

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 12.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

Mr. Winston Churchill.

The following further exchange of letters has taken place since the correspondence published in *The Social Crediter* for September 30 and October 14:—

(COPIES):

House of Commons,
London, S.W. 1.
24th October, 1950.

Churchill receives, yours was the only letter from a man of intelligence and penetration.

Yours faithfully,
EDWARD D. H. ODDY,
Hon. Secretary.

Basil L. Steele, Esq.,
Penrhyn Lodge,
Gloucester Gate,
London, N.W. 1.

The Right Hon. Winston Churchill, O.M., C.H., M.P.,
Chartwell,
Westerham, Kent.

*Will the Private Secretary kindly pass to Mr. Churchill
for his personal attention.*

Dear Sir,

Thank you very much indeed for the continued patience and courtesy shown in your letter of October 24th.

I am well aware that the British Government was not required by the French Government to commit this country to *specific* undertakings by participating in the Schuman Plan discussions. What it was required to do was to commit Great Britain to the *principle* of placing her heavy industries under supranational control.

A commentator at the time summed up the position in a most apt analogy. A young man could say to his father; "I accept the principle that you should choose my future wife for me but I reserve the right not to accept the woman you may select," or he could say: "I will endeavour to choose a wife of whom you approve but I utterly repudiate the principle that any right of selection is vested in you."

All that we are requesting, Sir, is that you will state emphatically whether or not you approve the principle that Great Britain's heavy industries should be placed under supranational control, and that if you do not so approve why you should have voted against the Government for refusing to accept it? This question is a very simple one.

With reference to the last paragraph of your letter of October 24th—the suggestion is made, though not pressed, that a failure to concur with most of the contributors to your vast correspondence lays me open to a charge of conceit. I should much prefer to stress the humility with which—even with the advantage of the preceding correspondence—I am still unable to understand the justification for any move in the direction of cartelised interlocking directorates (which is the realistic description of the Schuman Plan).

I find this question all the more difficult because the history of the past fifty years appears to demonstrate the fatal effects of the policy, first in Germany, and in close

Dear Sir,

I am writing on behalf of Mr. Churchill to thank you for your letter of October 4th.

It is noted that you feel any reply you make would demand a book to compass it and from my side I feel it is perhaps sufficient, in respect of the point you raise concerning conditions of participation in the Paris talks on the Schuman Plan, to refer you to the White Paper, Cmd. 7970 on the Anglo-French discussions prior to Paris, Document 10, clauses 3 and 4. These read:

3. The special position in these negotiations which the British Government wishes to preserve is justified in their Memorandum by the intention, said to be held by the French Government, of asking, as a prior condition, for full participation in the discussions, for an undertaking to pool coal and steel resources, and to set up an authority with certain sovereign powers.
4. As their representatives have informed the British representatives orally, the French Government wish particularly to confirm once more that these are not their intentions. As has already been made clear in the French Memorandum of 9th May, there will be no commitment except by the signature of a treaty between the States concerned and its parliamentary ratification.

It was on this categorical assurance that the Conservative leaders based their belief that the British Government could have gone to Paris without any inescapable commitment. You should also realise that the Schuman Plan has already been largely modified as a result of the Paris discussions and M. Schuman himself, addressing the Assembly at Strasbourg last August, said that the proposed High Authority "would not enjoy complete independence."

There are other things which could be quoted from M. Schuman supporting our views but I do not propose to bother you with any lengthy apologia.

In regard to your reference to Mr. Churchill's fan mail I would suggest that you are one of the contributors to this mail and that unless you wish to take up a somewhat conceited attitude to life (which I am sure you do not) it would be idle to suppose that out of the vast correspondence Mr.

sequence in our own country, under the guidance of the same influence which organised the background of the 1914-18 war.

To put the question at issue in its simplest form, we consider that cartelisation is both fundamentally repugnant to Conservative ideals and practically suspect as a political expedient; and for both these reasons it is, in our opinion, most undesirable that Great Britain should become further involved in measures of this character.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) BASIL L. STEELE.

The German Situation.

The following (translated) is extracted from a letter dated October 18 written by a German civil servant in the British Zone:—

"Germany's contribution to European defence and the treatment of so-called 'war-criminals.'

"Opinion here is divided. Some fear a Russian attack upon a defenceless Western Germany; others fear that the Russians may be provoked by our rearmament. Dr. Ardenauer has in part left the decision to the Allies, but the Bundestag must take the eventual decision.

"Some like Pastor Niemöller and Minister of the Interior, Heinemann reject rearmament on religious grounds, whilst others like Cardinal Frings of Cologne and the Evangelical Bishop of Wurm, of Stuttgart, reply 'There can be no unconditional peace. We shall have to defend our families, culture and religion against attack.'

"Naturally no German has any great desire to be a soldier so long as the injustice suffered by the so-called 'war-criminals' is not repaired. Personally I am convinced that Jews bear the chief blame for the unjust sentences and their stain upon England's honour. Jewish hate and sadism has worked itself out in them. I have studied the names of the judges and prosecuting counsel whenever I have had the opportunity, and have always found that *one* Jew was present. No one expects Jews to be just towards Germans, but for that reason they should not undertake to act as judges. I find it very painful that the English name should be abused for this general horror. The German people for the most part do not know who are the really guilty ones and are making England responsible for injustices for which Judah is responsible. Anyhow, it must now be seen whether the English people can repair these injustices and make answerable those who have allowed Jewry to wreak its vengeance through this abuse of the English tribunals.

"By referring to these matters it is far from my intention to hurt you or any other Englishman. But a great service will be done to England if there can be a clearing up. The injustice done by Hitler and the S.S. will not be removed by creating further injustice."

REALISTIC CONSTITUTIONALISM

(Notes for an Address to the Constitutional Research Association at Brown's Hotel, Mayfair, May 8, 1947)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

K.R.P. Publications

SIXPENCE (Postage 1d.)

Shaw.

So Shaw has passed on, and the most popular dramatist of the first half of the Twentieth Century will write no more. Most of his best plays were written in the last century, but his reputation for good or ill belongs to this. And besides, the plum of the 19th Century must be awarded to Ibsen, who in addition to his dramatic genius, in its own way as brilliant as Shaw's, had a far deeper mind, and was altogether without Shaw's senseless revolutionary kink. For, beyond all his dramatic genius, and the brilliance of his prose style—perhaps the most admirable example of honest, straight-forward English prose the modern world has to show,—beyond his undoubted charm and humanity, it has to be recorded that Shaw was a dissatisfied mischief-maker, as are all revolutionaries. No one can deny his importance and the influence he exerted in what must surely rank as one of the most crucial periods in the history of this country and of the world. But his influence was an upsetting one in the common and accepted sense of that word; and how much finer, and more difficult a thing it is to be a setter-up than an upsetter. And like all mischief-makers he has created a great deal of wholly unnecessary trouble by helping to confuse the real issues of his period, and impeding the emergence of correct solutions.

Now that he is gone the world of literature will be acclaiming him a great artist, and quite rightly from its point of view. But for readers of this journal it is in his much more questionable capacity of social reformer that the departed phenomenon known as George Bernard Shaw requires some assessment. How did that acute mind, as it approached what he knew was his impending removal from this earthly scene, view his own part in it? Or was he, perhaps, unaware that he had lent his brilliant literary gifts to the satisfaction of his own quite ordinary human disgruntlement, in place of trying to penetrate to the root of things?

Nevertheless, and in spite of all his apparent success, Shaw must have died a mentally baffled and mystified man. In terms of executive achievement, life on this plane inevitably spells comparative frustration. But those individuals go contentedly and peacefully who have found and acknowledged the true cause of this frustration; as it were, gratefully conscious at least of the positive harm they have been saved from doing. Within the last six months, to the positive knowledge of the present writer, Shaw spontaneously sent a cheque to a very needy friend whose patrimony of rubber shares had evaporated, indirectly, if not directly, because of events precipitated by the politico-economic activities of himself and his fellows. In the accompanying letter he lamented its comparative smallness, as seriously as it is in him to be serious, blaming the unmerciful incidence of super-tax. Since taxation is at the very root of the Shavian philosophy of Social Justice, it is possible to gauge the distressing depth of his final mental bewilderment.

Through the accident of his particular temperament, which was both impatient and puckish, allied to exceptional intellectual gifts of extreme activity, Shaw has undoubtedly been a very potent factor in the development of the social reactions produced by the Industrial Revolution in this country. To appreciate the forces of which he was an outstanding agent, and the "events" in which he figured so prominently, it is necessary to keep in mind this historic background. Though the point is frequently made that Great Britain is, or was, an island fortress, it is questionable if the

vital importance in history of that fact is properly understood. What it actually did was to enable the English genius to develop almost uninterruptedly for at least fifteen hundred years; uninfluenced, that is, by any external or alien pressure. It was an advantage that no other medieval people enjoyed, developing, as they did, out of the semi-pagan inheritance of the Holy Roman Empire. This Constitutional freedom was seriously threatened in the Thirteenth Century when Edward I. took drastic action to break the growing governmental dependence on Jewish finance, which was rapidly degrading the whole Feudal System and the country with it. Whig historians, naturally, make little of the incident, but the Autumn of 1290 when the complete banishment of all Jews from Great Britain took effect, was undoubtedly one of the great events in our not altogether uneventful history.

By that act England's course was set for the next four centuries which led up to and produced all the Elizabethan glories along with Shakespeare, whom Shaw affected to despise, Francis Bacon, and a host of lesser lights. After the Cromwellian rebellion, to a considerable extent by means of Jewish finance from Holland, the official re-admittance of the Jews was only a question of time, and the subsequent marriage of the heir to the English Throne to Dutch William, confirmed their position in the City. The process of infiltration, and the subservience and degradation of the peerage and the government, which Edward had so summarily stopped, recommenced almost where it had left off, pre-eminently among the newly-created Whig aristocracy, and City-biassed government gathered about the equally newly-created Bank of England.

From then on, England's hitherto comparatively single and united national policy, as it were, split in two, the one half—to continue our somewhat precarious analogy—curving up, the other down, till the phenomenon, actually perceived and harried in its incipient stages by Edward in his day, which Disraeli describes as Two Nations in *Sybil*, became an established fact. Edward's apprehensions of a British government entirely under alien financial influence, were realized, and Whiggery, whatever the name of the political party in office, became the effective political power.

This brings us to the Industrial Revolution, and to what the Germans call Manchesterismus; with Karl Marx like a busy wood-worm poring over his books in the British Museum, while Engels supplied the funds from his activities in the Lancashire Cotton trade. And we see in the process of being established as an art, the wolfish habit of biting the hand that feeds, so ably followed in the same context by such families as the Laskis. Shaw had been born in the later eighteen fifties into the comparative Christian freedoms of a nineteenth century upper-middle-class family and and his early life contained all the variety, opportunity and stimulating uncertainty which it was his destiny—or was it only his whim?—to do so much to destroy.

There have been great and world-shaking events since the time of Cromwell; the French Revolution, American Independence, the Napoleonic Wars, the rise of British Imperialism, the Russian Revolution, not to mention two shattering World Wars—all of which need to be appraised. But for all the immensity of these historic happenings, it is quite possible that as a factor in deciding the fate of the British Commonwealth of Nations in this century, and especially the last five years, no one of them ranks in importance

with the founding of the Fabian Society, primarily by Shaw and the Webbs in the eighties of last century. Step by step the path of Whiggism can be traced leading up to that unheralded, and fortuitous-seeming gathering of a handful of Intellectuals in the heart of resplendent Victorian London.

Shaw was an ardent disciple of the poet William Morris, who had attended the inaugural meeting of the International Association in 1864, when Karl Marx was present, and who told an audience of Oxford undergraduates he was addressing, "It is my business here to-night, and everywhere, to foster your discontent," going on to advise them to marry beneath them, so as to break down social barriers. Such things pass without comment to-day, but we know something of their effect on society. Morris's views were becoming greatly toned down by Shaw's time, under a somewhat severe knocking; besides he was nearing his death. But his former beliefs and the writings of Marx had taken firm root in Shaw's brilliant Machiavellian mind, and the founding of the Fabian Society followed inevitably. Out of it, as we all know, grew the Parliamentary Labour Party, which ultimately captured the Trades Union Movement; and later the founding of the London School of Economics, endowed by that fine flower of Whig Internationalism, Sir Ernest Cassell, as—in his own words—"a training ground for the bureaucracy of the Socialist State."

It is not suggested that the above is the only aspect of the last four centuries of English history. What is suggested, though, is that for all its unobtrusiveness, this stealthy penetration of British policy by International Finance, and the nation's public life by alien personalities; this subtle and deliberate deflecting of Great Britain's native constitution, is, historically-speaking, by far the most important. To follow its underground course, one has to shield one's eyes temporarily to the blinding spectacle of wars and revolutions, to see how the island fortress of British freedom has been captured, her left-wing ideologists and intellectuals materially assisting in the final assault which may be taken as the post-war election of 1945. There can be no question that Shaw's creation, the Fabian Society, and its direct offshoot the London School of Economics, played the predominant and decisive part in this.

What the fastidious and genuine appreciator of the arts, of the music and painting and literature of a pre-Marxian Christian culture, thought of these later phases one can only guess. Unlike the grumbling and bumble-headed J. B. Priestley, Shaw was too proud—or was it vanity, perhaps, that closed his lips?—to express what must have been his deep disgust at the antics of the Socialist government in power, and the ugly mess he himself had done so much to promote; and the alarming and depressing drabness his impious and ignorant creed of Equality was producing. But if it is a fact that there is no fool like an old fool, it is equally true that there is no more subversive social factor than the revolutionary Intellectual. Inevitably he is a Rationalist, as it is called, for no better reason presumably than that rationalism is based on the wholly unreasonable belief that what the human intellect cannot directly apprehend and embody is a formula, doesn't exist. This is an altogether irrational conclusion, refuted by all existing evidence, and leading directly to the creed of materialism: that it is only what can be seen and measured that has, or is reality. Only grant the premises, which is all a dialectician asks, whether they are false or true

(continued on page 3)

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 SEFron Park 435.

Vol. 25. No. 12.

Saturday, November 18, 1950.

From Week to Week

Pandit Nehru's Republic of "India," allee same like 'Melican flends' now, has not had long to wait before being confronted with the facts of life bred by Wall Street out of Sob-sister, with low-caste Hindu industrialists and Parsee bankers as stud-grooms, its heredity is exclusively that of the babu and the office-wallah. It is one of the tragedies of the British Raj in the real India that it *appeared* to be based on office work, whereas in fact it was office work which, more than any other factor, made its continuance impossible. But it was office work that the babus who in the main comprised the Indian National Congress, the Home Rule body, coveted. And in the main it is office-work to which they have flocked in their new-found autonomy from positions in which patronage and petty favours can be dispensed in comfort and, they think, security.

While Nehru and his friends may, and probably do, think that they can always run to New York for help in any emergency, it is most improbable that they are justified in their belief. "Britain" has been displaced from the position of the most favoured nation and the distressing code of decency imposed by the earlier Indian Civil Service has no doubt been suitably modified. That was what it was all about, and that the bright idea included using American troops to keep the North-West Frontier or to support Tibet against open or covert Russian aggression was never on the agenda, and is not, now. It is true that the cadres of the magnificent Indian Army still exist; but it is more than doubtful whether they could be used without the stiffening of the British regiments with which they were invariably brigaded, not to mention their picked British officers.

When, in 1904, the mysterious Gurdjeff, or Dordjjeff, used his varied talents in Lhasa with the object of furthering Russian interests at the expense of the British Empire, and India in particular, Sir Francis Younghusband, with a mere handful of troops, who never fired a shot, marched into Lhasa, and returned with a firm treaty of friendship with the Dalai Lama. His victory was won by prestige, not office work. We shall see if the new Republic's prestige, and that of Nehru's supporters will equally bear the strain.

Count Hermann Keyserling, partly for reasons which reflected upon himself rather than the objects of his aversion, did not like Americans. It is quite possible that he did not come into contact with the considerable minority who command both the respect and the liking of any reasonable indi-

vidual, and the United States, like the United Kingdom, is no more representative, as a collectivity, of the best products of its culture than Charles Dickens is a faithful reporter of the mid-nineteenth century English scene. It is significant that, over the North American continent, the same influences are concerned to stimulate the Puritan element in its worst manifestations as were, and are instrumental in presenting Dickens as a social portrait painter rather than as a caricaturist.

Nevertheless, Count Keyserling was probably correct when he wrote that "the North American race is bound to die out unless it changes completely."

The reason is not far to seek—the dominance of the mass mind. We are threatened, God wot, with an aggravated attack of the same malady in the British Isles, mainly from the same quarters as those infecting the United States, but there are still certain factors which limit the spread of the disease, chief amongst them the homogeneity of the underlying native population.

The "melting-pot" ideal is a proved myth; and what the United States has got is a mass of unassimilated units of the European proletariat having no cultural defence against imposed myths, primarily of course that of "win, tie, or wrangle" in the economic field. The remarkable fact is that it has taken so short a period to demonstrate the inadequacy of the pursuit; and its very superficial triumphs probably pose an even greater problem.

• • •

It ought to become clearer as each day passes that totalitarianism is a disease of incompetence. Any able man can obtain his ends by the proper kind of persuasion, and most men who are both able and experienced come to recognise that an objective which can only be obtained by ruthless methods is a bad objective.

The present "British" Government is a bad and degenerate government, so obsessed with a theory that it is impervious to facts. But we all share its responsibility, since it ought to have been obvious long ago that no Constitution should permit unlimited powers to the chances of a transient and venial group of office-bearers.

Political Shaw.

"Victorian Liberalism he hated alike for its shortcomings and for its virtues. It liked liberty and it liked capitalism, and Shaw hated them both. He wished to see society subject to the tyranny of a small number of ruthless and efficient men—whether they were super-men or commissars, Cecil Rhodes conquering the Boers or Mussolini bombing the Ethiopians, was no matter. He always gave his support to the enemies of liberty, because liberty meant untidiness . . . What is the purpose of these reforms? What is the end of man? Whither is he supposed to be moving? And to these all-important questions Shaw never gave any sort of coherent answer. . . . What between the Puritan's dislike of good living and the cynic's dislike of high living, it was difficult to know what sort of living he did believe in. . . ."

Christopher Hollis.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons, October 31, 1950.

King's Speech.

Mr. Speaker: I have to acquaint the House that this House has this day attended His Majesty in the House of Peers, and His Majesty was pleased to make a Most Gracious Speech from the Throne to both Houses of Parliament, of which, I have for greater accuracy, obtained a copy, which is as follows:

My Lords and Members of the House of Commons:

Five years ago, in the hour of our deliverance from war, I declared it to be the firm purpose of My Government to work, in concert with the Governments of all other peace-loving nations, for the attainment of enduring world peace. Yet despite the untiring efforts to this end of all My Peoples, helped by My Allies across the seas, the world is once more troubled with the menace of war. The avoidance of war remains the supreme desire of My Ministers and under this new peril they will seek by all means in their power to ensure the success of the measures for rearmament which they have taken. In the Session which lies before you the necessary increases in production for defence will call for further efforts and sacrifices, but I am confident that with the unflinching support of all My loyal subjects the nation will be enabled to play its full part in the defence of freedom and the preservation of peace.

In Korea, forces for the first time under the flag of the United Nations, are overcoming the invaders. The success of this historic action in which My Forces are playing their part marks a decisive moment in world affairs, and is arousing fresh hopes of achieving a united, free and democratic Korea. It has already given proof of the ability of the United Nations to meet a threat to world peace.

My Government also support strongly the efforts of the Specialised Agencies of the United Nations which are directed to improving the standard of living in impoverished or backward countries.

My Ministers in the United Kingdom will maintain the closest relations with the other Governments of the Commonwealth in order to safeguard freedom and peace. They will also continue to work with the Governments signatory to the North Atlantic and Brussels Treaties to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, to improve the defence of the North Atlantic area and thus to achieve security against attack.

In consultation with other Commonwealth Governments, My Ministers will give further study to plans for promoting the economic development of South and South-east Asia.

The development of the Colonial Territories and the welfare of their peoples will continue to receive the attention of My Government, and they will introduce legislation to supplement the sums made available for these purposes by the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, 1945.

I look forward with great pleasure to the forthcoming visit of the Queen of the Netherlands and the Prince of the Netherlands.

Members of the House of Commons:

The Estimates for the Public Services will be laid before you in due course.

My Lords and Members of the House of Commons:

I am glad to know that preparations are going forward throughout the United Kingdom for the Festival of Britain, 1951, which will demonstrate to the world the greatness of British achievement in the arts and sciences and in their application to industry and agriculture. The Queen and I look forward with high expectation to the opening of the Festival next May.

Although the rearmament programme will make heavy demands upon the nation, My Government will continue to give high priority to housing and will maintain the essentials of their social policy. They will do their utmost to ensure as far as possible the stability of costs and prices and to continue the export drive.

In order to defend full employment, to ensure that the resources of the community are used to best advantage and to avoid inflation, legislation will be introduced to make available to My Ministers, on a permanent basis but subject to appropriate Parliamentary safeguards, powers to regulate production, distribution and consumption and to control prices.

My Ministers propose the further development of the Civil Defence Services both as a responsibility of local authorities and, after due consultation with managements and workers, within large industrial units.

A Bill will be laid before you to provide for the hearing of appeals against convictions by courts-martial.

You will be asked to approve a measure to confer rights of reinstatement in civilian employment on reservists recalled to My Forces and on National Service men who, before the coming into force of the National Service Act, 1950, voluntarily undertook an additional six months' whole-time service.

Legislation will be laid before you to provide for the restoration of land devastated by ironstone extraction.

The disturbed international situation emphasises the need to intensify the efforts which My Ministers have been making to expand the production of food at home. A Bill will be laid before you still further to encourage the rearing of livestock in upland areas.

A measure will be laid before you to place on a permanent basis the legislation relating to the beet sugar industry and to transfer to public ownership the shares in the British Sugar Corporation which are not held by the Exchequer.

My Government will introduce legislation providing for the establishment of an authority with powers to reorganise and develop the white fish industry, and of a Scottish Committee of that authority.

A Bill will also be laid before you proposing more effective means of dealing with the poaching of salmon and trout in Scotland.

A Bill will be laid before you to amend the Restoration of Pre-War Trade Practices Act, 1942.

My Ministers have under consideration the reform of the law relating to leaseholds and meanwhile measures will

be introduced to provide for the continuation for a short period of ground leases relating to residential premises, so as to prevent some of the hardships which would otherwise arise on the termination of tenancies. Provision will also be made for facilitating the renewal of certain business tenancies.

A measure will also be laid before you to provide River Boards with more effective powers to deal with the pollution of rivers and streams.

Other measures will be laid before you if time permits; and it is hoped to make further progress with the consolidation of the Statute Law.

I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may rest upon your counsels.

Debate on the Address.

Mr. Emrys Hughes (South Ayrshire): . . . What has war meant to Korea? In the beginning we were told that the war in Korea was not a war at all, but a police operation. President Truman said that at a Press conference, and very much the same argument was elaborated by the Prime Minister in this House. But the police operation in Korea has extended into one of the most devastating and destructive wars in the history of the South-East. An American estimate is that 60 per cent. of the capital of South Korea has been destroyed. There have been some terrible and gruesome descriptions of Pyongyang, the capital of Northern Korea, and there is no doubt at all that in the process of liberating Korea enormous hardship, suffering and cruelty have been inflicted upon the very people that it was wished, presumably, to liberate.

If that is to be the result of liberation, if a country can only be liberated by the process of destroying its industrial life, by the blowing up of its towns and by driving hundreds of thousands of people on to its roads, then we are entitled to ask whether this process has been justified on the grounds of a political success. The question is now being asked: What are we going to do now in Korea? To that question there is no very decided answer. In yesterday's *Daily Herald* there was an article from one of their correspondents in the Far East who said that in American circles it was now argued that in 12 months' time the Americans were going to leave Korea and let the South murder the North, or *vice versa* as the case might be. Are there to be free elections in Korea, and, if so, will the people of Korea be able to turn out the United Nations?

What has been achieved in Korea? Has anything in the interest of the great majority of the people been achieved? Has there been a real, permanent political success or have we not just turned Korea into a hell upon earth, and called it by the polite name of "collective security"? Perhaps the Foreign Secretary, or someone who is to answer the Debate, will tell us and try to define to us what exactly is now the position of Mr. Syngman Rhee. Are we backing his Government and is that the kind of democracy for which scores of British lives have been lost?

I want to quote to the House from a dispatch that appeared on 28th October in *The Times*. I think we are indebted to the special correspondent of *The Times* for very courageous and objective descriptions of what he has seen in Korea. In this dispatch he describes the conditions in Boopyng police station, a village post a few miles from Seoul,

which flies the United Nations and South Korean flags. He says that "it provides a rather dreadful example" of what is happening in Korea. *The Times* correspondent describes six cells in the station, each measuring about 8 ft. by 16 ft., and says:

"On the day your correspondent visited it 290 men and women and seven babies were detained in them. They squatted on the floors unable to move or to lie down. Primitive sanitary arrangements were provided in the cells and to reach them prisoners had to clamber over the shoulders of their fellows."

He proceeds to describe what goes on in this police station as the normal method of police administration of the Government with which, presumably, we are to be associated, the Government which we went into Korea to support. . .

. . . I fail to see that we have done anything in the Far East except to create a state of fear. I do not believe we are entitled to take a smug, complacent view of Korea and to say that now the United Nations are there we shall re-establish law and order. Are we now going to recreate what we have destroyed? In the United States a Committee of Congress has already estimated that 200 million dollars will have to be subscribed for relief work alone in Korea. Presumably we have to rebuild the broken down railway bridges, and the tunnel which an hon. Member saw blown up in a night, to rebuild towns and repair what has been destroyed.

I was one of those who protested in the House against our action in Korea. I say that results as we have seen them in this miserable, unfortunate and tragic country of the Far East do not give us any great satisfaction as to what is likely to be achieved by what is politely called collective security. I do not believe that we have created anything more than fear in the Far East. . .

. . . We cannot have an extensive re-armament programme, which does not bring greater security, but leads to greater fear, without the political parties having to face intense public opinion. Whether the Tories or the Socialists are in power, we shall have the people in the housing queues asking why they have been deceived. I am watching with great interest the agitation for increased housing on the part of the Conservative Party. If we are not to go ahead with re-armament, we must reorientate our foreign policy. Whether we like it or not, Communism is in Asia, and it is absolutely impossible to stop Communism there by armed force. We have to realise that, too, in Europe. We are faced, therefore, with the inevitable contradiction that I outlined in the first part of my speech.

It is quite true, that if it came to war we could inflict enormous destruction on Russia by bombing and by the atom bomb. I believe the Russians realise that, and that there is a mood which is expressing itself in different speeches at Lake Success by those who represent Soviet Russia that the time has come when the nations should again get round the table and face the fact that another war means destruction to civilisation, whether Communist or capitalist. We can have an alternative to the peace policy being proclaimed by the Soviet Union. If our economists and planners drew up a world plan, a world Schumann plan, under which the industries and technical knowledge of the nations could be united for the good of the people of the world, it would meet with united accord throughout the world. Lord Boyd Orr and Mr. Reuther, the American trade unionist, have been associated with such a scheme. . .

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.

Publication "Report to Women."

Mr. Assheton asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to whom His Majesty's Stationery Office circulates "Report to Women"; why; and what is the annual cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Jay: "Report to Women" was first issued last June, in answer to requests from women's voluntary organisations for a document giving background information on economic subjects of interest to women. It is issued only on request, largely to the office-bearers of 14 women's organisations. The circulation has increased from 1,000 to 9,000 since June, and is rising. The monthly cost of duplication and distribution is £38 for the present circulation.

Aliens.

Sir R. Glyn asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury if he will make a return of the number of foreigners who have been admitted to this country since 1930, who have been, or are employed in various Government Departments and establishments, indicating, respectively, those who have been granted British nationality and the year in which such concession was granted; and, where such persons have changed their names, indicating the original name and country of origin.

Mr. Jay: This information is not available centrally. Moreover, it would be impossible now to collect it about any such people, alien or naturalised, who, having been employed as temporary civil servants, are no longer employed in the Civil Service. As regards any such aliens, and any such ex-aliens now naturalised, who are currently employed or who were one time employed on a permanent basis, the information could not be collected without an inordinate expenditure of time and labour.

House of Commons, November 1, 1950.

Debate on the Address

The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Ernest Davies): It may be for the convenience of the House if I intervene in the Debate at this stage to reply to matters which have been raised regarding foreign affairs. . . .

. . . Both my hon. Friend the hon. Member for Devonport (*Mr. Foot*) and the hon. and gallant Member for Horncastle (*Commander Maitland*) have raised questions on Spain. I think it is not difficult to explain to them the reason it was decided that we should abstain when it came to voting at the United Nations Assembly earlier this week. The explanation of our action is that we do not want in any way to give to the world an indication that we have changed in our attitude towards the Franco régime, but that we still condemn the basis on which the Franco régime was established, and that we are opposed to many of the actions which Franco has taken in carrying on his totalitarian régime. . . .

. . . The right hon. Gentleman, the Member for Saffron Walden asked questions concerning Korean relief and rehabili-

tation. We are much concerned with this matter. The House may not realise the tremendous problem which confronts the United Nations in establishing a system for relieving immediate distress in Korea, for rebuilding that country and rehabilitating both South and North Korea. The problem is one of great magnitude which will inevitably involve tens of millions of pounds; but already the Economic and Social Council are discussing a motion to establish an agent-general with power to receive contributions and to administer relief in liaison with the United Nations Unification Commission.

A decision on the amount of money required and the financial methods to be adopted will shortly be taken in New York. When that has been done and the contribution of this country has been decided upon, it will be necessary to lay a Supplementary Estimate before the House. Meanwhile, His Majesty's Government are doing what they can to meet the immediate demands for relief. They are sending supplies requested by the Unified Command. They are arranging for medical stores and other commodities which are in great demand. It is hoped that our contribution which, as has been stated, in the first instance is in the nature of £500,000, will be of some assistance.

I think it was the hon. Member for Devonport (*Mr. Foot*) who referred to the question of atrocities in Korea. Of course, His Majesty's Government consider that it is most regrettable that such atrocities should have taken place. Clearly, there have been atrocities on both sides. That cannot be brought into question. The attention of the Americans has been drawn to these reports which have been widely circulated in this country—including *The Times* report which has attracted much attention and which has been brought to the notice of the House to-day. The Americans have replied to us that the military command is doing what it can to stamp out any vindictiveness. . . .

. . . In recognising the People's Government of China we considered that we were facing the facts. We were accepting the fact that the People's Government of China was the effective Government of the country; and we recognised the Government at that time. It is unfortunate that the establishment of diplomatic relations has not yet been completed and that no real progress has been made. It is for the Chinese to take the next step. We have exercised considerable patience in this respect, and it seems that patience is essential.

Mr. Peter Roberts (*Sheffield, Heeley*): I wish to follow the hon. Gentleman's argument. The Chinese Government is one which has come into power by the use of force, in the same way, possibly, as the Spanish Government came into power. I fail to see how the argument he applied about the recognition of Spain and the question of sending an ambassador, can justify sending an ambassador to China. It seems to me to be inconsistent.

Mr. Davies: The attitude of Spain during the last war was very different from the attitude of China. Further, in regard to China, we have taken the lead at the United Nations, and it is the earnest hope of His Majesty's Government that the change-over from Chinese Nationalist to Peoples Government representation will take place as soon as possible in all competent organs of the United Nations. We cast an affirmative vote in the General Assembly and in the Economic and Social Council for what we considered to be the true representation of the Chinese Government, and we regret that so far it has not been possible to obtain the necessary majority

to bring about the change in this representation on the United Nations. . . .

Brigadier Rayner (Totnes): . . . One of the main requirements of Western Union defence is the preparation of a strong natural barrier behind which, in case of need and in the early stages, we could reorganise ourselves and wait for American reinforcements. One glance at the map of Europe is sufficient to show where that barrier exists. About three weeks ago I motored to Spain, where I have had certain interests for many years, and as from the vineyards around Narbonne I saw the peaks of the Pyrenees looming ever larger I thought it was about time we brought that splendid mountain barrier into our grand design of Western Union defence.

After passing from the rather strained tension of France into the easy leisurely atmosphere of Spain, I made the same remarks to a Catalan friend of mine. I noted his reply in my diary so that I could quote it to the House. He said, "Oh, yes. We would make a most useful ally but you will not let bygones be bygones; your policy towards us is hypocritical and stupid, and we dislike you increasingly." Those last words were strong ones, and I think it would be profitable in this Debate to consider whether they were justified. I, like the hon. and gallant Member for Horncastle, do not want to bring this vexed question too much to the fore tonight. It has been altogether too controversial in the past.

Although some of us had strong sympathies in one way or another during the Spanish civil war, and some of us blamed General Franco for his contacts with Hitler during the great war, surely it is time to let bygones be bygones? We have forgiven the Italians, we have been generous to the Germans, yet the Spaniards, who did not bomb any of our towns or ships, or kill any of our warriors, but on the contrary rendered aid to many of our submarine and air crews, and prevented Gibraltar from being taken by the back-door, we still blacklist and boycott.

Then, referring again to my Catalan friend's attack, would the Spaniards make good allies as conditions are at the present time? Certainly they would, for many reasons. First of all, they are a Christian Power, and as the nations of Christendom stand on guard against the powers of evil centred in the Kremlin, we cannot afford to do without the help of a single Christian Power. Secondly, they are strong and virile. Not only do the Pyrenees make the Iberian Peninsula a natural fortress, but that fortress is garrisoned by an army of 400,000 men, with two million trained reserves. Moreover, these men have that courage and dash common to most Spaniards, and are therefore a good deal more dependable than some other armies which I could mention. Thirdly, the Spaniards are now most surprisingly united.

At the end of the civil war, putting it at a rather low estimate, General Franco had half the nation on his side. Since then, the proportion has increased in the most incredible way. Hundreds of thousands have gone over to him month after month in gratitude for his having kept them out of the war and for the tremendous social improvements which he has made in a socially backward country. Republican exiles have been returning, even the best of them, such as Senor Azaña. As for the rest, it is noteworthy that, in the recent round-up of dangerous Communists in France, most of them were found to be Spanish exiles.

On most grounds, therefore, Spain would make a de-

sirable ally, and yet we continue to pull her nose. Why is it? It is for the simple reason that we do not agree with her Government. Yet nobody in his senses can pretend that Spain is an aggressive nation, and what right have we to say what kind of Government Spain shall have? What right have we to try to impose our own system of government on Spain? It is a bad habit which we have got into and which we are likely to regret in the years to come even in our own Commonwealth and Empire. Surely in the case of a proud and independent people with a history and a geography entirely different from ours, it is quite indefensible. Surely we should allow Spain to feel her way towards a democratic system of Government which suits her own customs and traditions and faith.

Now let me consider my Catalan friend's final crack that our Spanish policy is hypocritical and stupid. It is hypocrisy to send ambassadors into virtual imprisonment behind the Iron Curtain and yet to deny on totalitarian grounds an ambassador to a country where visitors and foreign journalists can go where they like and report what they will. And it is stupid at the present time to pursue a vendetta which denies to us the help of a country like Spain, with its strong army, a navy equal to that of France, and with its wonderful strategic position. . . .

. . . In the first place, we refused at the end of the war to back Spain for the United Nations largely because we wanted to make it easier for Russia to come in. But now the situation really is that in the warming up "cold war" against Communism we are keeping out one of the most anti-Communist nations in order to please the main Communist Power, and that seems rather silly. There are a lot of hon. Members opposite who have been to Spain recently, to my knowledge, and who have come back with the same opinion as I am putting forward now, but they remain silent. Let them support my suggestion that we should do the generous and gracious thing towards Spain and back her for entry, not only into the United Nations but also into Western Union. . . .

SHAW.

(continued from page 3)

is immaterial, and there is literally nothing to hold back your Intellectual, no restraint in the religious sense, which is derived from the Latin *religori*, to bind back, from drawing the wildest logical conclusions. This is the cult of dialectical materialism, the creed of the Jew Marx, of which both the Russian Politburo and Shaw's Fabian Society are exponents.

N. F. WEBB.

ESPIONAGE.

Report of the Royal Commission.

(Order in Council, P.C. 411, Feb. 5, 1946).

(Espionage in Canada).

" . . . we considered it of paramount importance that there should be available for all to read as complete an account as possible of the illegal activities which had already so seriously affected, and were designed even more seriously to affect, the safety and interests of Canada."—*The Commissioners*.

7/- (postage extra).

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

Liverpool.

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