement of floating votes will determine whether there is a Conservative majority comparable to that which the Labour Party has enjoyed for

five years, whether the Labour Party comes back having held most of its majority, or whether, as seems in general the most likely result, this election proves to be the first of several in succession, because neither Party will have a majority of a hundred. Governments with small majorities do not live long, certainly not five years. They are too much at the mercy of their dissatisfied wings, and each party sufficiently broadly based to be a national party has groups who make up its flanks and not its centre.

"The parties fighting the election will, of course, proclaim it as immensely important, and in one sense they are right: modern Governments have so much power to do harm, and some lesser power of doing good, that it does matter immensely who the men are, with what prepossessions and abilities they take far-reaching decisions. Mr. Ernest Bevin's personal instincts and feelings, for instance, have been exceedingly important. But there is another sense in which both the main parties will proclaim that the election is critical, where it is very doubtful how far they are right. The real movement of opinion, the formation and the modification of the underlying decisive public opinion, takes place at a deeper level than the party political, and with a different time-scale from Parliamentary life. . . .

"We can easily get the worst of both worlds if the election produces a Conservative Government before public opinion is ready for it. It is only too easy to envisage what bad results could follow from this combination, for a Conservative Government needs something more than a victory won because of the irritations aroused by Mr. Strachey and Dr. Summerskill among the kind of voters whose irritation is entirely due to a false idea that it is the easy duty of government to provide for them abundantly and cheaply. They will be changing their Minister of Food in the same way, and for the same reasons, that they transfer their custom from one shop to another, and Lord Woolton and his friends will promise to give better service. But to the extent that the electorate is a proletarian electorate, like that of ancient Rome, not feeling itself responsible for a great country but merely looking to see who is likely to do most for it, there is little point in a Conservative victory gained on such terms and under such conditions. And it would be likely to delay the only real and abiding victory, the rejection by the mind and heart of the nation of the collectivist philosophy, and its replacement by an understanding that all the good things that a rising national income makes possible can be secured in a much better form provided public opinion enforces upon the politicians the great and salutary Catholic principle whose clumsy name, 'subsidiary function,' tends to conceal its immediate daily relevance. . . ."—*The Tablet*.

Sense About the "B."B.C.

Is broadcasting "really worth while? Has it added to the sum of human wisdom? Has it furthered the happiness of the race? Is broadcasting a substitute for culture? . . ."

"A man is not 'morally better off for appreciating Brahms and Beethoven' . . ."

"It is . . . important that [the British public] should take to heart Sir William Haley's words to the effect that broadcasting exists to help people 'build a community in which wireless is only a very small part of a full and satisfying life.'"—Robert Speaight.

The Ban on Exposure

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*,

Dear Sir,

I send you copies of correspondence which may be of some interest as 'intelligence.' Over the last two years I have had no difficulty in getting letters published, unless they mention the enemy. Three times this year I have tried to get a letter along the lines of the copy enclosed* past the editor of the local paper, but they have all been rejected on the same grounds. Each time the editor has had his nose rubbed in his responsibility.

The Chairman of the local Chamber of Commerce wrote me an enthusiastic letter of thanks for my letter on devaluation† agreeing with what I said. But when I carried the matter further, naming the enemy and indicating that the devilment which is going on is deliberate policy, he dried up completely.

The source of resistance at this point seems to be local Freemasonry . . . a local Freemason . . . told me I could belong to any of the "official parties" but not do what I was doing.

Yours faithfully,

J. MITCHELL.

*† Both letters (from *The Hampshire Herald*) appear below:—

Devaluation and Responsibility

Sir,—The speech by the president of the Alton Chamber of Commerce on Devaluation was so encouraging—in its downrightness concerning the gravity of the situation and the manner in which a spade was called a spade—that I should be loth to cavil at some inaccuracies in it.

There is, however, one point of over-riding importance, omitted by him, which goes to the root of the trouble. This is covered by the word responsibility. I feel sure that Mr. Vokes and all good business men in the Alton Chamber would agree that no business undertaking could be a success without precise allocation of responsibility to results achieved with a clear and definite understanding among all concerned as to who takes the consequences of failure. This is clearly placed between those who provide the capital, the management and staff, and the customers.

Why is it that the man-in-the-street exercises so much more intelligence in his functions as a customer and consumer than he does as an elector?

There would have been no ruinous devaluation if only those who elected the present administration into power knew that they would be made responsible through differential taxation, or other means, to take all the financial consequences of the present disaster. The Socialists and planners would be finished now and for all time; and the so-called Conservative Party would have quickly to overhaul its programme under the eyes of a vastly more vigilant electorate. There might even be a Business Man's Party, with an entirely different programme.

Certain it is that it would not matter whether the candidate for election was a good general, spent his time making pretty speeches in all parts of his constituency or not, and Ministers who failed in their job could not be shuffled to another department nor promoted to the House of Lords.

Alton business men would be doing something really

effective if they were to get together and start a movement to introduce responsibility into politics.

Nothing else can restore sanity to our affairs and save our country from final and complete catastrophe. There is very little time left to stop the mad rush down the Gader-ene slope.—Yours, *etc.*,

JOHN MITCHELL.

Rockhouse Farm, Lower Froyle.

Fiddling While Britain Burns!

Sir,—It has been remarked that "every policy is the policy of a philosophy," and that "in each and every rationally constructed mechanism a policy is inherent." These remarks are germane to the discussion which has been going on in your columns under the above heading.

While apparently no longer of importance to many Britons, the two things which are of paramount importance to every patriotic Briton, are the sovereignty of our nation, and our economic system. The policy inherent in the conception of a sovereign state is the preservation of the control of your own affairs in your own nation. The policy inherent in an economic system is the facilitation of the production and distribution of goods and services. We find that all four political parties, Liberal, Socialist, Communist and conservative, and the Church of England (which being an established church is obviously concerned, since policy in this country is supposed to be based on a Christian philosophy), are united in denying these policies.

The Church and all political parties are united in their intention to hand over control of the affairs of our nation to a United States of Europe Government and eventually to a World Government. At a meeting convened to advocate this objective, we witness the Archbishop of Canterbury presiding, with a leading Socialist on his right hand and the leader of the so-called Tory Party on his left.

The idea of a United States of Europe was the misbegotten child of the most sinister secret societies in Europe during the eighteenth century. During the nineteenth century this movement was carried on by Marx and the First International, whose periodical was entitled "United States of Europe." Writing in Petrograd in 1918, Leon Trotsky said: "The United States of Europe is the motto of the revolutionary age into which we have emerged."

Are the Archbishop of Canterbury and his "Red" Dean really at loggerheads, and are our rulers and would-be rulers really at loggerheads with the Kremlin?

The foundation of the Charter of the United Nations was laid at the Conference of Foreign Secretaries in Moscow in 1943. It is openly admitted that the main factor in the progress towards the unification of Europe has been the pressure exerted by Russia, and as Mr. Churchill said at Strasbourg: "We are engaged in the process of creating a European unit in the world organisation of the United Nations."

Who is fiddling with our sovereignty?

On the question of our economic system, we find that 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, and yet as one observer has put it: "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."

This is what comes of all political parties, and the Church, insisting that the primary object of an economic system is to provide employment, and that all is well so long as there is full employment. Yet any schoolboy whose head is not already addled by the current madness knows that the same object of the extraordinary increase in productive capacity which has occurred over the last forty years would be to provide goods and services with less employment.

Who is fiddling with the economic system? *Demon est Deus inversus.—Yours, etc.,* JOHN MITCHELL.
Rockhouse Farm, Lower Froyle.

The following letter was not published:—

The Liberals Claim to Re-election

Sir,—In a memorandum circulated widely throughout the British Empire six months before the last war started I wrote in reference to the approaching war, "the true identity of the masses opposed, from the point of view of who will gain and who will lose (which is of course the only realistic basis of decision) is Europe against America and Russia." The memorandum contained a prediction "that a World War would start in 1939 from which America would emerge as dictator of the world." Well documented evidence was given to prove that the same group of men controlled both America and Russia and I wrote "the interests of this group who control America and Russia are international, and their aim is the disruption of Europe with a view to their domination of it. . . ."

On the outbreak of war in 1914 the U.S. Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Mr. Walter Page, cabled gleefully to President Wilson "the British Empire is delivered into our hands." It was the Liberal Party who did so much to initiate our downfall. The power behind the official Liberal Party in this country at the beginning of the century was Mond (later Lord Melchett), Isaacs (later Lord Reading) Samuel and Rothschild and it was their protégé, the solicitor to the Zionist Society, Lloyd George who paved the way for the steady socialisation of our national life. Bernard Shaw has described how the Liberal Party was permeated by the Fabians; and it was Lloyd George who was responsible for the first social insurance legislation in this country, later to be developed under the direction of his Liberal colleague Churchill who, while the people of this country were pre-occupied by war, deputed the Fabian, Lord Beveridge, to draft the socialist scheme which now afflicts us.

The Liberal Party passed the Parliament Act in 1911 which emasculated the House of Lords. It was the Liberal Lord Reading who was sent to the United States in 1917 and arranged a debt settlement which put the Bank of England completely under the thumb of Wall Street with the Wall Street trained Montagu Norman in control. Under a Liberal Government the pound sterling dropped in purchasing power from 95 to 37 between the years 1910 and 1920.

The economic terms of the Versailles Peace Treaty, which proved so disastrous and ensured that suitable conditions were created in Germany for the rise to power of an

extremist party, were drafted by Paul Warburg, head of the U.S.A. Federal Reserve Board, (whose brother Max Warburg, the ex-Kaiser's financial adviser was the German representative) and Bernard Baruch (life-time personal friend of the Liberal Churchill) while the whole tragic arrangement had the blessing of Lloyd George. The seeds of a second World War were then sown and under the financial policy relentlessly pursued by the same group through their representative in Germany, Mr. Schacht and his friend Montagu Norman in England, another war became inevitable.

The policy of unconditional surrender in the last war, consented to by the Liberal Churchill, financially and economically weakened all the European contestants so that they became completely subservient economically to the U.S. Government, while the military strategy of Eisenhower, with its appeasement of Russia, put that country in a commanding position in Europe.

As I said it was "America and Russia against Europe," and the war with Germany was used to disrupt Europe.

Now with the Socialists in power in England and backed financially by "America," the British people are deprived of any opposition to them because the official opposition masquerading under the name "Conservative" are really a combination of Liberals and Fabians, while the key elements in the Civil Service have been trained by the London School of Economics, endowed by Sir Ernest Cassel "to train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State," and advised at the present time by the Fabian organisation P.E.P.

The guiding light in P.E.P., whose founder members are Fabians, has been Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, with whom Mr. Churchill during the war dined weekly in private in the Savoy Hotel, and among the "Conservatives" who have supported its activities are Mr. Harold Macmillan, Mr. Amery, Mr. Kenneth Lindsay and Major Harvie Watt (Parliamentary Secretary to Mr. Churchill during the war).

The first duty of every patriotic Englishman is to know the enemies of his country. The same enemies have misled the English people for thirty years—ask the greatest man among them—Major C. H. Douglas. For thirty years he has warned people of what was going to happen, analysed the faults and advised as to the course to pursue in every circumstance. Everything possible has been done to suppress this advice and by clever propaganda and by playing on prejudice and ignorance to misguide people as to the nature of his advice.

Irretrievable disaster and complete and utter damnation awaits the people of these Islands unless they now recognise their enemies and turn to this great man for advice.

Yours, etc., JOHN MITCHELL.

Suspicion Grows

"[The Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa] and his colleagues really seem to believe that what they now call the 'non-white' nations are united in a conspiracy against little South Africa; that General Smuts really is working hand in glove with the South African Communist Party to 'destroy white civilisation,' and that sharing in this devilish conspiracy are all the English-speaking newspapers, which supply the outside world with 'distorted' news about the Union."—*The Scotsman*.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

the two stimuli to effort, direction of labour or the application of the price mechanism, the latter is much the milder. Hon. Gentlemen opposite ought to recognise by now it is the aim of all three parties to achieve full employment. We fundamentally believe in this aim. Hon. Gentlemen opposite must also recognise by now the fact that we on this side of the House are the principal authors of the authoritative economic White Paper on full employment.

There is no question that a more humane society arises through the association of full employment with the price mechanism than through the association of full employment with direction of labour. It is our aim on this side to achieve that combination of full employment and the price mechanism and we are well forward in so doing, far better forward than the party opposite. I think at the next General Election the people of this country are going to approve the Conservative intention to combine these two things because by that we shall achieve a much freer society than the combination put forward by the party opposite.

The only other point I have time for tonight is one on technical progress. I have no doubt at all in my mind that if the Supplies and Services Act, together with the direction of labour and the financial and other Socialist controls that go with it, had been applied to industries and services during the 18th century there would have been no Industrial Revolution, and that if they had been applied to industries and services in the 19th century, we would not have today any of the appurtenances of the modern age. I have no doubt that if this business of direction of industry and labour persists, we shall begin to fall behind the United States and other countries where they have a greater degree of freedom. It would be out of Order for me to mention those industries and services which I have in mind; but there is a range of 12 or 15 where the United States, since the war, has made bounds forward. We are now miles behind them in those industries and services.

Mr. Stubbs (Cambridgeshire): What about the unemployed?

Viscount Hinchingbrooke: Our falling behind is directly due to the freezing of the economy which comes about when these wholesale Socialist controls are applied. The Control of Engagement Order is part of this vicious system. If a man is not free to leave an industry and go into another industry, is it not possible that the industry into which he might want to go is retarded in its progress? There must be many men today who are tied to the coalmines who, if they were perfectly free to leave the mines and go into other industry might, out of their knowledge, zeal and brain-power contribute to the growth and development of those industries.

But here we have a Government which says, "We are concerned with a particular industry and wish to make it appear important. We have just nationalised the coalmines. There are 40 or 50 representatives of mining areas on our benches and we will apply full scale controls to that industry so that it shall appear to be prosperous and well staffed, filled with social capital and amenities of every sort and kind. But you never can tell that by so doing you are not denying other forms of industry of prime motive power—atomic energy, oil, hydro-electric energy, and perhaps other forms of energy not yet discovered—the vital opportunities to develop and go ahead. I believe that it is just as fatal in this century to apply these techniques of wholesale control to industry as it would have been fatal to Britain's technical

progress in the twentieth century to have applied them in the past.

The Minister of Labour (*Mr. Isaacs*): . . . There has been a lot of argument whether that ring fence [around agriculture and mining] is regarded as successful or not, but at any rate it has been maintained until the present moment at the request of the industries. Both the industries are now satisfied that they are able to carry on without the ring fence. Therefore, we propose to abolish the ring fence round these two industries as from 1st January. Do not let there be any misunderstanding or suggestion of any sort of trickery, because removing the ring fence does not mean moving the workers in these industries outside the Control of Engagement Order.

. . . This order will be continued to the end of this period. If it had not been for the situation in which this country finds itself through its economic problems this order would not have been repeated this year. That is quite definite.

There was some question of what we have done under the order. The House should understand the immensity of the task that the Ministry of Labour, through the employment exchanges, is carrying out. In the 12 months ending 26th October, we have actually filled through our Ministry 4,063,000 vacancies in this way—2,842,000 men and 1,221,000 women. These are going into industry, and we have to decide how many are going into first preference vacancies. First preference vacancies are jobs which are considered essential for the nation's welfare. They may change a little from time to time. We have filled vacancies of first preference category to the extent of 360,000 men and 137,000 women, giving a total of 497,000 in all. . . . The hon. Member for Bodmin (*Mr. D. Marshall*) made a reference—and I must say I thought he got very eloquent about it; I thought the Election had already begun—to men who stayed in an industry when they wanted to get out of it, and who were, therefore, unproductive. All I can say is that that is not a compliment to employers; I do not think that employers would keep a man who was unproductive. They do not keep men when there is no employment for them, or when they are not giving satisfaction.

Mr. D. Marshall: I would like to make myself quite clear; my point was that if a man does not like the work which he is doing, that man, up to a point, cannot tell if he is in fact producing to the maximum capacity. But as a matter of fact he certainly will not be doing so.

Mr. Isaacs: I do ask the hon. Member not to believe that one.

Mr. Marshall: It is true.

Mr. Isaacs: It is not, because if the bloke himself does not know, the overseer down below knows, and believe me, employers do not usually appoint overseers who do not know the capacity of their men. May I come to the point of the right hon. and learned Gentleman who opened this Debate? There has been reference to whether this order is permanent. It has to come before the House again, whatever the circumstances in the House next year. This order ends on 10th December. . . . I am quite certain that, so far as the Ministry over which at present I have the honour to preside is concerned, the officials of that Ministry will express themselves, if the Minister asks for the information in terms that this order should be dropped unless the needs of the country should make it essential for it to be continued. That is exactly what we are doing now. . . . We must maintain coal

production, cotton, agriculture, and production for export. What has been our experience? Some hon. Members say that this is theoretical, and that although we may not force people to go into jobs, it is wicked to have the power. Twenty-nine persons have actually been directed. Let me tell the House that I have made most careful and meticulous inquiries, and visited many of the officials throughout the country who are concerned with the operation of this order, and they say that seldom is there complaint with the instruction to take the work offered.

We want the order because there may be many instances of this kind. There may be a job of vital importance which has to be filled. There may be a man in the locality who has the skill to fill it, but he is unemployed and is anxious to take some other job for the time being. We have to have that job filled. Just as we had to take men from their homes in the war in the time of the country's needs, the country's needs remain today and we should therefore retain this order.

What complaint do we have? We have had meetings of the National Joint Advisory Council, employers and workers' representatives, regularly since the order first came into force. There have never been any complaints from them as to its harshness or unfairness. Each year they have advised the application of this order in the interests of the country. Have we had any complaints from the trade unions? Not a solitary one; and they are the people who represent these men.

Have we had complaints from any individual? So far as I can recall, only one, at the beginning of the scheme. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford (Mr. Hogg) smelled it out and put a Question on the Order Paper. I am glad that mistake happened because it brought home to the officials of the Ministry throughout the country that the order had to be obeyed very strictly and meticulously. That is the only complaint which has come to me at the Ministry. No other complaint has ever been made in this House. People will say, "Even though you are working it as nicely as all that, it is still wicked to have that power," but we believe that the interests of the country come first. We believe that many of us may have to put up with things with which we would not normally wish to put up if the country's needs requires us to do so. . . .

Mr. Byers: Before the right hon. Gentleman sits down, will he deal with the point I put to him? Did the Cabinet deliberately decide to extend the Control of Engagement Order notwithstanding that they had signed the Charter of Human Rights? It is an important point. Is this a deliberate attempt to abrogate the Charter of Human Rights?

Mr. Isaacs: No, Sir. I am glad that the hon. Gentleman reminded me of that because I asked for a note on it. In the Charter of Human Rights there is a clause which deals with emergencies. If the present policy were permanent it would be a violation of that Charter, but as it is an emergency we are able to act under it.

Mr. Rhys Davies (Westhoughton): . . . The Minister has told us that the ring fence is to be abolished in coalmining and agriculture, the two industries in which it operates. That is a very substantial step towards personal freedom. He said, also, that the Control of Engagement Order is not to be made permanent. That is very satisfactory, too.

I cannot understand some of the arguments put forth from both sides of the House in relation to the Control of Engagement Order. I am not moved at all by what the Conservatives say about personal freedom, when they always

support military conscription. Of all the foul offences against personal liberty, conscription is by far the worst. Then, on this side of the House the strange argument was advanced that because the pressure of poverty and unemployment directed men to labour, we must not complain against this form of direction. The direction arising from poverty has been abolished because a Labour Government has come into power, and it is argued that you must, forsooth, agree to a new compulsion because you have abolished the original. That argument will not avail—and certainly will not avail in the General Election campaign.

. . . I have spoken in this House on the rights of man on several occasions and, unfortunately, I have had to criticise my own colleagues in so doing. I am much encouraged by two events. During the war I stood almost alone against the foul policy of unconditional surrender, and the House of Commons almost howled me down. Lo and behold, a few years later I find that a new House of Commons agrees with me. I then challenged military conscription and my own Labour colleagues disagreed with me. Now, however, even our military commanders are doubting whether military conscription is worth while imposing at all. While thanking my right hon. Friend the Minister of Labour for what he has said, let me add that if we press the matter a little further, the Control of Engagement Order itself will come to an end.

It has been said on the other side of the House, and I challenge that statement, that direction of labour is part and parcel of Socialism. It is not. Every single "ism" is determined in the end by the interpretation put upon it by the "ists," and I object to the interpretation that is implied by some of our own people that because there is a Socialist State there must of necessity be control and direction of labour. As one who pleaded for Socialism long before many Members in this House were born, I wish to make it clear once again that I support the ownership and control of every material thing necessary for the life of the nation, but I have always presumed, from Kier Hardie downwards—and if he were here tonight he would most certainly support my point of view—that the adoption of Socialist principles would provide more freedom for the workman than does capitalism. And if Socialism does not mean that it will fail and a new generation will arise in this land to establish a new society where personal freedom is paramount.

I have been in Germany since the occupation. Our Government controls part of Germany. I do not think that a Control of Engagement Order is imposed in Germany. Just imagine a people we defeated in war being more free to choose their jobs than our own people who conquered them.

(To be continued)

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of *annual* subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.