

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 18. No. 20.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 19, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

David Lewis, the Anglicised name of the Jewish secretary of the C.C.F. (Canadian Socialist) Party is apparently in this country, and has been giving his views. He does not appear unduly optimistic as to a quick rise in the C.C.F., thinks the growth of Social Credit is "a dangerous development" and "has reason to believe that there is a tacit understanding between the Social Credit movement and the Progressive Conservatives, and that a combination of these two reactionary [*sic*] parties would be formidable."

It is not often that we find ourselves in agreement with a Jewish Socialist, but with certain obvious disclaimers, we should imagine that the situation is much like that.

There is one feature in the C.C.F. policy in Canada at the moment which we find perplexing; it is becoming almost violently anti-American, as it has always been anti-British. The C.C.F. is merely an offshoot of Fabian-London-School-of-Economics-German-Jew-State-Capitalism, with a clear pedigree to Jacob Schiff and Sir Ernest Cassel, and one of its sidelines has been "Union Now with Britain," a quick method of eliminating "Britain." Whether it is merely that Mr. Coldwell and his rather ragged following are becoming alarmed that absorption into the . . . States would mean their rapid extinction, or whether the Comrades are preparing to line up with Russia for the last act of the drama, is not clear. But no doubt we shall soon see. Perhaps they aren't being paid for having delivered our goods.

"Every time you blow up a British Arsenal, or wreck a British jail, or send a British railroad train sky-high, or let go with your guns and bombs at the British betrayers and invaders of your homeland, the Zionists of America make a little holiday in their hearts.

"We are out to raise millions for you, and the money is coming in, not from Zionists alone but from all Americans."

—BEN HECHT, Chairman, Palestine Resistance Fund.

In a reply to a formal protest by the British Ambassador in Washington, Mr. Hecht commented: "Any child can see that. I tell the terrorists to kill the British; it is quite easy, because England isn't anything now; she has no cause, and she has no Empire, she is old, and sour, and stupid."

Fas est et ab hoste doceri.

According to the *Green Mountaineer*, a politico-economic bulletin issued in Upper New York State, President Roosevelt, while Congress was in recess in 1943, authorised Henry Morgenthau, the Jew Secretary of the U.S. Treasury to print billions of notes covering unknown sums which have never been reported to the Treasury as required by the U.S. Currency Laws. These appear to have been demand notes in various currencies, but redeemable in American dollars at

current rates of exchange.

"Duplicate engraved printing plates of this fiat money were loaned to Russia to continue the process of issuing 'checks on the American tax-payer and his offspring, even to the third and fourth generation' [sub-quotes in original—*Ed.*, *T.S.C.*]. When the time came for an accounting, Russia not only refused to be audited, but also refused to surrender these plates."

Well, of course that situation presents no difficulty. Charge them to the British. They'll pay anything to anybody for anybody; except their own people.

Before the outbreak of World War II, the British Government proposed to create an Empire Air Force Training School in Western Canada. Mr. Mackenzie King refused flatly, on the ground that such a proposal infringed Canadian sovereignty. A proposal is now before the Canadian Parliament to give United States troops extra-territorial rights in Canada of a far more fundamental character than those refused to the British Empire, and it is perhaps superfluous to say that the Bill has the support of Mr. Mackenzie King. It is being strenuously and skilfully opposed by Social Credit Members, notably Mr. Blackmore.

If the vital affairs of what remains of the British Empire, or Commonwealth, or Trades Union, or what have you, are to be dictated from Wall St. and Washington, wouldn't it be better to show the latest films from Hollywood, featuring Mr. Ben Hecht, in St. Stephen's Hall, and to shut up the talking shop? It would save a lot of time and money.

That just shows you the Importance of being Ernest, or grand-nephew by marriage, to Ernest.

"There is no real sugar shortage in U.S.A. Hundreds of thousands of tons refined before Pearl Harbour are just waiting to be marketed at any price.

"I know, because I have made an 8,000 mile trip on which I investigated the sugar misrepresentations. I even found one refinery which could not operate this season because it had no further storage space and was unable to build sufficient additional storage."—Dr. C. L. GOODENOUGH, Boonville, California, U.S.A.

There is a difference, which may be significant, in the approach of the average Social Crediter to the average audience, as compared with that of the average Socialist. Generally speaking, the Social Crediter has a tendency to credit an enquirer with altogether too much understanding both of economics and social psychology, and to believe that any deficiencies can be supplied in five minutes; and in consequence, evokes an undeserved, sub-conscious resentment.

The Socialist, on the contrary, assumes his auditor to be just as ignorant of social technology as in fact he mostly is himself, and human nature being far more impressed by what it can grasp easily, even if erroneously, accepts such nonsense as "common ownership" with the feeling that the country has lost in him, or her, a born and ready made statesman. Once that idea takes root, its eradication is difficult. Combine it with the electoral system, and you have the present situation.

"I had a chance to discuss the political trends of post-war Europe with one of Britain's [*sic*] leading Conservative statesmen and publicists in London. Heart-broken as he was after the defeat of his Party, he envisaged a catastrophe even worse than mere socialism, in the near future. 'Believe me,' he stormed, pacing the floor of his fashionable West End apartment, 'the communists are going to take over. They'll step in when the socialists are through as sure as Lenin succeeded Kerensky, and there's nothing you or we can do about it.' 'Why,' I asked. 'Because the communists have got something. What have we got' *etc., etc.*"

The foregoing lurid extract is not from a Hollywood thriller but from an article by Mr. Ernest O. Hauser, an associate-editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*. We should suppose that Mr. Hauser is an American Jew of German connections, but we may be wrong. The interest of Mr. Hauser's article, to us, lies in the confirmation it affords of a fact which is becoming increasingly clear. There is not room in the Universe, not to mention the planet Earth, for commu-socialism and Christianity. There can be no more fatal mistake than to suppose that socialism is merely an economic system—it is, in its materialistic aspect, the policy of a philosophy. The war between socialism and Social Credit is only an earthly simulacrum of a War in Heaven. Whatever of the meanings, which are almost endless, we choose to attach to the word 'occultism' there is no doubt that in various forms it is the background of Russian policy, just as the downfall of Imperial Russia was connected with the Rasputin phenomenon. Occultism stands out from Mr. Hauser's suggestion that one of 'Britain's' leading (God help us) statesmen... stormed and said there was nothing we could do about it—the communists had something. It stands out a mile from the Canadian Spy Trials and their amazing revelations of completely inexplicable (by normal standards) subversive activities by well educated Canadians, Scots, and English. And it underlines heavily the really awful danger in which the majority of decent people in these islands stand by reason of a pathetic faith in the possibilities of salvation by an electoral turnover. A mysterious Power which can manifest, as it is manifesting, on every plane of human, and perhaps superhuman, activity, is not going to take a ballot-box very seriously except so far as it is helpful to the Big Idea.

**CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY
IN THE COMMON LAW**

BY

Richard O'Sullivan, K.C.

2/6 (POSTAGE 1d.)

Obtainable from:

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 30, 1947.

Rationed Food (Home Production)

Mr. Spence asked the Minister of Food if he will show for each main item of rationed food the percentage which is home produced.

Dr. Summerskill: As the answer contains a number of figures, I will, with permission, circulate it in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Following is the answer:

The percentage of the total supply of each main item of rationed food which was provided from home production in the year to the end of June, 1947, is as follows:

Liquid Milk	100
Eggs in shell	76
Carcase Meat	44
Canned corned meat	Nil
Bacon and ham	36
Cheese	12
Butter	7
Margarine, lard and compound cooking fat, less than	1
Sugar	27
Tea	Nil
Flour	23

Electricity Bill (Third Reading)

Mr. Fraser (Stone):... No one can suggest that the electricity supply industry has failed. There are two troubles with the industry. I think the Minister will agree with this. First of all, there is not enough power, and, secondly, there are 543 undertakings, which is too large a number. From the practical man's point of view those are the two outstanding things—a deficiency of generating plant and the fact that there are too large a number of undertakings in the distribution of electricity.

I would remind the Minister... that the past failure, or so-called failure, of electrical legislation has been due to technical methods. If he will look back into the history of the thing he will find that technical trouble has been one of the chief reasons why an ideal basis of legislation has not been produced in the past. Surely, the Minister will realise that the chief thing which upset 19th century legislation was the fact that there was a change from direct current to alternating current. At the moment all that is needed to carry through the necessary changes is a small Bill to see that more generating plant is provided, that greater administrative action is put into practice and that administrative action in the case of some of those 543 companies is concentrated.

The point at issue today in relation to the future of this country's electrical power supply is the future of atomic energy development. If we read the Baruch Report, we find that in the next 10 years it is almost certain that the 10 per cent. rise in the cost of coal will make the use of atomic energy practically certain. Just as in the past the change from direct to alternating current meant the scrapping of many tons of plant, so in the next 10 or 15 years we will see atomic energy being applied. This Bill is unnecessary, and leads, among other things, to great unfairness. Even if hon. Members opposite have not understood the full economic meanings of Marxism they have realised to the full the bitterness of gross egalitarianism, and to no economic

purpose whatever. I believe the disadvantages of this Bill enormously outweigh whatever possible advantages it has. I believe it is a dangerous Bill to bring forward when it is going to upset the whole process of electrical distribution and generation at the cost of an enormous compensation when these firms and municipal enterprises may in the next few years become antediluvian. I suggest this is no time to carry through this change which will mean an immense confusion of personnel and mean that all important liaison contact between industrial firms and electrical undertakings will be broken and disrupted. The Bill will mean that there is no guarantee of cheaper power. On that I merely quote the Minister himself when he said in Committee, on 25th February:

"There can be no guarantee that every potential consumer in the country will be supplied with either a cheap or an abundant supply until the physical resources to enable that to be done are available."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, *Standing Committee E*, 25th February, 1947, c. 19.]

He then went on to speak of the cost in the price of coal and generating plant. In this Bill, as presented to the public, there is no guarantee that there will be cheap electricity, yet this is done at a cost of £700 million in face of the fact that probably in under 20 years' time there will be introduced much more revolutionary methods of development of electricity than those at the present time when the direct current stations had to be scrapped in order to instal alternating current stations the cost of which was borne by the companies. Had they been allowed to carry on, I believe the municipalities and power companies would have carried out those changes, and borne the cost as in the past. As it is, the country is to be faced with bearing the immediate cost of £700 million compensation, and in addition the enormous price of the immediate installation of power plant to carry us over the next two or three years until the industry is fully developed to meet demands of generation. That is why I suggest that this Bill in this day of crisis is unimportant.

There are political disadvantages. The Bill means that a great many of the things which we have fought for for so long are in danger. The hon. Member for Stratford (Mr. Nicholls) said, "If I were in office, I would appoint none of you chaps to my board." That is my point; nor would we appoint Members opposite. This type of legislation leads direct to the American "place" system at its worst. I am not saying this against the Government, but against this type of legislation. When a Government changes this kind of legislation means that there are huge administrative changes made which are detrimental to the country. I believe that for the future development of democracy in this country it is essential that the powers of local government should be maintained as far as possible. We are seeing today an attack on the powers of local government. In our health services powers, and powers dealing with electricity, and now there is a definite and dangerous attack on the powers of local government. . .

. . . Bill read the Third Time, and passed.

House of Commons: July 1, 1947.

Food Supplies

The Minister of Food (Mr. Strachey): . . . Why is it a cardinal principle of His Majesty's Government's food policy today that we should maintain this system of bulk buying? It is, first of all, because it is an integral and,

I believe, indispensable part of the general policy by which, in the world conditions of today, we secure the available foodstuffs and distribute them equitably to the people of this country. I believe, for example, that it would be exceedingly difficult to maintain the whole rationing system which is, I think, universally agreed to be absolutely indispensable while foodstuffs are scarce, if at one point in their procurement they did not come into Government ownership. Further than that, it would be still more difficult to maintain the policy of price stabilisation by which prices of stable foodstuffs, at any rate, are brought within the reach of all the housewives of this country. I will have more to say about that in a moment.

Again, it would be particularly difficult to play our part in those systems of international allocation which, although they are sometimes irksome to us as I would not deny for a moment, are on balance something which has been of considerable benefit to us and of untold benefit to the world as a whole during the past two years. Also it would be almost impossible to do that under a system of unrestricted private trade. Finally—and this is a subject on which the right hon. and learned Gentleman touched—while certain currencies are what is called "hard"—and I take it that a hard currency is one which is hard to come by—it would be almost impossible to allow the importation of foodstuffs into this country to be carried out in the prewar way under private trade. . .

Lady Grant (Aberdeen, South): . . . It is always being said that large sections of the population in this country were unable through lack of wages to buy sufficient food prewar. I should like to quote the following figures which have been taken from a review in 1937 by Sir William Crawford. They concern the income group below 48s. a week. In 1937 they consumed 26.8 ozs. of meat, while now we consume 16.2. They consumed then 3.6 ozs. of bacon, and now our ration is 2. In fats they consumed in 1937, 10.2, while now the ration is 7. Tea amounted to 3.4 in 1937, and the ration is now 2.5. The only thing that has increased today is bread, which in 1937 was 62.4 ozs., while today it is 63 ozs.

I should also like, if I am not out of Order, to take up, in passing, some remarks by hon. Members opposite regarding certain organisations which are growing in strength throughout the country.

Miss Jennie Lee (Canmoch): And in wisdom after today.

Lady Grant: Those organisations have been criticised in this House and throughout the country by right hon. and hon. Members opposite, but the fact does remain that they include people from every walk of life. The fact is borne out by no less a person than the chairman of the Municipal and General Workers' Union speaking in Aberdeen a short time ago.

Mr. Skeffington-Lodge: On a point of Order. If it is out of Order for us on this side of the House to discuss the Housewives' League, surely it is out of Order for it to be discussed by the other side.

The Deputy-Chairman: I would ask the hon. Member to leave the deciding of that to me.

Lady Grant: I know that the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Skeffington-Lodge) takes a great personal interest in the Housewives' League.

(Continued on page 8.)

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. 18. No. 20.

Saturday, July 19, 1947.

P.E.P. and Immigration

Perhaps the least amusing Trend of the present century is that which, as persistently as if it were alive, continues to poke foreigners into Great Britain. Current opinion now believing that they will do our work for us, the Government proposes this year to import 100,000. As most of them will be former Displaced Persons from Europe and members of the Polish Armed Forces, who cannot be repatriated, we understand that they are almost certain to be accepted as British citizens in due course.

How many natives of this country are trying to emigrate? *Planning* No. 268 puts the total number of would-be emigrants at about one million, with the comment that they are recruited from among our most active people. One million of our most active people, then, have indicated in terms stronger and more realistic than any vote that ever was or could be taken, that they can no longer put up with conditions in this country. Mr. Attlee's reply is not to improve conditions, but to import a population who will relish them. This is a gesture of defiance: so much for democracy.

P.E.P. argues that we must have foreigners on a short term policy because certain industries are seriously undermanned (p. 18), because we don't submit to direction of labour (which it implies is the only alternative) (p. 20); and for humanitarian reasons; and that we must have immigrants on a long term policy because we need more highly qualified people in administration, research and the professions, more children and young people to make up for the low birthrate before the war, and to replace our natives who emigrate (p. 35).

Eight years ago the theme was identical, but the supporting arguments were different indeed. Today we are urged to take refugees to help do our work; in 1939 immigration was guaranteed to make more work! The following quotations are from *You and the Refugee* by Norman Angell and Dorothy Frances Buxton:

"When an emigrant comes here and brings his wife and children, they have to be fed, clothed, housed, warmed; and the first thing that happens therefore is that the grocer, the clothing store, the builder and the coal merchant are made busier." (p. 152).

"Even a refugee camp is a market, and a refugee child a consumer." (p. 154).

"(Of course the alien employee may not himself occupy a new house, but by occupying a house on the market he increases by one the net demand for houses.)

"The same thing applies to some degree to all the

goods, consumed by the newcomers. Extra capital expenditure is required to produce them: viz, extra shoe-making machinery, transport equipment, storage accommodation for the goods in process and transit, which he is destined to consume.

"According to Mr. Harrod, the total amount of capital equipment of all sorts required to cover the needs of a consumer in this country may probably be safely reckoned at about four times the annual value of his consumption. There will thus be an extra demand for capital goods consequent on the arrival of immigrants." (pp. 167-168).

"The refugees, and the people they employ, have to be housed. Their demand for housing accommodation is a stimulus to investment. They have to be fed, clothed, amused and transported from place to place." (p. 180).

When a single definite measure is pressed consistently for 'reasons' that change with events, seasons and intellectual fashions—and the instance given is only the last of a series—we begin to suspect that the Trend has indeed come alive, and that it truly is a purpose, *somebody's* purpose.

To all the arguments there are simple answers (for if some industries are undermanned the bureaucracy is certainly overmanned); but in fact the most interesting thing about such 'reasons' is their irrelevance. The problem is not, and never has been, economic. It has to do with the policy (in the exact sense of the word) of the people of this country and of those who would come here; and the various economic arguments for immigration are rationalisations expedient to obscure a just comparison of those policies.

While our people are native and our culture is still largely native, the cleavage in policy between the Christian and the Socialist-materialist could still be healed in action, as it was at Dunkirk,—if the right action were taken.

But were there established here a body of people who either had full political rights, or were dependent on the government, and who were unable to take part in such an integration, by reason of inherent and traditional anti-Christian tendencies, then the cleavage would be as permanent as that group of people.

Great Britain would be permanently crippled.

Planning adds:

"An early revision of this Act [the Aliens Restriction Act] and of the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914 (with various amendments) appears to be overdue and is recommended by P.E.P."

While the slightly pompous tone has interesting (and not unhelpful) implications, the 'recommendation' should be taken as a warning.

E.S.D.

H.R.H. Princess Elizabeth

On the occasion of the betrothal of Her Royal Highness Princess Elizabeth, Heiress Presumptive to the Throne, we offer to her and to the Royal Family our sincere good wishes, reaffirming our loyalty to the traditional Constitution of Great Britain.

"The Modern Version of Lynch Law"

A speech by MR. NORMAN JAQUES, Social Credit M.P. for Wetaskiwin, in the Canadian House of Commons on May 14, 1947.

Mr. Norman Jaques (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, . . . The subject I wish to bring up this afternoon is a statement which appeared in the press of May 7. I am quoting from the *Ottawa Journal*, which reprints an article taken from the *New York Post* in reference to a statement made by the anti-defamation league, and it quotes the league—

—as saying that Jaques had addressed "nationalist" rallies in various parts of the United States recently with Gerald L. K. Smith, leader of the newly organised Christian nationalist crusade. Smith told a press conference here yesterday—

That was in New York.

—that the crusade's ten-point programme includes preservation of the United States as a Christian nation, exposure of Communism, and the "safeguarding of America against the menace of bureaucratic fascism."

I may say that my reply to the press locally was as follows:

The Zionist terrorists are not confined to Palestine; probably the most poisonous of them are at work outside Palestine on this side of the Atlantic. Personally, I don't give a damn what they say. I'm not going to try to defend myself, but I am prepared to attack this common enemy of a free people any time or anywhere. This is the Zionist—that is the political Zionist-communist front which is just as much a terror here as in Palestine.

Then, as a result of further statements in the press, the leader of this group, made a statement on May 2, which appears at page 3021 of Hansard;

. . . I want to make it clear that neither the social credit movement in Canada nor the group of Social Credit members in this house takes its lead from Gerald L. K. Smith, nor is associated with him in any way.

I can confirm that statement. I neither take my lead from Gerald Smith, nor does he take his lead from me. Then the hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Low) went on to say:

The social credit movement finds its inspiration in the constructive principles of abundant living as taught by the Saviour of mankind, and in the economic teachings of Major C. H. Douglas of Scotland.

Let me say at once that all social crediters will agree to that. Social Credit is the policy of a philosophy and, to put it as shortly as possible, I would say that policy could be defined as a Christian nationalism, that is, Christian in its widest sense, not in any sense of organised religion, but in the sense of the ideals as laid down in the Christian gospels; while we take "nationalism" to mean loyalty to one's own country. If any member of this house is opposed to Christian ideals and is not loyal to his own country, will he please get up now and testify? Now is the time; if there is anyone who does not agree with that, let him get up and say so or forever hold his tongue on this subject.

Mr. Hartt [*]: Christianity is more than a form.

Mr. Knowles: It is also international, not national.

Mr. Hartt: It is international; it belongs to no one.

I am going to sit here and listen to this philosopher.

Mr. Johnston: It might do you some good.

Mr. Hartt: He might learn more from me than I would learn from him.

Mr. Jaques: I do not want any interruptions, either.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Jaques: Why should I be referred to as a "notorious" Christian nationalist? Why should anyone be notorious who publicly defends the ideals of the Christian way of life, and defends the principle of loyalty to his country? Let me quote from a speech made in this parliament:

I wish to protest against the idea that any flag is a Christian flag. This idea is something that we have heard from many who today are dead but the germs of whose ideas are still being disseminated. Goebbels is dead, but his ideology seeps even into this House of Commons. The swastika was also a flag, and it represented a system of barbarism and persecution.

That statement was made in this house by Fred Rose, a convicted communist spy, and it explains why communists hate Christian nationalism. According to the Marxian communists there must be one world flag, the hammer and sickle, the symbol of international atheism and slavery.

Let me give briefly my reasons for addressing meetings in the United States. In the first place, I was invited to address audiences by reason of certain speeches I had made in this house. I accepted, and went first to Detroit, where I addressed a large number of people. I am not going to enter into any details at all, nor am I going to defend my action. I think anyone who is familiar with the situation in the United States will admit, as I found to be the case, that there was and still is a tremendous anti-British propaganda carried on there. I addressed audiences in various cities, including Detroit, Chicago and St. Louis; later on, Los Angeles and cities up the Pacific coast, and quite recently Philadelphia. My reason for going, mainly if not wholly, was to see what little I could do to bring about a better state of feeling between the British and United States peoples. I believe I can make the claim that, at least to some extent, I have brought about a better feeling between our two peoples.

To show the necessity for this, let me quote the words of an American who visited western Canada last fall, and who addressed meetings in various cities in Canada. I take this from the press reports of his meetings. He is reported to have said:

In Palestine the Jews do not believe that the British Empire should be preserved. They believe the British should be driven into the sea, and the issue left to the Jews and the Arabs—

Mr. Hartt: That is not true. Why do you quote it?

Mr. Jaques: Because he said it.

Mr. Hartt: Who said it?

Mr. Jaques: I have told you; please listen. It continues:

. . . and the issue left to the Jews and the Arabs, with Russia in the background. Fascism is immensely strong in the United States today and there is intense anti-Semitism. Anything that happens in the United States is reflected in Canada, and Jews must fight fascism by supporting Russia

[*] Mr. Maurice Hartt, K.C., a Liberal and a Jew, won the bye-election in Montreal caused by the imprisonment of the Communist M.P., Fred Rose for spying on behalf of the U.S.S.R.

through labour unions and progressive action on political issues.

Those are the words of Albert Kahn—

Mr. Hartt: That is what Hitler said.

Mr. Jaques: Mr. Albert Kahn, formerly editor of the anti-defamation league's radio programme, "The Hour." I do not believe that Albert Kahn spoke for the majority of the Jews. He spoke for the communist part of them.

Mr. Hartt: That is possible.

Mr. Jaques: And I do not believe, either, that the majority of Jews in this country, or in the United States or in any other country are involved in communism, or in driving the British into the sea; because nowhere have they received better treatment than they have in Great Britain and in the British dominions.

Mr. Hartt: We could not live in Palestine without Great Britain, and we know it. It is true.

Mr. Low: There is no quarrel about that.

Mr. Jaques: No quarrel at all.

Mr. Blackmore: Fight the enemy; we are not your enemies.

Mr. Jaques: Let me quote from a United States magazine, *Destiny*, particularly from an editorial headed *Anti-Defamation League*, and stating:

Sinister forces in our midst have done their work well, spending millions to suppress the truth, that we Americans may not know the devilish and diabolical programme by which the enemy within hopes to take over this great nation and enslave its people. The activities of this organisation reach into every city, constituting a secret police in our midst, watching and listing our citizens. But read the facts, for free government in the United States is at stake, as well as the life and liberty of millions of innocent men and women. We have time yet to take action, but if we wait much longer it will be too late.

As proof of the power of this anti-defamation league, let me remind the house of meetings which took place in Ottawa a year ago last winter. We remember the meetings of the political zionists, one of which was held in this very house, which was well attended, and for which those who attended received no stigma.

Let me compare that with certain meetings held by the Canadian Arab friendship council. A dinner was held in the Chateau Laurier, to which were invited perhaps a hundred of the key people in Ottawa, including representatives from the churches, the professions, the city government, the civil service and members of parliament. Out of those hundred, I believe there were twelve or thirteen members of parliament. I do not think one business man or one representative from the professions or the churches accepted the invitation.

I asked friends of mine who are businessmen in Ottawa, and who were invited to the meeting, why they did not come. They did not hesitate to say that they did not dare to come, because had they been seen there their credit would have been injured.

The same thing happened in Edmonton. When I returned home from Ottawa I was asked to address a dinner meeting at the Macdonald Hotel in Edmonton. This meeting was called by the Canadian Arab friendship league. Again sixty or seventy of the key people in Edmonton were invited to attend, and again less than a handful—a half dozen, I think—put in an appearance. They told me the same

thing, that they were frightened of the anti-defamation league. That is the truth, and what is the good of hiding it?

Mr. Hartt: No, it is because the speaker was boring.

Mr. Jaques: Very funny! Very funny, indeed!

Mr. Hartt: We will get acquainted.

Mr. Knowles: You are going to be all right over there.

Mr. Hartt: We are going to be pals.

Mr. Jaques: I have no quarrel, nor can I have any quarrel with anyone loyal to Canada and to the British commonwealth. But I give fair warning that I will fight any man who is out to betray our country and to turn it over to the tender mercies of the communists. I am going to fight him, and I don't care whether he is Jew or Gentile.

Mr. Hartt: That's the boy; we are with you. Stick to your guns.

Mr. Jaques: Let anybody get up and—

Mr. Hartt: But don't shake all over the place.

Mr. Low: I see you are wearing your pants thin.

Mr. Hartt: I don't follow it.

Mr. Low: Don't make foolish remarks, then.

Mr. Hartt: Of that you are a good judge.

Mr. Jaques: I do not want to be interrupted continually. What is this criticism? What is this fear? What is behind it? What does it amount to? It is nothing but character assassination, and great principles are involved. Evil men have gained control of propaganda, and they can smear and assassinate the character of anyone who dares to raise his voice against them. Give a dog a bad name, and hang him. Smear a public man by misquoting what he says and prevent him from answering by refusing to publish what he does say, and he can be destroyed as thousands of honest, patriotic public men have been and are being destroyed. This is nothing but the modern version of lynch law by which honourable men can be morally lynched by the masses, so-called public opinion, which is fed on the lying propaganda of these character assassins. The masses can have no opinion of their own; they are indifferent to the truth and too cowardly to defend it even if they know the truth. Only responsible, free individuals can be brave and just and moral. The masses are mobs and a mob rules by lynch law. That is how dictators gained power in Germany and Russia, and that is how the communists hope to gain control of the world.

What is a fascist? I was surprised when I looked up the definition of the word "fascist" in the encyclopedia and found that it means anti-communist. When addressing audiences in the United States and in Canada I have noticed that when I spoke against communism invariably the word thrown at me was "fascist." The chief communist smear is anti-Semitism. That serves a double purpose. It frightens public men from denouncing the activities of the communists and at the same time it frightens the Jews who are not communists—and they are in the majority—into running to the communists for protection and paying them for it. That is well known.

What is a quisling today? I asked that question the other day in the committee. We were discussing displaced persons who had been sifted out in order that a certain percentage might be brought to this country or to the United States. I wanted to know how they had been sifted out, and I was told that the quislings and traitors had been sent

back whence they came. Then I said, "What is a quisling today?" It is quite clear that if Russia was helping to do the sifting anyone who opposed communism would be called a quisling and be sent back to Russia for punishment. Hundreds of thousands; not to say millions of people have been sent back to Russia to their death or to worse than death, while the united nations, we included, have stood by and nobody has raised his voice against it because, if they did, they would be smeared by the anti-defamation league.

Communism is not an economic question. In the United States some of the richest men are leading communists, multi-millionaires like Marshall Field, Mr. Corliss Lamont, a partner of Morgan's, and others. I suppose the most communistic community and perhaps the richest community in the United States is Hollywood. I have been there and I know that to be a fact. The essential nature of communism is that it is anti-Christian. Unless we realize that, we cannot understand it nor can we deal with it.

There have always been communist agents working in all groups, in all organisations and in all parties. This is not the first time that I have been threatened by the communist secret police. Some of their agents are working within our movement. One such was detected a few years ago, and among his papers was found a note reading:

There always are certain individuals prominent in the social credit movement who will deserve careful attention. Jaques is one of them. In my opinion this man is most dangerous to our cause.

That is, to communism.

Despite our efforts we have never been able to unseat him. Watch him carefully, he has many followers.

In essence Marxism is anti-Christian and, until that basic truth is realised, we can neither understand it nor cope with it. Karl Marx, the father of communism and socialism, was an atheist. He hated all religion as the opiate of the people, but above all he hated Christianity. The whole issue before the world today is clear-cut. We must choose whether we are to advance according to the ideals of the Christian gospels, or whether we are to retreat to world slavery according to the doctrines of Karl Marx. That is the one all-important question. All other questions depend upon it and, until it is settled, there can be no peace in the world.

Soon or later we must all stand up and be counted. I have many friends in the United States, fine, fearless people who are fighting the communist enemies of their country and of our country. I should be sorry not to meet them again. But my mind is made up; I am in a fight to a finish against the red communists and pink fellow travellers. I shall not be stopped by threats. My silence is not for sale at any price. You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.

SCIENCE, LIBERTY AND PEACE

By ALDOUS HUXLEY.

PRICE 3/6. POSTAGE 2d.

Obtainable from:

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

Soviet Russia and the Jews

The Executive Director of the Jewish Labour Committee in America, Mr. Jacob Pat, has written from first-hand information of the 150,000 Jews who, admitted to Soviet Russia at the beginning of the war, distributed all over its vast territory, were made Soviet citizens with all the rights and privileges that entails. In 1945, he says in an article in *The New Leader*, the Soviet Government declared that those who wished might regain their former citizenship and go back whence they came.

What happened?

"... They fled from the Soviet Union as though from the plague... they have abandoned their refuge and migrated into torn and exhausted Poland, and from there are trying every possible means to make their way into those same German camps."

Why this unanimous flight?

Because, says Mr. Pat, "although there is no racial discrimination, life in the Soviet Union is not worth living. A Jew who has lived in normal society would rather perish than try to live in the appalling state of want—physical, moral and spiritual—which prevails in that country."

"Although many of them had lived in filth and freezing cold, toiling at hard labour in Siberian forests and mines, they were ready to forgive that. All Russia is poor..."

"The moral disintegration was what made life intolerable.

"We had to lie every day and every moment. We had to lie to every man and every woman. We had always to be hiding something, cheating."

"Do you know that we all had to steal? Do you know that every one of us is thief?"

"Here is a story one of them told me—an illustration only:

"I worked as the head of a public library and bookstore. They approved of me in the central publishing house because I ordered many books and paid cash for them. But I lived in a state of perpetual agony because I made my money not by selling books but tearing pages out of books and selling them as paper to roll cigarettes. I got ten times the price of the book that way. Of course I had to give away sometimes as many as five pages as a bribe to a potential informer, but even so I got along."

"Stealing is essential to the life of the common man in the Soviet Union. He has to steal in order to exist. Wages are too low, the cost of living too high. People steal buttons, bits of string, nails, salt, needles, scraps of material, thread—anything. It is all sold on the black market, something else is bought with the money, and then that is sold again at a profit. The profit buys an extra bite of bread for your hungry child.

"As a result, you live in a state of constant fear. Sooner or later you get caught. You may get off by bribing—once or twice. But you will be caught again, and at last tried and sentenced to forced labour. Millions and millions of those so sentenced work in lumber camps, dig ditches and canals in freezing Siberia, or in the dry sands of the desert, where nobody would work voluntarily. The majority die in the camps, but some manage to escape, by buying forged documents. They live for a while the same fear-ridden

life for they have to steal again, and then they are caught and sentenced again, and so it goes."

Mr. Pat ascribes the exodus also to the complete abolition in the Soviet Union of the Jewish national life: there were no Jewish societies, universities, seminaries, labour unions, meetings, hospitals, banks and other organisations. All this stopped short on entry into the Soviet Union.

"They could not even protest.

"This is the Soviet Union, brother. One does not kick in the Soviet Union."

"And then all of a sudden the impossible happened. They were free to shake off Soviet Citizenship. They were free to go!"

"The impossible happened"—that was in 1945. Events have written the footnote to Mr. Pat's study. Or was that merely a preface?

In 1945 General Morgan commented on the organisation evident in the flow of Jews south-westward. He withdrew his words; but next year he was replaced by Mr. Cohen. The pressure on Palestine increased steadily. The friends of Mr. Ben Hecht taking up the wretched tools passed to them by Mr. Stalin, re-ground them with Rights that were not right and burnished them with a sharp hatred that was all they had left.

To bitter disillusion with Soviet Russia was added an inflaming frustration—a hope was instilled, a dream, with no basis of possibility and certain to be disappointed. Then arms and ships were provided.

Meanwhile, Soviet Russia took the Arab part; ready, no doubt, to collect the dividend from 'the impossible' happening.

Hitler's policy, as Demaree Best remarked in the *Saturday Evening Post* some time ago, was to 'frame' Great Britain into the appearance of always taking the Jews' part, and then to capitalise this among the Arab and Moslem peoples.

Stalin has taken up the policy Hitler laid down, and has developed it further, with the aid of Mr. Ben Hecht's friends.

Parliament

(Continued from page 3)

The Deputy-Chairman: The hon. Lady is now committing the offence.

Lady Grant: I accept your Ruling, Mr. Beaumont. I should like to ask the critics of these organisations since when has it been considered wrong for men and women in this country to put forward their views, however unpopular. It is held by a large section of the people in this country that our food resources are not only being mismanaged, but that our people are being misled by statements that are contrary to the fact. I appreciate perfectly the difficulties that confronted the Minister of Food after the war, but there are a great number of people in this country who cannot understand why the standard of our living is falling now in the open seas of peace. We know perfectly well that since 1945 there have been cuts in several of our vital rations, bacon, fats, cheese and bread and a deterioration in the quality of meat, while more goods have been based on points and others higher pointed, so that it means now that we

have to have 48 points to buy the equivalent of 24 points in 1945.

When one looks at facts like these we see that, while we may not be dying of starvation, we are undergoing a famine in quality. That is shown by the statistics I have quoted. We are, in fact, consuming a great many more starchy products, and who will say that any number of these products are in any way a good substitute for fats or proteins? I am not often in agreement with the hon. Lady for Coatbridge (Mrs. Mann), but I happen to agree with what she said the other day in Committee when she remarked that her children got one and a half times as much as a man. I also have children about the age which she mentioned, in their teens, and perhaps the hon. Lady, in her own words, "as woman to woman," will agree with me that it is very difficult indeed to satisfy such growing appetites today.

... I will not go into the question of bulk purchase, but I wish to put forward the view held by many who are not specialists, but who regard this question from a common-sense point of view, that our standard of living is gradually declining. It is true to say that the result of this lack of quality in our diet is having a grave effect upon our people's will to work. Every day we are finding that it brings chronic fatigue, which in its train brings many minor ailments which are not notifiable and therefore less noticeable, such as general debility and gastritis.

Mrs. Nichol: That is not true.

Lady Grant: Those things in turn lead on to voluntary absenteeism and "Go slow" movements, and an instinct to conserve strength.

Mrs. Braddock (Liverpool, Exchange): The hon. Lady has a "cheek" asking the workers to go on producing and speaking of them that way.

Lady Grant: Is that not Nature's way of adaptation to circumstances?

Lastly, I would ask the Minister what he is going to do about the person who more than any other is affected by the deterioration of nutrition in diet—the woman who is keeping house today? She does not go slow, or go absent, and she gives her bacon and her cheese to her husband and her fats and her sweets and sugar to her children. She is always working to the last limit of her capacity, and I would say that she ranks amongst the privileged section of the community, like the miners and other priority classes and she should come under the Schedule of Manual Workers.

I will end by putting to the Minister the point that a very great number of the people of this country consider not only that we are worse fed than before the war, but that our standard of living is declining and, therefore, that they lack confidence in Ministerial statements and in the present administration...

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food (Dr. Edith Summerskill): ... I think what has emerged clearly from this Debate is that all those criticisms which have been directed to my Department can be traced to one thing only, and that is the world shortage of food...