

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 26. No. 13.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 26, 1951.

6d, Weekly.

Farben

"Sulphur is short. Nickel is short. Tungsten is short. Molybdenum is short." That is what the daily paper says. It is not quite accurate, for it should read "kept short." And that, broadly speaking, is the theme of Howard Watson Ambruster's *Treason's Peace*. (Beechurst Press, New York, \$3.75.) The real threat to peace, Ambruster holds, is the monopoly known as I.G. Farben, the huge dye trust with a "cynical disbelief in the existence of social, economic or political morality." Before 1914, the leading German chemical companies were known as the Big Six, but they have since amalgamated into the gigantic Farbenindustrie. The Big Six spread their influence by the bribery of boss dyers, but Farben has advanced by much more sensational corruptions. By 1918, chemistry had become the keystone of modern warfare, and the big chemists survived the war all right. In 1925-26, "Farben . . . became the largest corporate structure in the world's chemical industry."

But American industrialists were not unfriendly: Du Pont, for instance, had various agreements with Farben, on Nylon for instance, and the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey was closely implicated, he says. As a result of these and similar agreements, "the magnesium production in U.S.A. was restricted. . . ." There was "almost complete abandonment of anti-trust law enforcement." Dr. Schmitz ("perhaps the most dangerous of Germany's living war criminals") became chairman of Farben in 1938, and was a director of the Deutsche Reichsbank and of the Bank of International Settlements. He travelled frequently to America, and created "the Swiss I.G. Chemie as a hide-out for Farben false fronts abroad." But American suspicions were soon taken in hand, if they arose, by such as John Foster Dulles, of the Wall Street law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell.

Mr. Ambruster, himself a chemical engineer and consultant, appears to have spent a great deal of his time in attempts to check the growth of Farben. Farben soon "tied in to an indissoluble union with the Hugo Stinnes and Fritz Thyssen steel interests," and these together were "the dominant force behind the scenes of a succession of German governments which finally descended to the gutters of Munich for Hitler's Nazis." We may note that Paul M. Warburg was on the board of directors of American I.G. In 1941, Dr. Dalton complained that Farben's affiliates in U.S.A. were nullifying the British blockade on Germany's export trade. In the same year, William C. Bullitt was elected on the General Aniline Board, but he never served as he was sent abroad by the President on a mission. The U.S. Treasury Department said that Farben "had been plotting the downfall of the free peoples who gave them an opportunity to prosper and grow rich by honest trade."

President Coolidge has been credited with a dislike of

mortgages. But his personal secretary, Clark, appears to have been involved with the Sterling group as vice-president of Drug, Inc. He was "in plain English, a Washington lobbyist." Herbert Hoover "borrowed" Clark in 1932, who became his official secretary. Otto Kahn, Warburg's partner, was made treasurer of the Republican Committee. Mr. Ambruster was, it seems, a Democrat politically, but he has to admit that this party were no less futile in dealing with Farben. Attorney General Biddle and his friend Corcoran apparently watched the foreign interests and the settlement of the Sterling case was said to mark "the lowest point in the history of the Department of Justice since the Harding Administration." For, "As one commentator put it, Tommy Corcoran hung his hat in the Attorney General's office during this period."

Senators King, Moses and Copeland gave Farben a nice welcome home in 1928. The vague Copeland Acts replaced the Wiley Acts, about food, drugs *etc.*, in 1938. This led to a patent medicine boom, and—as a sideline—to seventeen deaths from Sulfathiazole. Our author accepts Dr. Harry E. Barnes's suggestion that "either he should be prosecuted for criminal libel, or those whom he denounces should be relentlessly exposed and properly punished." Ambruster next turns to the lying advertisements of home remedies, such as ". . . . does not harm the heart." The medicine men also did a lot of espionage and put across considerable propaganda in South America, and were successful in the kind of sabotage which effectively restricted supplies. Secretary Hull seems to have done little about it all, at the State Department.

Mr. Ambruster had great difficulty in collecting allies. The "Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League" boycotted imports of Farben products. Wallace, as Vice-President, fought "with Jesse Jones on the quinine shortage and with Leo Crowley on the Atabrine shortage." Baruch's brother lent Ambruster his broadcasting station, and the Honourable Bernard M. Baruch himself said that Farben and Germany's war-making potential "must be eliminated; many of her plants shifted east and west to friendly countries; all other heavy industry destroyed." Judge Davis and Representative Jerry Voorhis demanded investigations. At least, the judge "proposed to do something about it." Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes charged that the patent-medicine and cosmetics industries, "through their advertising agencies, had directed the newspapers to kill the original Tugwell Food and Drug Bill." Truman, while a Senator, accused Standard of retarding the development of synthetic rubber in America because of its "tie-ups with Farben." But what little effort was made to enforce the anti-trust laws was not only "belated," but revealed an "utter lack of appropriate punishment." In the House of Lords, "Lord McGowan and Lord Melchett, another I.C.I. director, shouted defiance at the U.S. Department of Justice regarding the numerous instances in which I.C.I. was accused

with Du Pont of tie-ups with Farben." A cartel civil complaint on January 6, 1944, alleged that "a gigantic Anglo-American pool had been formed of the most important chemical products for peace and for war . . . with other lines stretching out from I.C.I. or Du Pont to Farben."

But the chemical interests were in good hands. Leo T. Crowley, Alien Property Custodian, had been chairman of Standard Gas in 1939 and was on the payroll of the J. Henry Schroder bank. And James Gerard, ambassador to Germany in the First War, declared: "some of us who are thinking over what is to happen after the war are contemplating universal cartels. . . ." Justice Jackson and the Morgenthau plan temporarily raised Ambruster's hopes, but he concludes, "I. G. Farben, unlike the governments and armies of Germany, never surrenders and never dies. Win, lose or draw, the pattern of Farben goes on." He alleges further that "the conspiracy to save the Farben war criminals from punishment, to revive the Farben structure, and to renew the Farben carry-over tie-ups, here and elsewhere, is proceeding on schedule." The pattern of Farben, he says, is "always to divide and conquer, and . . . very definitely traces its slimy threads into the sabotage of the eradication of I. G. Farben's war potential by the same influences inside the Government at Washington which have been pressing our foreign policies and our stand in the United Nations away from a possible rapprochement with Russia."

The book does not get quite to the bottom, and certainly does not come up to such a masterpiece as *The Brief for the Prosecution*, which is five times shorter. But its detailed information is of value. It only goes to show that *plus ça change, plus c'est le même chose*. Under all the disguises is the same old serpent. These types, incidentally, claim the moral leadership of the globe.

H. SWABEY.

The Irish Health Service

The following opens the correspondence column of *The Tablet* for May 12:—

"DEAR SIR,—Your article on the objections of the Irish Hierarchy to the compulsory Health Scheme for Ireland, and the correspondence which has ensued extending the discussion to the sphere of education, has clearly illustrated the principle behind the objections that your correspondent Mr. Phelan finds difficult to understand.

"The principle of 'universal taxation for universal education' is not necessarily a right one, because it is seldom questioned. It is certainly not a justification for extending the principle to every other 'social service.' Its extension in fact makes a challenge necessary, where on a smaller scale it could have been overlooked. The challenge has the advantage of being based on a knowledge of the effects the application of this principle has had.

"In the matter of schooling, for example, it has meant that the parents who are prepared to spend their money in buying the particular education they want for their children have had to pay for that education twice over. It is a common fallacy that those who spend their money this way are more wealthy than those who don't. Since technical training, the preparation for a job, was the only level on which rival denominations could meet in state education, the whole conception of education has been reduced to that level,

and it has been on the materialist criteria of 'equipment' that the fights for independent schools have been generally viewed. The third factor, the power question, lies in the conferring of powers in new spheres, not always temporal, on the temporal government, and making it even more lucrative to the man attracted by this sort of power and, therefore, less capable of fulfilling its proper function of government.

"The Health Service and new plans for legal aid in this country each in their own way, involve a transfer of power away from the individual to a central body (whether state-run or not), in making the salaries of doctors and lawyers less dependent on payments made by individuals than on third parties whose interests are not always the same. Even if teeth and spectacles are half paid for by the recipients directly, the state still effectively controls who shall receive incomes from those payments. The transfer of power is usually obscured by the reservation of long-standing personal relations with the professions on the old basis, which may last as long as the persons, but not very much longer.

"The one common point at issue in all these services, and projected services, is the right to 'Contract Out' without financial penalty for contracting out. In the educational sphere, for example, if parents who did not send their children to state schools did not pay in taxation towards the 'State Educational Service' the chances are that the money they would have to spend on education of their own choice would soon cancel out the claims that state schools have 'better equipment' than independent schools. In the matter of State Insurance, this right was claimed by 7,000 people in 1947, in a 'Petition for the Right to Contract Out.' As with Education, Medicine and Law, it is the transfer of power which is the important issue, and which is overlooked in all popular discussions of it. The individual's power to save and provide the benefits for himself is reduced, and as a result he is often forced to accept those provided by the state. He is made unnecessarily dependent on the temporal government in being forced to contribute, whether in taxation or in a 'special scheme,' in that he is making a contract with a party which can change the terms of its agreement at will, and that he has to accept the benefits under whatever terms the government chooses.

"The Medical Policy Association, in qualifying its opposition to the National Health Service, pointed out that if greater medical facilities existed than could be paid for by the public, the means of payment should be made available to the public AS INDIVIDUALS.... The same can be said of all other social services and, conversely, if the facilities do not exist, then schemes which claim to provide them at the cost of individual independence, are swindles.

"Under the present electoral system, majorities are manipulated to consent to this widespread transfer of power to a temporal government, either in the belief that the benefits they will receive have been created by the government (in which case they could be distributed otherwise, as I have indicated above), or that they have a right as a majority to confiscate what they wish in taxation from a minority, in order to provide themselves with the benefits. The latter belief has resulted in a system of bribery, fostered by the secret ballot, and more extensive than the local

briberies it was designed to end. The only suggestion recently put forward which deals effectively with this majority bribery, and guarantees the right to Contract Out of all such purely functual schemes in the National Life, postulates the abolition of the secret ballot, and the substitution of an open-recorded vote. All increases in taxation to pay for such schemes would be paid by those voting for the successful party. Savings for efficient administration would be paid 75 per cent. to the victorious voters during their party's office. This suggestion is important to anyone who looks beyond the material benefits given by governments to the questions of power and morality.

"Yours faithfully,

"St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. DRYDEN GILLING SMITH."

PARLIAMENT

We regret that a breakdown in transmission has prevented the appearance, under this heading, of the extracts usually forthcoming from the Official Report which have long been a regular feature of THE SOCIAL CREDITER. We hope that the curiosity of the choice of material to replace them at short notice, if nothing else does, may excuse the substitution.

HOUSE OF LORDS: Wednesday, May 9, 1951.

The Coronation Stone

Lord Brabazon of Tara rose to call attention to the historical associations of the Coronation Stone, to make a suggestion as to its disposal; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: I hope your Lordships will forgive me if, in these days of the dangerous present and of the forbidding future, I delay the House for a few moments in speaking about the past. To-day I have the privilege of being able to speak about a curious object—a stone; a stone of a strange shape, twenty-six inches by sixteen inches by ten-and-a-half inches; not a very valuable stone, made of what is called calcareous sandstone, to be found in most places in the world. It is the Stone of Destiny. Anybody might say at once, "Why speak about a stone because it is old? Are not all stones old?" Of course, that is true. But this one is so wrapped up with history and ceremonial and prophecy that it stands alone as something unique in the world.

Scientists tell us that our earth has been existing for 2,000,000,000 years. What is interesting is how short a time in our history there has been any real record of that history. If we go back more than 2,000 or 3,000 years, we cannot get anything reliable about the history of man. I know that in these times it is very fashionable to decry any old documents or any legends of the past, and even the Bible is looked upon as something quite imaginary. It is so easy to decry the evidences of the past. But I take my stand by the author of a book called *Thoughts and Adventures*. In that book there is an essay on Moses. The author of the book, oddly enough, is Mr. Winston Churchill. I should like to quote some words from his essay on Moses. They are as follows:

"We believe that the most scientific view, the most up-to-date and rationalistic conception, will find its fullest satisfaction in taking the Bible story literally. . . . We may be sure that all these things happened just as they were set down according to the Holy Writ. We may believe that they happened to people not very different from ourselves, and that the impressions those people received were faithfully recorded, and have been transmitted across

the centuries with far more accuracy than many of the telegraphed accounts we read of the goings-on of to-day. . . . Let the men of science and of learning expand their knowledge and probe with their researches every detail of the records which have been preserved to us from these dim ages. All they will do is to fortify the grand simplicity and essential accuracy of the recorded truths which have lighted so far the pilgrimage of man."

Of course, that is in reference to the Bible. Just as we must pay our respects to what is in the Bible, there are other records which we must not entirely despise, or think imaginary.

All dates before Christ are very difficult to determine. The calendar was very odd, and the Bible is no great help on dates. But, so far as I can imagine, it must have been about 1900 B.C.—nearly 4,000 years ago—that Jacob, afterwards to be called Isaac, had his great dream. He had this Stone as the pillow upon which he slept when he had the dream; and in the dream he received from Jehovah a promise that his descendants would be a great people and populate the whole world, and that all the nations of the world would thereby be blessed. Jacob was so impressed that he turned the Stone on end and anointed it, saying: "This Stone which I have set up for a pillow shall be God's House." And that Stone became for them an enduring witness of the great divine promise, and on his deathbed Jacob instructed Joseph to guard it well.

That Stone was looked upon as sacred by the Israelites, and was their greatest possession. Through all the wilderness and the wanderings it was taken with them. You can see on it to-day how it has been worn by the many journeys that it took on those days. At long last it found its true home in Jerusalem, in the Temple, alongside the Ark of the Covenant. Those two things were to the Israelites the two most sacred things in the world. All the Kings of the Royal House of David were crowned upon the Stone, until we come to the last King of Judea, Hezekiah. Hezekiah's history concerns us a little—for this reason. He conspired with the Egyptians to overcome Nebuchadnezzar. They were defeated, and Hezekiah was brought up before Nebuchadnezzar; both his sons were killed before him, and he had his eyes put out. That was meant to be the end of the Royal House of David. Well, Jeremiah, a prophet of those days, had always prophesied disaster for Judea if the policy of Hezekiah was continued.

It is very odd that, when one looks in the Bible and sees a catalogue of the remarkable things that were taken from the Temple and Jerusalem, there is no mention of what must have been the most valuable thing of all—namely, the Ark of the Covenant. I can quite see that Nebuchadnezzar, not knowing the history, did not think the Stone valuable; but he must have thought that the Ark of the Covenant was valuable. The Ark of the Covenant disappeared. It was obviously taken by somebody who had, first of all, a privileged position, such as Jeremiah had, and was hidden away. Whether it is hidden to-day in Palestine, or whether he took it with him and it is buried to-day on the hill of Tara, nobody knows. But it was certainly taken by Jeremiah, who also took the Stone. He left Palestine and went into Egypt, and he took with him the two daughters of Hezekiah, Tamar and Scota—and this is a most important point. Jeremiah dwelt in Egypt for some time, and then there is evidence to show that he went as far west as he could, and stopped on the way in Spain, where the younger daughter, Scota, was married. But he ended

(Continued on page 5).

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. 26. No. 13.

Saturday, May 26, 1951.

From Week to Week

"... Mr. Churchill said another foolish blunder was made when an American Admiral was given supreme command of the Atlantic—'although the bringing in of convoys to Europe and the feeding of this island can only be dealt with, as it was successfully dealt with from this side of the ocean and from this island with all its knowledge and experience during two world wars.

"While the public outcry was going on about this, the Government have been seeking to gain the supreme command in the Mediterranean to offset what they had given away in the Atlantic, but it would be to our interest that the United States should command in the Mediterranean.

"The best arrangement would, I am sure, be to have the passage of the convoys and of the trade across the Atlantic arranged as it was in the war and to welcome the Americans, with their powerful fleets of aircraft-carriers, in the Mediterranean as the leading allied Power there. . . ."

For our part, we think it no less than ominous that all reference to these remarks of Mr. Churchill's in his speech to the Scottish Unionists at Glasgow was omitted from at least the edition of *The Times* which we receive. If also it is true that even while he was speaking "the United States . . . have decided to abandon the plan to appoint an American admiral as Supreme Commander of the Allied Naval Forces in the North Atlantic," a piece of news also not found in *The Times* for Saturday, May 19, interest in the forthcoming visit of this statesman to America is intensified.

Is 'the fish-pond' (to call the Atlantic by an old-standing diminutive of American invention) to be by-passed to establish the Wall-Street—Tel-Aviv Axis? Once-Great Britain has, perhaps, 'no place to go' now she has had India taken from her, so she won't want the Mediterranean to go there. What does a global military power centred in the United States want with it? Is she going to do some fighting, or is she going to stop some fighting so that oil and Dead Sea Fruit can be transported safely to a predetermined quarter without interference? Bernard Baruch apart, which side is Mr. Churchill on?

A correspondent asks us, rather 'pointedly,' whether we have seen this from a quite recent edition of the Paris Edition of the *New York Herald-Tribune*:—

MacArthur or Marshall?

The world need not wait—

Impartial or partial
 The end of debate
 To know which "Five-Star" shall
 Our path indicate.

The slogan "Open strategy openly arrived at" introduces the jingle.

• • •

Following upon the recent article by Mr. Martin Lindsay, M.P., advocating secret voting by Members in Parliament, the political correspondent of the *Liverpool Daily Post*, announcing the tabling of a Motion for discussion in the House of Commons, says it has "deep significance" and "cuts at the roots of the two-party system round which modern British politics revolve." The comment, a column long, is cautious in tone, the sole positive opinion which receives uncontradicted emphasis being that secret voting by M.P.s would "leave a government too weak to do their job."

If even the present collection of hand-picked 'representatives' were released from fear of elimination from political life, no government could stand—that, of course, is only another way of putting the argument.

Mr. Silverman, it appears, has jumped into the breach with an amendment which approves the publication of division lists—"in the electors' interest": (evidently the M.P.s, the Silvermans, are the villains of the piece, for both the all-powerful Cabinet and the all-powerful People must keep their eyes on them! What fantastic nonsense politicians would have us think they think).

Anyhow, the Secret Ballot for M.P.s is out for an airing. The next thing is the open ballot for electors, with responsibility attached to each vote.

• • •

The Rev. Hugh Ross Williamson, in an address, said: "If we take such public action as will lead the non-Christian spectator to suppose that 'we all believe the same thing,' then we are acting a lie."

The rank and file of Non-conformists understood the issue better than many Churchmen. The almost unanimous Nonconformist repudiation of the Archbishop of Canterbury's overtures to them was a token of this.

"Whether or not the united rally is in accord with a resolution of Convocation, passed in 1943 and framed for the exigencies of a nation at war, is both debatable and irrelevant. What is certain is that it is a display, in circumstances which will gain it world-wide publicity, of the trend towards inter-denominationalism, which we have already seen at work in the invitation of those who are not members of the Church of England, to preach in St. Paul's Cathedral itself, in the use of a church—St. John's, Waterloo Road—which was once a famous centre of the faith in London, by bodies whose very existence is founded on a denial of that faith, and in the gradual usurpation by the British Council of Churches of functions which properly belong to the Church of England."

"Jointly and severally," Mr. Hugh Ross Williamson and Mr. Hannah must be giving the Archbishop a headache.

Order the book you need from:—

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

PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from page 3)

up in Ireland with the elder daughter, Tamar, and she was married to the King of Ireland of the day.

It is interesting to notice in Irish records how Jeremiah was proclaimed on arrival as the great prophet, known in Irish language as *Ollam Fodla*; and wrapped up with the great prophet are all the stories and legends: the "Stone wonderful" as it was referred to—"lia fail." As I have said, Princess Tamar married the King of Ireland. The King's name was Hereman, and the date was 600 B.C. All the Kings of Ireland from that date were crowned upon the Stone on Tara Hill for a thousand years, and it was not until later, in the fifth century, that Fergus, who was King of Ireland, moved into Scotland. Whether he conquered it, or just occupied it, I cannot find out, but he became the first King of Argyll. Knowing the value of having the respect and desire to be crowned King of Scotland upon that Stone, he sent for it from Ireland, and brought it from Tara to a place called Dunstaffnage, which was his capital. There he was crowned upon it, and became King Fergus the Great.

So it went on; and in the reign of Conran, in 563 B.C., he, being the third King of Argyll, at the request of St. Colomba, sent the Stone to the island which was then called Hy, and is now known as Iona. St. Colomba took a very prominent part in the early development of Christianity, and the island of Iona is always remembered and held sacred through the activities of St. Colomba in those days. Colomba died with his head upon the Stone. It remained there for 300 years. The Kings of Argyll were crowned on it until we come to MacAlpin, who became King of Scotland in the ninth century. He moved his capital from Perth, and the Stone was taken from Iona to Scone. It was therefore in Scotland for no fewer than 700 years. Finally, we come to what we might call modern days—that is, Edward I, 1296. He took the Stone to London after the Battle of Bannockburn. He should have restored it to Scotland. Whether it was in the Treaty or not is a little difficult to say, but certainly all the other regalia was restored to Scotland, though the Stone remained in England. It was not until James VI became King of England that, so to speak, it found its rightful place.

I want your Lordships to notice that in the Coronation Service no mention is ever made of the King of England: it is always to the King of Great Britain and Ireland. It is of no interest to anybody to be crowned upon this Stone unless whoever is crowned is a descendant of David, and the Kings of Scotland claim to be descended—and rightly, I maintain—from the royal line of the House of David. I draw the attention of those of your Lordships who are interested to the very mystical ceremony of the Coronation, so very analogous to the ancient Israel's coronation. I just want to put those years in their right order: 1,300 years with Israel; 1,000 years at Tara; 900 years in Scotland, and 600 years here. Your Lordships will admit that it is a Stone with a tremendous history.

Now we come to the present day. I do not want noble Lords in this debate to talk about the recent incident of theft and sacrilege. That undoubtedly shocked many people. But when people hold fanatical views their actions can be explained, if not forgiven, and I ask your Lordships this question: If that Stone had remained in Scotland, do you think there would have been a raid by English people to get it back to England? This is a sacred Stone, and it interests us so little that not one Bishop sits upon the Episcopal Benches while we

talk about one of the most sacred parts of our Coronation Service. I am Irish with English blood. I am not in any way connected with Scotland; nor have I anything to do with Scotland. And therefore I can speak entirely independently of what one might call racial prejudice. Of the Scots I have very definite opinions. I look upon them as one of the most remarkable and virile races of the world. They have an intense native patriotism. In their view, Scotland is the only country in the world; and yet, unlike so many other people who indulge in very strong national patriotism, their patriotism does not, as it does so frequently elsewhere, show itself in any war-like hate, which is the danger of tremendous national patriotism. I must say that I find this trait wholly admirable. Sometimes I wish we in England had some of that pride in ourselves in the present, such reverence of our past and such confidence in the future as is possessed by the Scots.

They claim that this Stone was taken from them and that they have a grievance. Of course, one can invent other grievances. If Ireland were a loyal subject to His Majesty, there would be a very strong case indeed for taking the Stone back to Ireland, where it had been for a thousand years. And when we think to-day of the new Israel, struggling bravely to make a new kingdom in the land where such wonderful things happened in the past, they also, if they had a King descended from the Royal House, might make a claim to have the Stone returned to them of right. Anyhow, to-day there is no King of Ireland and there is no King of Judah, so those particular claims do not arise. But were the claim to arise from Israel, I do not think anybody could resist it, because the prophecy is that it should be returned there some day. Some people say: "If you send it to Scotland it will encourage Scottish Nationalism." My Lords, Scottish Nationalism exists to-day, and since when has Scottish Nationalism been anything but a help to Great Britain? It is 500 years since the Scots were in any way anti-British. I take the view that this realm is not England and Scotland, but Great Britain; and I speak with the double claim of having, so to speak, the wish for the Stone to be in England and a wish for it to be in Ireland. After a great deal of consideration I myself take the view—because its connection with Tara is something very dear to me—that it should go back to Scotland to-day. There it would be guarded well. I do not think for one moment that a Coronation Service should take place anywhere but in the Abbey. There can be only one Coronation—in the centre of the Empire. The idea of having two or three Coronations in different countries is absurd, but were the Stone to be in Scotland it could easily be brought up with, I am sure, the consent of all Scotland, to any Coronation, which I hope will be many, many years ahead. I think some arrangement of that sort could be agreed upon.

Some people think that we would be parted from the Stone if it went to Scotland. Why should we be parted from it? It is part of Great Britain, and I say this about Scotland: Are they to be deprived of all the pageantry of their old great Kingdom? Everything has shifted down to London, and nothing much is left with them. This amalgamation with us has meant for them that all the traditions of Kingship and their past have disappeared, and I think that is hard. From the point of view of nationalism, I feel that it would be a gesture to show that it is not a question of England and Scotland, but of Great Britain alone. I hope that noble Lords

who speak in this debate will look upon the matter objectively, and will not relate any decision as to the future of this Stone to any of the immediate past happenings. I feel that that would be a great mistake. I would conclude by asking the Government, in their wisdom, to make a decision upon this point; and I would entreat them, because I am sure it is the right thing to do, to send the Stone and the Chair to a place in Scotland where it will be loved, revered and guarded by His Majesty's most loyal and devoted Northern subjects. I beg to move for Papers.

The Duke of Montrose: My Lords, if I have managed to hear my noble friend Lord Brabazon correctly, I rejoice to think that my views are very much the same as his. We are very fortunate at the present time in having a Union, a United Kingdom, and if there is anything in the word "union" we should be able to discuss this question quietly and calmly. I can quite understand that the English people are anxious to retain any historical relics belonging to their country. The Scottish people are similarly anxious to retain any relics belonging to theirs. I think the greatest disaster would be for any one country to try to make a "corner," or a sort of monopoly, in historical relics. That would be disastrous. We have, as I say, a Union, and we have often found that union means sharing: there cannot be unilateral arrangements on such matters as this; what applies to one country should apply to the other, too.

What is the history of this Stone of Scone, or Stone of Destiny, as it is sometimes called? Very few people really know what its history is. There are large numbers of professors of history at different universities, many writers of history all over the country, and all kinds of experts, self-appointed and otherwise, all wrangling at the present time about the history of the Stone. Some say it was Jacob's pillow; others say it never was. Some people say it was an Irish stone; others say it never was. Some say the Kings of Scotland were crowned upon it; but I have never heard of any king who was crowned on this Stone or, indeed, on any other stone. There is a sort of mist about its past and no one seems to have the correct facts about its history. It is enough to realise that for about 600 years the Stone has been in England. But it is sufficient for us to know that it has come to be looked upon as a sort of palladium that ensures that

"Where'er the Stone of Destiny is found a Scottish race shall reign."

That is the myth that has been associated with it for 600 years. Since there is this Union of the English and the Scottish people, since the English people have kept it for 600 years, why should not we in Scotland keep it for the next 600 years? Union, as I say, means sharing, and I think the Stone should be returned to the North.

As to the exact place for its keeping, I would point out that in England it has, of course, been in the keeping of the Church of England in the National Church of Westminster Abbey. If we had it in Scotland why should it not be in the care of our Scottish National Church, in the same way, its resting place being in Edinburgh? We shall be having a meeting of the Scottish Church Assembly within the next three days. I, as a member of that Assembly, know that the question of the Stone is coming up for discussion almost at once. It will come before what is called the greatest and most important committee in our Assembly, which is the Committee of the Church and

Nation. I cannot, of course, tell your Lordships what their deliverance or decision will be; but I am fairly sure that the Committee of Church and Nation will suggest to the Assembly that they should put forward an offer to take over the custody of the Stone, for keeping in St. Giles's in Edinburgh.

I hope that English people will not brush this matter aside and regard it as of no importance. I would remind your Lordships that the Church Assembly is the representative gathering of the Scottish Church. It is the largest gathering of our churchmen, who hold their religious opinions as firmly as the English people. If English people attempted to brush this matter aside there would be a great deal of trouble. Therefore, I ask all English people to give such an offer as I have suggested, if it comes, the serious, earnest and grave consideration to which it is entitled. I would remind your Lordships that His Majesty's Government is represented in the Assembly by the Lord High Commissioner, who is a Member of your Lordships' House—I am speaking of the noble Viscount, Lord Cunningham of Hyndhope. There are many other important persons on this committee, and they are not likely to put forward anything flippant or jocular. What they suggest will be serious, and should receive careful consideration.

Apart from these considerations, there are some people who say that the Stone is a symbol of the Union, and as such it must be underneath the Coronation Chair. Speaking as a Covenanter—I was the first Covenanter to sign in Edinburgh, and over 2,000,000 people have signed since—I can say that we recognise it to be a symbol. But what a dull symbol it is lying underneath the Chair, year in and year out! Nobody seems to know or care about it. It could be made so much better and so much more real a symbol. I say that this Stone should go back to Scotland. I have no doubt that when a Coronation occurs there would be keepers appointed to bring the Stone down to Westminster and put it under the Chair. Then, just before the Coronation took place, one of the first ceremonies would be that the keepers would go down the aisle of the Abbey in full public view and inspect the Chair, see that it was in order and the Stone in its place, and then return and report to the Earl Marshall that all was in order. This would take its place as a proper function at the Coronation. It would be only a small ceremony, but it would mean a great deal. It would signify the Union of Scotland and England in the crowning of their joint Sovereign, and it would let everyone know that Scotland and England were co-operating in the crowning. That would go a long way to please everybody and to stop all the wrangling that is now going on.

I have only one other comment to make. The question of the Stone has caused a good many things to be said and done which are regrettable and which everybody wishes had never been said or done. But your Lordships must remember that this act was not done by the people of Scotland; it was done by what *The Times* calls the "Scottish Patriots," another body altogether. They are what we call the extremists. There are very few people in Scotland who wish to seek a breaking of the Union; nobody but the extremists want to annul the Union or anything of that sort. We all know that every great political movement, every great Party movement, is bothered with extremists. Extremists are a thorn in their flesh. When I stood for an election, I knew how the Tariff Reformers were thorns in the flesh of poor Mr. Balfour and the Conservative Party generally. The Labour Party to-day have their ex-

tremists, their Communists. They are the thorns in their flesh. And so it was with other Governments. We have had our thorns. They were people who said and did all the things that are so disliked. All I can say is that the sooner we get our differences about this Stone settled, the better, because the longer the wrangling about the Stone goes on, the more harm will be done to all the good feeling that has existed between the English people and the Scottish people until to-day. We must get this matter settled as soon as we can. I cannot see why there should be any difference, if the old saying is right that,

"Where'er the Stone of Destiny is found, a Scottish race shall rule."

We have in our midst a most charming and delightful Heir Presumptive to the Throne, with Scottish blood coursing through her veins. Why go on wrangling about the Stone? We shall be pleased to see this question settled.

Lord Blackford: My Lords, I personally feel deeply grateful to my noble friend Lord Brabazon of Tara for raising this matter to-day. He treated us to a most interesting historic survey. Anything he says is always likely to be most interesting and original, and I thought his speech this afternoon was even more interesting than usual. He does not seem to have met with complete agreement from his noble Scottish friends as to the accuracy of his deductions. I myself thought he was a little bit shaky as Jeremiah was moving westwards. I should like to believe that everything he said was accurate, because it was so exceedingly attractive. As this Motion has been moved by an Irishman, perhaps I may occupy a few minutes in making one or two remarks among so many Lords who bear noble Scottish names, because I myself am half Scottish. The Scottish half of me is in full agreement with everything that has fallen from the lips of noble Lords who have so far spoken to the best and most desirable final destiny of the Stone of Scone. I am in favour of its going back to Scotland, but exactly where it should finally rest seems to me to be a matter which might well be left to the Scots themselves.

But the English half of me is interested in the reasons which led to this debate. We should not have had this debate if there had not been an outrage upon the Stone. What gave rise to the outrage? The noble Duke, the Duke of Montrose, and the noble Lords, Lord Clydesmuir and Lord Strabolgi, all touched on that point, but they talked a lot (this was particularly so in the case of the noble Duke) about Scottish national feeling. Well, of course, Scots have always had a very strong national feeling—all over the world, we have been bothered by their bagpipes and things, and we respect them for it. But, surely, we are here faced with something much different from that. This is, surely, a demand for local government, for self-government for Scotland. That was the underlying reason for the movement for Scottish Nationalism; that is the propaganda which is put forward by those who are behind what has happened in connection with the stone. The noble Duke says that they are only extremists. That may well be so; but extremists are the spearhead of movements, and are apt in the end to achieve the objects for which they strive. For instance, the ladies who in my young days went about smashing pictures in the National Gallery, breaking shop windows in Kensington High Street, burning country houses and generally giving us a great deal of trouble, were the fore-runners of a movement which eventually resulted in women getting the vote. I will not make any further comment on

the exploit of the young men who were concerned in this episode of the Stone except to say this—that everyone in authority seems to have united in helping them by giving them the utmost possible publicity.

There seems to be a very definite feeling in Scotland in favour of some form of self-government. There is, apparently, widespread dissatisfaction in Scotland concerning the way in which Scottish affairs are administered from Whitehall, and there appears to be a strong demand that the present system should be altered. I think we ought not to close our eyes to that demand, and that while there is plenty of time we should set about ascertaining the depth of grievance, and how it can be remedied. So far as I know, no authoritative body of Scotsmen has ever come forward to give us information on this subject. I am told that a Committee is sitting, under the chairmanship of the noble Lord, Lord Catto, inquiring into the matter. Whether that be true or not I do not know, but anyhow no publicity is given to that Committee. We know nothing of their proceedings or of any evidence that has been given before them. I understand that a demand has been put forward for a Royal Commission to inquire into this whole subject. It seems to me that that would be a very sensible course to take. If that were done we should get wide terms of reference, evidence could be called from all sides and a definite conclusion could be reached upon which the Parliament of Great Britain could judge. I think it is only right that the request which I have mentioned should be acceded to, and if it is acceded to, I feel that some good may come out of this deplorable episode in Westminster Abbey. Apart from that, further good will come if the Stone of Scone reaches a destiny which is acceptable to people in all parts of the country.

Lord Calverley: My Lords, I intervene in this debate as a parochial Englishman. I had the privilege of spending some time in Edinburgh attending the proceedings of a Royal Commission and listening to evidence, and what struck me particularly—and here I support what has just been said by the noble Lord, Lord Blackford—was the underlying sense of grievance felt by responsible Scotsmen. Clearly, they deemed that they should have wider scope to develop their government and also their psychology. As an Englishman, I try to put aside all thoughts of the ballyhoo that has been aroused because of what these young and enthusiastic scamps have done. I put all that behind me, and I seek to do what I can to help to remove the sense of grievance which obviously exists amongst those who, like the noble Duke and the Covenanters generally, so strongly desire the return of the Stone.

As an Englishman I have to acknowledge that we were simply receivers of the Stone, and that, so far as I can make out, it really belongs to Scotland. Therefore I suggest that the Lord President of the Council, if he has this job entrusted to him, or possibly the Privy Council, should decree that the Stone shall remain in Scotland. . . . I do not know the geography of the Palace. I want the Scots to have the Stone back. I want them to be greater partners of England in the future. The Scots have made a great contribution in the Union with us Englishmen. It is because we Yorkshiremen have a lot of Scottish blood in our veins that Yorkshire is the greatest county in the kingdom. But that is all by the way. My slogan is: the Stone should go back to Scotland. It should go either to Holyroodhouse or to St. Giles's Cathedral.

Lord Saltoun: My Lords, as one of the few Scotmen

taking part in this debate, I find myself asking whether it ought to take place at all. I understand that His Majesty the King is Visitor of Westminster Abbey and this matter concerns him; and if so, it does not concern us. So many of your Lordships have expressed opinions that perhaps, as I differ from nearly all those who have spoken, I may be allowed to express what I feel about it. I do not know whether I represent many Scotsmen, but I know that I represent some.

In one aspect the Stone is a trophy of war. It is a symbol of England's pride in the fact that, 650 years ago, King Edward I, with the enormous resources of England, succeeded in taking and holding down more than half of Scotland. As a Scot, I am not in the least ashamed of that. I am proud of the fact that after some time we, with our small resources, succeeded in driving him out again. I agree that it may not have been for the best interests of both countries that that happened, but for Scotland it was a fine achievement. England's pride in so near a success only enhances the pride I feel in having beaten her, on that occasion at least, in a fair field. Those in Scotland who are really anxious to get the Stone back must have in their hearts some slight feeling of shame, which I do not in the least share, that England had been so near success in the past. . . .

There is another reason why I do not want the Stone to go back to Scotland. I do not like the way in which this demonstration of national feeling came about. . . . It cast a blight and shadow on the strong movement which exists in Scotland for some form of Home Rule. . . .

Lord Macdonald of Gwaenysgor: . . . The Government do not look upon this Stone as something upon which they are going to pronounce having regard to the strong desire in Scotland for Home Rule. I do not think the history of the Stone at the moment is very important. I have read through the history of the Stone, and I am pleased to have done so. I think it was the noble Duke, the Duke of Montrose, who told us that there were historiographers in Scotland and in England who gave us a full story of it. I have one here and it would take the best part of half-an-hour to read it to your Lordships. It is called *The Stone of Destiny or Coronation Stone* by Doctor Henry Meikle. His history differs from the history given to-day, but not in sufficient detail for me to spend any time on it.

I think the interest of your Lordships' House to-day rests upon the question: What do the Government intend to do with this Stone now? That is all that matters. . . . But here is what the Government feel about the matter at the moment—I will read as slowly as I can what they have to say. It will no doubt be the general wish that the Stone should continue to be used at future Coronations of British Kings and Queens in the same way as it has been used in the past. Whether any alteration should be made in the arrangements for the custody between Coronations is a matter on which there is, no doubt, room for argument. But noble Lords will doubtless agree that the arrangements for the custody of the Stone ought not to be altered (if indeed they ought to be altered at all) without the fullest consideration and without taking into account all points of view. . . . All those suggestions are under consideration, and I can give this definite promise: that the Government will consider every suggestion made to-day and, in due course, will come to a final decision. But they are most anxious—and this needs emphasising—that the recent incident should not affect any decision made. . . .

More 'Social Good'

It seems that *The Times* and the General Secretary of the Fabian Society are both, in their several ways, looking for a "new economic policy which will release the potential productive energy of the country, with the State stimulating enterprise for the *social good* instead of confining and controlling it."—The social good, or abstractly qualified good, note, not your good or my good. Like Queen Victoria, we are not amused.

The 'Secret Chamber'?

From its being a legislative assembly, is it possible the House of Lords has become the most 'private and confidential' auditorium to be found in Europe?

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(Reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	6/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England.....	8d.
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.

ALSO

Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan.....	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....	(Cloth Edition) 7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...7/-	
On Planning the Earth, by Geoffrey Dobbs.....	6/1
Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson.....	21/-
Odlum v. Stratton	
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia	
by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.....	1/6

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

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