

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 26. No. 24.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 11, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The Queen Elizabeth is the transport of choice for the hundreds of teachers crossing and recrossing the Atlantic at the present delightful season with the (quite secondary) objective of taking in each others' teaching. UNO what the primary objective is. Most people know that what is left of English education and educational tests is a political mixture in which 'good' schools struggle with only moderate success against 'poor' schools, and 'cultural' subjects struggle with no success at all against the avalanche of 'new' knowledge. But has anyone enquired at all closely into the qualifications of American teachers to whom our children are being entrusted for instruction in Latin? Greek? Mathematics? History? English? There are some cultivated people in America; but we have heard some strange stories of 'a day in the life of a future American President.' English 'exchanges' have lots.

We understand that discussion is growing whether (a) the 'Conservative' Party is or is not the best of three evils or (b) the 'Conservative' Party is or is not the best of four evils. (In any case, one of the evils). Headway.

We note as a distinct encouragement to face the eleventh minute of the last hour with a show of resolution the speech of Viscount Hailsham in the House of Lords on July 31. He thought the Government persuaded that cowardice "is safer than courage, which makes our position most desperately dangerous." He did not share the Marquess of Salisbury's belief that, on balance, the Harriman mission was well advised. "I myself thought that the only sensible thing about it was said by the British Ambassador in Teheran, but he apparently was made to eat his words after saying them. He went on:—

"My Lords, I am half American myself. I am devoted to the friendship between this country and my mother's country. I have never supported those who wish to cause trouble between this country and the United States. But I see in this move, which is related to other moves, the greatest danger in recent months to our friendship with that country. The moment the Americans come to think that they have to help the British every time they are in trouble, it will be to the peril of good relations between our respective countries. The Americans have never seen quite so clearly as we do the benefits of the British Empire either to themselves or to the world at large; and if people are going to suppose that the Harriman mission is re-cementing the British Empire, I think they will have to consider the matter again. The truth of this matter is that if Mr. Harriman is negotiating about anything after the decision of the International Court in our favour he ought to be negotiating as to whether the Persians

are going to implement the injunction of the International Court. If they are not, there is nothing to negotiate about. The Americans know very clearly if we are weak in our affairs, and they have their own interests to pursue having regard to that fact."

... that sort of general interest in the subject which prepares for new pioneers the indispensable groundwork of a favourable pre-disposition in the public mind. True discoverers in any science know well what they owe to such mediation." Where is the 'indispensable groundwork'? (The words quoted are Burckhardt's).

Mr. A. Duff Cooper

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

Sir,

A letter addressed to me and presumably to all other 'Ministers of Religion' dated 2nd August, 1940, and signed by Duff Cooper, concluded with the following paragraph:—

"We, when the war is over, must also hope to see some unity in Europe, but a unity based upon the free will and consent of the various nations who will pool their resources, share their responsibilities and combine their armed forces while retaining their own liberty, just as the nations have done who form to-day the British Commonwealth."

Yours faithfully,

St. Leonards, August 3.

H. SWABEY.

Mr. Swabey, so well known to our readers as a valued contributor as well as the valiant Vicar of Lindsell, Essex, is, greatly to our personal loss and regret, on the eve of leaving England to be Rector of the Parish of Port Perry and Brooklin in the Province of Ontario, Canada. We assure him and Mrs. Swabey that they take with them the general good wishes of Social Crediters.

The Social Credit Secretariat

NOTICE

Letters on Secretariat business which would normally be addressed to the Social Credit Secretariat or to Dr. Tudor Jones personally should be addressed as indicated below between the dates August 14 and October 1:—

Mr. Hewlett Edwards,
Nether End,
Austrey,
Atherstone,
Warwickshire.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: July 19, 1951.

Broadcasting (Committee's Report)

(Mr. Selwyn Lloyd continued:—)

Again, in the case of a single organisation, we have another evil to which I do not think sufficient emphasis has been given this afternoon—the evil of the single employer. It was not always very easy to pin down various allegations which were made, and it would be very difficult for me to produce the precise individual cases in which evil results from this fact of the single employer, but I am perfectly certain that this operates in two ways. So far as those in charge are concerned, it must make them much more reluctant to dispense with the services of someone whom they think has become incompetent, and, in the case of the individual employee, it must make him much more reluctant to take action which he would otherwise take if he had an alternative source of employment. I think that has a depressing effect on the whole organisation.

Even more important than those two objections is the question of the concentration of power in the hands of a few individuals. The hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Reeves) said that the B.B.C. was not a monopoly. With regard to that issue, I think I prefer the words of Lord Reith, and I quote from his evidence:

"It was the brute force of monopoly that enabled the B.B.C. to become what it did and to do what it did; that made it possible for a policy of moral responsibility to be followed."

"The brute force of monopoly"—I do not think that that is an expression which will appeal or find very much favour in a free country.

I could go on, if time permitted, and refer to the evidence and example of the Labour Party. There is a reference in the main body of the Report to the evidence of the Labour Party, and in paragraph 359 we find:

"They maintained that admission of sponsoring would inevitably debase the standard of broadcasting.

... the vast majority of listeners, who naturally prefer to be entertained rather than educated, would no longer receive the talks, features, discussions, news and news commentaries ... for most listeners would keep their radios tuned into the stations that monopolised the best entertainment."

That may very well be true.

I agree with what my right hon. Friend the Member for Cirencester and Tewkesbury (Mr. W. S. Morrison) said about education. But surely in a free society moral uplift should not be a matter of compulsion. Surely we should have a degree of freedom in this at all events—whether we should be educated or entertained. It is quite intolerable that any people, whatever their motives, should sit down and say, "That is what is good for the British people to listen to over the air." That argument was really decisive in my mind and I am quite satisfied this monopoly is wrong and therefore should go.

It has been suggested that this issue of monopoly is disposed of. I think it is not being unfair to commentators in the newspapers to say that when they suggest this issue is not a very live one, they have a very strong vested interest in the issue of monopoly being disposed of. Should any form of sponsorship of radio programmes be permitted, it

might affect the resources devoted to other forms of advertising.

There are also other people who feel strongly about this issue of monopoly. And because I think this is not an occasion for venting party views, and particularly because I referred to the Labour Party evidence rather disparagingly, I now refer to the Fabian Society and thereby, I hope, display a degree of impartiality which will be welcome to the House. The Fabian Research Group, in Paper 56 in Appendix H of the Memoranda submitted to the Broadcasting Committee, expressed views on the issue of monopoly which I think are extremely sound and well put. They say on page 319:

"(e) The size of the monopoly and the variety of functions that it exercises give a dangerous amount of power to the officials who control it. They can choose who and what is to be heard and seen on the air, and exclude anything they dislike or distrust. However conscientiously these officials try to carry out their work the fact of monopoly constitutes a constant danger to freedom of expression and diversity of approach. . ."

They add:

"(f) This cultural monopoly has its counterpart in the professional monopoly. B.B.C. officials exercise the power of employment, engagements, and publicity over a wide field. Contributors to broadcasting in all its forms have to conform to the B.B.C. pattern if their work is to be accepted and an individual who falls foul of the head of a B.B.C. department can be deprived of access to the medium without any alternative being open to him, even if his work is good."

The Memorandum also says:

"(g) On the staff side the centralisation bred of monopoly has also become a defect and not a merit. The pyramid system, with the Director General as its apex, had its advantages in the early days of broadcasting when the opportunities were limited, the medium was new and the staff was small, but the organisation now is too large to be controlled by one man."

And they go on and develop other arguments I have used.

... If we agree that the monopoly should go, or if it is still an open question whether it should stay or go, we are forced to consideration of the alternatives. I agree that on this matter there is room for considerable difference of opinion, because I think one can draw a line between a set of alternatives which admit of sponsorship and commercial broadcasting and a set of alternatives that do not admit of that. In my Report it is clear that on the whole I come down in favour of the set of alternatives that admit of sponsorship; but if these are not acceptable to the majority of the House, I willingly accept the second set of alternatives in preference to the continuation of the existing set-up.

What are the alternatives which should be considered? The hon. Member for Greenwich had something fairly harsh to say about American broadcasting. I do not want to divert the debate into an attack or a defence of American broadcasting. There are many things about American broadcasting of which, on the whole, we would not approve but it is of course, quite a different set-up from anything suggested here because there is no public service there at all. The whole thing is left entirely to the large commercial networks and to the private commercial stations. There is no public service system at all, and that to me is at once a serious disadvantage.

In the Canadian system there is a public service parallel with private stations. The public service system to some extent depends on sponsorship for some of its revenue owing to the size of the country. But in Canada they have the very wise rule that private stations cannot become a kind of

chain stores. One cannot have a private network. Each private interest is permitted to have only one private station. In Australia and New Zealand there are, again, different methods, and I do not think it is necessary to go into them now. But it is not insignificant that America, Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand all have sponsored radio in some form or another.

The suggestion is made that sponsorship somehow is itself an evil, that it is evil to depend on revenue from advertising to carry out these activities. That is about the most hypocritical thing that can be put forward seeing that the biggest revenue earner for the B.B.C. is the "Radio Times" and about £1 million a year flows into the coffers of the B.B.C. from advertising revenue. So I do not think there is anything actually evil in itself in accepting money for advertisements.

Then it was suggested, I think by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations himself, that people in control of sponsored radio do not care for broadcasting and that only people who work for a public service system can care for broadcasting. That is completely contrary to my impression of those I met in America in charge of public networks. I think they care for broadcasting just as much as anybody in the employment of the B.B.C. because, after all, the object of commercial broadcasting is to obtain an audience. If it does not obtain an audience it does not last long; and is not that the object of a great many B.B.C. broadcasts? All the time they are watching audience figures and I do not think there is as much difference between the two outlooks towards broadcasting as people try to make out. The leaders of the broadcasting industry in America and Canada are animated just as much by the idea of good broadcasting and public service as the people concerned with broadcasting in this country.

There is also the suggestion that sponsorship would bring in the power of money. I suppose money has a great deal of power whether there is much or little of it. Making money is a motive which influences people very much. But in the case of commercial broadcasts the object is the obtaining of an audience and it seems to me that that is not so different from the object of the B.B.C. as to make it something which should be rejected for that reason.

Mr. Wedgwood Benn: I interrupt the hon. and learned Member because I gather his reference was to the comment I made about the power of money. The point is—and I think the hon. and learned Member should take into consideration—that it is just those programmes designed for the minority audience which do not attract sponsoring money, and therefore commercial broadcasting reduces rather than increases variety.

Mr. Lloyd: I do not think that is true, certainly not so far as New York is concerned. I think the programmes put out by the Municipal station in New York are as good as any on the Third Programme. I think that in New York there are programmes for minorities. I think there is something in the point, as I said in my Report, that probably 80 per cent. are monotonously similar, but I think in the remaining 20 per cent. one has that great variety. But I am not arguing for a counterpart of the American system. I quite agree that it is necessary to look after minorities. I do not believe we shall get as many wavelengths as they have in America; we cannot have the extreme number they

have. The most we could ever hope to have for any large area would be, say, three national transmissions and about half-a-dozen local transmissions.

I would, therefore, maintain the public service with adequate safeguards. I believe there is a great deal of truth in what has been said about B.B.C. news and I think there is a good deal to be said for the B.B.C. educational service, and also for the way in which they carry on the Overseas Service. Certainly I should seek to have a public service system continuing to carry on those services, in parallel with the competitive commercial enterprises.

So far as advertisements are concerned, of course one can ridicule the thing and say that it is not very pleasant to have a wonderful concert interrupted by an advertisement for bile beans, but I do not think that happens now. In America things are changing; they are changing there a good deal at the present time. It seems to me perfectly easy to make rules and regulations to see that our tastes are not offended.

When I was considering the question of personal taste I remembered a journey in a tube train. Travelling in the tube one day, I looked at some of the things advertised on the side of the tube—laxatives, and things to prevent spots—

Mr. Boothby (Aberdeenshire, East): Body odour.

Mr. Lloyd: But we do not have people writing to "The Times" saying what an impact and a bad influence those advertisements on the sides of the tube have on the travelling public. I am sure that we could get a code which would be acceptable. Certainly I should not have individual items interrupted by advertisements. Certainly we should have to restrict and supervise and control, and I think the advertising industry could probably make a very good code of rules for itself, although I quite agree that it would have to be supervised.

This is a matter upon which one should put forward concrete proposals, and the set-up I advocate is this. The retention of the B.B.C. with the duties to which I have already referred—news, education, overseas service, the provision of a national Home Service catering for minorities and probably being the main vehicle for the principal political broadcasts and that sort of thing. Its revenue would be secured by a licence fee. Alongside that I would have certainly one national network given over to commercial broadcasting and as many local stations as wavelengths and finance could be found for their operation. In that way we should get a very considerable variety in our British Broadcasting.

... Above these systems of the B.B.C., the independent national network and all the local private stations, we should have to have a national regulatory body with considerably more powers than has the F.C.C. in the United States of America. This body would have the duty of seeing that the taste of the public is preserved and of dealing with matters like the prevention of one interest obtaining more than one private station and the laying down of policy for religious broadcasts and for political broadcasts. If we had that commission for the control of broadcasting at the top, and underneath it these other bodies, we should have a set-up which would suit the needs of a free country.

(Continued on page 7.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: SEFTON Park 435.

Vol. 26. No. 24.

Saturday, August 11, 1951.

'Sophistication' of Bread (etc.)

The Sunday Post (1920—D. C. Thomson & Co., Ltd., Glasgow) has been for some time running a campaign against ageneised bread. Early in July it was reported that an increase of ten per cent. in the public demand for 'brown' bread had resulted. We place the description in inverted commas because we do not know anything about brown bread except that it is brown in colour, like brown cloth or chocolate icing, and a demand for it might produce results entirely different from those intended by customers. (*Vide * infra*). At the same time the exploitation of public dissatisfaction with the results of 'scientific' planning is evidence of the dissatisfaction, and willingness to take action on the part of those who experience it is, *per se*, healthy. We are not surprised that a rise in the circulation of *The Sunday Post* is believed to have occurred in Scotland. The discussion of the agene question has, as our readers know, spread to other newspapers—further evidence of popular distaste for a crooked economy. The following items are reprinted 'for the record':—

(1) A leading article headed "A Startling Discovery About Our Bread" in *The Sunday Post* for July 29:—

"Last week I stood in a flour mill and watched poison gas being pumped into flour.

"It was nitrogen trichloride—in one word, agene.

"The 'agene chamber' is a little glass-walled partition. Inside is a machine and a mass of tubes and cylinders.

"The machine is operated by special men in the mill. It's their job to watch all the dials and pressure gauges, and make sure the right amount of agene is passed into the flour.

"Every hour they take samples of each type of flour before and after ageneising, and compare them for colour with a standard sample.

"To make agene, nitrogen is brought to the mill in long, yellow cylinders. Salt water is run into a sixty-gallon tank. The nitrogen is passed through the salt water. It becomes nitrogen trichloride. Then it's pumped through the flour.

"And mark this. If a machine springs a leak, the agene men must wear gas-masks—until the leak is traced and stopped. Otherwise they'd be unconscious in a matter of minutes.

"Quite a few men have been knocked out by the gas at one time or another.

"I had a very cautious sniff at one of the pipes. I nearly choked! It smelt just like the chlorine gas they used to warn us about during the war.

"Why is this gas put into our bread?

"Agene is a bleaching agent. It also makes flour mature more quickly so that the loaf will rise.

"It's used in every type of flour except biscuit flour and wholemeal. [*]

"It's even in a great percentage of the brown bread you buy. It's in cakes, pastries, pies, scones, teabread, cookies, or anything made of white flour. [*]

"Wholemeal bread is the only type of bread which you can be certain doesn't contain agene. [*]

"The millers have no choice about using agene. It's laid down by the Food Ministry. The bakers want something to make their bread rise.

"Agene has been used for many years, but, under Government direction, a substitute is now being sought.

"Surely there's a better way than pumping poison gas through our flour!"

(2) Letters (a) to *The Scotsman* for July 31 and (b) to *The Dundee Advertiser* for July 18:—

(a)

SOPHISTICATION OF BREAD

Sir,—With your permission, in reply to "J. B. C.," we shall change the heading of our part in the correspondence, in order to make it clear that our objection is to all "improver" additions to flour.

It is not sufficient, in a matter of such grave importance for our people's health, that science should return a verdict of not proven. The serious misgiving in the minds of members of the Medical Research Council, that found expression in their warning about the sophistication of food (from which we quoted in our last letter to you) cannot be set aside. We do not believe that these scientists have changed their minds as a result of a few years' experimentation. They know better than we do, that short-term experiments are of limited value in the case of humans, and that a few years' observation is too little. Some of the medical evidence brought forward in other sections of the Press suggests that the harmful effects of "improvers" do not show themselves till about or after middle life.

This leads us to discount "J. B. C.'s" quotation from the Press statement of January, 1950, the authenticity of which we are willing to take his word for. The statement was probably dictated by expediency, and we are realistic enough to have some sympathy with this point of view, because, in default of a really sound whole-wheat loaf, unsophisticated and of nation-wide distribution, no good purpose will be served by creating a panic about white bread.

One of the aims of our society is to persuade the Ministries to act on the available evidence and institute a firm policy gradually to restore unsophisticated high-extraction flour. This will ultimately save the country millions of pounds in public health expenditure.

In his latest letter "J. B. C." presses us very hard about the reasons for using "improvers." A research chemist in cereals tells us that our original statement was an oversimplification of a highly-complicated matter. We wish to be generous and to withdraw it, especially the words, "That is all."

Our main point remains, that these are questions for the producer. If the same science and skill that have been applied to the production of bleached low-extraction flour were to be turned to whole-wheat, we would soon have a satisfactory loaf at an economic price.—We are &c.

ROBERT L. STUART, Vice-Chairman,
 Scottish Health and Soil Society.

A. GUTHRIE BADENOCH,
 Member of Council.

48, Manor Place, Edinburgh.

(Continued on page 8).

Crisis Time

As we enter the month of August—so fateful in the history of International Affairs—there is a general feeling that a decisive 'show-down' may not be long delayed, and a hope, amongst some, that the long period of perpetual British withdrawal from world leadership which began in 1917, is coming to an end.

The U.S.-directed U.N.O. war in Korea which was conclusively to vindicate the doctrine that Collective Action involving surrender of National Sovereignty alone can deal with the menace of aggression by Collectivized States, has lasted a year and cost a million lives. 'Korea' is beginning to fade away from the headlines but the word and fact of aggression is as topical as ever.

The dangers of peace are clearly perceived by all the politicians—and all the editors—who agree with Mr. Eden that 'Korea' has been a 'most valuable experiment,' and for more than a year all our politicians have agreed with all our economists that rearmament must have priority "owing to events in Korea."

When Mr. R. R. Stokes (now of the Labour Front Bench) the other day held out hopes that a cease-fire in Korea might lessen the importance of the 'rearmament programme,' and allowed his audience to draw the conclusion that the day might come when the desires of the individual consumers would again be considered, he was promptly rebuked by the leading politicians and the National Press, who deemed such sentiments to be entirely premature. For more than thirty years it has been premature in Soviet Russia to hope for an easing of the armament burden, and in Hitler's Germany no one was so foolish as publicly to express a desire for more butter and less heavy industry.

But, fortunately for our re-armament enthusiasts in the parties and editorial chairs, there is 'Persia,' there is 'Egypt,' to say nothing of 'Israel.'

In Persia there would seem to be two (if indeed they are separate) powers which are likely to benefit from another British withdrawal. From a recent Debate on the Persian crisis in the House of Commons, it emerged that our troubles there had been if not engineered, at least helped along by the intrigues of the emissaries of certain U.S. oil interests and by the activities of a local secret murder-society. At the same time we learn from the *Jewish Chronicle* that a liquidation of the British-created Abadan oil-fields and refineries would tend to enhance the importance of the 'Israel'-controlled Haifa refineries which have been idle since 1948, when the British withdrew and left the field open for the Russo-American-Jewish conquest of Palestine.

It is interesting that Mr. Truman should have chosen Mr. Averell Harriman to smooth out the difficulties which have arisen between the British and the Persians, for Mr. Harriman, *Sen.* was the 'Gentile front' of Kuhn Loeb and Co., the Wall Street firm which was instrumental in financing the Jewish conquest of Russia (1917) and of America (from 1933 onwards). It is reported (July 23) that certain U.S. oil companies are prepared to fill the vacuum that may be created by a complete withdrawal of British directors and technicians.

Equally revealing was the report in the early part of July that the news of Mr. Harriman's departure for Persia had the immediate effect of making the leaders of the British Conservative Party withdraw their demand for another

Debate on the Persian Oil question. Mr. Bernard Mannes Baruch of Washington and Wall Street is in Europe for talks with Mr. McCloy (formerly of the U.S. Treasury, and the U.N. world bank, and at the moment U.S. High Commissioner for Germany); with General 'Ike' Eisenhower (who believes in a world government "backed by a police force stronger than any nation or combination of nations") and, last but not least, with Mr. Winston Churchill (whose Party is "prepared to consider and if convinced, to concede abrogation of National Sovereignty.")

Considering all these things there can be little doubt that Mr. Harriman's efforts will be crowned with the success which the British National Press prophecy for them, and that the word 'Persia' may also, in its turn, disappear from the headlines.

But then there is Egypt. Our *contretemps* in the Suez zone and our difficulties with the Egyptians generally may also have more to do with oil and Israel than appears on the surface. Egypt, though not strictly an Arab country, is a leading member of the Arab League which organised the military resistance to the Russo-American-Jewish invasion of Palestine in 1948, and directs the present economic blockade against 'Israel.' That the modern Israelis who saw the Egyptian armies take the field against them in 1948 and who are constantly told of oil tankers *en route* for Haifa being stopped by the Egyptian authorities should have come to regard the King of Egypt and his government as their chief enemy (another example of how 'history' repeats itself) is understandable enough.

Egypt is perhaps the most important link in the chain of enemies which, according to the Hebrew Press in Israel, the Yiddish Press in the U.S.A. and the Zionist-controlled world press, everywhere surround the 'youngest democracy' in the Middle East.

It is therefore with some surprise that a special correspondent of the *Jewish Chronicle* (July 6, 1951) in an article entitled *Egyptian Enigma* has to admit that for the Jews of Egypt life seems to go on much as always. Not only are there no visible signs of persecution but His Eminence the Chief Rabbi of Egypt, Haim Nahoum Effendi "who has held that important office for some thirty years since relinquishing the Chief Rabbinate of the Ottoman Empire, will assure the visitor that the Jewish Community is getting along nicely."

We learn that the worldly leader of the Jewish Community is the owner of a flourishing department-store; that the leading Jewish bankers and lawyers pursue their avocations unmolested, and that the Jew Mizrahi Pasha who is legal adviser to the Royal Household was recently decorated with the highest honour in the land. Amongst the intimate friends and gambling partners of Pharaoh there are several Jews "who are active in the community."

If to this we add that the Egyptian import-export trade is largely in the hands of the leading Sephardi families of Cairo and Alexandria, and remember that Cairo for thousands of years has been the centre of secret societies and schismatic sects while Alexandria in the first centuries of our era played the same part as a clearing house of currencies and cultures as does New York of the 20th century, we are in a better position to take a detached view of the Egyptian phase of the continuous and spreading world crisis. As always, a perusal of the Zionist (for Jews only) Press furnishes facets

of the political picture lacking in our popular (for Gentiles chiefly) National Press according to which modern Egypt is a young upstart cheekily twisting the tail of the ageing British lion. The Diplomatic Correspondent of the *Jewish Chronicle* writes in an article *Britain and Egypt* (July 6, 1951) as follows:—

“The Egyptian Foreign Minister has told the Senate that under the newly ratified Arab League Pact, Egypt's neighbours would be bound to support that country should a state of war with Britain be proclaimed. . . .

“It is evident from the newly concluded sterling agreement with Egypt that the Government sticks obstinately to its own course of appeasing Cairo by financial concessions. If it were intended to apply financial pressure, this would have been the moment. In fact, Egypt was granted a further large amount, without any political conditions whatever. The Egyptian threat to abrogate the treaty and proclaim a state of war if Britain does not evacuate the Canal Zone, is not as hollow as it sounds. There is of course no question of open clashes, but the Egyptians calculate that they can make things so uncomfortable for the British that the Americans will feel compelled to step in—as they have done in Persia—with compromise proposals amounting to a partial acceptance of the Egyptian demands.

“At the very least, it is reckoned, this will curtail any British action designed to overawe Egypt. In due course, thereafter, the Persian manoeuvre would be repeated and the British forced to leave by an accumulation of threats and provocations—possibly including terrorist acts—leading to a state of tension with the Americans all the time counselling patience.

“Subsequently Egypt could afford to offer military facilities to the West on her own terms. These would certainly include complete control of the Suez Canal by Egypt. The present blockade, though ostensibly directed against Israel, is of course primarily designed to assert Egypt's Sovereignty over the Canal, and to lead to the eventual abrogation of the Canal Convention.

“All this depends upon how far the British Government is prepared to give way. The evidence suggests that Mr. Morrison and his advisers, after their experience in Persia, are even less inclined to be firm with Egypt. . . .”

Thus we see that Mr. Morrison who has always paid suitable tribute to Zionist aims and ideals (and never, like his robust predecessor, Mr. Bevin, done anything to incur the hatred of organised World Jewry) and his more or less hidden ‘advisers’ are pursuing the now traditional ‘Labour’ policy of appeasement of Britain's enemies, withdrawal from British spheres of influence and liquidation of British prestige.

We are soon however to be offered the ‘Conservative’ Party as an alternative to Mr. Morrison and his colleagues. But to all intents and purposes we have been subjected to a ‘bipartisan’ foreign policy since 1940 when Messrs. Churchill and Eden came to power with the assistance of their ‘Labour’ colleagues. It is difficult to see what difference the occupation by the Zionist Mr. Eden (“Korea has been a wonderful experiment”) of the ministerial desk in the Foreign Office in lieu of the Zionist Mr. Morrison (“Socialist Britain will show the way to world peace”) would have made to the series of well-planned crises described above. Can anybody imagine Mr. Eden, the perfect Etonian and our notorious pro-Soviet Foreign Minister from 1940-45, would be capable of

giving a true British bias to the Egyptian developments adumbrated in the illuminating passage quoted above? Is there any member of either Front Bench possessed of the backbone necessary to upset the Zionist time-table discernible in the following extracts:—

Firstly, there is the Zionist Jew, Mr. T. R. Fyvel dealing with events of 1935 in *No Ease in Zion*:—“The prevailing optimism found its voice in the new Zionist leader, Ben Gurion the Chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive. Ben Gurion . . . grew messianic. His office room in the Jewish Agency became filled with maps not only of Palestine, but of the whole Middle East from the Red Sea to the Persian Gulf.”

At the Zionist Congress in 1935 Mr. Ben Gurion laid down a ten-year plan for the immigration of one million Jewish families. Mr. Ben Gurion is to-day Prime Minister of Israel and his government pursues the so-called policy of the ‘ingathering of the exiles’ which is fast transforming Jewish Palestine into a Monster Ghetto teeming with the revolutionary proletarians of the Ghettos of Europe, Asia and the Middle East.

Secondly:—“Maybe the Israelis may have to give the Arabs another lesson and cut through their forces again like a knife through hot butter. Only this time the pleas of the United Nations will not deter them. They will shoot their way clear into Beirut, Amman and Alexandria.” The words are those of Mr. Emmanuel Celler, doyen of U.S. Congressmen and a veteran Zionist.

Thirdly:—(Douglas Reed: *Somewhere South of Suez*, p. 301):—“In ‘Colonial Office policy,’ however, the workings of those stealthy and invisible influences may be traced which operate through the apparent wielders of political power. Under Socialism, ‘Colonial Office policy’ is a product of the mysterious Fabian Society in London, in which Communist, Political Zionist and alien influences generally are strong; that is to say it is not a body qualified to uphold British interests in Africa or anywhere. The Fabians . . . are zealous for ‘African freedom and self-expression’ . . . and in effect their work would lead to the self-surrender or exclusion of the white man in or from Africa. That would be something in the line of the expansion of the Communist Empire and erection of the Zionist State.”

Fourthly (*Truth* June 1, 1951):—“Colonel Israel Somen, M.B.E., has been on a recent visit to London on behalf of the Nairobi City Council. Colonel Somen besides being the Chairman of that body's Finance Committee is Chairman of the Board for Kenya Jewry and Honorary Consul for the East African territories. He said (to a Press Conference)

‘Kenya is most important to the Jewish State, for not only is Nairobi a transit station on the air-route Lydda-Johannesburg but Kenya can become the emporium for Israel. . . .’

To sum up: if and when the King of Egypt (‘Pharaoh’ to ‘Israel’) once again, as in 1948, decides to march against the turbulent sons of Israel and the ‘Israeli’ armies begin to shoot their way through the forces of Egypt ‘like hot butter’ there will be no British force in the Canal Zone to prevent them from persuing ‘the enemy’ down through the African continent, swelling their cadres with the most promising recruits from the ghettos they pass, and liberating the

black majorities suffering under White European supremacy. If past revolutionary history is anything to go by, there will be impromptu executions of the white leaders (which will be duly regretted as inevitable excesses connected with democratic expansion by our politicians at home), there will be unaccountable surrenders of 'enemy' strongholds (which will prove to our parliamentarians the inherent strength of democratic revolutionary movements), there will be helpful mayors advised by Zionist experts and co-operative chieftains and potentates served by Jewish legalists, doctors and financiers, and as the frontiers of the Kingdom of Judah ('democracy' to Westminster) expand and the Shield of David everywhere (as in the U.S. Sixth Army) becomes the official badge of power and glory, the members of His Majesty's Government and Opposition will talk loudly about inevitable historical trends, and the British genius for compromise and decentralization.

But there are, fortunately still the back-benches. There is the *honourable and gallant gentleman** whose statesman-like speeches will be quoted long after the verbiage of the one-world-peace-government men will have been forgotten, and who, when he found that words of warning had no effect on the talkers-in-chief, tossed a coin to Mr. Morrison with the implicit request that he change his tune, and who then had the gratification of being sent out of the House by Mr. Speaker. And there are others, less bold perhaps, but equally rebellious, one of whom has suggested that the legal machinery for dealing with High Treason be examined and made up-to-date. Another may one day point to the fact that the House of Commons is only a part (and not the most important) of the British Constitution, and a third make bold to demand an Inquiry into the effect on this same ancient Constitution of the all-pervasive modernistic-materialist influences centering in the U.S.A., which may be read as Universal Administration of the Synagogues.—B. JENSEN.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3).

Mr. Charles Ian Orr-Ewing (Hendon, North): . . . a poll has recently been conducted by the "News Chronicle" which showed that 52 per cent. of the people favoured some sort of competition to the B.B.C. and, even more than that, felt that the B.B.C. would improve its programmes and its general outlook if competition were introduced. Surely, in the face of those figures the hon. Gentleman cannot say that "in the country as a whole," or "in areas up and down the country" or in similar phrases, there is overwhelming support for the retention of the existing monopoly.

If I may complain of one small thing in the Beveridge report, it is that it is almost too unwieldy and too indigestible for any politician fully to study. I hope that if a future investigation is held it will be possible to subdivide it into sections and to publish the sections one at a time so that they may be discussed by the Press and this House, instead of our having the whole 1,000 pages or two million words flung at us at one moment, which certainly gives us the most alarming indigestion.

My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Wirral (Mr. Selwyn Lloyd) referred to the Fabian Research Group as among those who gave evidence, but he did not refer to the opening words of their report, where they say:

"These representations are based on the belief that monopoly

of a medium of expression is dangerous."

Neither did he quote from the report of the Liberal Research Group an equally important point, where they said:

"Given the context of a Free Society, it seems to us indisputable in the circumstances of today and tomorrow that the monopoly of the B.B.C. in sound broadcasting and in television in this country can no longer be justified."

If I may, I will quote a third witness, a scientific witness of great renown who gave evidence with Geoffrey Crowther of "The Economist." They started Paragraph 2 of their report by saying that their main contention was:

"that monopoly in broadcasting is bad—bad for the public interest and bad for the broadcasting service itself."

There is a body of opinion, not closely associated with any one political party, which clearly believes that we have to seek some other alternative to the existing monopoly. . .

. . . Why have we no V.H.F. broadcasting today? It may be said that the answer lies in the matter of capital resources, but in the U.S.A. there are 700 V.H.F. broadcasting stations, 88 of them educational. It may be said, Major Milner, that that is a great rich country, unaffected by bombing in the war, but does this apply to Germany or Italy, who all have V.H.F. broadcasting stations operating, or to Denmark or Holland? If anyone had an excuse not to build new stations it would be these countries who had so many of their industrial buildings and their houses demolished, but there are today 57 different V.H.F. broadcasting stations operating in Western Europe. If there are 57 there, surely we can go ahead and have some here.

In case the Postmaster-General, when he replies, says that there will not be sufficient room within the V.H.F. waveband, I include also the term "U.H.F." because there is plenty of room on these frequencies. I know that the V.H.F. waveband is getting filled up, alarmingly so with ambulance and other services. The world has reserved the rest of that band for this kind of broadcasting, but as long as we can bring in the U.H.F. band there is room for all.

I should like now to touch quickly on the question of capital cost. The electronic equipment for a local V.H.F. station, run by universities or other approved authorities, would cost between £1,000 and £2,000—that is a quotation I received this morning. It really is absurd, when we are spending £50 million on electronic equipment for re-arming, to say that we cannot afford between £1,000 and £2,000 to secure a degree of freedom for thought in broadcasting.

It may be said, "That is all right for the transmitting stations, but what about the receivers?" According to the type of adapter which is used, these can be produced from £3 to £5 each, provided that the Chancellor of the Exchequer does not hang a millstone of 66 per cent. round the poor infant at its birth and drown it before it makes an appearance—before it gets a chance to make its presence felt.

. . . I cannot believe it right, as recommended in the Beveridge Report, that the B.B.C. should have referred to it applications for local stations to do broadcasting. Surely the B.B.C. should not ask to be judge, jury and defendant when a person applies for freedom to compete with it. It should surely be the Postmaster-General or, as I recommend, a Commission of British Broadcasting, which I hope the Government will seriously consider setting up.

I turn for a moment to the field of television. In the few hours given to this debate we are trying to lay the foundation stone for some years ahead, not only in the field of V.H.F.

* Major Legge-Bourke, M.P.

broadcasting, but also in the television field, and I think it extremely important that we should think most clearly on this subject. I am afraid it is not generally realised how far we have slipped behind the United States of America in television.

Mr. Gordon Walker indicated dissent.

Mr. Orr-Ewing: The right hon. Gentleman shakes his head, but it is not realised that one can sit in New York and switch on seven alternative programmes and there are 80 television studios. It seems pathetic that we have only succeeded in building two new studios in the whole of this country and that, with the two built before the war, makes a total of four. If it were suggested that their programmes and ours are not comparable, I would point out that from the seven programmes one can generally find something of first-class entertainment value, and what my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Wirral (Mr. Selwyn Lloyd) said is borne out by the Report.

I think the most outstanding factor is the amazing distances over which these programmes are relayed. . . .

. . . If I may summarise the points I have made the first is that now is the moment to develop V.H.F. broadcasting, and we should not put it off any longer because we are only falling further behind the rest of the world. Second, we need to build regional and some local television stations which can provide alternative programmes, and which can act as pace-makers to the B.B.C.. Third, we should recognise that some form of controlled sponsorship is necessary to provide these alternative television programmes if the licence fee is not to be raised to £5 or more, which is beyond the reach of many television owners. Four, we should set up a Commission of British Broadcasting to regulate the conditions under which this development of broadcasting shall take place. . . .

The Postmaster-General (Mr. Ness Edwards): . . . The great difficulty in developing these services is going to be the difficulty of getting the raw materials to do it. The hon. Member for Hendon, North (Mr. C. I. Orr-Ewing) knows this industry very well and also the defence demands that are being made upon it. He should be aware of the fact that there is not available in this industry that capacity which we require to meet our defence demands and any further burden we put upon it is going to postpone defence output when this country for its own safety requires these products.

Mr. C. I. Orr-Ewing: I cannot let the words of the right hon. Gentleman go, because during this year only 7½ per cent. of the radio industry mass production capacity will be dealing with our re-armament programme, so that it is well within the scope of the industry to meet this small need, which might be only £30,000 for several stations. It is really absurd to reject this sum when £50 million is to be spent, and I suggest that it is well within the industry's capacity. . . .

. . . Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved:

"That this House takes note of the Memorandum on the Report of the Broadcasting Committee, 1949 (Command 8291)."

On Planning The Earth

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

6/- (Postage extra).

SOPHISTICATION OF BREAD—(Continued from page 4)

(b)

AGENE IN BREAD

Dear Sir,—May I answer "J. A.'s" questions re agene, according to information which I have gathered during my research?

Question—Who is responsible for putting it in the bread?

Answer—The flour millers.

Question—Is the baker free to do it?

Answer—The agene and other chemicals are already in the flour when it reaches the baker.

Question—What is the purpose?

Answer—Primarily financial. Let me quote Lord Douglas of Barloch during the debate in the Lords on July 4:—

"It is clear that the public generally are quite unaware of the means by which this result is brought about and of the toxicity of the chemicals used. Some chemicals are used for 'maturing' flour in the space of a few hours, whereas nature takes weeks to affect this, and also for giving to inferior flour the characteristics of better flour. Others are used for the purpose of inducing flour to rise more in order to produce a loaf which contains more air and water, two substances which may be rather dearly bought in this way."

Our association and the British Housewives' League have been trying for a long time to demand a public enquiry into this matter. Now that the public are becoming enlightened and showing concern through a considerable drop in the sales of white bread, the bakers ought to join forces and demand the millers to stop the use of chemicals.—Yours truly,

ELIZABETH M. PATTULLO,

•Member Central Committee, S.H.A.

Sandyford, Kirriemuir.

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.....	3d.
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.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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

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