

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 15.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"We conquered and we built our Empires in Asia some three hundred years ago, in Africa only seventy years ago, but even here at a time when we still believed in the right of a superior civilisation to rule. This is only another way of saying that we believed in the aristocratic principle—rule not by the majority but rule by what in this country used to be called the quality. We have had rule by the quality in Europe, however roughly the quality was determined, for some two thousand years. We have it no longer. We have foresworn the aristocratic principle in favour of counting noses. It seems to me that in the moment of doing so, we put "paid" to our imperial mission. For ever since and in consequence of just that historical development, we have steadily been undermining our position as quality rulers by preaching the opposite principle of self-determination or majority rule."

J. Huizenga, Special Correspondent,
Journal of the Royal African Society.

There is no meaner fraud than the debasement of the currency, and no surer indication of the decadence of a nation than a flaccid acquiescence in it. But when to this is added the pretence that it is inevitable, and that, while it is in progress, those in control of financial policy are at their wits end to prevent it, we are on safe ground when we say that the present civilisation is approaching its last frontiers.

Not the least remarkable feature of the situation is the contemporaneous dification of "planning" with the results which are emerging; results to which Finance has contributed preponderatingly. Stripped of its smoke-screen of words, conferences and "Organisations," we are witnessing the attempt to resurrect the hopelessly discredited mercantilist system on a global scale. To say that it must fail is merely to point to history; but in this case, the failure will be on the scale of the attempt.

As it becomes clear that in the event of another world war, New York and Washington, and probably all the industrial cities from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes, will become the objectives of destructive bombing, a cry can be heard, and is rapidly swelling in volume to the effect that war is outrageous. It is felt that war on the Continent of Europe and the destruction of life and property at a convenient distance from which the spectacle can be enjoyed and plans made for "rehabilitation and reconstruction," is one thing; bombs on Broadway, is quite another.

While the sentiment is in itself impeccable, and most of us are willing to forget the complacency of Americans when London burnt, or even their visible annoyance in the autumn of 1939 when it didn't, it would be idle to pretend that the spectacle of the United States demonstrating to effete Europe

the art of diplomacy and world management has a certain attraction.

Since the death of the late Rt. Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King things have come to light which may have some importance when historians a generation hence return their final verdict on him. He is shown to have left three-quarters of a million dollars, and to have enjoyed in later years at least the income of a millionaire, what with income from investments, salary and perquisites. This is not to suggest that his estate consisted largely of ill-gotten gains. It is merely to suggest that Mr. King was a much wealthier man than anybody supposed. It is not customary for Canadian Premiers to leave huge estates. The richest of them all was undoubtedly Lord Bennett, but he had the good luck to be bequeathed a match factory. Sir Robert Borden could earn large sums at the bar. But Mr. King was not a renowned barrister, nor the owner of a flourishing industry. He was, until he entered politics, a social worker, an upholder of the rights of labour, an enthusiast who sought to better the lot of the poor man. The assumption that he was a poor man himself was not unreasonable; it was certainly unjustified. In addition, Mr. King sought to give the impression of straightened means. He apologised for the meagreness of the hospitality of Laurier House on the grounds that he could afford no better. Mr. King, to use an Irish expression, "made a poor mouth."

We have been told by a spokesman for Mr. King that he was surprised, even "shocked," when on taking an inventory he discovered what a large estate he had somehow absent-mindedly been able to accumulate. The public was probably shocked, too, without supposing that Mr. King had used his office for private gain. The shock was occasioned merely by the discovery that Mr. King was not quite the sort of man he had been generally supposed to be.

—*Toronto Globe and Mail*, Nov. 10, 1950.

To the Editor of The Times

Sir,—Your recent leading article on "History in Ledgers" [*] traces the rise of London banks from the business of the goldsmiths. Local banks arose in other ways. In Bedford Joseph Barnard's coal wharf, established in 1776, led to the setting up of a private bank in 1799. Not till 1916 did Barnard's Bank succumb to the "economic pincer movement" you describe. The bank's records are preserved, and have been deposited in this office, on behalf of the family, by Captain T. T. Barnard. Of how many other local private banks do the records survive?

Yours faithfully,

JOYCE GODBER, County Archivist,
County Record Office, Shire Hall, Bedford.

[*] *The Times*, November 17—Editor, T.S.C.

Rationing of Sugar

Stung by the fact that we have now been rationed for sugar for ten or eleven years, an elector in the Huyton constituency took the matter up with his representative, the Right hon. James Harold Wilson. He is Mr. John Brummitt who, in his first letter to the Member, said there was evidence that there was no shortage of sugar, and asked Mr. Wilson as his representative to do what he could to bring rationing to an end. Mr. Brummitt further volunteered the opinion that the de-rationing and subsequent re-rationing of sweets, a short time previously, *when sweets continued to be exported abroad*, was a manoeuvre to present rationing as a more desirable state than a free market when the goods disappear all together, so that people would *demand rationing*, as many did in letters to the press which were given considerable publicity. Mr. Wilson's reply follows:—

(Copy)

Board of Trade,
Millbank, S.W.1.
26th May, 1950.

From the President, Committee of Privy Council for Trade

Dear Mr. Brummitt,

Thank you for your letter of the 28th April about the price and rationing of sugar. I am sorry I have not been able to write to you before now, but I thought you would be interested to see the enclosed letter which has been received from the Private Secretary to the Minister of Food in reply to enquiries which were made for you. There is no need to return the letter, as I have a copy.

You may also like to see the attached copy of my Election address, as it deals with many of the points which you raised in your earlier letter.

You say that you have yet to hear that I have taken up in the House of Commons the question of rationing. The fact is that as a Minister of the Crown, whatever my views, I would be out of order in speaking on the floor of the House on a matter for which I have no Departmental responsibility. As a member of the Government, I do, of course, support any decision taken by the Government.

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD WILSON.

John Brummitt, Esq.

(Enclosure)

(Copy)

Ministry of Food,
Dean Bradley House,
Horseferry Road,
London, S.W.1.

24th May, 1950.

Dear Mrs. Cannon,

You wrote to us on the 4th May and sent a copy of a letter that Mr. Wilson had received from Mr. John Brummitt of Liverpool, about sugar.

The price of sugar in the free world market is three to four times what it was before the war but in this country the controlled price of granulated sugar today, 5d. a lb., is only a little over twice the 1939 price.

Although there may not be a world shortage of sugar there is no significant surplus at present, and what surplus there is can only be bought for dollars, which explains why

we are unable to buy the extra sugar that would be necessary to increase the ration.

We are under agreement with Commonwealth producers to take every bag of sugar they can give us up to the end of 1952 and we have recently had discussions about the position during the following five years. It is simply not true that we are failing to buy sugar that is available in sterling or other soft currency areas.

Mr. Brummitt's belief that we stage-managed the de-rationing of sweets so that it would be a failure has, of course, no foundation. We gave the sweets industry all the sugar we could spare at the time and when that proved insufficient to meet the unrationed demand we had no option but to re-impose rationing.

Mr. Brummitt may be sure that Mr. Webb is doing everything he can to improve our sugar position, for he realises how much importance people attach to sugar and he has repeatedly said that he considers the domestic consumer should have the highest priority for any additional supplies we may be able to obtain.

Yours sincerely,

(Mrs.) E. A. BAKER,

Assistant Private Secretary.

Mrs. E. Cannon,
Board of Trade,
Millbank,
London, S.W.1.

On July 10, the elector again wrote to Mr. Wilson reiterating that there was no shortage of sugar and adding that he was old enough to remember a time when, under a better system, people could buy all the sugar they wanted, and buy it very much cheaper than in our modern planned economy. Mr. Wilson replied as follows:—

(Copy)

Board of Trade,
Millbank,
S.W.1.

28 July, 1950.

Dear Mr. Brummitt,

I have now had an opportunity of reading your letter of the 10th July. You are, of course, quite wrong in thinking that we exported sweets in order to make the de-rationing of sweets a failure. A very large proportion of our exports of chocolate and sugar confectionery go to those markets whose currency is particularly valuable to us, and naturally every effort is being made to increase this trade.

There may be a surplus of sugar in the world in two years' time, but this is certainly not the position at the moment, and I am sure you will agree that it is the immediate supply position which affects the ration.

As has already been explained, it is only lack of dollars that prevents our buying additional sugar today, and as there is no surplus non-dollar sugar available anywhere it is impossible to increase the ration until the dollar position improves. We certainly hope for some increase in Commonwealth supplies during the next few years, but in addition to this we are looking into every possibility of acquiring sugar from non-dollar areas.

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD WILSON.

Mr. Brummitt returned to the attack in a letter dated November 9, 1950., as follows:—

(Copy)

The Right hon. James Harold Wilson,
House of Commons, London.

Dear Sir,

You would have no time to read, and I no time to write, the many things which at this moment require to be put right. For that reason I have preferred to try to obtain satisfaction upon one point only. I have chosen SUGAR. I have previously corresponded with you on this subject and I have to thank you for your letter of May 26, with enclosures.

Since that date many informed members of the House have pointed out repeatedly that there is plenty of sugar, and I dismiss as dishonest the statement of the Minister of Food that the Korean war has suddenly caused a world shortage of sugar. I have before me the recent statement by Mr. C. C. Campbell, Speaker of the Jamaican Parliament, which reads, "We in Jamaica are offering you sugar and still more sugar . . . The British people ought to rise in revolt against continued rationing." They ought indeed.

The excuse that dollars are necessary to get more sugar, I regard as an alibi. The Ministry of Food is the bottle-neck which will not allow the stuff to come into the country. I am old enough to remember a time when we all enjoyed as much sugar as we wanted and at a price which today seems ludicrous. That was at a time when we had no Ministry of Food. We still retain, I hope, the good sense to judge a tree by its fruits.

If the once-Great British Government has assumed responsibility for supplying us with sugar, and is unable in the event to supply it, why is not the centralised buying system discarded in favour of the one which has been so satisfactorily built up over many centuries?

I should like to emphasise that I am writing to you in your capacity as my representative, a position to which you were appointed at the General Election. It makes strange reading when I find in your letter that you "would be out of order in speaking on the floor of the House on a matter" which I have specifically put to you for re-presentation. Furthermore you say that you support any decision taken by the Government.

Does this mean that since the election you have changed you employers and that we in Huyton are now without a representative?

Since it is patent that the British Government does not represent the British people it would be pertinent to enquire whom they do represent.

I should like to make it quite clear that I am not a Conservative and belong to no party, party government being the mechanism for fooling all the people all the time. If I write with some asperity it is because I am increasingly concerned with the anti-British treatment being accorded to the British people.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN BRUMMITT.

P.S. I should like permission to publish this correspondence.—J.B.

Mr. Wilson replied:—

(Copy)

Board of Trade,
Millbank,
S.W.1.

22nd November, 1950.

Dear Mr. Brummitt,

I have now been in touch with the Minister of Food about the points raised in your letter of the 9th November, and he has written to me as follows:—

"I am afraid there is still a lot of misunderstanding about sugar particularly as far as Commonwealth supplies are concerned.

"The Ministry of Food has, in fact, undertaken to buy all the sugar that Jamaica can send us until the end of 1952. The difficulty at the moment is not that we will not buy sugar from the Commonwealth, but that the Commonwealth cannot yet produce enough. We hope they will be sending us more next year, but even then, unless dollars are available to buy sugar from other sources as well, I am afraid that there is no early hope of our being able to end rationing.

"From 1952 until 1957 Jamaica will share in the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, under which the West Indies will be able to export to this country or to Canada 900,000 tons of sugar, of which we have undertaken to buy 640,000 tons at guaranteed prices."

Mr. Webb adds that he would, of course, be only too pleased if you would make these facts widely known and you are therefore quite free to publish the correspondence that has passed between us on the question of sugar, if you wish.

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD WILSON.

Mr. Brummitt replied:—

(Copy)

The Right hon. Jas. Harold Wilson,
Member of Parliament for Huyton.

Dear Sir,

I am very much obliged by your letter of 22nd November, and should like to say that I do appreciate your painstaking and courteous replies to my representations.

We have now arrived at the stage where (1) the Minister of Food says he is buying all the sugar he can, and can't get enough and (2) the Speaker of the Jamaican Parliament says we are not taking all the sugar he is offering and the British people ought to rise in revolt against continued rationing.

At the moment I confess I do not know to which disinterested authority I should appeal in order to learn which of these gentlemen is speaking the truth.

But I cannot see any conceivable reason why the Jamaican should invent such a lie, whilst it is obvious that our Minister of Food should wish to repudiate his personal responsibility for continued rationing in the face of an alleged sufficiency.

The instance of sugar is, of course, merely the peg upon which I am trying to hang my argument, which is that the business of a Member of Parliament is to do what his constituents want. He must re-present their wishes or give up

(Continued on page 7)

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. 25. No. 15.

Saturday, December 9, 1950.

"American" Foreign Policy*

Although in many ways not as drastic as the Menzies Government's Anti-Communist Bill, the American Communist Control Bill was vetoed by President Truman, no doubt on the advice of men like Morgenthau, Frankfurter and Lehman. It is not without significance that all leading Jewish organisations in the U.S.A. campaigned vigorously against the Bill. Although the House of Representatives and the Senate both overrode the President's veto, they adjourned without providing any money to enforce it.

This news from America further confirms our contention that we are heading for complete disaster if we persist with a foreign policy which becomes more and more subservient to an "American" policy that, since the treachery of Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam, has always furthered the Communist conspiracy. Communist infiltration into the American State and other Departments has been dangerously successful. Mr. Dean Acheson, friend of Communist agent Hiss, still continues in the key position of American Secretary for State in spite of growing public unrest. The resignation of Mr. Acheson's colleague, Mr. Johnson, the U.S. Secretary for War, was no doubt designed to try and appease the American people, and to keep Mr. Acheson and his backers in control.

Although the Australian daily press makes little or no reference to the fact, it is encouraging to know that a section of the American Republican Party, following the courageous lead given by Senator McCarthy and several other Members, are beginning to direct attention to the policy of appeasing and supporting the Communist conspirators which the Roosevelt and Truman administrations have persistently followed. Republican Senator Bridges publicly stated last week that Mr. Acheson and his associates have prepared a "blue print for appeasement" which aims at having the Chinese Communists admitted to the "United" Nations. Right throughout the Korean episode the Communists, supported by Nehru, have done all in their power to have the Chinese Communists recognised as the official Chinese Government. If Mr. Acheson, whom Mr. Casey calls his personal friend, is successful with his blue print, he will have helped the Communist conspirators obtain another major victory.

If the Federal Government has an ounce of genuine patriotism, instead of treating Communist gangsters as equals in that great racket known as the "United" Nations, it should be seeking to promote an independent British Empire policy designed to ensure that the British peoples are not betrayed as they were during and after the two world wars of this century. Like its predecessor, the League of Nations, the "United" Nations should be allowed to die.

Like the Jewish-inspired "Russian" Revolution of 1917,

*] From *The New Times* (Melbourne) of October 13.

the break-up and degradation of the once great British Empire can be traced directly to the Zionist financial groups, who at present operate from the U.S.A., and have wielded such an evil influence on "American" policies. Patriotic Britishers and patriotic Americans must destroy the power of these groups if Western Christian Civilization is to survive.

Seen from Australia

2nd November, 1950.

"... I always have felt that the financial was the worst possible ground for opposing the National Health Service, and I feel, especially in view of the past history of the B.M.A. Executive, that there is an element of sabotage in the Guild plan of campaign. What seems certain is that at this stage, when everyone has had experience of the practical working of the service (doctors, I mean), as opposed to the rosy pictures of the propagandists, a decisive and final rejection of the whole scheme could be obtained. There was a majority against the introduction of the service, when a lot of doctors thought they should "give it a trial," and all that has happened since then should have disabused the minds of those who thought they should be fair. . . .

"... Our B.M.A. recently conducted a plebiscite on whether we should resign from the Lodges. I do not know what the figures were, but they favoured resignation, which accordingly has been ordered. As a result of this, the Lodges are going to offer a fee-for-service system, which they had flatly refused to do before. This is almost certainly the result of the action of our local Association in resigning previously (New South Wales). . . ."

(Abstracted from letters dated November 2 and October 30 from an Australian medical correspondent).

London D.S.C. Group

Between December 17 and January 9 Dr. Tudor Jones will address three meetings in London, one of which will be a social re-union. Details may be obtained by application to Mrs. B. M. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent, who requests that enquirers enclose a stamped addressed envelope.

T.S.C. Indices.

No index of *The Social Crediter* has been published for some time past. The construction of an index to our pages that is not an affront to the intelligence of our readers calls for powers of an exceptional order, which, in our present circumstances, are, when available, properly devoted to other, and we believe higher purposes. Experiments which we have made in employing professional experts on indexing have been fruitless, either from the high cost of an exhaustive analysis or from total insufficiency of any selection of topics which is not guided by a full understanding of our own and our readers' policy. The results have had to be discarded. With great regret, we must announce that we cannot promise future production of indices. We suggest that readers of *The Social Crediter* will find most useful an extension of the practice of compiling reference lists such as that published by us on March 20, 1948.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 20, 1950.

Dried Eggs.

Mr. George Jeger asked the Minister of Food whether he will make supplies of dried eggs available for domestic use.

Mr. Webb: I should like to be able to do this, but there are serious difficulties. Available supplies are bulk-packed in a form suitable only for allocation to trade users, and in any case the amount is only sufficient for them to receive a proportion of the quantities they used before the war.

Mr. Jeger: Will my right hon. Friend see that further quantities are imported, broken down into small packages, and given priority to the domestic consumer, rather than to caterers and traders?

Mr. Webb: Only if we get extra dollars for this purpose. The Chancellor has been able to allow some dollars for the amount of dried egg we are getting which goes to caterers directly, but indirectly, in the end, to consumers.

Mr. Nabarro: Will the right hon. Gentleman concentrate attention on increasing the supply and improving the freshness of shell eggs, instead of increasing the supply of dried eggs?

Mr. Jeger: Will my right hon. Friend look into the question of getting the same quantity of dried eggs, but in smaller quantities, rather than in bulk, which should not cost more dollars?

Falkland Island Dependencies.

Mr. Donner asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what measures he now proposes to take to implement the policy of His Majesty's Government to bring the question of Argentinian and Chilean violation of sovereignty and of prolonged trespass by the establishment of military and other posts on British territory in the Falkland Island Dependencies before the International Court of Justice, in view of the failure of Argentina and Chile to avail themselves of this offer.

Mr. Ernest Davies: I stated on 6th November that the offer of His Majesty's Government to submit this dispute to the International Court will remain open and I gave renewed assurance that His Majesty's Government regard the Falkland Island Dependencies as British territory. I have at present no further statement to make on the subject.

Mr. Donner: Does not acquiescence in the prolonged violation of British sovereignty only encourage unfriendly Powers to question and flout British interests the world over?

Mr. Davies: I do not accept that; I think the mere fact that we are acting with restraint in this matter, and not acting in a hot-headed way, may win us support from other countries.

Sir H. Williams: If foreigners came into the constituency of the hon. Member, would he ask the British Council to sling them out?

Mr. Donner: Will the Government consider raising the matter at the Security Council?

Newsprint Supplies.

Sir T. Moore asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will consider proposing to the General Assembly of the United Nations that all newsprint of the free nations shall be pooled, so as to provide reasonable and equal facilities for the newspapers of all its members.

Mr. Ernest Davies: No, Sir.

Sir T. Moore: This is an extraordinary situation. Can the hon. Gentleman explain why Britain, who was so prominent in winning the late war, should now go short of newsprint while the very countries we helped to liberate have apparently an abundance? Is there any justification for that?

Mr. Davies: The Question asks whether this matter should be put to the General Assembly of the United Nations. We do not consider that the General Assembly is a suitable body before which this question should be put.

Sir T. Moore: What is the suitable body?

House of Commons: November 20, 1950.

Tibet.

Mr. Blackburn (Birmingham, Northfield): I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, for calling me to raise the subject of the Chinese Communist Government's present aggression in Tibet. At the moment, there is a Chinese delegation on its way to Lake Success to discuss before the United Nations the subject "American aggression on Formosa." The subject which, really, the United Nations has to discuss is not American aggression on Formosa but Chinese Communist aggression on Tibet. In my submission, it is the duty of His Majesty's Government to do all in their power to prevent the Chinese Government from being able to attend the Security Council until this present aggression against Tibet has come to an end.

After all, of all the harmless countries in the world, surely Tibet is the most harmless. . . Even the "Daily Worker," even the Communists themselves, have for once not dared to proclaim that the country the Communists are attacking is really the aggressor. We have been told that the South Koreans marched against the North Koreans. We have been told of the terribly aggressive designs of Tito, in Yugoslavia, against the Soviet Union. But this lie was too great even for Stalin; even Stalin could not say that Tibet had attacked China and the Soviet Union. For once, if I may say so, we can congratulate Stalin and his friends upon their wisdom.

Nor, indeed, can it be suggested—although it would be an irrelevant suggestion if it were made—that Tibet is a country which is living in abject poverty. Let me quote from an excellent report in "The Times" of today. It admits, of course quite correctly, that Tibet is run under a feudal system, but it says:

"Yet the peasantry is by and large well off and there is no grinding poverty such as exists in China and India."

. . . Let us forget the legal argument for a moment. Let us come to the basic principles. The sure way of avoiding war, as we have now learned, is to resist aggression at the moment it first occurs. The parallel of Manchukuo in 1931 has been repeated over and over again in this House in relation to Korea, but it must not be repeated only in relation to Korea: it must be repeated in relation to Tibet as well. Otherwise, principles are a farce. Otherwise, all

our high sounding moral speeches from both Front Benches and from all parts of the House of Commons themselves become meaningless.

As a matter of fact, there is even greater moral justification for giving aid to Tibet than there was for giving aid to South Korea. Let the Communists take over Tibet, and they are on the borders of India. Tibet—and I am speaking subject to correction by my hon. Friend the Member for Derbyshire, West—has in its centre a plateau between 12,000 and 15,000 ft. above sea level. It is an ideal area for the establishment of air ports of all kinds. It is an ideal area from which to conduct a radio war to dominate India and Pakistan. On moral, strategic and political grounds we cannot afford to let Tibet fall.

I further suggest that the Government should immediately get in touch with the Governments of India and Pakistan, although Pakistan does not adjoin Tibet, and ask the Governments of India and Pakistan, with support from us, to send a brigade by air to Tibet. There is not the slightest doubt, in my view, that one brigade—

Mr. Emrys Hughes: Of volunteers?

Mr. Blackburn: I should prefer volunteers. The hon. Member knows my position on that. . . . But I do suggest that the northern frontiers of Tibet, the most difficult terrain in the world, could be efficiently protected to-day, and be defended against aggression from Communist China.

I end with this recollection. I remember well having said in 1947 in this House that if Nicolai Petkov fell the whole of Eastern Europe would be bowed under the Communists. I say to-night what I said about Nicolai Petkov—and what I said about Nicolai Petkov has been proved true—that if we allow the bell to toll for Tibet as we allowed the bell to toll for Nicolai Petkov, then we shall see the whole of Asia in imminent danger of falling under the domination of the foulest totalitarian tyranny this world has ever known.

Mr. Wakefield (Derbyshire, West): I think there may be a danger of confusing suzerainty with sovereignty. Suzerainty is a conception which is quite common in the East, where it is intended to signify a token prestige; but a suzerain has no right whatsoever to interfere with the autonomy of the vassal. I strongly support what the hon. Member for Birmingham, Northfield (Mr. Blackburn), has said about the pacific nature of the Tibetans. . . . They will not fight and defend themselves in the way that we should, because their whole nature derives from their religion. It is for that reason that they are incapable of defending themselves.

Whether we British can help them I do not know, but I do know that many people in India and Pakistan would volunteer if called upon. I do suggest that if we could associate ourselves with India in any physical protest, that we could make against this violation of Tibetan independence, then we should be very wise.

. . . I think that what the hon. Member for Northfield said about defence by air is possible. In 1904, we sent an expedition to Lhasa. It had a very laborious journey, but we did not then have the advantage of air transport. Of course, the physical difficulties in that part of the world are immense.

I must give the hon. Gentleman time to reply, but I should like to address myself for a moment to a point which has not yet been raised, and that is the attitude of the Chinese themselves. The Chinese did for a very long period

prior to 1894 govern Tibet. From 1894 to 1910, Tibet was independent, but from 1910 to 1912 there were again Chinese governors of Tibet, and Chinese school children have been brought up to believe that Tibet is a province of China. This new Communist Government is anxious, as all newly established governments are, to make a display of its strength, its patriotism and its courage. It is prepared to be aggressive. I have no doubt myself that this Chinese aggression is a natural form of expressing a new-found authority, of which advantage has been taken for sinister reasons, by a greater power.

The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Ernest Davies): I think that our position in regard to Tibet has been made quite clear in the replies which I have given to Parliamentary Questions which have been put to me in the last two or three weeks. As I stated this afternoon, this matter is now before the United Nations. Tibet has appealed to the United Nations, and the United Nations is considering whether it should put the matter on its agenda and take any action. I think that it would be very rash of us tonight to discuss the military possibility of going to the aid of Tibet, of whether that would be advisable and whether that would be successful. It is entirely a matter now before the United Nations, and I do not propose to discuss that aspect of it. . . .

. . . As I have stated, we deplore the action China has taken. Tibet was prepared to negotiate with China, and it was while the Tibetan representatives were actually on their way to Peking, that the Chinese took the aggressive action they did against this autonomous country. As the hon. Member said, this action was taken without provocation and while peaceful negotiations were in progress. I think that the action taken by the Chinese is inexcusable and unforgivable. . . .

. . . We have recognised that China does have suzerainty over Tibet. We have taken that attitude for a considerable time, but only on the understanding that Tibet is regarded as autonomous. This suzerainty has been quite nominal for a considerable time, and there has been no active interference from China as far as we are aware. It dates back to 1911, since when Tibet has enjoyed *de facto* independence within this framework of Chinese suzerainty. The independence of Tibet has not yet been lost. That fact must be kept in mind. It is tragic that she is being attacked, but she still remains autonomous and *de facto* independent.

Whether we continue to recognise the suzerainty of China or not, it in no way justifies the Chinese invasion of Tibet. But this present circumstance must make us look at this position again, and at this stage we are not in a position to say whether or not our legal attitude towards the country is affected by this. . . .

. . . As the hon. Gentleman has pointed out, and as the hon. Gentleman the Member for Derbyshire, West (Mr. E. Wakefield), has also pointed out, Tibet is also an inaccessible country. It is a romantic country. It is cut off from India, Pakistan and Nepal by the great Himalayas, and that makes it impossible in our view that she should be used as a base for aggression. Chinese alleged fears in this respect are, of course, quite absurd. . . .

Scotland (Black-out, Aberdeen).

Mr. Hector Hughes asked the Secretary of State for Scotland if he is aware that on the night of Monday, 13th November, 1950, there was in the City of Aberdeen a com-

plete electricity black-out which lasted from 35 minutes to one hour and disorganised the business of the city; can he state what was the cause of this; and what steps it is proposed shall be taken to obviate a similar occurrence in future.

Mr. McNeil: The electricity black-out which occurred in Aberdeen at 10-20 p.m. on 13th November was due to a technical fault which disconnected an important supply circuit. This in turn caused overloading which automatically shut off the generating plant. To prevent a recurrence the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board are making a detailed examination of the incident.

Newsprint Supplies (New Zealand Forests).

Mr. Hurd asked the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations if he has consulted the Government of New Zealand with a view to co-operation between the United Kingdom and the Dominion in the large scale development of newsprint supplies from the forests in the North Island, to the mutual advantage of both countries; and if he will make a statement.

Mr. Gordon-Walker: No, although I understand that the New Zealand Government have under consideration a project for the development of newsprint in the North Island. Any increase in the production of newsprint within the Commonwealth would be welcome.

House of Commons: November 23, 1950.

Industrial Shirts (Price).

Sir T. Moore asked the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the pre-war price of khaki industrial shirts for men was 2s. 11d. each, whereas now the permitted price is 19s. 9d.; and what is the reason for this increase.

Mr. H. Wilson: The present highest maximum retail price for a utility khaki industrial shirt is 18s. 11d. I am not in a position to say at what price a similar shirt would have been sold before the war, but there has undoubtedly been a large increase in price since then. This increase is due to the eight-fold increase in the price of raw cotton and to higher costs of manufacture and distribution.

Sir T. Moore: Does not this one item alone, even amongst many other thousands, make nonsense of the Government's constant claims that they are reducing the cost of living for the workers, who are the persons hardest hit by this fantastic increase?

Mrs. Jean Mann: Would my right hon. Friend not agree that the khaki industrial shirt at 2s. 11d. became an absolute rag after the first washing and is not comparable at all with the present shirt?

Synthetic Textiles.

Lieut.-Col. Lipton asked the President of the Board of Trade to what extent synthetic textiles are now being manufactured in this country as a substitute for wool; and when supplies will be available to the general public.

Mr. H. Wilson: Several synthetic fibres can be used for blending with wool, and rayon staple fibre is the one most used. Production of protein synthetic fibres in this country is only on an experimental scale at present, but one plant should be in commercial production early next year. Cloths made from this fibre will probably reach the public some 12 months later.

Lieut.-Col. Lipton: Will my right hon. Friend do everything he possibly can to encourage these various forms of production, which will help to minimise high living costs, and alleviate hardships among the people suffering from the rise in wool prices?

Mr. Wilson: Yes, Sir. We are already doing everything we can, and are giving a lot of help to the particular scheme I have mentioned.

Mr. Drayson: Will the right hon. Gentleman look into the question of exports of rayon staple fibre and other synthetic fibres which could be used on machinery in this country? Will he take note of the fact that there is in my constituency machinery that is idle because raw material is being exported.

Mr. Wilson: I am always prepared to consider the balance between the home use and the export of these commodities and I am quite sure the hon. Gentleman would not press for undue interference with the export drive.

Education (Teachers) (N.U.T. Membership).

Mr. Baker White asked the Minister of Education whether school teachers employed in schools coming within the jurisdiction of his Department must, as a condition of their employment, be members of the National Union of Teachers.

Mr. Tomlinson: I impose no such requirement. I have, moreover, informed the Durham local education authority, who are contemplating such a requirement, that, while I favour teachers joining a union or professional organisation, I do not consider that they should be coerced into doing so by the action of their employing authority. If the authority were to persist in the line of action proposed they might find themselves, as a result, unable to discharge their statutory obligations. I could not remain indifferent to this threat to the educational service and, if need be, I should use the powers which the Act gives me to prevent it.

RATIONING OF SUGAR (continued from page 3).

his claim to be their representative or mouth-piece. In this connection I am always careful to address you as "Member of Parliament for Huyton" whilst all your replies have been from "the President of the Board of Trade."

The implication is that I am disfranchised by reason of your appointment to the Board of Trade, but I am quite willing to believe that that is not your intention. That is why I return to this matter of sugar. If it is no use trying to get a representative to re-present, then Parliament is a sham, democracy has no meaning, and we are in the grip of a dictatorship.

I would not press this matter if I thought I was out of step with the other fifty-thousand electors in Huyton. On the contrary, I believe I speak for the vast majority. For every one that you can produce who wants rationing continued, I will undertake to produce ten who want rationing finished. And I belong to no party.

I have looked in vain for any hint in your letters that you accept this fundamental relationship between constituent and representative. If, as you say, you are unwilling to give public utterance to such a matter, will you use your undoubted influence in quarters able to respond to it?

Yours faithfully,

JOHN BRUMMITT.

Growing Doubts

Commenting, under this heading, on a recent book by Mr. Richard Law, *The Tablet* in its issue for November 25, wrote:—

“Broadly speaking, our basic mistakes have consisted in passivity and indolence and in abandoning the political wisdom of the past, with its achievement of a balanced constitution. We have concentrated all powers in the political parties, and made a half-hearted attempt to keep and lead all the peoples whom we had gathered into a political system with ourselves, while providing no other leadership beyond the temporary emotions of the British electorate. Never before in history did men attempt to hold together and to guide an empire without something in the nature of a senate, removed from the immediate pressure of the uniformed and uninterested multitude.”

“Men not merely without religion but without instruction in the necessary branches of knowledge, without piety towards the past or wisdom or depth, complacently and eagerly demand more and more complete power over human society, announce that they are competent to control and guide and plan, and at every check have as their natural and instinctive solution that they shall be given yet more power. It is a spectacle at once absurd and alarming, and it can be seen in almost every country, as men have discovered, and it is one of the great discoveries of an age of discovery, that the successful politician can arrogate to himself the fruits of success in so many other fields; that instead of laboriously building up a business, if he builds a political movement he can then appropriate any and every business that he likes.”

“... The trouble is that most day to day politicians have few ideas and are conscious that ideas are dangerous and excite mistrust, so that the formula for political success—though there are some illustrious exceptions—is to combine first-rate abilities with second-rate ideas, and above all, not to lose touch with the public or say anything that is not immediately intelligible and immediately palatable. When troubles are deep-seated any man who attempts to be honest and thorough in his diagnosis is bound to be rather grim to read, and this again is not welcome in public men. Yet the Conservative Party—less deeply submerged in illusions and philosophical errors than its rivals—has suffered far too much, and for far too long, from those who would not think at all, or from those who indulged in resolute shortsighted optimism, and it is high time more serious notes were struck, and high praise belongs to those who have the courage to strike them.”

Political Leukæmia

“There are many suggestions from various quarters now that a new approach ought to be made to the Kremlin, which is, in fact, the general directorate of persecution. I should hope that some at least of those who have that course in mind would be prepared to add a rider to say that they do not contemplate any accommodation until such horrors as religious persecution and slave labour cease. If anything else is attempted, I warn your Lordships that you will get only what Tom Hughes called the ‘Brown compromise.’

“It put me in mind of a passage in *Tom Brown's School-days*, which runs something as follows:

[“He never wants anything but what is right and fair; only

when you come to settle what is right and fair it is everything he wants and nothing you want.”]

“I know perfectly well that a great number of people who have in mind these ideas for rapprochement would not look at such a suggestion. One of the mischiefs of Western civilisation has for a long time past been the delusion that somehow politics and humanity can be divorced. In a material age like this there are very few people who will feel much or long about anything.

“When I was a child I was often told that Mr. Gladstone had set the country afire by his denunciation of persecutions and atrocities in Turkey; and, being young and innocent, I believed all that. I do not believe it now. I am quite sure he tried, but I am perfectly certain that he never set the country afire. Nothing on God's earth would set this country afire, and that is precisely one of our grave dangers. One of our most urgent security measures is that we should stop preening ourselves on our dispassion. We may die from the atomic bomb; we may also die from moral leukæmia; and the bloodstream of our body politic shows a continual increase in white corpuscles. Here in this Motion is a chance for an antidote.

“As the noble Lord, Lord Perth, said, we have frequently complained that some at least of these countries systematically fail in their obligations under the clauses affecting human rights. Why not make a start on them? We have a perfectly good ground for action. Why should not the United Nations, or such members of it as are willing to join, band themselves together in vowing that they will cut down to a rock-bottom minimum their relations with the persecutors so long as the persecution continues? That would be a great act of sanity and sanitation. It would put new heart into the world.”

[*Lord Vansittart in the House of Lords Debate on Communist Persecution of Religion (November 19).*]

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

| | |
|---|--------------|
| The Brief for the Prosecution..... | 8/6 |
| Social Credit | 3/6 |
| The Monopoly of Credit | (reprinting) |
| Credit Power and Democracy | 6/6 |
| The Big Idea | 2/6 |
| Programme for the Third World War..... | 2/- |
| The “Land for the (Chosen) People” Racket..... | 2/- |
| The Realistic Position of the Church of England | 8d. |
| 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) |

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

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