

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 11.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 15, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The New Zealand *Mirror* quotes Mr. Fenner Brockway as saying that in visiting the United States he found the extremists of the Left working with energy for the Roosevelt New Deal policy. He found Communists in charge of New Deal Offices and one of them said to him, "This is better than talking Communism; we are acting it."

It will be remembered that Mr. Israel Moses Sieff said of the New Deal, "Let us see how *our* Plan [P.E.P.] works in America."

WITHOUT COMMENT.

The "B".B.C. broadcast on April 29 "an incident typical of life in Jerusalem." The incident was the murder of an Englishman by an Arab," and the narrator was an anonymous "British Official" evacuated by air from Palestine.

"This struck me amidships. It tended to shatter negotiations we had been conducting with the British for three years. It derogated from Article VII of our basic lend-lease agreement with Britain [*sic*], signed in 1942, which provided that Britain [*sic*] would adopt a non-discriminatory commercial policy after the war, *meaning* that she would *give up imperial tariff preferences*."—Memoirs of Cordell Hull (our emphasis).

Meaning that the . . . States would set up Boards in Washington after the war to discriminate permanently against "Britain" with a view to disrupting the Empire, for the aggrandisement of the . . . States.

It is significant that any scheme, however reactionary, such as Sir Oswald Mosley's new stunt, (if it is Sir Oswald Mosley's) will be given a run on the one condition that it eliminates competition. There could be no more convincing proof that competition is of the very essence of freedom.

The essence of competition is that excellence carries its own rewards. The essence of monopoly, neo-guildism, syndicalism, communism and socialism is that rewards shall be apportioned by bureaucrats.

"A second important aspect of English character is the belief that character is something which grows like a plant, given proper soil and proper care; something which cannot be hurried and which is also, the English believe, ultimately dependent on the quality of the seed . . . Perhaps indeed because of a failure to apply strictly enough the adage 'you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear' it is necessary to recognise the equally English attitude of fierce equalitarianism . . ."

The preceding quotation is an extract from a penetrating analysis of the English character, "The English as a Foreigner

sees Them," by Miss Margaret Mead, an American anthropologist, which was broadcast in 1947.

THE IRON NEWS CURTAIN

The "B".B.C. issues two weekly periodicals, *The Radio Times*, (incorporating *World Radio*) and *The Listener*. We have searched both of these in vain for the wave length of any station transmitting from outside the British Isles.

There is a curious, awful, inevitability in events at the present period which, it would appear, involves the conclusion that they really are out of hand—that while they are the outcome of long-laid schemes, the schemes themselves have taken charge of affairs and we have to endure their consequences.

This conclusion is strengthened by the evidences of panic discernible in many quarters which, not so long ago, showed every sign of confidence. It may be assumed that President Truman is a fair indicator of certain policies; and his poise is not impressive.

The more deeply these matters are pondered, the more important becomes the idea embodied in Captain Dunne's *Experiment with Time*. In one sense, of course, the idea is latent in every religion; it is latent in the commonplaces of engineering and architecture. Anyone with access to the blueprints of *e.g.*, the Sydney Bridge, could have "seen" the Sydney Bridge before even one of its girders was rolled. And anyone with experience of large undertakings knows how they acquire momentum, and after a certain point, resist innovation.

There are dozens of Plans extant in which no-one believes, not even their Planners; but they proceed to their inevitable failure.

Perhaps one of the purer of the gems of thought and speech which have adorned the period of Office of Mr. Chuter Ede is his contribution to the Debate on the Amendment to the Representation of the People Bill, moved by Mr. A. R. Hurd, the Member for Newbury.

Mr. Hurd moved that a nominee for election should show clearly on his nomination paper his country of origin. With obvious common sense and truth, Mr. Hurd said, "In a crisis a man's judgment goes back to his early upbringing. If his roots are in Bratislava, Warsaw, or Belgrade, his action in a crisis would not be in the best interests of Britain [*sic*]."

To which Mr. Chuter Ede: "In my opinion, a person is either a British subject, or he is not . . . This Amendment is not worthy of a Parliament which, from time to time, has been saved by persons who were not of British nationality at birth."

We are left wondering (a) The extent to which "persons who were not of British nationality at birth" constitute the Parliament to which reference is made, (b) What was the nationality at birth of the persons *from* whom they "save" it, "from time to time."

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: April 22, 1948.

Monopoly (Inquiry and Control) Bill

The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Harold Wilson): . . . The main purpose of this Bill is the establishment of the Monopoly Commission. In any case where the conditions described in Clauses 3 to 5 of the Bill are found to operate, the Board of Trade have power to refer them to the Commission for investigation and report. The Commission are not given any power for initiating inquiries, nor has any member of the public the right of direct access to the Commission with any complaint or grievance which he wants investigated. The responsibility of deciding whether a case, large or small, should go to the Commission rests with the Board of Trade. One of the main reasons for that is that we are anxious to protect the Commission from having to waste time of dealing with cranks and cases of relatively small importance.

Mr. Lyttelton: And protecting industry too.

Mr. Wilson: And industry too. It will be for any person or trade with a grievance, including the cranks and the persecuted, to bring grievances to the Board of Trade. As the right hon. Gentleman will agree, this will not be anything new. We hope to refer to the Commission the most important cases from the point of view of public interest, especially those affecting the operation of important industries, and their capacity to maintain and expand export trade. But we do not intend to rule out cases which may appear to be quite small in their initial effect but which may cause harm to small traders. In any case, they will serve as test cases on which the Commission can build up a useful case law. I am in consultation with my colleagues on this question and I am satisfied that there are a number of cases where there is a strong *prima facie* argument for consideration by the Commission. I can assure the House that if this Bill is passed it will not be a dead letter and there is no question of the Commission suffering from under-employment.

In Clause 2, Subsection (1), there is a proviso

"that a reference shall not be made under this Subsection where the prevalence of the conditions in question is expressly authorised by or under any enactment."

This proviso, perhaps not unnaturally, has aroused public comment. It has been asked why public monopolies created by statute are excluded from inquiry and control as against private monopolies, and all kinds of sinister and unworthy explanations have been given for this proviso, so I had better explain the reasons for it.

It is true that by various statutes of this Parliament, and of previous Parliaments, monopolies have been established when it seemed to Parliament right that for technical or other reasons the public interest would best be served by the operation of the industry or service by a public monopoly. But when Parliament established that monopoly it laid down in general detail the conditions under which it would operate and the protections which it thought right the consumer or other traders affected should have against the possible abuse by the board or corporation of its monopoly powers. The statutes in question also provide for general powers of direction to be exercised by the appropriate Minister in relation to the board or corporation in question. In other words, the conditions under which these monopolies have been established

have already been through the most searching and detailed examination, not by a commission, but by the High Court of Parliament itself, and Parliament has laid down the conditions which are necessary for the full realisation of the public interest.

That is exactly what has not happened in the case of private monopolies or of some of the restrictive practices I have referred to, and in bringing these also before the searchlight of public inquiry and under the possibility of public control, we have put them, to a limited extent, on the same footing. [Laughter.] Well, take for example the fact that the Acts of Parliament providing for the nationalisation of coal-mines and the transport of this country have provided—

Mr. Lyttelton: Were all the Clauses of the Transport Bill fully discussed before the High Court of Parliament?

Mr. Wilson: That has been fully debated here before, and certainly every detail of the Transport Act has been more discussed than, for instance, the operations of the British and Allied Electrical Manufacturers' Association. In this case we have provided that there shall be no undue preference involving discrimination in favour of one trader or group of traders against another. But no trader has any such protection against a private monopoly or a restrictive trade association. This Bill at least provides the prospect that in appropriate cases such protection can be given. As I have said, in addition to the consumer councils and other measures of protection for the consumer provided for under the Coal Industry (Nationalisation) Act, the Board is subject to general direction in the exercise of its powers by the Minister of Fuel and Power, and no price-fixing monopoly is so subject to general direction. . . .

So this proviso does not discriminate in favour of public monopolies; rather it is based on the fact that where they have themselves been through the Parliamentary process before being allowed to function, it is only right that the public, through its Parliamentary representatives, should similarly have the right to satisfy itself on the operation of privately-owned monopolies. But public monopolies are by no means excluded from the operations of the Bill. If one of them were to engage in activities not directly provided for with prescribed safeguards under the statute—if, for instance, the National Coal Board were to make mining machinery—and if the other conditions of the Act were not fulfilled, it would be possible to have such activities brought before the Commission.

Further, we have provided in Clause 2 (2) that the Government can seek the expert advice of the Commission on the activities of a public board, even though there can be no formal reference under the Act. . . .

. . . In the modern world our view about international cartels must be very similar to what I have said about national cartels. They have the power to do harm, though they do not necessarily use that power. So in the International Trade Charter which has emerged from the Havana Conference there are international provisions quite similar to what is proposed in this Bill. The International Trade Organisation will first establish whether there is a *prima facie* case for inquiry into any monopoly or cartel about which complaint has been made by a member nation. If there is it will carry out a full investigation and may then decide whether the arrangements in question are having harmful effects on international trade. If it decides that they have, it may then

ask the members concerned to take action and may recommend particular remedies. Sub-section (1) of Clause 6 of the Bill enables us to find out the facts, and so to fulfil our obligations under the Charter—to supply the I.T.O. with the fact of an arrangement to which our nationals are parties. The question whether any national action will be required, following the international body's consideration of a particular case, will come at a later stage. At that stage, it would be necessary to make a full reference to the Commission if any question of sanctions arose.

Now I should like to come to the question of sanctions and the procedure which has to be followed before the sanctions can be used. I am quite confident—and I am sure that the House will agree—that publicity itself will operate, in the majority of cases, to cause a monopoly or association, which is acting against the public interest, to change its habits.

... Where the Commission recommends that a particular monopoly or price fixing arrangement is operating in a manner harmful to the public interest, the appropriate Government Department is empowered under the Bill to make an order, subject to affirmative Resolution of both Houses of Parliament, to prevent people entering into particular agreements, or to make existing agreements illegal; to put an end in particular cases to boycotts, stop lists and discrimination; to deal similarly with loyalty rebates, special discounts and other forms of preferential terms. Finally, powers are given in respect of conditional sales and other forms of conditional supply. . . .

Mr. Elwyn Jones (Plaiستow): . . . That 1919 committee reported that,

"the production of chemicals in this country is almost wholly in the hands of two great consolidations. In soap, tobacco, wallpaper, salt, cement and in the textile trades there are powerful combinations or consolidations of one or other kind which are in a position effectively to control output and prices."

The committee recommended that it would be desirable to institute in the United Kingdom machinery for the investigation of the operation of monopolies, trusts and combines. . . .

There was that report and various recommendations from distinguished committees, but no action was taken. In 1924 the Labour Government investigated this matter; but unfortunately they were not in power long enough to take action. In 1925 a Private Members' Bill—the Trusts and Combines Bill—was moved by hon. Members of the Labour Party; but that, of course, was not passed, because there was not sufficient support for it in the House. Those are matters of history; but they do show that the problem of abuse of monopoly has been an endemic feature of our community for far too long.

Now, happily, since the war, we are in a better position to be informed about the problems with which we are dealing. In America, since the end of the war there have been great State commissions of inquiry into the operations, not only of American Trusts and monopolies, but of international cartels and international trusts. There have been the Senate Committee on Patents, the Senate Committee under the Presidency of Mr. Truman, Senator Kilgore's Committee, and numerous inquiries by the United States Department of Justice. Their disclosures have been remarkable. They have explained, for instance, why Germany, which in 1918 was a defeated, broken Power, was

in 20 years in a position to challenge the world. The Kilgore Committee's findings have indicated quite clearly that the clue to that remarkable phenomenon was the power of the German cartels behind Hitler. The German cartels financed Hitler and helped him to power, as the right hon. and learned Member for West Derby (Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe) well knows. They continued to use their influence and connections throughout the world in order to promote German economic power for political, economic and, ultimately, military purposes.

The findings of the American committees on the operations of these cartels have indicated that on many occasions the cartels put profit before even patriotism. A member of the staff of Senator Kilgore's Committee, Darel McConkey, has produced a most informative book upon the subject of the operation of international cartels. He has indicated that the American committees found that the evidence proved overwhelmingly that these international cartels kept up prices, made vast profits, impaired the quality of goods, if necessary to make higher profits, made war on independent enterprises and restricted invention and technological changes.

I would like to give some instances from the investigations of these American committees into various important aspects of our international life. There is, for instance, the disclosure of the operation of the aluminium cartel, which I venture to bring to the attention of the House. In 1931 the aluminium cartel was formed and registered in Switzerland. It is very significant that these international cartels usually have their headquarters in small states. It may well be that this is done partly to free the operation of the cartels from the attention of Governments. When separate companies were formed to administer these cartels it is often found that the companies were registered in Switzerland, Belgium, Luxembourg or Lichtenstein, which happened in the bone glue, linoleum and electrical lamp industries. The Alliance Aluminium Co. was a world aluminium cartel, and aluminium manufacturers in all countries were members of it. On paper, the United States stood out of the aluminium cartel, because the anti-trust laws in the United States forbade cartels. But in practice the Aluminium Company of America adhered to every letter of the cartel agreement without formally being a member. The rules of this international cartel were very simple and characteristic, namely, to restrict production and increase profits. Those were the main objectives of the cartel.

The cartel operated quite satisfactorily and happily until the Nazis came to power, and the German Government decided to re-arm as quickly as they could. For that purpose, Goering needed as much aluminium as he could obtain for his aircraft. In these circumstances, the German members of the aluminium cartel asked to be released from their obligations to restrict production. In 1936, the cartel made a deal with the Nazis, by which they were to purchase their excess needs from the Aluminium Alliance, and in return were to receive as a gift, free of charge, 2,000,000 lb. of aluminium. The Aluminium company of Canada, as its share, gave the Nazis some 700,000 lb. of aluminium. That was at a time when, as we now know, the Nazi Government was deliberately preparing for aggression. After these arrangements, the international aluminium cartel exempted the German branch from observing any quotas, so long as they did not export and spoil the market. The effect of the cartel was seriously to

Continued on page 6.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free:
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 20. No. 11.

Saturday, May 15, 1948.

"Mine Own Executioner"

*I attempt from love's sickness to fly, but in vain.
 For I am myself my own fever and pain.*

The headlines in the press on May 6 told of the capitulation of the British Medical Association. Military terminology was used in certain of the editorial comments and the phrase "the end of organised resistance" had a familiar ring.

The *Times* newspaper, with that efficiency for which it is renowned, was able to publish an extract from the *British Medical Journal* two days before the periodical was itself published, a feat which only those familiar with the technique of weekly publication can appreciate. This extract stressed the hopelessness of further opposition to the National Health Service Act.

The Council of the B.M.A. met on Wednesday, May 5 and, after a seven hours' meeting, issued the statement, first heard on the 9 o'clock "B".B.C. news, advising the Medical Profession to co-operate with the Ministry of Health on certain conditions, or perhaps we should say on uncertain conditions.

Only an elementary knowledge of printing and publishing is needed to draw the inference that the *British Medical Journal* went to press before the Council met and that *The Times* had the comment in advance of the decision. If such is not the case we shall be happy to publish the *British Medical Journal's* disclaimer.

The Medical Profession is now in a bad way, but there are signs of hope. In spite of financial pressure of the worst kind, i.e. the threat of penury in old age, two thirds of the doctors voting expressed their disapproval of the Act and well over half the general practitioners, the "dogsbodies" of the scheme, voted against it.

Beveridgism has affected the Medical Profession very badly for some years, and P.E.P. has deluded it. Its present condition is due to its own fever for planning—hence the quotation which heads this article.

We predict that the planners' will be a Pyrrhic victory and that something as solid as a tile will descend upon the heads of the organisers of this "triumph."

The Representative Body meets on May 28, but it is doubtful if the Council's decision will be repudiated. The real resistance will come later.

"In Upper Galilee"

"In an Upper Galilee settlement, there is a Stock Farm for human beings. Fine figures of Jewish youths are imported, and breeding is accelerated. This blatant method of race production revolted us . . . I do not understand what all this is leading to—surely some form of Master Race, so similar, it seems, to the Nazis."—"Palestine Note-Book." *XIX Century*.

"Car Exports to Portugal"

Mr. F. A. R. M'Nab, whose letter to *The Scotsman* on "Car Exports to Portugal" we published in the issue of May 1, has replied to criticisms of his letter as follows, (*The Scotsman*, May 1):—

"6, Randolph Crescent, Edinburgh,
 "April 30, 1948.

"SIR,—Your readers will have read Mr. Gresham Cooke's letter of April 26, giving comparative figures for car exports to Portugal, with great interest, as I did. Mr. Cooke is in a much better position to give authoritative information on this subject than I am, and I have no doubt that the information given in his letter is true to the best of his knowledge and belief. Nevertheless, having surveyed the situation in Lisbon with my own eyes, I find it quite impossible to square the picture which I received there with the facts in Mr. Cooke's letter.

"I can quite appreciate that the manufacturers receive payment from the Treasury in sterling for the cars before they leave this country—they could not carry on otherwise—but the condition of the cars on Lisbon dock was so bad that it was quite obvious that no local agent had his capital tied up in them. I would recommend Mr. Cooke to go to Lisbon and see the position for himself. The dock in question is Alcantara.

"As to my survey of cars on the street, I can assure Mr. Cooke that I did not fall into the error he suggests. I was in America for three and a half years in 1942-45 driving a 1942 American car myself, and I can as easily distinguish an American post-war car from a pre-war (1942) one as I can a British car. The impression any visitor to Lisbon gets on first seeing the traffic is that there are no British cars there at all; then, gradually, as one gets used to it, one spots an odd one here and there, but never, having seen the position, will I be convinced that for every two American post-war cars on the street there are three British ones, as Mr. Cooke's figures suggest. Anyone who has been to Lisbon recently will agree that such a suggestion is quite fantastic.

"I am not the victim of any competitive propaganda in this matter, nor do I belittle the effort which the motor industry is making towards our national recovery. I write as an ordinary citizen, and Mr. Cooke's letter has not changed my mind. It has only convinced me that the motor industry is as much in the dark as to what is going on abroad as the rest of us are.—I am, etc."

Atomic Politics

"The White House is playing some very crude politics with the appointments to the Atomic Energy Commission. Obviously, nothing would please the President so much as another bitter dispute between GOP Senators about Lilienthal. The scrap over the Lilienthal appointment last year helped create the picture of a divided Republican majority. Truman profited in the public opinion polls; and the stock of Congress declined. Today, Mr. Truman is desperately seeking to recapture that happy situation by naming Lilienthal again, this time for a five-year term."—*Human Events*.

Food Talk

Mr. Strachey is going to Tanganyika for ground nuts. The widely held idea that he has reverted to his original diet is, however, erroneous.

The Great Betrayal

By C. H. DOUGLAS

(III)

There is really no room for doubt as to the nature and origin of the attack on the British Empire. It is fundamentally a cultural attack intended to eliminate or at least minimise the conception of human "quality" by substituting "equality"; and a recognition of this fact is the only key to a situation which is otherwise a mass of unrelated contradictions. It is an international attack, utilising national forces.

Attempts to define a culture are always unsatisfactory and inadequate, and the explanation of this can, I think, be found in its nature, which is four dimensional—it has an extension in Time, or it is not a culture. The ruling culture of the British Empire, and the feature which distinguishes it from many other contemporaries is tradition, *i.e.*, it is a true, not a spurious culture; and it is tradition more than any other factor, which the sponsors of dialectical materialism, Socialism, Marxism, and Communism, attack. There is little doubt that behind all of these is a Power which is completely aware of the reality of extension in Time, and of the immense dangers to which humanity is exposed by "a break with tradition." It is perhaps unnecessary to add that an extension in Time is only *one dimension*, but it is a *fundamental of quality*. ("My Word shall not pass away.")

Perhaps as elementary an introduction to this subject, in the political sense, as any other, is afforded by Spain under General Franco.

Times being what they are, it may be necessary to insist that I have neither intention or desire to apologise for General Franco, if he requires apology. What I do see quite clearly is that, with his associates, he defeated a primary attempt of Judaeo-Freemasonry, the Power which is using tradition to destroy tradition; that he stands as a protagonist, and a not unsuccessful protagonist, of the opposition to Judaeo-Masonic-Communism; that the culture of the British Empire, and its traditional basis, was a primary obstacle to the Masonic World Plan; and that, whether we like it or not, our natural ally in the present struggle is "Franco-Spain." And perhaps one of the greatest services rendered by the Canadian Royal Commission on Espionage was to uncover the existence of *e.g.*, *Englishmen*, "who placed loyalty to a (un-named) world Power above that which they owed to their own country"—a situation with which General Franco had to, and did, deal.

On April 17, 1948, the Washington (U.S.A.) *Times-Herald* published in a leader, portions of a correspondence which apparently passed between Sir Samuel Hoare, now Lord Templewood, then British Ambassador to Spain, and General Franco. So far as I am aware, this correspondence has not been published here. It may be noticed in passing that Lord Templewood belongs to a Quaker-Whig banking family, and that he was in Moscow at the time of the fall of the Czar.

On February 21, 1943, General Franco wrote to Sir Samuel Hoare:

"Our alarm at Russian advances is common not only to neutral nations, but also to all those people in Europe who have not yet lost their sensibilities and their realization of the peril.

"Communism is an enormous menace to the whole world and now it is sustained by the victorious armies of a great country, all those not blind must wake up.

"If the war's course continues unaltered it is evident that the Russian army will penetrate deeply into German territory. If this comes to pass, would it not be of the greatest danger for the Continent and for England, a sovietized Germany which would furnish Russia her secrets and war constructions, her engineers and specialists, giving that country the opportunity of building a huge empire extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific coasts?

"We think the situation extremely serious and we appeal to the British people's good sense to consider the matter; for if Russia occupies Germany nothing and nobody will stop her.

"If Germany did not exist, we Europeans would have to invent it, and it is ridiculous to think she could be replaced by a confederation of Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs and Romanians, who would rapidly convert to a confederation of Soviet states."

The test of science is prophecy.

Now listen to the sapience of the Quaker-Banker-Whig. He wrote:

"You say the greatest European danger is communism and that a Russian victory would mean the triumph of communism in European countries that would bring the destruction of European civilization and of Christian culture.

"Our point of view is, on the contrary, entirely different

"The feasible situation at the end of the war will be thus: French, English and American armies will occupy the European continent. These armies will be supplied with the best war weapons and would include fresh, first order troops, not wasted and tired as those of Russia's armies.

"I dare to bear prophecy that, at that moment, **THE GREATEST MILITARY POWER IN EUROPE WILL WITHOUT DOUBT BE THAT OF GREAT BRITAIN** . . . Consequently, British influence will be the greatest ever seen in Europe since the time of Napoleon's downfall.

"This influence will be supported by an enormous military power . . . with it we shall maintain full influence in all Europe and will help her reconstruction.

"So I accept no fear of afterwar Russian danger for Europe. Nor can I accept the idea that Russia will, at the end of the war, follow an anti-European policy of her own."

(To be continued)

AN EDITOR ON TRIAL.

REX v. CAUNT.

Alleged Seditious Libel.

(Official shorthand transcript of the Trial at the Liverpool Assizes of James Caunt, Editor of *The Morecambe and Heysham Visitor*, for alleged seditious libel against the Jewish People).

2/- NETT (Postage 1½d.)

Obtainable from:

K.R.P. Publications Limited, 7, Victoria St., Liverpool, 2.

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

prejudice the power of this and other countries to face Nazi aggression when it was visited upon us, and it resulted in a call some years ago, which we all remember, for our housewives to surrender their aluminium pots and pans.

In the field of synthetic rubber, the agreement between the constituent companies of another international cartel can be shown to have been very prejudicial to the preparedness of democratic countries to face the threat of Nazi aggression. It is a story which may well be familiar to hon. Members, but I venture to give the House an outline of it. In November, 1929, the I.G. Farben Company of Germany, then the biggest chemical combine in the world, signed an agreement with the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, which came to be known as the "Division of Fields agreement." It was an agreement whereby I.G. Farben agreed to stay out of the oil business so long as Standard Oil stayed out of the chemical business. In 1929, I.G. Farben took out a patent for the manufacture of synthetic rubber by the buna process. Standard Oil were doing their own work on synthetic rubber, and in 1937 they obtained a patent of their own for the butyl process. The tie up between I.G. Farben and Standard Oil resulted, in 1938, in Standard Oil giving the butyl process and the secrets of it to I.G. Farben, in return for a promise from I.G. Farben that Standard Oil would receive the details of the manufacture of buna rubber. Unfortunately, I.G. Farben held on to their secrets, the manufacture of synthetic rubber was not developed outside Germany and the result of this arrangement between these two vast world combines was that, when war ultimately came, the lack of synthetic rubber proved to be a very serious disadvantage to the democratic countries.

It is possible to give illustrations from many other fields of international cartels of the way in which these business arrangements over-rode the interests of patriotism and became a danger to the democratic way of life. These American inquiries have lifted the lid off international cartels, but unfortunately there have been no parallel inquiries in this country to indicate what part British combines and monopolies have played in these international cartels. It may well be that the international agreements of Imperial Chemical Industries are innocent and even helpful to our country, but it may well be, in view of the experience we have had of these inquiries into the activities of Standard Oil, that some of these I.C.I. cartel agreements have been positively harmful to the interests of this country.

One of the reasons why I welcome this Bill is that we shall now have an opportunity of finding out the facts. We know, for instance, that in 1929 I.C.I. joined the European nitrogen cartel. We know that in 1932 there was an agreement between I. G. Farben, the Royal Dutch Shell, Standard Oil and I.C.I. to form an international hydrogenation patents combine. We know that in 1932 I.C.I. joined the European dyestuffs cartel. Maybe all these agreements were not to the disadvantage of our country, but we should very much like them to be looked into. It is interesting to find that it appears from one of the reports of the American "Bone Committee" that in 1937 Du Pont and Imperial Chemicals merged their South American business and organised the company of Duperial of Brazil. I. G. Farben came into the field of this combine, and bought shares in a Duperial company in Argentina. The war came, and I.C.I. found it necessary to

do something about the situation in which they found themselves, being harnessed to a company belonging to the enemy power of Germany.

The reference by the Du Pont Company to the situation was somewhat delicate, namely, that "It was impracticable for Imperial Chemical Industries to be in partnership relations with a German company." This was after the war had started. The answer to this quandary given by these giants of the chemical world was this. Du Pont reported that arrangements had been made for repayment to I. G. Farben of the money advanced. The Du Pont Company informed I. G. Farben that they intended to use their good offices after the war to have I. G. Farben participation restored. This statement was made at a time when the German armies were sweeping over Europe, largely with the armaments and chemicals provided by I. G. Farben.

The American Anti-Trust actions and prosecutions have involved British companies to a certain extent, and it makes one curious as to what would be discovered if we had some thorough investigation in this country. We know that in America in September, 1944, the British firm of Borax Consolidated, Ltd., was charged with other companies with creating a world-wide monopoly of Borax, with refusing to sell to Allied purchasing agents, with maintaining exorbitant prices, with restricting output throughout the world, and with maintaining prices substantially in favour of Axis nations. We know that in the prosecution against firms engaged in the production of matches two British companies were involved, the British Match Corporation, and Bryant & Mays, Ltd.

In 1944, the United States Department of Justice filed an anti-trust suit against these two British companies and American and Swedish firms engaged in the production of matches. It is not a very pretty story. We have heard a good deal in this Debate about the encouragement of incentives, but the disincentive nature of these cartels is clearly shown in the history of the match. We know that the match cartel made it a point to buy up patents which might have threatened its monopoly of the match trade if any rival method of lighting cigarettes appeared. In 1931, two Hungarian inventors patented a match capable of striking hundreds of times before it wore out, and this patented match could be produced for 1½d. But it did not take long for the match cartel to get on the track of this dangerous threat to the match monopoly. The Swedish Match Company bought up this invention, and nothing more was heard of it. A similar fate befell the Ringier multi-light match, which would have been an equally useful invention for common humanity. Its suppression is typical of the functions of these cartels to maintain the private interests of its members at the expense of the comfort and well-being of the people of the world. This Bill should have been introduced long before in this country. We need to lift the stone of monopoly so that we can see what lies beneath it.

House of Commons: April 26, 1948.

News Service (Members' Names)

Major Beamish: I wish, with your permission, Mr Speaker, to raise a question which has had some publicity in the newspapers over the weekend, and in so doing I would like to apologise because I have given you so little warning of this matter, for reasons beyond my control. I apologise

also having been unable to warn the hon. Members concerned, in view of the fact that there are 57 of them.

This is a question concerned with a news service known as the Democratic and General News Service, incorporating the General News Service, whose offices are at 7a, Fitzroy Square, London, W.1, and of which the proprietor is Mr. Eric Cook. This news agency, I understand, does not normally serve the British Press, but specialises in serving the European and Empire Press. It is a news agency which distributes information throughout the world by cable, air mail and ocean mail. Copies of its productions are, apparently, mailed to members of the editorial board in this country.

The editorial board—I read from their publication of 19th December—consists of the following: Mrs. Braddock, M.P., member of the Labour Party National Executive; Mr. H. Lester Hutchinson, M.P.; Mr. John Platts-Mills, M.P.; Mr. Julius Silverman, M.P.; Captain Stephen Swingle, M.P.; and Mr. H. Gordon Schaffer. I am only concerned that, for the second time in a week, allegations have been made that hon. Members' signatures have been forged, or obtained in some way under false pretences, or, putting it in the best light, used for subversive purposes without the knowledge of the persons concerned. I have here 57 facsimile signatures of hon. Members of this House, of whom 55 are Socialists and two are Communists. These facsimile signatures follow a short covering letter recommending this news service.

I submit, with great respect, Sir, that this case, following as it has on what I may call the case of the Nenni telegram last week, is one of great gravity, which must cause all of us in the House, of all parties—and for that matter the whole country—deep concern. I submit, therefore, that these facts constitute a breach of privilege.

Mr. Bowles: Before you give your Ruling, Sir, may I put this point to you for your consideration? Surely, if no Member who has been mentioned by the hon. and gallant Member for Lewes (Major Beamish) has made any complaint to you or to the House that his name has been forged, it is not a matter which concerns the House.

Mr. Speaker: I confess that I have not had very long notice of this matter, although I appreciate the reasons why it came to me at such short notice. The fact is, however, that this is like the case the other day—an issue between a gentleman who is, I think, called Mr. Cook and a certain number of Members of Parliament. It is not a reflection on Parliament as a whole, and it is not really a matter which affects Privilege. It is a matter between some individual Members who, apparently, have had their signatures put down by mistake, or wrongly, and a gentleman called Mr. Cook. I cannot rule that there is a *prima facie* case of Privilege, although I confess that when names of Members are put down recklessly by all kinds of papers, on all kinds of occasions, it is a serious matter. It is not, however, a matter of Privilege, and the remedy lies between each of the hon. Members and the paper concerned. . . .

House of Commons: April 27, 1948.

Representation of the People Bill

Considered in Committee

THIRD SCHEDULE.—(*Proceedings at Parliamentary Elections.*)

Mr. Hurd (Newbury): I beg to move, in page 147, line 35, after "residence" to insert "nationality at birth."

The purpose of this Amendment is to show more clearly the nature of a candidate's British nationality. Under the present law, of course, a candidate has to be a British subject. This Amendment is designed to make it necessary for the candidate to declare whether he is British by birth or British by naturalisation—born in maybe Roumania, Poland or the United States. I have moved this Amendment because today many people strongly feel the need for preserving the British character of the British Parliament. We should all recognise that there is something in loyalty to the land of one's birth. We should also recognise that Communism has become an international conspiracy, and that the day may come when the British Parliament has to face the alien forces of Communism.

I submit to the Committee that in a crisis a man's judgment may be affected by his early upbringing. If his roots are in Bratislava, Warsaw or Belgrade, a man's actions in a crisis in Parliament may not be in the best interests of Britain. For very good reasons we are admitting large numbers of foreigners—and admitting them freely. We have had, I think, 95,000 new foreign workers brought in during the past year, and they will soon be qualifying for naturalisation.

I want to see that the electors do not unknowingly elect to the British Parliament candidates whose roots are far from Britain. That is all this Amendment seeks to do. There is nothing vicious in it. It is simply informative so far as the electors are concerned. It does not exclude anyone from becoming a candidate for Parliament, but it does ensure that the electors know a little about the man or woman for whom they are asked to vote. I need not say any more: I think I have made my point of view clear.

Mr. Gallacher: . . . There is no need for such an Amendment to be made in this Schedule. If a man or woman is good enough to be given British citizenship, then that man or woman is good enough to be elected to Parliament, irrespective of political views. I do not know what the political views of people naturalised in this country may be; they may be true blue Tory, they may be evanescent Liberals, or they may be mild moderate Labour—or they may reach a logical conclusion and accept the views of our forebears. Nobody ought to be so foolish as to propose that a person granted British nationality by naturalisation should be denied the ordinary rights of citizenship, or have to declare in a statement where he was born. What is important is not where he was born, but that he is a naturalised citizen, and is accepted as a naturalised citizen. That should be enough. The only purpose of making people declare where they were born would be the hope of creating prejudice against them. That is the only reason there can be, because it does not matter to the particular interest for which the candidate is standing. . . .

Mr. Baker White (Canterbury): I hope the hon. Member for West Fife (Mr. Gallacher) will forgive me if I do not follow him in his argument, save on the point of conspiracy, in connection with which I suggest that it might be a good thing if he were to read the spy trial report of the Royal Commission in Canada, from which he may be able to decide whether or not Communism is an international conspiracy.

Under our electoral laws it is possible for a complete stranger to go to any constituency and offer himself as a candidate for Parliament. It seems desirable that the electors should be enabled to know as much as possible about that candidate. Under the law of the land it is comparatively easy to change a name, so the name is no guide. Curiously

enough, the nationality at birth has to be declared when applying for the majority, if not all, of Government appointments. Similarly, the nationality at birth has to be declared when applying for a passport.

Mr. Hurd: It is shown on the passport.

Mr. Baker White: As my hon. Friend points out, it has to be shown on the passport permanently when one is travelling about the world. Today, we are faced with a completely new situation. Many thousands of men and women are coming into this country from abroad, and, unlike prisoners of war, they will not go away again, but they are coming here to stay for good. Just as the Huguenots and the Flemish peoples were absorbed into the life of this country, so will they, in due time, be absorbed. It may well be that some may wish to stand for Parliament. If they do, the public should know where they come from, and their original nationality. Therefore I support the Amendment.

Mr. Emrys Hughes (South Ayrshire): I want to support the point of view of the hon. Member for West Fife (Mr. Gallacher), because I rather resent the idea of Communism, which is merely an old English word, and a New Testament idea, being mixed up with the Communist Party or the Communist International. The theory of Communism, of which there is so much ignorance in this House, is not new; it is not a conspiracy, and it certainly is not the monopoly of any political party, but I rather suspect that the motive underlying this Amendment represents the point of view and the mental outlook of the Fascists. This is the sort of thing of which Hitler approved. Hitler demanded race purity; in Germany the whole idea was to create prejudice against the Jews. It is part and parcel of the mentality of the person who looks upon a foreigner as an inferior being. . . .

I hope that this reactionary Amendment will be rejected, not because I have any sympathy with the ideological attitude of the Communist Party, but because I do not believe that we should try to excite racial passions or racial prejudices in an election.

Mr. Ede: In my view a person is either a British subject or he is not. If a person is not a British subject he is not entitled to be nominated as a candidate for Parliament. If he is a British subject that, in my view, suffices, and I, as one who is responsible for having to admit into British nationality persons who are other than British subjects by birth, would deprecate an action which differentiated, after naturalisation, between one British subject and another. It is up to the electors of a constituency, by heckling, by attending at meetings, and by such other ways as may be open to them, to ascertain whether the candidate before them is a person to whom they should give their suffrages. If he is a British subject it is my view that there is no ground for him to have to state on his nomination paper how he came to be a British subject. There are some people who, if they had to put in their nationality at birth, would put Welsh; there are even some who would put Scottish. I have never described myself as English, although, so far as I can trace my ancestry back it is entirely English on both sides—which, of course, is a great disqualification for anything in England. . . .

Mr. Low (Blackpool, North): The right hon. Gentleman has, I think, imputed motives to my hon. Friends and myself which we do not have.

Mr. Shurmer (Birmingham, Sparkbrook): Why put down the Amendment?

Mr. Low: The right hon. Gentleman seems to think that we regard it as a dishonourable thing to have been born outside England. That is not the point at all. We think, and I feel that my hon. Friend made it clear, that that is a matter of information which should, with advantage to the electorate, be made known to them at the time of nomination. That, it seems to me, is the point of this Amendment. It is then for the electorate to decide whether they think such a person should come to the House of Commons or not. There really is not any question of necessarily holding a man born outside this country in less honour or less esteem than a man born in the country. . . . Why should we insist upon knowing this information about a man when he applies for a passport, or when he applies for certain situations under Government, and not insist upon knowing when he is applying to become a Member of the House of Commons? The right hon. Gentleman does not seem to have answered that point at all. If he has a satisfactory answer on that point perhaps we might begin to understand his case a little better than I do at present.

(To be continued)

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England.....	8d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

Also

Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit.....	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage.....	7/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	5/-
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
Protocols of Zion	1/6
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans	
by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
"Pages from <i>The Social Crediter</i> ".....	1½d.

(Full list on application).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.