

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 6.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

At the Congressional Enquiry which followed the Armistice Mr. Bernard Baruch, who had been Chairman of the U.S. Munitions Board, remarked with complacency, "Yes, I did have more power than any other man in the War."

So far as we are aware, there is no record of the exact Parliamentary authority by which the food supplies of this country are at the absolute mercy of a Board sitting in Washington. To say that World Food Supplies are allocated with "absolute fairness," besides being a blatant falsehood, since the United States is not rationed in anything except pig food, in itself carries with it an implication of such immensity that we hesitate to contemplate the inevitable consequences.

Who agreed to the abrogation of national property rights, any more than to the continuous abrogation of personal property rights in this and other countries?

What were Mr. Bernard Baruch, Mr. Benjamin Cohen and other "American" Jews doing in this country at the time that all these World Communistic arrangements were made?

When are we going to have an Enquiry to examine the consequences which would ensue if a Board, sitting in London, allocated a rationed economy to the United States, abolished the coupon and rationing system in England, and told the Americans that any time they wanted a good meal, they could come over here and get it?

As the Victory Celebrations on June 8 are not being regarded with undue enthusiasm why not transfer them to the Lands of the Victors? After all, we only did the fighting and the paying.

Mr. Ernest Bevin will lead the Delegation to Egypt. The cuisine and wines of Shepheard's Hotel are world famous.

In order to preserve the principle of Equal Rations for All, "Britain" will continue Austerity Fare and American pigs will be allocated 15 per cent. less bought feeding-stuffs. It is felt that this will ensure that the pigs will receive more from the surplus food now going to the incinerators.

Any rationing of American sheep might be regarded as an invidious reflection on the British Public, and Mr. Winant, the retiring Ambassador, considers that Anglo-American co-operation is satisfactory.

On the front page of the *Edmonton Bulletin* of March 7, 1946, four photographs, comprising all the non-Jews out

of thirteen persons at that date under arrest in the "spy trial," are given pride of place. Evidently there is a Gentile problem in Canada—something ought to be done about it.

There are few more misleading political labels than the word "liberal," and it is doubly unfortunate that it is coming into use as antithetical to "Socialism" or "Planned Economy." Political Liberalism was fundamentally a misapplication of the concept of freedom of association to the complete fallacy of freedom *in* association. Planning is not merely antithetical. It is an identification of politics with economics. We do not now say "Is there enough petrol in the country for the private cars which require it?" we say "How much will the Controller let me have?" Dr. Dalton does not say "what is the minimum in taxation I require for Revenue?" He says, "How shall I take from this class, which does not serve my purpose, and give to that, which does?"

So far as the confusion of ideas is honest, it derives from the belief that there is no room for difference of opinion as to what is the formula for sulphuric acid, and therefore, if you get the right formula for human well-being, it can be administered on the principles of mass-production.

Everything turns on this; it is the Materialistic Interpretation of History *versus* the Trinitarian Athanasian Creed; and both cannot be right.

Our grocer informs us that, owing to the severe droughts in the phosphorous-tree districts of Boriobebe Gha, there is little prospect of the Allied Food Control allotting more than one box of matches *per* week to each house in "Britain" before 1950.

Owing to the vast improvement in match-making machinery, the days when a box of matches was found on every restaurant table are never likely to return.

National Insurance The Right to Contract Out

Dr. C. G. Dobbs writes to say that despite considerable effort, no publicity has so far been given in the daily press to the fact that a number of people object strongly to the whole principle of compulsory State Insurance, and desire to contract out of it entirely. It is essential that this boycott should be either broken down, or fully exposed and its existence placed beyond argument.

"Anyone who wants to help can do so by writing at once at least one brief letter (say 100 words) to a daily newspaper, pointing out the existence of strong moral objections to the whole scheme for compulsory insurance,

referring to the Appeal to the King, Lords and Commons as evidence, and commenting on the omission of any mention of such a relevant and important matter in the daily press; afterwards informing me of the result (*e.g.*, name of paper; whether not printed, printed in part, or in full—cuttings enclosed, dates)."

Dr. Dobbs will be glad to receive, immediately if possible, any signatures already obtained to the form of petition. This is for *interim* use, and it is urged that the collection of signatures should be continued and where possible hastened. It should be noticed that the two forms of petition which are current do not conflict with one another but are complementary, and both may appropriately be signed by the same persons. The Health Bill has been so arranged that the question of contributions has been excluded from it, and relegated to the Insurance Bill, so as to create the maximum administrative difficulty arising from the contracting out of either.

A BEND IN THE LINE? An observer present at a British Medical Association meeting at Liverpool of March 31 (attendance about 1,000, one in five of the number women) reports that Dr. Hill's address analysed the Bill to be brought before Parliament and posed the dilemma. This time "the B.M.A. were not going to accept blame for blunders. The profession most recognise its responsibilities and make up its mind and then instruct the B.M.A., which would act accordingly." Every point made against the Bill was applauded; but deep silence met the suggestion that doctors accept responsibility.

[We hear that a lay audience somewhere in the Potteries was enthusiastic when Dr. Hill made an all-out attack on the Bill.]

A "Mysticism of the Majority"

"It is to-day, happily, a far cry from anything happening in Great Britain to these violent excesses on the continent, but in this country, too, there is a mysticism of the majority, a common confusion between what a majority may approve and sanction and what is in fact right and moral in itself. Majorities cannot create moral values, and injustice remains injustice however great the plebiscite in its favour. To take away men's property for no other reason than that you have the strength to take it away is a much lesser injustice than to take away a man's life for the same reason, that you have the strength and think it will be for your advantage or convenience if he ceases to exist. . . It is the essence of a healthy society that men can work and plan not for themselves but for their children, and can accumulate in the knowledge that they can store value for years ahead. That is the great source of patient building and long-range productivity, and of something even more important, the sense of living in a secure society, where the law if it is changed is only changed gradually and with the fullest recognition of what the expectations were which the institutions of society had encouraged and guaranteed."

—*The Tablet*, April 6.

"However much or little the art of painting may have been enriched by new ideas in recent years, much has been lost and nothing whatever has been added to the *craft* of painting since the death of Turner."—Bertram Nicholls.

PARLIAMENT

House of Lords: March 27, 1946.

FUTURE OF THE DEFENCE SERVICES

Lord Croft had given notice that he would call attention to the policy of His Majesty's Government with reference to the future of the Defence Services and move for Papers. . .

I do not wish to dwell to-day at any length on the past, but I must recall the fact that our present Cabinet consists very largely of the principal actors in the great disarmament campaign between the wars. They acted from the highest motives, and no one doubts their belief that that campaign was in the interests of peace. We all remember the mandate given to the late Mr. Arthur Henderson and the great work he attempted with regard to disarmament although there were warnings at that time as to the danger of that procedure. Alas, he failed in his mission.

We also must remember, however, that his Party, in spite of the fact that other countries did not respond, proceeded notwithstanding to demand on every platform and, it will be recalled, in some famous by-elections, with the support of the Peace Pledge Union, unilateral disarmament. Therefore in fact what happened was that we alone disarmed. What that cost us ultimately in British lives no man can assess, but few of your Lordships will, I think, disagree with me when I say that our weakness in defence largely rendered the League of Nations useless to prevent war, and that our whole attitude with regard to the armed strength of this country was the greatest incentive of all to Hitler and Mussolini to wage war against our people. We were rendered impotent to intervene at the vital moment when Hitler first started his aggression, when the Dictators saw us unarmed and regarded us as incapable of action and degenerate in spirit. We all rejoice that they had a rude awakening. But with that record behind the present guardians of our safety, I think we may be pardoned if we are a little uneasy.

Viscount Addison: May I just remind the noble Lord that we were not the Government of the country all those years?

Lord Croft: The noble Viscount is absolutely correct, but I think he will not deny that his Party were—as I said, from the highest motives—insistent and clamant in their demands that there should be disarmament by this country, and even that it must be unilateral.

Lord Henderson: Not unilateral.

Lord Croft: I am very glad to hear that, because in some of the speeches one read one did not notice that that was the case. Anyhow, I think noble Lords will agree with me, in whatever part of the House they sit, that there was this feeling in the country. It was a very big wave of feeling and it was supported very largely from one political angle. May I leave it at that? . . .

Our Ally Russia, had between the wars, I think I am right in saying, by far the largest standing Army in the World. Every year they passed into their reserves as many men probably as any other Power had in its total armed forces. The result was, that after the disastrous opening of the campaign in Russia, when the Germans advanced over a frontage of 1,500 miles and to a depth of some 750 miles, the Russians were able heroically to stand in the suburbs of Leningrad and within 40 miles of Moscow. Thus it was that these vast Russian reserves were able to turn the tide,

in spite of the fact that the total of Russians killed exceeded the total number of German troops against them, a staggering fact. . . .

Lord Chatfield: . . . I thank the noble Lord, Lord Croft, for his kindly reference to the Navy, which has reconciled me to some adverse criticism this afternoon of the Admiralty, but I think it was perhaps a little unfortunate that he should have raised that difficult question as to whether one Party or the other was most responsible for our lack of readiness when war broke out. I always emphasize that there should be no Party politics or Party bias, if we can avoid it, in discussing these defence matters. We have to agree I think that all three Parties were almost equally to blame for our lack of preparedness. . . .

In peace we refused to pour out the money that we wanted to arm our young men, and so, when war came, we poured out their blood instead. Let us hope that that shameful chapter in our national history is closed. Whether it is closed or not will very largely depend upon what is this final higher organisation for defence which the Government have promised to lay before us shortly.

The Earl of Cork and Orrery: . . . In the debate in another place which followed the Prime Minister's statement on the White Paper relating to defence much time was occupied by successive speakers in pressing for a speed-up of demobilisation and in pressing for a still more rapid reduction of the Armed Forces. If that is possible now, in the present disturbed state of the world, with U.N.O. decidedly wobbly, with many people in many lands almost dreading the resump-

own coasts? Can we say that never again shall we land troops upon foreign soil within range of enemy aerodromes without air support and without a single anti-aircraft gun for their protection? . . .

House of Commons: March 26, 1946.

ESSENTIAL WORK ORDERS (APPEALS)

Mr. W. J. Brown asked the Minister of Labour whether he intends to ask this House to approve an amendment to the Essential Work Order to prevent the machinery provided by that Order from being used either to compel men to be members of a trade union, or to deny them the right to be.

Mr. Isaacs: I assume the hon. Member is referring to the machinery of the Essential Work Order for determining appeals by workers against dismissal and for dealing with applications by employers for permission to discharge a worker. I am satisfied that the provision for appeal to an independent appeal board provides an adequate safeguard, both to employers and workers, against any attempt to misuse the machinery of the Order, and I have no intention of making any amendment of the kind suggested.

RATIONED FOOD SCALES

Sir W. Darling asked the Minister of Food the amount of the ration in the United Kingdom of meat, fats, cheese and rice, supplied respectively, to prisoners in military prisons, prisoners in civil prisons and normal citizens.

Sir B. Smith: The respective scales of food per week are as follows:

	Prisoners in Military Prisons.	Prisoners in Civil Prisons.	Normal Civilians.
Meat	35 ozs. (2s. 6d. per week approx.)	Fresh 8 ozs. Preserved 4 ozs. (combined not to exceed 1s. 2d. per week).	1s. 2d. per week
Fats	7 ozs.	7 ozs. (1 oz. cooking fat, 6 ozs. margarine)	7 ozs. (1 oz. cooking fat, 3 ozs. butter, 3 ozs. margarine)
Cheese	14 ozs.	3 ozs.	3 ozs.
Rice	Nil	3½ ozs.: if not available barley in lieu.	Nil

tion of hostilities, what are we to expect if U.N.O. becomes firmly established, if the international horizon clears a bit and things are going smoothly? I think that whatever the Government of the day may be, whatever its colour, it will have an irresistible pressure brought upon it to cut down the Armed Forces to the bone.

I think we have really got to try to combine being financially sound with being a strong military power if we are going to play our part in the world. The military strength of a nation lies not only in its first line effectives but in good reserves and it is the strength of the reserves that matters. Twice in half a century our Regular Army has been sacrificed so as to form a shield behind which the men could be trained to defend the home country but in spite of the devoted efforts of the Regular Army, on each occasion we have had to send half-trained troops to the front. Thousands of young lives have been wasted because there were no reserves ready. Thousands of young lives and much treasure have been sacrificed because of our unpreparedness in the matter of reserves. Have we learned our lesson? Can we say that never again shall we send unarmed and unprotected ships to sea to face enemy attack, to be sunk off our

March 28, 1946.

**ATOMIC ENERGY
(INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT)**

Mr. Blackburn (Birmingham, King's Norton): . . . There is a great embarrassment here, in that thorium is used in gas mantles. The production of gas mantles in Great Britain is 20 or 30 million per year. In those gas mantles there are 10,000 kilogrammes of thorium oxide, and, therefore, in the annual production of gas mantles in Britain there is sufficient thorium to produce a number of atomic bombs. That is a most serious matter from the point of view of the control of atomic energy. I should like to make it perfectly clear that thorium is only the equivalent of uranium; atomic bombs are not made solely from either uranium or thorium, a moderator has to be provided. But the essential material will be either uranium or thorium, thorium being not quite such a good material but far more plentiful. It is, unfortunately, a problem we shall have to tackle. The gas mantle industry in Britain obtains its thorium from Travancore, from the monazite sands which were originally worked by a

(Continued on page 7)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

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

Vol. 16. No. 6.

Saturday, April 13, 1946.

Sovereign Mind and the Sovereign-Minded

We willingly concede to *The Times* (of Printing House Square, *alibi catque alibi*) that times like ours of violent action and upheaval "stand in greater, not lesser, need than more settled ages to acknowledge the ultimate authority"—of 'abstract thought'?

No. And in any case, what is there abstract about Viscount Samuel (of Toxteth), the Provost of Oriel (Newman's college) and the Master of Baffioli, now Lord Lindsay (of Birker)?

'Divine Philosophy' is now, if we date it only from the foundation of the Milesian school, an arbitrary proceeding if there ever was one, in its two-thousand-five-hundred-and-twenty-first year (or thereabouts). The 'British' Institute of Philosophy in which *The Times's* curiously inappropriate correspondents are interested celebrated its twenty-first anniversary on April 6.

In 494 B.C., the invading Persians destroyed Miletus and the Milesian School with it, and the 'torch' passed to near-by Ephesus. The doctrine that all things were really water (Thales's) was superseded by that of Heraclitus, that, on the contrary, they are but flame, whereat, it appears the philosopher wept wet tears, and tradition has called him 'the weeping philosopher.' Nevertheless it is recorded of him that he preferred his soul dry, saying, "The dry soul is the best." If we understand him aright, we are inclined to agree, leaving it to Viscount Samuel (of Toxteth) and his ennobled and to-be-ennobled Supporters to form a quasi-heraldic group, a sort of Shield of David Lloyd George, the figures standing on a crocodile (prone, as crocodiles prefer), its tears forming an ungentle upward rain, to Heaven, signifying the ascendancy of the 'Sovereign Mind' (*vide The Times*) of Demos despite the 'contraction of membership' of the British Institute of Philosophy. We should not be surprised if Viscount Samuel (of Toxteth) supplied the link (hardly now a missing link) in the chain which binds the 'Government of Oxford' Group, Lazard Brothers, Johannesburg, Welsh non-conformity-cum-'Liberalism'-cum-'Moral' Philosophy-cum-revolutionary Planning into a sensible mechanism.

As usual, we are invited to assist the new thrust towards centralisation of "thought" on grounds which most readers of *The Times* may be counted on to consider firm as bed-rock. "There is no protection," so we are told, "against the tides of hysterical mass emotion, no assurance that technical invention will be directed to beneficent ends, unless somewhere in the commonwealth" (why in the commonwealth particularly?) "men of complete intellectual integrity" (cp.

C. H. D.: "Integrity") "are constantly engaged in the pursuit of final truth for its own sake, and by its light continually scrutinizing the ideas that are offered to the people as the springs of action. Such investigation and criticism are, and always must be, the task of an intellectual aristocracy; but such an aristocracy, maintaining intimate contact with the active world, should not be allowed to contract into an oligarchy of dwindling numbers and purely abstract interests." So you see, Clarence, the rain on the aristocratic shield isn't really going up from the crocodile's eyes. It's real rain. But, the sun will shine again soon, and the Royal Institute of 'British' Philosophy will rise in splendour from the (wet) ashes of a mere coterie of wet wiseacres.

They say they want to disseminate ideas. Why don't they get on with it, and leave *The Times* alone? "On the ruins of the natural and genealogical aristocracy of the *goyim* we have set up the aristocracy of our educated class headed by the aristocracy of money." "... all journals published by us will be of the most opposite, in appearance tendencies and opinions, thereby creating confidence in us and bringing over to us our quite unsuspecting opponents, who will thus fall into our trap and be rendered harmless." *The Times* does not say so. It says: (or the trio of British philosophers say): "An organisation is needed to furnish a platform for discussion." To 'formulate,' to 'disseminate,' to 'link.' The motive is transparent. Since the Reformation, logic has been the study of the undermining of logic, metaphysics the study of the undermined by the undermined. A world in ruins is the ethical coping-stone. The intact souls of our community are examining and re-examining the identity of Christian philosophy and Social Credit, both as veridical and complementary. Such minds are the commonwealth: there is no other commonwealth.

D'lib'rate

"The alarming state of the world's food supplies has only revealed itself to the responsible governments bit by bit in what might almost be a deliberately malevolent progression of calamities." (Our italics).

—*The Economist*, April 6.

"Brisbane" to "Liverpool"

The Social Credit Secretariat has, at present, no information other than that contained in the following paragraph concerning the communications between the Voters' Policy Association of Brisbane and the Lord Mayor of Liverpool. The paragraph is from the *Liverpool Daily Post* of April Fool's Day, 1946.

"BRISBANE TO AID LIVERPOOL: In response to a request, the Lord Mayor of Liverpool (Alderman Luke Hogan) is sending to the hon. secretary of the Voters' Policy Association of Brisbane, Australia, a list of needy people in Liverpool to whom members of the association could send food parcels."

Claims Against G.P.O.

The Postmaster-General received 6,172 claims in respect of money lost by registered post during the six months, September 1, 1945 to February 28, 1946.

Vansittartism

Lord Vansittart made his maiden speech in the House of Lords on March 18, 1942, on the theme that the German "people" were culpable not as agents but as principals. Not only on the ground of his long association as a civil servant with the Foreign Office previously, but because of the consistency of his propaganda which invited speculation on account of its studious avoidance of any reference to the control of German Banks and Heavy Industry or to the relationship between that control and the German inflation, as well as to the well-known fact that we had two Foreign Offices between 1925 and 1933 pursuing diametrically opposite policies (one in Threadneedle Street), interest has been excited in the question of Lord Vansittart's ultimate affiliations.

The following extracts from the House of Lords Debate on Provisions for Security, March 12, 1946, carry the issue a stage further:—

Lord Vansittart rose to call attention to the unsatisfactory provisions for security in this country; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: My Lords, security is a very important part of national defence, and, therefore, I make no apology for returning to the subject. Just over a year ago, I brought forward a Motion in this House drawing attention to some defects in our system, and asking that they should be remedied. That Motion was agreed to, and to-day I would be glad to know what if anything has been done in the interval. . . .

I asked that any person or body, drawing directly or indirectly subsidies from abroad for purposes of politics or propaganda should declare the fact and the amounts received. I should like that knowledge to be also available to the public. Once the Government were in possession of that knowledge they could easily discriminate between a friend, a foe and a doubtful person. Now, a word about the methods of importation of foreign subsidies. It is rather necessary, because it points to a distinct joint in our harness. Before the war we knew that the Fascists were getting funds from abroad. We were pretty certain that we knew the way in which this was being done. Indeed I was pretty certain I knew the man who was doing it. But we were quite powerless to verify, and even if we had had the power to verify, we could have done nothing. There is nothing to prevent a man leaving Dover with £5 and returning with £5,000. That sort of thing went on under our noses, and I believe that we should not again allow ourselves to lapse into a position of that kind.

I asked, thirdly, that drastic restrictions should be applied to the intake of aliens into this country immediately after the war, until we are in a position to cope with an influx which otherwise might contain dangers. I know that, on the contrary, we have thrown open this country to any displaced persons who have relatives here who are willing to receive them and look after them. I am not criticising that. It is a measure of humanity. But I am asking the Government if they are really quite sure that their measures of control and investigation of this intake are satisfactory. After the last war they were not. I would like to be sure that better methods are being followed this time. Let me give an example to show the sort of thing to which I refer. Two or three days ago I read in the Press that the Board of Trade were importing a couple of hundred German scientists and technicians. Again, I am not criticising. I

am sure that the Board of Trade has very good grounds for this action, and that it is fully warranted. But, I wonder if the Board of Trade or the Government quite realise that ninety *per cent.* of the scientists and technicians working for big industrial German firms were not only Nazis but ardent Nazis. I presume that this lot has been properly "vetted" or "screened"—to use a word which is fashionable now. At the same time, I would like to remind the House that the verb "to screen" has two meanings—the first is to sift, and the second is to conceal. If we are not careful we may find that verb, used in this connexion, gradually degenerating into the second sense. . . .

For a long time before the war, I was getting, by means of my own, a full account of what went on at Captain Ramsay's meetings. I can only say that they were imbued with rabid Nazi-ism and rabid anti-Semitism. And here I am going to diverge for a moment to say a word about anti-Semitism. It is the prep-school of violence. It is part of the ordinary technique of what, I think, is rather misleadingly called Fascism. As a matter of fact, there was very little anti-Semitism in Italy. In any case Fascism is relatively moribund, and was never very formidable, whereas Nazi-ism was always intensely formidable and is still very much alive. I daresay your Lordships will have noted that Field Marshal Montgomery stated last week that seventy-five *per cent.* of the Germans are still Nazis. . . .

I would, however, like to refer further to anti-Semitism and to remind your Lordships that it is deliberately used to create a violent frame of mind, and when that frame of mind has been created it is exploited for other purposes. That is why it was so immensely valuable to the Nazi technique. About a fortnight ago I saw in a Swiss review, *Die Weltwoche*, an article which was headed "The Diary of a Werewolf." It was the musings of a young S.S. Officer, in which he wrote, "Anti-Semitism was always the best of our propaganda weapons, and when we start again we shall have to start on the same basis." I pursue that subject no further, and come back to Captain Ramsay for a minute. When I found out what Captain Ramsay was up to, I wanted to have him prosecuted, knowing that there was another war coming, and I wanted him inside in good time. Other people took a different view, and he was left at liberty until the hour of our direst peril, in 1940, to consult with the traitor, Tyler Kent, who I consider an exceedingly lucky man not to have been hanged.

We have been assured that all those bodies were officially dissolved. Yes, but they are beginning, as I predicted, to come to some sort of life again. You have the 18B Detainees' Fund, the 18B Publicity Fund, with addresses at 21, Gray's Inn Road and 15, Woburn Square. Again, you have the League of ex-Service Men and Women, which is closely connected with them. Most of those who attended the functions of that body were ex-members of the British Union of Fascists. The British Union of Fascists has not been re-constituted, but it was sought to replace it for a while by a body known as the Independent Nationalists, which was launched at a meeting on March 24, 1945. This is an example of the necessity of keeping the thing in focus, because that movement has been a flop. It ran a certain number of meetings last year, of which I have a record, and I do not think the biggest had an attendance above five hundred. By the end of the year the number of people attending those meetings had grown very considerably. Thus,

on December 15, at the Royal Hotel, there were no less than 2,000 people, all howling away to their hearts' content. I think the figure I have given you shows that without any exaggeration or over-emphasis there is an expansive tendency there, and I predict the Government will find the expansive tendency is continuing.

Next I come to a rather more inner circle which styles itself "The National Front after Victory Group," which is housed at 15, Craven Street. Its membership is rather more interesting than that of the other bodies, but again we must keep the thing in focus, because they also are very short of funds and there have been abortive efforts to merge this body with the British People's Party. Coming a little lower down the scale, let us cast a glance at the so-called British Protestant League in Glasgow. That is run by Radcliffe, who also edits the *Vanguard*. The *Vanguard* is just a subversive rag, and I shall not worry you with any accounts of its turpitudes. Radcliffe has accused the members of the Government Front Bench of perpetrating worse atrocities than the Germans or the Japanese. A good many people have urged upon successive Home Secretaries that the *Vanguard* should be prosecuted, but no action has ever been taken. The reason given, of course, is that its circulation does not warrant the action, but that is a rotten argument. It means that a Home Secretary will prosecute when a paper has a circulation of 50,000, but will not prosecute papers, let us say, of 5,000, where the circulation works out exactly double.

I think it was the second speech I made in this House when I said, "You cannot measure sin by circulation," and I repeat that to-day. This matter of prosecution is again one of our weaknesses, and one of our deficiencies. May I drive that home with an even more cogent example? In 1936 a man called Lees, leader of the Imperial Fascist League, was prosecuted and jailed for six months for an attempt to create a public mischief. When he got out he immediately repeated the offence in a very aggravated form by publishing a book called, *My Irrelevant Defence*, and naturally he should have been prosecuted and jailed for considerably longer. But presumably nothing happened to him. After an interval he cropped up again. Early this year three men were convicted by a United States Court for inciting to riot, and the principal charge against them was that they had been circulating that very book. Only the day before yesterday this man hit the headlines again with more of the same offences, and he has been able to cock a snook at the Law.

I have mentioned these three men among others, Ramsay, Radcliffe and Lees, because I think jointly they point to a weakness in our system. I venture to suggest that the remedy may lie in some form of law of community libel. When Radcliffe accuses noble Lords on the Front Bench of atrocities, or when Lees accuses the Jews of ritual murder, I think there should be some law under which action against people of that kind would be facilitated. There is no explanation for these matters whatever, and it is fatal ever to dramatise them. As a matter of fact there are probably only about 5,000 registered Fascists in this country, but I think it is common knowledge that in all totalitarian movements the number of inscribed party members is always surpassed by the unregistered adherents.

I do submit to the House that it is entirely anomalous and absurd that we should be pledged to eradicate Nazism on the Continent and allow it to begin growing up here in

even an attenuated form. That kind of thing always exposes us to a certain amount of legitimate misunderstanding on the Continent and to a great deal more wilful misrepresentation. For the past six months the actions of this country have been subjected to a chorus of anti-British propaganda such as I have never in my life known or even dreamed of in peacetime, let alone from a professing Ally. One of the recurrent causes of these complaints is our alleged indulgence towards Fascism in this country. I think we might contribute to restrict the area of misrepresentation by slightly better methods for the control of what is not a danger but is certainly a nuisance. I know what I shall hear anon about freedom of speech, and I say in advance that I approve of freedom of speech. I can use a good deal of it myself and enjoy it, and I should be the last person in the world to wish to curtail it in any undue method. At the same time, freedom of speech should be a reasonable god, and not a fetish.

What I propose to the Government is what I hope your Lordships will find entirely reasonable, and which I hope meets the case without any exaggeration. I ask that there should be enacted legislation which will make it an offence for any person to print, utter or distribute, material calculated to stir up civil strife or hatred in this country or to subvert the Constitution of this country on totalitarian lines. I ask, moreover, that it should be an offence to import any funds or material from abroad for this purpose.

I ask, further, that it may be made an offence to import funds for any political purpose without declaring them. We have a democratic Constitution of which we are justly proud, and I submit that we should be prepared to defend it with clarity and vigour. I believe you are going to need those qualities. Therefore I ask that the principle and practice of our security should be reconsidered in the light of what I have said to-day. In one respect I think it may easily get on to the wrong lines. I shall say no more on that to-day and I hope that I may not have to revert to the subject. I beg to move for Papers.

(Other speeches in the Debate will be reported next week.)

The Hidden War

"The Second War has shown that powerful forces in all countries, masquerading variously as 'Communists,' 'Fascists' and what not, have learned how to manipulate these wars for the enslavement of peoples everywhere, 'victors' and 'vanquished' alike. In our country we have a Government and a Government Party containing side by side men of goodwill and British feeling (who vaguely realise this plot and do not know how to meet it) and others of illwill and anti-British feeling (who are in it and know exactly how to further it). They should be mortal enemies. They are shown to the public, in the upside-down mirror, as comrades. Thus the falsehood of the war is carried into the peace."

— D. R. in *Tidings*, No. 1, April, 1946.

WANTED. Social Crediter desires to rent country cottage, preferably near sea. Offers to sell considered. Particulars to E.J.P., c/o. *The Social Crediter*.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

company with German associations before the last war. The present concession is held by a company called Hopkin and Williams (Travancore) Ltd., in which a substantial interest is held by Imperial Chemical Industries. These supplies of thorium were described as being three-quarters of the world's supply before the war. . . .

FOREIGN NEWSPAPERS (GREAT BRITAIN)

Mr. Walker-Smith asked the Assistant Postmaster-General, as representing the Ministry of Information, what is now the number of periodicals and daily and weekly papers published in Great Britain under the auspices of foreign governments and organisations; and what is the amount of paper allotted for this purpose.

Mr. Burke: Under the Control of Paper Orders new periodicals may now be published without licence provided that they consume not more than 8 cwt. of paper in four months; I have no information as to the number of such periodicals. Twenty-five periodicals, newspapers, news bulletins and magazines published in Great Britain under the auspices of foreign Governments and organisations are allowed to use more than this minimum quantity; the total permitted consumption for these periodicals amounts to approximately 11 tons per week.

April 1, 1946.

TRADE DISPUTES AND TRADE UNIONS BILL

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby): . . . I now announce that I shall vote for this Amendment. I shall do so for two reasons. The first is that I think it will be quite unnecessary for the trade union movement in Britain ever again to beset the houses of individual Members as to whether they should or should not take part in a dispute. If a trade union, in order to get a man to join in a dispute, has to carry the conflict on to his doorstep, and upset the missus and the kids, in my opinion the trade union is very much better without the support of that man in any dispute into which it enters. . . .

I will give an example dating from the last General Election, in my division, where a member of the Labour Party, who had supported me in the 1942 by-election, declared his intention of supporting me in the General Election. Enormous and unwarranted pressure was brought to bear upon him by the Labour machine, and when that pressure which they brought to bear upon the man failed, it was transferred to his wife on the doorstep.

. . . I assert, on the authority of a former Home Secretary and an ex-civil servant, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Scottish Universities, that there is an abundance of material at the Home Office showing that this kind of thing has gone on. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Give some examples."] If I were to give examples—[*Interruption.*]

The Chairman: Hon. Members must permit the hon. Member to continue his speech.

Mr. Brown: I was about to say that if I were to give an instance from the files of the Home Office, there are hon. Members opposite who would get up and charge me with a breach of the Official Secrets Act.

The Attorney-General (*Sir Hartley Shawcross*): I

think I can assist the hon. Member. I believe it is a fact that nobody can be prosecuted under that Act without my authority, and I will here and now exonerate him.

Mr. Brown: In these days we travel fast. Up to now the Attorney-General has been the adviser of the House on the law; now he is the exonerator of criminals.

Colonel Ropner (Barkston Ash): . . . If the Government refuse to accept this Amendment, I suggest we shall be approaching a situation in which a Labour Government will enforce support of the Labour Party as a price which must be paid for getting a job.

We on these Benches consistently fight for freedom. Political freedom is one of the freedoms which we value highly in this country, and there can be no question, I submit, that as between "contracting in" and "contracting out" the former gives the greater measure of political freedom. . . .

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Cuthbert Headlam (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, North): . . . The Attorney-General, I thought, was rather cynical when he said there was no difference between contracting out and contracting in. In both cases, he said, those who refuse to pay the levy were "marked men." What did the Attorney-General mean by "marked men"? I am trying to suggest that a man who is in a minority, who refuses to take the view of a majority, and lives cheek by jowl with them and works daily with them is in a very difficult position. That is what I mean by a "marked man"

They are thrusting this Bill through Parliament to satisfy the *amour propre* of T.U.C. leaders who were responsible for the general strike. In doing so, I am certain they are laying up trouble for future governments in this country, whether Conservative or Socialist, because no man can tell what may be the future political complexion of the trade unions; they may not always be led by the fairly sensible, pink²-coloured gentlemen who are now in control.

Let me draw attention to one more of the arguments used by the Attorney-General with regard to the political levy. He asserted in his speech on Second Reading that if pressure is brought to bear upon an individual to pay a levy, or he is subject to intimidation for not doing so, he has the right to go to a very powerful, independent, impartial tribunal in the form of the Registrar-General of Friendly Societies. Perhaps, when the right hon. Gentleman replies, he will be so good as to amplify what he means by that statement? I know that the power of going to the Registrar exists, and the difficulty only arises for the ordinary citizen as to how to proceed.

Mr. Leslie (Sedgefield): He gets advice from the union.

Sir C. Headlam: He gets plenty of advice from the union if he happens to be a supporter of the faction that is running the union. [HON. MEMBERS: "Oh."] I know what I am talking about because I have had some experience of this myself. How, for instance, is a Durham miner to approach the Registrar-General? Perhaps the hon. and learned Gentleman will tell me when he replies? I know, however, that it is an extremely difficult thing to do unless the miner has someone to tell him how to do it. And how is the Registrar-General in a position to protect a Durham miner, or any other working man, effectively from intimidation or unpleasantness? I ask these questions because I

know of cases where particularly determined men, who have refused to pay the political levy, have—usually with the assistance of the Conservative or Liberal Parties—made application to the Registrar-General. Who is to help them otherwise? It was a long and tiresome process in the case of one with which I had to deal. Application was made to the Registrar-General and approval of the man's exemption and refund of his payments was made, but it took nearly two years before the business was finally settled. Surely, if contracting out is to be revived, some speedier and more easy method of obtaining exemption should be devised? ...

Mr. W. J. Brown: I must clear up this deeper heresy. One of the worst heresies is worship of the State. That is neither a man's first loyalty, nor his last. His first loyalty is to his own perception of truth, his second to his family, his third is to the State, and, after that, you can arrange the others in appropriate order. ...

I assert that it is an abuse of the State's position as employer to tell its employees that they must not be associated with the very workmen whose conditions regulate their own. There can be no case whatever against the Civil Service organisations being free to affiliate to the T.U.C. if they want to. They may not want to do so. They may regard the T.U.C. as a reactionary force. They may think that, so far from it being the spearhead of the working class movement in Britain, it is a brake on the movement. But that is for them to decide, and not for their employers to decide for them. That is the simple issue.

On the third issue, affiliation with outside political bodies, I speak with greater reserve. I used to take a strong view in favour of affiliating Civil Service organisations with the Labour Party. I am less sure of that after 30 years' experience of the public service. ...

PAPER EXPORTS

Mr. W. J. Brown asked the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the paper shortage in this country, he will stop further exports of paper from Britain.

Mr. Marquand: No, Sir. I consider it to be the national interest that the paper industry should make progress without delay in recovering its export markets.

The Soviet Government

"It would... be a mistake to assume that the appointment of a new Soviet Government has no political significance. For the formation of the new Government appears to be important in that the latent rivalry between the Party and the Army, recently discussed in *The Economist*, has been resolved. Not a single representative of the new Officers' Corps has been appointed to any leading post. The eight Vice-Premiers are all members of "The Old Stalinist Guard" in the Party. Molotov, Andreyev, Mikoyan, Kaganovitch and Voroshilov have been Stalin's closest associates for twenty odd years, since the days when he began his fight for leadership inside the Party. Beria, Kossegyn and Vosnesensky belong to a younger generation, but they too have reached their present high position through the Party. The fact that Zhukov, Vassilevsky, Koniev, Rokossovsky and other marshals and generals who made their names in recent campaigns have not been promoted to Cabinet rank is the more eloquent because of Voroshilov's appointment to the post of Vice-Premier and Budenny's election to the

permanent Præsidium of the Supreme Soviet. Voroshilov and Budenny are thus the only representatives of the Army in the new governmental bodies. Both these marshals made their fame in the Civil War and not in the war against Germany, in which they were regarded as failures. Both represent the citizen soldiery of 1918 to 1921 and not the more modern Officers' Corps, which was indoctrinated with Nationalist Russian slogans in 1942 to 1945."

— *The Economist*, April 6.

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 <i>The Tablet</i>).....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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