THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 15. No. 18. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1946. 6d. Weekly.

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY: *Quo Vadis?*

Unless the so-called Conservative Party is determined to disappear in a withering blast of contempt—an exit which in any case it will not find too easy to avoid—one of the first duties imposed upon it is to disembarrass itself of the Churchill family.

We have given due weight to the services—*in the situation that war forced upon us*—of Mr. Winston Churchill, and the manner of his dismissal by the electorate still retains an unpleasant odour. Nevertheless, and bearing in mind the very different origins and traditions of the ex-Prime Minister and Mr. David Lloyd George, the parallel between the history of 1915-1918 and 1940-1945 is too exact to be accidental. Both men were men of great driving power; both were clearly and unmistakeably brought to power, at a time of great national danger arising out of sinister intrigues by the same extra-national Forces; and both clearly accepted, if they did not make, some bargain with those Forces which involved the imposition of internal policies which could only result in the final eclipse of the British Empire *as an organ of British policy*. At this point, we should like to emphasise the identity of principle between what is obviously taking place in regard to the Empire, on the one hand, and the "acquisition by the nation" of minerals (coal, *etc.*) on the other. The principle of property in coal has not been abolished; on the contrary, it has been emphasised, and the British people, in consequence are paying four times the price for worse coal, since it became "their own property." Similarly, it is beginning to be clear enough that Mr. Churchill was on safe ground when he declared that he had not become His Majesty's First Minister to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire. Of course not. What a property! And who can do the fighting it involves more cheaply than the British?

Perhaps somewhat unwisely, Mr. Randolph Churchill, the ex-Prime Minister's son, is writing a syndicated column for transatlantic newspapers entitled "To-day in Europe." From these we gather "Ever since I began to take an interest in politics, I have been an ardent supporter of Zionism. Those of us here in Britain (*sic*) who support the Zionist experiment have always been grateful for the sympathy and financial support which has flowed in such generous measure from the United States" ... "There is still a school of political and military thought which argues that the breathing space which Chamberlain and Daladier won at Munich in 1938 gave us time to improve our defences."... "Those in England who have tried to defend the breathing-space..." *etc., etc., etc.*

It will of course be realised that these articles are written for American consumption. Even so, we feel that any implied connection with the Conservative Party, which however non-existent is sure to be assumed in the United States, is highly undesirable, and that we have bought as much of that very expensive luxury, Churchillian Whig politics, as we can afford.

We do not suppose that any of our readers will make the elementary mistake of thinking that anything was defeated at the General Election except the danger to the Dark Forces of a reversal of policy. The danger was perhaps not very great. But we are willing to concede to Mr. Churchill that it might be there. Now, of course, there is no danger except from the honest back-benchers and one other source.

"A Close-Knitted Body"

We have no report of any disclaimer by Lord Reading of the statement that, speaking at Cardiff on December 14, he said: "Some people regarded them [the Jews] as a close-knitted body of people all working in combination for some secretive and sinister object of their own."

The Missed Opportunity

Coming on a note put down some years ago, a picture forms in my mind of two men, both of whose names are the common coin of civilisation—the one a modern Jew, the other a sixteenth century Englishman,—attempting to project themselves into the future. Both were specifically moved by circumstances to express themselves and, consequently, their times; to fix their immediate state of consciousness intelligibly for future generations.

As far as I can see, it makes no difference to a statement of this kind, that the one happened to be a mathematician and the other was a poet and dramatist. When an individual talks in this way, he speaks as man to man and not as a specialist, even when, as with one of these two, his speciality is words. Their judge is to be the man-in-the-street of the future, and not their fellow specialists. mathematical and poetic. Nor is there, necessarily, any particular significance here in the difference of race; Hebrew or Anglo-Saxon, a great man sees greatly regardless of such matters, and no one but a fool can deny greatness of vision to the Hebrew prophets.

These two individuals I have in mind, who sought to speak to Futurity, were Albert Einstein and William Shakespeare. The immediate occasion for the first was created by a request from the committee of the 1939 New York World Fair for a statement from him, as the most universally acclaimed scientist of this era we like to call "the Scientific Age," for a message from the contemporary world to Posterity, to be buried on the site of the Fair. That of the other, the desire common to lovers, to preserve the image and unique beauty of his adored one for all time. The first, is sealed in a plastic Time Capsule, in the keeping of the ground; a modern equivalent of the Babylonian tile. The second was left free, and to the mercy of men's judgment and memories.

One is especially anxious not to make unfair comparisons, but in spite of their apparent difference, the two circumstances were not, I think, dissimilar. In moments of high emotion, which both must have been, what an individual is, and what he stands for, is bound to emerge. Age may have something to do with it, of course, and Einstein is a very old man; but what strikes one most forcibly in this instance, is the profound difference in quality of thought, and of effective imaginative projection. Making due allowance for the technical handicap where the use of words was concerned under which the scientist laboured, when set up against one of the world's greatest poets, it is the lack of anything really to say; of any visible fruit of observation or experience of Life on his part, that seems so remarkable. One is shocked by the sheer inconsistent poverty of his view of contemporary society, in contrast to the rich generosity of Shakespeare's mental picture, depending for preservation on its innate mental consistency.

Here they are, then, excerpts—Einstein's addressed to the people of A.D. 6939, and Shakespeare's to all and sundry of any age, as witness of his Fair One's persistent loveliness. Says Professor Einstein: "Our time is rich in inventive minds. . . .However, the production and distribution of commodities is entirely unorganised, so that everyone must live in fear of being eliminated from the economic cycle. . . . " (Whosoever the hand that wrote that, the voice is surely the voice of the London School of Economics.) He concludes, "This is due to the fact that the intelligence of the masses is incomparably lower than the intelligence of the few who produce something valuable for the community."

That is how the Professor views his neighbour, and his neighbour's potential impingement on his own existence; and that is the salient picture of this age he is impelled to preserve to Futurity. What immediately strikes one is the sheer, borrowed poverty of the style, suggesting the drone of the mesmerised automaton repeating his confession of guilt at an O.G.P.U. trial, more than anything else.

Now let us listen to Shakespere's impression of *his* neighbour; that she happened to be an attractive brunette, or even the young Earl of Southampton, as some say, has no bearing, that I can see, on the significant difference of vision employed. "Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?" he asks, and himself answers: "Thou art more lovely and more temperate." And then in a few lines, like an adept portraitist, he establishes his subject's essential characteristics against a background of our changeable climate. That beautifully accomplished, he bottles up his picture in the Elizabethan equivalent for a Time Capsule thus:

"But thy eternal summer shall not fade
Nor lose possession of that fair thou owest.
Nor shall Death brag thou wander'st in his shade
When in eternal lines to time thou grow'st;
So long as men can breathe, or eyes can see,
So long lives this, and this gives life to thee."

Has man so changed in four hundred years? Has the world so changed from that bold, imaginative, lovely picture, to this other, pitifully prophetic one, suggestive of a group of huddled refugees at the door of a soup kitchen, fearful of missing their ration; "of being eliminated from the economic cycle," whatever it may be?

No doubt it is an indictment of society as a whole that there are still individual members and groups—or races, for that matter—whose only picture of the situation is such a poverty-stricken one. Nevertheless, it is equally certain that society as a whole, cannot afford to permit such a spirit of timidity to dominate human policy. Besides, it is both resentful and warped. As an assumption of the real position to-day, or any day, the statement that, "The intelligence of the masses is incomparably lower than the intelligence of the few who produce something valuable for the community," is both incorrect—the part is not greater than the whole—and satanically egotistical. It confuses the expert's acquired professional skill in his own domain with innate intelligence and character; suggesting a condition of things utterly contradicted by the facts. In disproof of it, one has only to consider the example we have before us of the ineptitude displayed by one who is, perhaps, the greatest mathematician of all time, in his hopeless attempt to sum up his own age. There is not a farmer or a working man of my acquaintance who could not have made an incomparably better shot, if he was really put to it.

It is obvious that Professor Einstein, like so many others, sees in his panic the hope for the future in a bunch of really clever chaps, whether of a particular profession, or party, or a particular race, in control of that "production and distribution of commodities," which appears to him so "entirely unorganised." This is pure Fabianism. But, more than that, it is an example of the persistent Messianic Myth; salvation coming, or imposed from without. Nevertheless, the advice of Paul, who was both a Jew and a great man, to "work

out your own salvation in fear and trembling," was, and still is sound common sense.

The hope of every individual, as of Posterity, lies in no Fuehrer, or Party, but in the open understanding of each and every one of us, as sentient human beings, with eyes in our heads, and, no doubt, those heads well and properly screwed on.

"So long as men can breathe, or eyes can see,
So long lives this, and this gives life to thee."

And to limbo with your Time Capsule, if there isn't a soul left to unearth it.

NORMAN WEBB.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 13, 1945.

ANGLO-AMERICAN FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC DISCUSSIONS

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Thomas Moore (Ayr Burghs): ... I want to make it quite clear that I am not an economist, like the hon. Member for Chesterfield (Mr. Benson), I am not a Social Creditor, like the hon. Member for South Tottingham (Mr. N. Smith), I am not a commercial magnate, like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aldershot (Mr. Lyttelton), and I am not anti-gold, like the hon. Member for East Aberdeen (Mr. Boothby). In fact, I am speaking as a man in the street, for the common citizens of this country, with no political complex, no inhibitions, anti-nothing, as the men of Britain generally are, except when there is a shortage of beer. I am, indeed, even speaking for the charlady who so kindly and competently cleans my flat, and who said to me yesterday morning, "We are accustomed to hardships, we are used to hardships. Tell those Gentlemen in the House of Commons to stand up for Britain and not trail after the Americans and their spam." I believe that those are the views held by the majority of the people of this country, irrespective of their walk in life.

... I am leaving aside some very pertinent reflections which I had hoped to make on nationalisation—[*Laughter*]. Oh, yes, they bear very strongly upon my point of view, but I might add that we simply regard the adventures of the Government in the realms of nationalisation as acts of adolescent effervesence and a natural reaction to their unexpected victory. If advisable and in God's good time, they can be repealed as they have been in other countries....

This Loan takes no account of the forgotten factor, one which can never be over-stressed, that Britain was the first great country to wage war not because it was attacked but on account of an ideal which it believed to be right, that nations and individuals should be free to live and work, to pray and play, as they so desire provided they do not harm a neighbour.

... I say with modesty, but with complete sincerity, that I would prefer to leave public life for good rather than see my country tied for 55 years at least to the whims of a foreign country no matter how friendly, how intimate, or how trustworthy our relationships might be. Britain has not fought and won, has not suffered and survived two world wars to become the poor relation of even the most kindly, the most benevolent but most autocratic of kinsmen....

Mr. David Eccles (Chippenham): ... I am quite sure that many of the unattractive things which the Russian Government are doing now are done because of their fear that the ordinary men and women in Russia will find out that their level of life is much lower than ours and still lower than the American's....

There is nothing comparable in that document to tell the Americans what they ought not to do. Why is there nothing in it about their very peculiar methods of trying to corner the South American markets? There is nothing about that kind of discrimination. Why is there nothing about their insistence that the proceeds of the dollar loans should all be spent in the United States? That is discrimination on the grand scale; they have just applied it to the French loan. What is more, why is there nothing in it about immigration? What right have the Americans to tell us that we must not discriminate against the free movement of goods when they are discriminating against the free movement of persons? Will they take 5,000,000 refugees? I think we want to know where these fine principles of the Americans—which I very much admire—begin, and where they end....

Mr. Max Aitken (Holborn): ... the amount of the loan is not immense. It is not far from the total we spent in erecting factories and buying armaments in the United States before the war and during the first year of the war. Those armaments were used as the first bulwark of the Americans against the Nazis. It seems to me that that sum is not such a very great sum....

I believe that if the Empire was now asked to rally around this country, we would be able to tide over this desperate period and not have to take this disastrous loan...

Mr. Alfred Edwards (Middlesborough, East): ... I met an American over here during the last few weeks, and in talking with the Board of Trade and the Treasury he wanted to send us food-stuffs to any amount; he wanted to spend all the money in this country. The people held up their hands in horror, and said, "You cannot do that; that is barter," as though there was something unholy about it, as though all trade was not barter....

Mr. Churchill (Woodford): ... For all these reasons I should deprecate most strongly any considerable number of the Members of the party I have the honour to lead casting their votes against the proposals which are now before the House. If individual Members have passionately strong conscientious views, no one can blame them for expressing those views in Debate or going into the Lobby, where they will find themselves with some odd companions, but any heavy vote by Conservative Members against the proposals would be specially injurious to our interests in America. It would be a gratuitous assumption of responsibilities which we have no need to seek and no power to bear. It would also be utterly futile and even wanton proceeding, and a weak yeilding to emotions which the long interest of the State requires should be stoically restrained....

Question put:

The House divided: Ayes, 345; Noes, 98.

NOES.

Aitken, Hon. M.
Astor, Hon. M.
Baldwin, A. E.
Baxter, A. B.
Blackburn, Capt. A. R.
Bossom, A. C.
Bower, N.
Braddock, T. (Mitcham)
Braithwaite, Lt.-Comdr. J. G.
Brown, W. J. (Rugby)
Bullock, Capt. M.
Callaghan, James
Carson, E.
Castle, Mrs. B. A.
Challen, Flt.-Lieut. C.

(*Continued on page 6*)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free*: *One year* 30/-; *Six months* 15/-; *Three months* 7s. 6d.

Offices: (*Business*) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, *Telephone*: *Central* 8509; (*Editorial*) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, *Telephone*: *Sefton Park* 435.

Vol. 15. *No.* 18. *Saturday, January* 5, 1946.

From Week to Week

"Of 23 Divisional Generals" [of the Spanish Republican Army. *Editor, T.S.C.*] "twenty-one were members of the Grand Orient. They had taken the oath, 'I swear obedience without limitation to the head of the Council of Thirty-Three.... I swear not to recognise any mortal above him.' Both in 1929, for the abolition of the Dictatorship of Primo de Rivera, and in 1931, for the abolition of the Monarchy, the Masons gave their orders and the Generals obeyed.... seven of the eleven signatories of the 'Provisional Republican Government' were members of the Spanish Lodges."

— *Spanish Arena.* p. 100

Where do you think the present agitation against Spain is coming from?

• • •

No one can fail to notice the resurrection of "the call to youth" racket so stridently propagated in the early armistice years. It is never very clearly explained why the youth of 1918 to which this call was made, should have deteriorated into the middle-aged men who are responsible for all the sins of society, and, on analysis, it becomes evident that someone is looking hopefully for an opportunity to cash in on the nineteenth century aphorism that everyone who has not a hard heart must be a socialist at eighteen, and no one who has not a soft head is a socialist at forty.

Implicit in this truth, of course, is another, attributed to George Bernard Shaw; "Them as can, does; them as can't, teaches."

It is not unfair to say that the central idea of socialism is that the socialist can tell the man who is doing the job how to do it much better (not by demonstration, but by "orders"). At eighteen, this does not seem unreasonable; at forty, only people like Sir Stafford Cripps retain the idea that experience is a handicap.

• • •

Does anyone ever read the fatuous announcements of the Ministry of Food, and if anyone does, does he do anything with them? If they were produced on business terms, they would represent an expenditure of thousands of pounds a week. Being produced by a Government Department, they probably represent a fair proportion of the cost of the food they talk about, but don't grow.

Did you know that if you cut the fat off your meat ration, you saved some fat?

• • •

Dorval, the little French Canadian village on Lac St. Louis which is to be the terminus of the B.O.A.C. service to Canada is pronounced Dorval by everyone except the "B."B.C. which calls it Dorvle (8 a.m. December 27). Sounds more d'marcratic, y'know.

• • •

The demand for electrical energy has dropped during November by an amount equal to the total estimated output of all the 102 schemes scheduled for development by The North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board.

The Eastern Situation

The Editor,
The Social Crediter.

Sir,

I am very glad to see how faithfully you deal with Pandit Nehru. One does not need to be a fanatical Anglophile to see the utter baseness, meanness and tastelessness of Nehru's remark. Observe too, the nature of the man's standard of values, that of the successful go-getter parvenu and *arriviste*. Judged by such a scale Italy the Mother of European civilisation is of less account in the hierarchy of nations than that congeries of semi-barbarians the U.S.S.R. and the Vatican City-State that is merely acres in extent, but the headquarters of one of the greatest civilising and cultural forces the world has ever known—the Catholic Church —, much less.

And what lack of gumption, the power to see no more than what is underneath your nose, *not* to be able to see that the British connection alone stands between India and he "liberating" iron hand of Russia. What devastating unintelligence—if nothing worse, to be unable or unwilling to draw conclusions from the fact that those countries nearest to Russia, numbering the most enlightened, humane and civilised peoples in the world, such as Poland, Finland, Sweden and Norway, not to mention our own ancient homeland Iran, one and all, and with the best of historical and present reasons loathe, dread and detest the Proletarian Paradise.

I have been as severe a critic as anyone of England in certain of her dealings with India, but it seems to me that to deny that her rule is as of kindergarten mildness compared with that of the Red Fascists of the Kremlin is to deny the daylight. Who can doubt what the fate of our Muscovitishly-inclined Congressmen would be once the Russian claws got well and truly into India? Liquidation and Concentraton Camp for the larger part of them as soon as they ceased to be of any use as deliberate or unconscious fifth-columnists.

As a member of an ancient and tiny community *in* India but not *of* it either racially, culturally or historically, a community that as much resents being called "Indian" as the Scots, Welsh or Irish being called English, I have for a long time been trying to open the eyes of our community to the possible dangers ahead under Congress, *i.e.*, Hindu-majority rule, a rule that is most unlikely to prove any the less oppressive and tyrannous than any other form of majority rule, as Mr. Richardson so well shows in the letter in your current number. Cultural attacks upon the life and religion of Moslems are described in a number of instances given by the distinguished Muslim writer Sirdar Iqubal Ali Shah in his illuminating small book "Pakistan," which makes mincemeat of Congress propaganda. Worse even than this are the attacks being launched against a very much smaller minority, the Catholic Christians of Southern India, in one

(*Continued on page* 6)

Contemporary Gibbonish

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

It is part of the charlatanry with which "scientific" thinking is now infected, to suggest that history automatically repeats itself. As a consequence of this, the fact that the Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Byzantine and other great civilisations all had their rise and fall (or at any rate, are presented to us in that aspect) is supposed to be evidence that, *e.g.*, the British Empire must inevitably go the same way. The implication is of course Masonic; Nations and Empires are supposed to be merely repetitions, macrocosms, of the individual man, the microcosm, and to have their infancy, manhood and decline in the same manner, but over a greater duration, as that exhibited by the human being.

If there were no other grounds for objection to this theory, and there are many, anyone whose senses are not blunted by the schoolmen would suspect it as being too "neat." Similarity of behaviour is far more usually due to incompetence of observation than to actual identity of process. To the average non-travelled Englishmen all Chinamen look alike and are nearly indistinguishable from Japanese. But a Chinaman would not regard that idea as proving anything but the barbarism of the English.

Whether we are prepared to accept this conception of "rise and fall" at its face value or not, so far as our knowledge takes us, no Empire has previously "fallen" by proclamation, which appears to be the case with that of "Britain," unless, of course, the collapse of Jericho is an allegory from which we are intended to take warning. To add to the outstanding interest of the event, it appears to be the one contemporary phenomenon on which everyone is agreed. Our leading newspapers (produced strictly in accordance with war time economy standards both in paper and veracity) vie with our "British" organisation for relaying recorded negroid disharmony in their agreement with General de Gaulle and Professor Laski that "Britain" is a second-class Power; exit visas and travelling expenses are happily provided for Manchester experts in crematorium oratory, so that the good news may reach the humblest foreign, and particularly United States, mourner for "Britain's" vanished splendours. 'Tis strange; 'tis passing strange. Observe, also, how the history of the fall of the British Empire is being written while you wait. The high point of "Britain's" war effort was Dunkirk—in fact, in a few years' time it will be the only battle in which British troops were engaged.

There is little or no mention of the Battle of "Britain," which, according to one American account owed what importance it possessed to the "fact" that the Rolls-Royce engines in the Spitfires and Hurricanes were made in America. British troops were sometimes heard of behind the lines in Egypt and there are rumours of a British fleet in the Mediterranean, but there is not an inhabitant of the Middle West who cannot tell you how Rommel folded up before the generalship and fighting qualities of American strategists and troops whose location in Algeria (which he identifies with Egypt) effectively defeated the Germans two thousand miles away at El Alamein.

And, of course, everyone knows that the scattered and demoralised remnants of the British Army were finally rallied by the victorious Eisenhower, and Burma was recaptured by a couple of platoons of Americans, as conclusively proved by Messrs. Warner Bros. in their historic film, "Objective, Burma."

All these things being as they are, some examination of the nature of our decadence seems not merely desirable but obligatory. Let us first consider that modern criterion of greatness, size. The British Empire has in round numbers an area of 14,000,000 (fourteen million) square miles: the U.S.S.R. is second with 8,250,000 square miles. France is third with 4,336,000 square miles, and the United States ("unquestionably the greatest Power in the world to-day"—*vide* any Press, anywhere) has an area, including its Mandatory Jurisdiction, of 3,750,000 square miles, or slightly more than one quarter that of the area of the British Empire. As to population, the British Empire has a population of 498,000,000 (four hundred and ninety eight millions) or just over a quarter of the total estimated population of the earth, Russia (U.S.S.R.) is estimated to have a population of 166 millions, or about one third of that of the British Empire, and the United States has a population of 137,000,000 or rather more than one quarter that of the British Empire. Thirty millions of these are predominantly non-European in origin. It is stated by the Proclaimers that the British Empire is breaking up—in fact, it is, according to propaganda which is circulating everywhere in South Eastern Europe, due to disintegrate completely in a mere matter of months. This being so, it is rather odd that the British Empire is, at the time of writing, December 1945, *the only political area on the world's surface in which no fighting is in progress,* if we extend this phrase, as we are entitled to do in this connection, to "spheres of influence" such as Azerbaijan, China, and the puppet state of Panama, the preserves of Russia and the United States respectively.

Let us now take, without asserting, war as a criterion of greatness. No one will dispute the pre-eminence of air-power and its counter-measures as the deciding factor in this (present tense) war. The dominant and decisive aircraft at the decisive period of the war were British, powered by British designed and built engines, and, for the major part, fought by natives of these islands. The decisive counter-measure to aircraft was radar, invented, designed and built in Great Britain. *No decisive weapon used in this war originated outside the British Empire.*

But perhaps "Britain" did not exert herself? In 1940 "Britain" spent 39 *per cent,* Russia (not at war) spent 27 *per cent.* and the United States spent 3 *per cent.* on war. In 1941 the relative figures were 49 *per cent,* 35 *per cent.* and 11 *per cent.* In 1942, 53 *per cent.,* 45 *per cent.* and 35 *per cent.* In 1943, 54 *per cent.,* 48 *per cent.* and 46 *per cent.* In 1944, 54 *per cent.,* 44 *per cent.* and 46 *per cent.*

In 1943 and 1944, every British Dominion, as well as the British Isles, contributed a greater proportion of its national income towards winning the war than either Russia or the Unted States. And *over the whole period, the output per man* was greater than in the United States and incomparably greater than in Russia. But the amazing feature of the whole situation is that Great Britain, the keystone of the Imperial arch, (not excluding the British Dominions, to whom "Britain" owes large sterling, and in the case of Canada, dollar, debts) is the only major contestant emerging with a loss of overseas investments, a largely increased foreign debt, and a fantastically reduced standard of living.

Can it be that the Fall of the British Empire is a book-keeping transaction? In considering situations of this charac-

ter, it is important to avoid a common error—that of bolstering up an hypothesis with subsidiary ideas which are not factual. For instance, there are two carefully propagated ideas in connection with the Loan, the acceptance of which has just been authorised by the two Houses of Parliament. The first of these is that on balance the Loan is either inevitable or advantageous. In regard to this, I regard the case made by Lord Beaverbrook in his article in the *Sunday Express* as reasonably sound, and Lord Keynes's ridicule of it in the House of Lords as of the same reliability as his prophecies of the course of the wheat market in 1920. The second and skilfully suggested idea is that the United States is annoyed that we have "gone Red." On this, it may be helpful to state my opinion at once. Not only do I believe that every covert assistance has been given by the most powerful Forces in America—including the free services of half a million American soldiers as canvassers?—to ensure the return of a Socialist Government in this country, but I think I know exactly why that assistance has been given, and *subsequently to its success*, a loan has been forced on us. The primary preoccupation of the United States for years past has been Russia: as a result of the most careful investigation by such people as Joseph Davies and other less publicised insiders, their inner ring of officials *is satisfied that the Russian industrial system is the most inefficient the world has ever seen; and that a Socialist economy and the Bretton Woods Bank and Gold Standard-Dollar* will make foreclosure on this loan a *mathematical certainty in less than ten years.*

There is plenty of competent ability in the British Empire; it has the major physical assets of the earth; and such disadvantages, if they were disadvantages, as were involved by geography have been minimised by modern transport. If we are to see its disappearance in a cruder and untried organisation, we are witnessing the most amazing triumph of unarmed forces that the world (so far as we know) has ever seen.

THE EASTERN SITUATION (*Continued from page* 4)

of the States under Hndu rule, who have been made the victims of typical totalitarian tyrannical legislation interfering with their schools, their Press and their religious organisations. Here are two pretty large straws showing the direction of the wind, the Hindu wind—to small minority communities in India. And it was a very well-known and respected member of my own community too, who told me when I was in India during 1932-34, that the advent of Congress-controlled local governments, so far from easing up expenses and taxation, had greatly increased them, with, naturally, no gain whatsoever in efficiency.

Yours very faithfully,

KAIKHOSRU SHAPURJI SORABJI.

London, November 30, 1945.

(*Editor's Note*: It may be of assistance to those of our readers who are not familiar with India to sketch, however inadequately, the background of Mr. Sorabji's important letter.

The Parsis (Persians, Iranians) are a small community, probably not exceeding fifteen thousand in number, who settled on the Island of Bombay several centuries ago, and for the most part, still remain there. They are Zoroastrians, crudely described by the Lancashire cotton manufacturers who have so much to answer for in Bombay, as "Sun Worshippers"; and the policy of their philosophy has resulted in their exercising an influence in Indian affairs out of all proportion to their numbers, if not to their wealth, which is considerable. Many of the wealthiest of them have been strongly anti-British, a fact which may not be unconnected with their "opposite numbers" in Bombay, the Bagdad Jews whose chief representative is the family of Sassoon. In spite of this, the Parsi community was and is held in the highest estimation by the better type of resident English, both official and mercantile.

There is probably no body of people which by knowledge, detachment and character is more fitted to pronounce on the Indian situation. They are entirely familiar with the nature of the Indian Congress Party, which is merely an instrument, not in essence very different to the Trades Union Congress, of the Hindu millionaires such as the Birlas, who are pursuing an identical policy to that of Mond-Turnerism.

The idea is being sedulously propagated amongst those peculiar citizens of the United States, the international do-gooders, that only the wicked British stand in the way of a United India of which the Indian National Congress is the true representative. If anything could affect this opinion, independent testimony might. We are not sanguine.

PARLIAMENT (*Continued from page* 3)

Cocks, F. S.
Collins, V. J.
Comyns, Dr. L.
Conant, Maj. R. J. E.
Cooper, Wing-Comdr. G.
Corbett, Lt.-Col. U. (Ludlow)
Cove, W. G.
Crosthwaite-Eyre, Col. O. E.
Darling, Sir W. Y.
De la Bère, R.
Delargy, Captain H. J.
Digby, Maj. S. Wingfield
Dodds-Parker, Col. A. D.
Dower, E. L. G. (Caithness)
Duthie, W. S.
Edelman, M.
Erroll, Col. F. J.
Evans, S. N. (Wednesbury)
Fletcher, W. (Bury)
Follick, M.
Foot, M. M.
Fox, Sqn.-Ldr. Sir G.
Fraser, Maj. H. C. P. (Stone)
Fraser, Lt.-Col. Sir I. (Lonsdale)
Gammans, Capt. L. D.
Glossop, C. W. H.
Gomme-Duncan, Col. A. G.
Grenfell, D. R.
Hannon, Sir P. (Moseley)
Hare, Lt.-Col. Hon. J. H. (W'dbridge)
Harvey, Air-Comdre. A. V.
Herbert, Sir A. P.
Holmes, Sir J. Stanley
Joynson-Hicks, Lt.-Cdr. Hon. L. W.
Keeling, E. H.
Kendall, W. D.
Lancaster, Col. C. G.
Lee, Miss J. (Cannock)
Levy, B. W.
Linstead, H. N.
Lloyd, Brig. J. S. B. (Wirral)
McCallum, Maj. D.
Macpherson, Maj. N. (Dumfries)
Mann, Mrs. J.
Marlowe, A. A. H.
Marsden, Capt. A.
Mellor, Sir J.
Molson, A. H. E.
Moore, Lt.- Col. Sir T.
Neven-Spence, Major Sir B.
Noble, Comdr. A. H. P.
Nutting, Anthony
Peto, Brig. C. H. M.
Prior-Palmer, Brig. O.
Rayner, Brig. R.
Renton, D.
Roberts, H. (Handsworth)
Savory, Prof. D. L.
Shawcross, C. N. (Widnes)
Shepherd, Lieut. W. S. (Bucklow)
Smiles, Lt.-Col. Sir W.
Smith, E. P. (Ashford)
Smith, H. N. (Nottingham, S.)
Smithers, Sir W.
Stoddart-Scott, Col. M.
Stokes, R. R.
Taylor, C. S. (Eastbourne)
Taylor, Vice-Adm. E. A. (P'dd't'n, S.)
Teeling, Flt.-Lieut. W.
Thomson, Sir D. (Aberdeen, S.)
Thorneycroft, G. E. P. (Monmouth)
Touche, G. C.
Turton, R. H.
Usborne, Henry
Vane, W. M. T.
Wakefield, Sir W. W.
Walker-Smith, Lt.-Col. D.
Warbey, W. N.
Ward, Hon. G. R.
Webbe, Sir H. (Abbey)
White, D. (Fareham)

Wilcock, Group-Capt. C. A. B.
Williams, Lt.-Comdr. Gerald (T'nbr'ge)
York, C.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES:
Mr. Boothby and
Squadron-Leader Hollis

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has put before me a long argument, but I am bound to say that I can find no grounds at all for the argument he has put forward. I must say that I have given the matter great consideration, and if I had not made that concession yesterday we could not have discussed Bretton Woods at all. It would not be in Order under this Bill, because, after all, this Bill is conditional on Bretton Woods being accepted, and Bretton Woods, being a treaty, is not debatable by this House. Therefore, I can find no grounds at all for the observations which the hon. Member has made. I can only inform him that I have taken a great deal of advice on this matter, and this House cannot debate a matter on which it has already come to a conclusion. We have just now come to a conclusion on the Bretton Woods Agreement, and, therefore, discussion on it in connection with this Bill is ruled out entirely. In any case this Bill only deals with the financial arrangements. The diplomatic status of some persons and the enforceability of exchange contracts in the event of a treaty being decided are entirely hypothetical, and we cannot debate hypothetical matters. We can only debate those in the Bill inself.

Mr. Boothby: I can only say in view of your Ruling, Mr. Speaker, that I do charge the Government with a flagrant breach of the undertaking which has been given.

ALIENS: DOCTORS.

Major Symonds asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department why alien doctors, who have British medical qualifications and are on the permanent medical register, have to apply to his Department for permission to take up any new appointment, whether permanent or temporary, whereas, alien doctors on the temporary medical register can move from appointment to appointment without such permission; and if he is aware that alien doctors on the permanent medical register are handicapped, compared with those on the temporary register, in obtaining new appointments because of the long delay in dealing with their applications.

Mr. Ede: Alien doctors on the permanent medical register require permission to take a new appointment only if their stay here is subject to conditions requiring them to apply to my Department for such permission. The supervision of the work undertaken by alien doctors who are only temporarily registered, however, has been entrusted to the Central Medical War Committee.

REFUGEES (EMIGRATION)

Sir B. Neven-Spence asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many refugees from Nazi oppression, including children, were admitted to this country or came independently, between 1933 and 1945; how many of these remained here; how many have applied for visas for Palestine; and how many of these applications have been granted.

Mr. Ede: It is not possible to give a reliable figure showing how many of the persons admitted to this country between 1933 and 1945 can properly be classified as refugees from Nazi oppression. In one sense most of the persons admitted here from the countries which, during the war, were overrun by the Germans can so be described, and there are no figures to show how many of them had previously fled from Germany or Austria. So far as can be estimated, the number of German and Austrian refugees now in this country is under 40,000. Between 1933 and the end of June 1945, figures supplied by the Central Office for Refugees show that over 23,700 have emigrated, but the available figures do not show how many of these have gone to Palestine.

ALIENS.

Sir W. Smithers asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury why, when presenting a statement as to the number of aliens employed in Government Departments, he makes no differentiation between German and Stateless.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: It has been found convenient to adopt this form because the majority of Stateless persons were formerly of German nationality.

Sir W. Smithers asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury if, in view of the Nuremberg trial revelations, he will take immediate steps to dismiss all aliens in the employ of Government Departments.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: No, Sir. Such aliens have all been persons possessed of special qualifications employed on work for which no suitably qualified British subjects were readily available.

Sir W. Smithers asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury how many aliens are temporarily employed in Government Departments; and will he take immediate steps to terminate their employment and to replace them by British subjects.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: The number of enemy aliens whose employment has been specially permitted is 159 to date. We have no central information on friendly aliens employed.

A National 'Part-owner' and the Minister

Mr. W. B. Laurence has sent copies of the following further letters in the remarkable correspondence between himself and the Minister of Fuel and Power (see *The Social Crediter*, December 8). The correspondence focuses attention upon the essential point: Are we to upset the whole tried system of the country in order to demonstrate a hypothetical philosophical objective? The Mr. Geoffrey Heyworth referred to is, presumably, the Chairman of Lever Brothers and Unilever Ltd., a member of the London Passenger Transport Board since 1942:—

(COPY.)

Ministry of Fuel and Power,
Millbank, S.W. 1.
15 December, 1945.

Dear Sir,

In reference to your letter to Mr. Shinwell of 9 December regarding the advantages which may be derived from the nationalisation of the gas industry, you will find yourself better able to give your friends an answer on this matter if you will care to examine the report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Gas Industry, the Chairman of which was Mr. Geoffrey Heyworth, a well known business man.

For the moment I might perhaps just inform you that the Report reaches the conclusion that larger units are essential and that no voluntary process of grouping would be likely to be sufficiently speedy to satisfy the present and future requirements. The main objects which grouping into larger units can be expected to promote are:—

1. Some further reduction of production costs.
2. Improvement in labour conditions.
3. Further economy in capital charges.
4. More intensive study of distribution problems.
5. Further concentration on sales policy.
6. Greater concentration of development of 'fringe' and rural areas.
7. Further extension of coke grading and selling effort.
8. Expansion of research and its application.

Yours faithfully,

(signed) C. H. DE PRYER.

(COPY.)

18 December, 1945.

C. H. de Pryer, Esq.,
Ministry of Fuel and Power.

Dear Sir,

The suggestion in your letter F.L.N.316 of the 15th inst., that an examination of the report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Gas Industry will enlighten me about the advantage to myself, and others, as Consumers of Gas, when I and they become National Gas-owners, does not impress me, because my experience of such reports is that they are a mass of verbiage productive of a confusing picture in the minds of untechnical engineers, an impression strengthened, in this instance, by your apparent inability to give me a precise answer to my elementary question concerning the financial advantage of becoming a National Gas-owner. I notice that you refer to my letter as if it applied only to gas. My letter was also about the Coal Nationalisation, concerning the advantages of which I am as much in the dark as ever.

I gather from your letter under reply that I may obtain, perhaps, some philosophical political profit only, not any cash advantage, from Gas Nationalisation. I consider that your list of "main objects"—"main objects" may be and probably are quite distinct from ownership benefit—is more likely to result—especially Nos. 4 to 8—in increased cost to the National Owners—by way of either price or taxation or both. The expressions "more intensive study," "further concentration," "greater concentration" and "expansion of research" are suggestive of long avenues of bureaucratic expenditure, analagous to "the exploring of every avenue," so unfruitful in the past when it has been applied to other political problems—which are flatly contradictary of any real cash benefit to the consumers as national owners. Surely it is an amazing and also an impudent project to foist on to the already overburdened public a policy, the primary consequence of which will be a further raid on their pockets under the fiction and pretence that they will find solace in their being "national owners"? The promoters of these "nationalisation" schemes evidently imagine that they "can fool all the people all the time" by doping their minds with the term "nationalisation."

When Mr. Shinwell introduces these coal and gas nationalisation schemes in the House of Commons, will he "cut the cackle and get to the 'osses" and disclose the pocket advantage to the new owners, distinct from the theoretical and vague benefits under the heads of "research" "more intensive study" and "greater" and "further concentration" at the public expense? If not, why not, if his motives are really straightforward?

Yours faithfully,

W. B. LAURENCE.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....8/6
Economic Democracy.....(*edition exhausted*)
Social Credit.....3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....(*reprinting*)
Credit Power and Democracy.....(*edition exhausted*)
Warning Democracy.....(*edition exhausted*)
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.....(*reprinting*)

ALSO

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.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson...6d.
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 *The Tablet*).....1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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

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