

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 17. No. 15.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

We don't know what Mr. Winston Churchill thinks of the vapourings of his own son, but we can form a fairly close approximation to his opinion of Mr. Elliot Roosevelt, son of the late President. For sheer vulgar disloyalty, we should imagine that Mr. Roosevelt's book of "revelations" on the amount of Brandy drunk by Mr. Churchill, and the determination of the late President to show "Britain" where she belonged and to play in with Uncle Joe, must have set up an all-time low record. We are going down the hill fast; but outside the illustrated tabloids mostly written by anonymous aliens, we do not produce Elliot Roosevelts in this country.

The renewed attack by the Archbishop of York on the Roman Catholic Church, under the thinly veiled pretext of dissent from an old Papal Encyclical, is additional evidence of the thoroughly vicious nature of State control of ecclesiastical higher appointments. We have always thought the *ne temere* decree one of the rare lapses of judgment which have proceeded from the Vatican in modern times. It carries the appearance of a rather heavy-handed recruiting device with a certain atmosphere of unfairness. But it is fairly evident that it is the recruiting, and not the unfairness, that gives concern to the Archbishop of York—an appointment, like that of the Dean of Canterbury, proceeding from the sources which control the "Labour" Government. No observer can fail to recognise that the effective Church of England, so far as it renders lip-service to the New Testament, is the Church of Saul of Tarsus; and it is in antagonism with the Church of Peter the Fisherman for far deeper reasons than a marriage regulation. The chief concern of the Archbishop of York appears to be to use any pretext to confirm that antagonism, not to make it a matter of indifference whether the label "Anglican" or "Catholic" is attached to a child at baptism. He will receive every support both from Moscow and Wall Street.

The pity of it is that Dr. Garbett has no suspicion of the interests he serves. Archbishops ought to be, as they once were, statesmen, not priests appointed by the State; and Dr. Garbett is certainly not an English Statesman.

There could hardly be a more perfect example of Socialist mentality than the "Housing" Authority which made an expensive garden to the ten thousandth temporary house delivered, and after the ceremony to celebrate the occasion took away the garden at further great expense because the other houses had not yet made theirs.

"No people do so much harm as those who go about doing good."—Mandel Creighton, Bishop of London, 1904.

Reviewing a book by Mr. Hallett Abend in the *Saturday Review of Literature* (U.S.A.), Mr. David L. Cohn remarks "I hope this book will be read by our occupation armies overseas, and some of their fellow Americans at home. It might be helpful in closing the disastrous gulf between our brilliant technical competence and our almost incredible political ineptitude."

Those are wise words, whoever said them, and whatever the merits of the book to which reference is made. If ever a nation (if it is permissible to call a congeries of unrelated egotisms a nation) bore plain for all to see the marks of coming tribulation, it is the United States.

The plain fact appears to be made that in nations, as in individuals, a quick rise to wealth and power is almost invariably disastrous. In the nineteenth century the North Country English had a saying of the mushroom rich, "Three generations from clogs to clogs"—in general, justified by the event; and a beggar on horseback still goes to the devil. The explanation is fairly simple—riches and power are tools, and require a considerable apprenticeship to use wisely. The comparative success of an emigrant to the United States, while it had a personal component, is far more attributable to lack of the restrictive practices which have been growing in Europe since the French Revolution.

There appears to be little doubt that some occult Power is willing and anxious that political adolescents should have sharp and powerful tools, and is determined that they shall not keep them when they have learned to use them wisely. America is inevitably faced with a race against disruption lest she achieve wisdom while retaining wealth.

## Prevention of Violence Act.

The Home Secretary has found it necessary to renew for another year the Prevention of Violence (Temporary Provisions) Act, passed for two years just before the outbreak of war and since renewed yearly.

The reason given is "that it would not be wise, at this juncture, not to continue this Measure . . . in the disturbed state of *Europe* to-day. We feel that it would be as well to continue it until we are a little out of the wood, and know exactly what will happen during the next one or two years." [Our emphasis].

## . . . the Wood but not the Trees,

"If central planners, with a big influence on the actions of Government Departments, make mistakes, it is not individuals who suffer but the whole nation."

—Mr. Maclay, M.P., for Montrose Burghs, in the Debate on the Address.

## ODLUM v. STRATTON JUDGMENT

(Royal Courts of Justice, July 29, 1946.)

Before:

Mr. JUSTICE ATKINSON.

(continued)

Where is the public interest here? What public duty was being performed in this case at the expense of Mr. Odlum in order to boost Mr. Hudson? It is not a matter of public interest and in my judgment it is not a matter of comment; but if it be comment it must be a comment based on true facts, and therefore one has to address oneself to the truth of the statement which I think we occupied nine or ten days to thrash out in this Court.

I have the evidence before me and I do not want to spend more time in referring to it than is necessary. I have Mr. Odlum who deals with all these matters and denies them. I believe Mr. Odlum. I have the evidence of Mr. Main who spoke about all these matters. Mr. Main said: "You could not have a good herd on land which is in poor condition." Mr. Main spoke about the condition of the cottages. He denied that the implements were in a dilapidated state; he said they were all in good repair. He said that the crops were good. He went on to say: "Of course there was couch among the crops, but you find that on every farm; and although there were weeds, there were not more than usual." He said: "The grassland was good. I had the evidence of Mr. Cole, a very experienced farmer, who said the general condition of the farm was good, and he was certain that it was not in a poor condition. I had the evidence of Mr. Hawkins, a farmer who paid many visits to this farm. He said: "I thought the farm was in very good condition." Another witness was Mr. Phillips. I think he was the representative of a firm of millers and agricultural merchants who visited the farm regularly. Mr. Phillips said: "I noticed the crops and I thought in 1941 that they were very heavy, and I saw nothing wrong with them in 1942."

Then there was the man who valued what is called the cultivations when Mr. Hudson bought, Mr. Pinniger, and who I think produced the schedule of cultivations, and he and the valuer appointed by Mr. Hudson agreed the value of all these things; Exhibit P.41 contains all the details. Mr. Pinniger spoke quite well of the farm, what he has seen of it; and it is to be observed that the man who valued for Mr. Hudson on the other side has not been called although his opinion might have been helpful. I have also had the evidence of Mr. Simper, another farmer, who visited this farm three or four times a week. He told me that the grassland was above the average and that the farm buildings were far above the average farm, as everyone agrees that they were. Mr. Simper said that the implements were good, the condition of the farm was good, the cattle were excellent, the implements were in quite good condition; there were some very good crops, and so on.

Then there was a Miss Potter, who had lived there since 1936, first in one of the cottages off the main road. She was a hospital collector and in that capacity she visited all the cottages, and she said they were all in very good condition and that she never heard any complaint from anyone.

Then there was Mrs. Simper, who since September, 1939, has worked on the farm and who continued to work there after Mr. Hudson took it over. Mrs. Simper lived for a time in one of the cottages which was in a very good state of repair. Then she moved into a second cottage which was also in very good condition. Mrs. Simper had very good opportunity of judging; she said that all the cottages were in good repair and there was nothing to complain about; the tenants were happy and content. Apparently she had worked with all the implements and she said they were all in good working order. She spoke about the crops in 1941 and 1942. She took part in drainage work, particularly the drainage of the field "T", and described how they opened up the bottoms, put the rods up the drains and so on. She said the ditches and drains were not neglected and that the pasture was good. Then later on there was called the man who had done some repairs on the block of four cottages just before the sale and he said they were all in good repair.

There is a body of evidence and all of it independent; they are witnesses who have nothing to gain from Mr. Odlum, any of them, now that he has given up the farm; they have nothing to get out of him and they all come here and give this evidence (and it is a very strong body of evidence), everyone of them denying these particulars in support of this allegation.

Then I had a different type of evidence. The first witness was Mr. White, the manager for Mr. Hudson. It will be remembered that Mr. Odlum had said how, when he visited the farm with Mr. White as he often did, he had never heard anything but complimentary remarks. On that he was not challenged and Mr. White did not deny it. Mr. White first talked about the crops and there was criticism of one or two, for instance, of field "A." He said of one field that it was a fair crop; of another that there was a useful piece of barley; of another, three parts of it did not look too bad; of another, quite a good average crop—towards the road it looked all right; of another, a reasonably good crop; of another, quite a good crop—expressions of that sort. There were one or two complaints of something—it was not pressed—but at any rate the bulk of the comment on the fields was of that type.

But Mr. White's serious evidence was this: "There was not a decent field on the farm. There was not a good grazing field." Of course, if they were true, it would be a reflection upon Mr. Odlum. Mr. White said that the cottages were very, very bad; he went through a number of them—I think he said that some were better than others, but in the main he said they were very, very bad. The implements he could not condemn too strongly. I think there were two tractors which were quite useful but according to Mr. White they were in a most dilapidated state. Two points were mentioned in particular. He said the cultivator was minus a wheel and that the Ransome threshing machine was in such a condition that it was impossible to repair, "and you could do nothing with it."

Of course, I cannot look at the grass, but on the evidence I can test beyond all question the truth of some of the statements Mr. White has made. Take first the cottages. I have referred to the evidence of the people who lived in them. When Mr. Hudson bought this farm there were thirteen cottages, attractive looking small cottages, of which I have seen photographs. Mr. Hudson's view was that these cottages were too small for what an agricultural labourer wants to-day; and he took advantage of section 26 of the

Housing (Rural Workers) Act, 1926. That Act provides: "With a view to promoting the provision of housing accommodation for agricultural workers" the owner may apply to a local authority for approval of a scheme for improving and reconstructing houses; and the local authority has power after consultation with the Minister of Health to approve and then to make a contribution not exceeding £100, I think it is, towards the cost of the improvements, but by section 2 it is provided that no assistance shall be given under the Act when the value of the dwelling after completion of the proposed works would exceed £400.

We have had produced in this case originals of a number of applications made by Mr. Hudson and signed by him. Taking these four cottages, as an instance, they were described as in fair condition—because the Act says that money is not to be used for making good cottages in bad condition; it is for improvements. But Mr. Hudson had no difficulty and I am sure he would not have said it if it were not the truth. He described the cottages as being in fair condition. Then in some way, when the work was done, although the cost in some cases was going to be £600 or £700, he was able to answer the question, "What will be the value after the works are finished?" by saying approximately £400. Mr. Hudson had no difficulty in obtaining the necessary licenses and getting these cottages enlarged. But smallness is not a matter of condition. These were, of course, small cottages, and they were very much better cottages when their size was doubled. But it is not smallness that Mr. White was speaking about; it was rain pouring down the walls and coming through the roof and that sort of thing, and I just do not believe it in face of the mass of evidence the other way.

If we take the implements there one finds a very good test of the *bona fides* of Mr. White. He told me with contempt how the cultivator was minus a wheel. Thereupon Mr. Odium was recalled and he told me: "This was of such and such a type and the front wheel is removable. When you are using it with a tractor you take the wheel off and fix it on the back of the tractor. The wheel was there in the back of the shed ready to be put on whenever it was wanted. It was not a defect in the cultivator at all." Mr. White must have known that. Then he had not language strong enough for the Ransome threshing machine—and yet when these implements came to be sold the advertisement of that described it as an excellent threshing machine by Ransome, Sims and Jefferies and it was similarly catalogued as an excellent machine and fetched £190.

Mr. White told me: "I was ordered to run round the country to get all the second-hand implements I could." Was that true? It was ascertained in fact that he spent £7,280 on new implements and £7,175 on second-hand implements. Is it really to be believed that they were buying only second-hand implements? The fact is, of course, they were getting implements of a totally different type, absolutely up-to-date and expensive implements which doubtless made the old type implements of less use.

There is another test of Mr. White's evidence. He spoke of field "U", and after saying what a state it was in he said: "To-day it is practically all in potatoes." Now during the adjournment that day Mr. Odium had this field photographed and he produced a number of photographs of field "U" and in company with someone else he measured the acreage which was under potatoes. There were seven acres

and some fraction growing potatoes and six acres and some fraction just growing weeds; and those photographs show that that part of the field is nothing but a mass of weeds. The statement, therefore, that it was practically all in potatoes was just not true. And other photographs have been produced of other fields of which Mr. Odium spoke showing their state to-day, with the rushes there and this, that and the other, not so good as they were before. All these matters which one can test satisfy me that Mr. White's evidence as to the state of the grassland is evidence which I cannot and do not accept.

Then we had the evidence of Mr. Price, the writer of the letter, who saw the farm for the first time on 10th July, 1942, when he went there on this silage question. He said he had looked at it and the spring crops were fairly well grown. He made a great point of the reason why field "A" required potash; but he also said that the grassland was generally neglected and of poor quality with excessive weeds.

Now for obvious reasons I think I have to examine Mr. Price's evidence with some care, and I am going to test the truth and reliability of his evidence in the light of a few of the statements which he made. I turn first to Day 5, page 20. But before coming to that I want to return to that letter signed by Sir Donald Fergusson saying, quite wrongly, that

(continued on page 8)

### Zionism a Step to War

Headed "Political Zionism Held Step to War," the following is from the *Montreal Gazette* of November 6:—

"The Canadian Arab Friendship League yesterday charged political Zionists in every country, including Canada, as sharing the responsibilities for the admitted world-wide conspiracy against Britain. The league condemned in particular the recent bombing of the British Embassy in Rome and warned that similar acts of terrorism could be expected from the announced intentions of the terrorist organizations.

"How can Montreal supporters of political Zionism condone such terrible acts and be offended when the conspirators are called 'terrorists' instead of 'defenders of Zion?'" the statement of the league asked. "The present underground war waged by political Zionists against Britain and the Arab countries can only lead to more hatred and misunderstanding between the Jewish people and those of the Western World. Anti-Semitism, despised by Arabs because they are Semitic themselves, has already increased on this continent. Since the murder of Lord Moyne, the bombings of the Haifa railroad and the Tel-Aviv hotel, Anglo-Saxons in general and Arabs in particular have come to the conclusion that the main aim of political Zionism is the destruction of existing law and order and not the creation of a refuge for European Jewry. Their second aim, the founding of a political state on Arab soil, advocated for the past 27 years, is doomed to failure because of the methods employed by terrorists to gain such political recognition," the statement declared.

"The league at a special meeting last night approved a wire of protest which was sent to President Truman whose policy was termed 'anti-Arab' and 'against the best interests of American-Arab relations.' The wire, signed by M. S. Massoud, president of the league, said in part: 'This policy means another world war, which will start in the Holy Land and eventually involve Russia, the United States and Britain.'"

## 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. 17. No. 15.

Saturday, December 14, 1946.

### Sir Stafford Cripps and the F.B.I.

From time to time we are confronted with the problem presented by our inability to decide whether we are in the hands of rogues or, as we believe, conceited fanatics, incompetent in practical matters but useful to hidden Masters who plan our ruin and will acquire the assets.

This question arises afresh in contemplation of the address of Sir Stafford Cripps to the F.B.I., on the subject of Exports. Sir Stafford said "With the existing level of exports round about 110 *per cent.* of pre-war volume [our emphasis. Notice the omission of *price*—Editor, *T.S.C.*], we were still well down on our balance of payments.[?] . . . because 50 *per cent.* of our imports came from those countries [U.S.A. and Canada] whereas only 14 *per cent.* exports went there.

"We are therefore using the rest of our exports to pile up an excess of immediately unusable foreign currency—soft currency, because we cannot buy with them, or pay off some portion of sterling credits accumulated during the war, or else buy articles we need.

" . . . Hitherto, we had been accustomed to consider exports as the overspill from the home market[?] . . . may it not be sound policy to make goods primarily for the export market, with an overspill into the home market, rather than the other way round?"

We pause to allow that idea to sink in.

Leaving Sir Stafford Cripps's ideas of policy, let us examine his figures. Only 14 *per cent.* of an "export drive", the success of which his fellow-traveller, Dr. Dalton, says has exceeded his wildest hopes, goes to the countries which supply 50 *per cent.* of our imports. An examination of the advertisement columns of U.S. and Canadian papers makes it fairly certain that these are all consumer goods which we lack at home, and, like whisky, are being sold at one sixth of home prices. In return for these, we get a certain amount of food most of which we are giving to U.N.R.R.A., and Germany, and some of which is reaching Russian satellites, and after this, are running into debt to pay for the raw material of 86 *per cent.* of our exports to countries with "soft" currencies, in return for which we get nothing.

This is a state of affairs under a totalitarian Government which gibbers the word "Plan" at every criticism of its actions. We shall return in a moment to the Economic Policy of Sir Stafford Cripps as expounded by himself before the Federation of British Industries, but in the meantime we suggest that our readers consider the curious fact that only Great Britain, of the "victorious" nations, has a lowered standard of living and an increase in exports. And, also to exhibit); (a) the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada; (b) the

contemplate the loss on our capital exports on (merely as exhibits); (a) the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada; (b) the Armavir-Touapse, and the Black Sea-Kuban Railways in Russia and (c) the British-owned Argentine Railways, the the Primativa Co., and Brazilian Loans in South America.

Now to revert to Sir Stafford Cripps's policy. Although only 14 *per cent.* of the 110 *per cent.* of exports (*i.e.*, 15½ *per cent.* of pre-war) goes to pay for the raw material imported or supplied for the whole 110 *per cent.*, and this 14 *per cent.* includes consumable goods such as whisky, biscuits, tweeds and many other articles vitally needed by our own population, the wages paid for the production of the whole 110 *per cent.* are distributed in this country as an effective demand against the limited amount of goods for sale to the general public. That is to say, a Minister, who with his colleagues is constantly mouthing "the danger of inflation", and a Chancellor of the Exchequer who says he is conducting the finance of the country "with a song in his heart," are paying out eight times the wage costs of every production unit for which they receive any return (as Sir Stafford will not buy the imports available to "soft" currencies). With a realistic financial system, P.A.Y.E. under these conditions, ought to be 17/6 in the pound, instead of which Dr. Dalton is obviously hinting at transferring the inflation to prices.

So far as the situation is expounded by Sir Stafford Cripps, we have spent every working day since the cessation of hostilities in draining this country of its potential production, and piling up debt in order to do it. After the 1918 armistice we had a boom, followed by a comparatively mild slump. We have had no boom; we are heading for a far worse slump, and the immense stocks of surplus materials, which provided the public with a very real stock-pile during that entirely avoidable slump, have disappeared.

The luxury goods which this country can and does produce, and is producing for export are being simply given away. They are urgently required here to counteract the dangerous temper arising from Sir Stafford and his "austerity." The Cabinet, of course, does not notice this in its periodic rounds of Food-Talks.

### Sovereignty

K.R.P. Publications can meet orders for Sovereignty No. 3 containing articles by Elizabeth Dobbs, Douglas Reed, A. K. Chesterton, *etc.*, Price 1/6d., postage 1d.

Some copies of Sovereignty No. 2 are still available containing the important article "*The Objectives of Total War*" by Major C. H. Douglas.

### Credit Power and Democracy

A limited number of the Australian edition will shortly become available for sale.

### The Republican Victory in the United States of America

This article recently printed in *The Social Crediter* is available in pamphlet form 1d. each, 50 for 3/6. A wide and effective distribution is desired.



## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 25, 1946.

### Deportations (Report)

*Professor Savory* asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has now considered the deportation plan, forwarded to him by the hon. Member for the Queen's University of Belfast, in accordance with which 800,000 Poles are to be deported to the interior of Russia, involving practically the whole of the Polish intelligentsia; and whether, in view of the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements, he will protest to the Polish Provisional Government against this violation of the guarantee of free and unfettered elections.

*Mr. Mayhew*: I have no confirmation of this report. It appears to me an obviously fabricated propaganda story.

*Professor Savory*: Is not the hon. Gentleman aware that large numbers of Poles are already being deported, and have been deported, from the notorious prisons of Fordon in Pomerania and Wronki in Poznania to Russia? This is the beginning of the detailed scheme of which I sent a copy to the hon. Gentleman.

*Mr. Speaker*: The hon. Member seems to be giving information and not asking for it.

### Leader Scheme (Functions)

*Mr. Gammans* asked the Minister of Food if he will explain the functions of the Food Leader Scheme; how many people are being employed in a full or part-time capacity in this scheme; and what is the estimated annual cost of it.

*Mr. Strachey*: The chief purpose of the Food Leader Scheme is to provide a voluntary link between the ordinary housewife and the cookery and nutrition experts of my Department. The food leaders number some 23,000, but they are not employed by my Department either in a full-time or part-time capacity: they give their services. The only expenditure incurred is for such items as the occasional hire of halls and the provision of display material and Food Leader badges, and by the Stationery Office for printing. No separate records of these small items are maintained and to extract particulars would involve a disproportionate expenditure of labour.

*Mr. Gammans*: What are these people supposed to do?

*Mr. Strachey*: They are supposed to give nutritional leadership in their areas. [*Laughter.*] What there is amusing in that I do not know. How easily hon. Members opposite are amused.

*Sir Waldron Smithers*: The right hon. Gentleman has no sense of humour.

*Mr. Strachey*: These people explain for instance, the relief food and the welfare food schemes. I have just addressed a conference of them. I believe they are rendering a most valuable service. They are a group of very earnest people—[*Laughter.*] How extraordinary!—and very public spirited women, some of whom belong to the party opposite.

*Mr. Gammans*: In all seriousness, can the Minister explain what is meant by "nutritional leadership"?

*Mr. Strachey*: They explain to people the relative nutritional values of foodstuffs, so that the level of nutrition in the country shall be raised. That ought to be simple enough to understand.

*Mr. Boothby*: Will the Minister bring to the special attention of the food leaders the nutritional value of herring.

### Germany and U.S.S.R. (1939 Treaty)

*Sir E. Graham-Little* asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, to remove the widespread uncertainty regarding the terms of the Secret Supplementary Treaty of 1939 between the Third German Empire and the U.S.S.R., which contained proposals for the partition of Poland, he will arrange for a full official translation to be supplied to the public through His Majesty's Stationery Office which will have a guarantee of authenticity.

*Mr. Mayhew*: Consultations are taking place between the competent British and American authorities with regard to the publication of the protocol referred to by the hon. Member and other captured German documents. Pending the outcome of these consultations it would be improper to give official publication to this document as the originals are held jointly by the British and American authorities.

House of Commons: November 26, 1946.

### Exchange Control Bill

*Mr. Pickthorn* (Cambridge University): . . . I think that all the speakers who have preceded me, with one or, perhaps, two exceptions, have been experts in this matter and those whom the House naturally expects to address it on questions of currency, coinage and so on. I am not in that class and I make no apology, not being in that class, for addressing the House, because I think it extremely important that matters of this sort should be so explained that, if I may without immodesty say, persons of my sort can understand it. If, having read the Bill as carefully as I can, and having listened, I think, to every one of the speeches today, I still fall in error about the meaning of the Bill, I am sorry. No doubt, it is partly due to my own lack of ability, but I think it is also *prima facie* evidence that more explanation is needed. After all the business of this House is not to be a council of experts, but to be, in the main, a jury of ordinary men who shall be convinced by experts.

I should like to begin by referring to one or two of the points which the Chancellor mentioned in his speech. I thought he was less than just to his own standards when he talked about freedom and misery before the war and that sort of thing. There was a time—I do not know when, quite—perhaps when we were web-footed creatures paddling about in the mud, and then there was a long interval, and then there was the first Labour Government with an absolute majority. In the interval, there was a good deal of liberty, no doubt a good deal of misery, but also in that interval there was a very great improvement in material standards. Indeed, to me the most surprising thing of all, when one thinks of the political imbecility—of which I do not assert that my party is less guilty than the party opposite, but I do not think it is more guilty—of the last 30 or 40 years, is that the standards did not go up even then. I think, if I might say so without offence, that it is perfectly proper for some of the back bench Members opposite to talk that sort of stuff on a platform, but it is not for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to talk that sort of stuff to this House. Nor is it proper for him to explain to us the necessity for extreme and rigid regulation upon the basis of his promises of Treasury generosity. As has already been pointed out, and always is pointed out when it comes to that sort of argument, the right hon. Gentleman is neither permanent nor eternal. Neither are the right hon. Gentleman's advisers infallible. I get rather tired of the system of tribute paid which we have in this House. I

myself would not pay any tributes, either to his intellectual candour or to his clarity this afternoon. I do not think either was noticeable. But especially should we beware of these tributes to persons in the Civil Service or in a similar capacity. They are capable of making mistakes too, and especially, however good they are, they are bound to take short views in many matters. In this matter, above all, it seems to me they are bound to take short views.

The sort of simple-minded contrast we had from below the Gangway between personal advantage, which, of course, hon. Members on this side always think of, and public advantage which, of course, hon. Members opposite always think of, is not really very easily carried out in practice, and it seems to me hardly doubtful that any Treasury official must always, in judging of such matters, think of what is going to be the effect on exchanges within the next year or two; and so, indeed, in a sense, he should, because if a Government makes a mistake about its long view the whole country pays an immense price. If the derided and despised speculator, of whom we have heard so much this afternoon, makes a mistake, not all the specimens of the genus make the same mistake at the same moment. Therefore, they can take longish views. Treasury officials cannot take long views, and, therefore, I do not think that promise about their generosity from the right hon. Gentleman was of much use. Nor was it worthy of him to tell us that there were plenty of opportunities for review in Prayers against statutory instruments or directions or what not, and in the Opposition's ordinary opportunities in Committee of Supply. I suppose "review" may be a slightly ambiguous word, but one cannot propose Amendments to legislation on either of those occasions. . . .

I now wish to raise two points, one small and one large. The small point is, I think, rather important. I apologise if I may be, to some extent, barking up the wrong tree, but I think I understood the Bill, so far as my point went. The small point is about what is called cultural cooperation and all that—collections of initials such as C.E.M.A., and U.N.E.S.C.O. I may be prejudiced in the matter—I do not like being taxed—but it seems slightly absurd that I should be taxed in order that the Minister of Education, or the Parliamentary Secretary, some such person should go and have a jolly holiday in Paris talking with other Leftish chaps about intellectual cooperation in the future, while I am not allowed to buy one book or one picture from Paris, as far as I can understand. If only the right hon. Gentleman would leave me alone, I am all intellectual cooperation; I do not say I am all of it, but I am some of it. If only he would leave a lot of individual people alone, who could buy books and pictures from Paris, who could go to Paris occasionally and see their friends who are in positions in which they are directing culture and so forth—such as publishers, writers, painters and politicians—there would be a great deal more intellectual cooperation than under the present system.

I should like to know whether there can be any kind of assurance, for amendment or otherwise, for some sort of general relaxation of the following three specific sorts. First of all, to enable individuals to buy books direct from foreign countries. Apart from anything else, that would directly save currency; because if I buy books from Paris I buy them cheaply from publishers or booksellers, but if I can buy them only through licensed booksellers in England, more currency has to go out of the country in order to meet the francs he

spends than would otherwise be the case. There are indirect advantages in what I am proposing. This country has never exported anything except coal and skill. Of all the ways of exporting skill, the one that pays best—the one in which we risk the smallest amount of currency at the beginning to get the largest amount back later on—is when we buy a tree in, say, Labrador, and send it out to a foreign country in the shape of books. If we are to be the natural and central market in the English speaking world for books, everything possible ought to be done to encourage English people to import books from France, particularly, and from every other country where books are printed; otherwise, even on the direct short-term view, we shall lose a lot of currency which we need not lose.

Secondly, pictures. Could not something be done to allow individuals to buy pictures? Not even dealers can buy pictures now, I believe, except in very special cases. I believe it is very difficult for dealers to get permits: for an individual it is quite impossible. As an individual I am not likely to spend more than £30 or £40 on a picture, and even that on but rare occasions. Would all the individuals likely to buy pictures really export much sterling? What happens at present is that we spend money on boosting two sorts of painters and authors. In the main, we boost those who are good but are already perfectly well known to be good. Nothing could be more ridiculous than spending public resources on boosting Picasso; whatever may be thought of Picasso, he is there and is known to be there; or, alternatively, when we are not wasting resources on that sort of thing we are wasting them upon some second-rate painter or author as a rule. Here again, I do not suggest I would be a better judge than C.E.M.A. or U.N.E.S.C.O., or any of those organisations. All I say is that I and 20,000 other people would not all make the same wrong bet at the same moment; it would not be possible. May I not save the money I should be allowed to spend on American films and spend it on a real picture from Paris? I really think that is not unreasonable. If we are to have this extreme control of currency and exchange, some way must be found round that sort of thing or else civilisation is up—it will be finished. Either such enormous controls must not be asked for, or some way of giving liberties must be found—and not merely individual specific liberties, obtained as the result of long correspondence or ministerial conversation. . . .

I now wish to come to my major point, and I will be as quick about it as I can. I think it only fair that I should put it forward. Should we not have had our economic inquest before accepting this Bill as a permanency? The Bill is not urgent, because the powers are there already under Statutory instruments. It is no use hon. Gentlemen opposite taunting us about the date at which we expect to be able to do without this control. Of course, nobody can put a date to it. Equally, any party which has risen to power as the party opposite has upon two main principles—(a) the primacy of the economic over the political and (b) internationalism—any party that has risen on those two stepping stones must desire exchange restrictions to be reduced to zero as soon as possible. If not, it makes nonsense of the whole of its own basis, and one of the few safe predictions is that nonsense never lasts very long as a system of power. And on this my major and last point, ought we not to be told more about the effect upon the exchange of what has been happening hitherto? . . .

*The Solicitor-General* (Major Sir Frank Sockice): . . . The hon. Gentleman the Senior Burgess for Cambridge University (Mr. Pickthorn) was concerned about whether it would be possible by virtue of Regulations made under the Clauses of the Bill, for individuals to buy single books, and for dealers to buy pictures. I can answer those questions. There is nothing to stop an individual buying a book, provided he does so within the limit of the currency which he is allowed to take out with him for the purpose of foreign travel.

*Mr. Pickthorn*: What about buying by post from England?

*The Solicitor-General*: So far as imports of all sorts are concerned, they depend upon the import licensing machinery and not upon the Clauses of this Bill. If a particular dealer or importer obtains a licence enabling him to import pictures and to import books, then the necessary currency will be supplied to enable him to make use of that licence.

*Mr. Eccles* rose—

*The Solicitor-General*: I am extremely sorry; I hope the hon. Gentleman does not think I am being discourteous if I do not give way, but I have not very much more time.

*Mr. Eccles*: It needs a special licence.

#### Executive Committee, Surrey (Legal Action)

*Sir E. Graham-Little* asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he is aware that, in an action brought by Mrs. Linder against the chairman and secretary of the Surrey A.E.C., who sought to take possession of her property at Aldford, Surrey, the judge declared that he disbelieved the evidence given by the secretary and gave judgment that the notice to take possession was unauthorised; that, nevertheless, the secretary was continued in office and a member of the committee, who was defendant in the action, has since become chairman of the committee; what control is exercised by the Minister over these committees in such cases; who paid the costs of the action; and what was the expenditure incurred.

*Mr. T. Williams*: I am aware of the matters referred to in the first part of the Question. In his Judgment, which was delivered some 4½ years ago, the judge directed that my predecessor's attention should be drawn to certain aspects of the case. This was done, and after careful examination of all the circumstances the attention of all county war agricultural executive committees (which committees act as my agents under Orders and instructions given by me from time to time) was drawn to certain aspect of procedure. It was decided that no action was necessary in the case of the secretary of the particular committee concerned who was retained in his office and carried out his duties satisfactorily up to the time of his recent retirement from the committee. It is also correct that the member of the committee who was one of the defendants in the case was subsequently appointed chairman, an appointment amply justified by his subsequent services in that capacity. The expenditure involved by the Department in the action amounted to approximately £870.

*House of Commons*: November 27, 1946.

#### Surplus Stores (Proceeds of Sales)

*Sir R. Glynn* asked the Minister of Supply the total sum received from the disposal of wartime stores and material from the date of the end of the war with Japan until 31st October sold in the United Kingdom, North Africa, Europe,

India and the Far East, respectively; and if he will give in each case the estimate of the approximate quantities remaining unsold and their value.

*Mr. Wilmot*: Complete statistics are not yet available as to the total sums realised, but the estimated value of stores disposed of at the latest dates for which figures are available are as follows:

	£	
United Kingdom	208,100,000	To September 30, 1946
North Africa	300,000	To September 30, 1946
Europe	13,500,000	To September 30, 1946
India	27,500,000	To August 31, 1946.
Far East	500,000	To September 30, 1946
Overseas disposals of food (all overseas areas)	10,800,000	To September 30, 1946
Miscellaneous sales by the Admiralty (all overseas areas)	535,000	To September 30, 1946

Africa is estimated at £75,000,000 and £1,600,000, respectively. In Europe, the processes of declaration and disposal of surpluses are in some countries, e.g., France and Belgium, approaching completion, but in others, e.g., Germany and Austria, are only just commencing and figures are not available. In India, it is estimated that the disposals effected represent over 40 per cent. of the surpluses so far declared, but further substantial declarations are expected. In the Far East, disposal activity has only begun recently, and in some only of the widely scattered territories; complete statistics are not available.

### SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

(Advisory Chairman—Major C. H. DOUGLAS)

### ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL CREDIT

*An introductory Course of Lectures published with the authority of the Social Credit Secretariat, "a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise."*

#### CONTENTS

The Lectures and Studies Section of the Secretariat:

CONSTITUTION  
ORDINANCES  
SYLLABUS

INTRODUCTION  
COURSE A  
COURSE B

LECTURES I TO XX  
NOTES ON COURSES  
POSTSCRIPT (1946)

6/- net.

Published by

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

For and on behalf of The Director

for Lectures and Studies of the

Social Credit Secretariat, at

7, VICTORIA STREET,

LIVERPOOL, 2.

"Odlum v. Stratton"—(continued from page 3.)

he had been directed by the Minister of Agriculture to give that certificate. In the middle of the letter, having described the documents which were not to be produced, he says: "Other than letters of the 7th and 8th July, 1942, from Mr. A. Hurd to Mr. W. T. Price, and Mr. Price to Mr. Hurd." Those letters, which at first sight would seem to support the defendant's case, were these. Mr. Hurd had written on the 7th July, 1942—that is before the completion: "Dear Price, The Minister has mentioned to me again the deplorable condition in which he has found the Manningford Farm. He cannot understand why the farm was allowed to get into this state and he feels doubtful about the efficacy of the supervision of any such low grade farms in the district. I believe that the District Committee member concerned is Mr. Booth. I believe also that you have lately strengthened the Committee membership in this district so that it will be possible to arrange more effective supervision. Perhaps we can discuss when we meet."

This is the reply on the 8th July: "Dear Hurd, I acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 7th. I have already explained to the Minister the reasons why Manningford was in such a deplorable condition. I think you yourself know the circumstances of this case; that since Mr. Odlum lost his wife he has gone to pieces and his health has been particularly bad during the last twelve months.

"We did everything possible to try and get things put right, but as you know Mr. Odlum was particularly awkward and was a complete obstructionist. I think it is quite definite that if Odlum had not sold the farm the Committee would have taken possession by now.

"I spent a day on the farm yesterday and I must say I was agreeably surprised at the improved condition of the farm from what it was last spring"—he meant the spring that had just immediately passed—"and those crops that are left are looking reasonably well. This is due in the main to the efforts of Mr. Booth, who has spent a lot of time on the farm this last summer, and has in fact, one might say, farmed the place."

There is scarcely a statement in that letter—I do not see why I should mince language—which was not an untruth and a deliberate untruth. It was true that Mr. Odlum had lost his wife. It was untrue that he had gone to pieces. Mr. Odlum's health had been no worse during the past twelve months than it had been during the last few years. It was untrue that he was "particularly awkward and was a complete obstructionist." It was untrue that the Committee would have taken possession of that farm, and Mr. Price admits that it was untrue to say "This is due in the main to the efforts of Mr. Booth." He could not help but praise the crops and say they were good because they were there to be seen, and yet he says this was "due in the main to the efforts of Mr. Booth," who had been once on the farm in March—at any rate, never before March—and had nothing in the wide world to do with the fact that those crops were good.

Bearing those letters in mind let me come to the passages in his evidence which shows the sort of man Mr. Price really was, Day 5, page 20, at the top of the page: "(Q) Why did you think that the Committee would have taken possession if Mr. Odlum had not sold the farm—because the farm was being well managed or what? (A) Simply because the production of the farm was so low that something drastic had to be done to put it right. The Committee had given Mr.

Odlum, what was it, three years, and instead of the output of that farm improving it was steadily deteriorating. The trouble, my Lord, was that you have that farm in the middle of a good farming district and it is so difficult to get other farmers to do things if you have people there who will not—they question the example."

(To be continued)

## 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/-
Money and the Price System .....	7d.
The Use of Money .....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy .....	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal .....	6d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.

### ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart...	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster .....	20/-
The French Revolution by Nesta H. Webster .....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster .....	7/6
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster .....	5/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson .....	2/-
Protocols of Zion .....	1/6
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.
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.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate .....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
Social Credit: An Explanation for New Readers 1½d. each, or 50 copies for 5/-.	

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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