

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 24. No. 20.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 15, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

Free Making

Some Thoughts on the Fiction of the Class Struggle.

By Norman F. Webb.

Part II.

Brought down to economic terms—a feat which possibly represents the greatest achievement of Social Credit; because no large problems can be seen intelligently until they are so reduced—the issue between Socialism and Social Credit presents itself as the answer to this question of Scarcity versus Abundance, and the nature of life on this planet; not in the past but at this particular juncture. What today are the actual conditions natural and proper to Social existence?

In speaking of government Major Douglas has said that it is fantastic to assume that society is destined to be regulated or governed by anything not inherent in the nature of the universe. For instance, to take a single example, a country lacks bread because drought has ruined the wheat crops; that is an event inherent in nature. But if a country has the wheat and the inhabitants lack bread because they are without the money to buy it, we are faced with something quite different, a factor not inherent in nature, but in artifice, something artificial, the creation of our own minds; in this case the money system. In saying which, Douglas is not suggesting that society should be without regulations or a government but that what it has of both must be based on an understanding of nature. Nature, or the Natural Law, is, and therefore must be, accepted as the decisive factor or power in everything. In modern slang, what nature says goes and, it might be added, nothing goes naturally, smoothly, which is not in accordance with Natural Law.

That is what Douglas means, and what those who understand the Social Credit philosophy mean by the term Nature: the nature of our social problems, the nature of their solution, the nature of the conditions of our conscious existence here on earth, the nature of Nature. It is fairly obvious, if that is what we mean by Nature, that it is what the average Christian means by God, or the supreme and decisive factor in everything—"In the beginning was the Word . . ." the Law. So that this issue of scarcity versus abundance, the difference of opinion between Socialism and Social Credit as to the conditions natural to modern technological society, which some might be tempted to dismiss as not going deep enough, and which the moralists would certainly condemn as materialistic in emphasis, is shown to be very profound indeed. It is in fact, nothing less significant than the difference between the two protagonists in their concepts—the mental picture which men hold—of Nature, or God; on the one hand a picture of threatening hostility, and on the other, of potential friendliness or, if you like, of love.

Now, in a sense it is correct to say that this is a purely philosophical issue, since neither the Socialist nor the Social Crediter has directly seen Nature, and therefore their mental

picture can only be hypothetical or supposed. Nevertheless, as Douglas has pointed out, it is upon an individual's philosophy or belief that his or her policy—the practical line taken when the opportunity to do so occurs—is based. It follows, therefore, that far from being a purely academic matter, the philosophy we hold is all-important and decisive since it affects our mental picture,—really, the interpretation we accept of the nature of the problems confronting us, and consequently of the practical steps to be taken in overcoming them.

To anyone who takes the trouble to think the matter out, the truth of what has just been said is beyond dispute; he will not find it possible to deny it. But again, the objection will be raised in defence of continued inertia, that it is altogether too simplified and condensed a picture of an enormous and infinitely complex problem. It will be pointed out that there are illimitable shades and degrees of belief between those two arbitrary presentations of philosophical outlook; that the effective contrast between Socialist thought and that of Social Credit cannot possibly be as between black and white, darkness and light, the false and the true, traitors and paragons. But I maintain that it is the very size and complexity of the problem that forces on us the necessity of simplifying it to such an extent;—compelling us to take the advice tendered almost two thousand years ago, and to approach the matter with the simple realism of children along its own economic lines, omitting all philosophizing and moralizing, and therefore all self-righteousness. If we make the effort, we find that in spite of everything, it does quite naturally reduce itself, even as a world issue, to this simple question of scarcity or abundance; a question demanding, and capable of a straight answer, yes or no, on the material and statistical plane. And in confirmation of this, since we have invoked, though not stressed, the Christian concept of God, we should note the fact that the founder of Christianity, whom even his enemies allowed spoke with authority, and who advised tolerance and charity in all things, was nevertheless absolutely unequivocal and emphatic upon this point. He maintained that the nature of life was abundant, not parsimonious, and of God, loving not hostile, and the conditions or nature of His Law not restrictive, nor onerous, nor grudging, but free and light and generous. And finally, that Truth,—the reality of our immediate experience of it, the *fact* of it,—was not enslaving but liberating, as we started out by affirming where the knowledge of Social Credit was concerned.

"He that is not with me is against me," is to be taken as a statement of fact rather than a censure or criticism. All the more therefore is it to be taken literally and seriously. This is something entirely hidden from all those who while repudiating organised Socialism nevertheless dabble in Socialist remedies, calling themselves fondly by any other ideological title, Christian Democrats, Tories, Liberals, and what-not, while they salve their consciences with the panacea of the modified Welfare State. They are

those who refuse to face the unpleasant fact that the source and inspiration of all Socialist planning is suspect, because it is controlled by the conscious deliberate upholders of the opposite and therefore anti-Christian philosophy of want and hostility. As a consequence of that refusal they are blinded to the obvious fact that the alleged concern for the unfairly-treated individual, the under-dog, on the part of the exponents of Socialism, whether they are conscious of it or not, is reduced to the rankest hypocrisy, since the real and ultimate object of Socialism is simply the creation of the Super State, which is bound to destroy whatever degree of Christian liberty the individual has achieved.

To sum up then; Socialism is a matter of philosophic concept, of the mental picture held by certain individuals of the nature of the universe we inhabit as hostile and symbolised by the image of an arbitrary taskmaster opposed to a rebellious People. The basic economic tenet, or belief of this negative philosophy is scarcity, limitation; dis-belief in the bounty and kindness of nature. And along with that, and arising from it, is the political belief in an inevitably divided society, caused by the efforts of individuals striving against one another for a share of whatever there is, the so-called Class Struggle between the Haves and the Havenots. That represents the social problem as the Socialist sees it. As for the solution of the problem, which the Socialists regard themselves as chosen to supply and operate, it can be nothing but a share-out of whatever limited quantity of wealth there may be to share. And we see them busily at work all over the civilised globe acquiring the political powers to erect the necessary machinery.

Are they right, these anti-Christian Socialist believers in a parsimonious Nature (God) and the inevitability of the Supreme State, and is the Christian view wrong? Or is it the other way about? It will not suffice much longer for the philosophic Christian to comfort himself with the pseudo-philosophic reflection that there is probably right on both sides, as well as error; that all have sinned in the past, and no doubt will do so again. That has always been true of human actions, and the exponents of active methods. Such an attitude sounds impartial, but in fact gets us nowhere. In as far as it is sincere, it is merely an assertion of a sentimental and well-meaning desire to be tolerant and charitable, as of course we should be, in judging the motives and performance of our neighbours and ourselves. But this question goes far deeper, below motives and aspirations, which are bound to be more or less complex and debatable, to stark, simple fact. It asks: What aspect does life—your journey so far and its ultimate goal—wear for you? What does it look like? What do you see ahead? Is it a vista of want and scarcity and compulsion, of endless misunderstanding and hostility and scrapping for house-room between the Lion and the Lamb? Or is it one of potential abundance and co-operation and freedom? There is nothing particularly transcendental or metaphysical about that question. It deals with objective fact as simply as though I were to ask whether the distant hills looked smooth and blue to you, or jagged and brown. I'm not asking you what they are composed of, nor the reason for their colour and form, nor what can be done about it; but just: How do they look to you?

It is no longer a question of the correct method to meet a crisis. The question now is: Is there a crisis at all? What is the nature of the problem? The physical eye and

ear can obtain no reliable report of the realities of the situation through the impenetrable cloud of statistics and rumours that gets daily thicker. So we must ask the question of our inner, metaphysical selves; so to speak, of our inner eyes, What do they see? What is their view of the matter? Does it look to be crucial and a subject for desperate remedies, or does it appear merely to need the exercise of common sense? Is Nature (God) innately stingy and mankind naturally irrational and selfish? Or is God naturally bountiful, and mankind at bottom rational? No one can deny that the second of those alternatives is what the founder of Christianity recognised as the picture, and that therefore it must be what we call the Christian view or philosophy of life. Notwithstanding, who is there at the present time to be found to stand firmly and openly upon that optimistic philosophy, or for the practical policy it demands?

Look round the civilised globe: everywhere Communism, or Socialism, or near-Socialism controls all government policy, and all legislation is "conditioned" to meet an assumed scarcity and warranted further to curtail personal liberty. For the time being, at any rate, the entire world and the minds of its inhabitants belong to Socialism. And squarely opposed to it stands only Social Credit; not advancing a spiritual or transcendental hereafter to the Socialists' here-and-now, insisting on our making a comparison of two incomparables, which is the not very helpful way of the religious moralists, but holding views which are consistent and diametrically opposite to those of the Socialists regarding the nature of the universe, and of our economic and social problems, and consequently of their correct solution. Negatively, we assert a complete disbelief in *natural* scarcity in a technologically conscious community, or in any *natural* barrier to an equitable (not equal) distribution of whatever wealth such a community decides to produce. The Social Credit concept or idea of Society is not one of inevitable class struggle between the under-privileged and the over-privileged. Nor is the Social Crediter's concept of government and its proper and natural function that of a highly centralised, and therefore tyrannous power conducting a compulsory share-out. Because Social Credit recognises the obvious social divisions and injustices all round us as arising, not primarily, but only secondarily, from sectional greed; since they have identified the main cause to lie in a common ignorance, shared by all alike, of the natural laws which govern this universe, having already themselves studiously traced the road to economic salvation along the line of simple obedience to those laws.

That to the Social Crediter constitutes the nature of the universe in which we live and of which, because of our ignorance—you can call it disobedience, if you like—we have still largely to be made free. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," both positively and negatively; free from the embittering and blinding effects of the unbeliever's distorted view of Nature as a niggard, and hostile, and capricious. This is the primitive and pagan idea of an unloving and arbitrary God which, what we call Christianity was, and is, intended to correct, as being a false view or explanation of the Nature of things. Free from all these, as the Social Crediter finds himself; and as well, positively free to see the natural and obvious economic road ahead, which is hidden from society as a whole because men are still slaves and bound to the unlovely pagan illusion of a hostile Nature, which sets the dupes of Socialism devising

ridiculous detours round nothing at all, and spending millions on elaborate by-passes to avoid obstacles that exist nowhere but in their own minds, whose light is surely darkness.

“Full Employment” and “Over Production”

The following, signed D. Beamish of The Studio, Hermitage Road, Parkstone, Dorset, appeared in *Time and Tide* for July 1:—

“Sir,—What could be more absolute than the power which Mr. Keith Kilby and his adherents wish to confer on a ‘Parliament of Europe’ (as a step towards a World Parliament)?

“Few of us like criticism and, probably, the only reason why most of us tolerate it is that we cannot prevent it; and that we sometimes amend our ways in consequence is due to the fact that others wield a certain amount of power and influence besides ourselves.

“But what would happen if our hands were on the levers of power throughout the world? If, in short, we were members of the Cabinet of a European or World Parliament controlling all raw materials and all industry—because these were all ‘pooled’—controlling also through our agents all transport, education, housing, medicine, etc. When criticism and objections to our measures threatened to reach such proportions as might force us to modify them, would not the temptation to prevent their free expression and publication become overwhelming? There would, perhaps, be a President with a casting vote. What would be the difference between this personage and a Dictator of the World? If acceptance of a global dictatorship is the only way out of economic difficulties, all the blood and treasure poured out in fighting Hitler were given in vain. Hitler was *elected* to his position of supreme power. What power afterwards had those who elected him to modify his policy? King Lear discovered that it is easy to give away power but difficult if not impossible, to take it back if the gift is misused.

“Your correspondent contends that unless steel industries are merged they will presently be up against an impossible situation through over-production; the inference being that it is competition which compels them to over-produce. But that is not so. What forces production over and above what is necessary for the fulfilment of human needs is the acceptance as axiomatic of certain ideas which are inherently false, i.e., that employment is an end rather than a means with the inevitable corollary that to discontinue making steel when

there is enough would be disastrous because those concerned in the industry would be ‘unemployed.’

“In one sense employment is as necessary to people as air and food, but paid employment in industry for all is clearly incompatible with machinery (and atomic energy!). The very word ‘over production’ shows that the means of maintaining those displaced exists, and where the remedy lies.”

Jewish Activity in Germany

“The German Trade Unions, as you probably know, are at present fighting for the workers’ ‘Right to Vote’ in industry. These Trade Unions are today first and foremost political and under the influence of the SDP (Social Democratic Party), notwithstanding that many of their members are found in the bourgeois CDU (Christian Democratic Union). . . . But a further evil is now to be feared. The Trade Unions are demanding, not only the Right to Vote for the workers in their various concerns, but that Trade Union delegates, people not employed in the concern, shall have the right to attend the Board Meetings. The Trade Unions would thus bring all large-scale industry and the whole of industrial life under their control.

“Here we have the danger of a new dictatorship—the Dictatorship of the Trade Union Leader! We have had a taste of the power-hunger of these Trade Union ‘Führers’ and of the SDP between 1918 and 1933 and since 1945. Generally speaking, they are only democratic when the principles of democracy are to their advantage; they are malicious and intolerant enough of anyone thinking differently from themselves. . . . I am convinced that such a development must seriously cripple German industry, that it can lead to the overthrow of the democratic form of government, and that it is being made use of by some small caucus of Jews in the background. The SDP and the Trade Unions are supported in their efforts, not directly but yet unmistakably, by individuals in Paris, London, U.S.A. and in the Allied High Command in Bonn who are either Jews or standing under the influence of Jews. This Right to Vote for the worker is of course only one of many ways of preventing the restoration of a strong, healthy and ordered State. . . .”—*From a private letter, dated June 3, of a German civil servant (not a Social Crediter) in the Western Zone.*

Women’s Place is at Work

The *Daily Graphic* of July 5 featured in its front page “tall, elegant, silver-haired Miss Sally Butler, lawyer from Indianapolis” who, as International President of the Federation of Business and Professional Women, has arrived in London to address a congress of the federation.

She thinks a woman’s place is out at work.

“Peterborough” in the *Daily Telegraph* also reported on this. He has been invited to a banquet at the Guildhall on August 1 where only six other men will be present—the rest will be women delegates of the federation—over 700 guests in all. Vice-president of the British Section is Dame Caroline Haslett. “Peterborough” says that 1,200 boxes of chocolates will be given to the women by the Canadian Bank.

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

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. 24. No. 19. Saturday, July 15, 1950.

From Week to Week

"As the Internationale was played, they all [Messrs. Attlee, Noel Baker and Miss Ellen Wilkinson, in Madrid] joined in the clenched fist salute."—*The Times*, December 9, 1937.

MR. SHINWELL, M.P.:—

"For us there has been no other Government but that of the Republic. Perhaps we shall not be long in treating the British Government and Mr. Eden as you are treating Franco, the Italians and the Germans." (enormous ovation).—*Solidarid Obrera*, January 15, 1937.

On the authority of the late Dr. H. J. Boldt of Columbia University, "Woodrow Wilson was a Sephardic Jew . . . the name of his parents was Wohlson—a German-Jewish name; they probably came from Germany, went to England, where they were known as Mr. and Mrs. Wolfson, and when landed here called themselves Wilson."

Whether the "Schuman" Plan was propounded at this time to divert attention from Korea, or the North Korean outbreak is staged to produce a stampede under cover of which anything can be put over, is not yet wholly clear. But that they are integrally connected is as certain as that they have already demonstrated two important facts.

The first is that there is only one Party in this country, and that is the Party which is operated for the Proprietors by Messrs. Attlee, Churchill, Cripps, Oliver Lyttleton, Harold Macmillan and Herbert Morrison; and their somewhat less prominent assistants, Bevan, Shinwell and Co., are the understudies to keep the actors onto their jobs.

And the second fact is that not any identifiable politician or journalist appears to have even a moderately clear idea of the nature, possibilities or limitations of representation. We make this rather dogmatic statement because the alternative to it is that all politicians and journalists who deal with politics are fundamentally dishonest, and we do not believe that to be the case.

As a perhaps significant instance of what we have in mind we may consider the case of Mr. Christopher Hollis, M.P., premising that Mr. Hollis is a Roman Catholic and was appointed by the late, and to us, wholly unlamented, President Roosevelt to correlate and report on the prospects and dangers (to Mr. Roosevelt's friends) of "monetary reform."

Mr. Hollis is not, therefore, exactly a babe in the woods, and in contributing an article on the Schuman Plan to a

popular illustrated weekly he writes much which is sound, if not very novel. But the essential point is that he appears quite oblivious that he is advocating a policy of which the outcome is a mathematical certainty, because it is carefully designed to produce that outcome. Mr. Hollis agrees that the Plan has dangers; he does not mention the fact that once conceded, there is no more chance of retreat from the situation involved than there is of the return of nationalised coal to the original owners. The "Schuman" Plan is a plan to centralise power—to make power absolute; and a much abler Roman Catholic than Mr. Hollis, now much quoted but far too long neglected, wrote "All power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely." There is no danger of an evil result from the Schuman Plan; it is a certainty.

We have another bone to pick with Mr. Hollis—he seems to be incapable (with many others) of deciding whether the British Government, whatever that may be, exists to give away the remaining assets of the British, or to protect them. We have a dose at the end of his article of the really nauseating verbiage about leading the world by an example of generosity and self sacrifice. May we suggest that, first, he re-reads the parable of the unjust steward; and secondly that he contemplates the difference, if any, between unauthorised generosity and breach of trust?

The outstanding fact of the present situation is that United States policy cares no more for the interests of the once-Great British Dominions, except to see that they become and remain insignificant, than for, say, those of Portugal. If the British are so infantile as to "fall" for one confidence trick after another, that is their business. To do the Americans bare justice the camouflage is now perfunctory. Brigadier-General Bonner Fellers, U.S. Army, puts the matter quite shortly: "Our decisive participation in two wars and our leading role . . . gives us the right to dictate a *New World* [his emphasis] strategy." (*Human Events*).

The Egg Scheme

"Here is news of another grandiose piece of Socialist Empire Building. . . . The West African Protectorate of Gambia, an unhealthy swampy spot, the last place one would have thought suitable, has been chosen for the experiment. The EGG scheme is in the hands of the Colonial Development Corporation, who have already spent 14,000 dollars on 10,000 Rhode Island Red hatching eggs from America, because they say that no suitable eggs were available here. It was further explained that as Gambia was tropical, it was necessary to get these eggs from America (*Hansard*, July 19, 1949). So far no arrangement has been made for the purchase of either eggs or poultry from Gambia (*Hansard*, Nov. 21, 1949). Mr. Creech Jones: 'Advances so far approved amount to £810,000.' E. Summerskill: '4 boxes of eggs have been shipped to Britain as an experiment.' (*Hansard*, Dec. 14, 1949). . . . According to the *Yorkshire Post* 1/4/50, 'The annual report for 1949 of the Colonial Development Corporation is not yet available, but information so far revealed shows that results have not been impressive. £202,500 seems a high average price to pay for a box of eggs.'—*Housewives To-day*, July, 1950.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 26, 1950.

Schuman Plan

(The Debate continued)

Mr. Crossman (Coventry, East): . . . What is the purpose of the Schuman Plan?

Mr. Ellis Smith: There is no plan.

Mr. Crossman: If I may say so to my hon. Friend, there is no economic plan, but there is a political plan. The purpose of the Schuman Plan politically is to tie the Germans up so tightly that they will not be a menace to the French, but what ties the Germans up so tightly that they cannot be a menace to the French might tie this country up so tightly that it could not do its service to the world. Some constitutional institution designed to keep the Germans tied might have the disadvantage of keeping the British tied. This is the dilemma of the Schuman Plan. If a Frenchman believes, as I do not, that we can tame the Germans with words and constitutions, then what we use to tame the Germans will make it impossible for a responsible Government in this country to accept the same plan.

Mr. Boothby: Surely, the implication of that is that you can never get effective co-operation from Germany by any method.

Mr. Crossman: I want to bring these remarks to a logical conclusion, so I will answer that point straight away. Perhaps the lesson is that we cannot tame the Germans by a constitution and that it is better to have the British in, on terms appropriate to the British, to maintain the power relationship, which is the only thing which can tame Germany. One of the things about which we ought to warn our French friends is the belief that a constitution can cure chronic evils. . . .

. . . My second point is that the French want this for two reasons. One is the fear of Germany. The second is, of course, because of a certain inner defeatism which makes Frenchmen passionately believe in federal union. The amount of enthusiasm for federal union in any country is a measure of its defeatism and of its feeling of inability to measure up to its own problems. I do not underestimate the need for helping the French, but I would say that it is the nations who talk about "putting it in the kitty" who have nothing to put in. Look at the nations with self-confidence in Europe. We find that they are not addicts of federal union. Look at the nations which are defeated morally, the democratic Germans and the French. They feel that they must have a new framework of life, for the nation is no longer a framework which gives them a chance of survival.

I would say to the Opposition that it would be a very great mistake for this country to accept what a Frenchman feels as a defeatist, is the basis for defeating Communism. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have not taken that question nearly seriously enough. The French are obdurate about the principle of the supra-national authority because they hope that the supra-national authority will lead to a European political union. They are quite right and logical as democrats so to do, for no one except a cartel addict could possibly agree to remain at the stage where 12 men make decisions binding on the Government and are responsible to no one. Is it not obvious that the next stage must be a European parliament to which these men are responsible and which has a

capital? Every Frenchman puts this forward as a half-way house to federal union which may be more acceptable to the British Government than the more direct approach of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg.

It is only fair to ask the Opposition this question. Do they accept the principle of the Schuman Plan as the first stage towards the political union of Western Europe? If they do that, then they really are accepting it in the spirit of a Frenchman or in the spirit of the hon. Member for Reading, North (*Mr. R. Mackay*), who is, I think, the only Member of this House who conscientiously thinks that he believes in the federal union of Western Europe. But if they do not want a federal union of Western Europe and if they want to have this supra-national authority, and then one for transport, and then one for defence until we have half a dozen of them, responsible to no one, they are insulting the whole idea of democracy. The only way of democratising *M. Schuman's* suggestion is to complete it by a federal parliament.

It is absolutely essential that this House of Commons in reply to the French, who are our allies—that means that we treat them seriously and do not try to trick them by signing things we do not mean—should say quite openly whether they believe in federal union or not. I will say to the House that for some time I believed in it. I believed in it because I was a "Third Forcer." It was the only way I could see of bringing together a middle group. This was at the time when there seemed to be no hope of an Atlantic Union; it seemed the only thing to do in 1947 and 1948, to try to create a third middle group, because America was not going far enough for most of us who took that position. We could not foresee what would happen. We were wrong in our failure to see the great expansion of American foreign policy and possibilities since that date.

What astonishes me is that the Tory Party, which pours every sort of abuse on any idea of a Third Force, should fail to understand that a European federal union, which is the logical conclusion of supra-national authority, only makes sense in terms of a third force. . . .

. . . Therefore I ask the Tory Party this question: are they in favour of the federal union of Western Europe? Up till now they have been clever in not answering that question. Their leaders have gone about Europe advocating the United Europe movement which has one unfortunate resemblance to the League of Nations Union. It is based on an ambiguity. Just as the League of Nations Union was based on an ambiguity about pacifism and fighting, so European Union is based on an ambiguity about European unity and federalism. . . .

. . . There are many reasons why we are opposed to federal union. The Commonwealth has been mentioned and it is the overwhelming reason. We cannot be a member of a federation of Europe, or even a confederation of Europe—Switzerland is a confederation—and remain the motherland of a Commonwealth of independent nation states because the notion of Commonwealth is to achieve national independence, whereas the notion of federal union is to supercede nationalism by a new super-state. We cannot combine the two. We ought to tell Europe if we think so, even if we upset the Americans and lose Marshall Aid. But the Americans are our friends and it is high time they were told that there is no chance of federal union. If they are going to cut off Marshall Aid because of that, they must cut it off, but I do not think they will do it because they appre-

ciate honesty rather than double talk.

Our pamphlet did that. It was a party pamphlet which gave party political reasons why the Labour Party would never consent to the federal union of Western Europe. . . . I want to turn to the Conservative views on the supra-national authority. I agree with my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Hornchurch (Mr. Bing) that we are in something of a paradox. The Conservative Party for five years have been denouncing control and the upsetting of the price system, and now they suddenly say, "We want a complete and iron control, clamped by 12 just men, upon all Governments, on iron and steel and coal." [Interruption.] Hon. Members opposite cannot have been listening to the Debate, but I have been listening to Conservative after Conservative saying that he wants success for the Schuman Plan. [HON. MEMBERS: "Who says so?"] We have been told that the Conservative Party is in favour—[HON. MEMBERS: "Who says so?"] I cannot answer while the shouting continues.

The right hon. Gentleman said it, and every following speaker said that he wishes the Schuman Plan well and wants to accept the principle; and the principle of the Schuman Plan is that an authority shall be set up under which there shall be an iron price control, under which all production shall be centrally planned, under which there shall be no more free enterprise in iron or coal. Why should the party opposite, which up till now has stood for free enterprise, and has dilated against the control of iron and steel in this country, be delighted when it can find a control which is not subject to this Parliament, but subject to no Parliament at all? Then it is perfectly all right.

I have one explanation. Hon. Gentlemen opposite are very used to international controls which are not subject to Parliaments. Many of them have taken part in arranging them.—[HON. MEMBERS: "Which?"]—We will mention tin and rubber. There are one or two hon. Gentlemen opposite who in their back lives took part in tin or rubber price-fixing, and they say, "All this is international. This is really the stuff." That is what we are accustomed to. We have never had that in any Parliamentary control, and now that we have the Schuman Plan that is perfect because there is no Parliamentary control. I suggest that that is a very undemocratic reason for approving of a non-democratic authority. Is it really a sound principle of democracy? I ask the Liberals. The Liberals are saying, "We want a complete destruction of free enterprise and free trade altogether, and we want a monopoly, a State controlled, and super-State controlled monopoly," to which every American, if it happened in America, would have to apply the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, because it would be illegal in America.

Here are our Liberal friends saying that this is the solution in Europe, to institute a bigger control, a remoter control, a more central control, than anything dreamt of by a Socialist Government in this country, and to remove any vestige of democracy from it. Let us remember that that is the one point which M. Schuman made clear: that the authority shall not be subject to Parliament. Hon. Members may say, "We are going to change all that," but it is worth noticing that that was the one point which M. Schuman was not going to have changed in the three weeks of discussion before the Conference. In all seriousness I do not believe that a supra-national authority or high authority of this kind will do. . . . What we must not do is to believe that we can rely on these negotiations breaking down between the Germans and French and our coming in to save the conference.

My greatest fear is that for overwhelming reasons of French prestige and German national policy a treaty could very easily be signed between those two nations which might exclude us for ever.

Therefore, I agree with the right hon. Member for Warwick and Leamington on the danger of Western European affairs being dominated by the Germans, for that is what any Franco-German cartel would mean. It would be a return to German domination of France such as we had under Vichy. A distinguished German diplomat over here said to me the other day, "After all, we ran France for five years. We are not going to worry about the terms that are signed. We sign first and change after." We cannot sign like that, but we have to face that danger, and I do beg the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Prime Minister not to wait until the conference is concluded before putting forward their practical proposals—not to wait until Franco-German agreement has been reached.

It seems to me absolutely vital that the British proposals—for instance, the answer to the 40-page document which has reached London from Paris, I think, this morning—should be given as soon as possible in concrete terms, showing the concrete nature of the compromise proposal we are going to put forward, a proposal which would enable there to be an executive, that is to say a civil service, freed from Government interference and yet responsible to a democratic authority. It is not beyond the wit of man in Britain to devise that compromise. . . .

House of Commons: June 19, 1950.

Cream

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter asked the Minister of Food whether in view of the fact that he has not authorised the general manufacture of cream in this country, he will reconsider his decision to refuse to allow the importation of cream from Ireland and elsewhere on private account.

Wing-Commander Bullus asked the Minister of Food if he will now allow the importation by air and the sale in this country of Irish cream.

Mr. Webb: I see no good reason, at this stage, for revising this decision. In the first place, as I have said, it is more important to get butter than cream from the Irish Republic, and, in the second, I am anxious to get our home cream industry working before allowing overseas exporters to exploit our market. I hope I shall have the support of the hon. Gentlemen in this purpose.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: Is it not a fact that, on 26th April last, the right hon. Gentleman expressed the same hope that he is expressing today as a reason for not permitting the importation of Irish cream? Can he say whether he has any real hopes or intentions of getting the home cream industry generally going this year?

Mr. Webb: Not this year. It is far too late this year, but next year I am fairly certain that it will be going again.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: If not this year, then why not permit the importation of Irish cream this year?

Commander Noble: With reference to what the Minister said about re-starting the home industry, could he say whether, except for Devonshire cream, it is possible for permission to be given to sell home-produced cream?

Mr. Webb: No, not outside the hill farm area in the four counties.

Mr. Vane: Why is it too late to help the home cream industry this year? Cream is wanted all the year round.

Mr. Webb: The manufacturers themselves wanted advice about machinery and equipment, and I think they would like more notice.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: On a point of order. As the right hon. Gentleman has avoided the whole point of my question as to why he should not permit the importation of Irish cream until he starts the home industry, I wish to give notice that I shall raise the matter on the Adjournment.

Mr. Geoffrey Wilson asked the Minister of Food how many Cornish hill farmers have applied for a licence to make and sell clotted cream; how many of such licences have been issued by the regional supply milk officer since the coming into operation of the arrangements on the 1st June, 1950; and how the number of such applications compares with the number of milk producers in Cornwall.

Mr. Webb: Up to 14th June, 34 applications had been received and three licences granted. There are about 9,000 milk producers in the county, but it is estimated that not more than 300 of them are hill farmers eligible to take part in the scheme.

Mr. Wilson: Is the Minister aware that one of the three who has been granted a licence owns one cow, and in view of that will he dispel the popular illusion that Cornish cream can be legally obtained in Cornwall, and thereby protect the retailers?

Mr. Webb: I do not think that that question will do the Cornish cream industry any good at all. All these applications are being considered on their merits, and I am assured that each case approved is able to provide a reasonable supply of cream which can be marketed.

Czechoslovakian Chocolate

Sir H. Williams asked the Minister of Food how much chocolate has been imported this year from Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Webb: Nearly 1,400 tons up to 30th April, which is the latest date for which figures are available.

Sir H. Williams: Why is it possible to import chocolate from Czechoslovakia instead of allowing more to be produced in this country?

Mr. Webb: For the very simple reason that we have to sell manufactured goods to Czechoslovakia. If they and we are to have a balance of payments we have to buy things from each other.

Flour Improver

Dr. Barnett Stross asked the Minister of Food how soon will all flour which is treated by some form of improver be so treated that the agene process can be forbidden; and whether he will estimate the cost in dollars for machinery and chlorine dioxide, which must be imported from the United States of America.

Mr. Webb: It will take about two years to complete this change. The dollar cost will probably be about 337,000 United States dollars.

Dr. Stross: Is my right hon. Friend aware that there is a considerable body of medical opinion that believes that

peptic ulceration is aggravated by the agene process and that this has been responsible for the increase of duodenal and gastric ulcers within recent years? Will he give us an assurance that as soon as possible we shall be free from this somewhat poisonous improver?

Mr. Webb: Two years is the period.

Sugar

Brigadier Clarke asked the Minister of Food what success he has had in his negotiations for extra sugar supplies with the delegates from the West Indies.

Mr. Webb: The discussions are still going on; we have had three meetings with the delegation so far. But I must make it plain once more that these talks are about long-term price and quantity guarantees from 1953 onwards, not about any extra sugar which may be immediately available, since we are already buying all that is expected from the Colonies.

Brigadier Clarke: Will the Minister say when he anticipates to be able to stop bulk purchases of sugar?

Sir Peter Macdonald: How long does the Minister anticipate these negotiations will go on? They have dragged on for months, and it is about time they came to an end.

Mr. Webb: They are not dragging on, they have been going fairly quickly. I think there will be one more meeting and I think it will be possible for the Secretary of State for the Colonies to make a statement within a week, but not this week.

Mr. Driberg: In these negotiations, does my right hon. Friend always bear in mind that some of these Colonies are more dependent on this one export than, for instance, countries such as Australia?

Mr. Webb indicated assent.

Mr. Braine: Will the Minister bear in mind the requirements of the British housewife?

Wing-Commander Bullus asked the Minister of Food if, in view of world supplies of sugar now available, he will increase the sugar ration.

Mr. Hollis asked the Minister of Food whether, in view of the abundant supply, he will deration sugar.

Mr. Webb: No, Sir. There will certainly be no glut of sugar this year.

Wing-Commander Bullus: Is the Minister aware that he was recently reported as having said that in two years' time there would be a world glut of sugar? Is that the length of time which he places on the rationing of sugar?

Mr. Webb: First of all, I did not say there would be a glut. I said that if the present plans for production go through, we will have to be careful about a possible glut, but two years' time is different from now. The sugar that formed the subject of that speculation is not even grown, and at the moment there is no possibility of increasing the ration unless it were possible for us to spend more dollars on this commodity.

Sir H. Williams: Why does not the right hon. Gentleman buy from the West Indian delegation the extra 75,000 tons that they are willing to sell, and which is available now?

Mr. George Thomas asked the Minister of Food whether he will grant a special allocation of sugar to old people who are in receipt of the extra tea ration.

Mr. Webb: To give everyone over 70 extra sugar would mean a drain on our supplies which, I am afraid, we just cannot afford at present.

Mr. Peter Smithers: Has the Minister not now investigated the probability that his estimate about a glut is fairly near, within a year or two? Surely he can tide the old people over that period, particularly in view of the fact that some of them may not live to enjoy the glut?

Mr. Webb: Only at the expense of other consumers, that is all.

Ham

Mrs. Ganley asked the Minister of Food whether he can promise a supply of ham in shops for home consumption at Christmas.

Mr. Webb: Small quantities of ration free British canned ham are already in the shops, and imported canned ham should begin to arrive shortly under arrangements which I announced last week. I expect that some will be available at Christmas.

Mr. Shurmer: Can my right hon. Friend say why ham is going into hotels and restaurants and being sold in sandwiches in big stores, while the housewife cannot get any from the retail shops?

Trading Accounts (Subsidies)

Mr. Osborne asked the Minister of Food if he will divide the losses shown by his Department in the Comptroller and Auditor General's report for 1948-49 of £24,000,000 on animal feeding stuffs, £133,000,000 on cereals, £28,000,000 on egg products, £57,000,000 on meat, £44,000,000 on milk, £59,000,000 on milk products, £7,000,000 on oils and fats, £11,000,000 on potatoes and carrots, £20,000,000 on sugar and £18,000,000 on tea into the actual subsidy received by the public, and the trading profit or loss for each separate item.

M. Webb: With subsidised foods it is not practicable for us to do this. On some unsubsidised foods, however, we made profits which helped pay our total subsidy bill. With permission, I will publish these figures in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Mr. Osborne: Is the Minister not aware that by refusing to give these figures, he leads the public to feel that the losses on trading are much greater than they are, and would it not be better for him to publish the whole story?

Mr. Webb: It may cause the hon. Gentleman to feel that, but hardly the general public.

Following are the figures:

The figures for these unsubsidised foods are as follow:

	Profit £m.
Egg products sold to caterers, manufacturers and bakers ...	0.5
Meat—Imported canned meat, rabbits, poultry etc. ...	0.5
Milk products—Milk powder ...	0.2
Oils and fats including sales abroad or for export ...	12.7
Sugar—Raw sugar for export or sold direct abroad ...	1.4
	15.3

The Cold War

“Probably more important, although less publicised than the case of Alger Hiss, are the implications of the alleged Communist sympathies of the late Harry Dexter White. White was mentioned both by Whittaker Chambers and by Elizabeth Bentley as a source of information for Communist spy rings. Neither Chambers nor Bentley, despite the abuse hurled at them by people whom Arthur Koestler calls ‘Anti-anti-Communists,’ has been proved inaccurate on any major piece of testimony.

“White was the right-hand man of Henry Morgenthau, and the chief architect of the Morgenthau Plan for the deliberate economic ruin and destruction of Germany.

“A point that has been generally overlooked is that the Morgenthau Plan called for the policing of Germany exclusively by the troops of Germany's continental neighbours, excluding American and British armed forces.

“Is not this exactly what Stalin would have desired? A searching investigation of the origins of the Morgenthau Plan is long overdue.”—W. H. Chamberlin in *Human Events*.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprising)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
The “Land for the (Chosen) People” Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	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

Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....(Cloth Edition)	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...7/-	
Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson	21/-
Odlum v. Stratton	
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans	
by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.