

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 24. No. 12.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 20, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

COMMUNISTS IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

Text of Lord Vansittart's House of Lords Speech (*House of Lords, March 29*).

(Continued)

Looking at the matter in another way. There is disquieting information about the state of the public services. There is no reason on earth why all that information should not also be in the possession of our own authorities. Some of it may be, but undoubtedly some of it is not; and that is simply because there is neither time, men nor money to investigate the whole of that vast field. I myself have been more favourably placed, and I say this is no spirit of blame whatever—rather would I help our own authorities to similar possibilities. But before I leave this subject, I must again say that, if the Government want the best—and believe me, my Lords, they are going to need it—they cannot have it if this unpatriotic publicity continues. On the very day the Fuchs case broke, all sorts of “know-alls” rushed into print with criticism and nostrums. I do not wish to be personal where so many offended, but I noticed in one Sunday paper an article which said that M.I.5 had been a laughing stock, and then went on to recommend something which was beside the point. That, I regret to say, was by one of the supporters of their Lordships of the Left. We cannot have that sort of thing if we want a good service, because men in such a service neither can nor should defend themselves. We want silence over this sort of thing in the future, and I hope what has happened in the last few weeks will never be repeated.

Other branches of our military intelligence have perhaps been rather more legitimately open to criticism—and here I can be a little more indiscreet, because a great deal of publicity has been given to an instance by the Belgrade radio, which put out a story about four British Communists who had been in our Intelligence Corps in Cairo and had gone to Yugoslavia on various missions. According to Belgrade, their names were Major Peter Wright, Major James Klugman, Mrs. Betty Wallace and a Mr. Kenneth Syers. Major Peter Wright appears to have been a military attaché in Belgrade until the end of 1947—please note the date. I have not bothered to inquire much about the activities of Mrs. Betty Wallace, but I can tell your Lordships definitely that she is a member of the Communist Party headquarters here, and this headquarters rather indiscreetly let it out last month that she was “on a job in France,” as they put it—presumably connected with strikes. The last that I heard of Major Klugman was that he was an enthusiastic electioneering agent for Mrs. Pollitt. He has an editorial job on a Communist “rag” called *World News and Views*. That is a pretty bunch to have in our missions abroad!

I come now to the daisy of the bunch, Kenneth Syers. Mr. Syers, in the early stages of the war, was Secretary of the Oxford Regional Committee for the Edu-

cation of His Majesty's Forces. Curiously enough, I heard some complaints that they were getting only Communist stuff and Communist lecturers. I was not surprised; I thought that other people might have shared that view. From there he went to Cairo, and from Cairo he went to Yugoslavia. Now he is a pamphlet writer for the Bureau of Current Affairs at No. 117, Piccadilly. As late as April, 1949—again, please note the date—this Mr. Syers wrote a pamphlet, which was published by the Bureau, on Eastern Europe. I went through the stuff—I waded through an awful lot of muck every week—and this really was an extraordinary compound of ignorance and mendacity.

As I told your Lordships, I never speak “without my book.” Let me give you an example of what has been served up. On page 9 of the pamphlet you will find Syers explaining what an excellent thing it was for Eastern Europe to have been skinned alive by the Soviets for reparations. That was an excellent thing for them, he said, because it facilitated the restoration of their economy. That is nice stuff to give the troops, is it not? We must remember that all this output is taken as standard material for army education. I find it hard to be tender about this sort of thing. Someone is distinctly to blame. Perhaps the kindest thing I can say is that this country is largely peopled by lotus-eaters who would invite Guy Fawkes to the Carlton Grill: “Not half a bad fellow, my dear chap, and of course he would be much more at home underground.”

I cannot leave this topic without quoting one most typical instance of what I call our “national slop-along.” The offices of the Festival of Britain have been used for the dissemination of a pamphlet by a gentleman who calls himself Jiri Hronek. As your Lordships are aware, I have rather specialised in Communist aliases, and I need hardly tell you that his name is not Hronek but Langstein. He is a Viennese-born Jew who came to this country to escape Hitler, and who has rewarded our hospitality with most violent and vehement Anglophobia. He is one of our worst enemies. I can find no word to say in extenuation of Mr. Langstein. It seems to me a little odd that the offices of the Festival of Britain should be used for the popularisation of the works of this gentleman. I know that it is an accident, I do not for a moment believe that there is anything sinister in it—I call it just darned silly. I say that this is a typical small instance of the point which I have been trying to make during my speech so far, that what this country needs is a good shake-up. And if it cannot take that, it must take the consequences—and they will be bitter.

At last, I come to the public service. I have not time to deal with such matters as Communist penetration into the dockers' unions or the British Legion. I want to get on

to my own stamping ground, the public service, in which I have spent the greater part of my life and to which I am still profoundly attached. I have retained as many contacts as possible. I am still President of the Civil Service Society of Authors and, I hope not inappropriately, President of the Civil Service Boxing Association. I take the greatest interest in all the activities of my colleagues, for such I still consider them to be. Above all, I have a deep and warm sympathy for that great body of loyal public servants who for long have been fighting against Communist infiltration, as I believe, without adequate support and encouragement. I hope that today this House will give them the praise which they deserve, because they have deserved well of the nation.

I am perturbed at what is going on in the public service. I have avoided using the word "alarm" at this stage because I must tell your Lordships, with my usual frankness, that there are only 2 per cent. of Communists in the public service. But we always come back to the point that they have much more than their share of influence. Infiltration has been going on for some time. It has two purposes. The first is probably well known, and it is obvious; it is the collection of information, which is then passed on to Communist headquarters whence, if deemed worth while, it is sent to their alien masters. The second purpose has escaped the attention of both the public and the Press, and even, possibly, of His Majesty's Government. It is to ensure the smooth running of the Civil Service in the event of a coup or, to use Communist jargon, "the transfer of power." Your Lordships may all think that that is exceedingly optimistic. So do I. But we must understand the working of the Communist mind if we are to tackle this question at all. Our own Press is often filled with speculations as to what would happen if the Russians made a drive to the coast on the Continent, and this country were then subjected to bombardment, the dropping of parachutists and so on with the result that chaos was created. It does not seem to them quite so mad to prepare for a possible transfer of power just on the off chance. Members of the first category I mentioned just now seek to get into key Departments like Defence and Supply. Their main purpose, as I have said, is espionage, and when an agent is a member of a civil service trade union under Communist control there is clearly an open channel to any Soviet authority. The second category keep under cover. Their instructions are to learn as much as possible about the working of the Department, to inspire confidence and so to be ready if opportunity knocks. Put more crudely, their job is to find as many "mugs" as possible (to use Mr. Morrison's word) who will say: "Cryptos are not half bad fellows."

Before 1941, Communism in the public service was kept out of sight. Hardly any members of the service were allowed to take out Party cards, but cells were formed and cell leaders were appointed in liaison with organisers who co-operated with them and kept contact with Communist Party headquarters. There were usually six to eight members in each cell; at least one in each department. False names were used—I suppose it added a little to the excitement—and members were educated in accordance with a syllabus issued from Communist Party headquarters. Briefly, Communism in the public service followed the pattern of Communist secret societies, whose members observe and report on each other. After 1941 some more

active members were allowed to come into the open, but the majority still stayed under cover and, of course, after the outbreak of the cold war there was a natural trend back to the ban on open membership. But members were enjoined to seek promotion, to "muscle in" on good positions in secretariat, welfare, training and general establishment, and to keep open the door for others. Moreover, there was formed a body of so-called watchers, ostensibly unconnected with the Communist Party but reporting indirectly and regularly. And so infiltration increased.

I am going to give the House a concrete example in the Department of Inland Revenue. This is all the more remarkable because the Inland Revenue Staff Federation has had excellent representatives, Mr. Douglas Houghton and Mr. Callaghan, both Members of Parliament—but accidents can happen in the best regulated families. I have full particulars of sixteen Communists and 100 per cent. fellow travellers who have got themselves into good jobs in the Department of Inland Revenue. Again I am not talking from gossip or hearsay. In some cases I have actually seen the Communist Party membership cards, and to avoid argument or any nonsense of that kind, I have taken the suave precaution of retaining photostatic copies. In other cases I have full evidence of 100 per cent. collaboration. What they really have done is to form a chain between the junior and the senior appointments, and they begin to nourish hope of being able to exercise some influence on departmental policy. You may say that that is optimism; very possibly it is, although I am not entirely sure in this case; or again you may say that sixteen in a large department is a small number. Yes, I agree again; but we always come back to that cliché about influence and numbers. I am not starting any hare or scare; I am just telling you of the things I know. The point I am trying to drive home to the House and the country is that the infiltration is not only reaching, but has actually reached, a point where it no longer can be treated with inattention.

Other Departments are also affected, though to be frank with the House, I find the figures and names in my possession are on a smaller, and sometimes on a very considerably smaller, scale. Nevertheless, the taint is there. There is a touch in the Admiralty, more in the War Office, and other Departments affected are Food, Education, and Health. I venture to suggest that the Government, of its own initiative and responsibility, should undertake an investigation into the state of affairs in these various Departments, an investigation which I will do nothing to prejudice. But if our authorities should ever find themselves short of material or unable to conduct the investigation to their satisfaction, I am equipped to furnish certain indications which would enable the inquiry to be conducted efficaciously. Meanwhile, the House will have noticed that I have scrupulously forbore reading out a string of names, partly because some of you might not have thought that fair at this stage and still more because it would not have been fair to the public, for that is the last way in which any inquiry should be prefaced. Nothing could be more harmful. So much for details.

I come now to the general picture, which is slightly more alarming. Before I go any further I should like to say that nothing of what I have said or am about to say has any applicability at all to the Ministry of Labour Staff

Association, whose Secretary, the noble Lord, Lord Crook, is a member of this House. Here is a happy exception, on which I should like to congratulate the noble Lord. The same remarks apply to the Post Office unions, which have generally conducted their affairs with virility and common sense and awareness of the danger of Communist infiltration. If all associations were in such good shape I might have been able to speak less seriously to-day. I take some pride in paying these compliments, partly because they are deserved and partly because I want the House to feel that I am trying hard to be entirely fair throughout.

Now for the darker side. The staff side of the National Whitley Council comprises 550,000 civil servants in fifteen organisations. In three of these organisations the Communist technique of infiltration into full-time negotiating posts has been highly successful, and it is in these posts that information is most easily obtained.

I will say a word briefly about each. In the Civil Service Union the direction is fairly solidly on Communist Party lines. In the Institution of Professional Civil Servants the Secretary-General is a man called Mayne, who is widely and firmly reputed in the public service to be the real leader of the Communist group. I can only say that in this union the position is quite unsatisfactory. The same remark applies to the Civil Service Clerical Association, the largest of the Associations, with 150,000 members. Its General Secretary is probably known to your Lordships. He is Mr. L. C. White, who is actually on the editorial board of the *Daily Worker*. Nothing could be more unsatisfactory than that. Mr. White has behind him seven full-time officers who are entirely on the Party line. These men do the negotiations with other Ministries, including the Defence Ministries. It is not only the associations who cater for the lower grades which are affected; even the association representing the administrative class has a touch of it. The whole field of Civil Service trade unions as regards headquarters officers at negotiating-level has twenty-one Communists or virtually 100 per cent. fellow travellers.

Only forty-five Communists have been affected by the so-called "purge." I hope your Lordships will never use that misnomer. It is nothing of the sort; it is an extremely mild measure which one might call a small security transfer. It was well intended when it started, but in my judgment and in the judgment of many others it is no longer adequate to the situation. If I may offer a word of friendly advice to the Government, I would say that they should drop it in its present form and instead we should take certain selected Departments for screening throughout—and the operative word is "throughout"—and all Communists or suspected Communists should be relegated to non-screened Departments. In every borderline case the British public must have the benefit of the doubt, because all Communists and fellow travellers are really enemy agents. The non-screened Departments should set up active security units until their turn has come for screening. That is a rock bottom minimum. I hope our authorities will display some diligence in investigating a matter which is not only potential-ly but actually dangerous.

My own feelings are 100 per cent. with the main body of loyalists throughout who have already proclaimed their faith. They have said and written that

"Communists have no place in the British Civil Service

and we say to them 'Get Out!'"

I am in sympathy with that. After all, as I have already said, there are many other ways in which Communists can earn a livelihood. But in the acuity of a cold war, which may at any moment burst into a hot one, it does seem folly to maintain enemy agents in our inner fortress. A few weeks ago General Billotte, who speaks with authority on these matters, warned us that we have only two years in which we can count on security. I think in some ways even that is optimistic, because no wise man would guarantee any fixed period at all. I certainly should not.

In 1933 I calculated that peace could not be guaranteed after the beginning of 1938—that is, five years. For 1933 to 1938 read 1945 to 1950—five years again. We have had them. We are very much in the same position as in 1938. We have before us a short period in which we can make ourselves sufficiently formidable to be a deterrent. But progress is slow, and the danger great and imminent. But, there is one thing that we can do quickly, and that is to recover the sense of self-preservation—I wonder how often before in my life I have used that phrase. That instinct will surely tell us that the first thing to do is to set our own house in order against the day of evil. I hope I have said enough to show that action is imperative.

I wish to make one other constructive suggestion. The Western Allies should get together and form a Joint Department of Psychological Warfare as an integral part of Western defence. It should be put under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and none but the best candidates should apply. I am asking for nothing impossible. I expect no miracles, no legions of angels conjured from the clouds. I ask simply that we should do our plain and inescapable duty to the British people.

(Conclusion of Lord Vansittart's speech)

"A Hook in Leviathan"

Reviewing *A Hook in Leviathan*, by Bradley D. Nash and Cornelius Lynde, J. M. Lalley says, in *Human Events*:—

"It has many times been remarked that no business corporation could survive a year if it were to adopt the administrative methods and practices of the Government of the United States. It is now a question how much longer the Government itself can survive with them. As the complexity of modern society increases and the areas of the power of the State are extended, the ineptitude and wastefulness of the present bureaucratic establishment grows more evident and alarming; so that, remembering the analogy of the Roman Republic, and observing the experiences of contemporary nations, we may reasonably wonder whether any vast modern State can be efficiently managed upon any other principle than dictatorship. The conclusion of our authors appears to be that without a radical reorganisation of the Executive departments and agencies, Constitutional government in the United States could not outlast another great economic or military crisis."

For correct information concerning the Constitution of
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for
the Statement published in July, 1949, (postage 1d.)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

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. 24. No. 12.

Saturday, May 20, 1950

From Week to Week

ITEM. The "B".B.C. referred to Social Credit in its News Bulletin. Occasion, the Vote of the Canadian "Social Credit Party" with the C.C.F. (Socialist) Party against the Progressive Conservative Party, on a Motion by the latter to outlaw Communism. Both the "Social Credit Party" and the Socialist were strongly in favour of *Not* being beastly to the Communists. The Dean of Canterbury has left for Canada.

The Pilgrims, the Society of International Bankers masquerading as an Anglo-American Pacifist Club, entertained Mr. Dean Acheson to dinner while speeches symptomatic of I.B.'s masquerading at A.A.P.'s were delivered by various employees of I.B.'s masquerading as Prime Ministers and State Department Secretaries.

The cooking was excellent, and a good time was had by all.

Some time ago the American Edition of the *Readers Digest* (the article did not appear in the English Edition) published an excellent enquiry into the question of competitive industry in "Britain." The general conclusion of the writer was that British business always thought in terms of price rings, labour rings, and restrictive market practices rather than price and quality competition, and that it is almost wholeheartedly in favour of some system of controls, such as the Socialist Welfare State has continued under the cover of "war, or threat of war." We agree.

Not to put too fine a point on it, "British" business is rotten to the core. Since the Mond-Turner Conferences of 1927, which crystallised the corruption already widespread, business policy has not been (as it was cleverly presented) a struggle between "Labour" and "Capital," but a conspiracy between Trades Union leaders and cartels to fleece the public and ruin Great Britain. It may not be obvious at first sight, but there is a direct connection between the rage of certain interests at Lord Vansittart's exposé, and this situation. The line runs somewhat:

In the late nineteenth century, Sir Ernest Cassell was the policy-partner (he may have been the business partner) of Jacob Schiff. Schiff subscribed millions in gold to bring down Imperial Russia, prevent Russia from defeating Germany, and set up a monopolistic collectivist State on the ruins of the Czarist regime.

The colossally valuable "concession" to rebuild Russia was almost entirely held by the Harrimans, close affiliates of Schiff.

In the early twenties of this century, British Government Departments were infested with individuals whose main purpose was to facilitate the influx of Russian goods produced by slave labour, to be sold at current market prices by Russian Jews in this country. Through these channels, and in close co-operation with the Mond-Turner activities, the P.E.P. propaganda (really, a policy already imposed on the curiously supine British, and merely "propagandised" as a public relations device) was substituted for such "private enterprise" as remained after Montagu Norman (Otto Kahn, etc.) had done with it.

Broadly speaking, P.E.P., The London School of Economics, and Kuhn Loeb and Co., are the framework of the Brave New World. Of course there is nothing in this to stop the House of Commons debating whether Mr. Smith shall build a henhouse without a licence.

While sympathising with those correspondents who object to Lord Vansittart's failure to call a spade a b - - - y shovel, we think his attack on "Communism" was soundly conceived.

Apart from the well established principle that you may criticise what a Jew does, but must on no account say that a Jew did it, because that would be anti-Semitism, Lord Vansittart was asking for a decision from a House which contains a high percentage of Jews and crypto-Jews. None of these would wish *directly* to identify themselves with Communism, although they all knew, and the rest of the House knew, that it was Communism by another name which was in question. The event justified the tactic; Lord Vansittart scored all along the line, and the Gentile front lost heavily.

It will be noticed that Lord Rothschild took no part in the Debate.

Lord Samuel's Liberal Party has come out strongly in support of Scottish Home Rule—an additional reason for regarding this proposal *at this time*, with great caution. The so-called Liberal Party has always been an international party, because it is primarily a financial party, and Home Rule for Scotland *at this time*, is simply International Finance Control for Scotland.

The world's ills are in the highest sense political, not administrative, and Scotland is no exception. There is not the slightest chance of deflecting High Policy by administrative gerrymandering such as would be allowed *at the present time*.

REALISTIC CONSTITUTIONALISM

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

by C. H. DOUGLAS

K.R.P. Publications

SIXPENCE (Postage 1d.)

Order the book you need from:—

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., LIVERPOOL.

PARLIAMENT

House of Lords: May 2, 1950.

Parliamentary Privilege

(The Debate continued).

(In the continued account of the House of Lords Debate of May 2 which follows, Lord Vansittart's reply, with the interruptions punctuating it, is the only speech given in full from the Official Report. The later speakers were the Bishop of Bradford, Lord Simon of Wythenshawe, Lord Vansittart, Viscount Addison, Lord Morris, The Marquess of Salisbury, Viscount Mersey, The Archbishop of Canterbury and Viscount Stansgate. Some other Peers intervened.)

The Lord Bishop of Bradford: My Lords, there is nothing that I can add to what the noble Viscount has said with regard to the particular point, that the noble Lord, Lord Vansittart, gave me no previous notice of his intention to include my name in his "Black Record Series, No. 2." But, before we become overwhelmed with "Black Record Series, No. 3" and the indications are that that is going to be overwhelming in its flood—I should like to make a few comments upon the allegations which the noble Lord brought against me and my activities on previous occasions, the allegations which, in his opinion, justified him in putting my effigy into his "Chamber of Horrors."

First of all, with regard to this alphabetical monstrosity, the C.C.M.C.O.—that is, the Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership. This was formed about eight years ago as a direct outcome of two pamphlets, one, if I remember rightly, called *The Case for Common Ownership*, and the second called *It must be Christianity*—two pamphlets written by Sir Richard Acland, who at that time, was a Liberal Member of Parliament. The object of the Society was that we should try to study from the Christian point of view the mischief which was being done or which might be done through the unrestricted dominance of private ownership of property and private profit-making in industry. Now, of course, the noble Lord is not the only one of your Lordships who strongly disapproves of a Society formed for that purpose, but I hope that there would not be many among you who would feel that, because we were a collection of socialistically-minded clergy and ministers, therefore we were a kind of thieves' kitchen over which there presided a Fagin, whilst its secretary was a kind of Bill Sykes. It was a socialistic society.

One thing which none of your Lordships can deny is that Christian Socialism is by no means a new phenomenon in the Church. I need quote only such names as those of Charles Kingsley and F. D. Maurice of about a hundred years ago, and, in a more recent generation, Bishop Gore and Conrad Noel. Nor can your Lordships deny that there is not a little in the New Testament which can be put forward as a justification for Christian Socialism in the application of Christian principles. I have only to quote the *Magificat*, which has been truly described as "infinitely more revolutionary than the *Red Flag*," and the fourth chapter of the Book of the Acts, where we read that the first Christian church at Jerusalem was established on a communist basis and that they "had all things common." Certainly, it seems to me that a Christian Socialist has no reason whatever to be called upon to be apologetic for his views because some people do not like his Socialism any

more than he has because people do not like his Christianity. I was Chairman of the C.C.M.C.O. from the start. The secretary was the Reverend Gilbert Cope who, at that time, was Vicar of Highters Heath, Birmingham. The noble Viscount, Lord Stansgate, has dealt with the fact that he is not a canon and never was. I am quite sure that the noble Lord, Lord Vansittart, did not really intend to canonise him! The chief propaganda which we carried on was by means of pamphlets. I wrote one which was called *The Gospel for Dives*, and Mr. Cope wrote another to which reference has already been made by the mover of this Motion. To that pamphlet, I wrote a foreword commending it as a "lucid and penetrating analysis of the class struggle." I still believe that it was so. On the strength of one phrase, a phrase torn from its context, deprived of any of the qualifications and gravely misinterpreted, the noble Lord characterised Mr. Cope as a "murderous priest," and said that anyone who knows anything about "Canon" Cope must have known that he is a "potential killer." At any rate, the noble Lord, Lord Vansittart, did not know that he was not a canon. To that characterisation I make bold to offer a flat denial. I happen to know Mr. Cope. . . .

I now come to the defence of myself in regard to the C.C.M.C.O. I severed connection with them about three or four years ago, not because of any murderous proclivities of Mr. Cope—because those exist only in the noble Lord's prejudice—nor because of the socialistic tendency of the Society, with which, of course, I was well acquainted from the moment of its inception (indeed, that was the reason why I joined it), but because the Society in its publications was trending towards that typical admiration of Soviet Russia which seems to me the greatest silliness of Left Wing opinion, for I regard Russia as being so poor a specimen of real communism that I should describe it politically as a proletarian oligarchy, and economically as a system of State capitalism. Since I left the Society (I am glad to know that it survived my defection), it has changed its name and has now become the S.S.C.M.—the Society of Socialist Clergy and Ministers. I learned only last week that now its Chairman is the Dean of Canterbury. With the Dean of Canterbury, for some reason best known to himself, the noble Lord has bracketed me. I am afraid that is another instance of what I can only call typical inaccuracy on his part. Although I have a nodding acquaintance with the Dean, I have never at any moment in my life exchanged one single word with him about politics, Communism or Socialist affairs, or anything else which might come under the condemnation of the noble Lord. At the time I was Chairman of the Society the Dean was in no way connected with it; I believe he was not even a member. . . .

Lord Simon of Wythenshawe: My Lords, may I take this opportunity of expressing to you my regret that for the last three years, as Chairman of the B.B.C., I have not been allowed to take part in your deliberations. I am sure you will all agree that the Chairman of such an organisation must keep clear of Party speech, Party votes and Party politics. I am particularly sorry that I was not present when Lord Vansittart raised his Motion, because he referred to the B.B.C. on several occasions, and, I am afraid—although perhaps I am biased—on one or two occasions without giving due care to the things he said. . . .

I can assure your Lordships that the Governors of the

B.B.C. are constantly considering the very difficult problem of Russia, and constantly trying to devise better methods and to improve what we are doing. As one example of the kind of thought we are giving to the matter may I say that we have a General Advisory Council composed of fifty distinguished members of the community, whose Chairman, the noble Earl, Lord Halifax, I am glad to see here to-day? I am interested to see that he is sitting next to the noble Lord, Lord Vansittart. Just over a year ago, on the suggestion of the noble Lord, Lord Piercy, that Council devoted careful consideration to this problem of Communism. We had a full discussion, and no fewer than eight members of your Lordships House were present. At the end, the noble Lord, Lord Piercy, expressed himself as satisfied with the steps which the Governors of the B.B.C. were taking, and I am sure that Lord Halifax will agree that the general feeling of that distinguished assembly was the same as Lord Piercy's—they were satisfied with what the B.B.C. were doing. . . .

Lord Vansittart: My Lords, I have here a mass of material and nothing in front of me on which to rest it. I would, therefore, ask whether I may exercise the privilege—I think that even I have one privilege, as a Privy Councillor—of speaking from the Despatch Box, if the noble Viscount the Leader of the Opposition has no objection—he signifies assent, and I am very grateful.

Since I last had the pleasure of addressing this House, France, Italy, Australia, South Africa, and even Panama, have found the necessity of strengthening their measures against Communism. I cannot help feeling that in the light of the world stage, this particular Motion is not an exhilarating spectacle. On my way here, I seemed to remember a passage from the writings of Dean Swift. I mention it with diffidence because I have not, of course, had the opportunity of subjecting it to sufficient investigation. Speaking from memory the argument, roughly, runs thus. The writer says that in ancient Athens anyone could say what he liked about anyone else, but only generalisations were punishable, whereas, he pointed out, in England you could revile the whole people in any terms you liked, and you would then be thanked as a deliverer of precious and useful truths. But if anyone named anyone as an illustration, well then, of course, he must expect to have challenges sent to him and to be brought before the Bar of the House. I submit that when grave issues necessitate both generalisations and illustrations, this House is a proper forum from which the case should be put to the world.

My speech of March 29 caused great annoyance, not only among Communists and the ordinary run of fellow-travellers but among that particular breed of fellow-traveller who voyages by a train of thought from which the restaurant car is never detached. To distinguish it from the "Blue train," I am calling it the "Red train of thought." It is upholstered with the most comfortable assumptions, and a special line of red herrings are served, of which we have a succulent example before us to-day. In the book of Job it is written:

"My desire is that my adversary had written a book."

My adversary has written one. I think, it is called: "In the side-shows." The noble Viscount seems unable to emerge from them. Many of your Lordships may call to mind the words of the poet, William Cowper:

"He seemed to be, on the whole, a most loving, kissing, kind-hearted gentleman."

Well, the noble Viscount has come out and called me, in the most ostentatious manner, the equivalent of a liar. I shall, of course, retort to that by saying that by so doing he has taken his ticket and labelled himself a fellow passenger of fellow-travellers.

Lord Pethick-Lawrence: Shame.

Lord Vansittart: Some of your Lordships seem to say "No" to what I have just said. Well, one good crack deserves another. As the noble Viscount has attacked me on the widest possible front, I am going to retort on the widest possible front. I am not going to have it thought that I come to this House to make speeches without sufficient care or investigation. I am not in the least angry concerning reports which are continually put out from this Red train of thought. I am not one of those who lose their temper so often that they have to do without it. I know very well what I am doing and why. When I spoke on March 29 I was trying to give the gravest possible warning to this House and to the whole country. I said, in substance: "We are at war; it is not a cold war; in some parts it is a hot war, and it may become hotter; therefore let us put our house in order."

While on that subject may I deal with a point which was raised by the noble Viscount. He charged me with insufficient courtesy towards Mr. Stalin. I presume, therefore, that he was duly polite towards Mr. Hitler. I think that warning was worth retaining, but it has been lost sight of entirely. So we have this Motion. I am glad that it has given me an opportunity of restating my case, perhaps more succinctly, but I am afraid that the Motion is full of rather considerable falsehood. I am going to read what the noble Viscount, Lord Stansgate, said on April 4:

"I beg to mention a question of privilege, of which I have already given notice to the noble Lord. . . ."

I did not receive notice. On the morning of that Tuesday he sent me this little bit of paper. I have counted the words on it. There are seventy-eight. What he actually said on this paper was very different from what he has said in his Motion of 160 words, which is considerably longer. I am making nothing of it, but as the noble Lord is a stickler for form I should have thought he might have given due notice.

Viscount Stansgate: The noble Lord will forgive me, but it is usual to resume one's seat. Does the noble Lord remember that on Monday I telephoned to him and had a conversation in which I said I intended to put down a Motion which, being urgent, must be put down at once; and that I would send him a copy? On Tuesday he received a copy. The noble Lord must have forgotten that. I confess that it is a small point, but I consider him a Parliamentary hand.

Lord Vansittart: Naturally I had not forgotten that conversation, but what the noble Viscount told me he was going to put before the House was different from what he did put before your Lordships. If he calls that playing straight, I do not. Furthermore, the noble Viscount said that he gave me notice and that I expressed my intention of being present if possible. That was also misleading, because in that conversation on Monday to which the noble Viscount referred I told him clearly that it was a million to one I should not be there; and I gave him good and sufficient reason. I told him that I had an official lunch engagement and did not expect to go into lunch until 1-30 and that as I should be a long distance away I could not be at the House

by 2-30. I told him that I could manage Wednesday. The noble Viscount said that would not do for him. I cannot for the life of me see why, because this Motion was put down for a whole month after I spoke.

Viscount Stansgate: These are very silly points, but I should not like anyone to think that I am not sufficiently practical and not sufficiently honourable to do what I thought was right. The moment I conceived this Motion, I telephoned the noble Lord and explained to him that my Motion would be put down next day.

Lord Vansittart: Why?

Viscount Stansgate: Because it was a matter of Privilege, and a matter of Privilege is always urgent. The noble Lord told me that he had a luncheon engagement and that he was reasonably certain he could not be in the House in time. He made it clear that he wanted to be present if he could, and that is the reason why I said what I did: to make it clear that the noble Lord had been anxious to face the challenge. The matter need not be pursued, but if the noble Lord has been misled, he has not been misled by any dishonourable intention on my part—of that he can be sure.

Lord Vansittart: The noble Viscount knew that I should not be here, and I said that I should like to be here if possible. I have been interrupted a number of times, and as the noble Viscount will be speaking twice to my once, I do not propose to give way any more.

The noble Viscount says in his Motion that I made imputations on the conduct of the right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Bradford. That of course is quite untrue. I made no imputations on his conduct at all. I criticised his writings, which is a very different thing. One can make imputations on the conduct of Marlowe, Maupassant, Beaudelaire or of Wilde, or anybody else. But that is a different thing from criticising their conduct. I think, to put it the other way round, it is even possible to comment on the writings of Shakespeare without commenting on his conduct, of which we know very little. I am surprised that the noble Viscount, having treated me in this way, should come forward as a purist and as the apparently unsolicited defender of the right reverend Prelate. As soon as I was told that I should have given notice to the right reverend Prelate, I wrote him the following letter:

"I wish to apologise for not having let you know in advance that I should mention your name in the House of Lords. As I do not speak from notes I was uncertain beforehand how much I would say about the *Magnificat* series. Moreover, I thought anyhow that authorship—of which I have some experience—necessarily exposes all who practise it to criticism without prior notice. I personally should never object to my writings being criticised anywhere and anyhow. I nevertheless sincerely regret that I inadvertently failed to comply with a tradition."

I spoke in all good faith. It is the universal law in literature and letters that anybody can criticise a publication. I have written a good many books and I should like to say to your Lordships present now that any noble Lord is at perfect liberty to say anything about anything I have written at any time, and I shall have no objections whatever.

I think this is the attitude of most authors, and also the attitude of the right reverend Prelate as an author, because in the letter he wrote to me, he said:

"I do not feel in any way aggrieved at your omission to give me notice."

I think that the noble Viscount is suffering from what Talleyrand would have called an excess of zeal. The right

reverend Prelate said he was surprised that I had not taken more care to verify my facts. I shall deal with these facts fully later on, but there is one thing I should mention at once. The right reverend Prelate said in his letter:

"To call me a Communist is so wide of the mark that I cannot even be angry at the charge." Of course, I did nothing of the sort, as I shall show later on.

The noble Viscount says that I attacked people without giving them an opportunity of reply, and without due care and investigation. Let us be a little careful about that, for I notice that on April 19, a member of the noble Viscount's Party in another place said this:

"There is a growing feeling among those brought into contact with the British Museum that the Director has become a law unto himself, and the museum is rapidly becoming one of the worst managed museums in the whole of Europe."

I am glad that a question of Privilege did not arise on that. I should not like to see the time of Parliament wasted on quite such tiddling things. But while I am about it, I may say that I myself have sometimes had rough usage in another place. I remember (though it is a long time ago now) when two members of the noble Viscount's Party "cut loose" on me on account of my views on Germany. One of them said that I should be certified, and the other that I should be jailed. No question of Privilege arose on that. I was quite happy, because I know they are very nice fellows, though they do not know a great deal about Germany. At the same time I should like to think that that cordial invitation to Broadmoor was given without "sufficient investigation" as I have carried on fairly sanely for a number of years since.

I would carry that a little bit farther. I should like the House to imagine that I had become a member of it three years earlier than I actually did in 1938, and that Nazi penetration in this country had been equal to the Communist penetration. Of course, it was nothing like so great, but let us suppose that it had been. Following the terms of this Motion, I should have been inhibited from telling the House and the public anything about it. I will give a concrete example. During that time I had a profound conviction that The Link was not at all an organ for Anglo-German fellowship but for German propaganda, and that some of its members were in German pay. It was proved that I had been right. According to the terms of this Motion, however, it would have been expected that I should sit on that knowledge, to the benefit of our enemies and to the detriment of the British public. The noble Viscount does not seem to me to consider the British public very much. After all, they are among those unable to defend themselves against Communist intrigue and deceit unless people like myself stand up for them.

After all, we are fighting for our lives. The substance of this Motion is that we must not mention names. Was there ever such rubbish? You cannot possibly fight a cold war that way. You cannot possibly make a political omelette without breaking some bad eggs. I am reminded of an episode in my earlier years when I was at a political reception in Paris. Mr. Venizelos had just fallen from power; he came in; he was very sore and aloof. He waved to me. A lady notorious for hunting celebrities said to me: "Who is that?" I had just begun to say: "That is a very famous man," when she said: "I must go and talk to him." When he had shaken her off she came back to me and said: "Whom

did you say that was I was talking to?" I said: "If you had given me time I would have told you it was Mr. Venizelos." She said: "Mr. Venizelos, thank God I did not mention Greece." To such absurdities would the noble Viscount reduce this House. He says that he is jealous of its reputation. So am I. I am jealous that it should be an effective Assembly in the Third World War, which has really been going on for some time. If you follow the real gist of this, I think the noble Viscount is going in the opposite direction. If you listen to him and his friends you would think that, after speaking for over an hour without notes, all I had done was to mention the Pilgrim Trust, instead of the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust—a pure slip of the tongue. Some time ago I had to make a reproach to an employee, and got the unexpected answer: "That is very poultry." I think this Motion is a little "poultry," too.

When those in the Red strain of thought had had enough talking about the Pilgrim Trust they started chanting "witch hunt." I do not know whether it has ever occurred to the noble Viscount that what was wrong with witch hunting was that there were no witches; whereas there are in this country some very dangerous and formidable fifth columnists. But even supposing there had been witches, would it have been unreasonable to say: "Have a good time, witches. Do what you like, and go where you like. Go into business, into law or Parliament. Go to night clubs, and play table tennis. But keep out of broadcasting, teaching and the public service?" I do not think that would have satisfied the noble Viscount and his friends. He would have insisted also that the witches should go into medicine and give us "endemic mulleygrubs." While I am on the subject of witches, I would ask the noble Viscount to re-read G. K. Chesterton's poems, which is a worthy occupation. If the noble Viscount will go far enough back he will find a line:

"They think we're burning witches when we're only burning weeds."

The worst of the offenders of this chorus—and it is a very violent chorus indeed—was *The Tribune*. As in this mass of Billingsgate one particular mendacity stood forth, I will refute it now. I have no wish to add to the *Tribune's* troubles—I believe they are already engaged in one libel action, and I should certainly not wish to make things any worse—but they said that I have been proved wrong about a pamphlet which had been planted on the premises of the Festival of Britain. Here is the pamphlet. It says:

"Newspaper men of the world stop World War 3.—

and, of course, it is the usual sort of Communist "muck," proclaiming that all others are monsters and warmongers except the Soviet Union. But I made it plain that I no more blamed the management of the Festival of Britain for that than I would blame the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris because on Easter Day a Communist disguised as a Dominican got into the pulpit at Notre Dame and shouted: "God is dead." These are the sort of dirty little tricks that Communists think clever. But as the noble Viscount has expended a good deal of energy on this alleged foraging in wastepaper baskets, may I tell him that my friends do not do that—I have no friends who forage in wastepaper baskets. One of them went into the offices and picked this pamphlet up from a pile that was there—that is where it had been planted—and he brought it to me. There it is, and it is no good arguing about it. It is really rather a side issue. Other papers of the same kind have abused me

just as much. I do not think the *New Statesman* is much better, and the *Socialist Leader* is as abusive as *The Tribune*. *Reynolds News* wrote of "Lord Vanwitechunt"—the sort of jibe that I would have made at my prep. school on an off-day.

This leads me to one observation, and I shall make it because I have never encouraged anyone to think that they can hand me out that sort of stuff without getting a good-natured clout in return. All these people pay thin lip-service to the cause of anti-Communism, but if someone like myself says that we ought to do something about it they retire into a side alley and throw stones. In 1907 Sir Cecil Spring Rice, at the time of the first Anglo-Russian Agreement (I was then serving under him in Persia) said this:

"Negotiating with the Russians is like boxing with a bad smell."

I feel rather the same about competing with this sort of thing. But, in view of the comment about "Lord Vanwitechunt," perhaps I may allow myself some further observation. In May, 1948, the noble Viscount, Lord Alexander, said this:

"It is my personal opinion that there is a danger that Communist activities are undermining our own Sunday newspaper."

that is, *Reynolds News*—

"We must keep these things in mind if we are not to lose the liberty we value so much."

I am glad to think that that was said without involving any question of Privilege or libel.

(To be continued)

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

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

Also

Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements	
by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
(Please allow for posting when remitting).	

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