

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 19. No. 5.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The complete argument of Marxian economics rests on Marx's Theory of Surplus Value. This Theory is based on the orthodox proposition—that the act of production automatically creates the exact amount of distributed income necessary to buy the goods produced.

Since this proposition is increasingly unsound, Marx's deductions from it have no validity, and, in fact, lead to purely destructive conclusions.

It is fairly evident that unless some effective action can be taken against the Hidden Government operating, at the moment behind Messrs. Attlee and Dalton, we are to spend the last years of our corporate existence as a slave race building up a New World Empire for our Masters. Judging from the kite-flying of a monthly news-letter to which all things are known, and some told, South Africa is the New Jerusalem.

It is reliably stated elsewhere that South Africa imported from "Britain" last year nearly £200,000,000 of goods. It must not be hastily concluded that we were paid for them. With that monotonous regularity which characterises our affairs, we owe the money.

And then, of course, there is India. We owe India, after having built all her railways, bridges, roads and canals, and developed her industries, and maintained the Pax Britannica for eighty years, £1,500,000,000.

This will provide us with unpaid employment for quite a long time. And then, of course, we have to work to get the dollars to buy the raw material to make the goods to give to Africa and India. Austerity? Why, boy, it's a lulu. It's got everything.

We are an unaccountable people. After two years of the most bare-face imposture by a gang of junketeers, borne with something approaching apathy, it may quite easily transpire that the abolition of the basic petrol ration, itself an imposition on a once free race, will put a period to the happy days of Food Talks, and interfere with the projected winter tours of our Kommissars to the Mediterranean, the West Indies, and other luxury climates.

If this should prove to be the case, it will be one more proof that the peculiar political strength of the British is intuitive or instinctive, not rational. The abolition of the private motorist is recognised to be sheer tyranny, and it is that, quite as much as the drastic inconvenience, amounting to hardship, which may teach Mr. Shinwell that his days are numbered.

But we are sorry to see the intrusion of the "loss of taxes" fallacy. Since, with the assistance of many monetary reformers, the Government is wholly independent of the taxpayer by the nationalisation of the Bank of England, although the taxpayer is far from being independent of the Government, taxes are merely an instrument of policy. Mr.

Dalton does not really care if he doesn't get a penny from motorists, so long as he retains the power to get all the pounds they possess. If the petition which the motoring associations are to present is properly edited, this issue, together with the mystery of Empire petrol and its place in the controversy, will be authoritatively raised.

It is our opinion that, from now on, petitions against infringements on the liberty of the subject should be submitted in triplicate to:—

The First Sea Lord of the Admiralty
The Chief of the Imperial General Staff
The Chief of the Air Staff

for endorsement and forwarding to His Majesty the King.

"Slavery is likely to be abolished by the war, the power of chattel slavery destroyed. This, I and my European friends, are in favour of. For slavery is but the owning of labour, and carries with it the care of the labourer, while the modern or European plan is capital control of labour by controlling wages; this can be done by controlling money.

"The great debt which, we will see to it, is made out of the war must be used as a measure to control the volume of money."—*Hazard Banking Circular, U.S.A. 1862.*

But, of course, both kinds together are better than either separately.

"Uncle Sap"

Under this heading, *Exclusive News*, Washington, D.C. says that between 1942 and 1945 the U.S.A. supplied the world with \$48,000,000,000 of goods and services and received back \$8,000,000,000. "Most of the difference was wiped out as an act of grand generosity. During 1946, the United States provided \$15,300,000,000 to foreign countries, receiving \$7,100,000,000. Among the agencies used to transfer American wealth to Europe and Asia were U.N.R.R.A. and private remittances which together amounted to \$3,100,000,000. It looks now as though Europe would be willing to settle for an American contribution of \$5,000,000,000 a year for four years. Three institutions exist to transfer American wealth abroad: 1, The Export-Import bank has a lending authority of \$3,500,000,000. This bank is owned by the Government of the United States. Its loans may not be political in nature under the law. 2, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which rose out of the Bretton Woods Agreement. This bank has an authorized capital of \$10,000,000,000 (about \$8,000,000,000 paid up), of which the United States, among about forty-five countries, subscribed \$3,175,000,000. Only the United States possessed a free market for the purchase and resale of its securities. 3, The International Monetary fund exists to facilitate exchange operations. The sum total of all this is that spigots have been hammered into our national wealth to siphon it off. Dr. Sulzbach asks: 'Shall the United States give its wealth or lend it?' What's the difference?"

Concerning the 'Historical' Claim of 'the Jews' to Palestine

By BORGE JENSEN.

In July, 1946, Dr. George Kheirallah, who publishes the *Arab World*, New York, stated before the Standing Committee on External Affairs of the Canadian House of Commons that "the Jewish merchants from Stamboul went into the Tartar country, the Caspian district, and Judaized the Khazar Tartars. The result is that when you see thousands and thousands of Polish, Russian and Rumanian Jews they have neither the Semitic wisdom nor the blood. They are Tartars, and the Arabs to-day are constantly confronted with this Tartar invasion."

One remembers Disraeli's references to 'the Jews' as a splendidly organised *Caucasian* race and there come to mind, also, various descriptions of the peculiar mixture of semi-Asiatic races which inhabited the lands which gave birth to 'Stalin', the Georgian-Caucasian, and 'Lenin', in whose veins flowed a large admixture of Mongol blood, as well as of many of the lesser lights of the Soviet-Talmudic scheme of things.

Dr. Kheirallah's statement that ancient Semitic lands are at the moment being invaded by non-Semitic Tartar-Asiatics who have no more valid claim to 'Zion' than has e.g., Mr. Emanuel Shinwell to Wentworth Woodhouse, receives support from an article entitled 'Zionists Misleading World with Untruths for Palestine Conquest' which appeared in the *New York Herald Tribune*, on January 14, 1947, and which is now being distributed freely and widely by the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine, New York.

Coming from the Metropolis of World Jewry, and having the support of organisations of Americans both of the Christian, Mohammedan and Jewish faiths, all, apparently, violently anti-Zionist, this document is deserving of critical attention. We are informed that it has received no attention, critical or otherwise, from the official press of this country.

According to the text of this document, "The Zionists claim that persons of the Jewish Faith in eastern Europe (Polish, Lithuanian, Galician, Ukrainian, Russian and Rumanian) have a legitimate right to be "repatriated" to Palestine, connoting their right to *return* to the *country* of their origin. The basis for this Zionist claim is contradicted and disapproved by the world's foremost historians, ethnologists, anthropologists, philologists and cartographers. The works of these notable Jewish and non-Jewish authorities are to be found in the leading public libraries and educational institutions of higher learning. These authorities agree that persons of the Jewish faith in eastern Europe (Polish, Lithuanian, Galician, Ukrainian, Russian and Rumanian) are the descendants largely of a non-semitic Turkish-Finnish race which came into Europe from Asia about the 1st century A.D. by a land route north of the Caspian Sea. These people are known in history as Khazars. The Khazars had always been a pagan people. They settled in eastern Europe and there established the Khazar kingdom. By continuous and successful conquests for which the Khazars became famous in history, their kingdom increased in size until by the 8th century A.D. it occupied the greater portion of eastern Europe located west of the Urals and north of the Black Sea and extending far westwards into Europe. The Khazar nation was converted to Judaism at about the end of the 7th century A.D. The Khazar king in (ca.) 692 selected

Judaism rather than either the Christian or Moslem religions which were striving to convert the Khazar king and the Khazar nation to Christianity or to Mohammedanism. After the conversion of the Khazars to Judaism only a Jewish king could occupy the Khazar throne. Conversion of the Khazars to Judaism was very successful. Judaism became the state religion. Synagogues and schools for teaching Judaism to the Khazars and peoples conquered by them were built throughout the kingdom. Rabbis to officiate in synagogues and teachers for the schools were imported from Spain. These non-Semitic Turkish-Finnish people from Asia, now converted to Judaism, and as the Khazar kingdom dominated eastern Europe, this great and powerful Jewish kingdom at the peak of its power was collecting tribute from no less than twenty-five conquered peoples. *Conquest was their vocation.*

"To give light to them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow." Luke, 1: 79.

"This great and powerful Jewish kingdom flourished for almost five hundred years without a setback. Even the neighbouring mighty Byzantine and Persian empires feared the Khazars and eagerly sought military alliances with them. Towards the end of the 10th century A.D., the Khazars were defeated in a war with the Russians (Varangians) who came down upon them from out of the north. For the first time in their history this Jewish kingdom was defeated and the Khazars were conquered. This conquest of the Khazars was completed in the middle of the 13th century A.D. The Khazar population and former Khazar territory were thus incorporated into the expanded Russian state. The Khazar kingdom disappears at this time from the history of the world. The conquest of the Khazar kingdom by the Russians accounts for the presence in southern Russia of the large concentrated population of the Jewish faith. During the next few centuries large parts of this concentrated Jewish population were included in the newly formed Polish, Lithuanian, Galician, Rumanian and other states which through conquests were carved out of the former greater Russia. These new states were in their turn reconquered by Russia and these large concentrated Jewish populations were reunited again as Russians. From the 13th century A.D. to the outbreak of World War II the eastern European area of southern Russia underwent very little ethnic change and continued to include the descendants of the former Khazar Jewish kingdom. Zionists misrepresent to the world that these eastern European persons of the Jewish faith (Polish, Lithuanian, Galician, Ukrainian, Russian and Rumanian) have a legitimate right to be "repatriated" to Palestine, connoting a *return* to the *country* of their *origin*, a country with which Khazars in all their history have had neither a historical nor racial association, the Holy Land being about one-thousand five-hundred miles from the Khazar kingdom."

And ever since that day Russia has been invading and occupying neighbouring territory: "Conquest was their vocation."

We may recall Disraeli's remark about that 'Mysterious Russian diplomacy' which was controlled by his co-racialists. Disraeli was in the habit of spending his Sunday-nights with the London Rothschilds who managed the financial interests in England of the 'Czarist' administration. The London Rothschilds were 'Liberals' and their financial interests were expertly handled in 'reactionary' Germany by Baron von Bleichroeder of Berlin, and the Warburgs, of Hamburg, and in 'reactionary' Russia by Baron Gunzburg of St. Petersburg, and the Weinstains of Odessa.

The influence exercised over the 'Liberal' press of the world by the Rothschild-Bleichroeder-Warburg combination was decisive. From the middle of the 19th century till 1917, when Communists financed by them seized power in Petrograd, the 'Liberal' press of the world was consistently and solidly anti-Russian. Russia was held up to the world as that Oriental Despotism which it has since become. Russia is now described by the 'Lab-Liberal' press of the world as a workers' paradise.

The Pro-Sovietism of the 'Internationalist' Press and Parties was, from 1917 to 1933, combined with an equally ardent admiration for German 'Republican' 'Democracy', an admiration which the advent of 'Hitler' changed into a feeling of vehement 'anti-Nazism', which, in its turn—as Germany was emptied of her 'Jews' and the war against 'Hitler' drew near—broadened into that kind of anti-German frenzy which we associate with the name of Lord Vansittart. (The number of Jewish writers who have declared that the war against 'Hitler' was *their* war, is legion).

Since the end of the Jewish war against 'German' 'Fascism', the newspaper press of the world has in growing measure directed its powers of invective against the British Empire, now in the process of being liquidated under the guidance of Communist-Liberal Governments, often openly directed by 'Jews'.

The quarrel of "World Jewry"—that marvellously organized community of Common (*i.e.*, collectivized) Beings—with the British administration is not, as in the case of 'Czarist' Russian and 'Hitlerite' Germany, that a despotic Government persecutes their fellow 'religion'-ists (who, as a matter of common observation, are in open control of the key-positions of the economic life of this country) but that streams of their 'persecuted' co-Talmudists, are not allowed freely to converge on, and settle in, a tiny corner of the Empire in which the Rothschild Dynasty have been economically and otherwise interested since the middle of the 19th century when the first modern Jewish colonists settled, under Red-shield guidance, in the wine-growing parts of Palestine.

It has been pointed out by Professor Bentwich, former Attorney General of Palestine, Professor of International Relations of the Hebrew University, Mount Scopus, and prominent 'Labour' politician, that the Balfour Declaration to Lord Rothschild, and the 'Russian' Revolution took place in the same month, and we may perhaps be justified in considering them as a sort of twin-experiment. We know that the Communist and the Zionist movements were financed from the same source. We know that many of the 'officers' of the Tartar-Jewish revolutions in Russia, Hungary, Spain, *etc.*, found ready employment in the 'agricultural' development of Palestine, we know that the Jewish Agency for Palestine—the mysterious semi-autonomous body which the Jews in Palestine regard as their real government, with which the leading families in Israel, the Samuels, Isaacs, Warburgs, Rothschilds and Schiffs are intimately connected—are left an entirely free hand in the selection of the type of labourer deemed necessary for the continued success of the National Home experiment.

The Tartar-Jewish zealots who, apparently under perpetual hypnotic suggestion, are everlastingly singing the Hatimah, their National Anthem, in a posture of Prussian rigidity, while being carted from truck to ship and from ship to truck at the orders of the invisible Zionist High Command, offer the most frightening example of what can be done with

beings subjected to years of enforced collectivism. The Zionist 'democracy' have 'decided' to return to the 'land of their fathers.' The Zionist High Command encourages that belief with every means in its power. The lot of the Zionist 'democrat' on reaching his Promised Land is far from easy, often tragic. His essential function is to be a number, and with his often equally tragic fellows he adds up, or is beginning to add up to the desired total. An American writer has a word for it: the 'refugees' are merely being used as the political football of the leading Zionist Jews of the world. The *New York Herald Tribune* article sums the situation up as follows:

"Since 1916 Zionists have proceeded on the theory that their plan for creating an independent Jewish state in Palestine was the only certain method by which Zionists could acquire complete control and outright ownership of the proven Five Trillion Dollar (\$5,000,000,000,000.) chemical and mineral wealth of the Dead Sea. A Jewish state possessing this fabulous wealth would by virtue of its financial power soon become a nation with greater international importance than any nation in the *history of the world*. The real driving force behind the feverish Zionist "*give me Palestine or give me nothing*" struggle now going on is their hope of resurrecting in Palestine their former eastern European Jewish kingdom (Khazar). Zionists are using the horrible Hitler massacre *not for the purpose of accelerating the rescue of their co-religionists* from eastern Europe, as 'professional' Zionists would have the world believe as they *plead for contributions*, but *perverting this humanitarian task* to get the Five Trillion Dollar (\$5,000,000,000,000) juicy Palestine '*prize package*'. Twenty years before the arrival on the scene of Adolph Hitler and his Nazi murderers Zionists were *then using less impressive alibis* to justify their '*high-jacking*' of the Five Trillion Dollar (5,000,000,000,000) chemical and mineral wealth of the Dead Sea which always has rightfully belonged to the native Palestinians. Zionist membership has long been made up largely of persons of Eastern European origin (Polish, Lithuanian, Galician, Ukranian, Russian and Rumanian) and Zionist leadership has been almost exclusively made up of persons of the same origin. The *official report* of the British Crown Agents for the Colonies prepared for the Government of Palestine, entitled 'Production of Minerals from the Waters of the Dead Sea' states on page 2 there are *forty-two billion metric tons* of Potassium Chloride, Magnesium Bromide, Magnesium Chloride, Calcium Chloride and Sodium Chloride, 'and also a supply of potash which may be considered inexhaustible', of a total value of about Five Trillion Dollars (\$5,000,000,000,000) at to-day's prices. Zionists will some day be held responsible for the political pollution and

(continued on page 8.)

GLASGOW (Southern) D.S.C. SOCIETY.

A PUBLIC MEETING

will be held in

R.I. ROOMS, 200, BUCHANAN STREET,
on TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7, at 8 p.m.
at 8 p.m.

Subject: "On Demonstrating Social Credit."

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. 19. No. 5.

Saturday, October 4, 1947.

October

By some inscrutable rule either of plan or politics or nature, the late summer has always been a time of trial for Social Credit. Our major visible dangers seem regularly to present themselves fully fledged and ripe for slaughter in September. Readers have only to observe the volume numbers of *The Social Crediter* to remind themselves, if it is necessary, that we began publication in September—in a storm: “In September in the Rain”, as a song of the Common Man has it. Later Septembers have not been so publicly tempestuous: but we have never failed to observe the signs, nor to doubt whether they are sinister in direct proportion to their prominence. Nor have we entirely forgotten that, of the festivals of post-exilic Judaism, the Feast of the Trumpets at the beginning of the seventh month (Tishri, September-October) of the ecclesiastical year is the first of the Jewish civil year.

Be that as it may, we record that the present year is not exceptional; and it is an occasion for us to take stock of the position. We need not tell our converted that political ‘news’ nowadays, so far from being ‘hotter’ in the wake of events than it was in the days of runners and homing pigeons is colder to the point of petrification as each seasonal crop of the fruits of egalitarianism and ballot-box democracy is reaped. We must wait, now, until all can be told at the same time, before anyone knows anything at all—with exceptions, which modesty induces us to label unimportant. Thus, for example, “Direction of Labour” did not begin when the Sunday ‘News’-papers announced its advent, and their tardy candour might have been a signal for revolt against an imposition long suffered, but it could not be, in the nature of things, a mere premonition of a future need for the individual to bestir himself to avert a problematical threat to his liberties. It is not remarkable that most citizens should react ineffectually to their experiences if habitually and characteristically they will not be taught, either by precept or by example, that tomorrow’s oven will not give birth to yesterday’s calf. This is an extension of the principle that tomorrow’s oven will not cook to-day’s calf. Ovens don’t calve. Cooking and calving, and in due season, are both essential to the consumption of roast beef.

A strong tendency has always been in evidence for the strategies advised by the Secretariat last year (or even before last year) to awaken the spark of attention next year, for partial application the year after. We recognise this as a phenomenon inseparable from our self-appointed task as

advisers to a community stricken by the ravages of the prevailing social plague, and, however unfortunate, we would claim that in spite of it, the Social Credit Movement is exceptional among the great movements of history in regard to the positive progress it has made in a remarkably short time. We should be disposed to pay even greater homage to the spirit and endurance of Social Crediters generally (although that is not our business) were it not possible that complacency might develop where dissatisfaction would be more profitable. This is no time for complacency. *Of all times in history, this is the most important for us.* If we fail, there is no one else to succeed. What we ask may be beyond the will of supporters to accomplish; but it is not beyond the capacity. Capacity rises constantly to match the *idea*. Entertain the idea, if only for a moment, and it will return reinforced and clarified to remain. Possessed of the idea, execution rarely offers insuperable difficulty. The source of the idea is *The Social Crediter*. It is as much the source of the idea for others as it has been for you. We have, as has been said here before, concrete evidence bearing on this point. Those who say that our paper is ‘not for such as they’ (meaning the benighted) do themselves an injustice. We were all benighted.

The function of Social Crediters at the present moment should be that of the lighthouse (which, by the bye, is all but inaudible). To bring the metaphor into the sphere of practical politics, there is an inobvious but nevertheless not a distant parallel between the relationship between the priest and the soldier, the fighter, the doer: the Brahmin and the Kshatriya: of the Indian caste system and a modern western state. It is perhaps in the nature of Brahmins to nod: they become over-intellectualised in the line of their special aptitude. For that or for some other reason, our Brahmins, *i.e.*, our inspirers of policy on any but the ground (or groundling) level have been for some time ineffectual. We admit freely to the well-nigh overwhelming competition from the *ersatz* Brahmin and to a resultant confusion of cultures which are imposed on him, even upon competent ‘Brahmins’ of right (or not very wrong) mind. But we at all events are not confused. Nor, of course, are we ‘professional’ Brahmins and inheritors of the caste. But no one besides ourselves can revivify our Brahmins. The frequent reply to this line of persuasion is the retort, sensible enough in its way, ‘Yes, but unfortunately there are no Brahmins in my street, and the nearest lives a long way off.’ But there is a clear answer to that too: “Very well, if it is too far for you, it isn’t too far for *The Social Crediter*.”

We write these lines with a fresh observation of a sudden crystallisation, or recrystallisation, of an old salt: the notion that the culture for which we stand is not dying but that it is already dead, “and that its corpse has been stinking ever since.” In line with what we had to say in an earlier paragraph, this is plausible; but we do not believe it is wholly true. If the Christian “religion-culture” has to begin again in a new social setting, if it could do that, it is not dead, but living and living at the greatest potential, the vital phase of germination, when Life is at its greatest power, though perhaps its lowest performance measured otherwise than as pure growth. Social Credit *can* (and nothing else can) intervene at this point as effectively as at any other. But, in addition, it *may*, and when the Rubicon which still separates the true from the false New Age is once passed, it *may not*.

—T. J.

PARLIAMENT

House of Lords, September 9, 1947.

Economic Situation

The First Lord of the Admiralty (Viscount Hall): . . . Now, without any further preamble, I propose to tell the House that His Majesty's Government cannot agree that it is proper for the present occasion to be used for a general debate upon the state of the nation or, indeed, as an opportunity for eliciting any new statement of Government policy. In our view, whatever may be the constitutional right of your Lordships to meet as and when you please, it would certainly not be constitutional for His Majesty's Government to regard a meeting of this House alone, in the middle of the Parliamentary Recess, as a meeting of Parliament for the making of an important announcement of Government policy. Indeed, your Lordships yourselves would object, and very rightly so, if His Majesty's Government summoned only members of another place for the same purpose while they left your Lordships still inoperative and in adjournment. And yet, though I need hardly remind your Lordships that the other place is the Chamber of the popularly-elected representatives of the country, you are asking us to treat them as of no account—

Noble Lords: No.

Viscount Hall: —and to give your Lordships information upon Government policy while we deny it to another place. Neither this Government nor any other Government that I know of can have one policy in regard to the sittings of another place during the Recess and another policy for your Lordships' House. We could not refuse to meet another place until the 20th October and at the same time be willing to meet your Lordships this afternoon for a general debate on the economic situation.

We do not challenge your Lordships' constitutional right to meet apart from the other House. That is a convenience of which Governments in the past have constantly availed themselves. In the normal course of the business of a Session one House may well have legislative or other business to do while the other place—and very naturally this is usually your Lordships' House—have nothing before them for which to meet. But no one can pretend to represent to-day's meeting in the Summer Recess as in the normal course of business. When Parliament is in recess, its recall within that period must be for the Government of the day to decide under the emergency arrangements made by either House, the Opposition being of course entitled to put such pressure upon and to make such representations to them as they can command in the country should they consider recall necessary.

I should say to your Lordships that it is not the Government's intention that any speech other than the speech I am making at the present time shall be made from this Bench during to-day's proceedings. I am afraid we must decline to go beyond that. In the absence of my noble friend the Leader of the House, and of the noble and learned Viscount on the Woolsack, both of whom are, as your Lordships know, unavoidably absent abroad, it has fallen to me, who am but a comparatively recent member of this House, to make this statement; but I can assure your Lordships that my words represent the mind and the intention of His Majesty's Government, who have given the most careful

consideration to the constitutional problem presented by our meeting to-day. I hope your Lordships will forgive me if I have spoken plainly and bluntly; but I am sure it is best in the common interests of us all, irrespective of Party that these things should be said plainly so that we may know, beyond all doubt, exactly where we stand.

I have no desire to pursue the argument as to the constitutional propriety of to-day's proceedings. The British Constitution is fortunately an unwritten one, and as such matched to the political genius of our people. It is an instrument, not a master, and I can easily imagine the same powers being used both constitutionally and unconstitutionally. It is largely a matter of the spirit and little, if at all, of the letter. Noble Lords opposite have made no secret of the fact that they do not approve of much to which we have set our hand. But they have not used their constitutional powers in a manner contrary to the spirit of the Constitution. Rather have they chosen the path of understanding and co-operation, and we have got along very well so far.

I freely and gladly acknowledge, not only on my own behalf but on behalf of His Majesty's Government, that noble Lords opposite have hitherto used their majority here in a moderate and statesmanlike way, and in a manner which has given us on this side of the House no real or reasonable ground for complaint. For this we are indeed grateful to the noble Marquess, to the noble Viscount, Lord Samuel and to the noble Lords behind and on either side of them. I feel, therefore, the more emboldened to hope that, upon due consideration of the views which I have ventured to put forward to your Lordships' House on the present occasion, noble Lords will be ready and willing to adopt the course which I have proposed.

The Marquess of Salisbury: My Lords, your Lordships will have heard the statement which has just been made to your Lordship's House by the noble Viscount, Lord Hall, on behalf of the Government, and especially those portions which deal with the Motion standing in the name of the noble Viscount, Lord Swinton, with the affection and respect which the noble Viscount, Lord Hall, always commands in this House and also, if he will allow me to say so, with considerable regret. It is, of course, true, as he himself said, that the primary purpose for which this House has met to-day is to examine any Orders which may have been made under the Supplies and Services (Extended Powers) Act which was passed through this House just before the adjournment in August. The decision of this House to meet again on September 9 arose, as your Lordships know, in no respect from any desire to embarrass the Government. The aim, I think, as was explained quite clearly at the time from these Benches, was to deal with certain defects in the machinery of the Constitution which appeared to us to have been exposed by the passage of that Bill at the time it took place just before the Summer Recess.

In the past, all important legislation went through Parliament in the ordinary way, and the House of Commons and your Lordships' House had an ample opportunity of examining each clause and each sentence of each measure before it became effective; but lately, as we know, there has been a new development, not confined to any one Party alone, the growth of delegated legislation. It is true that even here a certain protection was given against the misuse of Orders

produced under Acts of this character by the power of Parliament to pray against them and, if necessary, to annul them if they were thought undesirable. But if Parliament is not sitting, Orders can, of course, be made and become effective (because they become effective immediately they are made) weeks or even months before they can be considered by Parliament and, if necessary, rejected. By that time—I am only recapitulating what was said three or four weeks ago—Orders may have been in operation for a considerable time and a great deal of harm may have been done.

It therefore seemed desirable, whatever might be done in another place, that your Lordships' House, at any rate, should not adjourn for too long a period but that it should meet at suitable intervals during the Recess and examine any Orders that might have been made and express an opinion upon them. That, as the noble Viscount, Lord Hall, quite rightly said, was the main purpose for which this House has met this afternoon and I believe it is not really disputed in any part of the House that that was the proper action for us to take. But I will not deny that it seemed to us on this side of the House likely that an early meeting of the House might be extremely valuable for a wider purpose. After all, we live to-day in times of storm and stress. There is no one but must be aware of the hazardous position in which this country at present stands. The gap between imports and exports to-day—there may be different figures on this—amounts to something in the nature of £700,000,000, and, as we all know, unless that gap can be bridged the whole standard of living of the British people, which has been built up by so much labour by past generations, is likely to suffer a catastrophic decline.

Every thinking man and woman in this country is watching with anxious concern the situation as it develops. It is not my object to-day to enter into controversy with the Government as to the policy which they have seen fit to adopt to deal with it, though they will not expect me to agree with all of it. But I think every one of us, whether in this House or outside, is anxious to know what steps are being taken to remedy the situation; and we had hoped that an opportunity would be afforded by this meeting of your Lordships' House for the Government to make a statement on the general position as they see it, to give information as to developments in the situation since we last met, to explain the reasons for certain steps which they have felt obliged to take, and to give us, if they could do so, some indication of their hopes for the future. That was our aim in putting down the Motion in the name of the noble Viscount, Lord Swinton. Any statement which the Government felt they could make would have had no captious reception. The situation is obviously far too serious to justify mere Party scores. Our aim—I am sure that I speak for the Liberal Opposition as well as for the Conservative Opposition—would have been, as it indeed always is, to do what we can to help the country out of its difficulties.

It was in the hope that the Government might be willing to co-operate in this examination of our national problems that the Conservative Opposition gave notice of a broadly worded Motion, which was so framed as to enable the Government to make some statement which could be the basis of discussion. The Government representatives in the House of Lords were aware of our intention to facilitate such a statement by means of a general Motion before the House rose. Indeed the machinery for ensuring that the Govern-

ment representatives were informed as to points which were likely to be raised was in fact discussed very briefly in informal conversations with more than one Minister. I cannot pretend that these Ministers were extremely enthusiastic about the prospect of a debate. I will not ask the Government to believe that. But so far as I know, no serious, certainly no fundamental, objection was raised, and at any rate nothing was said of the nature that has been said by the noble Viscount, Lord Hall, today.

The first time that I was aware of any really strong objection on the part of the Government to a debate was on August 28, that is, little more than a week before the House was due to meet. On that day I received a communication from the acting Prime Minister, the Lord President of the Council, writing not in his personal capacity, but on behalf of the Government; he said that he wrote with the concurrence of the Prime Minister. In this communication, referring to the possibility of a general discussion on the economic situation, he indicated that the Government were strongly opposed to any such proposal. The grounds he gave were not simply, as one might have expected, that a discussion at that time would be undesirable at the present delicate juncture, when difficult negotiations were taking place. One would have understood an argument of that kind. The objections of the Government were based, as they have been to-day, upon the wider considerations mentioned by the noble Viscount just now. The Acting Prime Minister made it clear that the Government were unwilling, on what he called "constitutional grounds," to make any reply to the House of Lords while the House of Commons were not sitting. On what authority this very novel theory is based I still, even after listening to the noble Viscount, do not know. The noble Viscount said—I hope I am not misinterpreting his words—that it would be treating the Commons with no respect if the Government were to make a statement in this House while refusing to call the other House. I think "refusing" is a very queer and significant word to use; but it is his word, not mine. At any rate, however that may be, surely that is a very simple remedy to that situation. If a statement needed to be made, the right course would surely have been to recall the other House. In that case a statement could be made to both.

Viscount Hall: Not on your dictation.

The Marquess of Salisbury: That seems to be rather a petty point of view. It is not a question of whether this House is dictating or not. We have met because we consider that we have a duty to perform. If in the view of the Government the situation is such as to require a statement in both Houses, surely the fact that the House of Lords has already decided to meet ought not to be any bar to recalling the other Chamber. Moreover, my Lords, in any case, whatever may be the decision that the Government may have thought fit to take about recalling the other place, surely it need not necessarily affect us. So far as I know—and I have made most careful inquiries—it is constitutionally within the province of either House to decide when they adjourn, when they will meet, and what business they will transact; and, indeed, noble Lords opposite will be able to recollect many occasions in the past when quite important statements of policy have, for instance, been made to the other place on a Friday, when your Lordships' House has not been sitting. So it is not a case of its being constitutionally necessary for both

**ORDER THE BOOKS YOU NEED THROUGH
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.**

Houses to be in Session.

It is to be noted that neither the noble Viscount, Lord Hall, nor the acting Prime Minister, in his previous communication based his case either on Erskine May or on any of the other great constitutional authorities. Their interpretation was, I understand, purely the product of their own unaided genius. Those of your Lordships—and I hope there are many—who are acquainted with the works of Lewis Carroll will remember the incident in *Alice in Wonderland* when Alice appeared at the trial of the Knave of Hearts and the King who was acting as Judge, and who being anxious to exclude her, invented a new regulation of the court, Rule 42, "All persons more than a mile high leave the Court" to which Alice retorted: "That is not a regular rule. You invented it just now." That appears to be exactly the attitude of the Government. They had intended, for reasons which may have been good or bad, to send away Parliament for nearly three months and, when this House was unwilling to be sent away, they invented a new principle of the Constitution, Rule 42, the Government can make no statement to the House of Lords while the House of Commons is adjourned. I believe—I say this seriously—that this will be widely felt both inside and outside this House, in all Parties, to be a most undesirable innovation. I do not intend unduly to labour this point. After all, this country is not in a mood to concern itself merely with constitutional niceties. What it does want is information—and more information—on the hard facts of the situation, and also as to the plan of the Government for meeting these hard facts. It is on those grounds that I think all of us on this side of the House most of all regret the Government's decision.

To my mind there would have been a great advantage both to the Government and everybody else in their giving some guidance to Parliament in the present situation. I had, indeed, imagined, in my simple-mindedness, that they would have welcomed the opportunity. After all, much has happened since Parliament adjourned early in August. There has been the visit of Sir Wilfrid Eady to the United States, there has been the apparent difference of view between representatives of the Government and Mr. Snyder as to the interpretation to be put on Article 9 of the American Loan Agreement. There have been recent statements by members of the Government on the extension of Empire trade and the possibility of Imperial discussions on this subject. There has been the Government announcement on new austerities. For instance there has been the announcement of the abolition of the basic petrol ration, which strikes so very cruel a blow at many hundreds of thousands of British people. I do not say that this is not justified; I have not the information, and I really do not know. But surely Parliament should be given the reasons for steps of that kind. There are also, in addition, the protracted and seemingly thorny negotiations with representatives of the mineworkers. The coal industry is now nationally owned. The British people, as we are constantly told, are the shareholders. Surely they have the right to know what is happening to their property. All these, and a great many other questions into which I will not go in detail, are of vital interest to the citizens of this country. Why should they have to wait nearly two months before any statement is made to them in Parliament.

The Government may very well have good reasons for not wanting to recall the members of the other place. They have had, as all of us are aware, a very gruelling summer. No doubt they deserve some rest and refreshment. But why not

take advantage of this heaven-sent opportunity, when one House of Parliament at any rate is sitting? It is not as if the Government were not making any pronouncements of policy to anyone. They seem to find not the slightest difficulty in making statements of broad policy, on all subjects, to outside bodies. Almost daily there are declarations in the Press, declarations on the radio, declarations to the Trades' Union Congress. I saw in the paper, I think this morning, that the President of the Board of Trade is making a very important pronouncement this week to the leaders of industry. None of us complains of these declarations. The more the British public are kept informed of the position, the better for everyone concerned. But why should Parliament alone be excluded, even when it is sitting? That is surely the proper place for the examination of policy, where it can be debated and discussed by recognized experts, of whom there are many in your Lordships' House, with the proper object of helping the country out of its difficulties.

I gravely fear that the attitude of the Government on this occasion will strike a severe blow at the prestige and authority of Parliament. It will be regretted by all those—and there are many in all Parties—who hold the British Constitution dear. But, my Lords, it is clear that the Government are unwilling to make a statement on all these matters. In such a situation, no doubt a debate on the Motions standing in the names of my noble friends, Viscount Swinton and Lord Teviot, would largely be stultified, and there seems to be no advantage in continuing them. Nor does it appear that there is anything important to be discussed arising from the Supplies and Services Act. Many people will find this a little surprising. The Bill was hustled through Parliament with feverish haste before the House rose in August. We were told that it was urgent and vital that the Government should have the very widest powers immediately; and there were fears raised that there would be very far-reaching action indeed. That is the main reason why we thought it our duty to meet this afternoon. But there is one thing, I think, that never occurred to any of us, and that is that no important Orders at all would be made. That, however, appears to be the position. All we can do is to take note of it.

And now, my Lords, in conclusion, to return for one moment to the question of an economic debate. The time may, of course, come when things reach such a pass that it will be desirable for this House to express its views, whether there is a Government statement or not. But in the meantime I can only advise the noble Viscount, Lord Swinton, and Lord Teviot, to withdraw their Motions, though no doubt they, and other noble Lords, may have something to say before the House adjourns for a further period, as to matters upon which Parliament and the country can hope for early information from the Government when the Government feel in a position to give such information. I do not think that any of your Lordships need fear that what has happened to-day will injure the reputation of this House. After all, we have done our best. We have tried to give the Government an opportunity, which they themselves might well have sought, of discussing with Parliament the dangers threatening our country, methods of avoiding those dangers, and some announcement of the policy which they intend to follow. If they refuse to take advantage of that opportunity, it will be a matter of deep disappointment not only to this House but to the country as a whole. I hope that, after further consideration, they will recognize this, and that on the next occasion we meet—and may it be at no distant date—they will agree to give the

House and their fellow citizens the guidance for which every one of us, to whichever Party we may belong, are looking; and I shall be glad of any assurance that the Government can give to-day that, if circumstances require it, Parliament will be recalled at an earlier date than October 20.

Viscount Samuel: . . . The speech of the noble Viscount, Lord Hall, would almost lead us to the conclusion that this House serves one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to hear Government statements. That is by no means the case. This House exists in order that its members may express their views on matters of importance, and those views are often expressed on behalf of great representative bodies of opinion and with a great weight of personal authority.

In so far as the Government statement is concerned to-day, I confess that I find that there is much force in what the noble Viscount said, and I do not, therefore, find myself in agreement wholly, or even mainly, with the views expressed by the noble Marquess, the Leader of the Opposition. . . . It is evident that great numbers of your Lordships have come here, although this is a day in the Recess, under a feeling of very great anxiety and with a sense that the interests of the country require that this matter should be fully ventilated and that the whole nation—all classes of the community and not least the coal miners—should be made aware that Parliament, at any rate that branch of Parliament which is now in session, does feel that the present state of the nation is one of the utmost gravity and it is not improving. I shall not go into the merits of this action, but no one can say that the economic situation is improving. It is rather deteriorating, which is the reverse. And time passes. Your Lordships will remember the lines:

"But at my back I always hear
Time's winged chariot hurrying near."

It is hurrying fast now, and drawing very near.

Viscount Swinton had the following Notice on the Paper: To ask His Majesty's Government, what developments there have been in the economic situation since the House adjourned, and what further steps have been taken by the Government to meet the present difficulties of the country; and to move for Papers. The noble Viscount said: I do not propose in the circumstances to move this Motion, but I will reserve for the Motion on the Adjournment the observations which I wish to offer to your Lordships. In view of something which was said by the Leader of the Liberal Party, I think it only fair to state, confirming what was said by the Leader of the Opposition, that the Motion standing in my name on the Paper was put down in full agreement between us, and with the full cognizance of all those on the Government Front Bench with whom we deal in this House. However, I do not move.

'Historical' Claim of the Jews—(continued from page 3.)

financial filth by which they have obtained temporary possession of the Dead Sea and are now removing from it wrongfully through the operation of Palestine Potash Ltd., a corporate 'front' for the secret Zionist 'high-command' the natural resources of the land which belong to the people who live there. Ironically Zionists are using the profits from this operation to finance the conquest of the country from these natives. When published, the facts will shock the world and rock the reputations of many names long held to be above suspicion."

The article then proceeds to show how the operations

ordered by the Zionist High Command is leading to unexpected developments in the Near East. The Arab peoples are becoming increasingly bitter against (not the British, as it was hoped?) but the Americans, as they are coming to realize that it is 'New York' far more than 'London' which dictates the 'British' policy in Palestine. A Cairo paper, *Al Misry*, is quoted as advocating a complete boycott of American merchandise and American 'culture' in the shape of books, periodicals, etc. There are many indications that New York, having for long with complete impunity sowed the wind, is now at last beginning to reap the whirlwind.

But this informative broadsheet ends up on an ominous note, for in the concluding paragraphs we are presented with the usual false alternative to political Zionism the plea for a continuation of a policy of peaceful 'assimilation' a plea which is put into the mouth of none other than Jacob H. Schiff, described as a great 'American humanitarian'.

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

Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	
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.
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.