

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 15. No. 15.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

### Under Which King?

There is no single aspect of political economy which deserves more attention, and receives less, than the nature of an order. Like so many other matters of importance and subtlety, most people understand so little of the subject that they are practically unaware that it presents any problem; still less, a problem on which the whole structure of society depends. The immense success of mediaeval civilisation (and its ultimate failure) can be seen to be linked with one conception of an order and the sanctions which sustained it; the different, but notable, achievements of the nineteenth century, and the chaos which has succeeded that short-lived adventure, are plainly the outcome of another. The problem is often stated by the use of the word "sovereignty"; and we have an indication of that identity in the title of the gold coin which ruled the nineteenth century, the English sovereign, as well as in the declared intention to remove national sovereignty to an international centre.

The essence of Mediaevalism (often, it may be noted, referred to as the Mediaeval Order) was the existence of the Church as a sanction, as an organisation for making effective certain checks and balances upon the use of physical force to carry an order from its utterance to its execution. The Church claimed to be, and was to quite a considerable extent, a living body of Superior Law, not different in intention but far higher in conception, to the Constitution of the United States. And it is important to notice that the breakdown of nineteenth century English prosperity can be seen in retrospect to be contemporaneous with the decadence in social prestige of the village parson.

Now the nature of the problem presented to political economy, as distinct from ideology, by an order, is simply this: Either Brown gives orders on his own behalf, or Mr. Pink-Geranium gives them for him. That someone has to give orders on Brown's behalf is not in dispute. And the decision between these two courses is *ultimately* dependent on which source of authority succeeds in making results most accurately and rapidly eventuate from orders, in reasonable identity between specification and product. And the problem is complicated for Mr. Pink-Geranium by the fact that he has no-one but Mr. Brown to whom to give orders, and Mr. Brown is convinced that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

There was a period, say between 1850 and 1914, in which the *economic* aspect of this problem was in a fair way to solution. The gold sovereign was a complete order system. Mr. Brown had only to tender his yellow warrant of sovereignty and he got what he wanted. He set in motion the most marvellous train of self acting psychological sanctions. Factories sprang to life, trains ran, and ships sailed, all concerned not merely to do his will, but to do it better than

anyone else. It is quite irrelevant to this particular argument that a large and increasing number of Mr. Browns had no sovereigns; it is a fact of history that the man who had one always wanted two, and in consequence, if every Mr. Brown had possessed a sovereign it would still have been effective. It is perhaps unnecessary to observe that the virtue of the gold sovereign lay not in its material but in its sanctions.

Now the *political* equivalent of the gold sovereign is the vote, and the merest glance at our life and times is sufficient to establish the conclusion that it fails to work. There is nothing in the possession of a vote which remotely approximates to the power of choice and the certainty of delivery enjoyed by Mr. Brown with his golden sovereign in the latter days of the nineteenth century. No-one outside the walls of a mental hospital would contend that the individual voter gets what he votes for, or voted for what he is getting. So obvious is this that the greatest difficulty is experienced in getting people to vote at all. The vote costs nothing: and it is worth precisely what it costs. If it cost ten shillings to vote, how many votes would be registered?

But the matter does not end there. While the political vote is valueless to the individual, it enables the Satanic Powers to claim a mandate which it in fact does not confer, and which it is powerless to enforce. This situation is so satisfactory that the ballot-box is a cardinal provision of the World State, and it is clear for any ordinarily intelligent person to see that it is the intention—and in "Britain" the rapidly developing fact—that the economic vote will be destroyed in its nineteenth century effectiveness, and substituted by the political vote as exercised in Russia.

It is urgently necessary to realise these matters because they dominate our future. British Governments now hold office by a trick; no British Government has any genuine mandate. Our whole political system is not merely irrational, it is a fraud and a usurpation. We have allowed the vicious nonsense which derided the values established by a thousand years of unique political experience to destroy in our name every safeguard against tyranny provided by historic continuity in the Three Estates, and we welcome the people who spawn this nonsense when they desert the Europe they have wrecked. Nothing can save us but a drastic de-hypnotisation. It is coming; but it may kill us.

C. H. DOUGLAS.

### K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

Arrangements have been made for the appointment of Mr. A. R. Turpin to the Managership of K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., Liverpool.

Miss G. M. Warts will join the staff as assistant and secretary to the Editor of *The Social Crediter*.

## PARLIAMENT

House of Lords: December 3, 1945.

### HYDRO-ELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT IN SCOTLAND

Debate resumed (according to Order) on the Motion moved by Lord Kinnaird on Thursday, 22 November—namely, That there be laid before the House Papers relating to the operation of the Hydro-Electric Development (Scotland) Act, 1943.

*Lord Lang of Lambeth:* ... Let there be no mistake that in this scheme the sacrifice demanded is so great that it might almost be called excessive. My noble friend Lord Airlie said it involved change, but not destruction. But in this case the change would be so complete that it is practically equivalent to destruction...

Then my noble friend paid a tribute, I have no doubt justly, to this panel of experts, who advised that this was the best possible scheme and there was no other that could compare with it. I could not help remembering the opinion of the late Lord Salisbury, that experts were admirable as witnesses but very bad as judges. These experts were all engineers who, of course, were bound by the limits of their outlook to consider the question mainly from the point of view of electricity with which they were concerned. For these reasons, I am still not convinced that all the abundant waters of the Highlands could not have enabled the Board to find another scheme which, if it were not so profitable or even so desirable, would at least have been possible and would not have involved this very serious sacrifice of a great and beautiful part of the Highlands...

But I turn to what is, after all, a wider issue—though that one is very important—namely, what degree of importance is likely to be given in future schemes to this question of amenities? Is it to be treated as a sort of side issue, almost negligible in comparison with the material interests that are involved? I do not like that word "amenity"; it seems to suggest something luxurious, desirable no doubt, but not of serious importance compared, as I said, with these material interests that are involved. It is extremely difficult always to assess the relative value of spiritual things like the influence of beautiful scenery, and material things like the supply of electricity; they stand on such different levels. But surely it is not extravagant to claim that in this age of a necessarily and increasingly mechanical character, the things that do elevate, sustain and strengthen the spirit and soul of the nation, have a great, a unique and an indispensable value...

Perhaps I may say a word about the people of the Highlands themselves... I am satisfied—and I know something about them—that a sense of the value of those glorious things in the midst of which they were born and bred, in the midst of which they live and do their work, though it is not often expressed in words (they are mainly a very silent folk) is deep seated in their subconscious lives. Let us not forget those things when we are discussing this particular scheme. The fact that the question of amenities has been fully and seriously discussed by your Lordships' House may have this very valuable result: it may secure that in future schemes these imponderable but profound values will have the place of importance which is their due.

*Lord Teviot:* ... I was one of those Scottish Members of Parliament who was very keen on the Caledonian Power Bill. That Bill was killed, I am afraid, by the English Members of Parliament. Out of the seventy-two Scottish Members of Parliament seventy voted for the Bill and only two against it. We were, however, defeated by the English and I have never forgotten that. I was very much impressed with that Bill; I took a lot of trouble in studying it and it seemed to me a most excellent scheme. I wonder whether it can be resuscitated and perhaps save the Tummel-Garry Falls and the great beauty that is now endangered by this present scheme.

I have read very carefully the speech which was made by Lord Airlie. In that speech he referred to the use of electricity for houses. I know of a burgh which I used to represent in which a housing scheme was carried out. Electricity was installed in the houses but it was very soon found that the people occupying the houses, the consumers, could not afford to use it. Consequently gas was installed and I understand now that only gas is being used in that particular part of the burgh. I entirely agree with my noble friend Lord Rosebery. We must get away from the control of the Electricity Commissioners. I have a suggestion to make. Cannot we in Scotland have Electricity Commissioners of our own?...

Surely many other schemes of the same sort for generating power may be turned completely topsy turvey when the use of atomic energy is fully developed...

Has the Severn scheme been considered in relation to this matter? We know for the first time that the effect of the tides can be harnessed. We had a debate in this House on the subject, in which my noble friend Lord Brabazon took part. It was he who first started the investigations into the Severn scheme. I understand that the Severn scheme is going to be put through, and surely we should not rush into this scheme without waiting to see how the Severn scheme works; because, if it is successful and does what it is expected to do, what about Pentland? There you have a tremendous rush of water, and we may be able to harness the sea there and so obviate interfering with the lovely places in our land. I hope that this matter is not regarded as having been entirely decided, and that those in authority will pause and take into consideration these very important questions, which may alter the whole complexion of this difficult scheme, which has aroused so much genuine opposition for various reasons, quite apart from the question of amenity...

*Lord Rushcliffe:* My Lords, I make no apology whatever, as an Englishman, for making some observations on the matter now before your Lordships' House, because I believe—and I think your Lordships will agree with me—that the beauties of Scotland, the lochs, the waterfalls and the rivers, are just as much the heritage and possession of an Englishman as the beauties of Wales or of the English Lakes are the possession of a Scotsman. It is because I believe, like the noble and most reverend Lord, Lord Lang, that that heritage is in very serious danger, that I am making these few observations. Further, I think that a point which has not been sufficiently emphasised is the fact—and in my view it is a fact—that a definite and precise pledge made in another place has been broken. I shall give my reasons for saying that. This pledge has not been read to your Lordships in its entirety, but it has been referred to. It

was given in another place by the then Secretary of State for Scotland on May 6, 1943, and it is as follows:

"If the hon. and gallant Member wants an assurance that we intend to appoint the strongest possible Amenity Committee and to give every assurance to that Amenity Committee that every reasonable recommendation that they make"—

I ask your Lordships to note those words—

"will be strongly enforced and backed by the Scottish Office, I can cheerfully give him that assurance"

The Amenity Committee was appointed and reported against this scheme; and it is my submission to your Lordships that unless the pledge which I have just read is to be dishonoured, the only question is whether their recommendation was reasonable. I shall deal with that in a moment.

I have neither the inclination nor the knowledge to discuss the technical aspects of the scheme. I do not discuss, because I do not know, whether Sir John Kennedy did or did not say that no other schemes were seriously discussed. I do not discuss either whether this scheme will in fact bring electricity to a single Highland home; I have not the knowledge to enable me to express an opinion. But I am concerned to show, if I can, that the protection which the Amenity Committee was set up to provide has, in view of the events which have happened, shown itself to have precisely no value at all. The noble Earl, Lord Rosebery, earlier in the debate, said:

"I appeal to your Lordships, and to everybody who has had a Government appointment; nobody in charge of any Department would delegate his power to a committee. I should not think it right to expect him to do so."

I, like my noble friend, have had Ministerial responsibility, and as a general proposition I should accept that statement as undoubtedly true. But if a Minister chooses to limit his prerogative, and if he chooses to give a pledge in order to allay opposition, to meet criticism and to relieve anxieties, then I submit that he should be held to his pledge. . . .

A tribunal was set up. I can well understand that the then Secretary of State found himself in an embarrassing position. He was torn, as it were, by conflicting loyalties—loyalty to the pledge which he had given, and on the strength of which he had got his Bill, and his very earnest and proper desire that electricity should be provided for the Highlands. He set up this tribunal, consisting, we were told, of an eminent lawyer, an ex-town council official, and a convener of a neighbouring county. But this tribunal was not the Amenity Committee which was promised; it was merely an *ad hoc* body set up to relieve the Minister of his embarrassment.

In any case, whatever his objects were in setting it up, that does not relieve your Lordships of responsibility because under the Act which set up this Board these orders, or any one of them, may, at any time, be annulled by the vote of either House of Parliament. Therefore your Lordships are not in the least absolved from responsibility in the matter if you are of the opinion that these objections were not reasonable. . . .

It really comes to this: Is the National Trust in future to be a National Trust for the preservation of properties committed to its charge, or is it to be merely the trustee of such properties until such time as the Hydro-Electric Board may choose to take them over and disfigure, destroy and deface them. . . .

It seems to me that in this debate, the account of which I have read with great interest, the most disturbing and

perhaps the most sinister statement made in the course of it was that by Lord Airlie, who said:

"But it must be remembered that the duty of these two Committees is to advise on amenity and fishery matters and nothing else. They cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered as vetoing committees. The Board's duty, therefore, as we see it, is to consider their advice and to take it if we can; but if we feel that the provision of electricity—which is, after all, our job—would be interfered with by the recommendations of either of these Committees, in our opinion we have no other course than to inform the Secretary of State that we are unable to accept these recommendations, giving the reasons why we cannot do so."

That means that in considering water power, waterfalls, rivers and glens, the one thing which has to be taken into consideration is the provision of electricity. The amenity value of waterfalls and rivers and so on, is negligible compared with their importance in providing electricity. I suspect that that statement of Lord Airlie's will by this time have been broadcast all over Scotland and I have not the slightest doubt that it will have caused the greatest alarm.

*The Earl of Airlie:* Is there any other way in which we could carry out the scheme put to us? These Amenity and Fishery Committees have to advise on these two other subjects. Sooner or later you will probably come to the parting of the ways where one must be weighed against the other. That was done at the Tribunal. So far as my Board was concerned, we could only take the line we did. I submit that it is not unreasonable.

*Lord Rushcliffe:* Lord Airlie may be right on that, but my point is that a pledge given by the Minister has been broken, that it is reasonable to say that the amenities that he affected to defend have not been carefully—

*The Earl of Airlie:* What I do object to is that it is described as a sinister remark. It was quite logical.

*Lord Rushcliffe:* It was sinister in this respect; it shows exactly what Scotland may expect in the future. I think it is alarming and sinister and that is a matter about which your Lordships can judge. As has already been pointed out, nothing we can do can prevent this scheme going on, but I think that the Hydro-Electric Board may be assured that if it goes on, as I suppose it will, it will proceed amidst the indignation, resentment and the anger not only of the people of Pitlochry, who are those most immediately affected, but of thousands of people both in England and in Scotland who will feel that their heritage has been needlessly and wantonly squandered.

*Viscount Samuel:* My Lords, I feel that an apology is owing to the Scottish members of your Lordships' House on account of the fact that two non-Scottish members are speaking in this debate in succession, but I can assure them that we are likely to be the only two in a debate which will include some fifteen speakers, not including the representative of the Government. Two points have been in controversy in this matter and one is the accusation that the North of England is to steal the products of the Scottish Hydro-Electric Board away from the Scottish people. That is a matter on which I would not venture to say a word; but the other point is one which affects the whole of this island—the preservation of the finest part of its scenery which is a common heritage for us all. It is on that ground that as a member of the Council for the Preservation of Rural England and also of the National Parks Committee, that I ventured to take a somewhat active part in the dis-

(Continued on page 7)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 15. No. 15. Saturday, December 15, 1945.

### From Week to Week

The Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Hewlett Johnson) speaking at a luncheon at the Savoy to a Russian Trade Delegation, made a moving appeal to British industrialists to furnish Russia with everything she wants in the hope that at some future but unspecified date, payment will be made in flax, timber, etc. Russian debts to this country for railway and other construction, to the value of nearly £1,000,000,000 are still unpaid.

It is no doubt an accident of make-up that the notice of his speech in *The Times* of December 1 is printed *vis-à-vis* an equally moving appeal headed "Mental Patients."

"These international do-gooders will embrace anything and everything to keep going. Recently we have seen this crowd embrace and court the Communists... No longer do the Communists denounce profits and Big Business... It has come to the point already where nobody can say anything against Russia. The Russians can call the United States of America anything it feels like at the moment. But my, my, we must never say anything against the Russians, because it might hurt their poor little feelings... Russia is the only ally that didn't give us even one penny of reverse lend-lease... Notice, we gave Russia 14,000 airplanes. Yet, whoever heard of Russia bombing anything except Finland?... The combined total that these schemers want to give Russia in the next five years is about twenty thousand million dollars of American money."

The foregoing extract is from an amazing speech made in Congress by the Hon. Alvin E. O'Konowski, on May 3, 1945 and reported in *The Canadian Social Crediter*. Mr. O'Konowski specifically accuses Baruch, Mellon, du Pont, Morgan, Rockefeller and Morgenthau of having arranged this war, and the same groups of being actively engaged at this time in arranging a third, in preparation for which both "Britain" and U.S.A. are to be weakened by exports to build up Russia.

The Report of a Committee "set up under the Coalition Government" (Beelzebub's Brethren Calling at 8 a.m. December 5, 1945) which recommends the nationalisation of the Gas Industry (no, Clarence, not d'markrazi, but coal gas) and its totalitarian control by the Ministry of Fuel and Power, proves one of two things, and possibly both. Either the so-called Labour Party made it a condition of their "assistance" in the Government of May, 1940 that they were to be allowed to make any and every preparation and disposition for a Socialist-Mond-Turner Revolution, in which case the bargain ought to be forced out into public knowledge and the parties to it impeached for high Treason in the face

of the enemy; or, as is quite probable, the Cartels have been in continuous control since 1931, as exemplified by Mr. Harold Macmillan's membership of P.E.P. and Mr. Ernest Bevin's steady rise to power. That the Ministry of Fuel and Power has always been the key to the mystery, with the son of the solicitor to the Zionist Committee as its Minister in a "Conservative" Government, and Mr. Emanuel (God with us) Shinwell his opposite number in a "Labour" Ministry ought to be obvious without further demonstration. But events will provide as much as anyone requires.

The C.C.F. (Socialist) Party has sustained another crushing defeat in the British Columbia Elections. At the dissolution of the Legislature it held 15 seats in a House of 48 Members, or 33 *per cent.*, its representation has now been reduced to 9, or 19 *per cent.*, and this in spite of the most expert splitting of the adverse vote, and the covert backing of all those International Influences beloved of our *Three-penny Daily Worker*. With the exception of the original victory in Saskatchewan, which was purely a protest vote, every Canadian Province has decisively rejected Socialism, and the interesting feature of the situation, is that the defeat has been progressive and continent-wide.

While the British Columbia Socialist Leader, Mr. Harold Winch, was re-elected, his majority was only one third of that by which he was elected in 1941.

It is amusing to recall the confident assertions of Mr. Winch that he would deal with the Canadians as the Bolsheviks dealt with the Kulaks. Evidently the Canadian farmer has other views, as (as usual) such support as the C.C.F. still retains is in the towns and factories.

No, Clarence, you will not get anything out of the American Loan, not even turkey and cranberry sauce. It is for the Common Good, so just settle down to harder work for Export, so that you can P—it back—A.Y.E.

### Gandhi

"... And to throw further light on the influence working through Gandhi we quote an interview given by Jaw Patel, the then president of the National Congress to the London Yiddish paper, *Die Zeit*, 28 August, 1931.

"Among other things he was asked,

"'Are there Jewish personalities in the movement which fights for India's liberty?' Patel hesitated and said, '... we know quite positively that representative Jewish leaders of India stand wholeheartedly on the side of those who struggle for Justice... One of Gandhi's most intimate friends is the Jewish savant Hacham Chaim Jehudi of Bombay, they study together the Torah. Gandhi takes advice from him in political matters, and he goes there often for a rest after his arduous work.'"

—*Inquire Within in The Patriot*, November 29, 1945.

### Wales for Tennessee

There has reached us, published by the Welsh Party Offices, Caernarfon, a pamphlet, *TVA for Wales*, which bears on the cover a design which pictorially represents the transportation of the Principality to the middle of Tennessee. A "TVA Conference" at Cardiff in November was addressed chiefly by Rudolf Mock, "Esq." of the American Embassy, London.

## The Atlantic Charter

By NORMAN JAQUES, M.P.

(A broadcast from Edmonton, Alberta, November 6, 1945.)

To-night I want to speak to you about the San Francisco Conference and the United Nations' Charter which was agreed to by the House of Commons on October 19 after several days of debate.

You may remember that the Motion to send a delegation to San Francisco was debated in the House last March on which occasion I said:—

All members, of course, desire peace, but it is evident we do not all agree as to the best way to obtain peace. Previous speakers have made their earnest appeals, and I can only hope they will credit me with like sincerity. It seems to me that this is not a party question, or even a question of right or left, it is a question of right or wrong. Freedom and justice are the only bases of lasting peace;—peace can be imposed by force but it cannot be maintained by force.

The defeat of German arms is certain, but the plots of international finance and communism, their plans for world control by the surrender of national sovereignties to world government and police force, have become a greater threat to our liberties as Christians and democrats than the disaster of Dunkerque.

For saying this I was criticised by Socialists and Communists, but it is now known that for most Europeans my statement was only too true; from the Elbe River to the Adriatic Sea, tens of millions of Europeans having lost their families, their homes and freedom now face starvation.

As Mr. Churchill has said—"At the present time police 'governments' rule over a great part of Europe. The family is gathered round the fireside to enjoy the scanty fruits of their toil. There they sit. Suddenly there is a knock at the door and a heavily armed policeman appears. He is not, of course, one of those 'bobbies' whom we honour and obey in London streets. It may be that the father, or son, or a friend sitting in the cottage is called out, and taken off into the dark and no one knows whether he will ever come back again, or what his fate has been. All they know is they had better not ask questions. There are millions of humble homes in Europe at the moment in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Austria, in Hungary, in Yugoslavia, in the Ukraine, in Rumania, in Bulgaria and other countries, where this fear is the main concern of the family life. President Roosevelt laid down the four freedoms in the Atlantic Charter—freedom from fear—but this has been interpreted as if it were only freedom from fear of invasion from a foreign country. That is now the least of the fears of the common man. That is not the fear of the ordinary family in Europe to-night. Their fear is of the policeman's knock. It is the fear for the life and liberty of the individual, for the fundamental rights of man, now menaced and precarious in so many lands, that people tremble."

To-day, right exists only for the powerful, for while the strong do what they like, the weak suffer what they must. But, according to the Atlantic Charter, it was agreed (1) To seek no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned, and (2) To see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Where is the Atlantic Charter to-day? I suggest it was scuttled or torpedoed in the Black Sea and with it were sunk the lives, liberties and hopes of millions of Christians and democrats. But, according to Professor Laski, a Socialist, and one of the most influential men in the world to-day—and I quote from his book *Faith, Reason and Civilisation*—"Christianity has failed and Russia is taking its place as the ideal for mankind and as the standard of public morality. The Old Testament is the gospel of hard work, while in the New Testament the central figure of Jesus shows little, or no concern for the workaday world."

What Professor Laski means is that we now should take the Talmud for our guide instead of the Gospels. Many of our Church leaders, having lost their own faith and vision as Christians, agree with Laski. Many Church leaders are quoted as great Socialists and they uphold Russia as an example of Christian democracy. They have become Church leaders as Marxists, and they are busy spreading the doctrines of Karl Marx instead of the gospels of Christianity.

Certain religious leaders are quoted by Socialists and Communists because they offer totalitarianism as a Christian ideal. True it is that a large part of our Church leadership has abandoned Christian principles for the dogmas of the scribes and pharisees. But if these political theologians, and theological politicians must preach Marxism, they should step down from the pulpit and get on a soap box.

Certainly these religious leaders have not uttered a single protest against the wholesale persecutions of people in Central and Eastern Europe since their "liberation" by Russia. Will these religious leaders confirm, or dare they deny the persecutions of political opponents by Communists in those so-called "liberated" countries? Will they condemn, or dare they justify these crimes? Can they compare the freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, of politics with our own British freedoms? Do they support, or do they oppose our monarchy and empire? Do they agree with Laski? Should we look to Russia for our ideals and moral standards? Have they lost their own vision and faith in Christianity? Do they want to Judaise Christianity and to "bolshevise" democracy? Do they "stand by" the Atlantic Charter? Did we fight and sacrifice our blood and treasure to preserve our democratic freedoms, or to create a totalitarian world? Are the gospels unreliable and unauthentic? Are we to follow Christian ideals according to the gospels, or Communist doctrines according to Karl Marx?

So far I have dealt only with our Allies, with those who fought with us, but who have been treated as though they had fought against us. What about our late enemies? What is happening to them? Mr. Churchill now states:—

I am particularly concerned, at this moment, with reports of conditions under which the expulsion of Germans from the new Poland are being carried out. About ten million people lived in these regions before the war. The new Polish Government say there are still more than a million who have not yet been expelled. Perhaps a million or more have taken refuge behind the British and American lines, thus increasing food scarcity in our sector.

But enormous numbers of these Germans are utterly unaccounted for. Where have they gone, and what has been their fate? The same conditions exist where large numbers of Germans are being expelled from Czechoslo-

vakia. Sparse and guarded accounts of what has happened and is happening have filtered through but it is not impossible that tragedy on a prodigious scale is unfolding itself behind the iron curtain which divides Europe in twain.

Meantime, what has been happening to those people lucky enough to find temporary sanctuary behind the American lines? According to a press despatch from Frankfort, October 4, General Eisenhower, contrary to a Yalta agreement, has instructed American troops to discontinue forcing Russian nationals to return home unless so ordered by the American government. Questioned as to whether American troops had fired over the heads or near the feet of Russians, Poles, and Ukrainians so as to compel them to board Soviet-bound trains one officer said—"Possibly for a time they were being pushed on trains without asking many questions." But why should people require to be shot-at before they will go home? Would we need to fire at any of these people to force them to go to England, or to Canada, or to any part of the British Commonwealth?

Have these crimes been denounced by our political theologians who are peddling Marxism instead of preaching Christianity? But truth will out. Led by Mr. Bevin, the Foreign Secretary, all sections of the British House of Commons made it clear the other day that British people are horrified by the spectre of European misery and starvation occurring now and threatening in even worse form this winter. There has been a truly extraordinary swing of opinion by the British people who suffered by the German "blitz" but who now feel their humanity outraged by conditions which Russia and Russian-controlled Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Ukraine, are imposing on their now helpless victims. Mr. Bevin hinted that men were being enslaved by the Russians, for refugees being sent *out of Russia* were in the overwhelming majority women and children, but no men.

Apart from feelings of pity and mercy there is deep fear that disease and economic collapse caused in Europe will spread all over the world.

All Members protested against the wanton and deliberate creation of unnecessary cruel conditions—the greatest catastrophe the human race ever experienced—by the criminal and lunatic policy of Russia, and even of the U.S.A. "We should consider," they said, "if it be not possible to make a new call to our allies, and if we find they will not act with us we should do our best to act alone. It is still our duty to show that this old country is the foremost champion of tolerance and decency." As I said a year ago—"The plots and plans of international finance and communism—of Shylock and Marx—threaten our existence as Christians and democrats." This partnership of Shylock and Marx may be denied by our political theologians, and theological politicians but, unless one understands the aims and plans of Marxism and of international finance, one cannot understand their intimate connection. Unless one understands their intimate relationship, one is led to believe the world's troubles and miseries are accidental. Unless these things are understood, one cannot understand further that Socialism and Communism are only means to an end. Finally, unless these facts are realised no one is qualified to discuss them with intelligence.

The awful fate of these helpless millions has been a weight on my mind and conscience for a long time. The

public have been led to believe, having overcome Hitler, all we had to do was to sign an agreement to bring about world peace and security. But, meantime, millions of people have lost their all—even their lives, and millions more face death from starvation.

We have been altogether too smug, too indifferent about the fate of these millions of helpless victims. There can be no lasting peace unless we build it on freedom and justice for all.

Already, it has become obvious to the American Secretary of State that the United Nations Charter will have, as its principal function, the guarantee of territorial grabs. . . . Is Laski right? Has Christianity failed? If so there can be no lasting peace. But already the British people are forgetting their wartime hates and are being inspired by the Christian spirit of love and mercy to all.

Christianity cannot fail the world, but the world has failed Christianity. That is the world's tragedy, and our only hope for peace and happiness is through a return to Christian ideals according to the Gospels.

YOU SHALL KNOW THE TRUTH AND THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE.

## The Jews in America

Under the heading "Jewish Intimidation," *The Patriot* for December 6 has the following:—

"Apparently a campaign of intimidation is being waged in New York against the *New York Daily News*, largely at the instance of the *Jewish Examiner*. The charge made is that the *Daily News* is anti-semitic and though 'pressure' in this country is exerted against organs similarly accused, the scale of intimidation in New York seems to be even more vicious. In his 'America in Danger,' dated 25 October, Mr. Chas. B. Hudson reprints the head-lines and contents of an editorial in the *Jewish Examiner* of 19 October, from which the extent of the pressure can be judged. The attack is headed 'Open Letter to the Publisher of the *N.Y. Daily News*' and reads in part:—

"... Why you have not been indicted with Laval, Goering, Ribbentrop and all the other war criminals for treason is a mystery to us. . . . We are declaring war on you. . . . And you know what happened to Hitler, Mussolini and their international gangster pals. . . . We didn't send a quarter of a million of our boys to their death and a million more to be maimed and crippled for life to save democracy abroad only to permit you and others like you to smash democracy at home. . . . *Henry Ford* was powerful too when he published his *Dearborn Independent*. But he, at least, when shown his error, had the decency to fold up his publication and issue a profound public apology to American Jewry. . . . We're going to tell your advertisers that our sense of justice will permit us no longer to purchase their wares if they are offered in your paper. . . . We're going to ask them (non-Jews) and our own readers to write to your advertisers. . . . Without readers and without advertisers your paper would quickly fold up. And that is the fate it deserves if American democracy is to be vindicated.'

"The use made of that over-worked word 'democracy' by a Jewish paper will be noted."

## PARLIAMENT

*(Continued from page 3)*

cussion on the question of amenities when the Hydro-Electric Development (Scotland) Bill was before your Lordships' House. At that time I had the advantage of two conferences with the then Secretary of State of Scotland at his request for the elucidation of the matter and then, both in this House and in the other House and in these conferences, the most emphatic assurances were given that if Parliament passed the Bill the utmost care would be taken to see that injury should not be done to the most beautiful parts of the Scottish Highlands. . . .

We are told by the Chairman of the Hydro-Electric Board that of course they must proceed—we have come to the parting of the ways and the Amenities Committee takes one view and his Board takes the other—and that if Scotland is to have electricity no account can be taken of the Amenities Committee. That is the situation and the procedure adopted in this particular case has been a very strange one. . . .

*Lord Sempill:* . . . Sweden, like Scotland, possesses many natural amenities and beautiful scenery, and is determined that they shall remain unimpaired. The latest schemes over there, engineered by Mr. Hellstrom and those associated with him, show that if it is necessary to generate electricity by water power, dried up river beds, unsightly pressure pipe lines and gaunt power stations can be avoided. With the permission of your Lordships, I beg to submit an outline diagram which will illustrate clearly the difference between the old unsightly above-ground lay-out that has spoiled so much of Scotland's lovely scenery and the modern underground methods that have recently been carried out with such great success in Sweden.

My noble friend and fellow Scot, Lord Westwood, who will reply to this debate, will understand how sad it is for us to contemplate the fact that His Majesty's Government should choose this year of all to plan to present Scotland with yet two more dried-up rivers and completely to destroy the meaning of those words that, in this bicentenary year of the Forty-Five, ring in our hearts:

"Cam ye by Athol lad wi the philibeag down by the Tummel and banks o' the Garry, saw ye the lads wi their bonnets and White Cockades leaving their mountains tae follow Prince Charlie."

*Lord Lovatt:* . . . Antagonism is being fostered at this moment between the Highlands and the Lowlands. You cannot woo the Glasgow housewives with refrigerators and leave the crofters faced with the winter grazing for their sheep and cattle flooded, yet with no chance of lighting their houses with electricity, which will be sent elsewhere. The noble Earl's second-in-command, Mr. McColl, made an equally unfortunate remark when he said recently in Edinburgh that all that stood in the way of the Hydro-Electric Board were salmon and amenities. I resent that remark very much indeed.

My late father, who, I think your Lordships will agree, took an interest in the Highlands and in Highland people, fought the unsavoury ramp on the Bwea Beaully because the people in the Highlands were not benefited at all. I submit that the whole approach to this matter should be reconsidered; there has been a change of attitude since the Act came into force. I should like to read you what Mr. Johnston said in 1943, because I think that the spirit in which the Act is being carried out has changed entirely since then. He said:

"... half the purpose of this Bill is to restore the population to the Highlands, to provide social amenities for the area; and we desire to have some clause in the Bill providing that this Board shall be something more than merely, as somebody said to-day, a cold-hearted hydro-electric organisation. It is a Development Board as well. It is the beginning, we hope, of a new era in the Highlands of Scotland. . . ."

Do not let anybody think that the Highlands are going to become repopulated and revived by an influx of generating stations. That is wholly false. . . .

*Lord Westwood:* . . . I should like to say that my right honourable friend the Secretary of State has the most complete confidence in the impartiality and integrity of those who have carried out the inquiries into these two schemes; and he is confident that mischievous suggestions of bias which have been made by opponents of the schemes will find no support in any responsible quarter.

*The Earl of Rosebery:* May I ask my noble friend when these allegations were made? I do not think that I have ever heard them before?

*Lord Westwood:* We have had quite a few criticisms and some observations which I would not say were all in favour of the scheme. Also there have been quite a lot of letters in the Press all over the country.

*The Earl of Rosebery:* I do not mean that, I mean this suggestion of mischievous bias against the Committees. The suggestion, I take it, is that the Amenity and Fisheries Committees are biased in some way or other. I have not heard that suggestion before.

*Lord Westwood:* I feel confident that the statement would not be submitted to me unless there was some ground for it.

*The Earl of Rosebery:* I do not know who is responsible for giving you your statement.

*Lord Westwood:* . . . May I say that I have yet to understand or learn that the people in Pitlochry are against the scheme? The merchants there are certainly not against it, neither are the shopkeepers. They have held meetings and practically all of them are in favour of the scheme. Of course, there may be dissenters. Scotland would not be what it is if we did not have dissenters there. . . . I feel confident that the people in Pitlochry, the merchants and the business folk, are welcoming this scheme. They recognise that at the present time there are only two or three months of the year when they can have the advantage of the summer tourist traffic. In winter there is practically little or no business being done. . . .

It really surprises me to hear so many objections to the scheme, because it has the approval of a Conservative Secretary of State for Scotland—namely, Mr. Walter Elliot, who was in office before Mr. Tom Johnston, and it has the approval of the late Secretary of State for Scotland before the present one—namely, the noble Earl, Lord Rosebery. Everybody agreed with it, but when it becomes an Act, and when really nothing can be done to annul it, objections are raised to it. We do not worry so much about that; we do not want to trail our coat intentionally, and we feel that it is sometimes best for noble Lords opposite to have these debates which act as safety valves and restrain them, possibly, from doing damage in another way. . . .

*The Earl of Airlie:* . . . Having said that I fully appreciate the difficulties, I am going to ask my noble friend

whether he will get in touch with the authorities at the War Office and find out whether the suggestion I am about to make is feasible. I am not aware of the actual position or of the state of the various units both inside this country and abroad, but I cannot help feeling that there must be Pioneer Companies and R.E. Companies either in the Middle East, the Far East, the Near East or in this country who are free—who have very little to do, if anything. Is it not possible that the War Office might be persuaded to arrange for certain of those units to be brought back and to be put on to this scheme? . . .

*Lord Kinnaird:* . . . As my noble Friend Lord Haddington is not able to reply, I should like to say that the statement about the National Trust seems to me to be totally inadequate. I think the position is most unsatisfactory, and I have little doubt that the people who are responsible for the National Trust will take the matter up again. It seems to me that one Act of Parliament forming a Hydro-Electric Board is simply overruling another Act of Parliament forming a National Trust. The position could not be more unsatisfactory . . .

The Secretary of State then said that he had passed the recommendation to an inquiry. He was bound to do so by the Act; he was not giving anything away by holding an inquiry, because he was bound to do so if the objections were not frivolous. If he will excuse me for saying so, therefore, I think that he has shirked his responsibility, which is to say whether he thinks that the recommendation is reasonable. If it is reasonable, we know that we shall get the Scottish Office to back us. He must know about it, however, before it is too late. I feel sure that these points, as the schemes come up one by one, will be most critically examined, and on every occasion that the recommendation of the Amenity Committee is disregarded the matter will be raised, and raised again and again, in this House.

. . . A question which has been mentioned in both inquiries is the public interest. It is said that this is in the public interest. What is the public interest? That is not easy to answer. As some guide to what is the public interest, I should like to refer to the terms of reference of the Cooper Committee:

"To consider the practicability and desirability of further developments in the use of water power resources in Scotland for the generation of electricity . . . with due regard to the general interests of the local population and to considerations of amenity."

The terms of reference occupy only six lines, but in them it was thought necessary to mention "due regard to the general interests of the local population and to considerations of amenity." I cannot feel that due regard has been given to either. . . .

. . . One is forced to the conclusion, as one sees how these schemes are developing and with the evidence of these two cases before one, that if the need of the Central Electricity Board is established that will be held to outweigh all other interests. The general interest of the locality and of amenity will not receive due consideration. The view of local authorities, of the Association for the Preservation of Rural Scotland, of the National Trust, and of the people of Scotland—to whom their love of their country is sacred—will not receive due consideration. That is the position as we see things developing now. May I say this with regard to the noble Earle, Lord Airlie? He was appointed Chairman of the Board not as an electrical expert but because it was

felt that we should have in him a person of wise judgment and great integrity who would see that all interests would receive the regard that was due to them. Scotland should be able to rely on him to give due consideration to the preservation of our national heritage and the general interests as well as the interests concerned with the production of electricity.

On Question, Motion for Papers negatived.

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy.....	( <i>edition exhausted</i> )
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	( <i>reprinting</i> )
Credit Power and Democracy.....	( <i>edition exhausted</i> )
Warning Democracy.....	( <i>edition exhausted</i> )
The Big Idea.....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	( <i>reprinting</i> )

### ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Jesus: Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
Why You Are Short of Coal by Aims of Industry.....	6d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
A Comprehensive Medical Service (Reprinted from <i>The Tablet</i> ).....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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