

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 12.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 22, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

### The Great Betrayal

By C. H. DOUGLAS

(IV)

Perhaps it is desirable, at this stage, to bring again into prominence the practical importance of recognising the world's ill as the result of a long-term policy. A skilful propaganda to the contrary has been linked with anti-Christianity. Reference to the subject has been made before, but, *e.g.*, the course of events in Alberta demonstrates that it will bear constant recall.

The first point on which to be clear is that if we are *not* faced with a long-term policy, our position is quite hopeless. If every step in the industrial arts merely confronts us with more devastating wars, more restrictions and controls, and, except in the United States, a lower standard of life, mankind is so hopelessly perverse that his only tolerable future lies in early annihilation, more especially in view of our decreasing (average) intelligence. But if we are facing a Satanic policy, our position, although very serious, is not necessarily irremediable. But we must first face the facts. No policy, no cure. Clear policy, clear problem. A problem clearly stated is half solved. The second aspect of this situation is equally indisputable. Policies *in vacuo* are a contradiction in terms. Policies embody strategies; you do not fight a strategy, you fight the human beings who are carrying out that strategy. "It's the system we're fighting not men" is one of those half-truths which are of the greatest assistance to the Enemy Generals.

Akin to this is the "anti-anti" or "anti-negative" propaganda. Without attaching too much importance to the fact that a double negative is a positive (*i.e.*, an anti-anti Jew or Russian is, by definition, a pro-Jew or Russian, not a neutral) it is fairly obvious that the main use of this technique is to stampede the innocent into disclosing their position, thus being put on the defensive. The best defence is attack. Do you propose to allow your enemy a monopoly of it?

This raises the question of (a) The inimical objective; (b) The Enemy troops.

For clarity and brevity it would be difficult to improve on St. Matthew iv, 8-9: "And the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down, and worship me." That is an offer of World Dominion, on condition of the acceptance of collectivism—the worship of the group idea.

In these days, we are fortunate in one thing, if in no more. We can actually see and read in our daily paper that the devil's offer has been accepted, and two attempts, the League of Nations, and U.N.O. have been set up. By their

fruits, ye shall know them.

Now as to the troops. As Mr. Jaques so clearly brought out in his speech, much, and probably the most important part of the organisation of the World State is financial and industrial—the control of credit and raw materials.

While it is difficult to deny the existence of such organisations as the international chemical trust, the World Bank and international monetary fund and similar world cartels, because they are visible to the eye and mentioned in the newspapers, their relation to the world state is not so visible and not so easily exposed. But if we grasp the fact that the essence of Communism, which is the politics of the World State, is centralised vesting of the planet in an organisation expropriating and cutting across all local and personal sovereignty, we cannot be much in error if we identify internationalists, open or concealed, with treason to the individual and his race and country. In an earlier part of the speech by Mr. Jaques to which reference has been made, he remarked, "The hon. Member for Macleod said, if I remember correctly, that there are just two kinds of people in the Civil Liberties Association (a Canadian "Red Front"), traitors and stooges, the dupes." *Ceteris paribus*, it appears to me to be true that any organisation which is working to transfer sovereignty from those who are associated under a national constitution, to those who have secretly concocted an international constitution by the misuse of national resources, whether those persons are working inside or outside the country, are enemies of, and traitors to, believers in the national conception. Their motives may be diverse and obscure; but when you see an enemy soldier, obviously working for your destruction, you do not investigate his motives, you shoot.

There are myriads of organisations which are working to destroy nationality (*not* Stateship) ranging from the highly "respectable" Royal Institute of International Affairs openly financed by cartels (Chatham House, whose secretary, Dr. Toynbee, said "we are working secretly, but with all our might, to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations") to the hundreds of Communist shop-stewards in industry working like musk-rats to cripple and disrupt local control. And, it should be remembered—there is a lucrative career in it.

The "Canadian" Broadcasting Corporation is notoriously "Red", and the genealogy of its parent organisation, the "B".B.C., as well as its peculiar form of extra-national management and its link with the patent monopoly of the Marconi network, can best be viewed as the functionalised monopoly of information. The London School of Economics has linked internationalists (frequently, but not always, Jews) in key positions in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

So far as the population of these islands is concerned, the triumph of the traitors has produced swift and spectacular results. Mr. Attlee's Administration claims that there are more persons gainfully employed (*i.e.*, being paid paper

money) than ever before. Not only that, but they are (so it is said) more efficiently directed, using more power and better machines and methods than would have been deemed possible in the time.

To which I should myself comment that not ten *per cent.* of the population is really better off, by which I mean has more control over its material and spiritual destiny, than it had fifty years ago, and this includes the New Kommissary) and ninety *per cent.* are not merely worse off, but their prospects are infinitely worse. That is where they have been brought by "traitors and stooges," in an era of unparalleled advancement in the industrial arts, directly and solely due to individual initiative.

If that were all, it would be serious enough. But the basic wealth of a nation is in its intangibles. It is faith which moves mountains, and the decline of faith is perhaps the most noticeable change in the general population. No-one believes in anything or anyone, any more. Let us eat, drink, and be merry in the Black Market, for to-morrow one more big racket will be put over on us. So far from the consumer being always right, he no longer has any rights, he merely has a few coupons. He doesn't give his orders to the shopkeeper, he gets what the "Co-operative" decides to let him have, of any quality or none, and if he doesn't like it, he mustn't throw it away—it's an "offence."

And if any explanation is required or given; it's the export drive. He is told to save, and his savings are taken off him by Government-stimulated rising prices, taxation, and down-right confiscation. He "buys" a house, and pays ten times what his grandfather did for the same house, and finds he hasn't bought it; it can be, and is, "requisitioned" at the instance of any obscure alien in a selected bureau. Until it is, and sometimes after, he pays in rates and taxes more than the original rent, for the privilege of "owning" it. If he murmurs, one of his conquerors tells him that "we" don't intend an Englishman's home to be his castle. In fact, "we" will see that it isn't. Why not emigrate? "We've plenty to replace you, and we are replacing you—you've served our turn."

(To be continued).

### Compulsory Voting

The Editor,

*The Social Crediter,*

Dear Sir,

It would be a mistake for the readers of your paper *The Social Crediter*, to accept without individual investigation the reports given by Parliamentary "representatives" on countries other than England. For example Sir W. Smiles in your paper of March 27 stated that in Canada we had compulsory voting. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is a movement under way to make voting compulsory, however, but it is not the practice yet, unless one of the Provinces has instituted a measure, in which case Canada cannot be said to have compulsory voting.

Sincerely,

Edmonton, Alberta, April 26.

ROY. H. ASHBY.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: April 27, 1948.*

### Representation of the People Bill

Considered in Committee

[The Debate continued:—]

*Mr. Grimston:* I do not think the Home Secretary has quite grasped what lies behind the Amendment. The hon. Member for North Blackpool (Mr. Low) has touched on one point. It is also the fact that anybody who is applying for His Majesty's commission in any of the Armed Forces has to disclose his nationality at birth. That has been the practice for some time. I find it very difficult to see why, when a person who is applying for a position in the Services has to disclose that information, it is regarded as raising prejudice if we ask that a would-be Member of Parliament should disclose the same information to his constituents. There is another point. The Home Secretary said that electors find these things out by heckling a candidate at election time. I should have thought it would be very much better to have the information straight out on the nomination paper, instead of encouraging inquiries about that sort of thing at meetings. Everything ought to be done to remove personalities from politics when an election campaign is being fought, and that is what this Amendment would do. If anybody who was not a British subject at birth had to declare it on his nomination paper everybody would know it, and there the matter would rest.

I do not believe that this disclosure of information would prejudice a candidate. It would be much more prejudicial if it were dragged out of him by personal haggling during the course of the campaign. I cannot understand what is the objection to a person who is seeking to become a Member of this House being asked to disclose his nationality and birth. It passes my comprehension. I have observed in this Debate that the proposal seems to fill the Communist Party with horror. The most violent objection to this Amendment was raised by the Communist Party.

*Mr. Gallacher rose—*

*Mr. Grimston:* I will give way in one moment. What is the real objection to this proposal? We have not received a satisfactory answer to that question.

*Mr. Gallacher:* The hon. Gentleman must not have been paying attention to the arguments put forward by the hon. Gentleman for Newbury (Mr. Hurd). His argument was that this Amendment was necessary in the Bill to keep a candidate who was a Communist, but who was not born in this country, from getting into Parliament.

*Mr. Grimston:* If that were the reason for the Amendment I would have thought the hon. Gentleman would not have been afraid of it, and would have been ready to accept it.

*Mr. Gallacher:* It is such a nonsensical argument.

*Mr. Grimston:* No adequate answer has been given as to why this proposal should not be accepted. We have to have regard to what is happening today. The Government are in the forefront in warning us of the dangers occurring in Eastern Europe, and which is creeping ever closer to this country. Then they resist an Amendment which asks for the disclosure of the nationality of a Parliamentary candidate.

*Mr. Selwyn Lloyd:* I was unimpressed by the answer of the Home Secretary. Apparently there are two reasons

for opposing the Amendment. The first is that the person who was born abroad and wishes to stand for Parliament in this country should be ashamed of that fact. But he is ashamed of the fact he is not the right sort of person to put himself forward at an election. The second reason is one which we continually find quite common among hon. Members opposite—a fundamental distrust of the common sense of the British electorate—if we trust the electorate—and they are capable of coming to a private judgment on these matters—why not tell them the facts? The very fact that hon. Members opposite say that the country of origin of a candidate should be concealed seems to me to suggest that the electorate would draw a false idea from this disclosure. That is wholly in line with the other analogies drawn about this Amendment.

*Mr. Keeling* (Twickenham): I recall a by-election in which the Conservative candidate was not born in the country, and his opponents got out placards which announced that fact. That would be more unfair to the candidate, whatever party he belonged to, than the simple specific statement on the nomination paper of the country of his birth.

Amendment negatived.

House of Commons: May 6, 1948.

### Fuel and Power Coal/Oil Conversion Schemes

1. *Mr. Erroll* asked the Minister of Fuel and Power if he will now make a statement on the coal/oil conversion programme.

[Two more questions on the same subject were asked].

*The Minister of Fuel and Power* (*Mr. Gaitskell*): The House will recall that the coal/oil conversion programme was started in the spring of 1946, at a time when our coal stocks were shrinking and there was plenty of fuel oil. By June, 1947, however, the oil supply position had changed radically and it was decided that no more conversion schemes could be authorised. By December, 1947, largely owing to the astonishing increase in American consumption, the world shortage had become more acute and it became necessary to defer the completion of unfinished schemes authorised earlier in the year.

Since then, there has been little improvement, while the closing of the Haifa refinery has created fresh difficulties. Accordingly, it will not be possible at present for all the postponed schemes to come into operation and in the majority of cases, the firms concerned must continue to burn coal, probably for some considerable time to come. The only exceptions to this will be schemes of conversion which have exceptional economic merit, e.g., in certain cases of steel, glass and pottery production, where the actual process of converting to oil is nearly completed. The firms concerned will be notified shortly.

*Mr. Erroll*: Can the Minister give a guarantee that existing consumers of fuel oil will get their full supplies; and can he make any statement in regard to the oil firing of Bankside Power Station?

*Mr. Gaitskell*: As regards the first part of the supplementary question, I think that we can take it that there will be sufficient oil for those firms which have already converted; it is because we want them to have enough oil that we have

deferred the conversion of others. I have no statement to make about Bankside Power Station.

*Mr. Odey*: Will the Minister bear in mind that many of these industrial firms changed over to oil from coal at the Government's request, and will he see that those firms that carried out the Government's policy will not be put to any financial loss in the matter?

*Mr. Gaitskell*: We cannot admit any claims for compensation of this kind. The process of conversion was a voluntary one, although I agree that the Government gave it encouragement.

### COAL INDUSTRY. Disputes (Output Losses).

*Mr. Boyd-Carpenter* asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what quantity of coal was lost as the result of industrial disputes in the mining industry in 1947; with similar figures for 1946.

*Mr. Gaitskell*: The estimated quantity of saleable coal lost as the result of industrial disputes in the mining industry in the year 1947 was 1,643,500 tons. The corresponding figure for 1946 was 769,800 tons.

*Mr. Baker White*: Would the Minister agree that the number of disputes and the quantity of coal lost in the first quarter of this year are greater than in the first quarter of last year?

*Mr. Gaitskell*: That is another question.

House of Commons: May 5, 1948.

### Enforcement Inspectors

*Mr. Thornton-Kemsley* asked the Minister of Food how many additional food enforcement inspectors will be required, and at what annual cost, to replace the part-time inspectors previously made available by local authorities who have now been released.

*Dr. Summerskill*: The number of full-time enforcement inspectors required is about half the number of part-time inspectors whom they are replacing. The overall cost will be about the same.

*Mr. Thornton-Kemsley*: Is it not unwise to dispense with the services of these local inspectors of weights and measures who, because of their local knowledge, have been of great service during the war and up to now?

*Dr. Summerskill*: Our experience convinces us that a full-time inspector is more efficient.

*Mr. Langford-Holt*: Are these enforcement officers employed on a temporary basis?

*Dr. Summerskill*: That is the whole point of the Question. They are full-time officers.

*Mr. Langford-Holt*: Are they on a temporary basis?

*Dr. Summerskill*: No, Sir.

*Mrs. Middleton*: Will the Parliamentary Secretary make a serious attempt to see how far the work of these food enforcement officers can be integrated with that of inspectors of weights and measures, especially in urban areas, and so save manpower by getting rid of unnecessary duplication?

*Dr. Summerskill*: Those are two different questions. The part-time people we were employing dealt with weights

(Continued on page 5.)

## 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. 12.

Saturday, May 22, 1948.

### From Week to Week

The best of our information suggests that this country, apart from the trained groups of Communist and other Fifth Columnists, is politically apathetic to an extent which can only be fully explained pathologically. However adverse the general comment on Mr. Attlee's Administration may be, and it is generally mildly adverse, there is not a sign that any considerable body of the electorate is looking for an alternative. The feeling is all the other way, although the reason is curious, and may quite easily be sound, in the odd British tradition. "They've got us into this mess, they can — well get us out" is a common form in which it is phrased. That it is defeatist cannot be doubted; the Party game has been played once too often.

Perhaps one of the most hopeful signs in a drab outlook is the astonishing growth of criticism regarding the structure of the Constitution. One, but only one of many, indications of this was offered by the enthusiasm of the crowds on the occasion of the modest Silver Jubilee celebrations of T.M. The King and Queen. We have no doubt whatever that our Fifth Columnists both inside and outside the country, as well as our open enemies, received almost the first major shock of the past three years from the disclosure that an intangible component of the real British Empire still remained to be dealt with.

It is probably an indication of the extent to which the Church of England, regarded as an organisation, has become honeycombed by Freemasonic and Communistic ideas, that the Archbishop of York in his enunciation of human rights, significantly omitted any reference to the right to own property — a right on which the Roman Catholic Church has always placed emphasis as a basis of freedom. It will be recalled that the Preamble to the American Declaration of Independence originally contained the phrase "the right to hold and own property" but under Masonic influence, said to be exercised through Jefferson, the meaningless phrase, "the pursuit of happiness" was substituted.

Various parties of U.S. oil prospectors are drilling all over Baluchistan, N.W. India (Pakistan).

Dear, dear, it hasn't taken long for the little pussies to gallop out of the bag, has it? How proud the generations of British who have served and died in the North West Provinces ought to be. But the Baluchis may yet have something to say.

(1) "The wrecks of ill-judged innovations are as much a peril to social navigation as are the rocks of vested interests."

- (2) "The idealism of the masses is in fact a greater obstacle to peace than their Chauvinism, for while the latter is latent and sporadic, the former is constant and more flattering to self esteem."
- (3) "In its approach to the problems of world policy modern rationalism inevitably puts police ahead of politics. It tends towards legalism, ideologies, and formulas, and however logical these may seem from its own standpoint, in application they are bound to be reactionary and productive of further conflict."
- (4) "The idea of peace by force in a dangerous and costly illusion. The integrative organs of a world economy cannot be designed in advance. They will grow out of experience, and assume forms and methods different from anything we have now."

—Professor W. A. Orton, *The Liberal Tradition*, quoted in *The Australian Social Crediter*.

"He (Mr. Nathan Laski) said candidly, that in spite of anything Mr. Joynson-Hicks might say, he was first and foremost, a Jew; and in spite of his life-long adhesion to Liberalism, if Mr. Churchill had not satisfied him on the questions they had put to him as Jews, he would not have been on his platform that day. It was because he was able to get more from Mr. Churchill than from Mr. Joynson-Hicks that he supported Mr. Churchill."—*Manchester Guardian*, April 21, 1908, quoted from the *Free Press*, 1939.

While most people have an instinctive feeling that the coming Palestine War differs in some way from its predecessors, it is probable that few of them could put that feeling into explanatory formula.

A speech made by a Toronto Jewish M.P., Mr. David Croll, K.C., on February 26, indicates clearly that the Jews themselves are under no delusion as to the fundamental nature of that difference, which is that, probably for the first time in two thousand years, they are committed to fight, and possibly lose, a war for themselves, in place of fomenting conflict between Gentiles whose losses are their gain. Mr. Croll's brilliant effort to commit the Canadian Government to place its forces at the disposal of the "United" Nations Organisation, primarily intended for use in such and similar Jewish exigencies, is only second in importance to the obvious lack of enthusiasm with which it was received.

But we think that this situation requires close attention in the light of the quotation from Mr. Nathan Laski's speech in support of Mr. Winston Churchill forty years ago. In this matter, if in no other, we cannot complain that the Jews have ever concealed that they are Jews first and what-have-you afterwards.

There is a solid body (for Jewish purposes) of Jews and crypto-Jews in the present Administration and titular opposition of this country. If we do not realise and guard against that situation, our day is done.

Fortunately, there is quite surprisingly clear appreciation of the game, amongst the rank and file, and a readiness to express their dislike of it.

### Sedition in India

It is with regret that, for reasons which our readers will have little difficulty in conjecturing, we find ourselves prevented from giving wider publicity to the Lecture on Sedition in India to which reference was made in our issue of April 24.



## A Canadian Bishop and Social Credit

Following upon a newspaper report prejudicial to Social Credit, and particularly the Quebec Union of Electors, which drew public comment from the Bishop of Amos, Mgr. Desmarais, the organiser of the union, M. Laurent Legault, and M. Réal Caouette, the Member of Parliament for Pontiac, were received by the Bishop, who authorised publication of the statement that he had not condemned, nor wished to condemn either the teaching or the movement with which they were associated. This fact emerges from a broadcast by M. Louis Even, the text of which is published in *Vers Demain* for April 15.

There M. Even said:—

"Social Credit is not a religion. The Union of Electors is not a religious organisation. The one and the other belong to the temporal domain, economic and political. The Church, as such, does not regard itself as having any competency in the temporal order of technical matters. She is careful to say so, and to repeat it when necessary. Technical methods, however, are means to objectives, themselves inspired by ideas with which religion and morality have the right to concern themselves.

"Social Credit proposes a reform of the distributive economy, by the introduction of a periodical dividend to everyone and of a compensatory adjustment of price. This distributive economy envisaged by Social Credit is a method in the service of an idea. What idea? The idea that every human being, without exception, should have a share in material goods, throughout his life on earth.

"Has that idea ever been condemned by the Church? Quite the contrary; the whole social teaching of the Church is centred on the same objective. Not to all an equal share—no, but to each and to all a just share in the product of nature and of industry, for we heed the Pope's own words; and this just share should suffice for an honest subsistence.

"Neither the Church nor any responsible authority in the Church has accordingly condemned this idea, which she preaches herself. Neither has she condemned the means which we propose for the accomplishment of this end, for technical matters are not her province.

"And what about the Union of Electors? Here we pass from an economic plan to a political plan. What is the Union of Electors? It is a political prescription, which we seek to substitute for the prescription of the political parties such as they are to-day.

"So the Union of Electors is also a technique, a political technique. This technique is also a method in the service of an idea. What idea? The idea that the men in power, the representatives of the people, should be at the service of the general wellbeing, at the service of the temporal prosperity of all and not at the service of powerful private interests.

"Has this idea ever been condemned by the Church? Not at all. Quite the contrary: it constitutes, conformably to St. Thomas, the guiding principle of all government which has a sense of responsibility, a sense of its proper function.

"No Bishop, neither any responsible authority in the Church, has ever condemned the idea of a government responsible for general temporal prosperity.

"As for the diverse political prescriptions, formulae, monarchies, republics, political parties of one name or another, Citizens' Leagues, Unions of Electors—these are methods, and,

as such, belong to the domain of the purely temporal. When the Church pronounces against a movement, it is not on account of its formula, but because of the evil end which it pursues, or of the evil means which it employs. That is why the Church condemns the parties and other organisations which propagate Communism.

"The declaration signed conjointly at Quebec on October 13, 1943, by all the archbishops and bishops, French and English, of the Canadian Provinces, and drawn up by Cardinal Villeneuve, declares specifically that Canadian Catholics are free to ally themselves with any political grouping they may choose, provided they do nothing to promote Communism. There once for all is the point which decides and which brings to naught the mendacious and tendentious assertions of party journals concerning Social Credit and the Union of Electors."

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

and measures, and they will continue to do so, but this is a full-time man employed by our Department.

## Foreign Affairs (Western Union)

*Mr. Zilliacus* (Gateshead): The general purpose of the European Recovery Programme has been stated quite accurately in a source which may surprise some hon. Members who hear it quoted by me—but I am always in favour of realism wherever I find it. I refer to the May number of the "Review of Stock Exchange quotations," in which this passage occurred:

"The Marshall Plan has been conceived, not as an adjustment of war expenditure, nor as a temporary loan to tide over a period of rehabilitation, but as a political move which by helping Europe to rebuild Western civilisation will prevent the spread of Communism. The American Administration clearly has in mind the restoration in Europe of a state of economic equilibrium founded on a price mechanism which, within reasonable limits, permits the free operation of the profit motive and the encouragement of private enterprise."

*Mr. Osborne*: What is wrong with that?

*Mr. Zilliacus*: It goes on:

"Great Britain cannot lightly escape the responsibility thrust upon her of leading western civilisation back to sanity, but if we are to succeed in this task many of the Labour Party's most ardent theories will have to be tempered by the cold logic of realism, necessitating a re-orientation of outlook of which there are already welcome signs."

Let us see how that is applied to the steel industry. The *New York Herald Tribune* on April 25 reported from London that:

"Labour Government chiefs have their fingers crossed on the appointment of Averell Harriman as roving Ambassador to keep in touch with participating nations under the European Recovery Programme. They know Mr. Harriman is a strong personality with pronounced views on government planning and Socialism. They have a pretty shrewd idea that Mr. Harriman is unfavourably disposed toward the theory of nationalisation. And he is liable to be in Britain or very nearby just when the all-out fight will commence on nationalisation of the iron and steel industry. They wonder how far Mr. Harriman, his pockets bulging with Marshall dollars, will go behind the scenes in opposition to this nationalisation project."

Behind Harriman is his boss Paul G. Hoffman of the Studebaker Corporation, who has gone on record as a fervent believer in the blessings of free enterprise and capitalism. Behind Paul Hoffman are the wide powers of the Marshall Plan and E.R.P., and behind that again Congress with its whiphand because of its voting Marshall Plan appropriations by annual instalments. Behind that again is the Administration. The man who seems to be emerging as favourite in the running for the Republican Presidential candidate is Mr.

Harold Stassen. Whoever is Republican candidate this time is in for all practical purposes. Mr. Stassen has gone on record repeatedly, emphatically and publicly as holding that any European State receiving American aid must refrain from any further Socialist experiments during period of receiving American assistance. He was asked at a Press conference in Washington whether that meant nationalisation of the British steel industry, and he said, "Yes." He was then asked what he would do if the British disregarded his view and went ahead and nationalised their steel industry notwithstanding. He said that, of course, he could not interfere in British internal affairs, but that in such circumstances Britain would become a bad risk, and the U.S.A. could not invest money in a bad risk. So much for controls, loss of national independence and American interference in the internal affairs of the participating States.

As to the powers of the Marshall Plan, a close study of it was made by two American economists in the *New Republic* of January 12. They summed up the Marshall Plan, as it had gone to Congress, as follows:

"It is not a program of European self-help by united effort, but is essentially a plan for the extension of American influence.

1. It is not directed toward industrial development and stable trade.

2. It does not encourage European economic co-operation.

3. It subordinates Western Europe economically to western Germany.

4. It imposes a large measure of American control on the internal economies of Western Europe."

*Sir Arthur Salter* (Oxford University): Is not the hon. Member rather surprised, in view of the opinion he is now expressing as to the predominant view in America, that a Republican Congress of America—after three years experience of, and knowledge of the fact that there is a Socialist Government in this country—has passed the Marshall Plan with no kind of discrimination and, indeed, has put forward a preliminary estimate under which the biggest single recipient of that aid is this Socialist Government?

*Mr. Zilliacus*: The Plan provides for a measure of control and policies which are quite effective in checking any further measures of Socialisation, and even in rolling back what has been done. [HON. MEMBERS: "Nonsense."] Somebody says "nonsense," but let me give a few more facts. It is facts that count, not feelings. The American administrator must approve each export country by country, and project by project, thus exercising direct American control over a large part of Europe's foreign trade. Then there are the blocked accounts in which we pay the equivalent in our own currency of any help received from the United States, and on which we can only draw for purposes approved by the United States. The *New Republic* continues:

"The huge blocks of local currencies coming under American control will give Washington decisive influence in the internal economies of the participating countries.

To obtain assistance, each participating country must agree to follow American principles with respect to currency stabilisation, rate of exchange, tariffs and foreign-trade controls."

That is what Secretary of the Treasury, John Snyder, said a few months ago, and I see now that the European States who participate in the scheme have to send Washington letters of intent. That struck a particularly poignant chord in me, because they apparently take the form of individual undertakings to be loyal to American principles and policies in international economic relations. The *New Republic* goes on to say that:

"the whole weight of American pressure will be used to hamper nationalisation of basic industries and to break down restrictions against unessential imports."

There is the provision for acquiring strategic raw materials and then there are the provisions for the pressure of such controls which:

"will compel Europe to open its doors to wall Street investments and American branch plants. The proposed economic co-operation bill specifically guarantees such projects for 14 years up to \$800 or \$850 million—five per cent. of the total cost of the program. But even more important, the exercise of economic controls by the United States is in itself a guarantee to American big business against European nationalization programs and against blocking the transmission of profits made in the participating countries."

That is the Marshall Plan. Unfortunately the scheme is likely to be economically unworkable, because it is tied to American foreign policy. By the Mundt Amendment passed by Congress, making explicit what was all along implicit—the United States reserves the right to forbid the export to East European countries of any goods made with materials supplied from America, provided the export of such goods is also forbidden by the United States, and that means American control of our foreign economic policies. It means our being unable to develop trade with the Eastern European countries and with the Soviet Union in precisely those goods which those countries want.

*Mr. M. Philips Price* (Forest of Dean) rose—

*Mr. Zilliacus*: I am sorry, I am speaking against time.

The other reason why it is unworkable is that a condition of receiving American help in France and Italy is to split these countries horizontally by supporting regimes which exclude the working class and the trade unions from any measure of power. Neither France nor Italy can be reconstructed without the full support, confidence and co-operation of the workers in those countries.

*Mr. Osborne*: Would the hon. Member refuse to accept Marshall aid altogether?

*Mr. Zilliacus*: I have said several times in this House that the way we can get the good out of the Marshall Plan, and avoid the dangers, is by coupling it with a policy of full trade and friendly political relations with the Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union. . . .

*Mr. Osborne*: Who is stopping it?

*Mr. Zilliacus*: That is the only way we can get out of the present jam and make the thing work. The worst of all is that the whole scheme of Western Union is linked up to American defence policy, and American defence policy towards Western Europe is that in a war with the Soviet Union Western Europe is expendable. The U.S. will fight in Western Europe to the last Englishman, to the last Frenchman and to the last native of Spaakistan, but they expect Western Europe to be over-run and wiped out, and propose to carry out a counter-offensive through the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East.

Those are the reasons why Western Union conceived on these lines is mortally dangerous. . . .

*Sir Arthur Salter* (Oxford University): . . . I can find nothing with which to agree in the speech of the hon. Member for Gateshead (*Mr. Zilliacus*) . . . I wish that he were in the House at this moment, for I would much sooner say in his presence than in his absence what I am about to say, and what I hope he will, at least, read in HANSARD.

I think I have never heard a more poisonous or more

pernicious speech. I do not think it will do immense harm—certainly in this country—because I cannot believe that anyone who is at all hesitating whether he will be on his side or the other will be anything but repelled by what he said. I do not think the hon. Member is very well qualified to speak on behalf of “our people.” I do not think he is very well qualified to speak on behalf of his party—if, indeed, it is still his party: I have not read the stop press news tonight. I do not think he is very well qualified to criticise, with the viciousness with which he did criticise, Tory Members whom he accused of appeasing Hitler before the last war. I do not think his record at that time was such as to give him any special right to criticise them in the tone and temper he did. But if he does criticise appeasement in that tone, or temper, that does not particularly qualify him for now advocating a form of appeasement that goes even further in regard to a menace not less serious. Those of his words that may do some harm were those which he spoke about the United States of America. Really, I have hardly ever heard anything so fantastically untrue and ridiculous. He talked of power politics, and of America’s exercising an influence upon the way of life of other peoples. It is quite true that America, like ourselves and practically every other country now, is interested in what is happening in other countries, and is trying to exercise an influence. One would not have gathered from the hon. Member that there was any other country in the world that was trying to affect the fate of other countries; and still less would one have gathered from him what is the difference between the kind of influence that America is exercising and the kind of influence that that other country is, in fact, exercising.

What is the purpose of America in the policy she is now pursuing? It is not, indeed, accurate to say, as the Foreign Secretary seemed to say a few weeks ago, that in the Marshall Plan she has only a humanitarian purpose and no political purpose. Of course, she has a political purpose. Her purpose is primarily political. But what is that purpose? It is a political purpose very much like our own during the war—the purpose of preserving her own and other people’s freedom. It is in that sense, and in that sense only, that she is exercising an influence on political movements in the free countries of Western Europe. The distinction she has made, and the only distinction she has made, in her foreign policy, in regard to the whole conception and framing of the Marshall Plan, is the distinction between countries which have free Parliamentary systems and which decide their own fates, and countries which have tyranny and which attempt to impose that tyranny on other countries against their will. How can any hon. Member now say in this House that we ought to take an exact middle line between these two opposing policies? The classic example of the mayor who said on taking office that he would do his best to keep the middle way between partiality and impartiality is nothing compared to such a fantastic goal and objective. Here, on the one side, is America directing her policy to giving countries that are still free any help that they may desire in preserving that freedom, and within that freedom deciding what ever may be the form of domestic policy they wish, whether Socialism or not Socialism; and, on the other side, there is the other country imposing by force, menace and intrigue her own system of slavery upon others. I do not know that I need go further in answering the hon. Member for Gateshead. . . .

*Mr. Rhys Davies (Westhoughton):* . . . So far as I am aware, there are over 60 sovereign countries in the world,

but no two nations in the world have ever been governed alike, and I doubt whether any two will ever be governed alike. If I read history correctly, in olden times it was argued that peace could be secured in the world if all human beings were either Catholics or Protestants. Another group in the Far East and the Middle East declared that if all mankind were to become Mohammedans peace would prevail. Then, I remember the old folk in the village where I was bred and born arguing on the other hand that there would be no peace in the world until we did away with all the kings; that monarchs and princes were the causes of every war in history. The first world war, however, destroyed about a dozen monarchies, but mankind is no more sane and peaceful after getting rid of kings, queens and princes.

I am not one of those who believe that all the world can ever be Communist, Fascist or, indeed, Socialist or democratic. What is the use of talking of world peace if we say to America that until she becomes a Socialist State we shall not live in peace with her? The Americans would laugh at us; and, incidentally, we must remember the power of that country. As far as I know she produces more coal and steel and has more factories, more aeroplanes and more ships on the high seas than the rest of the world combined. . . .

. . . I appeal for as much effort to save the peace as some people are putting forward to prepare for war against Russia. I have been rather alarmed recently at two articles in one of our most responsible weekly journals, *The Observer*, giving chapter and verse, statistics and strategy in readiness for the next war. I trust that our Government will stand firmly against any propaganda urging that this nation shall enter into a third world war.

Nobody objects to Communism more than I do. I object to all forms of totalitarianism, and I draw not the slightest distinction between one form of totalitarianism and another. One of the reasons for my objection is that I deny the right of one man, or of a dozen or even 100 men, to presume in their arrogance and conceit to do the political thinking of millions of their fellows. I am astonished sometimes that dictators do not familiarise themselves with the fate of their predecessors. . . .

### Professor Copland

“It was recently announced that Professor D. B. Copland is to be the Vice-Chancellor of the Canberra University. As this new University is to be financed by the Federal Government, we can be reasonably certain that it will be used to further the doctrine of centralised control of every phase of human activity. . . .

“It will be recalled that Professor Copland was an economic “adviser” to both Labour and non-Labour Governments. . . .

“Professor Copland and his associates visualise Governments as directing individuals to participate in activities over which they have no control. They support “full employment” as opposed to increasing leisure. Rather than advocate a rectification of the faults in the present financial rules, faults which they now admit, they support the exploitation of the results of these flaws to further what can only be termed a policy of totalitarianism.

This is the policy that the new Canberra University will further.—From a Radio talk by Eric D. Butler, quoted by *The New Times*, Melbourne.

## SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The following Groups and Associations are registered as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

### GREAT BRITAIN

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
- BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. A. Crothers, 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
- BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
- BRADFORD D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
- CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
- GLASGOW D.S.C. Group: W. Forrester, 81 Mitchell Street, Glasgow, C. 1.
- LIVERPOOL D.S.C.A. Hon. Sec., Mrs. Trayler, 67, Caldwell Road, Liverpool, 19.
- LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
- MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
- NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., T. H. Rea, 23 Clarewood Place, Fenham, Newcastle, 5.
- PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., F. G. Feather, 7, Drake Road, Westcliffe-on-Sea, Essex.
- SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19, Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.
- STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.
- Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), WOKING, and in BERKSHIRE. The last mentioned is a Services Group. Enquiries concerning all these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

### EUROPE

Hon. Secretary.

COPENHAGEN D.S.C. Group. J. P. Gjerulff.

### AUSTRALIA

#### New South Wales

- THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL CREDITER  
D.S.C.A. AND ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN OF N.S.W.  
SYDNEY D.S.C. Group  
DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH  
COWPER D.S.C. Group  
NEWCASTLE (N.S.W.) D.S.C. Group  
BELMONT D.S.C. Group  
BATHURST D.S.C. Group.  
SUTHERLAND V.P.A.

(H. A. Scouler, Editor).

Miss K. W. Marlow.  
Miss Grace Marsden.

Roy Gustard.  
J. McDonald.  
B. V. Murray.  
S. H. Morrow.  
R. R. Brazier.  
W. Prescott.

#### South Australia

- ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group  
GLENELG D.S.C. Group

C. H. Allen.  
E. C. Finn.

#### Western Australia

- PERTH D.S.C. Group  
EAST PERTH V.P.A.

W. F. Andrews.  
F. Jones.

#### Queensland

- QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association

A. W. Noakes.

#### Victoria

- HEADQUARTERS Group  
MELBOURNE D.S.C. Groups:

L. C. Hargreaves.

- A Group  
B Group  
C Group

A. J. O'Callaghan.  
F. C. Paice.  
Miss G. F. Greig.

#### Tasmania

- HOBART D.S.C. Group

James Guthrie.

### NEW ZEALAND

- PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association G. J. Billingham.  
AUCKLAND D.S.C. Group Mrs. W. James.

### SOUTH AFRICA

- PORT ELIZABETH D.S.C. Group L. W. Smith.

### CANADA

- OTTAWA (Parliamentary) D.S.C. Group  
OTTAWA D.S.C. Bureau of Canada Ralph L. Duclos, Pres.  
VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group J. Vans Macdonald.  
LIVERPOOL (Nova Scotia) D.S.C. Group T. E. D. Watson.  
SOUTH EDMONTON (Alberta) D.S.C. Group R. H. Ashby.

## To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

\*Associations desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in the following:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members

of Association .....

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat.†

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy for every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Deputy's Signature.....

To accompany the above form, a brief statement is requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,

Director of Organisation and Overseas Relations.

\*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

## 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.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.