

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 26. No. 1.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 3, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

WHAT IS SOCIAL CREDIT ?

Social Credit assumes that Society is primarily metaphysical, and must have regard to the organic relationships of its prototype.

PHILOSOPHY

POLICY

Economics

Administration

CONSUMER CONTROL
OF PRODUCTION

INTEGRAL
ACCOUNTING

HIERARCHY

CONTRACTING-OUT
MECHANISMS

OBJECTIVE: Social Stability by the integration of means and ends.

INCOMPATIBLES: Collectivism, Dialectic Materialism, Totalitarianism, Judæo-Masonic Philosophy and Policy.

Ballot-box democracy embodies all of these.

February, 1951.

Freemasonry and the Church of England

According to *Reynolds News*, the following motion has been accepted for discussion at the Convocation of Canterbury in May next:—

“That, in view of the facts

“(a) that the usages and customs of Freemasonry, its signs and symbols, its rites and ceremonies, are officially declared to ‘correspond in a great degree with the mysteries of ancient Egypt’;

“(b) that the innermost secret of Freemasonry, disclosed in the Royal Arch degree, is concerned with the nature of God;

“(c) that the name of Jesus Christ is excluded from all Masonic rituals under the jurisdiction of Grand Lodge;

“(d) that the names of certain pagan deities are pronounced with great solemnity in the Royal Arch ritual;

“(e) that according to universal Christian tradition ‘idolatry consists in worshipping God under any other conception of Him than that which is set before us in the Gospels’ (Archbishop William Temple);

“(f) that many members of the Church of England enter Freemasonry without realizing its doctrinal implications; a Committee of the Lower House be appointed to inquire whether the theological implications of Freemasonry, as distinct from its benevolent activities, are compatible with the Christian faith as held by the Church of England, and to report.”

The newspaper further states that copies of the resolution are being circulated to 232 clergy who are members of Convocation together with reprints of Mr. Walton Hannah’s article in *Theology*, which introduced the controversy. The Archbishop’s chaplain and the Reverend Mr. Hannah are said to have declined to divulge the terms of correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Mr. Hannah.

It is stated that “an influential churchman” will introduce the motion in Convocation.

Nearly three columns of letters about Freemasonry and the Church of England appear in *The Guardian* for February 23.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: February 12, 1951.

Coal Industry

Mr. Shepherd asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what was the average amount of coal issued to each householder in the United Kingdom during 1950 and the average cost per ton; and the average amount of concessionary coal issued to miners' households and the price per ton.

Mr. Robens: During 1950 the average amount of coal, including boiler fuel, delivered to householders was a little over two tons at an average cost of 90s. per ton including the cost of delivery. The average amount of free or concessionary coal supplied to men in the mining industry was about 10 tons. Where payment was made the average price was 8s. 4d. per ton, excluding the cost of delivery. The hon. gentleman will appreciate that concessionary or free coal is part of the miners' remuneration and is covered by wage agreements.

Mr. Shepherd: Is the hon. Gentleman fully satisfied that there is no abuse of this concessionary coal privilege and that all the coal is consumed in the houses for which it is intended? Further, will he say what approaches have been made to the miners to withhold acceptance of concessionary coal in view of the great hardship to other householders in the country?

Mr. Robens: Yes, my right hon. Friend made an appeal. . . .

Old Age Pensioners

Brigadier Clarke asked the Minister of Fuel and Power if he will consider subsidising fuel for old age pensioners in view of the fact that they have great difficulty in buying their present ration due to the high cost of living.

Mr. Robens: I regret that I am unable to consider the suggestion made in the hon. Gentleman's Question. Old age pensioners finding their income inadequate should, of course, apply to the National Assistance Board for supplementary grants.

Brigadier Clarke: Does the Minister appreciate that these poor people are now not only rationed by the purse but by the incompetence of His Majesty's Government? Does he consider that "fair shares for all?" . . .

House of Commons: February 12, 1951.

Sentenced Communist (Charges)

The following Question stood upon the Order Paper:

MR. ERNEST THURTLÉ, To ask the Attorney-General the terms of the charge on which Mr. Glading was given six years' penal servitude.

. . . *The Attorney-General:* If I may have the permission of the House, I will answer this Question, Sir, which appears to be of some interest? The answer is as follows:

Yes, Sir. Glading pleaded guilty to five charges of obtaining plans and information for a purpose prejudicial to the safety or interests of the State, contrary to Section 1 of the Official Secrets Act, 1911. The first charge related to the plan of a naval gun, the second to a part of an anti-tank mine pistol, the third to plans of an anti-submarine bomb fuse, the fourth to information contained in a book relating

to explosives and the fifth to four blue prints relating to a pressure bar apparatus.

Mr. Thurtle: Can the Attorney-General tell the House anything about the antecedents of Mr. Glading, and what his present position is in the Communist Party?

The Attorney-General: Yes, Sir. In 1929 Mr. Glading was elected to the Communist Party Central Committee and he subsequently served as a member of the politbureau and agitprop departments. In 1925 he had been to India as an agent of the Communist Internationale in Moscow and after returning to England he worked in close association with Mr. Harry Pollitt. He later became a professional spy for the Soviet Union. It is difficult to state the exact position occupied by those in the Communist hierarchy, but Glading is believed to occupy an important position.

Mr. Keeling: Is he a British subject?

The Attorney-General: He is a British subject.

Mr. Tomney: Can the Attorney-General tell us what is the official peace-time capacity of Mr. Glading?

The Attorney-General: So far as I know, Mr. Glading is employed in the Amalgamated Engineering Union.

Contracting Out

Mr. Janner asked the Minister of National Insurance how many people have contracted out of National Insurance.

Dr. Summerskill: I would refer my hon. Friend to paragraphs 6 to 12 of the recently published Report by the Government Actuary, and in particular to the table on page 7, where the latest available information is given.

House of Commons: February 14, 1951.

Defence (Government Policy)

Earl Winterton (Horsham): . . . Never in this world was greater nonsense talked than what is being said today in some quarters: that there is a common point of view

NOW READY:

On Planning The Earth

by

Geoffrey Dobbs

with a foreword by

Major C. H. DOUGLAS.

6/- (postage extra)

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

in Asia. We have only to look at the facts to see that. We see the Jews and the Arabs loathing each other as two races have not loathed each other for many years; ready to attack each other across the frontier. We have only to look at India and Pakistan. We were told by the Foreign Secretary in one of his recent speeches—one of those speeches more removed from reality than most of the speeches from the benches opposite—that there was more strength and military power in the Commonwealth now that India had been given self-government.

What is the position today? In Pakistan and India there are two armies growling and scowling at each other across the frontier. War might break out at any moment. It is certain—and I say this with some knowledge—that if a world war broke out neither India nor Pakistan could afford to send one man or gun in support of the cause of the Allies. . . .

House of Commons: February 15, 1951.

British Travel and Holidays Association, U.S.A. (Publicity)

Mr. Gammons asked the President of the Board of Trade if he proposes to make amendments to the advertisement prepared by the British Travel Centre in New York until the power cuts are no longer operative, and the meat ration has been increased.

Mr. H. Wilson: No, Sir. I do not propose to interfere with the publicity in the United States of the British Travel and Holidays Association.

Mr. Gammons: Does the right hon. Gentleman realise that the advertisement referred to in my Question says that this country is abounding in comfort and food, including famous British delicacies, and that if visitors come here they will find a gala spirit in the air? Further, will the right hon. Gentleman tell the House where we can find these famous delicacies, and whether the gala spirit in the air is on the other side of the House?

Mr. Wilson: All the overseas visitors to this country whom I have met do not share the jaundiced views of the hon. Member.

Sir Herbert Williams: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us how American visitors will be able to get Colchester oysters during the close season.

Film (Cost)

Lieut.-Commander Gurney Braithwaite asked the President of the Board of Trade the cost of production by the Crown Film Unit of "Welcome to our Table"; and in what countries is this film being exhibited.

Mr. H. Wilson: The cost of production was £3,259. The film has not yet gone into distribution, but the series of which it forms a part is normally shown in about 80 overseas territories.

Lieut.-Commander Braithwaite: Is it not the case that this film, which, presumably, seeks to attract foreign visitors to the Festival of Britain, depicts our table as groaning under outside joints of lamb and barons of beef, and will there not be grievous disillusionment among visitors when they arrive to find ewe mutton and reindeer steak?

Mr. Wilson: First, the hon. and gallant Member has

the title of the film wrong. That title was suggested at one stage, but was rejected before the hon. and gallant Member put the Question down. Second, it does not deal either with the Festival of Britain or with groaning tables. It is designed to help in the export of certain speciality food stuffs which have earned this country a great number of dollars in the past year or so.

Defence (Government Policy)

Mr. David Eccles (Chippenham): . . . The right hon. Gentleman next used the very serious argument that the expansion in production will be impeded by a shortage of materials. That is not a perfect alibi. A great deal of the shortage of materials is due, as my right hon. Friend the Member for Bromley (Mr. H. Macmillan) has said, to bad buying by the Government. The Chancellor knows as well as I do and as well as the Minister of Supply does that 12 months ago we could have placed contracts for more zinc and non-ferrous metals, but it was not done.

Mr. Gaitskell: Sulphur?

Mr. Eccles: The Chancellor is clever enough to take the one case of sulphur where the supply is very limited and in the hands of a few American firms, but had he got on somewhat better with Spain he would have got more pyrites from Spain. That has been left exceedingly late. . . . It is worth considering the Chancellor's analysis of where he would find the resources. Before I come to that I should like to say that I believe that politics dominates the whole affair and that unless we get the politics right we shall not get the resources. Let me consider for a moment what any government would be faced with in finding the resources in an economy bled, bullied and bedevilled like ours has been for the last six years.

I made an analysis which seems to be much the same as that of the right hon. Gentleman. There are four main instruments which this or any Government could use in an attempt to reduce demand in one direction or another so as to make room for the defence programme. They could try to curtail personal consumption and private investment by deflation, by taxation, by restrictions and physical controls or they could allow rising prices and lagging incomes to do the job for them. Given the economic and social consequences of a 10 *per cent.* bank rate, given the present level of taxation, given the resistance to drastic controls at a time when a national emergency is not felt, given in short the muddle and mess which we are in—I maintain that a Socialist Government, for all the reasonableness of the Chancellor this afternoon, must choose the instrument of inflation.

Let me examine the alternatives in an attempt to assess their value. What could the Chancellor do next April in his Budget? Just as the Minister of Defence has to call up the reservists whose skill will serve the need of the country, so the Chancellor, if he makes changes in taxation, must conform to the demands of industrial efficiency and financial stability. He will have to accept two principles in his Budget, to which I believe the whole House would agree. First, any increase in taxation must not be offset by a fall in savings or a spending of capital because, if it is, no resources will be released. Secondly, any increase in taxation must not discourage productive effort or the export drive.

Let us be realists. There are no substantial increases

(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. 26. No. 1.

Saturday, March 3, 1951.

Thick as Thieves

In the next column the opinion of a special correspondent of *The Times*, which must long have been the opinion of unprejudiced observers everywhere, is quoted bearing upon the complicity of the Opposition which does not oppose in the deterioration of public affairs. The "Conservative" Party could have turned out the "Labour" Party any time it liked, and, if the future of this country depended upon such an exchange, it was its duty to do so. The future of the country depends upon something far different, which we have formerly defined as the putting into key positions of a few honest men—and keeping them there. Whether an "overwhelming" number of electors share Mr. Churchill's sentiments concerning the command of H.M. Navy, or what Mr. Churchill's sentiments really are we cannot say. We can say that whatever the number is the one thing it does not do is to overwhelm.

Glaucon, etc.

Among others, two books recently published persuade us that a genuine movement among writers towards the "Right" has commenced. "Mixer" books there are in abundance—books which apparently innocently represent *Judeo-Christianity* (whatever that is) as the antithesis of, for example, collectivism or whatever it may be the "intelligent" reader is supposed for the time being to react against. But there is a work here and there which invites a less speculative eye. One is the English M. V. C. Jeffrey's *Glaucon: An Inquiry into the Aims of Education* and the other H. W. Gruhle's *Studium Generale*, reviewed by *The Lancet* in its issue of February 24. Professor Jeffreys says "I have named this book after Socrates' most faithful stooge in the *Republic*. He it is who follows the argument through to the end, and to him is addressed the final message: 'If you will listen to me and believe that the soul is immortal and able to endure all evil and all good, we shall always hold to the upper road and in every way follow justice and wisdom,' (x. 621)." The soul needs be immortal to survive the technological functionalism which, in place of the development of the individual person, is the exclusive interest of so-called educational institutions, excepting some in the care of the Church, today. Professor Jeffreys seems to understand beyond most of his colleagues this distinction. Also he seems to understand that a Religion is either political or it is nothing but a snare and a delusion.

Gruhle attacks that other great bugbear of modern men, the validity of psychoanalytical interpretations. We quote *The Lancet's* review:—

"Freud says of the dream that it protects sleep. This is Freud's interpretation of its *objective* purpose: the dreamer knows nothing of it. Freud refers to his own observation; but wrongly for no observation can support his thesis. Freud also says the dream is wish-fulfilment, an interpretation of *subjective* purpose, again unknown to the dreamer. Freud tells him: You don't know it, but I know. This Freud calls observation; he calls observation his own experience of evidence."

Gruhle sees in psychoanalysis teaching only the enchanting play of magic, poetry, and myths, which places it outside science and scientific criticism. He warns us against drawing any conclusion from therapeutic results which may be equally achieved by all kinds of procedures and creeds, though the rational appeal in the cloak of science is probably the most effective mode of faith-healing today. He insists that Jung, for instance, persuades his patient that his dream images are of deep significance and reveal eternal truths. When the patient has been converted to this belief, he thinks he has access to deep knowledge and secret meanings, and finds peace in this, his own religion. According to Gruhle, one has to see clearly the dividing line between the adept, who is stirred and may be deeply moved, and the sober scientist who can discover only misguided imagination.

"Karl Jasper, now professor of philosophy in Basle, was at one time a psychiatrist. His criticism (*Nervenarzt*, 1950, 21, 465) is distinguished by its moral undertone. He cannot find any criterion of true or false in the boundless interpretations, distortions, oppositions, and over-interpretations of everything, used by psycho-analysts; there is no standard of discernibility in the infinite flux of meanings they may find. To consider illness as guilt, as Freud sometimes does, and to extend this view more or less to all diseases is, in Jasper's opinion, a wholly unmedical attitude. It leads to an inhuman philosophy contrary to the physician's ethics."

"Acquiescent"

How "The Times" sees Opposition to Government

"No Government with an absolute majority in the House of Commons of only six votes could exist indefinitely without some acquiescence on the part of the Opposition. If the Opposition chose to harry the Government, week in and week out, with a series of important divisions over a period of three or four months the Government would surely fall sooner or later. Even the most diligent whipping would seem certain to break down under such unrelenting pressure.

"In fact, the Opposition have refrained from these tactics. . . . apart from [certain divisions] . . . the Opposition's attitude has up to now been one of acquiescence in the Government survival.

"It must be added, of course, that without strong party discipline the Government could not have lived through even these isolated weeks of trial. The machine is now so powerful that M.P.s can be relied on to vote even for those policies which they most distrust. The division on defence last week was only the most recent illustration of the tightening of the party reins. At the election of 1950 every Independent candidate was defeated, a fact which deters even the most adventurous from defying their party whip. . . ."—*The Times* Special Correspondent, February 23.

The Way to End the Soviet Menace

The following Memorandum is by Captain Arthur Rogers, certain of whose earlier memoranda on the Russian question have been published by The Social Crediter.

Can the British Empire seize the initiative in international affairs which is now held by the Soviet dictators? This question transcends in importance all other political and military issues. The answer is: Yes, but only if the facts are understood.

British, American and other allied resources are being mobilized to oppose a world menace which is centred and organised in Moscow. This great effort is being made for defence only. It is to continue on an ever-increasing scale but with no end in sight. Even so, the dispositions for defence are incomplete because they do not cover the Middle Eastern oil-fields, which are in jeopardy although now vital to Britain both militarily and economically. Moreover, there is no assurance that these defence measures, if prolonged indefinitely, will not lead to economic exhaustion and a situation well suited to the promoters of revolutionary Communism.

Soviet policy, with world revolution as its aim, operates on two planes. The Soviet dictators are now able to confront the Western Powers with a military threat. They may plan to maintain that threat passively where their own resources are concerned until their end is gained by means of the political technique in which they have already shown their skill. The British Empire and the Powers associated with her cannot afford to overlook this danger. It is evident that to withdraw huge numbers of men from normal production and to employ them solely, and for an unlimited time, in inadequate defence preparations might, in actual practice, prove favourable to the Soviets' revolutionary plans. At the best, no final decision can be reached merely by sending forces to Western Europe, however necessary that move may be.

The over-riding need of the Western Powers is to be able to stop the Soviet dictators from proceeding with their schemes. By nothing short of this can peace be assured. The first step must be to gain the initiative.

Examination of the means of obtaining the initiative calls for consideration of any weaknesses in the Soviet dictators' position. They must be opposed where they are weakest, and nothing must be done to help them to overcome a weakness. They have one great weakness, which is the detestation of their rule by an overwhelming majority of the Russian people, even including most of those who are employed by the Soviet State itself. It must not be forgotten, however, that this attitude of the Russian people to their present rulers is not their only characteristic. They are very patriotic and very brave. Their valour during the last two great wars, as in previous wars, has shown what they are prepared to do in the defence of Russia, their own native land.

The Western Powers can repeat Hitler's mistake in his Russian policy, which brought him to ruin, only at the peril of what remains of civilization.

It is now known that the plan of the German General Staff was that the German forces should enter the Soviet Union in the role of liberators from Soviet tyranny. They believed that if such a pretence were maintained the Soviet régime would be doomed; and events have shown that the

General Staff would have been proved right had they not been over-ruled. Countless Russian and German eye-witnesses have testified that when the German forces crossed the frontier in June, 1941, they were greeted as liberators by an enthusiastic people and were able to advance along the roads without opposition. The Russians did not believe that an army from the west would enter Russia except as the enemies of Soviet dictatorship, which is their own great enemy. Hitler, however, rejecting the advice of the General Staff, had said that he intended to be a conqueror. Thus, when it was realised that the Germans were the invading enemies of their native land, the Russian people offered resistance, and it became possible to bring the army into action to play a leading part in Hitler's defeat.

Although Russian hostility to Germany had sprung to life through Hitler's blunder, the Soviet dictators found themselves forced to depart from their own fundamental policy in order to maintain the unnatural union that had developed between themselves and the patriotic victims of their oppression. Soviet war-time propaganda was nationalist and patriotic—not internationalist and Communist. Soldiers and people were told about the heroic episodes of Russian history. Films were made to show the victories of Russian Emperors and the great thanksgiving services that followed. New military decorations were named after Russian leaders of old. An elaborate pretence was made of restoring the Orthodox Church to its ancient status.

The Red dictators have been compelled to maintain similar methods in their strained relations with the Western Powers, which cannot be concealed. They make every effort to convince the Russian people that the people of the West are the enemies of Russia and not the enemies of Communism. In this, they have received great help from certain western publicists and politicians, who seriously believe themselves engaged in propaganda against the Soviet Union. In the utterances of these people "the Russians" are perpetually abused for the actions of the Politbureau. There is self-righteous boasting about the perfection of conditions in the west, as compared with the horrors within the Soviet Union, about which the Russians know, expressed in a manner that makes the Russians believe that they are being mocked in their miseries. There is discussion of schemes for a partition of Russia, which arouses patriotic resentment. Russians are sneered at as orientals although Russia, as a great Christian country, was for centuries Europe's first line of defence against the hordes of Central Asia. In Great Britain alone, not a few people of influence, whose words are reported in the newspapers, have been so wrong-headed as to assert, without a shadow of truth, that the present danger is due not so much to Communist designs as to a revival of "Russian imperialism." Such utterances are often reproduced without comment in the official publications of the Soviet Union, so great is their value in helping the dictators to overcome their greatest weakness.

For correct information concerning the Constitution of
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
 Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for
 the Statement published in July, 1949 (*postage 1d.*)
 K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

The time is overdue for these mischief-makers to be silenced by declarations of policy in all His Majesty's possessions which make it plain that, whatever British relations with the Soviet rulers may be, there can be no question of desiring anything but sincere friendship with the people of Russia. To state that policy would not, however, achieve all that is required. The Russians, after their experience of the last ten years, cannot be expected to place great confidence in what they are told by foreigners; but this presents no serious difficulties.

(To be concluded.)

PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from page 3.)

in taxation that can be discovered which do not offend against one or other of these principles. As we all know the Chancellor has lost the room for manoeuvre. If he wants, as he does, more savings and more production, he is bound to come down to this House in April and tell us that by far the greater part of the re-armament programme cannot be financed out of new taxation but must be financed either out of economies in Government expenditure or out of the ravages of inflation.

I turn for a moment to the subject of restrictions and physical controls. Speaking for myself, I think that the defence programme, if it is to be started with vigour, calls for raw material allocations and production directives to deal with scarcities. But unless a sense of urgency takes hold of the public, who really believes that the war-time restrictions could work today? This is the heart of the problem of controls. The Government are in a great difficulty. Their internal divisions forbid them to create that sense of national urgency which would make reasonable restrictions acceptable. On the other hand, if they try—as they will be driven to if they want to carry this programme out under their administration—drastic controls as a substitute for national unity, those controls will not work.

Therefore the conclusion is inescapable: since there is no reserve of taxable capacity and there is no national unity, the Government will be driven to use this blind, brutal weapon of inflation. Inflation has its charms for the Chancellor. It relieves him of the search for new taxes. Rising prices, profits and incomes will float the Treasury off the rocks. For it is obvious that with a progressive system of taxation like ours the more the cost of living increases, dragging incomes after it, the larger is the share of the taxpayer's income which goes to the Treasury.

... On this side of the House we set our faces against this dishonourable surrender to the depreciation of the pound and all the social misery that must accompany it. Our policy would be very different. We would hold steadfastly to the two over-riding objectives of greater production—it means harder work—and stable purchasing power. Why should they be put at the top of the list? Because the personal sacrifices involved in working harder and in holding the price level while we are re-arming are far less than the personal sacrifices involved in the Government policy of transferring resources from one class or section to another, and using a rising cost of living to float off the Treasury.

We should not forget what a terrible thing inflation is. It is a subject on which Karl Marx and Lord Keynes agreed. They both said that if you want to overturn the existing basis of society, the easiest way to do it is to debauch the currency.

That debauch is beginning in Britain today. We cannot dodge the disagreeable consequences of imposing a huge bill for re-armament on our extended economy. Indeed these difficulties make it all the more necessary to be firm and resolute about our main objectives. My conclusion on that score is first of all that a significant increase in taxation will have to be paid by all classes and will mean lower savings and less productive effort.

Let us, therefore, have the courage to go to the country and make the case for reductions in Government expenditure as an alternative to runaway prices and more taxes. Then let us tell the electorate how strong defence and stable purchasing power can be attained by a judicious mixture of harder work and temporary economies. If we find that our price level is dragged upwards by an inflation in America, we can go to the leading members of the Commonwealth and discuss with them how to loosen the link between the pound and the dollar. Finally, and most important, we ought to explain to people what they do not understand now, that a vigorous lead from Britain in 1951 would both deter Soviet Russia and inspire Western Europe.

My whole argument is directed to show that politics are now much more important than economics—... Unless the party in power has its heart in its policy, that policy cannot succeed. Last night the Secretary of State for War confessed that his party think first of the economic state of the country and second of the safety of the nation. Well, we can have no confidence in such men. We need a new Parliament and a new government, backed by a loyal party and led by a man whose services to peace and freedom will leave no one here or abroad in any doubt where Britain stands.

Major Sir David Maxwell Fyfe (Liverpool, West Derby): ... Hon. Gentlemen opposite have challenged us again and again about why we have put down this Amendment. [HON. MEMBERS: "No."] We have been challenged over and over again; I have been listening to the debate. It is quite true that the hon. Member for Preston, South (Mr. Shackleton), not only challenged but put the answer himself, because he said it was quite clear that our reason was that we wanted to get hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite out, while they would vote against us because they wanted to keep hon. and right hon. Gentlemen in. He was quite blunt about it.

I want to make the position quite clear, because it would be wrong to speak to this Amendment without saying it. We have said that we have no confidence in the Ministers who are in charge of this programme. With regard to the Minister of Defence, we are bound to look back—and who would not look back?—to the fuel crisis of 1947. When the right hon. Gentleman gave his undertaking to the Z Reservists yesterday that they would not be called up next year, we remembered rather bitterly the undertakings which he gave to industry and the country that there would be no cuts.

Here is one of the most intricate economic and administrative problems ever put before the country. It is in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, whose claim to administrative fame is just in the word "groundnuts." But it does not really stop there. This is the point: in a short time we shall hear the result from Bristol, West, and the result is, of course, perfectly obvious, but suppose it were the other way round. Suppose the winner were Mr. Lawrence, who says, as he is reported in today's papers, "I do not believe in re-armament but if I am returned I will

vote for this Motion." The Government are attempting to bring in their programme on the strength and by the votes of those who disagree with their programme and have not the slightest confidence in any proposal which has been put forward. That is a mockery of Parliamentary democracy. The hon. Member for Preston, South spoke the one correct word—that they are voting only to keep us out. [*Inter-ruption.*] When a great idealist party of the past has come down to that cynical view of the present, the country will judge, and judge soon.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Aneurin Bevan): . . . For Heaven's sake do not let us have so much boggy man talk. I am speaking about those evil people in many parts of the world who are talking as if the third world war had already begun. We deny that. The fact of the matter is that the Tory Party is as old fashioned as the Communist Party. They are both living in a world that is gone. One has only to read a Communist thesis today to see that it has not changed in the last 100 years since Karl Marx wrote it, and I am a considerable student of Karl Marx.

The Soviet thinking has not adjusted itself to the fact that the most revolutionary power in the world is political democracy. She has not adjusted herself to the fact that progress can only be made in modern complicated industrial civilisation on the basis of peace. She still clings to the notion that war is a revolutionary opportunity, and she does so because the Soviet Union was born in war and because she knows that some nations tried to destroy her by war. Therefore she thinks in those terms. But the fact of the matter is that in the last five years not only has the Soviet Union been able to achieve a number of victories but she has also sustained a number of quite formidable defeats.

It has always been assumed that Soviet Marxism would gain its first and easiest victories in the heavily industrialised nations. That was always the assumption. It was because the theory of Marxism was born in Brussels, London, Paris, and New York, and not in the agrarian areas. As a consequence of that, she expected to find easy allies. But I am convinced, as I have said before, that the only kind of political system which is consistent with a modern artisan population is political representative democracy.

As the Soviet Union pushes further West she gets more and more theoretical defeats. She has been able under the protection of the Red Army to clamp the satellite states to her breast in the last five years, but the interesting thing is to see the growing hostility to Soviet propaganda in Western Europe and its failure to establish any foothold in Great Britain and in America. This forms the background of the Defence Debate, and very important conclusions follow from it, conclusions not drawn by the Opposition at all in the course of the debate.

The curious thing is that the Soviet Union has won its victories in those agrarian parts of the world where poverty is her chief ally. She has not won them, and she will not win them, in modern industrial communities. Therefore, we on this side of the House say that we must put ourselves in the position of armed preparedness, not to tempt her into seeking an easy victory, but, on the basis of that armed strength, to realise that the earliest opportunity must be taken to bring about not appeasement but the pacification of the tensions of the world.

There is all the difference in the world in that. The right

hon. Gentleman the Member for Woodford said in his speech that only one thing restrained Russia from attack—it was repeated from the Opposition Benches—and that was fear of the atom bomb. Do hon. Members really believe that? The Russians are very brave people. . . . If there is fear of the atom bomb, it is a mutual fear, and out of that mutual fear mutual sense may be born. Therefore we ourselves consider—we have always considered on this side of the House—that every opportunity must be eagerly sought in order to try and bring about an alleviation of international tension. But there was little evidence of that on the opposite side of the House.

I really was shocked, because the right hon. Gentleman in the course of his speech said not only was the Soviet Union restrained by the existence of the atom bomb, but it was restrained by the formidable preparations that were being made by the United States at the present time. The shocking thing about the right hon. Gentleman is that he never gives any credit to this nation at all.

Mr. Churchill: Oh!

Mr. Bevan: Never. At least, he never has except when it is under his own leadership. The right hon. Gentleman for the last five years has been talking as if we were flat on our backs. He has been speaking of the nation as being down and out.

The fact of the matter is that in the last three or four years Great Britain has made a greater contribution to defence than any other nation in the world in proportion to her size. Take the expenditure in terms of national income in 1949. [*HON. MEMBERS:* "Oh!"] Let us have at this stage of the debate some sense of responsibility. The United Kingdom spent in 1949 7.2 per cent. of its national income on defence, Canada 2.9 per cent., Australia 6 per cent., the U.S.A. 5.9 per cent., France 4.2 per cent., New Zealand 2.2 per cent. We were spending all the time although we were building up our resources. Yes, and we have today about 730,000 people in the Defence Forces as compared with about 480,000 in May, 1939. And we have had to sustain garrisons all over the world in different parts.

The right hon. Gentleman talks about the necessity of injecting the re-armament programme with greater energy and greater drive in the economic system— . . . If he means anything at all by the Amendment, that is what he means. The fact of the matter is, as everybody knows, that the extent to which stockpiling has already taken place, the extent to which the civil economy is being turned over to defence purposes in other parts of the world, is dragging prices up everywhere. Furthermore, may I remind the right hon. Gentleman that if we turn over the complicated machinery of modern industry to war preparation too quickly, or try to do it too quickly, we shall do so in a campaign of hate, in a campaign of hysteria, which may make it very difficult to control that machine when it has been created.

It is all very well to speak about these things in airy terms, but we want to do two things. We want to organise our defence programme in this country in such a fashion as will keep the love of peace as vital as ever it was before. But we have seen it in other places that a campaign for increased arms production is accompanied by a campaign of intolerance and hatred and witch-hunting. Therefore, we in this country are not at all anxious to imitate what has been done in other places. . . .

Aliens Naturalisation (Sponsors)

Lieut.-Colonel Bromley-Davenport asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the public interest which has been caused by his refusal to disclose who were the sponsors of Professor Fuchs for naturalisation, he will undertake that henceforward arrangements are made for a register to be kept of all such sponsorships which can be open to inspection by interested persons.

Mr. Ede: I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by adopting the course suggested by the hon. and gallant Member.

The Numbering of the People

1951 is to be a Festival of Figures but none but the devil will get any joy out of it. *The Times* leader-writer (February 19) with tongue in cheek concedes so much when he says "the arrangements made . . . have the usual apologetic note."

Stock-taking and balance sheets are inevitably connected and the interest of the spectator is in what they conceal rather than in what they reveal.

But to get the Asiatic angle on a census we must consult our Bibles in 2 *Kings* 24, and 1 *Chronicles* 21. After a series of military victories, King David, puffed up with conceit, commanded his chief general Joab to number his valiant men. Protesting, Joab complied and with his captains for 290 days toured the kingdoms of Judah and Israel. Skipping the tribes of Levi and Benjamin he came back to David with the totals which tactfully exaggerated the importance of the Royal tribe of Judah. However punishment followed, not on the King but on his subjects who had tamely collaborated in the Big Idea.

However, since B.C. 900, the Elders of Zion have made many "improvements." The All-seeing Eye is never satisfied with what it sees or thinks it sees. Moreover, the revelations of the weakness of simpletons who truthfully answer the inquisitions are of profound interest to the power maniacs who rule the world.

The Delhi correspondent of *The Times* (February 19) writing of the decennial census being taken in India on lines recommended by the United Nations, writes, "Now that religion no longer forms the basis of separate electorates for the purpose of political representation, the previous urge by rival communities to inflate their census returns no longer exists, . . ." No doubt most of the 600,000 enumerators will have a few ideas of their own and will not be outdone by Joab in initiative.

To the sophisticated the assurance of "secrecy" is perhaps the most intriguing feature. Although the memory of Fuchs, Pontecorvo and Nunn May is still fresh, we must still lament that there are far too many innocents amongst us.

To the promise of "secrecy" is added the threat of dreadful punishments for the wilfully inaccurate. But of course a census means Jobs for the Boys—and the Girls. That is what matters to the "full employment" merchants.

P. LANGMAID.

FIAT: Periodical devoted to exposure of Communist Plot. 6d. voluntary sub. secures specimen copy. Post Free. The Key Publishing Society, 11, Lower Abbey Street, Dublin.

Interregnum

"But it would be foolish to believe that that standard [the 'generally high and conscientious standard' of the English 'Civil Service'], the relic perhaps of a previous civilization, will indefinitely endure in the present interregnum. It is surely essential, if we value our liberties and the very elements of law, that the acts of the administration, however high its standards, should speedily become examinable by some tribunal able to afford to an aggrieved subject public and efficacious redress."—(C. J. Hamson in *The Times*, February 20).

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/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	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.

ALSO

Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....	(Cloth Edition) 7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...7/-	
Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan.....	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson.....	21/-
Odlum v. Stratton	
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia	
by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.....	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans	
by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

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