

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 21 No. 22.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 29, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Whether any effective good is achieved by an endeavour, in which we persist, to play the part of Greek Chorus to the world's tragedy and agony, is not easy to assess. It must be true that before anything practically useful can be done, there must be some understanding somewhere of the nature of the crime and the location of the main criminals; and, with other victims of the triumph of hope over experience, we do something to add to that knowledge.

But it is little less than staggering to observe the general reaction to the publicising of a very considerable body of evidence demonstrating the callous treason which has shaped the affairs of Great Britain and her dependencies—we emphasise the word—during the past fifty years at least. The attitude most commonly met is that of the mildly interested spectator. The business is not of course to be compared to a League football match, or even to a good detective story, but, if you don't have too much of it, it will serve to while away an hour.

We put down a great part of our distress to the skilful cultivation of this attitude of *panem et circenses*. "Let George do it" is not necessarily a vicious policy; but to avoid disaster in any field of activity, it must be *ad hoc*; as a principle, it leads where it always has led, into slavery. Professionalism, yes; but not to the exclusion of the essential paramountcy of amateurism.

And in further extenuation of the inertness found in the face of the worst threat in two thousand years, there is the largeness of the canvas and the four-dimensionality of the action. It may be useful, therefore, to apply a pantagraph in reverse; to scale down the picture, even at the expense of detail, so that something comprehensible can be seen as a whole.

The argument, then, is that there is an international world power which has as its aim its own transformation into a supranational power, unchallenged and unchallengeable, to which every knee must bow. Impractical and conceited intellectuals, gangsters and rogues all serve its turn. Its internationality takes the form of either appointing or controlling significant officials and executives in National Administrations and Industrial Cartels, and these men (and women) are under various forms of compulsion to obey the behests of the international power. Obviously, sooner or later, the interests of the international power (and no other interests receive a moment's consideration) require the reshuffling of national powers, such as the British Empire, lest they become (as the British did become) a menace to world power. A national power in this situation is systematically attacked through the agency of other National Administrations and Cartels. Notice particularly the bearing which this policy has on the idea that either "Russia" or "U.S.A." would be allowed to emerge from any conflict supreme *as such*.

The organisation chosen for the first attack was Imperial Germany, for many fairly obvious reasons on which it is not necessary to digress. That the outcome of this first phase of the attack was foreseen is proved by the shift of focus by international interests both from Germany and London, to New York *before the War*.

The second attack overlapped the first, and the organisation was and is the U.S.A. The major techniques are the fomentation of war and revolution, and two of the later instances are the conditions imposed by what is commonly called "Lend-lease" upon Great Britain and the fomentation of "Indonesian" revolt against the Dutch, preparatory to the grant by the "Indonesian Republic" of comprehensive concessions to a Mr. Matthew Fox of New York. In the trading monopoly to be set up over the whole of "Indonesia" the "Americans" control 51 *per cent.* of the shares.

As throwing light on the Lend-Lease contribution to the current "Revolution" in "Britain," which is as British as the Bolshevik Revolution was Russian, the *New York Times* of February 7, 1941, is helpful. Its Washington correspondent remarks:—

"The suspicion is, and for some time has been, that the American and British New Dealers who have most influence with the President (Roosevelt) aim at a socialisation of industry in both countries; that the form of the Lend-Lease Act will assist in bringing about that result here; and that Ambassador Winant was selected as the best liason officer to that end with Britons of like mind."

It may be observed that behind the shop-front provided by Mr. Winant, who was afterwards found shot, the individuals who actually collaborated with the "Britons" of like mind were Mr. Benjamin Cohen, Jnr., and Mr. Sidney Hillman (Schmuel Gilman), the latter one of the most dangerous Jews who ever operated under the cloak of American citizenship. They were in the closest touch with P.E.P., Mr. Emanuel Shinwell and Mr. Silkin.

Commenting on this situation, the *New Zealand Mirror* in its August issue remarks:— "Acceptance by foreign nations of an International New Deal [P.E.P.] programme of economic regimentation was evidently to be the price for American aid in the war."

It should be noted that (a) There has been no investigation into the 1940 debacle, both on the Continent and to the mysterious orders which hamstringing the Royal Navy in respect of the invasion of Norway, (b) From that time, the position of Great Britain was that of a satellite power of the United States. The position of Mr. Churchill, his obsession with military victory even at the cost of permanent civil defeat, and the insistence of Roosevelt on the removal of Chamberlain and his succession by Churchill, are instances of the ability and care with which the staff work of the international power is conducted.

Consider this picture; and then decide on the likelihood

of a major adjustment of financial technique which would prove fatal to the Plot, and, in the light of it whether it is sounder to pretend, as in Alberta, that there is no fight ahead but only an intellectual conversion, or that the whole world is faced with the greatest battle of all recorded history, on the issue of which all ancillary issues hang; and that the enlightenment of those that have ears to hear is an obligation.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: January 18, 1949.

Transjordan (British Forces)

Mr. Clement Davies (by Private Notice) asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs the reasons why British Armed Forces have been sent to Transjordan, Egypt and/or Palestine, areas where under the decision of the Security Council of May 29, 1948, no Armed Forces were to be sent, and whether the prior consent of the Security Council was obtained before such Armed Forces were sent; and further, whether he will give an assurance that British Armed Forces will not be ordered to engage in military operations in this area and that no further Armed Forces will be sent into this area.

Mr. Bevin: Having regard to the statement I have just made, I would deprecate having to go into details regarding the circumstances which led the Government of Transjordan to ask, under the Anglo-Transjordan Treaty, for the stationing of British Forces at Akaba. His Majesty's Government took the view that under the Treaty this was a request we could not refuse in the light of all the circumstances and events of that moment.

As these troops were sent to Transjordan territory and no troops have been sent to Palestine, there was no obligation upon us to seek the assent of the Security Council.

As regards the second part of the Question, our future action will be determined by our treaty obligations and United Nations decisions. We have no obligation or intention to engage in any offensive or aggressive action. We hope that the truce which now exists will be maintained and that no further question of military operations will arise. . . .

. . . on this question of recognition, it is not an easy matter, and we cannot take one State in an isolated way. There is another part of the world where the whole question of *de facto* recognition has created very serious trouble.

Mr. Churchill: Where?

Mr. Bevin: In Indonesia, where very serious troubles and very great difficulties have arisen on questions of sovereignty and so forth. Therefore, it is not an easy matter, and we have been trying to arrive at an arrangement on the basis of the United Nations decisions. We are only trying to get this matter cleared up. With regard to scuttling, I can think the right hon. Gentleman knows me well enough to realise that I am almost too fat to scuttle anywhere.

Mr. Janner: While appreciating the belated consent to be given to the victims in Cyprus to proceed to Israel, may I ask my right hon. Friend whether, pending the Debate, he will see to it that no steps are taken of a unilateral nature which will further complicate the position, and that no troops or forces will be sent to that part of the world in order to

encourage, or to appear to encourage, an attitude against Israel which is not the correct one, and will he definitely support the negotiations taking place between the two interested parties?

Mr. Bevin: My policy since I have been in Office has always been that this problem will never be settled, will never be settled—I repeat that—unless by agreement between the two parties. It has been my policy that force on either side will not finally settle it. We shall have trouble for years if we do not recognise that fact. I have been encouraging, helping and trying to get the negotiations going. On the other hand, there will be no need to move any troops at all, and no need to do anything, if both sides now keep the truce, and I shall be against either side that breaks it.

Mr. Churchill: May we feel assured that the Foreign Secretary will feel under no restrictions or impediments for taking any necessary measures to procure the safety and effective action of the troops which the Government have sent to Akaba, and that that does not depend upon any other issue than what is considered necessary by His Majesty's Government?

Mr. Bevin: I can give the right hon. Gentleman that assurance.

Mr. Churchill: Thank you.

Major Legge-Bourke: May I ask the Foreign Secretary if he can give an assurance that the Commanding Officer in the Canal Zone has been left entirely responsible for looking after the local security of the British troops in the Canal Zone?

Mr. Gallacher: May I ask the Foreign Secretary if it is not the case that Transjordan is not in these discussions for an armistice, and would it not strengthen the possibility of an armistice and of lasting peace, particularly with Transjordan, if there was *de facto* recognition of the Israeli Government?

Mr. Bevin: Transjordan was the first country to make an armistice; they entered into it. They have never invaded —[*Interruption.*] All the stuff which the hon. Gentleman gets is not correct.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gallacher: You are pals again.

Mr. Bevin: Never mind whether they are pals or enemies; I do not mind. The fact is that Transjordan troops have never yet entered any territory allocated to the Israelis by the United Nations.

Mr. H. Strauss: May I ask the Foreign Secretary one question regarding his statement about Cyprus? Does he say that the release of these men is taking place with Arab consent?

Mr. Bevin: No. They were kept there without Arab consent, and without the Arabs asking for it. They were dealt with under entirely different arrangements.

Mr. Sydney Silverman: While endorsing what my right hon. Friend has said about there never having been an invasion from Transjordan into the area allotted by the United Nations to Israel, is it not equally true that there has never been any incursion from the State of Israel into any part of Transjordan, and in these circumstances was it necessary to send any troops at all?

Mr. Bevin: This is where we get into details. The fact is that there was reconnaissance the other way, and very grave danger was felt. I do not want to say any more, and, unless I am provoked, I will not say any more.

Private Members' Bills

The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison): I beg to move,

"That—

(1) save as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this order, Government business shall have precedence at every sitting for the remainder of the Session;

(2) Public Bills other than Government Bills shall have precedence over Government business on Friday, February 11 and on the six next succeeding Fridays;

(3) on and after Friday, June 24 Public Bills other than Government Bills shall be arranged on the Order Paper in the following order: Considerations of Lords Amendments, Third Readings, Considerations of Report not already entered upon and adjourned proceedings on Consideration; and Bills so arranged shall have precedence over Government business on Friday, June 24 and on the two next succeeding Fridays;

... (5) for the remainder of the Session no Public Bills other than Government Bills or Bills introduced under paragraph (4) of this Order shall be introduced."

... The proposal is to set apart seven Fridays for the Second Readings of Private Members' Bills, the priority of which will be determined by a ballot. If the House agrees to this Motion the first of these will be Friday, February 11, and the last of the seven consecutive Fridays will be March 15. The Government propose to set apart three Fridays, if required, for the consideration of Private Members' Bills which have reached their final stages. These Fridays will occur after the Whitsun Recess; the first will be Friday, June 24 and the last Friday, July 8. . . .

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby): . . . We [the Select Committee on the Procedure of the House] made the strongest possible recommendation that the complete and full rights of Private Members should be restored at the earliest possible date. We are now at the beginning of 1949, and the war has been over four years, and if we cannot reassert four years after the end of the war the very modest measure of rights which Private Members had, we are in a very parlous condition indeed.

I want the same rights as we had before in the matter of Bills. I want the Ten-minute Rule restored. I also want Motions restored, because Motions were generally as valuable as, and sometimes more valuable than, a Bill. In a Motion one was not tied down to the precise terms of a draft Bill. One could introduce a Motion in general terms in order to concentrate public opinion on an important matter and have a first-class Debate in the House and a Division at the end. It was not binding on the Government but it was a valuable indication of public and parliamentary opinion.

The Government's Motion does not give back those rights, and I join other hon. Members in asking the Government to amend the Motion in order to do so. . . .

Earl Winterton (Horsham): . . . I am bound to say . . . that it is with a feeling of something approaching very deep melancholy that I have watched the attitude of the House towards this Debate. We have had most admirable speeches

from both sides of the House, but the impression left in my mind—I hope this will not get me into trouble with the Chair—is that the House as a whole, both those Members in it and those who are not in it, have really ceased to take any real practical interest in this matter of Private Members' time.

I am judging now from the attendance in the House, and from the general attitude during the Debate. I cannot imagine such things happening even 10 or 15 years ago. Then, the House would have been full. Various Members, especially those who had just joined the House, would have been getting up to protest. Today there is the same kind of attitude as on all these occasions when the Government proposes motions of this kind. It does not matter whether it is a Tory or a Socialist Government. They find the same argument against their opponents. It is all a natural process. To use a phrase which has been given by an hon. Member below the Gangway, and which has been held to be in Order by Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the House is gradually being turned into a body of official stooges and thinks it does not really matter. This is a very serious thing from the point of view of the whole position of Parliament.

I am not going to attack this Government in particular. I attack the whole system. I have done so when I have been supporting a Government. I have constantly attacked the whole attitude of Governments—and, if I may say so, of chief whips on both sides of the House—towards this question of Private Members' time.

The first thing I want to say, if I might have the attention of the Home Secretary is this. The assumption, as it seemed to me, inherent in the speech—although I did not hear all of it—of the Leader of the House, was that in this case the Government had made a concession. I agree with the three Independent Members below the Gangway that this is not a question of concession. I would say that the right of Private Members to have a due amount of time to introduce Bills or to propose Motions was an inalienable, hereditary, right of Private Members.

Mr. Eric Fletcher (Islington, East) indicated dissent.

Earl Winterton: I see an hon. Member shake his head, but I say that in the past it was so and it was Private Members or the House as a whole who made concessions when they allowed successive Governments to take up an amount of time they would never have dreamed of taking 30 or 40 years ago.

Mr. Fletcher: I understood the noble Lord to say that it was an inalienable right, but surely, he would not disagree

(Continued on page 6.)

STATES ACTUAL, REAL & POTENTIAL

by

TUDOR JONES, Sc.D., M.D., F.R.S.E.

(The substance of an Address to the Speke Discussion Group on 7th December, 1948).

PRICE 6d.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

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. 21. No. 22.

Saturday, January 29, 1949.

Wooden Walls?

Why is the effective level of intelligence displayed in the common operations of daily life, performed when the individual is acting *solo*, so much higher than that shown in operations, even operations not nearly so naturally difficult, performed in concert? When a man buys a pane of glass to mend a window, he measures the window and in turn measures the pane after giving the right specification to the vendor, does not forget to buy putty, studies the weather and his and other people's convenience, disposes of broken fragments which he is replacing systematically, paints the exposed surfaces in due course and thinks no more about it. He may be relatively unfamiliar with these operations of craftsmanship; but that does not delay him for long. Yet, with far greater familiarity with all that is visibly and sensibly involved, not only the tyro but the reputedly accomplished performer, seems to find the counterparts of margins, size-weight ratios and particularly order, the natural sequence of events, quite beyond his grasp if the matter in hand is one touching social organisation.

The extraordinary veneration of centralisation now current is an example to which for some time we have been paying close attention. In addition to the great multiplication of official boards of all kinds, unofficial boards of all kinds are springing up like mushrooms. Is this merely an instance of the play of the instinct of imitation—the child gunman reproducing the excitements of the films? Of mass suggestion? Of somnambulism? Conference is the order of the day. Soon there will be a Washerwomen's Conference, followed by a Seven O'clock Washerwomen's Conference, a Mean Street Washerwomen's Conference, a Light Materials Washerwomen's Conference and a Heavy Materials Washerwomen's Conference, a Conference of the Blued and the Unblued Finished Garment-washers Washerwomen. They will, they say, gain the benefit of the Exchange of Experience; they will Pool Resources; they will Get Fuller and Ever-Fuller Information. About washing? They know (or they used to know) all there was to be known about washing. They will get to know what other washerwomen, the Seven-Thirties, the Cambrics and the Wools are doing; and these Conferences will be Informal, admittedly Self-Appointed—but Great Oaks from Little Acorns grow; and what could be a better justification? The Wooden Walls of Old England, don't you know! Oak!

This isn't the sort of thinking that goes on (or went on) in an English farm-house in 1900, or at any time before. It's the sort of thing one associates with lunatics.

Our Secretary says our Secretary must go to the Secretaries' Conference. Oh, is there a Secretaries Conference, one asks? How long has it been in existence? Who has constituted it? Why should he go? The answer

is that he must go in order to report back. And what can he have heard, we ask? Surely the other Secretaries are in like case with himself—or have they been told what to tell Our Secretary? And what is Our Secretary going to contribute to the merriment? Oh, he is only going for information. What information?

These outings are not so innocent, nor so useless as they seem. They act as a lens, as a burning glass: they focus the feeble rays of ignorance and ineptitude until feebleness and ineptitude outdazzle and burn up knowledge and understanding; and it is as easy to see that this must be so as it is to see why you can't mend a window by weight.

Cardinal Mindszenty

The following addendum to the earlier published statements (cited by *The Social Crediter*) alleging the use of drugs to extort 'confessions' from prisoners in the hands of the Communists appears in *The Tablet* for January 22, following the text of a further document from the Hungarian Hierarchy:—

"Very great interest has been aroused by the document which we printed last week under the heading 'Trial by Actedron.' It should perhaps have been made more clear that this was not written by the Cardinal himself; it will have been noted that it referred to him in the third person; but it was drawn up at his request, on the basis of information supplied to him before his arrest, asking that it should be widely disseminated after his arrest. It was written in Budapest on December 28, by a priest who has been very close to the Cardinal, and there is no doubt at all about its authenticity."

The article goes on to give further information concerning what is known in England about Actedron and, also about the use made in political trials of Evipan and similar synthetic anaesthetics under various names, e.g., Pentothal. (Readers will remember the appearance of the phrase "applied hypno- and narco-analysis," in last week's article on the "Management" of Criminals in Denmark.)

In 1940

From *Week to Week*, January 22:—The date, "In 1946," introducing sentences from *The Edmonton Bulletin* of December 4, 1948, was corrected too late for printing. It should have been "In 1940."

"... Major Douglas possesses one of the most penetrating intellects of our time; he has a profound knowledge of the 'set-up' behind governments—and he is fearless—a combination of gifts most rare in a time-serving world."
 —Truth.

THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

by C. H. DOUGLAS

8/6 NET.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 7, VICTORIA STREET,
 LIVERPOOL, 2.

ROUGH PASSAGE

The whole idea of abstract Truth is having a very rough passage just now. That condition, of course, appears to be more or less chronic with it; but there is a rhythm in the contest between what we call "right" and "wrong", and the present era certainly gives the impression of being one in which there is a perversity of peculiar ferociousness abroad. It is natural, no doubt, to regard one's own span of consciousness on this plane as unique, and we must be on our guard against the tendency. Nonetheless, we must not forget that at the inauguration of the Christian era there were predictions of an ideological crisis to come regarding the concept of Truth; even indications of the conditions in which it would arise, to which the prevailing state of affairs appears to be a fairly close approximation. There can be no doubt, I think, that the scope of current world events makes the not inconsiderable upheavals that have convulsed Western civilisation in the past look like no more than civil and domestic brawls.

It is not easy to bring this matter immediately home to our consciousness. Abstract Truth is apt to be a cold and unconvincing subject, even for discussion, notwithstanding that it is the focal centre of what we call Christianity, a term that can only be adequately defined as the cult of Truth. Unless we can accept it as embodied in some *way of living*, or better, some particular body of individuals who live that way, it is very hard to bring it down to earth and make a tangible and intelligible issue out of it. But if we say that Christianity, which is a particular outlook and way of living that outlook, is having a rough passage, meaning by that abstract term, Christianity, Western Christendom, including the United States for what she is worth spiritually—neither more nor less,—then I think we are approaching something more tangible. And if we push the matter further, taking Great Britain as the spiritual and cultural, if not now the material head of Christendom, as she undoubtedly is, then I think we can accept her and, in a more dispersed sense her Dominions and Empire, as the embodiment of the Christian idea of abstract Truth.*

On England, or Great Britain, then, in the collective and abstract sense, as also in the concrete and individual one, is focussed the "rough" treatment reserved for Christian Truth. And all of us, in the degree determined by our individual identification with Christianity; with the British way of life, of living Truth, are inevitably sharers in it with her. This "rough passage", like everything else of the kind, begins in the domain of mind or thinking, and is exemplified not only in physical hardship, but in constant defamation; in persistent writing-down and de-motion—"enough to deceive even the very elect", *i.e.*, the victim himself!

From a world-political point of view Great Britain gives the impression of being ham-strung, the sinews of her resolution cut, and her actions rendered fruitless and her case without conviction, even perhaps to herself. And in the circumstances I cannot help feeling that there is a strong link of identity between the position this country finds herself

* I exclude Europe from this admittedly over-simplified concept of Christianity—except in so far as she is an integral and inescapable part of its historical origin—mainly for the convenience of argument; because the focus of post-Reformation Christianity undoubtedly transferred to England, where it has achieved a comparatively full expression.

in, and that occupied by the Social Credit philosophy, and most certainly their present treatment at the hands of the world in general is very similar. Both are assumed not to count—and maybe for the moment they don't—in the affairs of the world. The very foundations of thought upon which England and the culture she stands for has been built up, and which is the basis of the scientific economic of Social Credit—that is, Christian realism; the belief and understanding of an operative and Natural Law—is being assailed and contradicted and denied expression everywhere. And in honourable company with it is found Social Credit, its natural and proper Twentieth Century extension, which, so far, Christendom has failed to undertake. Both Great Britain and Social Credit are today at an apparently complete discount as world factors, and are being ignored where practicable, and where this is not possible, are being written down feverishly. All of which represents the concrete aspect of the abstract, mental attack on philosophic reality; which attack is known as dialectical materialism.

The present position of the whole concept of Truth, or Christian realism, and with it those who uphold it, is like that of a ship in a hurricane, through which it must pass. There is very little the crew can do while the fury lasts beyond keeping up their heads and their hearts, and refusing to panic or allow themselves for a moment to doubt the integrity of their craft. What raised the storm belongs to the past, and is beyond prayer. It has just to be weathered, till it has blown itself out. And it is this apparent executive inability that constitutes the essential test of one's faith. (I say apparent because there is such confusion in human thinking as to what constitutes positive activity).

In physical metaphor the situation of the ship is a useful parallel to that of the idea of Natural Law today, and those who hold to it. And the outcome from that situation, which only Faith can foretell and time prove, will be determined by the firmness or otherwise—the thoroughness—with which Truth, the commonsense of realism, has been planted in the "inner parts" of Christian peoples. Is it deeply enough embedded, for instance, in the people of Great Britain and the Empire, to withstand the disintegrating and atavistic influence of panic—which is active disbelief, or absence of Faith—promoted with diabolical cunning? Apparently, it was not in the Germans, nor in the Russians, nor, in a less specific sense, in any of the European nations,—not even cultured France,—most of whom received their Christian indoctrination with a generous lacing of Roman paganism. It is now left with the English-speaking countries, with England at their head, to answer the question and give the proof. And for the individual consciousness, in which alone all issues arise and are resolved, there is nothing he can do about it but endeavour to be true to himself—no small job! and await with confidence the abatement of the wind.

NORMAN WEBB.

Palestine's Place in the World Crisis

Mr. Arthur Rogers, whose book *The Palestine Mystery* has been reviewed in *The Social Crediter* writes from 2 Holly Bush Hill, N.W.3:—

Great Britain will be unable to defend herself, and her undertakings to other nations will fall to the ground, if there

is not a just settlement of the Palestine problem. This grave situation may be seen from the following facts:—

1. There is no assurance that Great Britain's foreign policy, including her support of Western Union, will not be forcibly challenged by the Soviet Union. In such a conflict the most important area would be where Great Britain is least able to defend her vital interests and the Soviet Union best able to attack them.

2. The armed forces needed by Great Britain to resist the Soviet Union, and to carry out her international obligations, are entirely dependent upon oil or petrol for their motive power, but less than two *per cent.* of Great Britain's oil requirements are obtainable in the British Empire—in Trinidad. There are, however, vast oil resources in which the British Government has financial interests in Arab countries and in Persia.

3. Great Britain's chief source of oil supply is in Persia. It would come to an immediate end with an outbreak of hostilities with the Soviet Union.

4. The Iraq-Haifa oil pipe-line is in Zionist hands in the valley of Armageddon, in northern Palestine, and the Iraq Government declared on December 27, 1948, that they will not permit the oil to flow through it again "until the Palestine problem is solved and the Arabs' just demands met."

5. During the 1939-45 war, when transport from the Middle East became difficult, 40 *per cent.* of Great Britain's oil came from Venezuela. Since then, the Cominform has established its South American base in that country, where there is now a Communist organisation "in every village." Recent reports state that the Venezuelan Government which seized power on November 23 is considering a cancellation of the existing oil concessions. Moreover, Venezuela is outside the sterling area. That source of oil supply is therefore no longer reliable.

6. Apart from the difficulties due to the great distance of the Dutch East Indies, there is now no assurance of oil supplies from that region. After the U.S.A. and Japan entered the last war, *The American Hebrew*, which is the chief organ of American Zionism, published an article in two consecutive issues emphasising that a return to the pre-war status of the Dutch East Indies could not be tolerated because "we" (the American Zionists) required the oil there.

7. Of the remaining major sources of oil supply, those which are not in Soviet hands are under American control, and their yield is barely adequate for U.S.A. needs. Other minor sources of supply are altogether inadequate for British needs.

8. King Abdulla of Transjordan, who was appointed by the Colonial Office in 1921, is disliked by other Arab rulers; but, on account of the Iraq pipe-line, Great Britain is bound by treaty to help Transjordan if attacked by another State. On the other hand, Zionist leaders have stated persistently that they need Transjordan as well as Palestine for their "national home", and they are backed by the Soviet Union. Great Britain's recognition of "Israel" as a Sovereign State would, therefore, be at the risk of starting another Great War.

9. Great Britain would be without the oil supplies now needed for carrying on such a war. If not entirely overcome by the Soviets in a military sense, she would be defeated by the Zionist financiers of the U.S.A., who have often admitted

that they financed the Russian Revolution.

10. There is a popular view that the U.S.A. Government (as well as the American people) are so hostile to the Soviet Union that they are certain to rush to the aid of any country at war with Communism and can be counted upon to dispose of the Soviets at short notice by means of Atom bombs. Apart from the morality and military efficacy of Atom bombs, this view of the intentions of those who control American policy is not supported by the attitude of the U.S.A. to Communist successes in China. It is contradicted by the actions of the U.S.A. in relation to Palestine and the Dutch East Indies, where her policy has been closely aligned to that of the Soviet Union.

In view of the terrible dangers outlined above, every effort must be made to prevent the development of war from the Palestine issue. An explanation of the cause and cure of the Palestine problem is to be found in *The Palestine Mystery—Sidelights on Secret Policy*; but attention should be drawn here to certain events which followed the publication and wide distribution of that small book. Consistently with the disclosures it made, Count Bernadotte formally advised U.N.O. to adopt a partition boundary whereby the Zionists would be excluded from the Dead Sea. He was promptly assassinated. The British Government, however, have held out for his partition scheme and have refused to recognise "Israel" as a Sovereign State, in both cases against considerable pressure from the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. and certain politicians at home.

There has been a complete and significant boycott of *The Palestine Mystery* in the newspapers of the United Kingdom which publish the advertisements of big-business combines, but in marked contrast there have been detailed notices in Dominion papers, while articles of two and three columns about it have appeared conspicuously in the chief news pages of leading daily papers published in Brussels, Madrid, Buenos-Aires, Beirut, Cairo, Fez and Casablanca. There have also been three foreign radio broadcasts on the subject, while foreign publishers have asked for permission to produce French, Spanish and Arabic editions.

It is hoped that the foregoing will convince readers of this memorandum that it deals with a matter of over-riding importance and that they will give the subject the careful and immediate attention for which it calls.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

with the view that this House, on three successive occasions has voluntarily surrendered Private Members' time to the Government in the belief that it was in the interests of the House to do so.

Earl Winterton: I accept the hon. Member's rebuke; it was a most unfortunate use of phrase. What I wanted to convey was that in regard to time the rights rest with hon. Members and not with the Government. Gradually, in recent years the assumption has grown up that the Government are the people who have the rights, while in fact they are not. In the next Parliament there may be a Government with a small majority one way or another and there might be a revolt on the idea that it rests with the Government to say what should be the situation in regard to the allocation of the House's time.

I must call attention to the fact that this is not a kind of

right or some sort of constitutional theory which has no actual value at present. Indeed some of the most valuable legislation passed in this House has been as a result of Private Members' Bills and Motions, such as the Plimsoll Line and the Divorce Bill. In my long experience and, no doubt, in the long experience of one or two hon. Members opposite, there have been occasions when Private Members' Motions have had a considerable effect on the fortunes of the Government and on Parliament. This is not a thing which should be easily thrown away. I think I have the assent of Members on both sides of the House when I say that the rights of the House as a whole should be regarded. While we should not be so ungrateful as to say "no" to anything which the Government do to restore those rights, they should not be regarded as a concession, but as the realisation of the fact that the position as it existed in the last three years has been intolerable from the point of view of the interests of the House as a whole, whatever may be said from the point of view of the Government.

I think right hon. Gentlemen opposite will agree that the rights in this matter rest with the House as a whole and it is the house which should decide and not the Government. The Government can use their majority to vote it down, but the right rests with the House. It would be amusing to some of the ghosts of the past if they could come back and hear some of the extraordinary theories put forward in these Debates. When they heard that the Government had actually allowed hon. Members to bring in six Bills, the answer would be, "What a miserable lot you are, whip ridden on both sides of the House. Why not tell the Government, or the Opposition—the leaders on both benches—who are the masters." The great bulk of the Members of the House are the masters.

Earl Winterton: . . . I put the point with all seriousness to the Government and stress the fact that this is not a party Debate. There were one or two quips by the hon. Member for Nelson and Colne (Mr. S. Silverman) which, no doubt, were barbed against my hon. Friends, but on the whole it has not been party Debate. There has been a general consensus of opinion that the Ten-minute Rule should be reinstated. There is no reason why the Government should not introduce a second Resolution and permit Bills to be introduced under that Rule. We might also ask whether it would be possible to have Private Members' Motions, which seem so to frighten the Government. In view of the general attitude of the House, we are entitled to ask the right hon. Gentleman to give favourable consideration to these points.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede): . . . The Government believe, and I hope that the House will believe, that Private Members will be sufficiently keen in the ballot to be able to fill up the whole of the seven Fridays. It therefore leaves us with the question, is it worth while to have the right of presentation merely that Bills may be printed? The hon. Member the junior Burgess for Oxford University (Sir A. Herbert) thinks it is important. I say quite frankly that I do not think it is. I think that is reducing parliamentary procedure to something little better than a farce— . . .

. . . I come now to the question of Bills under the Ten-minute Rule. There again I wish to point out that if they are to get on to the Statute Book they will have to take precedence in Committee over the Bills that receive the high

places in the ballot for the seven Fridays. We ask the House, and the House is master in these matters, to say that it is better that those Bills which are balloted for, and which have been carefully prepared, should be the Bills that should receive attention in Committee. . . .

I do not think that the present is the time at which the maintenance of the Standing Order with regard to the Ten-minute Rule should be brought into use. [HON. MEMBERS: "Why?"] I thought that I had given the argument. I have known the House, on a Ten-minute Rule discussion, with only one speech on each side, give decisions which I am sure did not represent the considered opinion of the House on the issue. There was the Division taken on the Ten-minute Rule Bill, introduced by Captain Ramsay in the last House on Reuters, which was animated with a great deal of racial and anti-Semitic prejudice.

Dr. Haden Guest: It is not fair of the right hon. Gentleman to choose a Bill which he disliked. Many of these Bills were very valuable.

Mr. Ede: I did not say that there was any party issue. I admit that unfortunately people on both sides were misled on that occasion. I suggest that a discussion which is limited to ten minutes on both sides is not a very useful way of ascertaining the considered opinion of the House on a vital issue.

Mr. E. Fletcher: It is important that the House should know whether the Home Secretary is opposing the reintroduction of the Ten-minute Rule altogether as a principle, contrary to the recommendations of the Select Committee on procedure, or whether he is merely opposing its reintroduction in this Session.

Mr. Ede: I admit that I have spoken for longer than I had intended. That is largely because I have been interrupted so much. I am sure that my hon. Friend will recollect that I started off by saying that the Standing Orders of the House remain. It is the view of the House as expressed by its Standing Orders that in ordinary times the Ten-minute Rule Bills should be introduced. I am not arguing against the retention of the Ten-minute Rule under the Standing Orders. I could consider occasions when even I—I put it deliberately like that—when even I might support the use of the Ten-minute Rule. . . .

Mr. Michael Astor (Surrey, Eastern): . . . As a new Member I cannot over-estimate the importance of a minority point of view. It does not occur to me, being part of a political minority in this House, that what I term a minority point of view can always be expressed in Debates on major issues. The Government take a certain line over an industry or in regard to some foreign relationship. They take one line and we may oppose it. But in fact there may be an entirely different approach from an entirely different basis which, as pointed out by the hon. Member for Rugby (Mr. W. J. Brown) can well be avoided by the Government. It can be precluded from the matter under discussion. What I mean by a minority point of view is in no sense the minority point of view expressed by a large political party such as my own. I would point out that the minority is always and invariably right and the majority is always invariably

GESTETNER REAM DUPLICATOR. Just rebuilt by makers. Automatic feed, etc., £30. 10% to S.C.S. funds.

wrong at one stage in a controversy. In the early stage an idea starts among a few people, and very often it takes a long time for the idea to percolate and form the opinion of the majority.

The Lord President of the Council appealed earlier for tidiness in Debate. That is all right in the case of a specific Debate, let us say on Middle East affairs, but the idea can be carried too far. In these times of streamlined legislation anything which promotes and encourages original ideas and even eccentricity in ideas is important. I think that not only should members be allowed but they should be encouraged to enter into the field of legislation of an entirely unofficial kind—unofficial that is to say to either party—whether it be responsible or irresponsible. For my own part, I think that this Chamber would be a very depressing place indeed if we heard expressed only a uniformity of opinion, representing the two or three parties in the House, on all matters. As I see the matter, after only three years as a Member, there is generally speaking in Debate and in approach to legislation too much uniformity. A legitimate vehicle for expression of minority views would be provided if the Home Secretary and the Government would make the maximum allowances for Private Members' time, and the real interests of the public would be further safeguarded.

Captain Crookshank (Gainsborough): I beg to move, as an Amendment to the proposed Motion, to leave out paragraph (5).

The effect of the Amendment will be to make it possible to present Bills and to allow of Debate on a Motion for leave to introduce a Bill under the Ten-minute Rule. Both these points have been very much discussed this afternoon, and I therefore do not propose to go over the ground again, but I would ask the Government, seeing that this is a matter for private Members only, that they should leave it to a free vote of the House, because all hon. Members who have spoken from that side as well as from this, have stressed the desirability of the restoration of both these ancient rights.

The right hon. Gentleman, in winding up just now, said that it was often the case that it was not worth presenting Bills for the purpose of having them printed. I want to point out that it is very well worth while having Bills printed and circulated, and that it is a device which the Government itself frequently adopt. At the end of a Session, a Government very often introduces Bills with which it has no intention of proceeding, but which are printed so that the country might become familiar with them so that they can be proceeded with in the next Session.

Mr. Ede: I am loth to interrupt the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, who is such a stickler for points of Order, but I would point out that he is making a second speech without asking the leave of the House. I do not suggest that that leave should not be granted.

Captain Crookshank: I am perfectly in Order; otherwise, Mr. Speaker, you would have called me to Order. If the right hon. Gentleman has any doubts about the matter, he will find that, on page 398 of *Erskine May*, it is stated that, in a Debate about procedure, an hon. Member may move an Amendment even if he has spoken before. That is on page 398, and I commend it to the Deputy Leader of the House before he interrupts me next time.

I was just making the point that it is well worth while printing Bills, and that it is a practice which all Governments, so far as I recollect, and even this Government, have used.

Obviously, they put forward certain proposals with which the country becomes familiar, with a view to their passage in the next Session of Parliament.

With regard to the Ten-minute Rule, I am sorry the right hon. Gentleman turned that down so definitely, and I hope, in view of what was said by the right hon. Gentleman behind him, that he will change his mind and that he will not be over-influenced by the Lord President, who is on record as having said that this particular procedure, in his opinion, was farcical. . . .

Motion made, and question put, "That the words proposed to be left out, stand part of the Question."

The House divided: Ayes, 250; Noes, 153.

THE LIBRARY

The following additions to the Library have recently been made:—

- E18 Social Credit Secretariat—*Elements of Social Credit*
- A80 Barbour. Nevill,—*Nisi Dominus*.
- A81 Feiling. Keith,—*The Life of Neville Chamberlain*.
- A82 Evans. Trevor,—*Berlin*.
- A83 Williams-Thompson. R. B.,—*The Palestine Problem*.
- A84 Bullitt. William C.,—*The Great Globe Itself*.
- A85 Knox. Frank,—*We Planned. it that Way*.
- A86 "Peta"—*Our Money*.
- A87 Lindsay. Sir Lionel,—*Addled Art*.
- A88 James. Norman B.,—
The Autobiography of a Nobody.
- A89 From Archives of German Foreign Office—
Nazi-Soviet Relations.
- A90 Fry,—*Waters Flowing Eastwards*.
- A91 de Poncins. Vicomte Leon,—
The Secret Powers Behind Revolution.
- A92 Kravchenko. Victor,—*I Chose Freedom*.
- A93 Sayers. Dorothy,—*The Mind of the Maker*.
- A94 Phillips. R. P.,—*Modern Thomistic Philosophy**
- A95 D'Arcy. M. C.,—*The Mind and Heart of Love*.
- A96 Williamson. Hugh Ross,—*The Arrow and the Sword*.
- A97 Watkins. E. I.,—*Catholic Art and Culture.**
- A98 de Jouvenel. Bertrand,—*Power.**
- F11 Brogan. Colm,—*The Democrat at the Supper Table*.
- F12 Sterne. Julian,—*The Secret of the Zodiac*.
- F13 Reed. Douglas,—*Galanty Show*.
- F14 Roberts. Kenneth,—*Oliver Wiswell*.
- F15 Tolstoy. Leo,—*Resurrection*.
- P86 Douglas. C. H.,—*Realistic Constitutionalism*.
- P87 Rogers. Arthur,—*New English Justice*.
- P88 Jensen. B.,—*The Palestine Plot*.
- P89 *Dictatorship by Taxation*.

Books marked (*) may be obtained by arrangement from the library of *The Social Crediter* through the usual Library channel (see advertisement below).

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.