

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 26. No. 23.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.  
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 4, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

### Abdullah of Jordan

British newspapers have been in agreement in referring to the assassination of King Abdullah as a tragedy which deprives Great Britain of one of the oldest and most faithful of her staunch allies. To say this may conform to the maxim "De mortuis nihil nisi bunkum." It hardly conforms to the facts.

After negotiations which threatened to become interminable, the Sharif Abdullah and his younger brother, the Sharif Faisal, took up arms against the Ottoman Empire in July, 1916, under the nominal leadership of their father, the aged Sharif Hussain of Mecca. They, and the tribal leaders who joined them, were paid by Colonel T. E. Lawrence such huge sums of money in golden British sovereigns, in anticipation of what they might do, that for some years those coins could be bought in Arabia in exchange for Egyptian or Indian currency worth about fifteen shillings at the regular rate of exchange.

The chief military activities led by the Sharif Faisal, who had Lawrence as his adviser, were the "mopping up" of Turkish garrisons in western Arabia which had been isolated by the successes of British arms further north, in Palestine. The force which operated in the desert on the right flank of Field Marshall Allenby's army was comprised of Anzac and Indian (Bikanir) Camel Corps. During the final stages of the campaign, however, the force under Faisal had moved north and was with the other camel corps on the army's right flank when the greatest defeat was inflicted upon the Turks. After the war, there fell into the hands of the Entente Powers' officers in Constantinople the original of a letter from the Sharif Faisal to the Turkish commander which treacherously predicted this British attack and said that, if it failed, he and his father's force would *desert the British and join the Turks*.

The success of the British attack caused the Turks to evacuate Damascus. Whereupon Faisal, with the connivance of Lawrence, who accompanied him, managed to reach Damascus first, where Faisal proclaimed himself King of Syria. This action was taken without the knowledge or consent of the British Commander in Chief and in violation of the Sykes-Picot Agreement, whereby Syria was recognised as a French sphere of influence.

When the French assumed control of Syria, in 1919, they ordered Faisal to leave the country within twenty-four hours; but, before this, he had written to the British Government saying that he and his family accepted the Balfour Declaration concerning Palestine, which was an act of treachery to their fellow Arabs.

After his ejection from Syria, Faisal spent some time in London, at the Hyde Park Hotel, where he was visited by Lawrence and was often in conference with the representatives of oil-producing companies; but, for a time, he and his

brother, the Sharif Abdullah—whose military activities had been of a minor character—were without financial support from H. M. Government.

In 1920, an armed insurrection broke out among the volatile tribesmen in Iraq and spread very rapidly until it became an almost general rising—to no small extent through the incompetence of the British G. O. C. in C., General Sir Aylmer Haldane, who had been recently appointed by Winston Churchill, then Secretary of State for War. Several isolated British garrisons were overrun, others were invested for many weeks, all railway communications were severed, and Baghdad was virtually besieged. After some months of heavy fighting and the arrival of considerable reinforcements of Indian troops, the insurrection was suppressed, but the British casualties were very heavy.

Even before any outbreak had occurred, the General Staff in Iraq had obtained irrefutable documentary evidence that *an insurrection was being organised by the Sharif Abdullah*.

In 1921, Winston Churchill, who had then become Colonial Secretary, summoned all the Commanders-in-Chief and Chief Political Officers in Arab countries to a conference in Cairo for consultation on future policy. He opened the proceedings by saying that he had brought with him Colonel T. E. Lawrence, because he was the greatest authority on Arab affairs—which was quite untrue and an insult to everyone else present(\*)—and whom he would therefore invite to speak first. Lawrence then advocated that Faisal be sent to Iraq and Abdullah to Trans-Jordan, with a view to their being "elected" the rulers of those countries. But for the views expressed by Miss Gertrude Bell, there was unanimous opposition to Lawrence's proposals, other policies being put forward. Mr. Churchill then thanked those present for stating their views, which (he said) would be very carefully considered by H. M. Government, and added that the Cabinet's decision would be communicated as soon as possible. Those attending the conference had barely returned to their posts, however, when they received cables telling them that the policy advocated by Colonel Lawrence had been adopted.(†) The Chief Political Officer in Iraq, Colonel A. T. Wilson—later Sir Arnold Wilson, M.P.—promptly resigned and left for England on the same day.(§)

There is no doubt at all that Abdullah and Faisal were made kings of Trans-Jordan and Iraq for two reasons. They had accepted the "Jewish national home" in Palestine. They had also proved themselves amenable to the plans worked out

(\*) Recent correspondence in *The Times* concerning Lawrence's knowledge (or lack of knowledge) of Arabic may be consulted by readers. Concerning Lawrence's knowledge of Lawrence we cannot, at present, express an opinion. See also (†) *infra*.—Editor, T.S.C.

(§) We have a letter from him on this subject. He was killed in action.—Editor, T.S.C.

by British politicians and financiers regarding the control and disposal of Iraqi oil. Neither British nor Arab interests had been considered.

Between 1916 and the day of his death, there was only a brief period, from 1919 to 1921, during which Abdullah was not receiving most substantial monetary, political and military support from the British public. He devoted that interval to the engineering of a widespread and bloody revolt against British authority, causing the death of great numbers of British and Indian soldiers. For this effort he was rewarded at the hands of Winston Churchill.

Arab unity is, without doubt, an essential British interest. It would create a political barrier against disturbing influences from the north and could also provide, militarily, something in the nature of a shock-absorber. This unity was made impossible when H. M. Government, through Winston Churchill's influence, decided to back Abdullah and Faisal. The most reliable and statesmanlike—if not very docile—of all Arab potentates is King of Sa'udi Arabia—Abd'ul Aziz ibn Abd'ul Rahman ibn Faisal as Sa'ud, who is usually known as Ibn Sa'ud. The writer of this obituary notice has seen many private letters in which Ibn Sa'ud has expressed his detestation of all for which the Sharifian family stands. A strict and devout Moslem, Ibn Sa'ud's first objection has always been that Abdullah and Faisal promoted a state of society which is neither Moslem nor Christian, Arab nor European, but one which embraces all that is bad, and little that is good, in those differing forms of civilization. Moreover, Ibn Sa'ud is uncompromisingly opposed to Zionism.

Apart from this important consideration, King Abdullah, in consequence of his support of Zionism where it concerns the national home in Palestine, persistently pursued policies at variance with those of other Arab States, thus making it impossible for the Arab League to organise an effective combination against the unprovoked aggression undertaken by the Zionists with the backing of the Soviets and American politicians.

It would be only too true to say that Abdullah supported the policy of leading British politicians. It would, therefore, be untrue to say that he supported British interests.

ARTHUR ROGERS (July 22, 1951).

P.S. The designation "Sharif" is used for persons believed to be descended from the prophet Muhammad through his grandson Hassan, "Saiyid" being used for those descended through the grandson Hussain.—A.R.

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.)

Grand Orient

### FREEMASONRY UNMASKED

by MGR. GEORGE E. DILLON, D.D.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

5/-

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: July 12, 1951.

### Agriculture (Scotland)

(Captain Duncan continued:—)

The figures for the arable and grass acreage have been reversed, and the total is now 500,000 acres less than it was. I think this has been replaced by an increase of 500,000 acres in what are called rough grazings. Therefore, what has happened in Britain is that, although land has been taken for housing, for aerodromes, for munition factories and for a thousand and one different purposes, we have not extended, but have only just managed to maintain, the area of agricultural land of all kinds in this country.

Surely, the moral of that is that if, as the hon. Member for Stirling and Falkirk Burghs (Mr. Malcolm McPherson) says, we are to have an aggressive policy, we must get more land either under arable cultivation or under grass to replace what is inevitably going to happen when we take away more land for housing, aerodromes and munition factories. It always seems to be the good land which is taken, and we must replace that good land with land which must be dug out of the hills and the rocks. Agriculture is gradually being driven back into the hills, and we must make the best use we can of our land, and extend the area of our land which is being cultivated in some form or another.

The third figure I want to quote has been quoted already in a slightly different form by the hon. Member for West Perth (Mr. Snadden), and it concerns the number of cattle. I agree that, as a result of the policy adopted during the war and carried out since, the number of cattle has increased. In 1939, taking cattle of all kinds, there were 8,872,000 cattle in the country; this is the United Kingdom figure. In June, 1950, there were 10,600,000, an increase of roughly, 1,800,000 cattle.

That is good, but, when we come to meat—and it is a little difficult to work out a correct figure from the Monthly Digest of Statistics—taking meat of all kinds, and not only cattle, the actual amount of meat coming off the farms and going into the butchers' shops in 1938 was 21,000 tons per week, while from May, 1950, to April, 1951, it was only 18,433 tons per week. I admit that the two figures are not completely comparable. I have only quoted the figures for cattle, which show an increase, but, as I think the Lord Advocate has already said, there is an increase in the number of pigs that are sold and we are also picking up on the number of sheep, although we are not yet up to the pre-war figures.

Mr. Woodburn: Was the hon. Gentleman including in his figures in both cases the imported cattle which were fed and fattened here, for the meat market?

Captain Duncan: These figures do include the Irish imported cattle. I am talking in terms of home-produced meat, not imported meat. These figures mean, in fact, that although we are getting more cattle, they are not being transformed into meat; in fact, there is less meat. The answer to that is that we farmers have got to keep our cattle longer on our farms because we have not got enough feedingstuffs to feed them up quickly, and therefore this question of feedingstuffs is really the key in a meat-starved world in which the British people will have to suffer and play their part in suffering shortages. If we can get more feedingstuffs, it is the only way in which we can get more meat. . . .

... This spring has been no better than that of last year. To show the appalling effect of this last winter on hill sheep farming, I should like to tell the Committee that I know one man who had only 30 lambs left out of a ewe stock of 400. I heard only on Monday of another case of a man with 6,000 ewes who does not know how many lambs he has left but knows that he lost 1,200 ewes—that is a quarter of his ewe stock. That is one item on the debit side.

The next item is the increase in costs. This is definitely beginning to discourage farmers from going all out on production. They are getting frightened of these continually rising prices. I have some prices here which I can quote either in cash or in percentages. Let me give this one figure in cash. On 1st July, 1945, the price of fertiliser was £9 10s. This July the price is £20 6s. 2d. Taking March, 1949, as 100, the price of superphosphates is now 240.7. The price of potato fertiliser has been almost doubled since 1949. These are very heavy costs.

There have been great increases in the prices of tractors and particularly in the prices of spare parts of tractors. The price of the Fordson Major tractor has gone up 16½ per cent. The cost of tyres has gone up. The price of the big tyre on the rear wheel of the Fordson has gone up from £16 17s. 8d. in 1947 to £32 7s. 3d. now. I have figures here for spare parts, showing increases in price of 50 per cent., 60 per cent. and 83 per cent. Farmers are beginning to get worried about these very high increased costs.

The cost of feedingstuffs has gone up. One cannot get a decent protein feedingstuff now under £30 a ton. It is an enormous price to pay and it is having an effect on poultry keeping and pig rearing. The last item is the freight charges. They went up 16½ per cent. in 1950. They have gone up another 10 per cent. in 1951 and, as my hon. Friend the Member for West Perth said, farms are mostly isolated and the cost of transport is colossal compared with the cost of transport from town to town. This cost of transport is beginning to hit the farmers and the more isolated they are the more it hits them.

Finally, the reduction in capital investment announced by the Chancellor will hit the farmer. . . .

House of Commons: July 19, 1951.

### Resale Price Maintenance

*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Thomas Moore* asked the President of the Board of Trade whether, in connection with the proposals he now has under consideration for permitting traders to under-cut agreed fixed retail prices, he intends equally to put an end to schemes under which traders are forbidden to sell goods above particular fixed prices; and whether, in view of the present and increasing shortage of consumer goods, he will again review his policy in this matter with a view to ensuring that any action taken to promote competition and instability in the retail trade will not result in more prices being raised than reduced.

*Mr. Bottomley*: As was made clear in paragraph 20 of the recent White Paper on Resale Price Maintenance (Cmd. 8274), nothing proposed by the Government would prevent manufacturers from continuing to fix maximum resale prices. Moreover, the Government has statutory powers to impose maximum prices if necessary. We see no reason, therefore,

to expect the results postulated by the hon. and gallant Member.

*Sir T. Moore*: Is the Minister aware that this proposed disturbance of the existing price maintenance system has gravely alarmed the retail trade generally? Does he realise that if persisted in, it will drive out of business many small traders?

*Mr. Bottomley*: These are matters which can be debated on the White Paper.

*Mr. Gibson*: Would it not be better to tackle this question of retail prices by a change of policy and to get rid of the ceiling on subsidies, so keeping prices within the present wage rates and avoiding runaway wage claims by trade unions?

*Mr. Gammans* asked the President of the Board of Trade if he will give an assurance that the Bill to implement the Government's policy with regard to resale price maintenance will be applicable to the nationalised industries as to other industries.

*Mr. Bottomley*: Yes, Sir.

*Mr. Gammans*: Do I understand that it will be quite legal for a travel agency to sell British railway tickets at cut prices or for a village postmistress to sell 13 penny stamps for a 1s. if she so desires?

*Mr. Bottomley*: No, Sir. Those things are not goods; they are services for which a charge is made.

*Sir Herbert Williams*: Would it be legal to sell the "Daily Herald" for a penny?

### Toxic Chemicals (Use)

*Mr. Nugent* asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he has considered the opinion of the Working Party on Toxic Chemicals in Agriculture that, despite the risk to human life, the use of these weed-killers and insecticides should continue; what is the policy of his Department in this connection; and what action he is taking to implement the working-party's recommendations.

*Mr. T. Williams*: As I indicated in reply to my hon. Friend the Member for Norfolk, North (Mr. Gooch), on 22nd February, I think that the working party's analysis of this problem is sound; and, in consultation with my Department, the organisations concerned have recommended to their members measures for this season on the lines proposed by the working party. The working party's recommendations that certain of their proposals should be reinforced by legislation is under consideration.

*Major Sir Thomas Dugdale*: Is the Minister sure that the action he proposes to take will prevent a recurrence of tragic and fatal accidents such as occurred in the North Riding of Yorkshire, when two workers lost their lives? Is he satisfied that the recommendations of the working party are widely known throughout the countryside?

*Mr. Williams*: Yes, Sir. I think that if the protective clothing, etc., is worn and other rules and regulations are faithfully observed, the danger would be almost wholly removed.

*Mr. Nugent*: Is the Minister aware that there is a good deal of anxiety about this matter on account of the loss of life, on the one hand, and the need to use these chemicals,

(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. 23.

Saturday, August 4, 1951.

### From Week to Week

Both Churchill and Smuts are venerated idols of that public which follows political discussion (such as it is) without understanding the first thing about it. Smuts was able to pass freely, by some hidden (occult) means, between the Boer and the British lines during the South African War. How much of Churchill's behaviour originates from the manner of his escape from captivity in South Africa, when a prisoner of war? What was the manner of his escape? It has been painted as an heroic exploit.

“My father's friend and mine” said “Unless the peoples of Europe unite and quickly give their all-out support to General Eisenhower . . . you cannot count on America's economic and military aid continuing.”

Churchill might have asked where “America” would be then; but he didn't. He said “Let us try to smooth General Eisenhower's path.” There is every sign that the nominee of the powers behind the parties is still the Labour Party. It is a hated party, and becoming more passionately hated every day. Yet paradoxically the administrative initiative lies with it. We are not saved by paradoxes. If (as they say), the Labour Party is disrupted, disruption in this connection is a force.

“For to speak a bold truth, it is a fatal miscarriage so ill to order affairs as to pass for a fool in one company, when in another you might be treated as a philosopher. Which I desire some certain gentlemen of my acquaintance to lay up in their hearts, as a very seasonable *innuendo*.”—*(A Tale of a Tub)*.

Seasonable, yes; we have been looking for it. But we can see scarcely any other company but the confederacy of Jews, Gnostics, Rabble and what have you.

History, we are told, is “a highly charged transitional phase in which a fevered individualism struts its brief hour upon the stage, until, having emerged from the co-conscious solidarity of the primitive pack, it is absorbed in the massive solidarity of the totally organized world state.” (This is not *The Social Crediter* speaking but THE TIMES: its reviewer is contemplating with equanimity, or almost with equanimity, the inevitability of the abolition of individual

personality in favour of “an ant-like compulsive pattern of behaviour.”) So we glimpse the cleft in THE TIMES's hoof. We have had the inevitability of State Medicine, of Socialism, of Atomic Warfare. From the behaviour of the publicists concentric with Finance, these are lesser evils than choosing Douglas. —But, we forget, in their cosmos there is no choice.

The *temper* of satire is white-hot. The temper of the New Testament “sufficient unto the day.” The *metal* of both is perhaps the same.

The mob, like Lear, kills its physicians; and, like Lear, ‘bestows its fee upon the foul disease.’ Then the foul disease destroys it.

### Marshal Petain

With the passing of Marshal Petain, France has lost one of her greatest sons and a martyr in her cause. It will be remembered that he and General Weygand were called to high command when, too late, it was seen that the military policy pursued up to that time had proved fatal and the then high-command deplorably inefficient.

Marshal Petain was at once faced with some terrible problems. From a military point of view the time was passed to prevent defeat. Obviously all he could do was to save as much as he could of the France he loved so dearly. Considering that he would have been forced to acquiesce had the Germans demanded unconditional surrender, he bargained with remarkable success.

It was precisely the time of these very delicate negotiations that Mr. Churchill chose to offer Marshal Petain “Union” with France. It is well to remember that Mr. Churchill asked neither the British people nor Parliament, and has been stated not even to have consulted his own cabinet before offering to give away the sovereignty of Great Britain. Marshal Petain was rightly indignant, and is reported to have said that the offer was not merely an insult to France, it was impudent. But what passes for ‘greatness’ in Churchill is possibly impudence.

From the position he found himself in, Petain must have suddenly seen that France was being attacked from two sides. It must have looked to him, and judging by post-war events, rightly-so, that which ever side won, France's sovereignty was to be abolished. *He* evidently was not in the plot for world domination. Whether he had heard it or not, his views coincided with the principle put so admirably by Disraeli: “Cosmopolitanism and patriotism are opposites and irreconcilable.”

Had the offer of “union” never been made, it may be that the attitude of Marshal Petain and of the French people would have been different, and the course of the war changed in our favour. One wonders whether the post war miscarriage of justice in finding Petain guilty was not due to the emphatic manner in which he immediately rejected that disgraceful proposal.

One Englishman at least salutes Henri Phillippe Petain, Marshal of France, a great Frenchman, a very great patriot!

H.R.P.

**The Student Christian Movement  
In Schools**

We Report the following correspondence:—

(Copies)

July 18, 1951.

The Rev. Ronald Preston,  
St. Anselm Hall,  
Manchester.

Dear Sir,

I am informed that, ostensibly discussing "Christianity and Communism" to schoolchildren at Manchester Grammar School yesterday under the auspices of the Student Christian Movement in Schools, you stated (a) that the Dean of Canterbury was, in the thirties, a Social Crediter; but, in the forties, a Communist; and, (b) that the economics of Major C. H. Douglas could easily be disproved by a first-year student of Political Economy.

In regard to (a), there is no suggestion that your intention was to do more than to illustrate the confusion of mind of the Dean of Canterbury, and, in the case of one of your audience at least, the inference was not drawn that Social Credit and Communism had anything in common: ("Social Credit? It is the only thing we fear"—Molotov, as reported by the Dean of Canterbury).

(b), if you are correctly reported, is altogether a different matter. Unquestionably only a small minority, if any, of your audience knew what you were talking about. You were not challenged to repeat the first-year student's simple demonstration, nor did you offer to do so. The effect, therefore, was to discourage interest in something unfamiliar and indicated only by its name, *i.e.*, to prejudice. I will say no more of this technique than that we have long been familiar with it, and, indeed, regard it as, in a sense, highly complimentary to Major Douglas and uncomplimentary to his critics. If there were, in fact, a contrary demonstration to Major Douglas's, concerning the financing of a long-term production cycle, Major Douglas and *The Social Crediter* would be among the first to give it full publicity. The last occasion on which anyone claiming technical competency to criticise Social Credit attacked Major Douglas's demonstration was in October, 1942, when the Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy in the University of Aberdeen (not a first-year student) published an article entitled "Social Credit is a Fallacy" in a journal edited by Edward Hulton, "World Review." The article conformed to the conventional recipe for 'refutations' of Social Credit, *viz.*, avoidance of direct citation of any complete statement of his thesis by Major Douglas himself, or by anyone presenting his thesis in its entirety, the critic being free to state his own view of the central features of Social Credit technics in a form suitably adapted to his own purpose. Presented with a mathematical demonstration for criticism, Prof. Lindley Fraser, after considerable delay, withdrew from discussion with us, without providing more than an unsupported opinion of its inadequacy.

In default of a refutation of the central thesis of Social Credit on that occasion, we should be pleased to give every consideration to that of yourself or of the first-year student of your acquaintance—or of anyone else—and, to facilitate your work, I have pleasure in appending an orderly statement of Major Douglas's proposition.

If there should be no satisfactory answer to this invitation, the Social Credit press will be informed.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) Tudor Jones, Deputy Chairman,  
The Social Credit Secretariat.

(attached)

**FINANCING OF A LONG-TERM PRODUCTION  
CYCLE**

Let  $N_1$  = average length of the credit cycle in years  

$$= \frac{\text{bank deposits} \times 2}{\text{bank clearings per annum} + L - K}$$

where  $K$  is the value of "Second hand Transactions."  
 ("Second hand transactions" are those which do not cancel a cost.)

Then  $N_1$  = average period of circulation of A payments + L

L = Internal (non-clearing bank) transactions

Let  $N_2$  = average length in years of the production cycle at any selected period  

$$= (\text{process time} \times \text{number of processes})$$

+ 
$$\frac{100}{\text{depreciation \%} + \text{obsolescence \%} + \text{consumption \%}}$$
  
 $N_2$  = average period of time cost production and destruction.

Costs are generated in production and cancelled in consumption.

Therefore  $N_2$  = average period of cost cycle.

$N_1$  is the order of 2 months;

$N_2$  is the order of 20 years.

Let  $n_1 = \frac{1}{N_1}$  = number of circulations per year, say 6.

Let  $n_2 = \frac{1}{N_2}$  = number of circulations per year, say 1/20.

Let A = all disbursements by a manufacturer which create costs = wages and salaries.

Let B = all disbursements by a manufacturer which transfer costs = payments to other organisations.

The manufacturer pays £A per annum into the  $N_1$  system, and £B per annum into the  $N_2$  system.

Disregarding profit, the price of production is (£A + B) per annum.

But to purchase (*i.e.*, to cancel the allocated cost of) £(A + B) there is present in the hands of the consumer—

$$\frac{\text{£}(An_1 + Bn_2)}{n_1} = \text{£} \left( A + B \frac{n_2}{n_1} \right)$$

Consequently, the rate of production of price values exceeds the rate at which they can be cancelled by the purchasing power in the hands of the consumer by an amount proportional to  $B \left( 1 - \frac{n_2}{n_1} \right)$

= approx. B.

This deficit may be made up by the export of goods on credit, by writing down of goods below cost, by bankruptcies, and by money distributed for public works and charged to debt. But in the main, it is represented by mounting debt.

St. Anselm Hall,  
Manchester.  
July 20, 1951.

Dear Dr. Jones,

Thank you for your letter. I was correctly reported. As you imply I made it perfectly clear that there is no connection between Social Credit and Communism: my point with reference to Dr. Johnson was that training as an engineer does not necessarily mean that one is therefore a sagacious person in the realm of politics and economics.

With regard to your second point, I must be excused from entering upon a discussion of this point. I have done so on many previous occasions but with no result. The literature on the matter is presumably as well known to you as to me. I am well aware that Social Crediters do not accept the refutations of economists, but that does not in itself get us anywhere. I had British Israelite adherents in my parish once with whom *pari passu* the same situation occurred.

I have on occasion discussed the matter in detail, but the Conference this week was clearly not a suitable occasion when one was answering supplementary questions on the spot. If anyone consults me about this matter and really wants to follow it up, I always give references to literature on both sides.

Yours sincerely,  
(Signed) Ronald Preston.

July 25, 1951.

Dear Sir,

I hereby acknowledge receipt of your reply to my letter of July 18, which is, as you appear to foresee, '*non satis*,' for which reason I propose to proceed to the course intimated in the last paragraph of my letter.

In addition, I intend to bring the printed correspondence to the notice of Secretaries of the parent body of The Student Christian Movement in Schools, not, however, with any great expectation that the corruption of their minds has not proceeded already sufficiently far to prevent their clear apprehension of the intellectual and moral principles involved. "Faith [Credit] is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," and, accordingly, nothing "gets us anywhere" unless it is our policy to get somewhere.

Yours faithfully,  
(Signed) Tudor Jones.

*Postscript.* A later report has reached me stating that, in the course of your address, you asserted that "since Communism is a religion, if we got rid of Communism there would be no religion, for without an adversary, namely Communism, Christianity could not exist." Would you care to comment on this report?—T.J.

Mr. Preston replied by postcard dated July 27:—"The statement you attribute to me in your postscript is so ridiculous that it can hardly be commented upon."

## Mr. W. J. Brown

The following note, signed Joyce Mew, in *Housewives' Today* for July, clarifies the position of Mr. W. J. Brown:—

Mr. W. J. Brown, lost his seat as Independent Member for Rugby, in 1950, when the Conservatives decided to enter the contest. The seat was won by Labour.

Mr. Brown is now Independent Candidate for West Fulham, the seat at present held by Dr. Edith Summerskill. The Conservatives are not contesting this seat in the expected election, and they have offered their support to Mr. Brown. After some correspondence, Mr. Brown accepted their assistance, on the strict understanding that it involved no party "tie-up" whatever, and that he was free to vote on matters in the House "as his conscience dictated."

This, of course, is no counsel of perfection. It is obvious that the Party Whips—"My Party—right or wrong!"—is the negation of democracy and something has got to be done about it.

Mrs. Mew, Chairman of the League, accompanied by Mrs. Baldwin, a Council member, and Chairman of the Wandsworth Branch of the League, visited the Conservative headquarters in West Fulham. The agent explained the situation, and stressed the difficulties they had with the dyed-in-the-wool Tories, in their intention to support Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown's sincerity and integrity are strong assets, and are already making a deep impression in the constituency. Mrs. Mew and Mrs. Baldwin had many questions to put to the agent. They learned that an early election was considered unlikely. They were offered platforms at two coming meetings, and given encouragement to start a branch in the district. He hoped that we should not take all his best workers away!

But we know that it is always the willing horse that gets the whip and it is the same conscientious workers who shoulder the burden, in any association.

The agent agreed that the sorry example of the T.U.C. was warning enough for us to avoid anything in the nature of party commitments. The League feels that the first necessity is to get a few honest Independents into the House; we are in a strong enough position to aid Mr. Brown to the full, and completely to disregard any further gibes that we are tied to the apron strings of the Tory Party.

---

## PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3).

on the other? Will he see that the position is firmly and clearly dealt with so that farmers may know to what extent they can safely use these chemicals?

*Mr. Williams:* The Parliamentary Secretary made a statement last evening on this matter, and the question of legislation is now under active consideration.

*Mr. Nugent:* What does that mean?

*Colonel Gomme-Duncan:* Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that the mere fact that these poisons are being thrown about the countryside indicates that something is very

## On Planning The Earth

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

6/- (Postage extra).

far from right, and that the matter is being tackled from the wrong end? What should be borne in mind is that it is the soil that produces the pests, and which should be dealt with; not poison scattered on after the pests have arrived.

### Naturalisation Applications

*Mr. H. Nicholls* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many applications for British naturalisation have been granted since January, 1946, against the advice of the local police authority concerned.

*Mr. Ede*: The police are not asked to advise me and, while it is open to them to do so, I am, of course, not bound to accept their advice whether or not it is favourable to the applicant. Reports submitted by the police are confidential, and it would not be in the public interest to disclose the nature of the advice tendered by the police when they see fit to volunteer it.

### Food Supplies (Sugar)

*Mr. Nigel Fisher* asked the Minister of Food if he will increase the tonnage of Empire-produced sugar which may be imported into this country at the guaranteed price.

*Mr. F. Willey*: His Majesty's Government have undertaken to purchase the whole of the exportable surplus of Commonwealth sugar at the guaranteed price up to the end of 1952. After that date the quantity purchased under the guarantee is governed by the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. The target of exportable sugar under this Agreement is well above the current exportable surplus.

*Mr. N. Macpherson* asked the Minister of Food how the price of sugar to the housewife would compare with the present subsidised price recently raised to 6d. if an economic price were being charged to manufacturing users of sugar and if there were no consumer subsidy.

*Mr. Webb*: If all sugar consumed in the United Kingdom were charged at an economic price, i.e., a price which showed neither profit nor loss to the Ministry, it is estimated that, after allowing for the costs of distribution, etc., the retail price to the housewife would be about 6½d. a lb.

### Broadcasting (Committee's Report)

*The Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations (Mr. Gordon-Walker)*: I beg to move:

"That this House takes note of the Memorandum on the Report of the Broadcasting Committee, 1949 (Command 8291)."

The Licence and the Charter of the Corporation expire on 31st December, and this autumn the draft new Charter will have to be laid before the House and the terms of the new licence will have to be decided by the House. Therefore, between now and next autumn we have to take very large and important decisions. In order to focus discussion on this matter, and to enable the House to express its views, the Government have published a White Paper on the actions the recommendations of the Beveridge Committee that they propose should be taken on Committee.

I would emphasise, as is made clear in the White Paper, that the recommendations of the Government are not final recommendations. . . .

*Mr. Selwyn Lloyd (Wirral)*: I wish to put forward a point of view which is rather different from any that has been put before the House in this Debate. I confess that so many provoking remarks were made during the earlier speeches that my notes are now quite illegible, which may or may not be an advantage. . . .

. . . The question of the percentage of the licence money to be kept, television for public viewing, copyright and all the rest are side-issues compared with the main question of monopoly. May I seek to remove one or two misconceptions? I say categorically that the technical objection to a change is not a valid one. I have been at some pains to take competent technical advice on this matter and the truth of what I am saying is indeed implicit in the evidence of the B.B.C. itself. I see that the Secretary of State agrees with me that it is technically possible to have a considerable variety of transmissions in this country now.

*Mr. Gordon-Walker*: I think the B.B.C. view was that it soon would be rather than that it was now possible.

*Mr. Lloyd*: I say that it is only the actions of the B.B.C. which have prevented that situation from being possible at present. I was talking yesterday to someone who was employed by the Corporation, who told me that in his opinion it would be possible, by very small adjustments, to have regional low-power transmissions without any question of V.H.F. entering into the matter. It is obvious that if we had V.H.F. we could have at least a hundred local transmissions throughout the length and breadth of the country. That is a modest plan or put forward when we remember that New York has 45 different sound programmes and seven television programmes serving a population which is less than that of London.

The other misconception which has to be removed is the question of the capital investment programme. The cost of developing these local broadcasting facilities is relatively very small. I instanced in my minority Report the case of a 100-watt transmitter costing about £1,500; and I saw near Washington a station, the F.M. section of which was estimated to cost about 30,000 dollars. These figures are of such a nature as to show that no serious objection on capital investment cost can be raised against the institution of local broadcasting.

I come to the question whether we should alter the structure. I do not wish to disparage the work of the B.B.C. It has attracted to it the services of many people of great distinction, and I think that, broadly speaking, the B.B.C. has done a good job of work. If I have any criticism to offer, it is that I think that, in the higher quarters, the tendency is slightly one of self-righteousness, because there is still a tendency to regard any criticism as being a sort of sin against the Ark of the Covenant. I also think the B.B.C. are subject to criticism for their quite deliberate action to prevent the growth of local broadcasting and to prevent the alternative methods of transmission now technically possible. I think it would be fair to state that that is fairly well substantiated. I do not want to use the word "deliberate" to suggest any wicked intuition. But it certainly has been the deliberate policy of those in charge of the B.B.C. to see that only the monopoly is technically possible.

I have no desire to disparage personalities. I have nothing really against the B.B.C., except what I have just said, and my sole purpose is to see that we have the best possible set-up in this country. I do not agree with what my right hon. Friend said or implied in suggesting that this was not the time to make a change and that a change was impossible at present, or that we should consider the Charter during the next seven years and consider whether to make the change then. I consider that if we do not make the change now or in the near future, it will become increasingly difficult to do it at all, in view of the enormous developments in television and in V.H.F. I think it will be technically very difficult to try to make a change after another seven years have elapsed.

I entirely agree, however, with my right hon. Friend that it would be wrong to extend the Charter for 15 years. I personally agree that every five years we should have this investigation into the operations of the Corporation, not on such a grand scale as that of the Beveridge Committee, but that it should be in the power of the Government to refer to that investigation committee any policy matters, if they wished so to do. I think that is not a bad compromise between the Government's point of view and that of some of my hon. Friends.

I come back to the basic question of the monopoly. I think that it is quite intolerable that, in this field, which does so much to inform, educate, entertain and instruct, there should be any single body of people deciding what is to be put over the air or shown upon the screen. I think it would be intolerable if there were to be in this country a single national newspaper, with a 6d. edition—the Third Programme—and a 3d. edition—the Home Service—and a 1d. edition—the Light Programme—and with the control of these three newspaper editions vested in a single national newspaper corporation. We should have no local newspapers of any kind, and should have only one system of dissemination of news conducted by this national newspaper corporation.

I think it would be quite intolerable, whatever may be the defects—and there are different views of the merits or defects—of our present Press system, but we cannot forget the findings of the Press Commission in regard to them. Or, in regard to the theatre, would it really be tolerated to have a single national theatre corporation deciding what was to be put on at every theatre in the country? Or, again, with regard to publishing, would it be tolerated that we should have one body of people deciding what books were to be published, so that, if the decision of that body went against one, one would have no chance of getting a book published at all? I think that would be completely intolerable in any sort of free society. It is quite inconceivable that a single body of men and women, however good and however responsible they may be, should be allowed to have the final say in that matter.

Concurrently with that basic view, we see the ordinary faults of monopoly, and there were certain matters on which I agreed with my right hon. Friend concerning a public monopoly. I think that, on the whole, a public monopoly is rather worse than a private monopoly, although I have no love for a private monopoly either. I think it is quite wrong to have these great aggregations of power in the hands of small sections of people.

So far as the evils of monopoly are concerned, I think

they are conceded, and that makes the conclusions of the Report all the more extraordinary. It seems to me that the B.B.C. is far too big already. It is suffering from the evils of an over-large bureaucracy and over-centralisation. It is impossible for the Director General to know every member of his staff, or, I should think, even a great number of the staff. The thing has grown quite out of proportion to what it was in the days before the war. I think the figures show that in 1935 the B.B.C. had 2,500 employees, while at the moment it has at least 13,000, and I think the number is going up fairly rapidly.

If we have that monopoly or a single organisation controlling this new development, we are bound to have a conservative attitude towards new techniques. I am against conserving in this field; I am for change. If we have one large organisation, the tendency is for the old technique to be a little suspicious of the development of the new technique. I think that has happened on television, and I am quite certain that it is happening in regard to V.H.F.

(To be continued).

### Television in U.S.A.

Under the heading "Television and the Cinema: The Twilight of the Film Industry," *The Tablet* says there are ten million sets of television receivers now in operation in the United States, and there is every prospect that the number will rise to thirty millions within a year or two. A Long Island housing project of ten thousand homes is built for viewing as much as for living. Telephone subscribers can order a film programme over the telephone cables for a dollar on the telephone account.

## 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.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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