From Week to Week

Fifty-nine thousand bottles of whisky have just been delivered in Stockholm, the advance guard of a much larger consignment. It is being sold in Stockholm at lower prices than the statutory price in Great Britain, at which price whisky is practically unobtainable.

For many years past, including the war period, Sweden has had the highest standard of living in Europe. What are we getting from Sweden; at what price; and if we have to export something, why do we have to export things in short supply? Why are we sinking German ships, instead of selling them?

We understand that Professor Laski has followed the fifty-nine thousand bottles of best Scotch whisky to Sweden. After all, they can't expect to get it for nothing, can they?

Any idea that dear Harold is deserting the sinking ship, however, should be dismissed as premature. Just looking round "till the cooking improves, at 'home."

"In the dark days of 1940, a great dispute arose behind the scene of State. Which weapons of political warfare should be used to undermine Germany's influence?... A giant propaganda of amazing subtlety having given the impression that the Nazis were creatures of the Right" (our emphasis) "supported and succoured by conservative forces... the second school was convinced we should finance and encourage Communist movements everywhere. This school prevailed. Vast sums of money, backed up by all resources, were switched over to support the extreme Left, all over Europe." — Review of World Affairs, August 29, 1945.

Now, Clarence, what word would you substitute for "school" in the foregoing quotation? And what do you think of a Governmental system which decides between Communism and Conservatism merely on the grounds that the Powers behind Hitler having pretended that he was a Communist, the Powers behind Churchill would pretend that he was a Communist?

Starving Europe. "Gaiety in Budapest. Abundance of Food in Restaurants. Well-filled Shops."
— Headlines in The Scotsman, September 1, 1945.

Well, you voted to let bureaucrats dispose of your property to their friends on the Continent, didn't you? or don't you know what you voted for?

"Russia has suffered relatively little in regard to food production. Her losses in cattle and hogs are surprisingly low... Yet the Soviet Government has continued to import large amounts of beef and pork products through UNRRA... and has sent large portions of this supply to Finland, Poland and Balkan countries to buttress "Red" political control..."


"Mr. Herbert Lehman" (Head of UNRRA) "is related by marriage, and associated with the Morgenthau, Seligmans, Wertheims, Lewisohns, Warburgs."
— Congressional Record, 1934.

Isn't prophecy wondrous? Six years to a day the war has lasted—the "B."B.C. told us three times over, so that we shouldn't miss it. Six years eggzactly. And the prophets no doubt knew by a scratch on the Pyramids that half a million Japs would be vapourised (in Russia we call it "liquidated"—about thirty millions of them) so as to make it just six years. And just see the beautiful dawn of the New World when taxes are all paid by non-Trades Unionists. Makes you religious-like, don't it?

"Axioms" of Society. No. 2 "Trades Unions are necessary and desirable, and are an indication of a progressive community." (Trades-Unions, in the British sense have been abolished in Russia, the Socialist paradise.)

Perhaps few subjects are so little understood by the general public, and even by trades-unionists themselves, as trades-unionism. Its activities may be classified as (1) intimidation of non-Trades-Unionists. (2) The exaction of tribute. In America that amounts to sheer blackmail accompanied by threats and violence, both to employers and employed. (3) The provision of a rapidly increasing number of well-paid bureaucratic offices. (4) The restriction of output to bolster up a large labour-force and maintain political power. (5) The transfer of the independent status of the craftsman to the Trades-Unions. (6) The raising of the commodity-price of labour at the expense of the public. (7) The robbery of private property, jointly with the Financial-International Cartels, and its transfer to the Trades-Unions.

The first steps in this final item are forecast in the present Government programme.

A Trades Union is simply a labour monopoly, and is subject to the same over-riding criticism as any other monopoly, the object of which is to obtain absolute power over the thing monopolised. "All power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." It is arguable—it is by no means axiomatic—that the early craft-unions were beneficial.

Like so many other aspects of the machine-age, this argument is almost always taken out of its context, two features of which are the progress of the industrial arts...
and the structure of the price system, which simply means that increases of wages must go into prices, and so are paid by the consumer, who is in many cases also the Trades-Unionist. It is probable that a fixed money wage, accompanied by a continuous fall in the price level, would have benefited the wage-earner far more than the collective wage-rate increases exacted by trades-unions. The naive idea that wage increases have come out of the employers' profits, while it is still used for propaganda purposes, is not seriously believed by the Trades-Union official. The argument of the industrialist that falling prices mean trade stagnation is of course childish, and is only justified by the existence of the monopoly of credit.

The whole of the activities of the Trades Unions are now a dead loss to the community in the same way that the Beveridge Scheme involved the collection of larger sums in premiums than could be distributed in benefits, because, inter alia, of administration expenses. But, of course, the political situation created by the conspiracy between the Labour Cartel and the International Financial and Industrial Cartels is the primary menace to civilisation.

As must be the case with monopolies, which are essentially egalitarian, trades unionism tends to stifle initiative, encourage stagnation, and to substitute political action for competitive improvement.

The domination of the British Constitution by Labour, if it existed, would be pure, genuine Fascism-Government by function. Labour is no more, and no less, than a function, and has no more, and no less, claim to consideration than any other function, such as sleep. But of course Socialism merely uses "Labour" to obtain a Parliamentary franchise for an over-riding monopoly—if it were feasible to capitalise for this purpose, it would serve even better.

One of the first practical necessities of the situation is to disrupt and disintegrate Trades-Unionism in its monopolistic form. The really Satanic forces behind politics at the present time realised years ago that a great war was their last chance to force sufficient people into factories to enable them to create a false identity between "Labour" and the general population; force this population into the Trades-Unions even temporarily, so as to give time to pass legislation to keep them there permanently, and to sweep away any other class but the proletariat.

The idea that the Trades-Union Congress shall take over, and pass on to a vicious type of secretly-controlled organisation modelled on the "B.B.C. and the London Passenger Transport Board, all the transport of the country—an organisation against which the individual or even the House of Commons would have no redress whatever, is so fundamentally tyrannical that it must be assumed that every evil force is behind the Trades-Unions in the proposals it is making. Such a measure would be, as quite possibly it is intended to be a preliminary step to the disappearance, as a separate entity, of the British people. It is part of the policy so obligingly disclosed by Dr. Toynbee of the "Royal" Institute of International Affairs, founded by the Financial Experts who wrecked the Treaty of Versailles; "We are working secretly, but with all our might, to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations." "Chatham House" will attend to the business of divesting the nation of sovereignty while Socialism divests the individual of freedom. Transport House and Imperial Chemical Industries-I. G. Farben-Dupont-Canadian Industries, Ltd., are all one happy family.

The kind of nonsense which is used to buttress the markrazi is well illustrated by the statement of J. B. Priestley that "Democracy rests on the true old saying that 'Nobody is wiser than everybody.'"

For sheer fatuity this remark ranks high in political thought. It is as much as to say that the more water you put in your whisky the better whisky it will be, and the more people who shout when Caruso sings, the finer the music. Mr. Priestley is evidently obsessed with the mob mind just now, and in the article from which the foregoing pearl of thought is taken, he goes on to say "The opinion that makes itself felt is group opinion." (His emphasis.) A group never had an opinion, never could have an opinion, and has no mechanism by which it could conceive an opinion. It can act on an opinion, but it must get that opinion from an individual. The recent election is an instance of a group acting on an injected opinion; and we hope that Mr. Priestley will like the result.

Sir Stafford Cripps at Blackpool, September 9, 1945: "The dress that the mother goes without this year is helping to make sure that her children will get what they need in the years to come."

Now where have we heard that one before?

There are occasions on which—for a short period only—we revert to our standpoint of twenty-five years ago; that the poor, dear politicians and Big Business-men are doing their best and are just waiting for some bright Social Crediter to demonstrate A + B to them and then they will wring his hand, tears will gush from their tired eyes, and they will stammer, in broken English—we mean accents—"My dear, dear, fellow, this is what we have been waiting for. Now everything will be all right." But when we hear once again the dear old story we remember so well in 1919—no, Clarence, we do not propose to republish The Delusion of Super-Production, which appeared almost egzzactly twenty-seven years ago in the English Review. We merely wish to enquire what price will be obtained for poor mother's dress which she can't have, when it is sold to the dear Hottentots; whether, once again we shall buy from the Hottentots raw cotton to make another dress to send them to pay for the raw cotton and in fact, and to put it shortly, how many more times is once-Great Britain to have a raw deal in "peace" so that she can have another raw deal in the next war?

We pause for an answer from Lord Keynes.

Mr. Christopher Hollis, M.P., whose incursion into monetary science some years ago appeared to promise much, had a rather hush-hush job with President Roosevelt prior to the war. Whether post hoc, or propter hoc we cannot say, but his subsequent pronouncements on money do not inspire enthusiasm, and we would particularly dissociate ourselves from the inference to be drawn from a recent article bearing his name which suggests that a fall of prices would be a calamity. A fall of prices is absolutely essential to avert a flight from sterling. That does not of course mean that unjust debts should be paid in appreciated pounds, or paper dollars bought with real values. We have
noticed many times that there appears to be a sheer inability
on the part of monetary experts both orthodox and un-
orthodox (we make no attempt to classify Mr. Hollis) to
apply the simplest principles of double-entry bookkeeping, or
of cost-accounting, to the money system. In consequence,
many of their doubtless well-meaning proposals are so in-
compatible with each other, that the whole subject assumes
the aspect of a mad-hatters’ tea-party.

Who Fought The War

We won’t waste time over the question of who won
the war, because we knew before it started but the details
of who fought it may be of passing interest:—

(From an Editorial in the New York World-Telegram.)

Britain-baiters like to harp on such refrains as “Britain
lets her colonies fight her wars,” and “England will fight
for the last Canadian.”

British Empire casualty totals just made public show
up this sort of propaganda. Here they are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Wounded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>233,042</td>
<td>57,472</td>
<td>275,975</td>
<td>183,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>36,018</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>53,073</td>
<td>9,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>21,415</td>
<td>6,519</td>
<td>37,477</td>
<td>26,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>9,844</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>19,253</td>
<td>8,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>6,417</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>13,773</td>
<td>14,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>23,295</td>
<td>12,264</td>
<td>62,064</td>
<td>79,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonies</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>14,811</td>
<td>6,773</td>
<td>8,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>336,772</td>
<td>98,113</td>
<td>468,388</td>
<td>330,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The population of the United Kingdom (England,
Scotland, Wales and North Ireland) is about 47,000,000.
Populations of the other countries are, roughly: Canada
11,500,000; Australia 7,250,000; New Zealand 1,600,000;
South Africa 11,000,000; India 389,000,000.

A little figuring shows, in ratio to population, the
following percentages of lives sacrificed during World
War II:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>.00006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the United Kingdom life loss must be added 1,200
Home Guards, 60,000 civilians killed in air raids and V-1
and V-2 attacks and most of the 30,000 merchant navy dead.

With these added the United Kingdom total of killed
is 324,000 and the percentage of population is almost .007.

So the British of the home islands have not only sacri-
ficed more lives in total than all the rest of the Empire
combined—they have sacrificed a greater number in propor-
tion to population than any other part of the Empire.

The United States’ life sacrifice has been .0018 of
our population—nearly 250,000 of our 135,000,000.

The “Land for the (Chosen)
People” Racket

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 2s. (Postage extra).


PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: August 23, 1945.

ALIENS (NATURALISATION)

Colonel Ropner asked the Secretary of State for the
Home Department how many aliens have during the war
received naturalisation on the ground that such naturalisation
was a matter of direct national interest.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS (STATISTICS)

Sir J. Mellor asked the Minister of Health if he will
give an estimate of the average number of civilians, per
doctor, in the United Kingdom; and of the average number
of officers and other ranks, per doctor, in the B.L.A.

Mr. A. Bevan: According to the best information at
my disposal the average number of civilians per general
practitioner in the United Kingdom is 2,576. The cor-
responding number in relation to medical practitioners of
all kinds is 1,359. With regard to the second part of the
Question, my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for
War informs me that the number of Army personnel per
medical officer in the B.L.A. is about 409, but that, as stated
previously, these officers have considerable additional com-
mittments to displaced persons and others.

MONEY (PURCHASING POWER)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer
if, taking the purchasing power of the £ in 1900 as 100,
he will state the corresponding figure at the latest available
date; and the figure calculated for the whole field of personal
expenditure.

Mr. Dalton: According to the best calculations avail-
able, the figure for July, 1945, is 44. Calculated over the
whole field of personal expenditure, the figure for July, 1945,
would probably be about 39.

INVESTMENTS (PLANNING)

Mr. Churchill asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if
the words in the Gracious Speech, “the effective planning
of investment,” extend to the planning and control of the
spending by limited companies and others of their own
cash resources and to the control of their power to borrow
from their banks; and whether he can make any further
statement on this and cognate matters.

Mr. Dalton: As I explained in the Debate on the
Address, I cannot anticipate in any detail the contents of
the legislation which the Government propose to introduce
on this subject. The planning of investment has two aspects,
the physical and the financial. On the physical side the
Government’s policy is to secure that the available labour
and materials are used in accordance with whatever plans
may from time to time be required for the purposes of
employment policy and national development. On the
financial side the control of demands on the capital market
will, as I stated on Tuesday, be exercised according to the
same principles. But there is no intention of compelling
anyone to invest his resources in one way rather than another.
In particular, the proposed legislation will not provide for
(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.


The Rebuilding of Prestige

"In the things of the spirit, there is apparently very little, if any, evolution. Homer wrote, nearly three thousand years ago, as supreme an expression of human life in absolute literary values as the world has ever known, and, with all reverence, ... is ever likely to know... It used to be a favourite expression of Virchow... the greatest of living anthropologists [1913] that from the history of the human race the theory of evolution receives no confirmation of any kind." — Walsh, The Thirteenth, Greatest of Centuries, p.4.

The greatest task which lies before the élite of Europe in general, and Great Britain in particular, is to reverse the amazing "moral" prestige of the Left—a prestige identical with that skilfully built round the Satanist Cromwell. Evidence is useless. It is futile to point to the fast disappearing remnants of Jacobean or Carolean houses and farms, and their replacement by pre-fabricated nightmares; to suggest contemplation of York Minster in relation to a Ford Factory; to compare Magna Carta, or any Plantagenet fourteenth century legislation with the Defence Regulations, or the food and drink of Elizabethan times with spam and chemical beer. The clear indications, which are there for anyone to see that everyone is, relatively to the possibilities of the period, worse off both materially and spiritually, as the ideas which have been persistently inculcated as progressive since the French Revolution become operative, convey no message to our politicians. In this matter, Baconian or inductive methods seem as futile as Aristotelian logic. What is the use of showing a chemical experiment to a blind man? It is only necessary to notice the tendency of the overseas, and particularly American newspaper press to assume that the rabble must be representative of God's will, that excellence is anti-social, and that success is only moral if it is vulgar, to become convinced that there is some peculiarly perverse influence at work which utilises the lowest human frailties to defeat the judgement of experience.

Closely involved in this matter is the fact that the most valuable services rendered by individuals to humanity are generally quite unrecognised at the time of their gift and would not even be permitted in Russia. The "lazy" Euclid drawing figures in the sand, James Watt "playing" with his mother's kitchen kettle, are now canonised because they are contributory to the only kind of advance that contemporary society considers to be "real." Pythagoras is probably known, where he is known, more by the relation of the squares on the perpendicular and base of a triangle, to that on the hypothenuse, than by his effect on the thought of the European continent, and so on the world.

This is far from being an abstract consideration. The extraordinary, if largely unconscious, insolence of modern bureaucracy in arrogating to itself the power to "distribute incomes fairly"; to dispossess this man of his property and hand it over to that man, and to assess eternal values as laid down by the London School of Economics, far transcends anything known in these islands in the days of feudalism, as the most casual investigation of the documents and laws of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries will disclose. The feudal baron was subject to a very real code, non-material either in origin or sanctions; and the use of the atomic bomb is a measure of the distance we have fallen from it.

Perversion

The cleavage between the policy advocated in these pages, and that of the Planners (leaving all questions of motive apart) is that which separates the organic from the mechanistic, and it is curious and significant that the real argument centres round perversion.

No one in their senses would suggest that Waterloo Bridge should have been built without planning. No one in their senses would suggest that the doubtless well-meaning planning of the Forestry Commission, which seems to derive its inspiration from the coiffure en brosse of a German shopkeeper, is really an improvement on the Caledonian Forest.

It may be purely co-incidental, but side by side with the exploits of the Forestry Commission, the lovely, hardy, and durable British Pine is dying out, together with the high-grown larch. The latter, if properly seasoned, was a valuable and durable timber. The low-ground larch, which grows quickly and is beloved of the Planners, is hardly worth the trouble of planting.

The point we have in mind is simple, but formidable. Planning, in the sense that the word is used by the Socialists and their inspirers and supporters the International Finance Ring, is not a life process, it is a death process, a petrifaction. It postulates finality and omniscience. It assumes that the mysterious cosmic process, of which we know less than nothing, can be arrested with advantage, not merely by humanity, but by humanity at this passing moment. A plan which is changed from day to day is not a plan at all, it is a process, and has to be lived, not bureaucratised.

We have little doubt that the admonitions "Take no thought for tomorrow," "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof" and many others of a like nature, meant just this. To interfere in an organic process without even recognising that it exists, can only have one outcome.

"Amnesty"

Two rather strange posters are to be seen in London just now. (1) says "Demand Amnesty for all military and civilian prisoners under War Time Laws." It is published by the Freedom League. The people to benefit would be deserters and black market Jews.

(2) is a picture of the ruins of a city completely devastated and letterpress to the effect that if the reader wants to avoid this he must join Federal Union.
An Anti-Bureaucratic Campaign in Queensland

The Queensland Voters' Policy Association has fired the first shot in the anti-bureaucrat campaign in Queensland. The following letter was sent to every M.H.R. and Senator in Queensland:

Dear Sir,—My League has been formed of citizens who believe that under cover of war-emergency, great strides have been made in Australia towards the Totalitarian State.

We detest totalitarianism and all it connotes; we much prefer our former British way of life, which affords to the individual the widest opportunity to live his own life in his own way, with the minimum of interference from Government officials and other external authority; which supports the old claim that “An Englishman’s home is his Castle.”

We are determined that the policies imposed upon us under war-emergency shall not endure and persist as permanent features of the peace.

We believe that our well-tried British way of life, which encourages the individual to exercise his own initiative, is not only more to our taste and more comfortable to live under, but also incomparably more efficient in accomplishing an objective; that we won the war against Germany not because of the totalitarianism which in large measure we adopted, but in spite of it—that we could have won the war against Germany more quickly and with less cost, had we not been hamstrung at every turn by bureaucratic interference. Had totalitarian methods of organisation been more efficient than ours, then Germany, who was prepared to the teeth for war, would have made short work of Britain, who had been treacherously prepared, by disarmament; for the slaughter.

We recognise in our subjection to bureaucratic control, a fundamental departure from our former way of life, to which we are determined to return. We, therefore, dedicate ourselves to the ousting of the Bureaucrat and to his replacement by one who receives a mandate from the people, and who returns periodically to give an account of his stewardship to, and is subject to dismissal by the people—that is, by a responsible Minister of the Crown.

The characteristic of stable government is that such Government has the consent of the governed. Any other kind of government is tyranny.

The alternative to stable government is lawlessness, chaos, disorder, and revolt. These symptoms are already too prevalent in our community to escape the attention of any but the wilfully blind. They are clear indications of, and follow inevitably from, the abdication of Ministers, who instead of accepting responsibility, endeavour to evade it by the appointment of Boards, Commissions and Bureaucrats.

There is only one way to restore stable Government—i.e., to oust the Bureaucrat, and restore Responsible Ministers.

Bureaucrats are appointed by Governments, who are supported by representatives, who, finally, in their turn, are elected, and paid, by electors.

For the guidance of Electors we are asking you and all others, M's, H.R. and Senators, from this State, to classify themselves as pro-bureaucrats or anti-bureaucrats. To that end you are invited to answer the following questions:

Will you immediately and from this time forward exert yourself to the utmost—

1. To reduce to pre-war numbers the numbers of public servants?
2. To especially consider for elimination all senior appointments to the public service made since 3/9/39?
3. To oppose the appointment of any additional Boards, Commissions, or bureaucrats?
4. To abolish bureaucratic direction of policy and to insist that the responsibility for policy shall rest on a responsible Minister of the Crown?
5. To resist any further regimentation of the people?
6. To insist that all measures of regimentation shall be rapidly relaxed and repealed?

You are asked to answer each of these issues “Yes” or “No,” and you will then be provisionally registered with us as pro-bureaucrat or anti-bureaucrat. If no answer is received from you within 14 days of the date of this letter, you will be classified as pro-bureaucrat.

We propose to organise in each electorate so that a flow of last preferences shall be directed to all retiring pro-bureaucrats.

Yours faithfully, (Mrs.) M. De Mattos, Hon. Secretary.

After two weeks, says the New Times of July 27, only three replies had been received. Mr. Fadden replied in general terms, stating that his opposition to bureaucracy was known. He referred to some of his statements. “Mere statements” says the newspaper, are not enough. Mr. Fadden’s electors should either receive a written pledge that the reduction of the number of bureaucrats will be his Number One policy at all times, or, failing this, work to ensure that he gets last preference votes at the next elections.

“Senator Cooper expressed general agreement, but said that controls cannot be done away with immediately. Mr. Adermann was in agreement with a reduction in bureaucrats ‘as far as possible!’ This is insufficient guarantee. Electors must insist on unqualified support of their policy.

“Queensland electors should now be busy backing up work of the Voter’s Policy Association and getting the anti-bureaucrat canvass under way. Members of Parliament must be made to realise that electors mean business.”

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to The Social Crediter has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N. 6.
PARLIAMENT (Continued from page 3)

the exercise of financial control over the use by business undertakings of their own cash or other existing resources. As regards relations between banks and their customers, I do not contemplate any substantial change in the present arrangements. Borrowing from banks is, in certain circumstances, already subject to the capital issues control; and the banks have already been asked by my predecessor to observe the same principles in regard to the granting of advances as apply to the grant of Treasury consent to new issues.

GERMAN LOSSES (BRITISH INVESTORS)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the position of British subjects who invested their money in German sterling loan; and will he take steps to ensure that the claims of these pre-war bondholders will not be subordinated to reparations.

Mr. Dalton: I am not in a position to make any statement on this matter at the present time.

ATOMIC BOMB SECRETS

Sir W. Smithers asked the Prime Minister if he will give an assurance that the secrets of the manufacture of the atomic bomb shall not be disclosed to any other Power without first obtaining the consent of this House.

The Prime Minister: Before they reach any decision on this matter the Government will wish to have such advice as the newly appointed Advisory Committee can offer, and they must, of course, move in concert with the Government of the United States. As regards the second part of the Question, I am unable to give a specific undertaking, but I can assure the House that the Government will wish to pay full regard to the views of hon. Members.

RAILWAY CONTROL AGREEMENT (PAYMENTS)

Mr. Ernest Davies asked the Minister of War Transport the sums that have accrued to His Majesty’s Government for each of the years during which the 1941 Agreement between the railway companies, the L.P.T.B. and His Majesty’s Government has been in force; and the total sum thereof.

Mr. Barnes: The amounts paid to the Government under the Railway Control Agreement, being the estimated excess of net revenue over the fixed annual sums due to the controlled undertakings since the beginning of 1941, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>£21,656,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>£45,657,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>£62,099,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>£46,787,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£176,199,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT (STAFFING)

Mr. Callaghan asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will keep in mind the heavy strain under which Inland Revenue staffs are working; and if he will make arrangements in advance to strengthen them to cope with any additional work his further Budget may entail.

Mr. Dalton: Yes, Sir. I am well aware of the heavy pressure of work in the Inland Revenue, and I am now examining the question of providing the Department with adequate staff.

INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT, GERMANY (REMOVAL)

Colonel Erroll asked the Secretary of State for War whether it is our policy to remove from the British controlled area of Germany machine tools and other production equipment required for our own use in the same manner as is being done in the Russian occupied zone.

Mr. Bellenger: The policy agreed between His Majesty’s Government and the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. concerning removals of industrial capital equipment is set out in the agreement on German Reparations issued after the Potsdam Conference. This provides that removals of industrial capital equipment shall begin as soon as possible and steps are being taken towards its implementation in the British zone, including deliveries to the United Kingdom.

SPANISH REPUBLICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Major Wilkes asked the Secretary of State for War how many Spanish Republican prisoners are held in internment camps in this country; and what steps he proposes to take for their release and resettlement in a manner befitting the great services they have rendered to the United Nations.

Mr. Bellenger: There are 222 Spanish Republicans held in the United Kingdom as prisoners of war. They had taken refuge in France and were conscripted by the Germans into the Todt Organisation, in which they were serving at the time of their capture by our Forces. The question of their return to France, is at present under discussion between His Majesty’s Government and the French Government.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. Zilliacus (Gateshead): Let us say frankly that we believe Socialism is a fundamental necessity to the reconstruction of Europe and the spread of political democracy and liberty in Europe. Those were our words when we were in opposition; let us stick to this policy now that we are in power. We have acted on that belief in this country; let us act on it abroad. The necessity for Socialism does not stop at our frontiers, but expands throughout Europe. A new wind is blowing throughout the world and we are part of the wind. My right hon. Friend the Lord Privy Seal said a few days ago that he hoped it would be understood that the coming into power of Labour meant something different in this House. It means something different throughout the world. For this election, if you like, is our British version of the Russian Revolution, or, better still, perhaps it bears the same relation to the Russian Revolution and to its successor, the resistance movements in Europe, as the Government and Parliament that brought in the Reform Bill of 1832 bore to the French Revolution, and just as the Whigs and Liberals of the 19th Century made no bones about their sympathy and support for the middle-class revolutions that were engaged in cleaning up the remnants of feudalism and the power of the landed aristocracy on the Continent, I hope that Labour in this country, to-day as
yesterday, will send its sympathy and support and give its co-operation to the resistance movements which are working for a new social order in Europe. Let the message go forth that the hopes of those in other countries who greeted the advent of a Labour Government with joy are not mistaken, that their great expectations are not to be dashed to the ground, that we are not merely a Tory "Caretaker" Government in foreign affairs, but that foreign policy from now on will be inspired by a new vision, a new spirit, a new hope, new aims and new purposes...

Mr. Clement Davies (Montgomery): ... There is only one way that I can see by which we can achieve the ideal we all desire and that is, to submit ourselves throughout the world to one Sovereign just as we do within the borders of a State, within the borders of these Islands, one people subject to one law, and having for that law a sense of obedience for that law, a respect and even a passion...

Mr. Boothby (Aberdeen and Kincardine, Eastern): ... If we look at the Preamble written by Marshal Smuts, we find that it is as impressive, as far as it goes, as anything written by Marshal Smuts would be, but it is curiously unspecific and couched in the vaguest terms. I would ask hon. Members to compare this Preamble, written by one of the greatest democrats of our time, with another declaration written by perhaps the greatest democrat of all time, Thomas Jefferson:

"I do not like the omission of a Bill of Rights providing clearly and without the aid of sophisms for freedom of religion, freedom of the Press, protection against standing armies, restriction against monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force of the Habeas Corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters of fact. Let me add that a Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every Government on earth, general or particular, and what no Government should refuse, or rest on inferences... I cannot give up my guidance to the magistrate, because he knows no more the way to Heaven than I do, and is less concerned to direct me right than I am to go right."

I say "ditto" to Mr. Jefferson. All human experience goes to show that power—and we have now to create an instrument of unchallengable power or perish—can only endure if it secures liberties under the reign of law which men will make great sacrifices to retain...

What I want to impress upon the House to-night, to urge upon it, is that it is now a matter of dire practical necessity to create an effective International Police Force...

Who is Marshal Tito that he should now be turning down prematurely on the wrong side. Who is Marshal Tito that he should now be turning down prematurely on the wrong side. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Ernest Bevin):... There is only one way that I can see by which we can achieve the ideal we all desire and that is, to submit ourselves throughout the world to one Sovereign just as we do within the borders of a State, within the borders of these Islands, one people subject to one law, and having for that law a sense of obedience for that law, a respect and even a passion...

Mr. Boothby: ... If we look at the Preamble written by Marshal Smuts, we find that it is as impressive, as far as it goes, as anything written by Marshal Smuts would be, but it is curiously unspecific and couched in the vaguest terms. I would ask hon. Members to compare this Preamble, written by one of the greatest democrats of our time, with another declaration written by perhaps the greatest democrat of all time, Thomas Jefferson:

"I do not like the omission of a Bill of Rights providing clearly and without the aid of sophisms for freedom of religion, freedom of the Press, protection against standing armies, restriction against monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force of the Habeas Corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters of fact. Let me add that a Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every Government on earth, general or particular, and what no Government should refuse, or rest on inferences... I cannot give up my guidance to the magistrate, because he knows no more the way to Heaven than I do, and is less concerned to direct me right than I am to go right."

I say "ditto" to Mr. Jefferson. All human experience goes to show that power—and we have now to create an instrument of unchallengable power or perish—can only endure if it secures liberties under the reign of law which men will make great sacrifices to retain...

What I want to impress upon the House to-night, to urge upon it, is that it is now a matter of dire practical necessity to create an effective International Police Force...

Who is Marshal Tito that he should now be turning down prematurely on the wrong side. Who is Marshal Tito that he should now be turning down prematurely on the wrong side. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Ernest Bevin):... There is only one way that I can see by which we can achieve the ideal we all desire and that is, to submit ourselves throughout the world to one Sovereign just as we do within the borders of a State, within the borders of these Islands, one people subject to one law, and having for that law a sense of obedience for that law, a respect and even a passion...

Mr. George Griffiths (Hemsworth): What declaration did you lot not make?

Colonel Stanley: I can show the hon. Gentleman, if he likes, exactly what I wrote to any constituent who asked me about Palestine.

Mr. G. Griffiths: I said "you lot."

Colonel Stanley: The hon. Gentleman will have seen that on this particular subject we were wise enough at that moment to maintain a complete silence.

Mr. Griffiths: The right hon. Gentleman's party were sitting on the fence then.

Colonel Stanley: It is better perhaps than coming down prematurely on the wrong side.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Ernest Bevin): You cannot always get off.

Colonel Stanley: In my early days I was a student at the Staff College and I remember General Montgomery coming down to lecture to us. He instituted a famous and not very popular system in the Army of a seven mile run for all officers of all ages and all occupations. The A.D.M.S. of the Corps said to him, "General, if you make some of these people do this run they will die," and he answered, "Let them die. Far better that they should die now than in the face of the enemy." There is great truth in that. If you are to have difficulties and weaknesses it is far better to disclose them now, when you have time to deal with them, than that they should be concealed when the test comes and disclosed only then...
It is certain that in this new world we shall find some familiar faces. When my right hon. and hon. Friends are finally allowed in, no doubt after a period of what, in the old days, used to be called, euphemistically, “Political education” we shall not be quite at sea. We shall at least find there Lord Croft, who, having played the part of the wicked industrialist in the old world, is now, with little change in his make-up or costume, cast for the part of one of the financial cherubs of the new. Frankly, I am still sceptical. If I do not believe that a new world was created in the early days of July I am not so sure whether a new world has not been created in the early days of August. Certainly, we have seen a new phenomenon for evil, and possibly for good, but at any rate a phenomenon where evil is certain and good is problematical for the future.

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Ernest Bevin): ... As far as the administration of our existing mandate is concerned, there has been no change in the policy to which we were all a party in the Coalition Government. It was thoroughly threshed out at that time. There was no party difference about it at all, and we arrived at a decision on this question which I can assure my right hon. and gallant Friend has not even been reconsidered, because we regarded it as really settled.

House of Lords: August 23, 1945.

CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Lord Strabolgi: ... As I have mentioned Japan, perhaps your Lordships will permit me in my concluding sentences to say that there is rather too much gloom and apprehension about the future settlement in Japan. Some very cogent remarks were made on that subject by my noble friend Lord Latham in his speech in moving the humble Address last week. I used to know Japan rather well and I am going to suggest to your Lordships something that is likely to happen in Japan and which I have not seen referred to anywhere else, either in debates in Parliament or in the Press. There is in Japan, though it is underground, a proletarian movement. I think it would be wrong to describe it simply as Communist. It is a revolt of the educated, intelligent working class against the appalling conditions of servitude in which they have lived for a generation or more. It has been savagely suppressed, but I have reason to believe from information which reaches me that it still exists. Some of its leaders have managed to escape abroad. This movement may become an important factor in Japan, and may solve one of the difficult problems of the future of the Japanese Dynasty and other matters into which I do not wish to enter in detail now. If it is a fact that this proletarian movement in Japan, which will probably be republican in form—at any rate it is a revolt against the feudalism and militarism which have been Japan’s ruin—is what I have been led to believe, I do hope that the Allied Armies of Occupation and their leaders will be well informed in advance as to what to expect. A mere blind persecution of Japanese who are described as Socialists and therefore outside the pale would possibly end this hopeful movement.

It would, after all, be better for the Japanese to get rid of themselves of this quaint survival of medievalism that their Government presents rather than for there to be any idea of this being forced upon them by the victorious Allies.

Jewish “Collaborator”

For “ruthless collaboration” with the Germans, Helga Zweig, a twenty year old German Jewess, says the London Evening News, has been sentenced to death by a Brussels military court. She is said to have even denounced her parents to the Gestapo to obtain their personal effects.
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