

# THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 17.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 26, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

According to the "B."B.C. 8 a.m. Bulletin, Home Service, June 14, 17 per cent. of our exports of capital goods (in the last year?) have been to "India" and "Pakistan." How much of this has been paid for by sterling balances run up in the defence of India? Or to put it still more shortly. How much of it is sheer loss? May we have the names of the Civil Servants involved?

It ought to be borne steadily in mind that for the last fifty years, the ostensible Government of this country, with its relation to the outside world, has consisted of a facade of M.P.s., most of the House of Lords, and a shrinking area of undefined influence with H.M. the King, or other occupant of the Throne, as centre. The real power has been the Fabianised and alienised Civil Service, notably the Treasury, playing in with the Bank of "England," and a few key Rothschilds, Samuels, Isaacs and Mondes in the Houses of Parliament.

When, therefore, "the Tories" are accused of the appalling calamities of that period, the accusation only has substance because no man ought to allow himself to occupy an office under false pretences. Responsibility without power indicates power without responsibility somewhere. The policy has been a Civil Service policy, protected by the clever device of Parliamentary responsibility without *de facto* power.

The only difference in the situation caused by the 1945 election is that the real, if covert, policy of the traitorous gang has become the overt policy of the Cabinet.

Before there can be any future for us (and it must be remembered that there are powerful influences, long covert but now overt, which are determined that our very name shall disappear from the earth) the Civil Service requires a drastic purge and a complete re-orientation in a restored Constitution. Bulk trading through anonymous Civil Servants would only be tolerated by the inhabitants of an institution for degenerates.

### AS OTHERS SEE US.

"Prime Minister Thakin Nu (seated), an old man of forty-two, watches Britain's [*sic*] Attlee sign the treaty through which the once-mighty British Empire bowed out of Burma."—*Saturday Evening Post* (U.S.A.) May 29, 1948.

About £8,000,000 of debt has been allocated to "Britain" by Mr. Paul Hoffman, the administrator of the Marshall Plan. We are not told whether we wanted the cheese (mousetrap), aluminium, and tobacco which this represents; we are not told what quantities we get for the money with which we are debited; we are not told whether these goods, which are surplus to U.S. home requirements are debited at the highest price level of all time and are to be repaid at low price levels. In fact we aren't told anything, and we couldn't care less. Let our Mr. Isaacs fix it as before.

Walter H. Page, American Ambassador to Britain, writing from London on October 25, 1913, to President Wilson said:—

"The future of the world belongs to us. A man needs to live here, with two eyes in his head, a very little time to become very sure of this. Everybody will see it presently. These English are spending their capital, and it is their capital that continues to give them their vast power. Now what are we going to do with the leadership of the world presently when it clearly falls into our hands? And how can we use the English for the highest uses of democracy?"—Page 144 of "*The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page*" (Heincmann, London, 1924).

In 1905, a certain Colonel Goldsmid, of the well-known family of Jewish bankers, recommended to Dr. Theodore Herzl, the Zionist, the imposition of heavy taxes upon land, with a view to the ruin of the landholders. It will be observed that this was prior to the "Liberal Landslide" of 1906 which inaugurated the period of "spending our capital," e.g., Estate and Legacy Duties, to which Mr. Walter H. Page makes reference.

There is an exact parallel between the sweeping victory of the Liberals (the financiers party) with whom the nascent Labour Party was associated, in 1906, and the sweeping victory of the Labour Party (with whom the financiers are associated) in 1945, and the history of the years 1906-14 can be seen clearly as a coherent part of the "use of the English for the highest uses of democracy," i.e. their subordination to Wall Street.

"No man will treat with indifference the principle of race. It is the key to history, and why history is so often confused is that it has been written by men who are ignorant of this principle, and all the knowledge it involves."—*Endymion*, Benjamin D'Israeli.

Experience of life and politics leads to the conclusion that the German conception of the *zeitgeist*—the idea which is "in the air" is always one with which to reckon. To what extent it is the fruition of propaganda, or, on the other hand, an unexplained upsurge of the sub-conscious, is not always clear. It is possible that there are two varieties, a "real" and a synthetic, but without one of them little that is effective can be done. One of the most astonishing, and in some ways un-noticed accompaniments of Social Credit propaganda is the sub-conscious and often instantaneous recognition of its appropriateness—always the hallmark of a world idea. In the same way Constitutional reform is recognised as a live issue everywhere.

The imposition on the Germans of a currency racket almost identical with that recently inflicted on Russia should, but probably will not, convince sceptics that all countries are suffering, in their varying degree, from the same domina-

tion of the Sanhedrin. The essential nature of these "reforms" is anti-Christian and Satanic. More than anything else, they are, and are intended to be, a blow at faith itself, and so, in turn, at all Faiths. Nothing could lead more directly to Communism.

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 3, 1948.

### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (Paper and Stationery)

Brigadier Rayner asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will provide figures showing the average amount of paper and stationery consumed by each of the principal Government Departments during the period 1929-39; and how this compares with such consumption during 1947 or the last year for which figures are available.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: Following is the available information:

#### CONSUMPTION OF PAPER AND STATIONERY BY PRINCIPAL DEPARTMENTS DURING THE PERIOD 1931 TO 1938 AND DURING THE YEAR 1947.

Department	Annual Average 1931 to	
	1938	1947
	Tons	Tons
Admiralty ... ..	2,150	3,620
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries ... ..	240	930
Air Ministry ... ..	1,590	3,480
Customs and Excise ... ..	680	380
Ministry of Food ... ..	—	3,860
Foreign Office (including Diplomatic and Consular Services) ... ..	340	2,020
Foreign Office (German Section) ... ..	—	1,040
Ministry of Fuel and Power ... ..	50	760
Inland Revenue ... ..	2,650	5,210
Ministry of Health ... ..	660	360
Ministry of Labour and National Service ... ..	1,530	1,410
Ministry of National Insurance ... ..	—	2,030
Parliament (House of Commons) ... ..	140	680
Post Office (excluding Telephone Directories) ... ..	4,780	5,120
Post Office (Telephone Directories) ... ..	6,710	6,090
Ministry of Supply ... ..	—	2,330
Board of Trade ... ..	350	1,610
War Office ... ..	2,440	9,070
Ministry of Works ... ..	330	1,180

### NON-TRADITIONAL HOUSES (Expenditure)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Works what sums have been respectively spent from public funds in developing the aluminium temporary bungalow, the aluminium permanent bungalow, the aluminium two-storey prototype, and all

other types of non-traditional houses; what sums have been paid direct to manufacturers of these houses in respect of the capital cost of tools and any other costs for their manufacture; what liability to public funds will accrue on the termination of contracts with his Department or otherwise on the cessation of their manufacture; and to which company or companies, and for which types.

Mr. Key: The expenditure from public funds on development is as follows:—

	£
Aluminium temporary house ... ..	139,000
Aluminium permanent house ... ..	200
Aluminium two-storey house ... ..	10,000
Steel temporary house ... ..	91,957
Steel permanent house (includes tools) ... ..	67,865
Airey (142 houses) ... ..	219,809
Bryant (72 houses) ... ..	135,638
Smith's Building System (158 houses) ... ..	241,456
Basiform (50 houses) ... ..	56,175
Howard (22 houses) ... ..	25,707
Orlit (130 houses) ... ..	270,877
Riley (236 houses) ... ..	490,000
Spooner (46 houses) ... ..	64,316
Schindler/Göhner (94 houses) ... ..	188,000
Stent (50 houses) ... ..	83,549
Wates (60 houses) ... ..	84,282
Wimpey (54 houses) ... ..	75,468
Woolaway (62 houses) ... ..	105,831

The numbers in brackets refer to houses ordered by the Ministry of Works to test the merits of promising systems of non-traditional construction. The costs are estimated final costs of the erected houses which, on completion, are normally sold to local authorities at the estimated cost of equivalent accommodation in traditional construction.

For the aluminium temporary house the sum of £1,050,000 was paid to the manufacturers for jigs and tools. In addition £2,300,000 was spent on plant and equipment and in adapting premises for use by the manufacturers. These assets remain Government property. For the steel temporary house £111,605 was paid to the manufacturers for tools. There should be no liability on the termination of contracts except perhaps for reinstatement of premises after removal of plant. This cannot yet be assessed.

For the Stent house £4,566 was paid to the manufacturers for a factory for the production of component parts. This will be refunded in full in the event of the Ministry ordering a further 500 houses and to the extent of £3,566 in any other event. For the Smith's Building System the Ministry of Works carry a contingent liability of £17,500 for the cost of nine gantries; the extent to which it matures will depend on the number of houses eventually built.

House of Commons: June 9, 1948.

### COLONIAL EMPIRE (Subsidies)

Mr. T. Reid asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies what Colonies received subsidies during the war from the British taxpayer to reduce their cost of living; what Colonies have received such subsidies since the end of the war; and how much in each case up to date.

Mr. Creech Jones: As the answer is long and contains a number of figures I propose, with my hon. Friend's permission, to circulate it in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Mr. Keeling: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether the cost to the British taxpayer in paying these subsidies is not outweighed by the gain to the British taxpayer through

### 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.

paying less than world prices for Colonial products, including West Indian sugar?

*Mr. Creech Jones:* That is always true, but if the hon. Gentleman will put the question down I will give him a full answer.

*Mr. Reid:* Is it not clear that it is not the policy of the British Government to try to meet the cost of food subsidies in the Colonies, except in very extreme cases?

*Mr. Creech Jones:* That is the general line, but we have given considerable assistance in the past.

*Brigadier Rayner:* Is not that answer another proof that Great Britain, *vis-a-vis* her Empire, usually gives much more than she receives.

*Following is the answer:*

The following Colonial territories received subsidies during the war from the British taxpayer to reduce their cost of living, to the extent shown:

Antigua	... ..	£19,997
British Guiana	... ..	£208,333
Cyprus	... ..	£667,258
Jamaica	... ..	£970,900
Turks and Caicos Islands	... ..	£39,000

In Malta a policy of selling certain essential commodities imported through the COSUP organisation at subsidised prices was adopted.

The following territories have received subsidies to the extent shown since the war to reduce their cost of living:

British Guiana	... ..	£366,667
Jamaica	... ..	£179,414
Turks and Caicos Islands	... ..	£34,827
Malta	... ..	£1,350,000

In addition the following territories which have paid out subsidies to reduce their cost of living have received at different times general grants-in-aid from His Majesty's Government. It is not possible to indicate the extent to which these general grants-in-aid can be regarded as having been used as subsidies:

Dominica.
Montserrat.
St. Lucia.
Gilbert and Ellice Islands.
Solomon Islands.

### MASS EDUCATION OFFICERS

*Mr. Rankin* asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies how many Mass Education Officers are now employed in Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia.

*Mr. Creech Jones:* In Nyasaland one Mass Education Officer and one Mass Education Assistant are employed, together with two African assistants. In Northern Rhodesia mass education is being undertaken as part of the work of the Education and Information Department and by Missions, but no officials carry the title of "Mass Education Officer."

### STATE OF ISRAEL (Recognition)

*Mr. Piratin* asked the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations whether he was consulted by the Government of South Africa before the latter Government made its

announcement of the recognition of the Provisional State of Israel.

*Mr. P. Noel-Baker:* We have been in the closest touch with all British Commonwealth Governments on every aspect of the Palestine question. It is not the practice to divulge the nature of the individual communications which have passed.

*House of Commons: June 10, 1948.*

### BREAKDOWNS

*Captain John Crowder* asked the Minister of Fuel and Power if he will make a statement regarding the breakdown of the electricity service on Sunday, May 23.

[*Other questions were asked on the same subject*].

*Mr. Gaitskell:* Regulation 21 (c) of the Electricity Supply Regulations, 1937, is sufficient to ensure that reports in such breakdowns in supply are submitted to me by the electricity boards. There was, therefore, no occasion for me to ask for information under Section 5 (5) of the Electricity Act, 1947. The Chairman of the British Electricity Authority made a very full statement on Monday, May 24, and, as I have not yet received the reports under the Regulation 21 (c), I have nothing to add to his statement.

*Mr. Stewart:* Does not Section 5 (5) empower the Minister to issue directions to the British Electricity Authority, and can it possibly be that, following upon an electricity breakdown which stretched from the East Coast to Bristol and Plymouth and affected all stages of life, the Minister took no steps to instruct them at all?

*Mr. Gaitskell:* It would obviously be extremely foolish to issue directions before one had received a report on the whole affair.

*Captain Crowder:* Can the Minister say whether the reports we have read in the Press of the reasons for the breakdown are correct, because the Lord President of the Council has told us on so many occasions that we must not believe the things we read in the Press?

*Mr. Gaitskell:* I think that the causes are fairly clear—shortage of plant and an excessively bad spell of cool weather, combined with two breakdowns on the line.

*Mr. Bracken:* Can we have an agreement between the Minister and the Lord President of the Council that we should postpone all discussions on the Gas Bill until the Minister receives the report on the breakdown of electricity, as nationalisation is obviously not working?

*Mr. Palmer:* Is the Minister aware that the cause of this breakdown was purely technical and that a similar breakdown occurred in 1934?

*Mr. Gaitskell:* That is perfectly correct.

### CAPITAL PUNISHMENT (Royal Prerogative)

*The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede):* Some doubt having arisen following the statement which I made to the House on April 16 in regard to the advice which I should tender to His Majesty on the exercise of the Royal Prerogative of Mercy, I think it may be convenient if I now restate the position in the light of existing circumstances, and I am grateful to you, Sir, and the House

(*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. 17.

Saturday, June 26, 1948.

### Alberta Douglas Social Credit Council

It is with great pleasure that we include, as an honorary affiliate of the Secretariat, the Douglas Social Credit Council formed in Alberta under the lead of Mr. A. V. Bourcier, M.L.A., late chairman of the Social Credit Board dissolved by Mr. Manning.

The position of this Council is unique in that it has locally available the invaluable advice of Mr. L. D. Byrne, and under these circumstances no undertaking such as is normally required is necessary on its behalf. While any advice on general matters which we can furnish is always at its disposal on request, its local and unique experience qualifies it, under its present auspices, for sound, autonomous action.

### Central Control of "Science"

Writing to *The Times* on June 21, Dr. John R. Baker and Professor Tansley protested against a proposal to be made on that day to a conference at the Royal Society that a central secretariat should have the right of acceptance or rejection, as well as the allocation, of scientific papers, which it would distribute in return for block subscriptions in respect of particular branches of science. The signators to the letter, the first of whom is a zoologist writer on *inter alia*, chemical control of conception, and the second an early populariser of the 'new' psychology, describe the proposal as totalitarian, and assert that "the present arrangement serves the needs of scientists so well in most respects that its destruction would be little short of a disaster." They write on behalf of, or from, the Society for Freedom in Science, at Oxford, a body which has not yet given, so far as we know, any clear indication of great resolution to master the questions which, one would assume from its title, lie close to its heart, or mind, as the case may be.

Following close upon the publication of Professor Cohen's proposals for the remodelling of the curriculum for the training of doctors (medical), itself in the press when the final stages of the B.M.A. treason were being enacted, readers of this journal will recognise that, whatever the outcome of the 'conference' in London (and this note is written in advance of any report of it), our frequent warnings concerning the scope and comprehensiveness of the plans for the subordination of life and thought to central, but hidden policy have not exaggerated anything materially.

Concerning Messrs. Baker and Tansley's protest, we await with resignation the now familiar reply to all criticisms of the *method* of enshackling this and other nations that it

does no more than regularise and make tidy what is already current practice. (The implied suggestion that this passes unnoticed by the critics is, of course, an even sounder reason in our minds for heavily discounting their competency than it is in the minds of the defenders of the newly-won position, whatever it may be). Along one line, but only along one line, this defence is incontestable; and it would be well if those to whom it is addressed, whether combatants or the ignorant public it is so greatly desired to impress and to sway, should pay some heed to it. But, when they have done so, that is not the time to retire defeated from the field but rather to re-enter it in dead earnest. What is fatal in the present programme is not only the centralisation which it entails but the policy which it is intended that entrenchment of power should implement. And as yet the Bakers and Tansleys do not recognise the all important fact that modern science is not a policy but a technique, and they are satisfied to be left as the sole practitioners of the art. There's nothing like leather.

While it serves to show unmistakably to all who can see the direction in which we are being driven, the present desperate haste of the planners to put the finishing touches to the slave state can best be impeded by a straight challenge of those premises which are the presumed basis for their actions. Since "science" has become chiefly remarkable for its agency in the mass production of apparently insoluble practical problems, why not let us have a close season for scientific "discoveries," to last at least long enough for the practical sense of the community to recover its wind?

Democracy does not understand education, and, as the late Sir Joseph Larmor protested, education will be worthless "until it is rescued from the clutches of research." And another competent observer may be quoted: "As to 'research,' in the modern sense, it's all very well; I've no fault to find with it, nor with the industrious men who engage in it. The only trouble is that they call it *science*, when it's really *trade*."

Traders are people who sell things, and we are being sold.

### A Judaic Policy

The Dublin *Standard* of June 4 reports an address by Lieut. Colonel Creagh-Scott to the National Agricultural and Industrial Development Association, delivered on May 27, wherein the speaker said "The 1694 Act, inaugurating the debt system of finance and legalised usury, was framed by Jews and their Christian satellites... the policy pursued had a philosophy behind it and that philosophy was and is Judaic."

We are informed that this outspoken address was received enthusiastically, but note that the *Standard*, though giving a reasonable account stopped short of the specific identification made of the Jewish members of the government.

### Why?

According to the *Evening Standard* of June 16, "with Mr. Costello, the Eire Premier here for trade talks, is Mr. Dillon his Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Dillon has a conundrum to pose to our Ministry of Agriculture: 'Why do you not buy our tinned beef, although you buy our tinned horsemeat?'"

## National Insurance The Right to Contract Out

### The Place of the Campaign.

The document bearing the above title, which was signed by 7,000 people in 1946, has now been reprinted as a four-page leaflet, with space for 20 signatures and a brief foreword outlining its history; it is therefore now available\* again at a time when, with the coming into effect of the Acts, its value is likely to be increasingly realised. This has been made possible by the action of Mr. H. F. Marfleet, a social creditor who has volunteered to have his address printed on the leaflets, to act as a collecting point for the signatures, and, to the limited extent that centralised action is necessary, to act as a focus for the campaign. To him, therefore, further correspondence (when necessary) and offers of assistance should be addressed, but those interested are asked to remember that while a certain, not large, reserve of help, both work and money, will be urgently needed at the centre, the progressive decentralising of initiative is the only thing which can save us. The following notes on the place and purpose of the campaign may be of use to those who are concerned to pursue it.

The recent success of the British Medical Association in using the magic of organisation to disrupt and emasculate the opposition of 80 *per cent.* of the Medical Profession to the 'Health' Service has thrown into strong relief the fact that no partial opposition to a totalitarian (*i.e.* all-in) Plan can hope to be effective. Either the power to use universal compulsion is successfully challenged, or we submit to it: concessions, or exceptions, 'granted' by the Government, though they can be used to expose the argument that universality is *technically* necessary, are merely bargains in which the weaker party always pays the higher price in freedom.

It was with this situation in mind that the document was worded, in 1946, first as an appeal to the triple powers of our Constitution to preserve *all* those personal liberties which we have inherited, second, as an exposure of the nature and origins of National Insurance, third, as an unequivocal declaration of its immoral and un-Christian nature, and finally, as declaring the intention of those who sign it to press for repeal. Those who have complained that it is too long, too closely reasoned, or that it 'goes too far to get many signatures', or who wonder why the very legitimate grievances of special classes, such as the self-employed and pensioners, or the question of the crippling cost of the thing to the Nation as a whole, have not been exploited in it, have been under a misapprehension as to its purpose.

We must attack the key point, totalitarian compulsion—all else is secondary, and even if concessions are obtained (and they are *always* fraudulent) they cannot affect the main issue. As for those who think the document is 'too long and goes too far' for the public (even though they themselves agree with it), I would ask them to consider what their objective really is in this matter, and under what circumstances it may be obtained.

Contracting Out implies destroying the entire basis of the Insurance Acts, and disentangling them completely from general taxation. Before any such thing is within reach there has got to be a far deeper and more widespread appreciation of the pernicious nature and origins of National Insurance that at present obtains, backed by a determination to act. This

is an objective needing time and continuity of effort. To a large extent we can rely on the effects of the Acts themselves to produce the necessary output of energy, but unless there is some *cumulative* means of directing feelings aroused in an effective direction, they will be dissipated in impotent fury, or in ineffective successive attacks against one imposition after another. This cumulative means, together with the necessary exposure and information, the Declaration supplies, and it is quite proper for social creditors (acting as the civil servants of policy) to provide the public with such a means, but at the same time, to bear in mind that it takes them only a certain way towards their objective.

Before compulsory insurance can possibly be attacked effectively there has got to be a widespread knowledge of realities which are appreciated as a whole only by Social Crediters; more particularly of the economic alternative to the Social Service State, and the political alternative to the irresponsible ballot. Ultimately the Declaration, and all such action, is *only* of value in so far as it helps people to go a certain way towards an understanding of the situation, and puts some of them in touch with a source which will help them to go further. Only the unthinking can seriously suppose that the signing of documents is going to gain our objective, and if we lead people to think so we are deceiving them, and the total result of our action is to lead people into further disheartenment and to confirm the belief that nothing can be done. Effective action must take the form of a step in the right direction, *up* the ladder, so to speak, towards that state of decentralised understanding and initiative in which the power of monopoly can be broken.

The Declaration against National Insurance is, or can be, a useful, though not a very high, 'rung' on this ladder: either it is that, or it is a pure waste of time; not that it does not, within itself, carry certain sanctions which are intensely disliked by *e.g.*, The Ministry of National Insurance, but those sanctions (chiefly of exposure) are insufficient unless they are cumulative and lead on to something more. There are also in existence lower 'rungs', such as the short Petitions designed to be sent to the King through the Service Chiefs, the value of which is not in their substance but in their appeal to a power other than Parliament; and there are very much higher rungs, such as the works of Major Douglas and *The Social Crediter*; but even these last are ineffective if they do not lead the reader to the real objective, the development of decentralised understanding and initiative.

The whole point about this 'ladder' is that people should move, and be helped to move, *up* it, not *down* it! That means that an effective document is not one which *easily* gets signatures but one which takes people a little further than they could have gone without it. If the short Petitions, for instance, take any substantial time and energy from people who have already reached the stage of the 'Declaration', they will be diverting energy downhill, away from our objective; if, on the other hand they contact entirely new people, and act as feeders to the more permanent effort which was started in 1946, the energy, provided it was originally below the 'Declaration' level, will be directed uphill. Even so, I think the events of this summer will ensure that there are more people willing to support the Declaration than we can cope with. The gap in the 'ladder' seems to me to be above that level, not below it. It is the assisting of people who have signed the Declaration to carry on under their own initiative and to learn more about the circumstances of their own predicament from the only source which can inform them

\*From K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1½d. each; 4/6 for 50, postage extra.

correctly that seems to justify the spending of some time and energy by Social Crediters; but it is one thing for Social Crediters to provide the 'ladder', to keep it in repair and to direct people's attention to it; it is quite another thing for them to spend their time running up and down it to create the impression of a crowd!

It is difficult to put the emphasis correctly so that it neither encourages people to over-spend their energies at too low a level of effectiveness, nor discourages them from doing a thing, if they do it at all, with all their might, and in the full conviction that it is worth while. The general principle seems to be: never use energy which is available for work at a higher level, but if possible use that which would otherwise waste itself at a lower level. For instance, in anybody who is not completely apathetic, a great deal of fury and indignation is necessarily aroused every day by the behaviour of the administration. Speaking personally, the uctuous air of benevolence with which our social servicers rob us with threats of draconic punishment, make whatever impudent conditions they like about the doling out of pittances of our own money to us when we are in desperate straits of some sort and therefore in a poor position to refuse the conditions, and pay themselves out of the proceeds—I say it is not so much the robbery as the pretence that this unspeakable behaviour is a Great Benevolent Act which produces nausea.

But more effective than any subjective feeling is the Declaration, which has a good edge to it, and a certain amount of weight (more, apparently, than some people like); and if people would use it on their local National Insurance Office as well as the Ministry, which is already heartily sick of it, instead of venting their rage on the family, the furniture, or the cat, then it might give them some satisfaction; but *not* if it is going to be done instead of abolishing the secret ballot, which is more important. It has got to lead up to that to be effective, and an important intermediate step is to use it to increase the readership of *The Social Crediter*.

In conclusion, a few words about Petitions might not be out of place. The document which I am now calling The Declaration incorporates in its first few words a Petition to Our Sovereign Lord the King, which, however, it has not so far been found possible to deliver to him. This was tested out by the process of sending the original petition, from the *four* people who first signed it, together with a statement that a definite number of other people also supported it, first of all direct to Buckingham Palace, and later copies of it to the Ministers concerned, the Lords, the Archbishops, and finally the Chiefs of the Three Fighting Services. What happened in the first case was that the King's Secretary definitely refused to submit it to His Majesty, stating that he had not the power to do so, but was forwarding it to The Minister of National Insurance, and the Minister then asserted that *The King* had referred it to him, and by His Majesty's command he had given it his careful consideration, but was unable, *etc., etc.* A letter challenging this was not answered by the Ministry, but later when they received the Petition again from the Chief of one of the Services (Lord Tedder) they sent out a copy of the same letter (about His Majesty's commands, *etc.*) The position therefore is that the signatures have not reached His Majesty, and there is no intention of surrendering them to anyone else but an authorised representative of *our* Sovereign Lord the King, and least of all to any representative of the Government Monopopoly against whose tyrannies the petition is directed. This means

that, unlike most petitions, which might be described as a roundabout way of putting a lot of paper and signatures, and the work and aspirations they represent, into a Government waste-paper basket, the Petition and Declaration against National Insurance operates as a sort of continuous open ballot in favour of the assertions made therein, a basis for further action, which can be cumulative until its objective is reached.

The main value of the project lies in its wide dissemination setting up a flow towards an improved understanding of the situation, but the central collection of names and addresses constitutes a useful basis for publicity from time to time, and provides a selection from among the general public of people who are more likely than others to be ready for the next step on the ladder, which at present is *The Social Crediter*.  
C. G. D.

(The text of the Declaration was republished in THE SOCIAL CREDITER for June 12).

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3)

for the opportunity to do so.

His Majesty's Prerogative completely to pardon an offender or, by a condition pardon, to mitigate the full penalty imposed by law only arises after the sentence of the court dealing with the offence to which the pardon relates and is exercised only after a submission on each occasion of the relevant facts and considerations. Thus, His Majesty's discretion is exercised in the light of the circumstances existing in each particular case, but it is exercised on advice and it is my duty, in advising His Majesty, to guide myself in accordance with consistent principles as far as may be practicable.

Moreover, I am bound in each case to have regard to all relevant considerations including, for instance, amongst other considerations, the reaction which a particular course might be expected to produce in the minds of the public. This consideration has special weight if the law relating to the irrevocable penalty of death may be in process of alteration by Parliament.

At the time of my original statement it seemed not unlikely that within the course of the present session of Parliament, the death penalty for murder might be suspended for at least five years. That, at all events, was the decision of this House accepted by His Majesty's Government. On that assumption, whilst it would clearly have been intolerable merely to respite sentences and to leave in doubt the fate of persons under sentence of death until the Criminal Justice Bill had finally been passed into law, it seemed to me manifestly undesirable that, during the interim period, while the legislation was under consideration, the execution of the death penalty in a particular case should depend on the stage which happened to have been reached in the Parliamentary process.

Accordingly, I came to the conclusion that it would be my duty in considering capital cases during the interim period, to treat the prospect of an early change in the law as a compelling reason for advising the commutation of such sentences. If, without making any public statement I had done what I have done in each of the five recent capital cases, namely recommended a reprieve mainly or solely on the ground that there was a prospect of an early change in the law and that the carrying out of the death sentence in these circumstances would be abhorrent to public opinion, no

question about the constitutional propriety of my action would have arisen.

My action has been called in question not because I recommended these five reprieves, but because I stated beforehand the course which I proposed to follow. It is said that by so doing and thus indicating that all persons convicted of murder during the interim period would have their sentences commuted, I converted what would otherwise have been a legitimate procedure into a misuse of the Royal Prerogative for the purpose of dispensing with the law.

On this abstruse issue different views appear to be held by lawyers, but the broad issue appears to me to be as follows: If the public have been left in ignorance of the reason for reprieves in cases which presented no mitigating features, the resulting bewilderment as to the principles guiding the exercise of the Prerogative would have been most unfortunate. I, therefore, felt it right in the most exceptional circumstances to state the general lines of policy that I should follow.

For these reasons I made the statement on April 16. That statement was not questioned, and I had every reason to believe that it commanded general assent until nearly seven weeks later it was suggested that by making that statement I had exposed myself to a charge of unconstitutional conduct. My answer to that charge is simply this: that while it is of high importance to avoid even the appearance of infringing a constitutional principle, it is also important that the public should be aware of the general principles upon which His Majesty would be advised in the exercise of His Prerogative.

What I have so far said relates to the statement of April 16 and the circumstances in which it was made. Those circumstances have in my view changed as a result of the further Parliamentary discussion on the Bill. In consequence I feel it right to take this opportunity to make it plain that from now on each case will be considered on its merits, regard being had to the special considerations relating to that case and all other relevant considerations either of a public or private nature.

*Mr. Eden:* I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman has so clearly stated that, in view of the decisions which have been taken, the statement of April 16 is modified in the light of those decisions. I should like to be quite clear about this. It is a little difficult to follow these intricate statements, but, as I understand it, the position now is that we revert to exactly the position—[HON. MEMBERS: "No."] I am only asking. Perhaps the Home Secretary might be allowed to answer. Are we reverting to exactly the position of the Home Secretary before the statement of April 16?

*Mr. Ede:* I shall consider each case on its merits in the light of all the circumstances at the time I have to tender advice on each occasion.

*Mr. Eden:* I am very much obliged. Was not that exactly the constitutional position of the Home Secretary before April 16?

*Hon. Members:* Answer.

*Mr. Ede:* I am not trying to make a point. I am trying to make it clear where we are.

*Mr. Ede:* That was the position prior to that statement. The considerations I have to take into account may of course be varied by the growth of public opinion one way or the other.

*Hon. Members:* Oh.

*Mr. Clement Davies:* I am glad that the Home Secretary has now made this statement. He has, in my opinion at any rate, made the constitutional position perfectly clear. I think that in making the statement on April 16 he did make a mistake on a grave constitutional issue. I would add that we all know the right hon. Gentleman and his kindness of heart, and we know that the statement he made on April 16 was made with the very best motive.

*Mr. Sydney Silverman:* Can my right hon. Friend say on what date the change was made in the formula used by His Majesty's judges in pronouncing the death sentence, whether it is proposed that the new form shall continue, and whether that change had the agreement of the Lord Chief Justice and the other judges; and whether that agreement was given before or after the constitutional doubts arose?

*Mr. Ede:* I do not want to say anything that would appear to be a criticism of the Lord Chief Justice—

*Hon. Members:* Why not?

*Mr. Brendan Bracken:* It would be completely out of Order.

*Mr. Ede:*—in his capacity as Lord Chief Justice, but on April 19, he wrote to me to say that in view of the statement I had made in the House on the 16th, he, in consultation with the judges, proposed to modify the procedure in the courts, and at no time until the speech of an ex-Lord Chancellor in another place had anyone suggested to me that my action was un-constitutional. I would say to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Montgomery (Mr. C. Davies), whom I thank for what he said, that he is a lawyer and I am not, and as far as I know he did not spot the mistake until it was pointed out.

*Mr. Nally:* While I agree entirely with the general tenor of the Home Secretary's statement, there is a point towards the end which I must confess I am quite unable to understand. Are we to understand that we now revert to the position before this House took its decision on the death penalty, and does it follow from that that the Home Secretary, in considering cases now before him or cases which may come before him in the weeks ahead, will be guided by the position as it was before the House took that vote or by the position as it may be as a result of a compromise agreement? In short, are we reverting to the position before we took our vote when in point of fact it is highly likely that this House and another place will reach an agreement which still rules out several types of murder from being subject to the death penalty?

*Mr. Ede:* No, Sir. My position is the constitutional one of Home Secretary. In giving this advice, I have to have regard to all the circumstances surrounding the particular case, and I do not think that I ought to be pressed to go beyond that.

*Mr. John Paton:* On that point, may I ask my right hon. Friend if part of the general circumstances which he must consider in dealing with each case individually is the effect which the mere accident of time may have as an element in determining the fate of one man as compared with another?

*Mr. Ede:* I do not think I have anything to add to the statement which I have made, but it is quite clear that it is possible that that would be one of the circumstances. May I reply to a point put by the hon. Member for Nelson and Colne (Mr. S. Silverman) which I missed? The formula

to be used in the courts is a matter for the judges. It was altered by them recently, and I do not think it would be right of me to intervene at this stage to suggest either that the alteration should continue or that they should revert. I think that is a matter entirely for His Majesty's judges.

*Mr. Emrys Roberts:* Referring to what the Home Secretary has just said, with which I entirely agree, would he consider publishing the communications which took place between him and the Lord Chief Justice, in order to clear away the impression which was created in another place—which I believe was quite wrong—that the Home Secretary had tried to give a direction to the judiciary?

*Mr. Ede:* No, Sir. I hope the House will be prepared to accept the statement I have made. The present formula used in the courts is that which the judges themselves suggested should be used.

*Mr. Bing:* On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Could I seek your Ruling on one point? This discussion arises out of a statement which was made by the Lord Chief Justice—[HON. MEMBERS: "Lord Chancellor."] Up till now, while we have been permitted to comment on and quote from statements made by Ministers, that has not extended to, or the case has not come up, where such a statement is made by an officer of State. It is a very difficult position, I would suggest, with all respect to this House, when statements are made which we cannot criticise and cannot even quote. I was going to suggest that it would perhaps be possible, where a statement is made by an officer of State criticising a Minister in regard to the Executive's conduct, which it is the duty of this House and not of any other place to judge, that it should be proper for us to quote and refer to what was said.

*Mr. Speaker:* I am afraid I can give the hon. Member no encouragement whatsoever. If we once start quoting speeches made in another place, be they by the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice, or any private Member, we are getting back into the stage when this House is going to fight with the other, which is the one thing we always try strongly to avoid. I must rule that any quotation, any reference to a speech—which was a debating speech after all, not a statement of law—is out of Order in this House.

*Mr. Eden:* I cannot agree more with what you have just said, Mr. Speaker, but I want to make the position quite clear. The position as I understand it is that if there is statement of policy, we in this House are entitled to refer to statements of policy but we are not entitled to quote or refer to individual speeches?

*Mr. Speaker:* I was speaking about the other day when the Lord Chancellor made a debating statement, and I thought it was liable to be quoted. I was wrong. Even that one may not quote. It must be a definite statement of policy by a Minister of the Crown. That can be quoted in this House, and that is all.

*Mr. Henry Strauss:* May I put one question to the Home Secretary? I understood him to say that he did not appreciate until some weeks later that this constitutional point arose. How does he reconcile that with the statement made by the Lord President of the Council a week ago today that he had thought the point might have been taken at once, and thereby showed that he was well conscious of the constitutional point?

*Mr. Ede:* I do not think I am called upon either to reconcile the statement or to defend my right hon. Friend.

The hon. and learned Gentleman himself, on occasion, tries to claim the position of being a constitutional authority. Not a single lawyer on that side of the House, or on any other side of the House, suggested that any constitutional principle was involved until an ex-Lord Chancellor spoke in another place. . . .

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

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.  
(Postage 1d.)

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

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

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

### ALSO

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

(Full list on application).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
(Please allow for postage when remitting).  
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.