THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 26. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper. Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1951. 6d. Weekly.

Education

By G. D. GILLING SMITH.

(*Concluded*)

" Democracy morality " has also obscured the importance of having Statesmen for the well-being of a country. The political governments and their university-trained bureaucracies of the present century have clearly shown that the type of mind suited to arranging and ruthlessly simplifying data, in a laboratory or library, to a pattern which can be comprehended in a reasoned system, is not suited to the administrative tasks that go with government. The type of mind that understands the management of horses, even though its conversational abilities may make it less attractive from the point of view of companionship, has the qualities and experience better fitted for administration, which requires extensive dealings with human beings.

It seems therefore a primary requirement of an education system that it shall be the prop available to this last-mentioned type of intelligence. The criticism that one hears levelled against the " bad old universities " of such times as the 18th Century, because they were " prerogatives of the upper classes and the aristocracy," are based on a conception of education as an end-product that " ought to be shared " *etc.* It ignores the more important point that the good management of the country's affairs is likely to be assisted if those destined to be at the helm have had the right sort of education. One feels that as with the principles of association, the business of getting the right people into the universities, and the converse, is the best part of the way towards getting the right syllabus and the right sort of education. It must be remembered that the mere bringing into contact with each other of young and active minds in surroundings where important questions are continually discussed, where it is the convention that they are the main part of the day's social conversation, is practically half what even to-day constitutes a good university education. A glance at the type of education given by the Roman Catholic Church to those destined to fill important positions in its hierarchy, which certainly has little to do with the amassing of heaps of disconnected scholarship that may or may not be useful to someone else, should give some idea of the quality and range of the education system that ought to be available to secular administrators and potential statesmen. It may also be worth hazarding a suggestion that it was this fact of the Church hierarchy alone being educated, in any real sense of the word, that led to the widespread use of Churchmen in the later middle ages as civil administrators, hence to a greater confusion of the functions of power and authority, and to the attempt of the secular power to arrogate to itself both functions at the reformation. In England before the conquest, the situation had been simplified by the existence side by side of two distinct kinds of learning: the written learning of the Latin world which was the study of the priesthood and the unwritten learning of Germanic traditions including its epic poems, ideals of right action and loyalty to one's lord, and principles of common law, which was the province of the aristocracy. Not that the two traditions never made contact —all our written records of Old English literature and laws are evidence of that contact, the adaptation of the Latin alphabet and habit of expressing vocal noises as marks on parchment to the Germanic oral traditional learning. The important point was that, however much they may have been interactive and necessary to one another in Old English civilization, they were felt as distinct and their separate functions instinctively perceived.

This idea of an aristocratic lore and tradition is not, I think, to be relegated to the category of " curiosities in history books." I take it that most Social Crediters have a clearer picture of what is meant by an " aristocracy " than the popular one—"part of that heterogeneous collection which fills the ' Society ' pages ' in newspapers." If one thinks of certain families which have transmitted from generation to generation a culture and at the same time provided the surroundings that have been found by experience most congenial to the natural growth of their own sons to their full stature, one can understand the different results of these people coming into contact with a written tradition from those of the mechanically-minded parchment-fingerers who only see written matter as stuff to be filed in different compartments of the mind. There is an element of having had to have lived a part of the cultural tradition one is seeking in books, in order to give life to the latter, so that it can be understood and assimilated. One must perceive that the living tradition must exist side by side with but not too dependent on the written tradition in order that the latter may fulfill its function, (a fact ignored by the Protestant reformers who wished to make do with the Bible) so that the accumulated heritage of experience which the tradition contains may be applied in the right way to situations in the present. Its existence is a necessary condition of the teaching of the rudiments of a culture—the living model must ever be kept in view.

In a series of articles written for *The New Age* in 1919 under the title " The Regional," Ezra Pound makes among other things two points in connection with the idea of aristocracy as a model and therefore as a necessary part in any process of education.

" Wholly ' unjust ' concentrations of power (£ s. d.) have undoubtedly helped civilization." (It might be emphasised that *The New Age* at that time represented a Socialist outlook which would have tended to regard all unequal distributions of property as " Unjust concentration of power " and was not particularly concerned with the distinction, now important to us, between ownership of property and estates, and the concentrations of financial and political power, which the Social Credit movement and Ezra Pound himself have subsequently done much to clarify.) "It is their function to provide models, to set standards of living apparently unattainable for all . . . only in the rarest of cases has a collective administration attained any state of discrimination comparable to that en-

forced by individuals. . . . Whatever be the 'catch' in over-production [one might here point for further definition to the chapter on 'what is enough' in *The Elements of Social Credit*.—G.S.] it is the duty of a sane manufacturing system to 'overproduce' every luxury which tends to increase the comforts and amenities of existence. . . . The function of an aristocracy is largely to criticise, select, castigate luxury, to reduce the baroque to an elegance. . . . A fine model of life as of architecture, or in the arts, has its value, and any real system of sociology, as opposed to a doctrinaire system must recognise this value and its nature."

The concentrating of power (£ s. d.) in a different type of hands from those of a traditional aristocracy, or capable of being assimilated to that aristocracy, and on a scale exceeding that which was associated with the later days of the Roman Empire, has been instrumental in setting up a different type of model of living, which has served as a model even for many of the families that would otherwise have been models in their own right. The baroque far from being "reduced to an elegance" by the 'film-star' patrons of luxury has run riot.

More education of the German-American kind, far from assisting in the establishment of the correct principles of association, will only lead away from them. Also, since a good and effective system of education is dependent on the application of those principles to the society in which we live, no consideration of the idea, the function, or systems of education which does not lay due emphasis on this relationship and on the principles themselves, can hope to be more than a rearrangement of data within the closed walls of the German-American system for which it will undoubtedly be speaking.

Baruchism

To the Editor of *The Social Crediter*.

Sir,—Wars are Baruch's power harvests. The more Gentiles Baruch The Gentile Killer can kill, the easier he can dominate the world. Tinpot presidents and premiers disobey at their peril Baruch's orders to send their countrymen abroad to be killed, as in Korea, while Israelis proclaim their neutrality. Baruch orders us to spend on Gentile-killing gear fabulous sums that could make our living better. Depose Baruch from world dictatorship and let none succeed him.

Yours faithfully,

GEOFFREY BOWLES.

London, February 11.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: February 6, 1951.

Coal Imports (Dollars)

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer how much dollar currency has been made available to the National Coal Board for the purchase of coal from abroad.

Mr. Gaitskell: On their current import programme, the National Coal Board had by 22nd January spent 3,345,440 dollars on purchases of coal from the United States of America.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: Has any limit been imposed by the right hon. Gentleman on future expenditure under this heading, and if so, what is that limit?

Mr. Gaitskell: They have been authorised to purchase up to 1.2 million tons of coal.

Brigadier Rayner: Was not the Chancellor rather disappointed to find the Coal Board buying coal at £7 a ton and selling it at £4 a ton.

Mr. Nabarro: Is the figure which the right hon. Gentleman has quoted based on an f.o.b. or a c.i.f. basis, and was the coal transported in British or American ships?

Mr. Gaitskell: The figure is the cost including the freight figure and it includes such dollar freight as there was.

Mr. Paget: Is not the position that, because of the efficiency of the National Coal Board, coal produced in England is about half the price of coal produced in the rest of the world?

Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd: Does not the right hon. Gentleman's reply mean that before these transactions are completed, dollar expenditure by the National Coal Board will be at least twice as much as that which was indignantly refused by the Government for increasing the basic ration of petrol last year?

Government Departments Officials (Powers of Entry)

Mr. Fitzroy Maclean asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the total number of officials authorised to carry out inspections and investigations in private houses and premises without a search warrant.

Mr. Gaitskell: The number of officials who may exercise statutory powers to enter private houses used exclusively as such is 5,478, of whom 4,484 are officers of the Inland Revenue mainly rating valuation staff; 974 are assessors acting for the War Damage Commission, and 20 are members or officers of the Board of Control.

Mr. Maclean: Can the Chancellor say if that includes all premises—all private premises and business premises as well?

Mr. Gaitskell: No, Sir, it does not include business premises.

Mr. Maclean: Why not?

Mr. Gaitskell: Because the Question relates to houses.

House of Commons: *February* 8, 1951.

Village Schools

Mr. Odey asked the Minister of Education whether, in view of the many instances where children have long distances to go to school, and the detrimental effect on village community life, he will now reconsider the general policy of closing village schools.

Mr. Tomlinson: I have laid down no such policy. Under Section 13 of the Education Act, 1944, a proposal by a local education authority to cease to maintain a school involves the issue of public notices, with the possibility of an appeal to me. I should not approve any such proposal unless, after considering all the circumstances, and, in particular, the best interests of the children, I was satisfied that the proposal was justified.

Mr. Odey: Will the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind that, in rural areas like the East Riding of Yorkshire, where a large number of village schools have been closed, it is not only the distance that children have to travel to new schools but a question of the danger from the traffic on country roads where there are no footpaths? Will he also bear in mind the position of Low Cattan, about which I have sent him some particulars and about which I propose to send him further information?

Mr. Tomlinson: All these things are taken into consideration as and when a decision is taken. I would point out to the hon. Member that, in the case of the school he has mentioned, and particulars of which he sent me, and which was closed in 1928, a good deal of revision would be needed before I altered my opinion in that connection.

Aliens (Naturalisation)

Mr. J. Morrison asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many aliens were naturalised during 1950; and how many applications were pending at the beginning of this year, compared with the beginning of 1950.

Mr. Ede: 7,033 aliens were naturalised in 1950. About 2,650 applications were pending at the end of 1950 as compared with about 3,750 at the beginning.

Meat Supplies

Captain Crookshank (Gainsborough): I beg to move, to leave out from "That" to the end of the Question, and to add instead thereof:

"In view of the mismanagement and lack of foresight shown in the supply of meat, whether home-produced or imported, and of the recent reduction in the weekly ration to the lowest level yet endured in this country, this House has no confidence in the capacity of His Majesty's Government to deal with the meat problem."

. . . What we are considering today is not what we think will happen, but what has happened, is happening and will go on happening—and that is the fact that, through the

"mismanagement and lack of foresight."

as we call it, or, more colloquially, through the muddle of His Majesty's Government, His Majesty's lieges are reduced to eating the smallest ration of meat ever known in this country.

Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Kirkwood (Dunbartonshire, East): The right hon. and gallant Gentleman has never been hard up.

Captain Crookshank: The right hon. Gentleman has started on that point already. I did not expect to have to deal with it so soon, but I might as well get it out of the way before we go on. The ration today represents 8d. worth. It is difficult to put it exactly into weight. If it is taken in the most expensive form of steak, at 2s. 8d. a lb.—not 2s., as the Minister wrongly said the other day—it represents somewhere about four ounces, or about the size of a match-box. If, on the other hand, it is taken in the form in which one can get most of the material, or whatever hon. Members like to call it, that comes from fat and antique ewe mutton, one can get about six ounces. One of the experts, the president of the meat trade, puts the general average at five ounces.

To be as generous as we can with the Minister of Food, let us assume that it is six ounces which can be obtained for the 8d. . . .

. . . Before the war this country was the largest meat eating country in Europe except Denmark. Today it is on the lowest standard in Europe—with two exceptions of countries which were over-run during the war. The amount which was eaten in this country before the war averaged [HON. MEMBERS: "Averaged."] It is all right. Hon. Gentlemen had better wait for it—averaged 26 ounces a week. That was the the average; which is well over four times the maximum that anybody can have of the worst possible meat put on the market today. . . .

. . . First of all, I will take the great mass of people—small salary earners and wage earners who were earning under £5 a week. [An HON. MEMBER: "Luxury."] All right, it was a luxury if the hon. Gentleman likes to call it so. I am merely giving the statistical facts. I am not putting adjectives into this at all. According to the inquiry undertaken by the Ministry of Labour in 1937 to 1938, in that section of the community a workers' family of an average size—of course, this is one of those statistical curiosities of an average size of three and threequarters people—consumed on the average 20 ounces of carcase meat per head per week. Our maximum today—the highest possible maximum—is between five and six ounces.

I pass from that group to people with lower rate of wages. This is quoted from Mr. Seebohm Rowntree's famous report, which has always been accepted in this House when dealing with topics of this kind. He gave the case of a man and his wife and three children in 1935, with earnings of 41s. 8d. a week.

Mr. Harrison (Nottingham, East): Good wages then.

Captain Crookshank: I am making no comments. I am merely giving the figures. That family on 41s. 8d., a husband, his wife and three children, were purchasing just on 18 ounces per head per week. [*Interruption.*] Well, nobody else has ever questioned Mr. Seebohm Rowntree before.

Mr. Kirkwood rose——

Captain Crookshank: I am coming to the unemployed. . . .

I pass now from those two sections to unemployed persons. Again I am quoting from Mr. Rowntree, and the

(*Continued on page* 6).

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; *Six months* 15/-; *Three months* 7s. 6d.

Offices: (*Business*) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, *Telephone*: *Central* 8509; (*Editorial*) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, *Telephone SEFton Park* 435.

Vol. 25. *No.* 26. *Saturday, February* 24, 1951.

From Week to Week

Freemasonry, despite the only slightly less-objectionable features—the good intentions with which Hell is paved, the acts of charity and so on—which occupy its defenders all the time, not just some of the time in the telling, is essentially a confederacy of mediocrities united by a common perversion of the meaning of the phrase, 'unity is strength.' The strength is the strength of mass, of e-quality. Wherever "two or three are gathered together in My name," the assertion is, "you cannot defeat us now because really there is only one of us." But the assertion wherever mediocrity is gathered together is "you cannot defeat us now because there are two (or more) of us." The word 'strength' occurs fourteen times in the authorised version of the New Testament, and there it ranks, as a quality, dubiously; but it is spread lavishly over the Old Testament. 'Faith,' we are told, appears in the New Testament in over a hundred and ninety of its verses. These contrasts reflect a divergence at least as wide between two Theologies, the pre- or non-Christian and the Christian. To call the non-Christian anti-Christian is to use a synonym: "he that is not with me is against me."

We do not yet see where the present initiative, in both the English and Roman Churches, will lead. The only potentially comparable action taken in our lifetime was that of (a few) doctors against monopolistic exploitation of the individual's interest in his physical well-being, his health. Not to a far greater degree only, but on a far higher plane, the Professional and the Vocational are in conflict in the "row" about secret societies and secret allegiances. This is only another way of saying that the day of reckoning draws nearer. In terms of Authority we think we know how the account stands. In terms of Power we don't—this side of infinity. We share both the Vatican's dislike of the brat and Mr. Hannah's dislike of the parent, and have ourselves our eye on the grandparent, stigmatised by *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* as just "Liberalism." But we believe that in whatever quarter the breed is assailed with understanding and resolution it will come down as a breed. So does the breed.

• • •

Reynolds News again devoted space to 'readers' opinions' for and against Mr. Hannah last Sunday. Could it be that Grand Orient is kicking away the ladder? All the more reason for getting after them while there is time.

• • •

Admiral Leahy's book, *I Was There,* has been remaindered in the United States at 59 cents. Ventriloquist's dummy for Roosevelt as he seems to have been a good deal of the time, Leahy in his book did establish what stinkers the allies were in abandoning Pétain to the vermin of France. The case of Mihaelovitch is only another example of the recompense servants can expect from the gang of international swindlers who rose to power in England in the wake of Disraeli, and then shifted their central office, leaving Mr. Churchill's to the sumptuous mercies of Luce. Roosevelt, the peerless leader and idol of the American press, was so incompetent that he couldn't even stop de Gaulle, when Churchill was fostering his so gallic soul-mate.

• • •

The Jewish Chronicle for February 9 says:

"The Festival gardens authorities have placed orders with the Redifice Construction Company, of London, for two canteens, a snack bar, a children's zoo, a large restaurant of about 8,000 square feet fronting the river (to be known as the West End restaurant), various stores buildings, a large block of offices housing the administration, and various booths and shops. The company has also received orders for 200 houses from the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authorities in New South Wales, and for 1,000 houses from the Government of Queensland."

Will the bricks go with the beef and the butter ex Liverpool?

Tass Agency and Diplomatic Immunity

In the House of Lords on February 14, Lord Vansittart asked His Majesty's Government whether any diplomatic immunities or privileges are still being claimed by and accorded to the Tass Agency, and if so, at what date this unprecedented position will be terminated.

The Official Report gives the reply and following question and answer as follows:—

The Lord Chancellor (Viscount Jowitt): My Lords, the Tass Agency in this country was recognised by the Court of Appeal, in the case *Krajina* v. *Tass Agency,* to be a Department of the Soviet State and, as such, the Court held that in accordance with an established principle of international law it enjoys in this country immunity from suit. The immunity which the court held to be enjoyed by the Tass Agency was the immunity of a foreign sovereign State and, as such, should be distinguished from such diplomatic immunities and privileges as are extended to the members of foreign missions. As I announced in this House on November 23, 1949, an Inter-Departmental Committee has been established to consider and report on the whole question of State and diplomatic immunity—this, I need hardly say, covers a wide field. As soon as the Report of this Committee becomes available His Majesty's Government intend to review the situation and consider what action to alter the existing state of affairs is practicable and desirable.

Lord Vansittart: My Lords, I thank the noble and learned Viscount for his reply; but seeing that I raised this matter about fifteen months ago, I earnestly hope that I shall not be kept waiting very much longer for a solution of this particular matter, whatever may happen in the wider field of diplomatic privilege.

The Lord Chancellor: My Lords, I hope that a preliminary Report will be ready shortly but it is unlikely that this will be published. It may well be desirable in a matter of this importance to consult with other like-minded Governments before any final Report is published.

Lord Vansittart: May I hope that this consultation with like-minded Governments will be expedited so far as is possible?

Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg

The appointment in November, 1950, of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, a Hungarian-born New York Jewess, as Assistant Secretary of Defence has caused a flutter in the political dovecotes of Washington and New York which a confirmation of this appointment by a Senate Armed Services Committee a few weeks later did nothing to still.

The December 15 issue of *Common Sense* (Union, New Jersey) and the first number of a new publication *Know the Truth,* by the anti-Zionist Jew, Benjamin Freedman are devoted in their entirety to Mrs. Rosenberg's elevation to the rank of Cabinet Minister.

A recent issue of the London Zionist periodical, *The Jewish Chronicle,* carried a leading article *The Rosenberg Affair* which described the violent opposition led by 'anti-semites' against the lady. The writer stressed, with some pride, the fact that Mrs. Rosenberg, a member of a minority group and an immigrant, is the first American woman to occupy a position which has hitherto been considered essentially a man's job. The only other woman even to approach Mrs. Rosenberg's exalted position, Miss Frances Perkins, who served Roosevelt in junior ministerial capacities, was also a Jewess.

We may remark in passing that in this country another woman bearing the name of Rosenberg played a large, perhaps decisive part in the two first 'British' 'labour' administrations. Miss Rose Rosenberg was from 1923 the private secretary of the first British Socialist Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, and remained so during his life time. After Macdonald's death she served as private secretary to the Lord President of the Council. Throughout this period she was legal adviser to the National Council for Civil Liberties.

In *Know the Truth* (Vol. 1, No. 1) Mr. Freedman writes:

"Entirely aside from all views expressed so far regarding the appointment of Anna M. Rosenberg as Assistant Secretary of Defence, there remains the important question of the propriety of selecting her for the position which she is now filling. According to Mrs. Rosenberg's testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on November 29, 1950, Mrs. Rosenberg still retains ownership of about 43 *per cent.* in the labour-relations consultant business in which she has owned until recently 66⅔ *per cent.,* and in which she has been engaged nearly all of her adult life. Drew Pearson, Co-Chairman of the United Jewish Appeal with Mrs. Rosenberg, said in his *Washington Merry-Go-Round* on December 18, 1950, that Mrs. Rosenberg 'made $250,000 a year as labour adviseor to the Rockefellers, Macy's and other corporations.'

"In the hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee on November 29, 1950, Mrs. Rosenberg stated her present clients in her labour-relations consultant business, besides the 'five Rockefeller brothers,' were John Whitney who represents the extensive Whitney financial empire, Lazar Freres & Co., a Lehman Bros. affiliate, and an important member of the Lehman Bros.-Kuhn, Loeb & Co.-Dillon, Reed & Co., omnipotent international financial dynasty, Albert Lasker, a close associate of Bernard M. Baruch, R. H. Macy & Co., whose president is a brother of the president of the American Smelting & Refining Co., William Warner & Co., owner of the Richard Hudnut business (Walter Winchell's employer), Alfred Vanderbilt and Senator Benton and his Encyclopedia Britannica, Britannica Films, and Musak interests. They were her 1950 clients.

"Employers of large numbers of workers whose companies are not under the direct or indirect control of the powerful interests represented by the names mentioned above may have reason to question the selection of Mrs. Rosenberg for the position where Mrs. Rosenberg becomes, according to Sidney Fields in the *New York Mirror* of November 15, 1950, 'In charge of the nation's manpower, a job which makes her boss of every working man and woman in the country.'

"Mrs. Rosenberg will have the power of a dictator to determine which factories shall receive additional workers and which factories shall reduce the number of workers employed by them. It does not seem quite proper to have in that position a person who owns 43 *per cent.* in a business which advises certain employers of large numbers of workers upon their labour problems. It is difficult to imagine that Mrs. Rosenberg will not unconsciously favour with all the workers they request the factories of her clients who provided her with an income of $250,000 a year. Mrs. Rosenberg states that great pressure was brought upon her to accept her present position. These friends may have placed her in a very embarrassing position. In the competition to obtain workers during the labour shortage to which Mrs. Rosenberg refers, friction between the clients of her labour-relations consultant business and non-clients may intensify this embarrassing situation. In any event the business in which Mrs. Rosenberg owns 43 *per cent.,* and in which her family may own the balance, will not be the sufferer financially!

"When Mrs. Rosenberg testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on November 29, 1950, she was only asked to name the clients of her business at the time she left to take up her new position. Mrs. Rosenberg volunteered a great deal of information on the subject but did not go into the question of who her clients were from the time she first entered the labour-relations consultant business." . . .

"In view of the recommendations of Mrs. Rosenberg in 1944 regarding the 'reindoctrination camps' for G.I.'s returning to private life from World War II, it seems no more than reasonable that the veterans' groups should have had ample opportunity to express the attitude of 10,000,000 veterans regarding the appointment of Mrs. Rosenberg to the position of Assistant Secretary of Defence. The majority of these veterans of World War II are now workers in factories. They may wish to know the present attitude of Mrs. Rosenberg on the subject of 'reindoctrination.' The 14,000,000 American boys who will shortly be wearing uniforms might also like to hear Mrs. Rosenberg express her present sentiments on the subject of 'reindoctrination camps' for veterans returning to private life from World War III."

More information on the career of the lady who is now "boss of every man and woman" in America is given in the current issue of *Common Sense* in which Mr. McGinley writes:—

"It appears from every public record that Anna M. Rosenberg actually acquired her great influence in the political world through her close friendship with Sidney Hillman. The late Sidney Hillman had great political power. Sidney 'Clear-it-with-Sidney' Hillman is credited with having been responsible for the selection of Harry S. Truman as Vice-Presidential candidate in the 1944 elections. Sidney Hillman, according to biographies on his life, was born Schmuel Gilman in Lithuania, Russia, and fled to the United States after he was sought by the Russian government for violent revolutionary

activities. He is said to have been a leading member of the Bund, a Russian Marxist organization which Senator Benton's Encyclopedia Britannica describes as 'the spearhead of the world-revolution.'"

B.J.

The Grid in Northern Ireland

The following appeared in *The Belfast Newsletter* for February 12:—

Sir,

Again I sit in the still darkness of dawn, unwarmed and unlit (though not entirely unenlightened), except for that poor man's friend, the candle. What is happening at Ballylumford[*], or wherever, I don't know and, in a sense, I don't care. The Grid authorities have their difficulties, of which I am quite aware; they are merely the agents of a mistaken policy. It is to the average newspaper reader that I am impelled to appeal by the gloom of my immediate situation, reflecting so closely that of civilized society in general today. For at least the last sixteen years in your hospitable columns I have been inveighing against the dangers of centralized control, and urging the enfranchised public to oppose it in every form and every place. In a world threatened by totalitarianism, as ours is, Decentralisation of power is the only policy that holds out any hope for the individual, as such, if only in the negative form of no *further* concentration of control either in Transport or Electricity, or Health, or Education or whatever.

There was a time in the mid-thirties, when some of us, including myself, were urging a decentralization of purchasing-power (its wider distribution) to a not altogether inattentive public. The context in which we argued then was very different, of course, from the present one, with its shortages threatening from every quarter. At that time milk was being poured down the public drains in this city, though thousands of children were in need of it, and similar acts of sabotage were world-wide. But the mistaken principle in operation was the same then as it is today. It *could*, and should have been reversed, and the inevitable increase of unemployment might have forced the issue; but unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on how one regards the matters, Hitler chose that moment to move into the Rhine area, and the threat of war, with its necessity to re-arm, came to provide employment and taught us all to avoid the real issue, and incidentally to make World War II inevitable.

With us in Great Britain today, thanks to the efforts of a hopelessly doctrinaire government, the necessity to face that issue seems to have been indefinitely postponed, and a bleak régime of scarcity, typified by an eight ounce allowance of meat, put in its place. But it was obvious, a short time ago, that the United States was seriously threatened by a repetition of the slump of the Thirties, with its attendant problem of too great concentration (centralization) of purchasing-power. Again the issue has been avoided, and by the same means; the same impulse which armed Hitler and moved him to march into Alsace, has done the same for China and the North Koreans, and impelled them over parallel 38. The situation is saved in the United States, and employment ensured, besides the re-imposition of a lot of useful controls. But what of this unfortunate land, with a huge rearmament programme superimposed on an artificially restricted productive system; it will be miraculous if we escape some equivalent of the German or Russian Work State.

Let no one take what I say as a discouragement to the rearmament programme. Unfortunately we have let ourselves in for that, and should never have allowed our defences to get so low. But that need not blind us to the stark fact that beyond an obvious, and well-defined limit—far over-passed in this country even sixteen years ago—centralization of control is positively inefficient. Surely those who are experiencing that in the darkness of this morning, can at least see the truth of that. Incidentally, were war actually to come, nothing is more vulnerable, nor more strategically inept than an electrical grid; not the least objection being that the high tension cables are visible at night from the air.—Yours, etc.,

NORMAN F. WEBB.

[*] The main Grid station in Northern Ireland.

PARLIAMENT. (*Continued from page* 3.)

case is that of an unemployed man in York with a wife and four children on benefit at 36s. a week. Now, that man, at the period of this review, was getting, per head of the family, over nine ounces.

Mr. Hastings rose——

Captain Crookshank: If the hon. Gentleman likes to look at Mr. Rowntree's book he will find the case there. They had 9⅓ ounces per head per week, and it was made up of 2 lb. of roasting beef, ½ lb. of minced beef, ½ lb. of beef sausages, ½ lb. of pie meat, and 2 ounces of potted meat. That is a higher ration by 50 *per cent.* than is secured today. They had ½ lb. of liver, too.

Several Hon. Members rose——

Mr. Speaker: These constant interruptions are really not helpful. Even if hon. Members do not want to hear, I should like to hear what these figures are. Then they can be answered afterwards. Let us hear what the right hon. and gallant Gentleman has to say. I shall do my best to see that people are called who can give adequate answers. That is up to me.

Captain Crookshank: I am extremely flattered that you should wish to hear what I want to say, Mr. Speaker. I must apologise that my remarks seem to have such an effervescent effect upon other people.

I now come to the fourth category of the pre-war consumers about whom I wanted to give evidence in reply to the very proper interjection of the right hon. Member, and that is the amount of carcase meat and other meat consumed in workhouses. If hon. Gentlemen like, they can look up the dietary of the London County Council, where they will find that in 1938 inmates, as they call them—it is not my word—in public assistance institutions got each week 1 lb. of carcase meat plus 3¾ ozs. of corned beef—something like three times as much as the maximum that people can get today.

Having been diverted by that rather long answer to an interjection, perhaps I can now get back to the main theme of the grievances of the people against His Majesty's Government. The words we use are "mismanagement and lack of foresight"—muddle. "Muddle" is the word engraven on the Government's hearts. "Muddle" is the theme song of all their actions, not only in meat. There is muddle in defence, muddle in groundnuts, muddle in newsprint, muddle in coal, muddle in housing, and now the greatest of all—meat. "Muddle, muddle, toil and muddle" is their motto. The

trouble is that those witches somewhere on the Whitehall heath cannot go on and say

"Fire burn; and cauldron bubble,"

because there is a fuel muddle, as well. And the blame is there, on the right hon. Gentleman himself. Go into any butcher's shop and you will see a notice: "Don't blame the butchers. Blame me." We are taking the opportunity, not only on behalf of the butchers of this country but on behalf of every housewife.

. . . Between July, 1941, and November, 1945, the meat ration was kept continuously level, with only three periods when corned beef had to be introduced. Apart from that, it was completely level from July, 1941, to November, 1945, at the rate of 1s. 2d. per week. That was the period when Lord Woolton was in charge to start with, and it ended up with the much maligned Sir Ben Smith, who I am sure we would all wish to see back again after what we have had to endure since he went.

During that period, in spite of there being a war, in spite of the destruction by bombs and torpedoes, rail dislocation and the thousand and one difficulties of a period of hostility, the level of the ration was kept up. In order to keep up that level it was, of course, necessary for stocks to be accumulated well ahead of time: a bit of foresight. Since then, in what is roughly the same number of months, there have been 27 alterations in the meat ration. A startling fact from a Government of planners!

Eightpenny worth of carcase meat a week, and that the maximum, and then the Lord President of the Council, in Leeds in August, 1945, gave his motto for this Government: "We have left behind the old scarcity economics of the capitalist world." If 26 ounces of carcase meat was the old scarcity economics of the capitalist world, what on earth are we to say of the five to six ounces a week we have today? . . .

. . . I find Government propaganda in, for example, the United States in the "National Geographical Magazine"—a paper with a great circulation, which is hardly surprising to those who know it well—saying, as an invitation to come to Britain this year:

"You will find abounding comfort in Britain now, with food, including famous British delicacies, plentiful in restaurants, hotels and inns."

They will not find any honest helpings such as British workmen used to have, of "meat and two veg."; they will not find much of the roast beef of old England.

Mr. Ellis Smith (Stoke-on-Trent, South): We were in the war when they were not.

Captain Crookshank: We are not in a war today.

. . . Let us see where we have got to in home production at present. Up till now, in beef cattle production we have not yet reached the production we had before the war. In mutton and lamb we are still 17 *per cent.* below pre-war. For pigs, 25 *per cent.* [HON. MEMBERS: "Above?"] Below pre-war. That is what we always are. We are never anything above. Let me disabuse the minds of hon. Gentlmen opposite on that. It is always below. Before the war we took 58 *per cent.* of our pig population for pork. Today we take only 18 *per cent.* for pork, and two-thirds of that is only of manufacturing quality.

. . . Secondly, there is the meat that is imported. We have the Dominions and we have the Argentine. From the Dominions we get, as the Minister said the other day, all that they can send. I am not quite sure whether it is actually true of all the places from which we used to buy, and from the Argentine, for some months, we have been getting nothing at all. In the meanwhile, the right hon. Gentleman is scurrying round all over the place and in the most unlikely places to try to collect bits and pieces of meat; not to eke out the ration—because most of it will not be carcase meat fit to put on the ration—but in order that people with money can buy meat outside the ration.

We hear of cargoes of goats arriving at Hull. We hear of reindeer meat from Lapland, and of a lot of manufactured meat, which admittedly cannot be used for manufacture. We hear of meat at £177 per ton reported to have been bought in France, and offers made to buy mutton from Germany of all places—a defeated enemy country. What really becomes of the argument that there has been any planning and any foresight in all this?

On the other hand, what do we find? We find efforts to get goat and reindeer and all these things, and we find, even in this country, advertisements creeping into such respectable newspapers as the "Western Morning News":

"Wanted, live, fat, healthy horses for human consumption. We also pay top prices. Also plain horses for immediate slaughter."

We find the most extraordinary things going on in the meat world. We find that Ireland is sending meat to the United States. We find that in Canada—I have a letter here from a lady as far away as Victoria, Vancouver Island—saying that:

"Steak and kidney pie is being sold in large quantities in the shops here, packed in Manchester, and selling for much less than similar Canadian products. It makes many people very indignant."

I thought that was a very strong one, and further inquiries have since brought to my knowledge that for over two years there has been developed a considerable export scheme of English grown meat to—of all countries—the United States, Canada and the Argentine. Apparently, there are factories here licensed by the Minister to have tin plate provided for the purpose of packing meat and sending it to the Argentine. Beyond that—I do not know whether or not this will please hon. Gentlemen opposite—other countries on the list appear to be Denmark—from whom we are getting what we can in the way of meat incidentally—Russia, Japan, Germany, and, finally, Spain.

Apparently, as from May this year, the price of this meat is to increased by 15 per cent. from which, I assume, perhaps wrongly, that up to now it has not been purchased at a really economic price. The Lord President of the Council talked about the scarcity economics of the capitalists, but in a world under Socialist administration, in which the United States sends coals to Newcastle and Great Britain sends meat to the Argentine—well! These are the two sources from which we can get meat. As I said, home production could have been stepped up. That has not been done. I agree that we are legislating about it at the moment, but we have not yet caught up with the pre-war position. The right hon. Gentleman mutters a fact under his breath of which I am well aware, that we have one million, or some such number, more animals, but they are not beef; they are milk. That is another story. That is my other speech which I have promised. . . .

. . . The fact of the matter is, I fear, that the Government as a whole are far more concerned about the cost of living index than about either the cost of living itself or the standard of living. I may be wrong, and I shall be glad if I

am told so, but I somehow feel that they are crushed between the desire not to see the cost of living index go up—not the cost of living, because everyone knows that that goes bounding up whatever the cost of living index says—and their firm decision—I suppose that it still is firm—announced in the last Budget statement that the global total of food subsidies will not go up.

The effect of these two factors is that if for some reason the price of one of the subsidised goods of which as much as possible is required goes up, and if the Government have to keep tight on the cost of living index and the subsidies, the only thing that can happen is that people must have less, however plentiful it may be, in spite of the fact that, although it may be more expensive, it is probably relatively cheap in relation to other goods. That is the dilemma into which we get.

The right hon. Gentleman, not having bought Argentine meat because the Government thought the price too high—do not let the right hon. Gentleman think that I am questioning that—and the meat ration, having therefore gone down, has felt that the butchers' margin for not cutting up meat because there was no meat to cut up should be increased, and he is now paying £150,000 a week more for this purpose than when the ration was last reduced, making a total of £23 million a year. The right hon. Gentleman rather whimsically announced yesterday that:

> "The cost will form part of my Department's trading results and will be borne out of its trading vote. The cost-of-living figures will not be affected, since the retail prices of meat are unchanged."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 7th February; Vol. 483, c. 208.]

Therefore, in lieu of the meat we cannot have because it is too expensive, and because we are in honour bound to recoup the butchers, we find that the money is to come, not from anything that reflects on the cost of living index, but from a source which will certainly affect the cost of living, because this £23 million loss on the Ministry's trading account has to come from somewhere, which is, of course, the taxpayer. Of course, it does not hold down the cost of living, although it may hold down the cost of living index and the food subsidies. It does not check the cost of living—everyone knows that we have had Questions in the House from all sides about that.

The result is that the housewife goes out to see what she can get by way of unrationed goods, which is why we have the reindeer and the goats coming in, as well as Irish ham sent back to us from the Continent at double the price. That is why rabbits and hares have gone up to fantastic figures; it is because there is so little meat to be bought that the housewife will somehow make a sacrifice. The housewife makes a double sacrifice, because not only does she not eat her own ration so that her husband and children can have it, but she perhaps uses some of her savings to buy something that is unrationed and more expensive to make up for the loss.

The answers must be to look at the results. What is the point of a Ministry of Food, and what is the point of a Minister of Food? The Minister's duty is to try and provide us with adequate foodstuffs within the realm, whether he does the purchasing or it is left to private trade, which is something I am not discussing for the moment. If certain goods are rationed, he has to see that the ration is honoured week by week. He has to see that sufficient stocks are available to cover all emergencies. If that is what he is there for, let us look at the results. What are the results? We find that we now have 8d. worth of meat as compared with an average consumption that was four times higher before the war and one and a half times higher among the poorest members of the community, those who were unemployed and on unemployment benefit.

Does it never cross the mind of the Government that the policy has broken in their hands and that State trading in meat has collapsed? The whole point of a policy is to get some results, but a policy which reduces and reduces the meat ration until it is only 8d. worth of carcase meat, which is 5 oz. or 6 oz. a week, is a policy in ruins. In these circumstances what surely must a wise man do? Must he not look round and say, "We have been wrong. Times have changed?" . . . .

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton.