

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20 No. 14.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 5, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

It may well be that, in retrospect, the defeat of General Smuts and his Administration will be seen as the beginning of the end of fifty years of British decadence. All the worst influences in British life, although latent, became dominant as the result of the South African War, and in the First World War, the South African control over Lloyd George was notorious, General Smuts being the broker. From that time, South Africa has been, through him, a mere satrapy of Wall St. and Washington, and although Dr. Malan is reported to be in favour of breaking the Imperial link, (but has laughed at the suggestion) it is quite possible that British interests will be far better served by him than by his predecessor.

It is doubtful whether many people (we are not overlooking *Truth's* significant leader "Farewell to Zion") realise what a turning-point in British history is marked by the dual relinquishment of the Palestine Mandate and the re-orientation of Foreign and Colonial Office policy, if not openly in favour of the Arabs, definitely away from the Jews.

Without the over-simplification against which we are so often warned, English history, which is the determinant history of these islands, can, like Gaul, be divided into three parts (English history is not Anglo-Saxon history). The first period extends from the Conquest to the partial expulsion of the Jews and the apparent suppression of the Knights Templar by Edward I; the second from the beginning of the fourteenth century to the Civil Wars of the seventeenth (a period which includes the Wars of the Roses in which most of the original and feudal aristocracy were eliminated and the Mediæval Church corrupted and dethroned); and the third, from the Hanoverian succession to the present time, which covers the return and the subsequent rise to almost complete power of the Jewish Financial Hierarchy.

If we were to say that for nine hundred years, the corporate fortunes of these islands have been swayed positively or negatively by an alien body of Oriental and Tartar outcasts moulded into a race by a religion, it would in the first place sound fantastic, and, in the second, it would not be true without considerable elaboration. But such is the conditioning of our minds that it would not sound unreasonable to claim that the power of gold had ruled us, and the modern historian, while, perhaps rightly, objecting to so simple a thesis, would not deem it ridiculous. And if we acknowledge the supremacy of the Jew, not merely as a bullion-broker but as a master of the techniques for manipulating the intangibles associated with gold, we arrive at much the original conclusion by an alternative route.

It ought to be emphasised that, if we accept this statement of the determining power of finance (always admitting the existence of factors which have modified it profoundly), it still does not provide a legitimate indictment of the Jews. Except under duress, the Jew has never denied his separate-

ness, and has asserted his superiority. If it were true, which of course it is not, that it has taken nine hundred years for the English to learn that bankers create the means of payment out of nothing, while simpletons produce the things paid for, it would merely prove that the English were born to be ruled by Jews.

The true case against the Jew is one which can be laid against many Orientals—the systematic and continuous use of bribery and corruption to sterilise genuine reform and to popularise error and degradation. As the Jew, Dr. Oscar Levy, wrote "We Jews are the world's deceivers." That is what has made these islands, first a tool, and now a scapegoat. And the end of the Mandate is our chance to put our house in order.

We understand, on the authority of *The Evening Standard*, that Mr. Bernard Mannes Baruch proposes to visit London in July, and that a suite of rooms has been reserved for him in a London hotel much favoured by visiting royalty.

We consider that Mr. Baruch is one of the most influential of the group of "American" Jews who used every ounce of their very considerable power to ensure the outbreak of the Second World War and that it should achieve the downfall of British influence not less than the defeat of Germany. For this reason we regard the visits of Mr. Baruch to this country as being typically insolent as well as dangerous, and we suggest that postcards to that effect be sent to him at his New York address, 597, Madison Avenue.

To anyone who will observe contemporary "foreign" or inter-national politics, which are much cruder than, *e.g.*, those of the nineteenth century, it must be obvious that there are groups which are constantly striving to make peace impossible, so that they may fish in troubled waters. Stalin and his grotesque vetos are the more blatant expression of this policy; but as Mr. Ernest Bevin, who has our sincere sympathy, remarked some time ago, the Palestine question was rendered insoluble by the intervention at critical moments of Mr. Truman and the U.S. State Department.

We never expected to find ourselves in the position of King's Champion for Mr. Chamberlain; but we are increasingly confident that the policy of the last three years of his life was wise, honest, and could have been successful. But it was hampered and crippled from both sides of the Atlantic, because it was directed to the interests of Europe as well as to those of the British Empire. And there were, and are, forces both in this country and in the . . . States which are implacably determined to erase European, *i.e.*, Christian civilisation from even the memory of mankind. Anyone who cannot see that the paper shortage, the restriction of travel, the monopoly of broadcasting, the incredible vacillations of doctrine and policy in the State Churches, to mention only a few agencies, are directed at that culture, is blind to the

mainspring of contemporary politics.

"There are possibilities of big extensions of the chemical industry in Scotland, particularly if the power of the hydro-electric schemes can be made available to it . . .

"It was emphasised at a Press conference yesterday that the Report on the Chemical Industry in Scotland would not be allowed to lie on the table, but that action was already being taken on it."—*The Scotsman*, May 21, 1948.

"What is obvious is that coal is the principal raw material of the chemical industry, that every ton released strengthens the chemical industry; and that the chemical industry, with its collateral, electro-metallurgy, is making preparations to take delivery of a high percentage of the electrical energy generated by Scottish water-power."—*The Brief for the Prosecution*, C. H. Douglas, p. 75. Published 1944.

Waal, waal, waal.

We have considerable difficulty in deciding whether Sir Stafford Cripps is just a clever lawyer speaking to a brief, or whether he is so abysmally ignorant of the elements of political economy that his own inconsistencies seem reasonable to him.

So far as we can obtain any grip of Socialist theory—it is its elusiveness has baffled more agile brains than ours—it is an absolutist system, not a competitive one. That is to say, its essence is Plans, not exploitation—economic adventure. Very well, then. Speaking at Glasgow on May 21, Sir Stafford said "Our whole future depends . . . on applying new ideas to the deployment of machinery and labour . . . not in a few years time, but here and now . . ." What does the man mean? Is it suggested that *absolutely*, our methods and machinery are less capable of sufficient *absolute* output than they were, say, fifty years ago when we were prosperous? Or does he mean, what he appears to say, that it is our *competitive* power which has to be stepped up, that we have to give more and more for less and less? If the latter meaning is correct, will Sir Stafford Cripps answer a plain question: Does Socialism mean intensified competition under severe controls, coupons, grinding taxation, alien legislators, bad housing, poor quality goods? Because that appears to be the kind of civilisation he wants intensified.

When he has answered that one, will he kindly say how much of our annual production do we have to give away in exchange for sterling balances held abroad? How is it that we have made such abysmally incompetent financial arrangements that we emerge from every war a huge debtor and Wall Street emerges a huge creditor? What assets and credits have we abandoned in India, Burma, and Palestine? The whole of our policy is being conditioned by the existence of debts (debts) the origin of which is obscure. The excuse for the maddening controls and prohibitions which are essential to the slave state designed for us is "austerity." How long is "austerity" to go on if we have to work for a long term of years to pay off debts for which we never received value? And, to take the case of India, are we to build up Birla and Tata industries for the benefit of the U.S.A. with huge sterling *balances* which ought to be *liabilities* of the Indian Government?

Then perhaps Dr. Edith Summerskill (Mrs. Samuel) will

tell us why we are importing considerable quantities of inferior continental "Processed" cheeses and are forbidden to make and sell the immensely superior genuine Stilton, Cheshire, and Wensleydale?

Finally, and more in hope than expectancy, could we be excused from the further invocation by Sir Stafford Cripps of Christianity as a necessary ingredient of the successful slave state?

"You cannot guarantee security and preserve liberty, and if liberty goes, your guarantee of security becomes worthless, because a state which enslaves its citizens cuts itself off from the only source of power, the self-reliance and initiative of free men. When we offer to protect people, as we have done, from the cradle to the grave, we are corrupting the character of our people, and betraying the democratic ideal."—Lord Lloyd, P.C., at St. Andrew's University, 1938.

It is quite a typical, if subtle, insult to the Christian Sunday that the "B".B.C. devotes the period before the 6 p.m. News Bulletin on that day to a report on the doings of the Hebrew god, Money, as exemplified in the Savings Committees. It is not very far in the past to the time when it was, to put it at its lowest, bad manners, to discuss business on Sunday. We have changed all that; but the curious part of the picture is that in those days we were good business men, while to-day, when no scruples are allowed to cramp our style, it doesn't win games.

How much of the inefficiency of the Grid electrical supply is technical, and how much is sabotage, we are not in a position to say. Organisational centralisation and mechanical interlocking are not the same thing, although they may be related. But we have no doubt that the senseless pursuit of mere size, to which bureaucratic Trades' Unionism and Socialism is particularly subject, is an increasing danger to every genuine interest of these islands. The recent breakdowns in electricity supply are only a foretaste of the risks we are running.

Iraq

"I can think of no country I have visited during the last ten years where conditions and the political atmosphere were so different from what the outside world imagined as in Iraq in the late spring of this year, barely six weeks after the signing of the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty at Portsmouth. Not even in Palestine have I met such universal and uninhibited anti-British sentiment. The whole country knew it and expressed it feelingly; the foreign embassies in Baghdad knew it and discussed it among themselves; only the House on the River remains apparently sceptical; the British Embassy was by no means convinced; the sound and tumult of the street did not reach the protected compound. The younger British officials who are dotted about the country, who come into contact with the people and therefore belong to that class of officials who have no influence or say in matters of policy had no illusions about the state of affairs . . . 'We do not like you; we do not like your country; we do not like your climate and we do not like your politics; but we love your oil.'"—Jon Kimche in *XIX Century*.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: May 13, 1948.

Central Office of Information

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter (Kingston-upon-Thames): In the concluding passages of his speech the right hon. Gentleman seemed to suggest that the Central Office of Information was something in the nature of a secondary organisation for the dissemination of the more reputable platitudes. If that is so, it is performed somewhat expensively. I believe that in the closing passages the Lord President was not inclined to argue against that proposition with undue force.

... The real difficulty is this: The Lord President talked of factual statements. I am not going to suggest that, on the whole, these statements are not factual, but the question is which facts. No information service in the world can disseminate all the facts about the situation in the world to-day. Even the Government's present lavish expenditure of paper cannot carry that. So we are driven to the conviction that the officials of this Department have to select between one fact and another. It is a platitude of propaganda that it is the selection of facts that is the true art of propaganda.

... The Lord President sought to defend his officials, and I am not seeking, so far as this respect of the matter is concerned, to attack them. All I am suggesting is that to put upon them the function of issuing statements and making announcements on matters of public affairs puts them in an impossible position, however impartial they may desire to be. Let us assume as an hypothesis that the Government have been a ghastly failure. What are these officials to say? They are asked to issue a factual statement. Are they to say that their masters are wholly incompetent for their jobs and that the difficulties in which the country is involved are directly due to the mishandling of its affairs by their official chiefs? I am not concerned at the moment whether that is the state of affairs or not. I am putting it as an hypothesis, and it is a possibility.

Then the Lord President says that certain statements irritate the public and that it is the object of certain statements to give the public a pat on the back. Assume that the facts of the economic situation of this country are grim. Assume that what the Chancellor of the Exchequer has said on this subject is true. Is it suggested that these public officials in putting out these factual statements, in order, as the Lord President says, not to irritate the public, must gloss over these inconvenient facts and suggest that all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds? Does not the Lord President see how completely inconsistent that kind of policy must be with the attempt of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to awaken the country to the gravity of the position, and does he not also see that inevitably these officials find themselves involved in controversy? ...

... I say that if you carry as far as the right hon. Gentleman has done the issuing of these statements on broad general matters of importance to the public, these officials cannot conduct their affairs without giving to the public an impression either favourable or adverse to the Government. The Lord President said that my right hon. Friend was asking these officials to denounce the Government; I think the Lord President said to "put out Opposition propaganda." That is not the point. The case is that they should not indulge in political propaganda either way and not argue the case on

controversial matters. That is the duty of the Ministers of the Crown. They speak, when they do speak, admittedly as partisans. The public can judge of their statements as statements of partisans whose own political careers and futures are involved.

When an official puts out a statement it has an appearance of impartiality, and that is the vice of this particular method of dealing with public affairs. When it comes to putting out statements of a kind designed to prevent the people becoming irritated, surely there we are necessarily involved in political propaganda. Assume the handling of our affairs has been such that the people should become irritated, are we not involving our system in political propaganda if we put out statements deliberately designed to prevent the public being irritated?

... As the Under-Secretary will recollect, on a previous occasion I mentioned the briefing of speakers by the Central Office of Information. It so happens that a number of these interesting briefs are in my possession at the moment. Before giving the Lord President the advantage of one or two of them, let me tell him about one of these briefing parties. In connection with the schemes for National Insurance a briefing party was held early this year—I think in March—at which the material used consisted of 10 White Papers, three Labour Party pamphlets and, I should add in fairness, a *News Chronicle* production. Is not that again some indication of the use of public funds—for these speakers are not only briefed but paid from public funds—for the putting forward, indirectly, of Labour Party propaganda?

We are faced with this dilemma. Either these Labour Party pamphlets which are used to brief these speakers are good Labour Party propaganda—which in my own view they are—or they are not. If they are good Labour Party propaganda, they must have an effect on the speakers. If they are not good Labour Party propaganda I shall be interested to hear the Lord President say so, and I shall expect to see certain rapid changes at Transport House. ...

I invite the attention of the Lord President to some of these briefs. Here is one:

"That is why the Control of Engagement Order was made in October, 1947. This ensures that everyone seeking a new job has a choice of really vital jobs to go into. This is not the same thing as direction, which is used only in very few cases where a worker, apparently without any good reason, persistently refuses to take a job of essential work or any job at all."

I am not concerned for the moment whether hon. Members opposite think that is accurate or not. The fact remains that a large section of our fellow countrymen regards both the control of engagement and the direction of labour as morally indefensible and morally wrong. They are entitled to that opinion, and there is no reason why the contrary opinion should be put out at the public expense.

Let me give another example, on food this time:

"At the present time we are living on a calorie level of about 2,870 a day, on the average"—

that is before the White Paper—

"compared with 3,000 before the war. Averages are always deceptive, especially when distribution has become so much fairer, as it has since pre-war days."

Mr. Fernyhough (Jarrow): So it has.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: The very fact that hon. Members opposite think that is so is some evidence in support of my

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. 14.

Saturday, June 5, 1948.

Coming Battle

Indications are multiplying that some tardy reaction to the plain evidences of world-wide treason to the rule of Law in any realistic sense is developing. It is a long time since we have been able to record the occurrence, in one week, of, for example, such significant events and statements as the overthrow of General Smuts in South Africa, the persistent rejection by the electorates of the Australian States of the demands of the Planners, the obvious embarrassment of the Zionists and their fellow-travellers in England and America, not to mention such apparently minor matters as the open allegation by Lord Horder (years after it should have been made from as prominent a source) that "the ball was passed to the other side, by whom I do not know"—a reference to the political manoeuvring of the B.M.A.—and what appears to have been a serious approach to the Constitutional issue by Mr. Charles Morgan in an address at Oxford. We say 'appears' because *The Times*, which saw fit to comment upon it, does not seem to have deemed it proper to inform its readers more directly concerning the matter in its news columns.

Such signs of coming battle are a challenge to all who read this journal to redouble their efforts to extend its range and influence. That doughty agnostic, Thomas Henry Huxley, once defended a cinderella of the sciences by saying that its accomplishments were less well known than they should be because, by sheer force of their truth, they "passed into the euthanasia of scientific knowledge." They were "absorbed," and, paradox not distant in origin from some of our troublesome paradoxes of 'democracy,' what everyone knew did not seem to be knowledge. *The Social Crediter* seems, for the time being at least, to be cast for a similar rôle, and the potency of its prophetic function comes to be overlaid by the heavy satisfaction of general realisation. At the same time, that realisation is two fold, and, through its agency each new dose of cosmic poison foretold reaches the victims of world tyranny with a small but increasing accompaniment of antidote. But again the responsibility is with us for increasing and continuing to increase the quiet power of this service.

"National Vote of Censure" in Australia

On May 29 Australian electors had to decide whether they were in favour of an addition to the Federal Constitution which would increase the permanent power of the Federal Government and its ever-increasing army of officials. This, a continuation of the struggle with the Chifley Government, with the details of which readers of this journal have been made familiar, was the occasion of the "Prices Referendum" in which the Federal Government sought power to control permanently "Rents and Prices (including Charges)", a further

stage in the claim of the centralised government to override the State Parliaments, and to line them up with a centralised policy decision. This aspect has been clearly before the Australian electorate since at least 1945, when Dr. Evatt, fresh from the defeat of the Government in the 1944 Referendum, rushed off to San Francisco to get "full employment" written into the United Nations Charter. While there (Melbourne *Argus*, June 16, 1945) he said "... every international agreement we make places an obligation upon Australia to fill it. For this reason it may well be that in certain circumstances the existing external affairs power can be used by the Commonwealth Parliament for the purpose of carrying into effect in Australia the precise terms of the international agreement."

Australian Social Crediters, and particularly *The New Times*, of Melbourne, have been ceaselessly active in opposition to these measures, and have added materially to the realism of the discussion.

Because of its references to the decline of Mr. Chifley's prestige and the Australian recognition of the significance of the vote, we print *The Sunday Times's* telegram last Sunday announcing the "complete and unmistakable" verdict in all the States against centralised control:—

"The Australian people, in a nation-wide referendum, have refused to give the Federal Government power to interfere permanently with private enterprise by control of rents, prices or profits. The proposal of the Prime Minister, Mr. Chifley, for an amendment of the Constitution to perpetuate these war-time central controls was defeated by clear majorities in all States. His prestige, since he personally stumped the country, has suffered considerably.

"Dr. Evatt, Australian Attorney-General, said tonight: 'Although the returns are not yet complete, the decision of the people is clear and unmistakable.' Mr. Menzies, Federal Opposition leader, said it confirmed the impression that 'this Government is on the way out.'

"The voting is regarded as possessing more than ordinary significance. Even some safe Labour Party constituencies voted against the Federal Government demand most emphatically."

On April 9, under the heading "Prices Referendum Must be decisively Defeated," *The New Times* wrote:—

"The Prices Referendum must not only be defeated; it must be made the opportunity of administering to the Federal Government the greatest possible electoral chastisement.

"An overwhelming 'No' vote on May 29 will make it clear beyond all doubt that Australian electors are opposed to the totalitarian policy of any more power for Canberra.

"A successful revolt against Canberra on May 29 may easily prove a turning point in the battle to save Australians from the menace which ushered in Guild Socialism in Italy, National Socialism in Germany, Communism in Russia, and which has reduced our British kith and kin to a state where they are little better off than were the Germans under Hitler.

"The philosophy which has resulted in open economic conscription in Great Britain is the same philosophy underlying the policies of the Canberra dictators."

The Communists were leading advocates of a "Yes" vote in the Referendum.

In the opinion of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the vote "amounts to a national vote of censure."

The Great Betrayal

By C. H. DOUGLAS

(VI)

One of the reasons frequently and reasonably advanced against what is called the world plot theory is that it postulates a degree both of organisation and discipline which is out of all proportion to anything with which we are familiar on the necessary scale.

It would be possible to answer this objection on its own ground, because there are several aspects of religion, secret societies and commerce which are not too greatly disproportionate to such a task. But, in fact, it is highly probable that the proof does not lie along those lines, and that permeation and perversion, the product of education, observation, and patronage, is the technique mainly effective. A little elaboration of this theme may be useful.

If you want to catch mice, you don't specialise in canaries, you keep a cat. If long observation has convinced you that success in politics or industry is impossible unless a certain hierarchy of function is preserved, and you wish to destroy a rival, you don't, at least at first, order him to consult his office boy before making a major decision—you stimulate the formation of Trades' Unions, permeate the schools, take great care that words such as policy, administration and ownership are mixed up so that they can mean anything or nothing, and secure executives in the Trades' Unions who are both ambitious and technically ignorant. In fact, you hypnotise everyone into agreement that the office boy knows it all. If you can ensure that Trades' Union policy is based on the assumption that the object of life is full employment you have an almost omnipotent monopoly ready made. The leisure class is, you say, living on the worker, and, consumption being a mere by-product of production, the consumer should be given less and less and the production process absorb more and more. You will almost automatically develop a state of affairs which requires supermen to run it. Then abolish all principles of law, morals or politics on some theory such as the divine right of majorities and the omnipotence of

Parliament, and you may be confident, that your Materialist State, which requires supermen to run it, will elect for that purpose demagogues ignorant of the elements of the problem with which they are required to deal. Quite naturally, they fail, and still more "sacrifices" are suggested. Quite a small organisation of conscious, trained traitors can bring about this situation. It takes time, and "wars or the threat of wars," but it can be done. It has been done in the British Isles, and the evidences of it are indisputable.

The defence against it is to expose the strategy, minimise the demand for labour, maximalise the availability of consumption goods, and break up every monopoly whether of goods or labour.

These policies are only possible inside the framework of a Constitution which has an organic relation to reality. For instance, if it is once established, as it is being established, that the primary object of the Constitution is to demolish the rights of the individual ("Parliament is supreme—it could, in its wisdom, decree that all blue-eyed babies be destroyed at birth") and so centralise them that they can be transferred out of the country and the nation, which is the exact opposite of the Constitution envisaged and re-enforced by Magna Carta, the measures I have just suggested lose all meaning. They would be the last method by which to establish the centralised world, which is neither organic nor realistic. It is mechanistic, static, and abstract. There seems to be small doubt that its primary agency has been, and still is, the Financial System which has been increasingly a conscious and lying aberration of a magnificent instrument for good. By its agency, Constitutions, Governments and Peoples have been corrupted. "Ye are of your Father, the devil. He was a liar from the beginning."

The plight of the British is not a consequence of the war, neither, in the true sense, does it originate in the so-called Labour Party. All the ingredients of defeat can be found, active and conscious, in the Baldwin-P.E.P. reign of the Armistice period. Their shop window is redressed—that is all.

(Conclusion).

"Israel": First Week

"The Coming War in Palestine must be unique in one respect. It is the first time the world has been given six months' notice of the precise date on which a war will break out."—T. R. Little, writing from New York, May 9, to the *Arab News Bulletin*, of May 21.

May 14: The birth of the Jewish State of Israel was proclaimed from Tel Aviv this afternoon: "We members of the National Council of the Jewish State of Israel representing the Jewish people in Palestine and the Zionist movement of the World, met together in solemn assembly on the day of the termination of the British Mandate for Palestine and by virtue of natural and historic right of the Jewish people, and by resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, hereby proclaim the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine to be called 'Israel'. The State will be open to all Jewish immigrants . . ." Ben-Gurion (Polish Jew) Premier; Moshe Shertok (Russian Jew) Foreign Affairs; Dr. Weizmann (Anglo-Russian Jew) President. "One of the first acts of the Jewish Provisional Government was to revoke the British White Paper of 1939 limiting immigration

and legislation limiting land sales. All other existing laws remain in force in the Jewish State."—(*The Scotsman*, May 15). The U.S. recognizes "the provisional government as the *de facto* authority of the new State of Israel. Guatemala and Sweden follow suit. A few hours after the proclamation of the Jewish State Egyptian troops were ordered to invade Palestine. At midnight Sir Allan Cunningham, the last British High Commissioner for Palestine, sailed for England.

May 15: Israel invaded on three sides. Ben-Gurion broadcasts to New York: "Tel-Aviv is being bombed as I am speaking . . . we expect that all decent people throughout the world will help us in our difficult task." In Jerusalem, Haganah occupy all positions evacuated by the British. The leader of Irgun declares: "the government of Israel is our government." Haganah and Irgun form one army. In Egypt, 600 Zionists are arrested and sent into concentration camps. Great Britain "will not give Israel recognition yet."

May 16: Israel appeals to U.N. Security Council to stop Egypt's intervention in Palestine. In London, Captain Shimon Hacothen, formerly of the British Army, speaks at a meeting to celebrate the proclamation of the Jewish State:

"Fighting in Palestine is costing Jewry £3,000,000 monthly." Acre falls to the Jews. "Israel" applies for membership of the United Nations.

May 17: Soviet Russia acknowledges "Israel" as the *de jure* government. ("Soviet" Consulates had opened immediately after the Proclamation of Independence). Every Jew up to the age of 35, and every Jewess up to the age of 25 are mobilised and under direction. A U.S. resolution is put before the Security Council, threatening the Arab States with economic sanctions, the rupture of diplomatic relations and military action.

May 18: Arab Legion enters Jerusalem. Many Jews killed in Tel-Aviv air-raid. At Lake Success, Sir Alexander Cadogan intimates that Great Britain is not yet prepared to recognize the action of the Jews in setting up a State of Israel. He is instructed from London to substitute "Jewish authorities in Palestine" for the term "the provisional Government of Israel."

May 19: Sir Alexander said that under the partition scheme Arabs and Jews would have obtained independence on October 1, 1948, and, therefore, the proclamation of the Jewish State was a unilateral act and not based strictly on the acts of the United Nations Commission. Australia bans arms to Palestine. The U.S. State Department officials state that representatives of both the Provisional Government of Israel and the Arab States have already placed orders with American private manufacturers and the Arms Surplus Authorities of the American Government for arms which would be rushed to Palestine immediately the ban is lifted. Poland and Czechoslovakia acknowledge "Israel". Acre falls to the Jews. The Arab Legion advance with heavy guns and armoured cars into the northern districts of Jerusalem. They claim that the Sheik Jarrah quarter has been cleared of Jews.

May 19-20: Miss Susan Strange, correspondent of *The Scotsman* at Lake Success writes: "The United States bears more exclusively than ever it did two months ago the main responsibility for whatever the Security Council does or does not do . . . Prompt American recognition of Israel has encouraged and given strength to the pressure here to lift the arms embargo for the Middle East. It is probably only a question of time before this is done. Raising a resolution here under Chapter Seven inevitably points towards economic sanctions against the Arab States. By these two moves the United States would find itself irrevocably on the Jewish side."

The Security Council continue the debate on the American proposal to end hostilities with a threat of sanctions, and on the British amendment, deleting threats. Mr. Tarasenko, Ukrainian delegate, takes the Zionist line of accusing Britain of being legally and actually responsible for the entry of Transjordan troops into Palestine.

Mr. Eliahu Epstein, acting representative of "Israel" in Washington, is appointed official representative of "Israel" to the United States. Mr. Aubrey Eban, formerly of the British Army, is appointed official representative of "Israel" to the United Nations. "Israel" formally applies for recognition by the British Government. Armed Lebanese guard forcibly removes forty-one American Jews from an American vessel at Haifa. In the British zone of Germany a Jewish recruiting office issue a proclamation calling upon able-bodied Jews in the zone to volunteer for service in the Jewish forces in Palestine. France affords a *de facto* recognition of "Israel," sending "fraternal greetings".

May 22: Fight for the Old City of Jerusalem nears end. Wailing Wall goes to the Arabs. At Lake Success Mr. Gromyko accuses Great Britain of "merely trying to hinder the Security Council from taking effective measures to end strife in Palestine."

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

view that it is their point of view which is being put forward. But they must face the fact that there are in this country people, equally entitled to their opinion, who think that that is poisonous nonsense. One would have thought that those who wished to avoid controversial subjects would have trodden warily on that of petrol; but a brief was issued on the subject of basic petrol. Surely the Lord President will agree that these impartial people, putting out factual statements, might have proceeded a little delicately when discussing that subject, with all the effect it had on public opinion. They say:

"Moreover, we have not got enough tankers of our own. Some petrol has to be imported in American tankers, for which we pay dollar freight."

There again, so far as it goes, a perfectly accurate statement, but, of course, it might well be objected that if all the facts were to be given there might have been some observations on the subject of the American tankers which were available in 1945, and which, had there been a little foresight on the part of the Government, would still have been available to carry our petrol.

That is only an example of the theme on which I began: all of the facts cannot be supplied; some of them must be selected; and the way in which they are selected inevitably and inescapably has a political propaganda effect. That is no attack on the officials concerned. It is an attack on their political masters for imposing upon them the task of impartiality in these matters which is beyond human wisdom and competence. I agree with all that my right hon. Friend said on the value of the minor Information Services of the Government, but when we come to these great matters of public policy and public controversy, upon which great masses of our fellow countrymen feel deeply one way or another, we cannot indulge through the machinery of a Government Department, and at the expense of the taxpayer, in statements of fact which are so unbiased, so comprehensive, that they will be accepted by all our fellow countrymen as a proper use of their money. That is why it seems to me, particularly in view of what was said by the Lord President of the extension of the work of this office, that, in immortal words slightly adapted, the Central Office of Information has increased, is increasing and should be diminished.

Mr. Pickthorn (Cambridge University): . . . My first connection with propaganda was in 1918 when I was responsible for advising the Army Council about Germany and what was going on in Germany. All that I saw then and all that I have seen since has led me to believe propaganda a tool unworthy of a great state. Far more often than not it does more harm than good. Invariably it muddies the next stage in our development. There is in propaganda at any one stage something which is always misleading in the succeeding stage, and which often does far more harm than good. To announce the need for propaganda is a confession that the character of the State as such is not sufficient to carry its weight in world affairs. I believe that propaganda almost always does more harm than good.

There are one or two things which I have to say about films . . .

. . . The name of the film, "The World is Rich"—I do

not know how far the Council is responsible for that, but I think wholly—is really hopelessly dishonest and tendentious, and I should have thought out of step and fashion even for the propaganda policy of the hon. Gentleman's party opposite. That was the nonsense talked in the 1930's about poverty in the midst of plenty, and the world full of enough for everyone if only we could push the bankers or somebody off it. I did not think that anyone believes that nonsense now. I should have thought that to have called by that name a Government-sponsored film now, unless it were in some spasm of very bitter irony, was quite unforgivable. . . .

Mr. Driberg (Maldon): The hon. Member the senior Burgess for Cambridge University (Mr. Pickthorn) said that in the House of Commons we always pay respect to experts in their own field, whether they be lawyers or historians like himself. I hope he will pay some respect next time he hears an hon. Member on this side assuring him from bitter personal experience that the legend of "Poverty in the midst of plenty" in the 1930's was not the nonsense that the hon. Gentleman supposed it to be.

Mr. Pickthorn: I did not think poverty was nonsense. I am familiar with that. What I thought was nonsense was the assumption that there was plenty of plenty if only people could get at it.

Mr. Driberg: Poverty in the midst of plenty was a familiar phenomenon of the 1930's. It was a disgrace to this country and to the Government then in power. Everybody knows what was meant by the phrase, which the hon. Member chose to deride. . . .

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay (Combined English Universities): . . . The point I want to make is that all the wrong reasons for the Central Office of Information have been given by Government speakers today. . . . Implicit behind the whole of the arguments was that a very important change was going on in this country, and it was important that the people here and abroad should know about it. But supposing they do not agree with the change?

This Department is a hang-over from the war: when we all or the overwhelming majority were in agreement. I agree with the hon. Member for Maldon that there is always a minority, but broadly speaking, the whole of this country was united during the war. In my own constituency of Kilmarnock, every Sunday night for four years I had colossal meetings with 1,200 to 1,500 people. It was a grand thing and often the people were inspired. But in peace the people are not going to be inspired by Government sponsored speakers. I am altogether opposed to the whole of the domestic speaking arrangements in this country on behalf of the Central Office of Information. It is absolutely scandalous that this is still going on. I want to make it clear that

By
C. H. DOUGLAS:
**THE REALISTIC POSITION OF
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND**

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.
(Postage 1d.)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, LIVERPOOL.

in my opinion there would be an even worse impression if there were another Government in power. It is not a question of party politics. We have had too much of party politics here today. Suppose a Conservative Government get into power and they have these creative civil servants, what is the position? Where lies freedom under these present conditions? It is exactly what is happening on the Continent. [*Interruption.*] It is no use hon. Members opposite denying it and particularly the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for Scotland after the speech which he delivered on the Second Reading of the Representation of the People Bill. In country after country I have seen step by step the emergence of two key Ministries—one for Information and the other the Ministry of the Interior.

If hon. Members opposite had explained their true feelings we should know where they are. If they had said as good Marxists "The capitalist Press are against us and we are in power; we want the best possible technicians to put across our case," I should have known where hon. Members stand. The Under-Secretary who is to reply will no doubt say we must be objective about these matters. I want to dissociate myself from the speeches which have been made by hon. Members opposite; but I also want to say that I support that portion of the expenditure which is devoted to overseas services. . . .

The analogy of Montgomery's Army used by the hon. Member for Aston (Mr. Wyatt), is a very dangerous one. Montgomery's men were all told what the plan was. Is that the way to treat the independent citizens of Britain? Are they to be told what the plan is to solve our difficult and subtle economic problems? Speeches here today have been even more dangerous in their attacks on individual liberty than any I have ever heard, and I have a great deal of support for some of the things which the Government are doing. If any Bills have been agreed in their larger sense, our Insurance Bills have, but even here controversy enters. The Government must talk about existing and proposed legislation and not ancient legislation. If a Conservative Government came into power they would focus its propaganda on the legislation which they were going to put through. That is inherent in a domestic propaganda service. I cannot finish my speech because I have promised to give way to the right hon. and learned Member for West Derby (Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe). My final sentence is: For Heaven's sake abolish this ridiculous speaking programme in this country because it is a waste of money and it is a disgrace to continue Government-sponsored speakers after the war.

Major Sir David Maxwell Fyfe (Liverpool, West Derby): . . . I should like to point out that in his speech the hon. Member for Maldon (Mr. Driberg) pirouetted for three important moments away from his tendentious pinpricks against the Opposition into three essential verities.

I will remind him of the three important verities to which he gave tongue. First, he said that the Central Office of Information should be used by the Government as a reply to those who opposed it. Secondly, he developed that by saying that it should specially be used as a reply to the Opposition Press. His third verity, which truly sets out the state of his mind and the state of mind of so many of his colleagues, was that it should be used as an instrument to show the benefits of the Government. The hon. Gentleman exactly deployed and delimited the matters against which we are complaining. He stated, with the clarity and wealth of phrase which he always uses, the beginnings of the approach

of the one-party State—get into office, and use the public funds to repel attacks upon you. He said it three times. I am very glad that he had the courage to come out into the open and let us know where we are. . . . the principles with regard to the Government information service as enunciated by my right hon. Friend. I understood that they were the principles which the Government accepted when this set-up came into being. The first is that each Minister shall be responsible for the information policy of his own Department with the aid of a small but highly trained information staff. The second is that there shall be adequate machinery for the co-ordination of both home and overseas Information Services so as to ensure consistency of policy and presentation. The third is that there shall be a central Government agency to carry out on behalf of Departments most of the common technical and production functions.

We accepted these principles. We think they are wise. Departments are obviously concerned with certain matters which they have to explain. There must be co-ordination, and so long as it is limited to the matter of a really common service we shall be quite prepared to consider it provided that it works. Now we come to the second principle, to which the Lord President gave general agreement. There is no reason why this matter should not be discussed because it has been public knowledge and has been the subject of public discussion for some time. Running this institution is a Ministerial Committee of which the right hon. Gentleman is the Chairman. He was good enough to tell me that it now deals with both home and overseas Information Services.

Here we have this extraordinary development with regard to the Official Committee. Namely, that we have what was the home Information Services Official Committee, the committee which deals, at any rate *inter alia*, with home information. I understand the chairman of that committee is the head of the C.O.I. We have now, interlocked with that, the Economic Information Committee which, though the nominal sub-committee of the old Official Committee, has as its chairman the gentleman from the Economic Information Unit. I am not going to mention names. I do not think that is desirable, if it can be avoided, but I do not think that any hon. Member will have any doubt about who I am mentioning. It is a well-known matter.

What we see in that set-up is a move towards the creation of a very different body from the original mere co-ordinated body that was contemplated. I ask the Committee to observe, in the striking phrase of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Brighton (Mr. Marlowe), that this is where we have the beginning of the Goebbelsisation of a service. We have the changing from a co-ordinating matter, from the old idea that it would not have contacts with the home Press, into a process of forging an instrument and building up an organisation which aims at being complete in itself and technically capable of handling every aspect of propaganda—Press, posters, radio, films, exhibitions and other means of propaganda which may be available. That is going far beyond the two propositions which I accepted, and from which the Government started—namely, a co-ordinating committee and a common service which would provide certain necessities in the same way as the Stationery Office. . . .

A timely publication which has reached us is "The 'Palestine' Plot," by B. Jensen, published by W. L. Richardson, Lawers, Aberfeldy, at the price of 3/-. Part II, "Preliminary Documentation of the 'Palestine' Plot," brings the subject down to 1939.

DOES IT FIT THE FACTS ?

(Major Douglas's correspondence with the Rev. Dr. Salis Daiches in *The Scotsman*: collected by B. M. Palmer).
4/.

From K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

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.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(<i>reprinting</i>)
The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
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.