

# THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 11. No. 12.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

## MODERN SCIENCE (VI)

Of a fast-moving, interrelated system of thought and action such as our political-economic society, it is difficult to take a "bird's-eye" view, and the more of a specialist one is, the more difficult it is. The fostering of specialisation of function is, therefore, a powerful weapon wherewith to gain the mastery over society, ready to the hand of anyone who has power to use it in alliance with the intention to dictate policy. Bearing this in mind, a totalitarian government is, by definition, a hidden government: it sees without itself being seen. It sees the confluence of the streams of individual action, while the individuals contributing see only individuals and individual acts.

Mr. G. M. Young, to whom I have already referred in these articles, has been complaining against the tendency to proffer a "simple diagnosis." While freely admitting that a complicated diagnosis is much harder to understand, and therefore much easier, if wrong, to "put over," I submit that what is required is a diagnosis, and that its accordance or otherwise with the powers of the education-shocked public to understand it is a speculative irrelevance which might well be left to be dealt with when the diagnosis is found. At the same time, I think we may be grateful for Mr. Young's story of the secondary-school children who could not use a French dictionary because they had not learned the letters of the alphabet in the traditional order. Without going further at the present stage, but as something germane to the issue, it should be pointed out that the divorce of a mastery of English from familiarity with other languages effected has arisen, in part, from the same cause as the separation of physics from chemistry, namely, insistence upon carrying instruction to the boundary of mental capacity. Never mind the child; find a way of making it learn *something*, never mind what, or why. It *must* learn: we must be "an educated democracy."

It will be apparent that of the 43 *per cent.* of Secondary School pupils who, in 1929, took Chemistry in their School Certificate, not many became 'chemists.' Presumably, most of them were deterred from studying physics because a reasonably good grasp of the more commonly used demonstrations in mathematics is required by way of preliminary. The physics training which Larmor and his generation received consisted, mainly if not entirely, in a complete review of the ground covered by Galileo, Kepler and Newton, upon the completion of which they felt themselves ready for anything that might turn up. This is still the 'Natural Philosophy' of the Scottish universities. I am told that there are medical students who are taught 'physics' without any previous instruction in mechanics. It seems that what they are taught is a few formulae, while the lecturer expatiates on the principles underlying the construction of

various gadgets which represent his understanding of some of the 'mechanisms' of the living animal body (*e.g.*, the system of vessels for circulating the blood), and other mechanisms which form the working parts of (expensive) experimental and diagnostic apparatus (*e.g.*, the capillary galvanometer). Thus they come to rely more and more upon 'indicators' impelling them to a course of action: but what else the 'indicator' 'indicates' besides the prescribed action becomes more and more an impertinence to inquire.

One has not to look to the future for the time when the conscious, intelligent individual may be converted into the perfectly efficient *tool*, unconscious of everything but his function, by these means. The time has arrived. Nor is it only a caste segregated by aptitude that is affected. The whole system of thought is submitted to a broadside of fire, while up from the fo'c'sle and down from the bridge its whole integrity is undermined. The boy who goes no further than the first steps is transformed. He has the whole 'Law' at his back: the law of the conservation of matter! Money?—Oh, well, it's an enzyme, of course! There is such a thing as *La Philosophie Chimique*. In the grip of *La Philosophie Chimique*, little Tommy detaches himself from his 'ignorant' parents, who cannot understand that salt is merely the chloride of sodium, from the whole philosophical ground from which he has sprung, in which, simple or complex (and most philosophies which work are simple), he was rooted. But why should he have roots? Trees have roots. Trees and their roots can be dispensed with. Indigo and rubber can be synthesised artificially—*i.e.*, chemically. Tommy looks forward to the day when it will be possible to concoct Tommy in the laboratory. Tommy's philosophy does not comprise the question why this accomplishment is inherently desirable or to whom it is desirable? With great respect for Tommy, why go to all this trouble?

I was visited lately by a gynaecologist who asked me to give him an account of the methods available for detecting deviations from the normal (let that pass) in the reproductive male cells. I told him that the recorded visible deviations were striking and easily demonstrated. He said he feared so, and that a new specialist "service" was springing up, if indeed it was not already supplying grist to the mill of the enterprising, with the object of "certifying" the normality of material for artificial insemination. "That wouldn't be in time to be of much use to Bevin, would it?" No. "What's the idea? Going to found a matriarchal society?" The idea was being exploited in America. "But what's the idea?" Oh, sterile marriages, inheritance, *etc.*, *etc.* "But why start now: this is the era of disinheritance, isn't it?" Yes, he thought it was a ramp. But to call it a ramp is to underestimate it. It is not *a* ramp, but *the* ramp. A correspondent puts it clearly: it is "the canalisation of externally-selected

functions, with atrophy of other potentialities. So long as this takes place the critical faculty may be allowed to continue. It may even be encouraged. This is one aspect of ruling humanity by functions: the 'culture' of 'pure' functions. What is being interfered with is synthetic mental processes. Retention of these is reserved for the rulers."

TUDOR JONES.

(To be Continued.)

## The Power of the Bureaucrat

The following letter appeared in THE SCOTSMAN of November 17, 1943:—

Sir,

Your correspondent, Mr. W. A. Ross, writing in your issue of November 9, is correct in stating that the swelling tide of bureaucratic State control (which we all devoutly hope will in time sweep Hitler off his feet, while regretting that in the mean-time it has swept so many middle-class British business men out of their businesses) did not begin with this war, but has been rapidly rising since the end of the last one. He gives us impressive statistics of the rise of Government-controlled building during the inter-war period, but omits to remind us of the unprecedented decline in taste of design and quality of material witnessed in the same period, which will stand out in British architectural history as the all-time low water mark of British home building. Nor does your correspondent, as did the Prime Minister the other day, recall the remarkable deterioration of our railways when these, after the last war, were *de facto*, if not *de jure*, nationalised. The matchless muddle wrought by the inefficiency during the early part of this war by our first State monopoly, the Post Office (which, incidentally, has pursued a policy of inflation since the first days of the war by raising all its charges), is equally passed over in silence.

These examples, and all the others that every one of us can supply from our daily experience, should make it clear to Mr. Ross why our people are beginning to "loathe bureaucracy," and why we view with the gravest misgivings the Beveridge proposals for giving *carte blanche* to people who create a dozen problems for every one they solve. We do not deny the willingness of the bureaucrats to "kill giants," but their discernment as to what giants should be killed appears to be faulty. While they have made a "bonny mess" of "freedom" and "Personal Initiative," those other giants, "Want" and "Disease" and the rest not only remain with us, but grow in proportion as the power of bureaucracy is extended.

In view of this, one can agree with Mr. Ross that the praise with which "the people" is said to have received the scheme "is undiscriminating if anything." The report, says your correspondent, "has swept the country," and it is significant, I think, that even the Official Report in Brief ("all that anyone needs to know about the Beveridge Report") contains no hint of the extent of the restrictive and oppressive regulations of the complete version, which few of the "people" have either the money to acquire or the leisure to peruse.

One wonders, to take paragraph 248, what the four million Old Age Pensioners, who at the moment are petitioning the Government for an unconditional pension, will make of Sir William's suggestion that "no person retired on pension

would be permitted to hold an occupation card in respect of a shop, small holding, fishingboat, &c.;" or of paragraph 249: "No fresh unconditional pension should be granted after the day appointed for the beginning of the new scheme." Paragraph 371 makes it quite plain that neither old nor young are to be allowed to exercise freedom of choice of occupation. Those who refuse "suitable" employment, leave work without "just cause," fail to attend a work or training centre, forfeit their unemployment benefit. Further, disability benefits will (paragraph 128) be subject to "imposition of special behaviour conditions," and (paragraph 131), "conditions imposed on benefit must be enforced where necessary by suitable penalties."

I am, etc.,

Killin, November 14, 1943.

W. L. RICHARDSON.

## PARLIAMENTARY PALESTINE COMMITTEE

When the Parliamentary Palestine Committee was reconstituted recently, says the *Jewish Chronicle*, Lord Winster (House of Lords) and Mr. S. S. Hammersley, M.P. (House of Commons) were elected Joint Chairmen; Mr. A. Creech Jones, M.P., and Mr. Geoffrey Mander, M.P., Vice-Chairmen; and Captain W. F. Strickland, M.P., and Mr. Barnett Janner, Joint Hon. Secretaries.

Several others will be appointed on the Executive.

"This is a good team of officers... who will strive to make up for the loss of the late Lord Wedgwood and Colonel Cazalet in the critical days for Palestine that lie ahead. Lord Winster was well known in the Commons as Commander Fletcher, Labour Member for Nuneaton, and he has made his mark in the House of Lords since he went there in 1942.

"His Co-Chairman on the Committee, Mr. S. S. Hammersley (Conservative, East Willesden), is a business man... He has a keen and searching mind and has long been noted for his interest in the Jews.

"Mr. Geoffrey Mander (Liberal, East Wolverhampton) is a progressive of vision and energy and has on many occasions shown his staunch friendship for the Jewish cause.

"Mr. Creech Jones (Labour, Shipley) is in regular touch with Palestine. He is Parliamentary Private Secretary to Mr. Bevin, Minister of Labour.

"Captain W. F. Strickland (Con., Coventry), who has consented to conduct the secretaryship of the Committee with Mr. Barnett Janner, is deeply sincere in everything he undertakes, and is highly respected in the House. He saw war service in Egypt and Palestine in the last war and visited Palestine on a Parliamentary deputation some years before the present war."

## NAZIS AND THE BEVERIDGE PLAN

A German propaganda sheet circulated in Prisoner of War Camps says that the Germans hope that British planning may bring the country closer to the rigid planning of National Socialism and hence to Nazism itself. Of the Beveridge Plan it says: "In spite of the unfavourable attitude of the British Government it will materialise. We Germans welcome all constructive steps taken by England in this direction."

### THE BUSINESS VOTE

Mr. Herbert Morrison's assurance, on the Report stage of the Parliament (Elections and Meeting) Bill on November 3, of co-operation between Home Office, registration officers and party organisers in the registration of electors entitled to a Business Vote will not reassure those who value among the soundest attributes of our electoral system its relative (compared with that of the United States, for instance) independence of the party system. By his rejection as impracticable of other amendments designed to inform inexperienced voters—there will be many of them, as Parliament is eight years old—of the privileges they may claim, the Home Secretary provided Parliament with the alternative of either depreciating the effectiveness of the business vote, a result no doubt acceptable to Socialists, who do not appreciate individual enterprise, or instituting a closer incorporation of the Party Organisations into the electoral machine.

### "FAITH IN OUR RACE"

Through the Council for Education in World Citizenship, General Smuts wrote a letter to the Youth of Britain for Armistice Day. In the letter, says *The Scotsman*, the General said:

"Twenty odd years ago... we pledged our allegiance to the League of Nations. We believed in good-will and human co-operation in our effort to find a new way to future peaceful human society. We failed. The spirit in us was too weak to act up to the ideal of the great covenant. We pay to-day a heavier price than ever before for human frailty and failure. But still we shall not sit down; we shall never sit down to defeat or give up what we strove for. The faith in our race, the light we have seen in the attainment of our idea will continue to give us strength in our hearts."

### "THE CALEDONIAN WEATHER INQUIRY"

In the *Scotsman* of November 10, *A Scotsman's Log* has the following:—

"Having read in the London Press that Scotland is agog with reconstruction plans, we feel no compunction in drawing attention to a report on which this column has been quietly engaged for some time. We call it 'The Caledonian Weather Inquiry' and we hope that Mr. Johnston will use the report as the basis of a Bill one wet day. Here is an extract:—

"As we have shown Scottish weather has been allowed to drift into a condition which must give the true patriot cause for alarm. Unless a programme of regeneration is introduced forthwith, within ten years we shall have lost our weather altogether. Our Committee recommends either that the whole of Scotland should be air-conditioned, a scheme which could be carried out for the expenditure of 50 billion pounds over a period of 500 years, and give employment to five million workmen or else that a group of artificial sunlight installations should be erected at suitable centres capable of supplying the industrial belt with continuous sunshine. Although the latter project would cost only 45 billion pounds, and could be completed in 450 years, it would have the disadvantage of depriving the rural popu-

lation of sunlight. The Committee suggests, therefore, that both schemes should be introduced simultaneously, and that tenders should be invited immediately. . . ."

### The Russian Enigma

"The revolution is over. The Five Year plan is finished. The Soviet volcano is cooling and, in cooling, seeks its equilibrium. The masses are disappointed in a revolution from the benefits of which they are excluded. The bourgeois and landowners have been replaced by the bureaucrats . . . But the disappointed masses are politically passive. . . ."

"Very different is the position in the camp of the 'masters.' They fight for the inheritance of the revolution. The masters—that is to say, the two groups of Communist and non-party bureaucrats. The former have the Party and the workers' organisations at their disposal, they have a predominating influence in the administration and in the army. The non-Communist bureaucrats, consisting of intellectuals and technicians, direct the production and command the workers in workshops and heavy industries. They direct a highly centralised, corporate organisation, the ITR of technical personnel; this is very important in the State apparatus and in the army, and has the support of one of the most powerful and most secret forces in Russia, the Church. For one must never forget that the important strata of the people who no longer believe in the revolution have faith in the Church, which has succeeded in modernising itself."

(Stalin tried first to bring these two factions together, and hoped by crushing the Left-wing Opposition to warn the non-Party malcontents).

"In actual fact the very opposite happened. The Moscow Trials brought the Communist Party into disrepute and stimulated the appetite of the non-Party Bolsheviks. These circumstances naturally brought the army into the forefront. The army is sufficiently connected with the revolution to defend the Communist bureaucracy against any reactionary attack; it is, in short, the incarnation of the new national 'class-less unity.' Such might well be the roots of a Soviet Bonapartism. External dangers increase the chances of such a development.

"By assassinating the generals of the revolution, Stalin has by no means triumphed. The young army-chiefs—for one cannot just abolish generals—may show themselves more enterprising than their predecessors. To prevent a military dictatorship, all Stalin has to do is to succeed in reconciling the two bureaucracies with one another and with the Church . . ."

"The murder of the generals meant that the military dictatorship was ripening in Russia. But whether it was already mature . . . it would be difficult to say. It would be more prudent to say that the trial of the generals, as all the Soviet trials between 1929 and 1937, had a preventive character. What might happen was to be prevented. The accused were guilty of potential crimes. The accusations were put in the most convenient forms each time, and contained what Stalin deemed as useful charges against his enemies."—ANTON CILIGA, in *The Russian Enigma*, first published in France in 1938, and in England by Routledge, 1940. P. 287 ff.

## 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: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,  
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 11. No. 12.

Saturday, November 27, 1943.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It is important to remember, in the blizzard of froth and fable regarding Russia, that the first important Treaty negotiated by the Bolsheviks was between Walther Rathenau, on behalf of Germany, and Tchitcherin, on behalf of Russia. Rathenau, the German-Jew, had about as much interest in the interests of the "workers," beyond keeping them at work, as has Montagu Norman, and was credited with close co-operation with Ludwig and Moritz Mond.

This being a d'markrazi, the Minister who is to Reconstruct us has never been elected to anything larger than a club.

It does not appear to have occurred to critics of the Beveridge ramp that universal insurance merely consists in spending a considerable percentage of your compulsory savings in maintaining a lot of useless people to spend your money for you. All insurance is based on the proposition that, over a given period, premiums paid exceed claims liquidated.

"The Reichswehr chiefs who are conducting the *Abmachungen* (Agreements Plot) delude themselves that they can use Bolshevik Russia to help them in their hoped-for war of revenge against Europe, and then, in the hour of victory, hold the Bolsheviks at bay, and keep them in their place. The more subtle psychologists at the Kremlin, of course, know better, but are wise enough to keep their knowledge to themselves. The fact that in the end, this German-Russian plot will bring about the destruction of Germany, will not in any way reconcile Europe to its own destruction at the hands of of Germany and Russia together."

—*The Russian Face of Germany*, by C. F. MELVILLE, 1932.

"The liberation of mankind was to start with the 'dictatorship of the proletariat.' We have got it to-day in a large part of the world. The Wave of the Future has been rolling over the world for twenty-four years. When Russia was once more invaded by German armies, as in the hours when that Wave engulfed the Russian Empire, the Russian standard of living was almost back to where it was in 1913."

—*This Age of Fable*, by GUSTAV STOLPER, p. 290.

We know nothing whatever about the activities of Sir Oswald Mosley, and not much about his political objectives, and with what little we know, we disagree. But we think that the petition to keep him in gaol, and protesting against his release on medical grounds, by a deputation claiming to represent 20,000 "workers," because "it will create unrest and dissatisfaction among the workers on the home front" strikes a new and ominous note in politics, although it can be seen to be a direct consequence of our new ideas of the liberty of the subject and the supercession of Magna Carta. It is part of the older and apparently outmoded tradition of these islands that popular clamour shall in no case be allowed to influence the course of the law. But it is a short step, and evidently a familiar step to some of our population, from the abrogation of trial by judge and jury, to trial and execution by the mob, in respect of which even Pontius Pilate washed his hands. We doubt whether five *per cent.* of the "workers" who are so concerned about the unrest on the home front have ever done anything of importance in their lives but create unrest, either in this country or more probably in the ghettos of Germany and Poland.

Lord Melchett's (of Imperial Chemical Industries, son of Moritz Mond) letter to the London *Times* is very clever. Quite properly, it snubs the bureaucracy-worshippers, not less than the earnest little people who say unemployment is all the fault of the industrial system. Ah, but the problem lies in the field of Finance (thunder on the Left). This calls for research—much research.

So you see we're now on the right track, and at the end of it we shall find—well now, would you believe it?—full employment. So Mond, Beveridge and Morrison all agree.

A contemporary review points out that in his speech at Burnley recently Mr. Herbert Morrison said, in a passage which was omitted from many of the newspaper reports, that the German challenge was never merely "a challenge of a power-drunk clique." It is, he said, "also the challenge of a slave society which boasted its slavery, dignified its barbaric creed with the title of New Order, and sought to foist not only its power, but its philosophy of rigid, over-organised, over-efficient regimentation on all people. All over the world the breed found its adherents and sympathisers. . . . Keep in mind the recollection of this issue: the idea of slave organisation will not necessarily be quite dead in the world even when the Nazis and the Fascists are only a nightmare memory. We had an idea, too; a far older idea, with far deeper roots, though we were less good at trumpeting it abroad; it was the idea of the free human spirit—the free society."

Mr. Hector Perrier, Provincial Secretary of Quebec, told the 21st convention of Canada and Newfoundland Education Association recently that Quebec was claiming absolute autonomy in matters of education.

Mr. Perrier said that Quebec was ready "to stand against any interference of the federal bureaucracy."

He added that although Canadians of other provinces were inclined to think otherwise, the educational system in the province of Quebec was not based on a racial principle but on one of education.

## DIVIDE AND RULE

By B. M. PALMER

A few days after reading the House of Lords debate on Agriculture and Food Values (in which their Lordships demonstrated, among other things that the long end of the tape is not by any means completely severed, and that the German-Jew plutocracy of conspirators knew what they were doing in 1911 when they crippled the second chamber) I came upon an advertisement in a pseudo-intellectual weekly. There was something about this advertisement that drew the eye at once with a sort of repulsion, yet the workmanship was admirable and the printing beyond criticism. It was a reproduction of a pen and ink drawing of a rat, a grey squirrel, and a rabbit. These three little animals, arranged in a friendly group among leaves and flowers, were making a hearty meal together. But the artist had given such a turn to his pen that each little face was loathsome and vile, while yet quite recognisable as a type. Here was nature, no longer a friend, but an enemy. It was as if some evil incarnation had taken place. Animism *in excelsis*. The drawing was an advertisement for Imperial Chemical Industries, and its object to persuade farmers to destroy these pests by gassing them.

The immediate task is to synthesise the situation away from the Encyclopaedist heresy, which is simply a Satanic application of the principle of "Divide and Rule." Love of animals is essentially a Christian virtue, in a very realistic sense. And, moreover, its quality is Immanence, not Omnipotence.

It is not the part of writers in this paper to supply the type of inherited hierarchical knowledge of function so admirably demonstrated in the House of Lords by men who have been farmers for generations; but we can all learn to expose the encyclopaedist heresy wherever we find that attempts are being made to represent *part* of a truth without reference to the whole. In this case the exercise of common sense—that is, automatic and continual reference of results back to theories—would naturally lead to the questions: "If there are too many rats, rabbits and grey squirrels, why are there too many?" "If gassing kills these animals so effectively in their burrows, what about soil bacteria, earth worms, 'man's greatest friend,' and other useful living organisms?" "If gassing is the most *humane* (sic) method of destruction, why is it so feared and loathed by human beings that the imminence of a gas attack is more likely to cause mob hysteria than any other diabolical threat yet devised by vested interests?"

It seems to me that we have to pursue a very exact course in this matter. While for instance nothing would be more unprofitable than to embark on a discussion with an I.C.I. expert concerning the exact effects of gassing, we should be able to put him in his place with regard to its *purpose*. I think that to be called on to be experts on *policy*, as all Social Crediters are certainly called on to be, may be a bigger task than some of us used to think possible—"What are you trying to do?" *not* "How are you trying to do it?"

What is I.C.I. trying to do? Could it, by any chance, be a cornering of the world's instruments of destruction,

under the control of the only essential internationalists, so that when the time came they could be handed over intact, and quite beyond the control of any one nation, or even group of nations?

A letter entitled the *Future of the Cartel* appeared in the *Times* on October 28. Among other points it was stated: "If you make any regulations giving a State Government rights over an international or inter-State organisation, you set up a competition among States offering the most attractive terms to secure the settlement of such organisations on their territory. . . . Supervision and control of international organisations never can be exercised by any but international bodies, if it must be done at all. Unless we have such international controlling bodies we shall never be rid of economic nationalism and the latent or economic warfare which is its concomitant."—E. P. GOLDSCHMIDT.

To me this frame of mind seems equivalent to saying: "Let's encourage the breeding of rats so that we can have an I.C.I. organisation to supply the means of gassing them." And, of course, plenty of rats are a safeguard against economic nationalism. Aren't they?

Do you see how very neatly all the pieces fit together in the framework?

Divide and rule—divide the people from the mechanism of the State which should serve them; divide the manufacture and distribution of essential requirements from all relation to the desires of consumers; divide the symptom from its cause—and who shall say how long the spoliation may continue?

## Points From Parliament

House of Lords: November 10, 1943.

### STATUTE OF WESTMINSTER 1931 (AMENDMENT) BILL

*Lord Strabolgi*: My Lords, I beg leave to introduce a Bill to extend the provisions of the Statute of Westminster, 1931, to India, and to move that it be read a first time.

Moved, That the Bill be now read.—(*Lord Strabolgi*).

*Viscount Cranborne*: My Lords, I beg on behalf of His Majesty's Government to oppose the Bill for which the noble Lord has just moved the introduction. This, I fully recognise, is a very unusual procedure. It is very rare that a Bill should be opposed on the First Reading, but this particular Bill, I suggest to your Lordships, ought never to have been introduced into your Lordships' House at all. I would have imagined, if I may say so, that the noble Lord himself would have recognised that if there is any Act which is completely unsuitable for an individual Peer to attempt to amend by means of a Private Members' Bill, it is the Statute of Westminster, which is the foundation of the whole constitutional structure of the British Commonwealth of Nations. If such a Bill were to be introduced—and I cannot feel that at the present juncture it would serve any useful purpose—it must be introduced, clearly, by His Majesty's Government after previous consultation with the Governments of the Dominions. To introduce it without such consultation—and it is obvious, I think, that any private member such as the

noble Lord himself is in no position to have undertaken the necessary negotiations with the other Governments of the Commonwealth—would be as though one in a partnership of five were to attempt to introduce a sixth partner without any consultation with the other partners. That would not only be beyond his power, but it would be, I think, a very great discourtesy to the other partners. I really cannot conceive why the noble Lord should have chosen this very eccentric method of ventilating this subject. I should have thought that the natural procedure would have been to put down a Motion for a debate in the ordinary way. In any case I feel certain that your Lordships will not wish to let this matter to go any further, and I beg, therefore, here quite briefly to oppose this motion for the First Reading.

*Lord Strabolgi:* My Lords, the action of the noble Viscount, the Leader of the House, is not unexpected. Although I had no intimation until just before we met, I anticipated something of this kind. There is, of course, a precedent, as the Noble Viscount says, for opposing a Bill on First Reading. In any case I indicated through the usual channels that I had no intention of proceeding beyond the First Reading stage until there was some measure of agreement. I hoped to get the Bill printed and the matter discussed and considered. I must say at once that, though I naturally talked the matter over with my noble friend, Lord Addison, I am proceeding in this matter entirely on my own initiative, and I am not in any way seeking to commit my colleagues and my noble friends on this side of the House. . . In view of the noble Viscount's attitude I do not propose to proceed with the First Reading.

On Question, Motion negatived.

*House of Commons: November 11, 1943.*

### MOSCOW CONFERENCE

*Mr. Pickthorn (Cambridge University):* . . . I am bound to say that I was rather horrified by the suggestion of a new League of Nations to be designed by the hon. Gentleman and Member for East Wolverhampton (Mr. Mander). What particularly interested me about his remarks—and I would couple with them some of the remarks which came from the hon. Member for the Forest of Dean (Mr. Price)—was his frequent references to "smaller Powers." I beg this House to remember that we are a small Power. England is a small Power. Even if we can be quite sure of the co-operation of Wales, Scotland, Cornwall and Northern Ireland, we still remain a small Power. The danger of talking of other peoples of 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 as if they were peoples of a different kind from us is a very gross danger, and it is very amusing to find that it almost always comes from those gentlemen who are most internationally-minded. I wish to return later for a moment to that point. On the League of Nations point, I think it is not wholly out of Order to say one word of advice. The hon. Member for East Wolverhampton says that if you only have a good League of Nations, designed from Wolverhampton, all the citizens of the whole League would each one of them react in defence of the League the moment any danger comes from outside—I suppose the danger would come from the planet Mars—as, he said, every citizen in the British Empire reacts at once. But every

citizen in the British Empire does not react at once. It took many generations until we got to the point where it could be confidently presumed that a high enough proportion would react at once for us to be able to be one global, self-contained sovereign Power in Britain, let alone the Empire. If there are enough people in this country who really think that something of the same sort could be done in six months, six years, or sixty years for the whole of the world, I feel sadly certain that we shall see the wheel go round even faster next time than it went round before, and that after an even shorter interval of peace we shall have once more an even more unnecessary and even more bloody war. . . .

I would like the House to consider very carefully—and for greater accuracy, as they say, I have the version from *Soviet War News*—some of the words in the documents issued from the Moscow Conference. The Foreign Secretary told us that the great benefit of it had been that it had created understanding between "our three countries." Indeed, that is a great benefit. I have no doubt that there is truth in it. I should have no doubt if only because he told me so. I have even less doubt when I read Marshal Stalin's speech and read that:

"We can say without exaggeration that by all this they have considerably facilitated the successes of our summer campaign. . . It is obvious that the opening of a real second front . . . will considerably speed up the victory over Hitlerite Germany."

I have no doubt that there is in Russia a fuller understanding that we, after all, are doing our share, and that to a certain extent, after proper consultations, we must be allowed to do it in our own way. That is very nice for us, and one may say, I hope, without being excessively jingo, that it is very nice for the Russians, that we should be understanding each other better and getting on better. But I want to say a word about the other peoples. The people responsible for overseas broadcasting do not seem to understand that what matters is not the people that you think you are broadcasting to, but the other people who are listening, the people who overhear it, so to speak. We have to think of what Europe has felt about these declarations. I sympathise with the hon. gentleman the Member for Maldon (Mr. Driberg) when he begged to be allowed to have some views about what is being thought in Europe. People must not assume too readily—and there has been a good deal of assuming lately—that all the people of Europe are leaning to the Left. But there must be a certain amount of assuming. I have been to a great deal of trouble to see all the foreigners I can and to read all the foreign papers I can. It is not very much when you have got it. . . but. . . I must say that the impression given by the English newspapers of a chorus of 100 per cent. uncritical enthusiasm among neutrals is certainly not a fair impression. It would be very remarkable if it was. I think the British public is not, in those respects, very well served by its newspapers.

The hon. Gentleman who spoke last was very anxious about the monarchy in Greece. I have not the least interest in the monarchy in Greece; I have no views about it. I do not care which side the thing goes at all. But it is a dangerous principle, this principle of his. His principle is that every part of Europe which has been occupied by Germany or by German satellites, including Italy, must, on becoming unoccupied, start absolutely from scratch. I do not know if people who think that intend to apply these rules to the Baltic provinces or the Ukraine, whether they suggest that

we should then have an international Commission, with a Brazilian chairman, somebody from Scandinavia and somebody from Haiti, to hold a plebiscite in the Ukraine, to find out whether they desire an *Anschluss* with their great neighbour in the East or not.

*Mr. Driberg:* Does the hon. Member agree with what the Prime Minister has said, that it will be for the Greek people to decide the future government of their country?

*Mr. Pickthorn:* I believe it will be for the British people to decide on the future government of their country; it will be for the Greek people to decide upon the future government of their country. I do not think it will be a good thing on the day on which the Armistice sirens are sounded for the British people to say, "Now we will start from bed-rock or from scratch and consider whether we should have a republic or a monarchy." In Europe, where it is possible to start, not from scratch, but from the point where it was last a going concern, this should be done, and I am sure it is in the interests of this country that it should be done. I am more emboldened to say it because hon. Members opposite who talk the anti-monarchical, anti-traditionalist stuff, also when it suits them talk traditionally. The hon. Member for the Forest of Dean (Mr. Price) spoke of traditionalist Russia and said that the more traditionalist the Russians were the better, and that though they had done things which would not have been done in Western civilisation, it did not matter because it was all in their tradition. I have been reading in the *New Leader* that England is second to none in her revolutionary tradition. That is to my mind a good reassurance; our revolutionary tradition may go on for another six months or so without blowing up.

... It is said that this is the time to argue that everything in Europe should start with a clean slate after the victory. I should find it very frightening indeed if I were a little civil servant with growing children living somewhere in a not very fruitful part of France, and in other parts of Europe I should find it more difficult still to swallow. With these things at the back of our minds, I would invite hon. Members to look at the declaration upon Italy. I hope that Italy will turn into a democracy. I expect that Italy will turn into a democracy. I should have thought it was almost certain that if you left Italy alone, it would turn into some sort of a democracy. It is very difficult to believe that you will make it more likely that Italy will turn into a democracy and that democracy will be popular and go easily, by saying seven times that Fascism must be abolished and democracy instituted, and then say that

"nothing in this resolution is to operate against the right of the Italian people ultimately to choose their own form of Government."

I have often put my signature to documents that were very badly drafted, because there were two other chaps in it. But this is a great public document which is apparently to replace the Atlantic Charter more or less as the foundation deed of the new world. Europe will be frightened at any looseness of drafting. . . If we overdo this crying up democracy, imposing democracy, I do not believe that it will be in the interest of democracy. Democrats are in this paradoxical situation, that if you are an autocrat you may say that your principles compel you to impose autocracy anywhere else. If you are a democrat, you cannot do that; democrats must allow others to choose democracy or not. And then there are different sorts of democracy. When the French read this and wonder what sort of democracy the Italians

will set up as a result of it, they will be a little puzzled whether it will be the democracy personified by my hon. Friend or by Mr. Harriman or by Marshal Voroshilov. Democracy is, to imitate the tremendous vocabulary of the Prime Minister, a tribiguous word, or even a polybiguous word, and so is Fascism. I think I know pretty well what Fascism means inside Italy. When it is said that Fascism is something bad in itself I agree, but I do not know exactly what it does mean. When it is provided that everything Fascist should be destroyed, and that everything that was bad was Fascist and somebody suggested that they would have to relood the Pontine Marshes, I thought that that was rather pernickety, rather sea-lawyerly.

... I beg the House to believe that it is extremely dubious whether it is in the interest of democracy or of this country or of Europe that democracy should be so much something imposed. There is a similar question I would address to the right hon. Gentleman, and it is about what is called the trial of war criminals. I wonder whether anybody would be bold enough to guess how often the trial of war criminals is clearly mentioned in these documents. The answer is, I think, "Not at all." It is difficult to talk on this particular subject without having some risk of being priggish. We have had a fairly easy time, and it is fairly easy for us to be Christians and forgiving. Any man of my age or a little older has suffered enough from Germany to be excused if he feels a desire for vengeance, but still as compared with the Poles, the Greeks, the Belgians, the Serbs, we have suffered nothing at all. We have so little imagination of how terrible the world can be that we have not even feared things which they have not only feared but for years have endured. I should hate to sound superior and priggish as perhaps I do when I say that the notion of punishing your country's enemies seems rather infantile, slightly vulgar, and is extremely impolitic. If you are going to punish them, I would go the whole hog and say, "I don't like your dirty faces; you have done dirty tricks, and so off with your dirty heads." There is something to be said for taking that line. I want to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether all this language in his declaration is carefully chosen. It apparently indicates that people are to be punished, and it does not clearly indicate that anybody is to be tried. There is I think no explicit mention of trial throughout the document. I should like to know whether that is deliberate and whether that is what it means. In either case this, if it appears, whichever way, to be a wound to Law, like the clauses about Italy is rather dangerous from a European point of view.

Everyone has talked to-day of Russia almost exclusively, and with almost excessive reverence; I yield to no man in my desire for friendship and co-operation with Russia. But there has even been language appropriate to the Deity about Russia: "With Russia all things are possible and without Russia nothing is possible." That has been said, I think, at least twice to-day. It contains some truth. It is also true that with Europe a great deal is possible and without Europe very little indeed is possible. If there is not, when this war is over, a Europe which is certain of her own frontiers, conscious of her public law, and of the authorities of governments and the expected standards of their relationships, if there is not something like that very soon after the last shot is fired, it will be organised by somebody, and I cannot see who else it will be by but Germany. We should not

give Europe an impression that anything we shall do cannot be defended by European tradition and European notions of European law.

*Mr. Mander:* The hon. Member must have overlooked a certain phrase in the passage which says:

"Will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished according to the laws of those liberated countries and of the free Government which will be erected therein."

*Mr. Pickthorn:* One has never failed to get guidance from the Liberal Party. I do not say that the idea of the punishment of war criminals was actually invented by Liberals, but the earliest trace of it I know was in the autumn of 1914, when a Liberal journalist said that the Kaiser and the Crown Prince, if guilty, were to be tried. That is precisely the point I am trying to make. If we give Europe the impression that old England, looked to as embodying all justice, cricket, playing with a straight bat, a fair deal for your opponent, is falling into that sort of error, it will be frightfully difficult to re-make the Concert of Europe. It says that they are to be judged. It does not say that they are to be tried.

*Mr. Mander:* According to law.

*Mr. Pickthorn:* They are to be punished according to law. The question I ask is, Is it the intention that they are to be tried or is it not? And one other specific question, what exactly is meant by the declaration in the Note implying that after the termination of hostilities the United Nations will not employ their military forces within the territories of other States? I should like some assurance on what that means and how far it fetters the policy of His Majesty's Government.

I beg of His Majesty's Government to make sure that this House and the country are much more frequently and fully informed about foreign policy and about the state of Europe than we have been for the last five years. One way to inform the House and the country is that all documents should be plain and unambiguous. I do not want to criticise my right hon. Friend, because I think that it was a momentary inadvertence, and also I did not get it down accurately, but his last sentence\* to-day might frighten many Europeans. It was something to the effect that he hoped that we, that was Russia and us, could get together to arrange Europe so as to give it a chance of peace once more. I beg that every time there is a Governmental utterance about foreign policy there should be insistence that Europe is what we care about, as much as we care about our Alliance with the United States and about Russia, and that we do not think Europe can be reconstituted as a blank slate, placed so high that only the three very biggest boys can draw on it. We must remember that Europe is older than this country, older than the United States, older than Russia or our Empire. It is only an ill-shaped promontory upon the face of Asia, but most of the greatness of human history has come out of it. There are old lines, long traditions of law and of decency, of what is to be accepted and what is not, often contravened, but the standards have been there for hundreds, even thousands of years, and unless we continually restate in our public declarations when setting our hands to help

\**Mr. Eden:* "... is it not possible that out of it all we [presumably the Allies] shall be able together so to order the world that these cities that have been shattered shall live again, and that this time they can live their lives in lasting peace."

reconstitute Europe we shall have to do it by beginning from what was left of the public statute and international law of Europe, when tyranny first burst upon it and burst it to pieces, unless we do that, our chance of retaining the leadership of Europe goes, and without that I believe it will be almost impossible to continue to be either the elder brother of the British Empire or the equal partner of the United States of America.

## Christmas Gifts

### Selections From Our Book List

#### ABERHART MANNING

*The memoir of Mr. Aberhart published in the EDMONTON BULLETIN, and that journal's report of Mr. Manning's speech on policy broadcast on his becoming Premier of Alberta.* 9d.

With portraits of Mr. Aberhart and Mr. Manning.

By C. H. DOUGLAS

#### THE BIG IDEA (2/6)

The Land for the (Chosen)  
People Racket (2/-)

#### RECONSTRUCTION (6d.)

*The GLASGOW EVENING TIMES articles of May, 1932, on Social Credit.*

The Monopoly of Credit (3/6)

#### SOCIAL CREDIT (3/6)

(Please allow for postage when remitting.)

From K. R. P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED  
49 PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL 15