

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 27. No. 25.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1952.

6d. Weekly

To Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, to Her Majesty The Queen Mother, to Her Majesty Queen Mary and to all members of the Royal Family, we offer, on behalf of Social Crediters, our deepest sympathy in the great personal loss they have suffered by the death of His Late Majesty, King George VI.

To our new Queen, we offer loyalty and the hope that her reign may be blessed.

From Week to Week

We mistrust profoundly the notion, widely disseminated, that by the ascent to the Throne of a second Queen Elizabeth a great age of English history is mystically inaugurated by some power of monarchy enhanced because a woman is on the Throne. It is true, we believe, that, because the British are bereft of their King, the machinations of men no less than the march of events will not for one moment be affected.

"Great Elizabeth" had Power and some Authority. Queen Elizabeth II has no Power. Enemies of our country, who were and are no less enemies of our country because they are also the enemies of Christian society and civilisation, have stripped Kingship everywhere of the last vestiges of Power, and have all but separated it from Authority. When men speak of the Constitution, let it be known that this is the Constitution: that, in and for the Realm, the King's is the voice of Authority. We work that that voice should be heard.

The truer opinion we have cited receives heavy backing from our esteemed contemporary, *Truth*, which, simultaneously, presses hard for an answer to the question, why it is that our country should be compelled, against her will, to surrender to an allied admiral what she has never surrendered to an enemy admiral—her peerless fleets?

"Britain" says *Truth*, "is patently acting under duress. Washington, it may be, can now sing:

*If steel be the price of Admiralty,
Lord God, we ha' released a million tons.*

If we have not sold out for steel, then for what have we sold out? What pressure has been used, that we should bargain away our right to command our own ships at sea? What, moreover, is the American motive? They must know that their fiat is the deadliest humiliation that could be offered to our historic nation. Either they must have some strong, hidden reason for wanting the Atlantic Command, or else they so despise us that they are careless of the hurts and insults they inflict upon us. One thing is certain. If the Royal Navy is to maintain its quality, it must be

withdrawn on the first possible occasion from the unsavoury oceanic hugger-mugger to which it is being sacrificed."

• • •

Despite, but not in contradiction to our words about a mystical power, it must be borne in mind, and by us especially who seek the grain's weight in mustard seed for the turning of the balance, that every hope that does not "draw nectar in a sieve" invigorates. The enemy should not have a monopoly in enlisting the invigorated citizen. We are all too shy; were we not so shy the circulation of this small journal would be ten times what it is. Our salesmen decry our wares: "Oh, Sir; I wonder whether I should show you this: it is hard, *even for me*, to understand it all." The even-for-me psychology is one which should be faced from every point on the circumference of the circle the as-if-timorous speaker has drawn around himself—he drew it! He should project himself to it, and take a look back at his stationary centre.

• • •

As though in preview of the apparent curtailment of its opportunities of corruption, the B.B.C., a night or two before, broadcast on its Television Service: "World Survey. United Kingdom." Mrs. Wyndham Goldie was the producer, and the Socialist M.P. Christopher Mayhew dilated on the question, "Is Britain a first-rate power?" The conclusion that it isn't was illustrated by parts of a film showing the Delhi Durbar forty years ago. Then, "We have no power in Egypt now." "This is what the Egyptians want . . ." "This is what the Persians want . . ." A Mr. William Clark was called upon to clinch the argument, which he did by asserting that "our power now consists of holding the free world together; but Britain's old power has gone, [note of pathos or jubilation] never to return. Britain [never 'Great' no more] stands for 'the World that ought to be.'" "Britain has only five battleships. The U.S.A. has (?) fifteen." Our lack of both military and economic power made it obvious that "we" could not command that an English Admiral should be in charge of the Atlantic. "But Britain really has a chance in a World Government." "We" were now "the world's greatest debtor country."

A viewer who telephoned his protest to Alexandra Palace found no one there to listen to him. On the following day he continued his hunt for the ear of responsibility, but could get no nearer to it than Mrs. Wyndham Goldie's secretary.

The 'British' contribution was backed up by two other speakers, one an official of the Columbia Broadcasting Corporation of America. Said the American, when asked for his opinion, "Britain has lost the power of initiative. I don't think she can ever recover it. The power of decisive initiative goes to the nations who have lots of money and the big

battalions. It doesn't look as if you have an independent policy—look at the American Admiral” (or words to this effect). Then the lady correspondent of *The Hindustani Times* was called upon to give her views on the greatness or otherwise of “Britain”!! She believed that feelings of friendship between Indians and British were better now than before the surrender of power. Moral power was more important than military power (Shades of Kashmir!) Couldn't we be independent of America?

When, we wonder, will salesmen of false ideas about money (they are not 'economists')—Mr. Herbert G. Williams, for example—begin to see that “forcing down prices” is always, in the current financial context, sheer unadulterated, unblushing, unpardonable, unmitigated robbery? The average price is an inevitable summation of cost (financial cost) and is unreal; but you don't restore it to reality by robbing everybody to make the figures *look* right.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: January 29, 1952.

(Continued).

Hydro-Electric Development (Scotland) Bill

The Joint Under-Secretary of State for Scotland (Mr. McNair Snadden): I beg to move, “That the Bill be now read a Second time.”

This is a short Bill. Its purpose is to increase from £100 million to £200 million the statutory limit on the amount of borrowed money which the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board may have outstanding at any time. The Board has already been authorised to borrow up to nearly £94 million of the permissible total of £100 million. That £94 million has not yet actually been borrowed by the Board. The total borrowed to date is only £56 million, but the balance between that figure and £94 million is earmarked for works already approved.

Further schemes both for the generation and transmission of electricity have been submitted by the Board for confirmation. Other schemes are in preparation and, as hon. Members know, the work of the distribution of electricity is going on continuously. Consequently, further provision for borrowing is essential. . .

Mr. Gerald Nabarro (Kidderminster): . . . At the outset, I should like to temper with a little realism the idealism of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Stirling (Mr. Woodburn). In his useful contribution to this debate, he inferred that the capital development cost of schemes of this description is not a matter of over-riding or even major importance. I consider he is wrong in pushing to one side the capital cost element in a hydro-electric scheme. Nobody in this debate so far has attempted to draw a comparison between the capital cost of generating one kilowatt of power from a hydro-electric scheme in Scotland and the cost of generating one kilowatt of power from a power station in England, Scotland or elsewhere. It is pertinent, as we are voting a very large sum of money, an extra £100 million of borrowing powers for capital development of Scottish hydro-electric schemes, that a direct comparison between these costs should be made. . .

. . . Hydro-electric schemes in Scotland have cost about £94 million, and for that sum a total of 282,900 kilowatts of electric power is being provided which, on the basis of 1,000 kilowatts to one megawatt, equals 283 megawatts of electric power to date. That means that the installed capital cost of one kilowatt of power from hydro-electric schemes of Scotland is no less than £332.—[*Interruption.*] That is the capital cost, not the cost for a year or production, as my hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh South suggests.

The Third Annual Report of the British Electricity Authority gives a corresponding figure of capital cost, taken as an average of the installation cost, for power stations in the whole of the area controlled by the British Electricity Authority. That area excludes the North of Scotland and the hydro-electric schemes. That cost is £50 per kilowatt installed. In other words, the cost is approximately one-sixth to one-seventh of the corresponding installed capital cost under the hydro-electric schemes.

. . . My hon. Friend the Member for Ross and Cromarty (Mr. John MacLeod) has asked how the residents in this part of the Highlands of Scotland are otherwise to get their power. I have no desire to deprive them of electric power, but the purpose of hydro-electric schemes in the North of Scotland, is, as he well knows, not only to provide local residents with power and to attract industries to the area, but to export power to the Lowlands of Scotland and, what is equally important, to the North of England. If the capital cost of developing power under a hydro-electric scheme is six to seven times greater than it is in a power station in England, then capital costs are of very great importance. That is quite aside from the question of providing local residents with power in the Highlands, which is, of course, of local interest.

Mr. Woodburn: I should like to clear up this point about the cost of the scheme. The production of hydro-electricity today, compared with electricity produced at a station built for steam, would be 30 per cent. cheaper, calculated on an annual cost basis. In a steam station, electricity would cost 50 per cent. more to produce than in a station like that at Loch Sloy, on a peak load basis. It may be that the cost of cement and steel at Loch Sloy would be more than for a steam station built today, but I do not think the hon. Member should try to alter the whole basis of capital cost in order to support his argument.

Mr. Nabarro: The right hon. Gentleman forces me to occupy the attention of the House for longer than I had intended. If he is not prepared to take the figure on the basis which I argued, perhaps he will allow me to put it in another and much simpler way. The Hydro-Electric Board have spent £94 million to date.

Mr. Snadden: It is not a fact that the Hydro-Electric Board have spent £94 million. That is the borrowing power. The Board have only spent £56 million.

Mr. Nabarro: The borrowing powers were £100 million, and are now to be advanced to £200 million. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to say that the whole of the original sum voted for borrowing powers is in sight of being expended. The Joint Under-Secretary of State readily agrees with me. The point I want to make to the right hon. Gentleman is that last year the British Electricity Authority used £85 million for capital development on power stations. For that sum they generated approximately an extra 1,100 megawatts

of power. In Scotland, we have a capital commitment, over a period of five years, of approximately £94 million, of which perhaps only £56 million is taken up to date, yet the megawattage of power available is only approximately one quarter of that available from the British Electricity Authority for an expenditure of £85 million. . .

. . . The other argument, an economic one, is the effect upon our coal economy, and the contribution that hydro-electricity schemes can make towards balancing our coal budget. The excessively high capital cost of hydro-electric schemes is justified, in existing circumstances, by the extremely bad coal prospects for the United Kingdom during the next few years. I am not over-emphasising when I say "extremely bad." I point to the fact that in 1951, excluding bunkers, we exported only eight million tons of coal, and we brought into this country 1,220,000 tons of American coal. It therefore follows that our net exports of coal, excluding bunkers, were approximately 6,750,000 tons, which is the lowest figure on record for any year of peace.

If these hydro-electric schemes are capable of providing electric power for just a small part of the United Kingdom—which is undoubtedly so, but it is a very small part—in addition to the needs of the local residents, then there is, on grounds of coal economy alone a case for justifying a six times higher capital expenditure to get the electric power, instead of paying American dollars to import coal. [*Interruption.*] I am not going back over my tracks, but I am satisfied that the capital cost of development is as high as I have said.

Major D. McCallum: I think my hon. Friend has the emphasis wrong. He said "in addition to supplying electricity" to Ross and Cromarty, for instance. The whole essence of the thing is to supply electricity to Ross and Cromarty, and then, if there is any over, to give it to England.

Mr. Nabarro: I am sorry to cross swords with my hon. and gallant Friend, but in my view that is not the essence of the scheme. If £100 million of the nation's capital resources has to be put into a scheme to provide electricity for something of the order of 1 per cent. of the nation's population, I should say that the whole scheme is perhaps out of balance.

I hope that when he replies the Under-Secretary will give us a comparison of the cost to a consumer, per unit of electricity derived from the hydro-electric scheme in Scotland—taking such places as Aberdeen, Edinburgh or Glasgow—and the comparable cost to a consumer in England for a unit of power generated by a standard British Electricity Authority power station.

In justifying this extremely high capital cost of hydro-electric development, I should be glad if the Under-Secretary would tell us what benefit the electricity grid south of the Border will derive from hydro-electric generation in the course of the next three or four years. When the schemes were first promoted, one of the principal facets in the arguments of the people who raised the original sums of capital, was the fact that the scheme would be capable of exporting electricity cheaply to the North of England. Only a negligible amount has yet become available. . . the excessively high cost of capital development of the hydro-electric schemes could only be justified on account of the fact that there is a direct saving in coal. It is primarily for that reason that I am supporting the Bill.

Captain J. A. L. Duncan (South Angus): . . . There should be some form of public relations between the public and the Board so that there is proper knowledge and confidence between the Board and the public.

One other aspect occurs to me. There are ample opportunities in the north of Scotland for public relations to be developed on a quite cheap, if not an almost free, basis. There are many clubs—Rotarians, Chambers of Commerce, the Housewives' League, for example—and all sorts of bodies who are only too anxious to get people to talk to them, to give lectures and so on, in the winter months all over the north of Scotland, if only the Board can provide the experts with the knowledge and ability to put over the case. I am quite certain that the relations of this national monopoly in the north of Scotland would be very much better, and Ministers would have very much less trouble in the House, if this was gone into and if the public relations aspect of the hydro-electric industry in the north of Scotland was examined.

Mr. Snadden: . . . In a way I feel that my hon. Friend the Member for Kidderminster (*Mr. Nabarro*) has misled the House in this debate. I should like to point out to him that this Bill authorises the Board to borrow. It is not voting the Board money. . .

. . . I was very puzzled to grasp what it was that my hon. Friend, with all his vast experience of the subject, was asking. If it had been about pigs and cows I could have understood him, but I came to the conclusion that he had been very woolly. The comparison is not between the capital cost of kilowatts but between the costs per unit of output. The cost per unit of hydro-generated power is vastly cheaper than that of steam power, and if it were not so the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board would vanish. It is rather dangerous to be misled on this. . .

House of Commons: January 30, 1952.

Statutory Instruments

Mr. L. Hale asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury how many Statutory Instruments have been made from 1st November, 1951 until 28th January, 1952; and why the number of Statutory Instruments is increasing.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: The number of instruments made in the period 1st November, 1951—28th January, 1952 (inclusive) is 572. The number of general Orders was 220 as compared with 262 in the corresponding period a year before. Local printed orders were 115 as against 102, and local non-printed orders 237 as against 131.

The number of Statutory Instruments of a general character consequently shows a substantial and satisfactory decrease, and the total number of Instruments made is inflated only by local Orders relating to such matters as diseases of animals, traffic movements, etc.

Electricity Power Stations (Megawatt Costs)

Mr. Nabarro asked the Minister of Fuel and Power the capital cost of providing one megawatt of new generating capacity, calculated at January, 1952.

Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd: As the cost of constructing power

(Continued on page 6)

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. 27. No. 25.

Saturday, February 16, 1952.

The Constitution in the New Reign

We have previously expressed our opinion that, in quarters unfamiliar to the general public, the British Constitution is a topic of serious and, perhaps, informed conversation, and that this has been so since the general election. The drive towards a co-ordination of the 'democratic' as contrasted, however unrealistically, with the 'anti-democratic' (Communist) forces cannot be carried far without legal cover of some sort—even if the legal cover is obtained by some 'illegal' or treasonable manœuvre. The 'honour' of modern states is rooted in dishonour—ultimately dishonour of the sort associated with the counting house, but involving a great deal more than mere speculation of coins; speculation of *credit* (faith).

We await the turn of the wheel, not supinely, but expectantly, believing that when it comes near to rest, and foreseeing then in what circumstances it will come to rest, there may be something we can do about it—keeping our heads *above* water, with a sufficiency of composure, and, perhaps, some dignity.

We wish the water were cleaner.

By the time these lines are in print, the colour and the odour may be several degrees worse than it is; but, whoever is bent on fishing in muddy waters can't want for much, and certainly isn't waiting. Reading the newspapers of the past few days, as a collectivity, one would think there was no hidden corner of political life since Palmerston into which their writers were not peeping with inquisitive eyes. But what attracts their interest is not so clear. It is not impossible that, since there is little wisdom in a multiplicity of counsel, obscurity *per se*, is *one* objective. There seem to be others.

The Times has evoked criticism on the score of mutilating the broadcast by Mr. Churchill last week. After "The Crown has become the mysterious link which binds," *etc.*, the following was omitted: "Peoples who would never tolerate the assertion of a written Constitution which implied any diminution of their independence are the foremost to be proud of their loyalty to the Crown."

"We have been greatly blessed amid our many anxieties and in the mighty world that has grown up around our small island, we have been greatly blessed that this new, intangible, inexpressible, but for practical purposes apparently an all-powerful element of union, should have leapt into being among us.

"How vital it is, not only to the future of the British Commonwealth and Empire but, I believe, also to the cause

of world freedom and peace which we serve, that the occupant of the Throne should be equal to the august and indefinable responsibilities which this supreme office requires." *The Times* then goes on: "for fifteen years . . ." *etc.*

On those occasions when the Prime Minister feels called upon to contest some ascription to him of inconvenient expressions, he is very ready with a well-supported "I did not say that," so ready as to show that he, at least, attaches importance to the precise word in this position and not in that. His words are measured. When we measure them, they do not always conform to popular estimates of their dimensions; but we should be the last to accept that Mr. Churchill's words are, on almost any occasion, idle words. They are usually very busy words. And from the busy words which *The Times* thought to contain too little (or too much) for general currency in 'cold print,' which let it not be forgotten has its disadvantages in comparison with the 'air-borne' phrase, the one which stands out is 'Constitution.' It is a question we have heard before: "Is there a Constitutional crisis?" If so, what is it?

Before long, Mr. Churchill, if he lives, will have to stand by while events answer for him a question which he lived as a politician by his mastery of the art of persuading has not answered yet. For a long time Mr. Churchill has a very large number of people (we would call it 'a majority' if the word did not stink) that, while doubtless a past-master at double-crossing, his unmatched skill was entirely at their disposal and exerted solely in their interest. Very soon, unless his path is indeed the easy slope of descent, he will need support that is not based upon a fundamental misunderstanding. Then he will have to pay for every ounce of it—with integrity. Why not now, before the price goes up? Why not now, before the battle he is presumed to be fighting by charitable minds is lost?

The Church and Politics

" . . . To ask . . . whether the Church can stand aside from politics is to ask whether she can conscientiously remain aloof from political issues which have a bearing on faith and morals and on the accomplishment of the Church's divinely-given mission. To ask the question in this form is really to answer it, at least in the eyes of anyone who has the faintest conception of the Church's mission and function."

" . . . between those who recognize the Church's primary function and aim and those who regard her as a society subordinate to the State there is a fundamental difference of conviction in regard to man. For the supporter of the omniscient and morally autonomous State man is a purely this-worldly being, who in no way exceeds, as it were, the dimensions of political society. For the Catholic on the other hand man, though rooted in this world, has a supernatural and eternal vocation. What is more, his supernatural end is his only final end. One cannot say, therefore, that the State cares for man's temporal final end, and that the State is completely autonomous in regard to that end, for there is no such final temporal end. Man has but one final end; and though the State has its own functions, it must exercise

(Continued on page 8).

Niebuhr on Nature

By H. SWABEY.

When Reinhold Niebuhr, of the New York Union Theological Seminary, delivered the Gifford Lectures in 1939, he was only the fourth American to be invited to do so. The lectures subsequently appeared in two volumes, the first of which is called *The Nature and Destiny of Man*.

After a reference in the preface to "the remarkable spiritual health and vigour of the people of Scotland and Great Britain," he appears to less advantage when he pronounces that "the moral cynicism and nihilism of romantic fascism is more unqualifiedly destructive than the provisional cynicism and ultimate utopianism of communism." It refers, perhaps, to a deal that did not come off.

He appears to be less than fair to what he calls "classicism" when he remarks that "classical influences corroded" Christianity, as it would be juster to admit that The Classics have made a permanent contribution to realism. An interesting admission is that, "Protestantism significantly places the rational concept of the 'natural law' in a more insignificant position than in Catholic thought."

But he deals ably with the various methods of eliminating the individual. Hobbes finds "no place for human individuality. His individuals are animal natures whose egohood consists in the impulse of survival." He adds the "deification of the state by Hegel"—for whom, indeed the state was the equivalent of Nirvana—and the romantic substitution of the nation (the "larger individual") with its result: "This collective individual then supplants the single individual as the centre of existence and the source of meaning." He warns too that Rousseau's *general will* "... is easily transmuted into the tyranny of a minority, which uses the instruments of modern democracy to give its purposes the semblance of majority consent."

The Protestant fallacy consists, perhaps, in eliminating the Catholic methods of getting rid of "sin" and then being left with a peculiar selection of sins on its hands. Niebuhr claims to state the "Biblical view" of the problem, but the bulk of his quotations are from Isaiah and the Epistle to the Romans. The Gospels are seldom cited. As a consequence, Augustine, the theologian who suggested that man's nature was *depraved*—the current doctrine was that it was *deprived*—is taken as the authority for Christian thought. Calvin, it may be added, pronounced our nature *totally depraved*; and how such a nature could respond to anything not totally evil he did not, apparently explain. Dr. Niebuhr does not go as far as that, but he apparently approves of the damage accomplished at the Reformation to the "Catholic synthesis." But his version of the Christian concept of individuality is worth repeating: "The individual is conceived of as a creature of infinite possibilities which cannot be fulfilled within terms of this temporal existence."

His analysis of sin into Pride and Sensuality is less satisfying than Dante's description of the seven "deadly" sins. Niebuhr says, "When anxiety has conceived, it brings forth both pride and sensuality." He is indeed so hard on what he calls—with the minimum of definition—the "egotism" of man, that he might justifiably be suspected of being a Rotarian whose hypocritical motto is *Service not Self*. ("Higher than Christianity.") Dante considered sin as a perversion or defect of Love, and Niebuhr would at least have been more intelligible if he had devoted a para-

graph to the Christian precept, Love thy neighbour as thyself.

There is, of course, need for Christian doctrine to distinguish this faith from Liberal Judaism, but it is also necessary that the right doctrine be selected. Otherwise confusing statements arise, such as this: "The ultimate proof of the freedom of the human spirit is its own recognition that its will is not free to choose between good and evil." The conditioning circumstances are not specified. Another rather glib statement has slipped in: "Thus the absolute natural law demanded complete liberty and equality. . ." Another curious idea—a sop for the times, perhaps,—is "The anti-aristocratic emphasis of the Bible. . ." And people may still be found who regret that "the Catholic synthesis broke down under the combined pressure of Renaissance and Reformation."

Dr. Niebuhr shines most when he ascribes "Original Righteousness" to every individual, as well as other less desirable traits, and this may be sufficient counterpoise to the gloomier views of Karl Barth and other Augustinian theologians. It might perhaps be illuminating to quote another thinker whose views, apparently, are much closer to those of the Christian Gospel:

"The tendency of man's nature to good is like the tendency of water to flow downwards. . . By striking water, you may make it go over your forehead, and by damming it, you may force it up a hill. . . When men are made to do what is not good, their nature is dealt with in this way. . . Benevolence, righteousness, propriety and knowledge are not infused into us from without. We are certainly furnished with them. . . Hence it is said, 'Seek and ye shall find them. Neglect, and you will lose them!' (*The Works of Mencius*—Dr. Legge's translation.)

This would lead to an analysis of the forces that make men "to do what is not good," external as well as internal; and it is this kind of equipment that such places as the Union Theological Seminary should be able to supply.

World Jewry Wants War !!!

We are so close to the blood and tears of the Second World War that no normal human being desires to be massacred in a repetition of this calamity. It behoves us, then, to examine the forces which are leading us into it. The agencies which are creating a war fever in America and Russia are the daily press, the radio, television, and the movies. All of these agencies are completely in Jewish hands. They are devoted to promoting the Third World War because the World Zionist Organization confidently expects to assume its role as the master of the world once America and Russia are destroyed.

Russia has been preparing for this calamity since 1917, when Communist Jews murdered the ruling class of Russia and subjected the Russian people to a reign of terror which still holds them in abject submission. America was won much more easily, by little more than her daily press. No criticism, or unfavourable reference to the Jewish plan has been seen in a metropolitan American newspaper since 1900. Consequently, Lord Reading, Chief of the British Mission to the United States during the First World War, was never referred to by his given name of Rufus Isaacs (the Isaacs family owned Marconi Wireless), nor was it pointed out to

the American people that Sir William Wiseman, head of the British Secret Service in America at that time, was a partner of Kuhn, Loeb Co., the New York firm which financed Trotsky in the Communist Revolution of 1917. Anti-British feeling in the United States today is misplaced, since it should be anti-Jewish feeling. America should be particularly considerate of the English people, who have been despoiled by international Jewish bankers, for we are undergoing the same process.

Since America is already under the heel of the Jew, it may well be asked why it is necessary to lead this nation into a bloody war, and the answers to this are several. First, there is the national debt, a matter of total longterm obligations of 650 billion dollars. While the Jews are content for the moment to collect a yearly interest on this sum of seven billion dollars, without touching the principal, eventually they will desire to increase their annual profits by requiring the Treasury to retire a percentage of the debt, and this will be a crucial moment in the internal political structure of the United States. Further servicing of the debt cannot be accomplished without substantially lowering the standard of living here, as well as placing a much more oppressive burden upon the taxpayer. Consequently, the debt cannot be serviced without a much more rigorous control over the individual than can be achieved under the present, so-called democratic government. The answer to this problem is the totalitarianism of that Hebrew philosophy of government, Communism.

The achievement of Communism in America can only be brought about by a Third World War, which it is now intended that America shall lose. Since the present "American" government is at the top level entirely composed of various lawyers, investment counsellors, etc., of the Jewish international bankers, typically, Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, Robert Lovett, and Anna Rosenberg, the problem of betraying America to the Communist armies is a simple one. The present stripping of the American continent of its defensive forces is a logical expression of this ideal. Our troops and weapons are sent thousands of miles from the proposed Russian attack. The plan is that the Russian armies shall move from Siberian bases down through Alaska and Canada to seize the automobile factories of Detroit. Russia's tank and truck production has never been sufficient to support a fullscale war, and since there can be no Lord Beaverbrook-W. Averell Harriman Mission to Moscow to supply Russia with tanks and trucks, the only alternative is to turn the factories over to them. How, then, one should inquire, can our big industrialists support the present "American" government, if that government is dedicated to betraying our people? The answer to that is in the history of Germany. Although Germany lost the First World War, her big industrialists lost nothing, nor did the Jewish bankers who backed them lose anything. It should be remembered that the firm of I. G. Farben, which has been a Warburg family enterprise from its inception, has survived the Second World War and is now the most flourishing corporation in postwar Germany. When we lose the Third World War to the Zionist Communist government of Russia, does anyone seriously believe that such plants as Studebaker, always controlled by the Lehman family of bankers, would suffer? It is the political ambitions of the great corporations which determine military strategy in our time, and if we notice in Poor's Directory of

Directors that the partners of Lehman Brothers, Senator Herbert Lehman's family house, hold one hundred and seventeen directorships in the largest corporations in America, partner Thomas A. Morgan being the Chairman of Sperry Gyroscope and Vickers as well as a dozen others, we can understand why General Lucius Clay was welcomed as a partner when he returned from Germany, and given the Presidency of Continental Can Co., a firm in which Lehmans have never held less than three directorships at a time.

The corporations controlled by Jewish bankers have no nationalist loyalties. That is why we have the United Nations, and that is why we have a government which is devoted to betraying the American people into the hands of the Communists. There has never been but the one issue before the American people, whether we shall be free men or slaves, and it is the response of Americans to this challenge which will determine the history of the twentieth Century.—E. MULLINS.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3).

stations varies considerably it is not possible to be exact, but a sum of £60,000 per megawatt represents a fair average figure for January 1952.

Germany (Steel Production)

Mr. Harmar Nicholls asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs the annual level of steel production permitted to Germany under existing occupation decree; and by how much German Steel production was in excess of such a figure in the year ending 31st December, 1951.

Mr. Eden: I would refer my hon. Friend to the reply given to him yesterday by my hon. Friend the Under-Secretary of State.

Mr. Nicholls: Is my right hon. Friend satisfied, in view of the special re-armament effort we are making, that we are getting a fair share of the excess production?

Mr. Eden: Well, we did not do very well last year for a variety of reasons. [HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear."] I am not blaming anybody but merely stating the fact; there was a variety of reasons, into which we need not enter. We have had some discussions recently with the German Government and we hope as a result of them to have a substantial tonnage of steel from Germany this year.

Mr. I. Mikardo: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, whilst he is exercising his efforts to increase the tonnage, at the same moment his right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade is withholding licences for imports?

Mr. Eden: I did not think so. The position is, of course, that Germany has a fixed amount for herself, and over and above that we get a certain percentage. I did not know that there was any kind of withholding. If that is so, I will gladly look into it.

Brussels Migration Conference

Major Tufton Beamish asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will make a statement on the results of the Brussels Migration Conference; and what relation decisions taken at this conference have to his policy

for the future functions of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

Mr. Eden: The Brussels Migration Conference established a "Provisional Inter-Governmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe," with the object of transporting 115,000 migrants from Europe in the coming year. The decisions taken by the Brussels Conference do not alter the functions assigned to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, or His Majesty's Government's attitude to the High Commissioner.

Major Beamish: Is my right hon. Friend aware that, apart from the fact that the High Commissioner for Refugees has neither the money nor the machinery to carry on the good work of I.R.O., the refugee problem has been seriously aggravated for months past by the fact that about 400 new refugees come every week from the Iron Curtain countries to the West, and that they are not subject to international care; and may I appeal particularly to my right hon. Friend to direct his attention to that aspect of the problem?

Mr. Eden: I will look into the matter.

Genocide Convention (Ratification)

Mr. Janner asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is now in a position to ratify the Genocide Convention.

Mr. Eden: His Majesty's Government hope shortly to reach a decision on this question.

Mr. Janner: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider, first of all, that this matter has been before the Government for a very considerable time; that 32 States have already ratified or acceded to this Convention; and there is really no reason, in view of the decision of the International Court at The Hague, why steps should not be taken immediately by the Government to ratify it?

Mr. Eden: We naturally abhor the crime of genocide, but there are legal difficulties.

Mr. Janner indicated dissent.

Mr. Eden: The hon. Gentleman shakes his head. I have not his legal knowledge, but I am told that there are legal difficulties in embodying this into the law of the land, and they were very well explained to him, if I may say so, by the late Minister of State on 8th May, 1950. The reasons were very good then, and, so far as I have been able to discover, they are quite as good today.

Mr. Janner: I am afraid that will not do. May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he put those reasons before the International Court of Justice when they were arriving at their decision, which was reached on 28th May, 1951, that every State could and should ratify or accede to this Convention; and whether he opposed, and for what reasons he opposed, if he did, the decision of the Assembly recently that every member State should be called upon to do so?

Mr. Eden: I think that what the International Court said was that States were entitled to have reservations when they ratified, and States have had reservations—all sorts of reservations—and that is one of the reasons why we have to look at these reservations before we can decide what we can do.

Mr. Janner: In view of the unsatisfactory nature of

the answer, I beg to give notice that I propose to raise the matter on the Adjournment at the earliest opportunity.

East Africa

Overseas Food Corporation Operations

Mr. Anthony Hurd asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will make a statement on the changes in staff and production plans effected by the Overseas Food Corporation to carry out a long-term farming policy on its properties in Tanganyika formerly intended for mechanised groundnut production.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Oliver Lyttelton): The Corporation have been carrying out the changes in their organisation and farming programme necessary to carry out the long-term plan approved by His Majesty's Government. The European staff, which numbered 1,153 on 31st March, 1951, will be reduced to 590 on 31st March next.

The Corporation's farming policy is now concentrated on establishing, through a variety of small farms serviced from the centre, an economic system of mechanised arable farming. For the time being the Corporation is adhering to a rotation of groundnuts, maize and sorghum, but is pursuing small scale experiments with other crops including beans, castor, cotton, rice, tobacco and various fibres.

Under the new plan farming is restricted to 24,000 acres at Kongwa and 60,000 each at Urambo and the Southern Province. The current crop extends to 73,500 acres made up of 15,000 each at Kongwa and the Southern Province, and 43,500 at Urambo.

Colonial Empire (Cotton Production)

Mr. Anthony Greenwood asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies what schemes are in hand for developing the growing of cotton in Colonial Territories; and what further schemes are proposed.

Mr. Lyttelton: In order to satisfy the hon. Member the reply necessarily contains a lot of detail. I will, with the hon. Member's permission, circulate it in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Following is the statement:

Colonial cotton production in recent years has averaged half a million bales (of 400 lbs.) per annum. The figures for 1949-50 were:—

| | Bales |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Uganda | 342,000 |
| Kenya | 8,000 |
| Tanganyika | 50,000 |
| Nigeria (Export) | 62,000 |
| Nyasaland | 10,000 |
| West Indies | 6,000 |
| Others (mainly Aden) | 6,000 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 484,000 |

With the exception of small quantities, it is a peasant-cultivated crop. Production may be increased by improved cultivation in existing areas of production, or by bringing new areas into production. The measures adopted necessarily vary according to the climatic and economic conditions in individual territories. Details of the measures being taken by the different Colonial Governments concerned, to whom considerable help has been given

by the Empire Cotton Growing Corporation, are given below.

Uganda which normally produces about 70 per cent. of all colonial raw cotton is concentrating on increasing considerably the yield per acre of those areas at present under cultivation by introducing higher yielding disease-resistant strains, by encouraging improved cultivation methods and by seed treatment to reduce blackarm disease. It is hoped that it may be possible to raise annual production by 50 per cent. to about 450,000 bales per annum in the near future.

In *Tanganyika* mechanised aids to peasant cultivation are being introduced in resettlement schemes in Sukumaland. In addition the Department of Agriculture has concentrated a large number of staff in cotton-growing areas to encourage improved cultivation and increased planting. By these means it is hoped almost to raise the annual cotton crop by about 80 per cent. to about 90,000 bales.

In *Nigeria*, which is the second largest colonial cotton producer, a special cotton development team has been charged with responsibility for improving cotton production both by improving yields of cultivation methods and by the opening up of new areas and the improvement of marketing and ginning facilities and communications. It is hoped to expand Nigeria's production of American type cotton by about 300 per cent. to some 200,000 bales per annum in the next ten years.

In *Nyasaland* better planting methods and pure strains of cotton are being introduced to reduce losses through red bollworm. The extension of the area under cultivation will depend on the possibilities of irrigation which are being investigated at present. If irrigation proves feasible an expansion of production to about 100 per cent. to 20,000 bales per annum should be possible.

The British West Indies are the sole producers of Sea Island cotton, the market for which is limited. Improvements here are concentrated on the introduction of new strains to improve quality, and expansion of output beyond 5,000 bales will depend upon market demand.

A very high grade cotton of the Sudan type is being grown under irrigation in the Abyan district of the *Western Aden Protectorate* and it is hoped to increase output to about 10,000 bales in the near future.

The possibilities of growing cotton in other territories have been or are being examined but the only one which at present holds out any prospect of large scale production is the Gold Coast, if the Volta River scheme is adopted. Preliminary experiments are being carried out in the Volta Area.

Certain Colonial producers, namely Nigeria, Nyasaland and the Aden Protectorate, have entered into long term contracts with the United Kingdom Raw Cotton Commission, which, by offering a stable market for some years ahead, serve to encourage expansion of production. In addition advances by the Raw Cotton Commission have been of considerable help in starting irrigated cotton production in the Aden Protectorate.

Barbados (Oil Prospecting Rights)

Mr. Harold Davies asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies what concessions have been granted by the Government of Barbados to the Gulf Oil Company of Pittsburg to prospect for oil; and how these prospecting rights compare with those granted to the British Union Oil Company.

Mr. Lyttelton: The British Union Oil Company received the first offer of prospecting rights over 55 per cent. of the Island with the first choice of area. The Company rejected the offer and broke off negotiations with the Barbados Government. The Gulf Oil Corporation subsequently took up rights over 50 per cent. of the Island.

I hope that the British Union Oil Company will apply for rights over the 50 per cent. of the Island which is still available for prospecting.

Mr. Davies: Am I to gather from the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that there has been no discrimination whatsoever against the British oil company?

Mr. Lyttelton: As I said in my answer, the oil company received the first offer of prospecting rights.

Mr. Bernard Braine: Is my right hon. Friend aware that the British company had been prospecting for oil for over 30 years, and had discovered oil, that conditions were offered to it and to the American company which were quite unacceptable to the British company, and that, after the British company had withdrawn, more favourable conditions were offered to the American company? Is he further aware that when I was in Barbados last year quite serious allegations were being made about this?

Mr. Lyttelton: These matters were not raised at all by the original Question. This goes into the past. I was asked what concessions had been granted to the Gulf Oil Company.

Mr. Braine: Will my right hon. Friend consider representations on the subject which I shall make to him?

Mr. Lyttelton: Certainly, Sir, but, as far as my information goes, the American company received the same offer as was made to the British company.

Entropy of Letters

"The man of understanding can no more sit quiet and resigned while his country lets its literature decay, and lets good writing meet with contempt, than a good doctor could sit quiet and contented while some ignorant child was infecting itself with tuberculosis under the impression that it was merely eating jam tarts."

"It is very difficult to make people understand the *impersonal* indignation that a decay of writing can cause men who understand what it implies, and the end whereto it leads. It is almost impossible to express any degree of such indignation without being called 'embittered,' or something of that sort." (Ezra Pound.)

THE CHURCH AND POLITICS—(cont'd from page 4).

them in such a way as not to hinder man's attainment of that end. If the State puts obstacles in the way of man's attaining his end, it is the right and duty of the Church to bring what pressure she can by appropriate and legitimate means to secure the removal of those obstacles. Her insistence on her authority is not the fruit of political ambition: she is bound to insist on it for the sake of man himself. It may often bring her opposition; but her Founder Himself was not *persona grata* with the powers of this world." (F. C. Coplestone, S.J., in *The Tablet*, February 9.)

Grand Orient

FREEMASONRY UNMASKED

by MGR. GEORGE E. DILLON, D.D.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

5/-

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