

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 27. No. 9.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

"O.H.M.S.—Issued by the Returning Officer," we read:—" . . . Mark your vote on the ballot paper *secretly* in one of the voting compartments . . . Then fold the ballot paper in two to *conceal* your vote . . ." Has this official legal authority to *enjoin* secrecy on the behaviour of the elector? Is this what the party leaders mean when they insist on the secrecy of the ballot? Will the obligation thus placed upon the voter soon become a legal obligation—that in no circumstances must he tell anyone how he voted? In whose interest is this surreptitious note introduced into the Returning Officers's advice? If it is a Party interest, is the election vitiated thereby? If it is not a Party interest, is the election vitiated thereby?

. . .

We observe with mingled feelings that *The Guardian* in what was to have been its last appearance but isn't puts the Industrial Revolution in a true perspective, without, however, indicating why it is a true perspective. We will indicate the reason later. It says:—"In an earlier age—before the Industrial Revolution, at any rate—Faith was the universal, and prior to the individual. None questioned the priority and sovereignty of Faith. If any individual wished to separate himself from the world of Faith, it *had to be* a deliberate act. It could only be the result of a special decision. There was an objective world of Faith, to which the common man paid customary homage. . . ."

The newspaper goes on to say that it is the flight from God which has now become the objective fact. "The only guide to conduct is public opinion, or the conventions of society. And what exactly do they lead to?" Tension. "The Christians will be at loggerheads with society. It is inevitable. But of how many professing Christians who read this paper can it be said that they recognise a constant tension between the worlds of Faith and Unfaith? Not many, we imagine. The world around us no longer likes a saint. The sincere practice of Christian piety may be recognised as heroic by a few enlightened men and women in every circle. But by the conventional it is condemned as a form of eccentricity, and you will seldom find genuine Christians at the top. What the world likes, whether he be a business man, or a doctor, or even a prelate, is a man whose views and outlook make him easy to work with and live with. Such a man might not be a man of God.

"The time, however, is coming when many changes will be witnessed. Already we see the writing on the wall. Wealth is already threatened. Communism is spreading rapidly in this island. The spread of Communism is a symptom of the flight from God. But there are also, dimly discernable, signs of something far more revolutionary. It is not Communism, but real Christianity. And when this new movement begins to grow, it is not only Communism which will peter out like a damp squib. It will purge society itself, scattering the proud and important, and bringing back the

poor and humble. And, when they that are first shall be last, all those phases of the Flight from God which Picard describes will be transformed in a God-centred society."

We have protested before (see *T.S.C.* for September 15 for the latest occasion) against the indiscriminating association of virtue and poverty: poverty of possessions may, and usually does mean *weak* rather than *poor* in spirit. But we are all for a con-centric in place of the present ex-centric society.

The Industrial Revolution established this eccentricity by being the means of transferring the *policy* of industry from the satisfaction of individual needs to the satisfaction of the abstract needs, of industry itself. Industrialists were not themselves responsible for this, unless as accomplices with Financiers. The rule of Dutch Finance, which imposed upon industrialists the duty of recovering from the public the financial cost of production, negligible to financiers themselves and actually impossible of collection, determined that accelerating expansion, regardless of social needs, must be at least one condition of industry's continued existence. The expansion was the means of distributing a part of the defect of purchasing power. The world must become a factory, not to produce goods but to keep factories going. The eccentricity of modern society is "full employment."

. . .

A B.U.P. telegram dated Teheran, October 15, says:—

"A leader of the extremist Fayadian Islam sect said to-day Iran probably would consider favourably a proposal by former U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr., to settle the Iranian oil dispute provided 'no strings' are attached.

Morgenthau's plan provides that the United Nations purchase controlling interest in the industry formerly operated by the British here."

We have from time to time said a lot of hard things about the indigenous electorate, and harder still about the not-so-indigenous; but they must 'have something to them' to make it a matter of paramount importance that their watchful eye should be substituted by that of "the sole example in history of a country which passed from barbarism to decadence without an intervening period of civilisation." When the "United Nations," now perhaps on the way out, departs, will there be a 'credit balance' due to them from the British taxpayer—just like India?

On Planning The Earth

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

6/- (Postage extra).

PARLIAMENT

House of Lords: July 17, 1951.

Finance Bill

(The debate continued: Lord Rennell is speaking):—

The cure is not to prevent people doing what they want to do but to cure the reasons why they want to do it. The cure is perfectly easy. It is so to arrange your taxation that it will not prevent the development of companies, as I am going to submit the profits tax does. Secondly, the cure is not to go on applying the Socialist policy of nationalising industries. I am perhaps not alone in thinking this, because I notice that supporters of the Government in public places take the same view about further nationalisation. I believe that if the Government were to say that they were at an end of their policy of nationalisation, as some of our greater trade union leaders in this country apparently wish them to do, it would reassure a number of people who have been contemplating the transfer of the domicile of their companies overseas, especially where those people are, in the main or in the majority, shareholders of those companies.

There was a time when foreign concerns liked to be domiciled in England because they enjoyed the advantages of our, on the whole, very good company law. Moreover, they enjoyed the advantages of the protection of English courts. It has always been one of our great sources of pride that foreign bodies, even if they were not concerned with this country—and in particular I have in mind shipowners—would domicile their disputes in this country because they thought they would get fairer treatment than elsewhere. Companies whose majority shareholders used to prefer for these reasons to be in London rather than in any other place are becoming fewer and fewer. Therefore I regard this particular clause which seeks to prevent, and to be an obstacle in the way of, people getting away from a régime that they do not like, as another major tombstone on the road to liberty.

The last clause that I want to take is Clause 37, which deals with sales between associated persons and subsidiary companies. The implication of this is very serious. Frankly, the outcome depends entirely on how the clause is applied. I know there are certain reasons in connection with double taxation, and the conventions dealing with double taxation, which might make a clause of this sort desirable. But in its present form that clause in fact could make it perfectly impossible, without incurring penalties, for any company in this country with a subsidiary abroad to sell to that subsidiary at a lower rate than to a third party; or, in other words, sales at arms' length. It is common knowledge that most industrial concerns producing in this country who have wanted to set up overseas in the Dominions and Colonies have had to set up subsidiaries and, in order to start those subsidiaries in business, have had to sell at lower rates than they were selling to third parties—at arms' length. This clause could make that impossible. I regard that as another though perhaps slightly smaller, tombstone.

Looking over the Finance Bill as a whole, and looking back over what has been said about it since the beginning of April, I hope that in future years supporters of the Opposition Parties in this country will take the trouble of reading and studying the Finance Acts produced by the Government now in power before giving themselves over to quite so much jubilation as they did on this occasion.

Any jubilation they may have felt in April must be profoundly modified by reading the import of the four clauses to which I have referred, and also by considering the impact of the new rates of profits tax on both undistributed and distributed profits. Even on the tax side, there seems to be no cause for jubilation. Over the clauses dealing with the subjects that I have discussed there is great cause for grief—greater than over the last two Finance Acts. I do not disagree with anything that the noble Lord said about the necessity of paying for rearmament. I do not disagree in any way with the increases in tax which are necessary to achieve that end, provided that they are coupled with the proper economies and provided that the increases are applied in such a way as not to damage the economic structure of the country.

In that respect I regard the profits tax on distributed profits as entirely pernicious. If, in order to find the money to pay for our rearmament, it is necessary to have a tax on corporation profits, then let us have it; we must have it. But let us have it on profits and not on distributed profits. The effect of this large tax on distributed profits is unfair in the extreme. Holders of preference shares and debentures do not contribute to the tax on distributed profits. The sole contributor to the tax on distributed profits is the equity holder, the owner of the risk-bearing capital. The economic effect is already apparent. It is to force industries, for rearmament as for every other purpose, into borrowing money when they ought not to borrow money because, under the distributed profits tax, the cost of raising money by equity, ordinary share capital, is absolutely out of the question.

If, as the noble Lord said, we are to have an expanding economy to carry our armament programme, and are to continue the social benefits which we enjoy, much more capital will be required. The imposition of a profits tax on distributed profits is not the way to secure that capital; it is the way to make it more and more difficult to attract the capital.

Lord Pakenham: May I interrupt the noble Lord if he will allow me, to ask him where he would place the tax?

Lord Rennell: I said on all profits, not on distributed profits. The noble Lord referred to the increase of profits in the month of June, which he said were up by 13.9 per cent., and to the increases in profits which had been shown for the last few months as justifying the taxation of distribution of those profits. I do not know whether the noble Lord meant it, but he left with me the impression that there was something naughty or reprehensible in these increases in profits and that they should, therefore be removed. Has it passed through the noble Lord's mind that these increases in profits may also, perhaps, be a reflection of increased efficiency in production? Is the increased efficiency in production which has undoubtedly taken place an undesirable or naughty thing?

Lord Pakenham: I am sorry to intervene again, but I think the noble Lord has misunderstood me. The figures I gave for this year were figures of dividends.

Lord Rennell: I do not think that will make any substantial difference to what I am going to say. Profits have increased and dividends have increased. Is it wrong that profits should increase, and that dividends should increase when they are the reflection of increased efficiency? Should somebody be penalised because he makes more profit by reason of his production being more efficient? Is that the way to raise capital for enterprise hereafter? I think the

answers to those questions are not needed from me. I urge the Government to consider this question of profits tax, which I regard as of vital importance and as having been the major blot on the Finance Acts of the last three years. I think that in any event it is an undesirable tax, but if we must have something of the sort it should not be in the form in which it now stands on the Statue Book, and in which it will shortly stand there when this Bill becomes an Act. . . .

House of Lords: July 25, 1951.

The British Broadcasting Corporation

Lord Woolton rose to call attention to the Report of the Broadcasting Committee, 1949 (Cmd. 8116), and to subsequent publications realting thereto; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: . . . I admit at once, that on this question of monopoly I have both prejudice and fear. I do not like monopolies of any sort, whether Government or private. I share that point of view at least with noble Lords opposite. I dislike the effect which monopolies have on the people in charge of them. When I say that, I hope that the Governors—one of whom I see is sitting here—will not feel that I am saying I do not like their minds. But it is a dangerous thing to have so much power. The question is whether there is room both for the B.B.C., with its assured revenue, and for some form of free enterprise. I recognise at once that the B.B.C. is a Conservative-created monopoly—I had better give noble Lords opposite that point in case they raise it. I agree that it has served a most useful purpose. I think it was essential to have this monopoly when the Conservative Party created it. But that does not seem to be an argument for maintaining it when the industry is no longer an infant industry and, indeed, has grown to strength and maturity. I can find only one strong argument that commends itself to my mind in favour of continuing the B.B.C. in its present form, and that is that it seems to be working very well at present. On that complacent tone, perhaps it would be convenient to stop thinking about it.

But I do not think we can do that; I do not think we can say that this is "The Only Way." We are here threatened with the continuance of this monopoly for fifteen years; and that with an industry which has developed so rapidly that there is not a noble Lord in this Chamber who could foretell what sort of services may be available from it in three or four years' time, let alone in fifteen years. Monopoly stifles enterprise, not only in the things that it monopolises but also in the invention and production of the instruments that it uses. But what about fifteen years hence—and an unknown Board of Governors? Surely there is something to be said for the idea that, if there were other users of broadcasting in this country, they might provide considerable and additional encouragement to the development of new scientific methods and processes—and that in itself is a matter of vital importance to the defence services of the nation.

I ask your Lordships: What is the answer to this question? What is the objection to competition? We are told that if we have competition the bad will drive out the good, and that broadcasting in this country would be much worse if it were left in some part to people who are motivated by a desire to sell goods by broadcasting. I wonder whether that is true. I wonder what is the evidence for that argu-

ment. It is based on the idea, apparently, that we needs must love the worst if we are free. I do not think that reflects our general character. There are two types of B.B.C. programmes which I find very much below the standard of sponsored American programmes. Strangely, one is the programme designed to amuse us, to make us laugh. The other is the religious programme. I think the B.B.C. are very wise in giving people free tickets to go as audiences in the amusement parts of their programmes, because it gives listeners an idea of when they ought to laugh. Otherwise, I, for one, frequently find myself puzzled to find out what there is to laugh at. And then it occurs to me that if these people were televised they might perhaps look funnier than they sound—as they so easily could. I am quite certain that sponsored programmes would give us a livelier variety.

I hope your Lordships will forgive me, for I think this is a digression, but I cannot help saying this. I am most concerned about the religious programmes. When I was in America a year ago, I had more to do with broadcasting in the course of three weeks than I normally have in a year in this country. Of all the programmes that I heard or took part in, the one that impressed me most was three-quarters of an hour of a religious service, paid for by the Roman Catholic Church. It was full of vitality and conviction. It was a first-class broadcasting performance. I must say, it held me. Protestant as I am, I listened to it with most profound admiration. I generally listen to the programme in this country "Lift up your Hearts," at ten minutes to eight every morning. The religious organisations of this country get it free, day in and day out, and whilst, of course, there are brilliant exceptions, on the whole even the weather forecast that follows seems lively in comparison—maybe because they have an expert broadcaster giving the dismal news about the weather. I cannot help but think that what is given freely is valued lightly. I hope your Lordships will forgive me for having brought up this matter. I do not think it really arises out of the Report, but I am deeply convinced that the religious organisations of this country—and I hate to think of this country ceasing to be a Christian country—are missing a very great opportunity. I hope that the Spiritual Lords here will not think that I have gone beyond my temporal province in mentioning it.

Let me turn to the question of monopoly. There is another and a human factor which I am sure we must take into account. I do not like the idea of there being only one employer in any occupation. If any man falls foul of the B.B.C. and loses his job, or feels that he has to give up his job on that account, he is finished for broadcasting in this country. It is true that he can probably go abroad and do very well there. Then again, look at the matter from the point of view of the Directors of the B.B.C. They are very human and considerate gentlemen. They know quite well that, if they dismiss anybody from the B.B.C. because he is not very good, that man has no chance of getting a job in his own chosen profession anywhere else. I think that is a factor of which we must take notice.

Let me now give your Lordships the conclusions at which I have arrived, as a result of the considerable amount of thought that I have given to this problem—and not only since the Beveridge Report came out. Let me say that I am speaking personally, for I do not regard this as a

(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. 27. No. 9.

Saturday, October 27, 1951.

A Breathing Space

When these lines appear in print it will be known whether Mr. Winston Churchill's plea for a breathing space as the most desirable requisite for the adjustment of the world's present difficulties will have his active backing or whether, like other instances of wishful-thinking, it is to fade from memory. From many points of view it seems as though all the political effort of the years since the beginning, not the end, of the third phase of the World War had been directed to the end of preventing the occurrence of a breathing space for anyone anywhere. The Red Queen's exhortation, "Faster, faster," has been obeyed everywhere. No one has been able to escape obedience, and however much faster everybody went, nobody managed to remain anything like where they were. This craze for speed without sensible result has been remarked upon as a specially sinister feature of our time.

We do not, of course, know whether Mr. Churchill was making anything more than a rhetorical point when he mentioned the need for sitting still and taking stock. The picture his words conjured up in our minds may not have been his. It may be that he can do nothing to realise his own vision or ours. But we are bound to say we found the prospect, as we saw it, attractive in the extreme, and, if he can do anything to realise it, we would beg him not to weary in well doing. There is hardly any limit we should set to either the volume of breathing or the extent of space or time given over to the life-giving exercise. Let him be not daunted. Let the wheels of the presses slow down and stop. Let there be a close season for the multiplication of printed words for at least twenty years. Let there be no propaganda of any kind, no 'news' (which, as the proverb has it, is Good News), no sermons, no tales told by an idiot, no tale-telling of any sort. Let there be no false labels on bottles, no candidates' addresses, no speeches. Let all bookselling be prohibited, unless it be of poems older than five hundred years and a day. Let the heated metals cool, and the hot oil cease from stinking. Let the breeze blow through the streets, emptied of 'workers' hastening under an hypnotic impulsion to produce things which none can eat, or wear, or regard with awe and wonder. Let the grass grow. Let the ear of man hear anything but his own silly voice. Let his lungs fill, and empty, rhythmically. Let his heart beat, beat, beat.

Where Is It Going?

"The shipbuilding industry was in an unprecedented position. At the present time they had 6,250,000 tons gross on order. To place that into perspective they must remember that the high peak point after the war was in 1948 when in 12 months they had taken 2,000,000 tons gross of orders. In 1949 that had descended to the very low figure of 400,000 tons gross. For the 12 months ended Sept. 30 last it was 4,000,000 tons. That intake was exactly three times their present annual rate of output and material supplies would be their great problem.

"All that work had to be faced under conditions of very great frustration. The shortages of material, the effect of so-called planning, bulk buying and many other unnatural and uneconomic interferences by non-experienced people had resulted in a maximum of difficulties for producers and those who were the real and practical planners of production. It was a fearful outlook that it was people whose only contact with industry had been through a certain school of economics who were really determining where industry was going."

(Report of a speech by Sir Amos Ayre to the Shipbuilding Conference at Glasgow, October 12.)

"The World has Changed"

Mr. John Drummond of Megginch, who for twenty years has been distributing milk to four hundred people in the Carse of Gowrie, will do so no longer. The laird's letter to his customers, printed by the *Dundee Courier* on August 21, is as follows:—

"Dear Customer,—This is to say good-bye and thank you for your custom.

"I started the milk round about 20 years ago, with the idea of a better milk supply for the district. The block trade of the villages gave enough return to enable distribution to the unprofitable outlying customers.

"By 1939 we had reached a very high standard of quality and distribution (our analysis shows we were producing about the cleanest milk in three counties).

"Came the war and troubles which have increased ever since. We have not been able to purchase new delivery vans; one cannot conduct an efficient service with a fleet of derelict corks; many of the side roads are getting worse; the constant breakdowns make it impossible to maintain our milk at a consistently high standard.

"The prices at which we purchase materials are now at a higher ratio than the price we receive for our milk. We cannot stand competition on the lucrative parts of the round and continue serving the unprofitable outlying customers.

"Moreover, the world has changed; the days when the private individual contributed money to organise schemes to help his neighbours are superseded by State taxation and welfare.

"I am sorry it had to end like this. I had hoped we might have built up something worth while. In case you are stuck, I will keep one van touring the district until you get fixed up elsewhere.

"Thank you, dear customer, and good luck."

It is suggested that the milk will go to the Milk Marketing Board at Dundee.

The Warburgs, an American Success Story

By E. MULLINS.

In the 1890s, two young gentlemen leisurely toured Europe, stopping at the fashionable resorts and astonishing the impoverished aristocracy by the amount of money they spent. These were members of the new ruling class of Europe, Paul and Felix Warburg, sons of the powerful Jewish banker M. M. Warburg of Hamburg, German representatives of the Rothschilds. After they had completed their Grand Tour, the young gentlemen were employed in Paris and London banking houses and then migrated to America. They played a considerable part in the subsequent history of this country, although they have been extremely reticent about their own importance, and, indeed, have concealed their influence as much as possible.

Felix Warburg arrived in New York in 1898, and became a partner in the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb Company, the American representatives of the Rothschilds. Kuhn, Loeb specialized in railroad properties, and, according to Department of Commerce figures, controlled sixty-four per cent. of all railroad mileage in the United States in 1900. This figure dropped to a mere forty-one per cent. by 1939. The analysis of Jewish control of the United States in 1900 was: J. P. Morgan and Kuhn Loeb, ninety-three per cent. of American railroad mileage; Speyer & Co., New York real estate and South American minerals; J. & W. Seligman, sugar and public utilities; August Belmont (Schoenberg), New York subways; and Lazard Frères, gold and silver, specializing in international gold movements. These Jewish banking houses also held important directorships in American heavy industry, Kuhn, Loeb controlling such properties as Western Union, Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., U.S. Rubber, and International Telephone & Telegraph.

In 1902, Paul Warburg arrived in the United States, and became a partner in Kuhn, Loeb Co., at a salary of five hundred thousand dollars a year. He married Nina Loeb, and brother Felix married Frieda Schiff, the daughter of Jacob Schiff, financier of the Russian Revolution in 1917 and senior partner of Kuhn, Loeb Co. Schiff had put up E. H. Harriman as a front to secure for Kuhn, Loeb the vast Union Pacific Railroad properties, then held by the United States Government. Otto Kahn and Harriman were later prosecuted for this conspiracy and convicted, but the Supreme Court reversed the verdict, proving, then as now, that the Supreme Court never judges against a Jewish banker. Harriman's sons, E. R. and W. A. Harriman have been prominent in the State Department, W. A. Harriman having been our unofficial Secretary of State for some years.

Despite his huge salary, Paul Warburg paid little attention to the business of Kuhn, Loeb Company. Instead, he spent much of his time writing and lecturing on the subject of banking reform, and was probably the wealthiest writer on economics we have ever known. He was a member of the secret party on Jekyll Island, Georgia, in November, 1911, where the Aldrich Plan was written. This Plan was later passed by Congress as the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. There is a great deal of documentation on Paul Warburg's activities on behalf of the Act. He spent most of 1913 in Washington, exerting pressure on Congress to pass the Owen-Glass Bill, later called the Federal Reserve Act, which would give international Jewish bankers complete control of the financial resources of the United States. Colonel Edward

M. House, the unofficial President of the United States during Woodrow Wilson's two administrations, and International Rothschild agent, wrote in his memoirs, "The Intimate Papers of Colonel House:—

"December 19, 1912. I talked with Paul Warburg over the telephone, regarding currency reform. I told him of my trip to Washington and what I had done there to get it in working order. I told him that the Senate and the Congressmen seemed anxious to do what he desired, and that President-elect Wilson thought straight concerning the issue.

"March 13, 1913. Paul Warburg and I had an intimate discussion regarding currency reform.

"October 13, 1913. Paul Warburg was my first caller today. He came to discuss the currency measure. There are many features of the Owen-Glass bill that he does not approve. I promised to put him in touch with William McAdoo and Senator Owen, so that he might discuss it with them.

"November 27, 1913. Paul Warburg telephoned about his trip to Washington. Later he and Jacob Schiff came over for a few minutes. Warburg did most of the talking. He had a new suggestion in regard to grouping the regular reserve banks so as to get the units welded together and in easier touch with the Federal Reserve Board."

House's Memoirs also include the following sentence:—
"President Wilson accepted House's suggestion of Paul Warburg of New York for the Federal Reserve Board because of Warburg's interest and experience in currency problems under both Republican and Democratic administrations." (Jewish bankers are always above party politics, and support the Republican and Democratic parties simultaneously, contributing to both because they wish to keep up the appearance of a popular government. The only party to which the Jews really support and believe in is the Communist Party).

The Federal Reserve Act was important enough to take up Paul Warburg's time for eleven years because it created a Central Bank of the United States, owned by private stockholders. This stock, capitalized at \$143,000,000 in 1914, was reported by the Treasury Department in 1947 to be worth forty-five billion dollars. It was worth his effort to enact the banking and currency bill. More important, the principal job of a central bank is war finance. The First World War began a few months after the Federal Reserve System was set up. Without the mobilization of credit which the System afforded, European nations could not have engaged in the World War, because they fought on American money.

Colonel Ely Garrison, in "Roosevelt, Wilson, and the Federal Reserve Act," wrote that, "Paul Warburg is the man who got the Federal Reserve Act together, after the Aldrich Plan aroused such nationwide resentment and opposition. The master mind of both plans was Baron Alfred Rothschild of London."

Woodrow Wilson named Paul Warburg the first Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. Warburg wished to set the Federal Reserve System up the way he wanted it, but despite the fact that he dictated to the government of the United States, he was not quite so popular with the people. Many editors and writers objected to Wilson's handing the monetary system of our country over to an international Jewish banker, although he was merely fulfilling his prom-

ises to his Jewish backers. The public outcry forced the Senate to make a token investigation of Warburg, and he was asked to appear before a Senate Sub-committee in June of 1914 and answer some questions about his international banking connections and his activities in getting the Federal Reserve Act through Congress. Warburg refused to appear, because he dare not risk public denunciation as a Rothschild agent. *The Nation* on July 23, 1914, observed:—

“Mr. Warburg finally had a conference with Senator O’Gorman and agreed to meet the members of the Senate Sub-committee informally, with a view to coming to an understanding and to giving them any reasonable information that they might desire. The opinion in Washington is that Mr. Warburg’s confirmation is assured.” *The Nation* was correct. The Senate confirmed Mr. Warburg as the first Governor of the Federal Reserve System, after an informal meeting at which no minutes were taken and no public statements made. Mr. Warburg was very eager to leave his five hundred thousand dollars a year at Kuhn, Loeb Co., for a salary of twelve thousand a year with the System, an instance of his devotion to public service.

(To be continued).

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3).

Party matter. I do not want to involve anybody else in my opinions, and I have taken the opportunity of not consulting my Leader in this House about what I am going to say. He told me that I could say what I liked. I have come to the conclusion that the B.B.C. should be retained in full possession of their present powers, except that they should not have, for any long period, the exclusive right of broadcasting in this country. Under the powers which the Postmaster-General now possesses, I think that, within a reasonable distance of time from now, some station should be either leased or created that would permit of sponsored programmes; but from this station, or from any other station except the B.B.C., I would prohibit Party political broadcasts or broadcasts overseas. I want the B.B.C. to continue to be “the Voice of Britain” overseas.

As regards Party political broadcasts, I do not want any sponsored politics on the air. In this matter, I should declare an interest, because I do not want to see either of the two wealthy Political Parties in this country, the Communists and the Socialists, having an advantage over the Party to which the noble Viscount, Lord Samuel, belongs, or to the Party with which I am associated. Further, I believe that there is much to be said for a wider choice in broadcasting stations. I believe that we should encourage the development of local pride and civic sense in our provincial cities. Edinburgh, Cardiff, Glasgow, Manchester, Liverpool and Belfast are all places that have interests and talents different from those that we find here in the Metropolis. We should be wise to cultivate these national and regional interests, and I wonder whether we could not do this and, at the same time, get away from the broadcasting monopoly that some of us fear.

I am given to understand, though I speak without expert knowledge, that the installation of very-high-frequency stations can be carried out for comparatively small sums, and that there is room for considerable development of broadcasting stations by this means. I see no reason why such stations should not be installed and supported by local

interests. What have we to fear from such freedom arising from the development of a new technique? I believe that by this compromise we could obtain the best of all worlds. The B.B.C. would have nothing to lose; they would remain as the national organisation; they would broadcast to the country; they would broadcast overseas; they would be, and would be recognised by other nations as, “the Voice of Britain”; their revenue would be secure. All the time they would be stimulated to technical advance by the fresh enterprise of the smaller and independent bodies, who would have to be very much alive to retain their place in face of the wealth and the power of this great national organisation. Thirdly, I suggest that, through very-high-frequency broadcasting on a local basis, we should overcome the problems that are worrying us about developing local feeling in the various areas of the country. I will not strain your Lordships’ patience any longer. I have done my best to give your Lordships the views at which I have arrived in the face of many difficulties, difficulties that have been enhanced by my personal admiration for the work of the British Broadcasting Corporation, their staff and their Governors. I have not trespassed on your time to deal with the problems of television, and the relation between films and television, because I believe that other noble Lords more competent than I am, will deal with those subjects.

The Earl of Elgin and Kincardine: . . . The noble Lord, Lord Woolton told us of a very impressive service to which he was privileged to listen on the other side of the Atlantic. I have no doubt that Sir William Haley could give us, through the medium of the B.B.C., just as impressive a service in this country as that the noble Lord listened to in America. But that is not the purpose of these short services in the morning, “Lift up your Hearts.” They are meant just to give us something to think about; and if they end in a quiet moment, so much the better, rather than that we should try to fill up the interval between that and the weather forecast. Also, in my estimation, little improvement can be made at that time upon a careful reading of verses from the Bible. I feel that the noble Lord, Lord Woolton, was perhaps a little unkind in making that comparison to the detriment of the B.B.C.

But there are real dangers in monopoly and in “Londonisation.” They lead to the position which has already been referred to this afternoon, of the B.B.C. becoming an oracle. The noble Lord who sits below me referred to this question, and made special reference to the news service. It is that service which, to my mind, exactly illustrates “Londonisation.” It was, surely, an argument rather against “Londonisation” than for it when the noble Lord said that all regions were provided with five or ten minutes for their regional news, except London. London does not require it, because it has the whole of the national news service given through London spectacles. This looking at things always from the London point of view, to my mind, requires investigation and a new attitude. Why should we always begin our weather forecasts in London? Why not begin in the North, and work Southwards. Why should we think from the London point of view, and concentrate our news efforts within a radius of the home counties?

I should like to give your Lordships two illustrations of items of news in Scotland which were either left out completely from the national broadcast, or were referred to only incidentally. One was very recent. It was a wonderful parade of Scots Guards at Holyrood—something

which we probably shall not see again in our lifetime—when the King himself was to have presented new Colours to the two battalions. That ceremony took place at Holyrood in the morning. There was one sentence about it in the news bulletin at six o'clock. With a message from the King himself, delivered to the country through the mouth of the Duke of Gloucester; with the presence of the two battalions of the Scots Guards; with the presentation of the new Colours and their dedication—surely, that was worthy of a proper reference in the national bulletin. Another similar omission of reference was in the case of the Royal Highland Show at Dundee in 1949. That Show was a record. The attendance at the Show on one particular day beat anything that the Royal Agricultural Society of England has ever put up, which shows the response there was in Scotland. Not a single word was given in the national bulletin about that Show, although Her Majesty the Queen came personally from London to attend it. I give those merely as examples of the kind of thing that shows that we ought to have a different system, and break through the London spectacles through which the news is always given.

Now let me pass to the question, referred to by several speakers, of how we can improve and bring fresh light into the broadcasting service through our suggestion of greater devolution. There are three proposals before us. One is that of the B.B.C., in which they say that the greatest possible devolution is given to the regional controller; that he has complete independence in regard to his programme, except for certain matters; and that he has at his hand the advisory committee. Then we have the Government's proposal in the White Paper that we should have an extra Governor on the B.B.C. responsible for the national regions, who shall be given the help of a national council in the particular country to which he belongs. That has been so much criticised that I do not think I need deal further with it, except to say this. Speaking from the point of view of one who has given a good deal of his life to local government, I feel that those who are elected to local government have "plenty on their plate" without further duties such as are suggested in the Government White Paper. We have suggested that, in addition to the extra Governor, to which the Government agree, the Governor who represents Scotland or Wales should be chairman of a small selected council; and that that selected council should have the power to initiate and propose.

Here I should like to refer to the speech of the noble Lord, Lord Radcliffe, who criticised this council, by saying that I think he criticised it from not quite understanding the whole procedure, or that he forgot that there was a second part to this council—namely, that the Governor himself, as chairman of the council, was a member of the Board of Governors in London; he is the link which brings the two together. Therefore, I think that, although there may be difficulties in the working of the procedure, with good will on both sides there should be the possibility of making it work. I have absolutely no hesitation in saying that, of the three alternatives before us, the one which we propose in the Committee's Report is the one which I recommend. That particular procedure not only gives a greater opportunity to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland if they wish to initiate programmes on their own, but it gives greater opportunity to the producers and artists, who will have the encouragement of alternative employment either with the national region or with the London programme.

I have before me some figures of recent research with regard to the question raised by the noble Lord, Lord Radcliffe, as to whether or not the regions could substantiate and really wish to have their own programmes. In the Report we analyse the figures given in paragraph 228, Table 5, of listeners under the Home Service, the Light Programme and the Third Programme. In that analysis Scotland in 1948 worked out at 44 per cent. for the Home Service, 55 per cent. for the Light Programme and 1 per cent. for the Third Programme. But the figures given to me from Listener Research in June of this year are 52 per cent. for the Home Service, 47 per cent. for the Light Programme and still 1 per cent. for the Third Programme, showing that Scotland, from the listeners' point of view, has gone up in its appreciation of its Home Service to over 50 per cent. That compares with England as a whole for 1948 at 36 per cent. for the Home Service, and 63 per cent. for the Light Programme, and in 1949 at 33 per cent. for the Home Service and 66 per cent. for the Light Programme. I think that is encouraging from the point of view of Scotland taking a personal interest in its own programme. For these reasons I hope that the Government will give careful consideration to this question of devolution and the form it should take, and I sincerely hope that they will finally abandon the question of councils recruited from local authorities.

"Governments" Accept

The following is the text of an announcement issued in Washington for publication on October 11:—

The International Materials Conference announced today that the governments of the countries represented on the Manganese-Nickel-Cobalt Committee have accepted the Committee's recommendation that plans of distribution of nickel and cobalt for the Fourth Quarter of 1951 be put into operation at once. These countries are the following: Belgium (representing BENELUX), Brazil, Canada, Cuba, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, India, Norway, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The plans of allocation have been forwarded to all interested governments for immediate implementation.

In both cases the total available production of primary metal, oxides and salts of all participating countries has been taken into account for distribution: individual allocations represent entitlements for consumption in the fourth quarter, out of domestic production or imports. At the same time the Committee has calculated the net amount that each country shall purchase for import or sell for export during the quarter.

In order to ensure that countries normally importing semi-manufactured products will continue to receive sufficient supplies of these products for essential end uses, the Committee recommended that exporting countries maintain their exports in accordance with normal patterns of trade and at a level commensurate with their allocation.

In accepting the plans of distribution, governments assume the responsibility for seeing that their allocations are

not exceeded and for taking whatever action is necessary to implement the plans.

All countries were urged to adopt measures to eliminate non-essential uses of these metals and to encourage, where possible, their substitution by metals more readily available. In this connection it was recommended that countries using pure nickel or a high nickel alloy for coinage consider the possibility of substituting a down-graded alloy or plated material.

Non-member governments were given an opportunity to supplement the information submitted by them by oral representations to the Committee concerning their individual requirements. It has been provided that all governments will have the right to appeal to the Committee within one month.

In arriving at its conclusions the Committee considered the estimated production and requirements of nickel and cobalt for the fourth quarter of 1951. Its study has shown that, for this period, nickel production is expected to be 31,500 metric tons; total stated requirements amount to 56,800, indicating a deficit of some 25,300 tons. Production of cobalt is estimated at 2,075 metric tons; total stated requirements amount to over 4,000 indicating a deficit of approximately 2,000 tons.

The methods of distribution developed and specific allocations recommended for the fourth quarter of 1951 were not intended to carry any commitment for the future either on the part of the Committee or of the participating governments.

Below are the Allocations of nickel and cobalt for the fourth quarter of 1951.

Allocations of Nickel, Metal, Oxides and Salts and Cobalt Metal, Oxides and Salts for the Fourth Quarter of 1951.

(Unit: Metric Tons)

Country	Total Allocation of Nickel (Metal Content)	Total Allocation of Cobalt (Metal Content)
Argentina	10	2.5
Australia	197	13.3
Austria	225	20.0
Belgo-Lux.Econ.Union	108.5	26.0
Brazil	50	5.1
Canada	750	29.3
Colombia	2.5	0.1
Denmark	22	4.2
Egypt	0.6	—
Finland	24	0.4
France	1,461	75.0
Germany	1,425	127.5
Greece	2	—
India	245	14.1
Italy	265	14.5
Japan	485	60.4
Mexico	8	0.8
Netherlands	66	39.8
Norway	68	3.7
New Zealand	3	14.6
Pakistan	0.5	—
Portugal	4	0.4
Southern Rhodesia	0.7	0.2
Spain	50	5.0
Sweden	736	42.2
Switzerland	113.5	1.9
Turkey	5	1.4
Union of South Africa	16	5.2
United Kingdom	5,088	329.1
United States	19,690	1,212.4
Uruguay	2.5	—
Yugoslavia	30	0.5
Totals	31,153.8	2,049.6

Grand Orient
FREEMASONRY UNMASKED
by MGR. GEORGE E. DILLON, D.D.
From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD. 5/-

Wanted: (New or Second-hand):—Copies of Credit Power and Democracy, Warning Democracy, Control and Distribution of Production—all by C. H. Douglas. Apply this Journal.

BOOKS TO READ
By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....8/6
 Social Credit.....3/6
 The Monopoly of Credit.....(Reprising)
 Credit Power and Democracy.....6/6
 The Big Idea2/6
 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 Constitutionalism6d.
 Security, Institutional and Personal.....6d.
 Reconstruction6d.
 Social Credit Principles1½d.

ALSO

Introduction to Social Credit
 by Bryan W. Monahan.....5/- (cloth 8/6)
 Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....(Cloth Edition) 7/6
 Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...7/-
 On Planning the Earth, by Geoffrey Dobbs.....6/1
 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

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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

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