

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 22. No. 10.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"The British people are willing to endure sacrifices and even hardships to close the dollar gap."—Mr. Harold Wilson, President of the Board of Trade, at Annecy, April 18.

Amidst loud applause, Mr. Wilson then retired to his luxurious hotel in the warm glitter of the spring sunshine where a six course *déjeuner à la fourchette*, washed down by the delicate wines of the Haute-Savoie, was served at the expense of the brave British.

We have seen only one reference to the obvious connection between the delay in passing the Marshall Aid appropriation and the British assurance contained in the Budget that we shall get no benefit from it, but it doesn't matter anyway. We couldn't care less.

Mr. Dean Acheson, the American Foreign Office Head, was secretary to Mr. Justice Brandeis, the Zionist, and, later, Assistant to Henry Morgenthau. He is closely affiliated to Messrs Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and therefore, to Mr. Bernard Baruch.

We agree with our esteemed contemporary *Truth*, that Lord Beveridge's broadcast on the Indian Civil Service is neither an adequate, nor, in some ways, an accurate reply to the egregious attack on the British entitled *Bengal Lights*, to which it made reference. The main inference to be derived from it is that to the competition-examination system, which provided Lord Beveridge's father with an opportunity to reform the millennial civilisation of India, could be attributed the outstanding success of British Administration which did not attempt reformation, more particularly in its earlier days.

No one with any intimate knowledge of India would accept that idea. Almost exactly the reverse was the case, and when, at the beginning of this century, the Soudanese Civil Service was organised, the failure of the competition-examination system was admitted and quite different requirements were added to such as were demanded by orthodox examination.

The real explanation of the illusion of success, in its early days, for the Macauley Trevelyan system was typically British—the examination was heavily weighted in favour of the Classical Scholar, and the Classical Scholar came predominantly from the expensive Public Schools and Oxford with the final polish of a specialist "crammer." (The Cambridge Mathematical Scholar had to be quite exceptional to get a place). And the expensive Public Schools and Oxford were, in the middle of the nineteenth century, largely the home of a cultural caste.

Lord Beveridge, being a good socialist, cannot bear the idea or contemplate the evidence that a caste-culture can have virtues. Yet, if he had that type of mind, there are enough lessons to be learnt from the history of the British in India to demolish nine-tenths of the principles he taught at the London School of Economics.

Who ordered British warships to proceed up a Chinese river giving no room for manoeuvre, with armies actively engaged on either side, and how is it that no air cover was provided?

How is it that the Communist armies are provided with "Field" guns capable of crippling a 10,000 tons cruiser at considerable range, and who supplied those guns, and is keeping them supplied with ammunition?

"The Constitution functions only when the people keep their own money, and dole it out through their own representatives to an executive which takes orders."—*Human Events*, U.S.A.

It is quite remarkable how difficult even intelligent people seem to find the simplest financial theorems. Anything more obvious than that, given the premise that money is *effective* demand, then nationalised money (*e.g.*, the Bank of England) is both nationalised property and absolute centralised economic power, is difficult to contend; but large numbers of "educated" and even politically-minded individuals support, or supported, "the right of the State to be the sole issuer of money" without any real consciousness that they were asking for an absolute dictatorship. And the same people, and perhaps more added to them, are abysmally unconscious that taxation is now simply a device to keep them poor and powerless, not a necessity of "the Government" to provide itself with money. "The Government" does not, in fact, provide itself with one penny of money from taxation; it uses the "money" included in taxation figures to render a visible overdraft invisible ("the repayment of an overdraft destroys a credit").

While the functions and even the capacities of the money system have been warped and distorted perhaps irretrievably, it is still fundamentally true that when any kind of a money system operates in a *free economy*, whoever pays the piper calls the tune. That is the situation which must be restored *at all costs*, if we are to still the devil's bagpipes. It is the failure to grasp the simple proposition which is contained in the preceding paragraphs which is at the root of the devastating ineffectiveness of the "Conservative" Party. The fundamental virtue of genuine Conservatism is that it does, at bottom, believe that "man was born free" (not equal) "and is everywhere in chains." But it then talks about "a strong policy at the centre and freedom at the circumference," which is as much as to say that the rim of a wheel can be independent of the hub. Yet ten men pulling on a rope do not need to be all the same weight.

We are now said to live in a Planned Economy. Never in our whole history, and perhaps nowhere else, have the activities of a population been so misdirected as they are at this time in these islands. Perhaps that is why there is so much listless "work." Why hurry, when you are on the wrong road?

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: April 6, 1949.

Meat Ration

Sir R. Glyn asked the Minister of Food what is the estimated number of persons entitled to the higher scale of meat ration; what quantity of meat is thus supplied weekly; and whether, in view of the reduced meat ration in force today, he will consider the need to permit agricultural workers to be in the higher scale, or to remove all restrictions on pig-keeping by agricultural workers so that they can obtain increased quantities of food.

Dr. Summerskill: The number of consumers who receive individual allowances of meat in excess of the general ration is 1,180,000 involving the issue of 470 tons of meat weekly. In view of the very serious meat supply position, my right hon. Friend regrets that he is unable to allow an increased ration for agricultural workers. An agricultural worker is under less stringent conditions than other pig keepers and is allowed to kill two pigs a year. The restrictions on self-supplier pig-keeping must be maintained for the present in order to prevent abuse.

Mr. Joynson-Hicks: Will the right hon. Lady consider some method of increasing the meat ration for agricultural workers who are unable to keep pigs?

Dr. Summerskill: In the light of the Debate yesterday the hon. Gentleman will agree that things are difficult.

Mr. Odey: Does the right hon. Lady realise that agricultural workers are in a position of special disadvantage as they have no access to works canteens?

Dr. Summerskill: Yes.

Cream (Hill Farms)

Mr. Collins asked the Minister of Food if whilst milk is derationed, he will permit farmers in hill areas who do not sell liquid milk to make and sell cream under conditions similar to those submitted to him in the Exmoor Scheme in 1947.

Dr. Summerskill: It would be difficult to restrict such a concession to isolated farmers and any widespread manufacture of cream would divert milk away from products which are more urgently required. However, we are looking at the question again and I will write to my hon. Friend as soon as I can.

Mr. Collins: Is my right hon. Friend aware that this scheme relates only to those farms which through inaccessibility or for other reasons have never been able to contribute to the general milk pool? Therefore it could not possibly affect the milk ration, but it would help the farmers in such areas.

Dr. Summerskill: I fully realise that, but we are a little fearful lest it might be abused.

Leeward Islands—Oil Boring Project

Major Beamish asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will make a statement on his immediate plans to proceed with under-water boring for oil along the coast of the Leeward Islands; what will be the approximate cost of this project over the next five years; and when boring is to commence.

Mr. Rees-Williams: My right hon. Friend is consulting

the Governor and will communicate with the hon. and gallant Member when his reply has been received.

Major Beamish: Are we really to understand that although the Governor has stated that this is an immediate project, the Colonial Office has no knowledge of it? Is not that a most extraordinary state of affairs?

Mr. Rees-Williams: That is not the case. The Governor has been asked to consult the Director of the British Guiana Geological Survey with regard to taking the necessary steps.

Ways and Means

Considered in Committee.

[Major MILNER in the Chair]

FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC STATEMENT

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Stafford Cripps):

REVENUE

... The total revenue was £4,007 million, or £242 million more than the estimate of £3,765 million. Of this total, Customs and Excise duties accounted for about £1,557 million, a surplus of £10 million over the estimate.

Smokers were responsible for the unprecedented total of £604 million or £24 million above the estimate. On the other hand, the receipts of £418 million from beer and other alcoholic liquors were £23 million less than estimated, due to decreased consumption. Purchase Tax brought in £291 million, a surplus of £9 million over the estimate.

Betting duties produced almost exactly the estimated £23,500,000, though the new licence duty on bookmakers brought in only £1,750,000, compared with the £3 million estimate. This deficiency is partly due to the decline in the number of people employed, which is all to the good, and partly to the bookmakers transferring their activities to the cheaper enclosures. Football pools produced £12,250,000, and totalisators on greyhound racecourses £9,500,000, which was the estimate.

Inland Revenue duties have produced £2,058 million, an increase of £143 million over the estimate of £1,915 million. Stamp duties were £1 million up at £56 million; Surtax £8 million up at £98 million; Profits Tax and Excess Profits Tax together gave £279 million, an increase of £29 million. Income Tax which was estimated at £1,309 million, produced £58 million more, at £1,367 million. Death Duties gave £177 million, an increase of £17 million, due to a somewhat higher level of Stock Exchange prices than had been anticipated. Miscellaneous Duties were £1 million.

The response to the appeal for early payment of the Special Contribution was quite remarkable. There was an immediate response, and altogether the receipts amounted to nearly £80 million in a year, an increase of no less than £30 million over the estimate of £50 million. I should like to pay a tribute to the public spirit of those taxpayers who have contributed to this excellent result. Motor tax brought in £53 million, an increase of £3 million over the estimate. Non-Tax Revenue receipts were £339 million as against the estimate of £253 million. Trading services realised £28 million (£29 million less than estimated), but miscellaneous revenue was £181 million, or £113 million more than the estimate of £68 million. This excess was due to the payment for war stores from India under the settlement concluded last July, which had not been provided for in the Budget.

EXPENDITURE.

If we now turn to the expenditure side we find that, compared with the actual estimate of expenditure of £2,976 million, the out-turn was, in fact, £3,176 million, an increase of £200 million. The cost of interest on National Debt and other Consolidated Fund services, including £23 million for sinking funds, was £542 million, against the estimate of £534 million. The increases on Supply services have already been examined in detail, when the Supplementary Estimates were authorised by the House. The Supplementary Estimates amounted to £309 million. The principal ones were £87 million for Defence, £52 million for food, and £58 million for national health. Set against these increases were savings, amounting in all to £117 million, making a net increase of £192 million, compared with the original Budget provision of £2,442 million.

. . . When I hear people speaking of reducing taxation, and, at the same time, see the costs of the social services rising rapidly, in response very often to the demands of the same people, I sometimes rather wonder whether they appreciate to the full the old adage that "we cannot have our cake and eat it." This last year the people of this country have enjoyed an unexampled national dividend in the form of a free Health Service, at the cost, for the nine months of its operation, of £208 million. [An HON. MEMBER: "Free?"] Free to the individual. [*] Next year, for twelve months, it is estimated to cost £260 million. It is not possible to get increases of benefits of such an order at the cost of the Budget, and, at the same time, to experience decreases in taxation.

We must, therefore, make adequate provision to meet this Government expenditure. It is recurrent expenditure, and forms part of the current standard of life, which, as a community, we have chosen for ourselves. Such expenditure must be paid for out of the current income of the community, by taxation. If we do not do this unflinchingly, we shall face inflation. . . .

. . . The Social Services are a permanent and continuing obligation, and that obligation is one which automatically increases as those services inevitably develop. Let me remind the Committee of some of the bigger social services Estimates for 1949: The two Education services (England and Wales and Scotland) £208 million; the two Health Services (England and Wales and Scotland) £260 million. National Insurance (the contribution of the Exchequer to the Insurance Fund, and the cost of family allowances) £208 million, and National Assistance £87 million. Here, in four blocks of services alone, we have benefits amounting to £763 million.

A great part of this expenditure relieves the individual, or his or her friends and relations, from charges which would otherwise fall upon them. There is a true compensating saving in private and personal expenditure which must be reckoned a real saving to the individual, and this is additional to the benefit of the better services which are made available. But the cost in 1949 is not the end. . . .

These Social Service expenditures will, therefore, inevitably increase over the next five or ten years. In 1946, it was actuarially calculated that the cost of National Insurance benefits would rise from £452 million in 1948 to £545 million in 1958, of which the Exchequer share would rise from £118 million to £190 million. Nothing can stop this, except

the cutting down of the Social Services themselves, and that I do not believe anyone is prepared to recommend, because we all know their immense value to the people of this country.

We must, therefore, recognise the unpleasant fact that these services must be paid for, and they must be paid for by taxation, direct or indirect. . . . as long as the Defence Forces and the Social Services are maintained, whatever Government is in power a very high rate of taxation will continue to be necessary.

When considering this matter, we must bear in mind the very great and highly desirable redistribution of wealth that has already taken place over the last few years within our community. To a large extent, this has resulted from the provision of these extended Social Services—services for the less well to do at the cost of the more well to do—thereby making more equal the shares of the national income enjoyed. This has been a purposeful policy, I think most successfully carried through.

But there is not much further immediate possibility of the redistribution of national income by way of taxation in this country; for the future, we must rely rather upon the creation of more distributable wealth than upon the redistribution of the income that exists. Total taxation, local and national, is now more than 40 *per cent.* of the national income, and at that level the redistribution of income entailed in the payment for Social Services already falls, to a considerable extent, upon those who are the recipients of these services.

We must, therefore, moderate the speed of our advance in the extended application of the existing Social Services to our progressive ability to pay for them by an increase in our national income. Otherwise, we shall not be able to avoid entrenching, to an intolerable extent, upon the liberty of spending by the private individual for his own purposes. Hon. Members will recall that their traditional role is to be the defenders of the taxpayer against the rapacity of the Executive. Over many years now, the widening of the franchise and the introduction of services of immediate personal benefit to the people have naturally led Members on all sides of the House to take a keen interest in services of such benefit to their constituents and to press for their extension.

The roles of the private Member and the Executive in relation to expenditure have thus tended to become reversed. But do not let us forget that the House of Commons' responsibility for finance still remains, and cannot be abrogated, and that while Members may press for all round increases of expenditure, the time comes, as it has come today, when they have the responsibility of finding that money and meeting their own demands. I would venture to hope that, when demanding future increases for the services in which they are interested, hon. Members will keep fully in their minds the other side of their responsibilities. . . .

. . . The Committee will be in no doubt, from what I have already said, that there is no room, this year, for any substantial alterations in taxation in a downward direction. The community as a whole will enjoy extra benefits this year in extended social services and defence measures, and cannot, therefore, have them over again in the form of remission of taxation. There seems to be a curious idea abroad in some people's minds that, as a result of last year, I have available a surplus for disposal. That is, of course, a complete fallacy. That money has all been used up for the intended disinfla-

[*] Compare with the passage so marked below.—Ed.

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. 22. No. 10.

Saturday, May 7, 1939.

Dis-discovery

There is a certain pleasant irony in that it was the "B".B.C. that was the instrument of the escape from cover which occurred last week on the occasion of the Academy Banquet. *The Times*, in the edition we have seen hid its chagrin in observing that "the speeches were broadcast," and said nothing else about them. The Archbishop of Canterbury was dull, and Lord Montgomery duller, although some quarters of the press noticed that (like Mr. Attlee's) his undivided allegiance was no longer to the Sovereign State of once-great Britain. But all the other speakers had some truth to disclose of the kind which rarely reaches the public ear. Mr. Churchill was glad that the Archbishop could sometimes detach himself from philosophical and theological discussions with his "local Dean," and pictured the consequences which might ensue should Cabinet Ministers take up painting, and for example, Mr. Aneurin Bevan paint Mr. Morrison's portrait and *vice versa*. The Lord Chief Justice of England ridiculed Jurisprudence and put in a word or two for Law, besides retailing the old story of the Judge who knew of only one Coliseum, reminded by Counsel "Ah, yes, My Lord. That's in Rome, where the Christians were food thrown to the lions; but there's another, ten minutes' walk from the Trocadero, where the lions throw food to the Christians." We sympathised with the President, an Englishman trying to say what he damn-well meant about something he damn-well knew, and we observed the choice accuracy of his ascription of modern perversion to a propagandist stunt. Now that Cripps is away, can't we have some more such merry occasions?

The London Meeting

Many expressions of satisfaction have been received following the meeting of subscribers to *The Social Crediter* at the Cora Hotel, London, on April 23. Among these is one to which reference will be made later, which draws attention to the difficulty experienced in these difficult times of giving continuous attention, however greatly the individual may wish to do so, to anything which is not on the Planners' agenda. Once lost, freedom is very hard to regain. The people of England have learned that this is so from bitter experience, and there is at least some reaction to the knowledge. "Find out what the enemy wants you to do, and don't do it," is sound strategical and tactical advice. We believe that more people than is apparent are learning to carry it out.

The meeting began soon after 10-15 a.m., and was resumed after lunch. The informal conversations of the

afternoon were not the least useful contributions to the occasion.

After a brief welcome to those present and a definition of the circumstances and intention of the meeting, the chairman read the following message from Major Douglas:—

"Fearnan,

"April 21, 1949

"My dear Tudor Jones,

"In asking you to convey my best wishes and kindest regards to all who attend your conference, may I suggest that a great deal of attention should be focussed by them on the fundamental changes which have been brought about in the Constitution, and, as one aspect, the radical dishonesty which now characterises our politics and finance? Without going further, our so-called democracy is one of the least democratic systems ever current.

"One very important aspect is concerned with the change from individualised credit to collective credit. Without, I hope, being misunderstood, it is clear that such virtues as were possessed by gold coinage, derived from the individual credit it conferred on the possessor.

"At bottom, Social Credit is concerned with the restoration, the atonement, of the individual and his credit, and consequently his individual responsibility. I think it is very important to keep this in mind, because it provides a touchstone both for policies and 'schemes.'

"At the moment, I do not think there is any more vital or promising policy and proposal visible than that of 'The Light Horse.'

"I wish I could convey to your meeting my sense of the obligation it owes to you for your steady, unwavering loyalty to the common objective during these difficult and fateful years.

"Yours most truly,

"C. H. DOUGLAS."

The warm reception given to the reading of this letter, passages from which were repeated by request at a later stage, gave colour to the meeting. It was explained, for the benefit of any who did not know the origin of the phrase as we have applied it to a serious situation, that this arose from a sporting notion that a Light Horse might after all move faster and more surely to the end which the tired multitudes of this world desired than the Heavy Brigade whose movements were occasioning increasing apprehension everywhere. The original questions put to readers of *The Social Crediter*, on Major Douglas's advice, were read, and the way was paved for a discussion of points of tactics, which even the most zealous Social Crediters still find difficult. Great interest was shown in Mr. Hewlett Edwards's reading from his own files of recent correspondence with men to whom the British Broadcasting Corporation accords the 'freedom of the air.' Thereafter, the meeting moved to an informal exchange of experiences 'in the field.'

Various developments arising out of the discussions are being considered, and particularly the possibility of circulating an "Action Bulletin," incorporating as much as possible of the material of Mr. Hewlett Edwards's letters for closer study as a guide to methods of approach. A further point arises from the letter mentioned earlier in this note, which asked for references.

(1) A compilation of references to the Constitutional Issue in *The Social Crediter* from September, 1945, to March,

1948, appeared in *The Social Crediter* for March 20, 1948. A list of *addenda* to this list will be published shortly. (It is emphasised that such lists are firstly to promote and assist study, but that only for the guidance of correct action.)

(2) An example of the first fruits of the interrogation which had been proceeding in the paper, the work of Dr. and Mrs. Geoffrey Dobbs, appeared on March 16, 1948, under the title, "A Political System."

(3) Major Douglas's "Notes for an Address to the Constitutional Research Association: *Realistic Constitutionalism*" appeared in *The Social Crediter* for May 24, 1947, and has been reissued in pamphlet form.

(4) Major Douglas's article on "The Realistic Position of the Church of England" appeared serially in *The Social Crediter*, October 25 to November 22, 1947. This also has been reprinted and is obtainable.

Fagin Again

To the Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

Sir,—The incident in the Berlin cinema which gave rise to the article that appeared on this subject in *The Social Crediter* on March 19 has had some interesting repercussions: the battle for and against the right of Gentiles to learn the historical truth about "Fagin and Co." continues unabated.

When in Denmark recently, the writer noticed that a young journalist on the staff of a newspaper which appears on the tiny island of Aeroe had given an adverse report on the behaviour of the Jews over the Fagin conflict in Berlin. The Danish metropolitan press which, if possible, is even more barren of real news than its London counterpart, took a dark view of the affair and made reference to the necessity for offering apologies to the Jewish community. Back in this country the writer learns from the leading British Zionist journal (*vide The Jewish Chronicle*, April 8) that the

Danish Minister of Justice is to take legal proceedings against *Aeroe Avis*, a provincial paper, for publishing an anti-Semitic article following the prohibition of the showing of *Oliver Twist* in Germany.

The Danish papers were brimful of the momentous signing of the Atlantic Pact which little Denmark and slightly bigger Norway had, with some little effort from outside, been prevailed upon at length to sign, while Sweden, a medium-sized country as countries go, held aloof, having it will be remembered, strong economic ties with the Soviet Bloc. All three (or four, if we include Finland) Scandinavian countries were amongst the first, however, to follow the Americo-Soviet lead of recognising the 'State' of 'Israel.'

But to return to Fagin: The Vienna correspondent of the *Jewish Chronicle* relates (April 8) that "the anti-Semitic newspaper *Alpenruf* (Call of the Alps), published in the British zone of Austria, was recently allowed [*sic*] to see, with British occupation troops in Graz, the film *Oliver Twist*. In a subsequent review in his paper, the critic launched an anti-Semitic tirade of a kind not heard here since the Nazi regime. Dickens, he said, undoubtedly created the figure of Fagin 'in accordance with originals who, in those times, carried on their dirty craft in the notorious quarters of London.' Jewish protests against the showing of the film, he added, were equivalent to a confession of guilt. They created

the impression that the Jews are 'intent on suppressing every memory of their former behaviour' . . ."

The Jewish Chronicle does not comment upon the Austrian journalist's analysis except indirectly by the wording of the heading, "Critic's Outburst." That may be wise, for Dickens himself, will be found to agree substantially with the 'outburst' of the 'anti-Semitic' Austrian journalist, and *The Jewish Chronicle* are not yet prepared to launch an offensive against the opinions and reputations of those 'anti-revolutionary' and/or 'anti-Semitic' writers of the West whose works do not conform to the pattern of the New Order. That no doubt, will come later. And so, while time remains, let us quote the letter written by Charles Dickens on July 10, 1863, to the Jewish lady who protested against his choice of scoundrel (Letters of Charles Dickens, Macmillan, London, 1893, p. 563, quoted in *The Patriot*, April, 1949).

"I hope you will excuse this tardy reply to your letter. It is often impossible for me, by any means, to keep pace with my correspondents. I must take leave to say, that if there by any general feeling on the part of the intelligent Jewish people, that I have done them what you describe as a 'great wrong,' they are a far less sensible, a far less just, and a far less good-tempered people than I have always supposed them to be. Fagin in *Oliver Twist* is a Jew, because it unfortunately was true of the time to which the story refers, that that class of criminal almost invariably was a Jew. But surely no sensible man or woman of your persuasion can fail to observe—firstly, that all the rest of the wicked dramatis-personæ are Christians; and secondly, that he is called the 'Jew' not because of his religion, but because of his race. If I were to write a story, in which I described a Frenchman or a Spaniard as 'the Roman Catholic,' I should do a very indecent and unjustifiable thing; but I make mention of Fagin as the Jew because he is one of the Jewish people, and because it conveys that kind of idea of him which I should give my readers of a Chinaman by calling him Chinese."

And even as we write current events confirm that the Jews, in spite of all the sophisticated explanations of their intellectuals, are, as Dickens pointed out, a people, a racial-national unit, and that their real interest in the Gentile world is what they can get out of it for their own racial-national purposes: what treasures can they bring from the Dispersion back with them to 'Israel.'?

There is, for example, Mr. Stross, "Labour" M.P. for the Hanley Division of Stoke-on-Trent and Medical Advisor to the North Staffs. Milners' Federation who, in his capacity of Chairman of the "Friends of Tel-Aviv Museum," opens his heart to a reporter of *The Jewish Chronicle* and confesses that "we feel that a people who have for 2,000 years absorbed all that Western culture has to offer cannot return to their original [*sic*] home in the Middle East without bringing the fruits of the Diaspora with them," and that he hopes that Old Masters of the best type will find their way to Tel-Aviv, over and above the works of contemporary and deceased Jewish painters. So we can look forward to seeing the stream of old paintings and old furniture that during the last generation has gone from the Old to the New World diverted, or partly diverted to Tel-Aviv, and later, no doubt to Jerusalem.

That was culture. Now politics: Anglo-Saxons who are alive to the 'trends' of the times have been greatly perturbed by the recent absorption of essentially British-stocked

Newfoundland by only partly British stocked Canada. We know that the Zionists of Canada are strong, and that they dominate both the Federal and the Provincial legislatures, Social Credit, or otherwise. The leading Zionist journal comments: "Canada's New Province . . . Canada is now a richer Dominion through the acquisition of Newfoundland. Of course, the first question asked by Jews after any political upheaval is: 'Is it good for our people?'"

Of course . . . Now one of the greatest political upheavals of the pre-1914 period was the Young Turk Revolution of 1907 and what the Jews gained from that upheaval can be imagined from the fact that the Revolution was planned by the Jew-dominated Masonic lodges of Salonica, a town which then possessed a larger 'Jewry' than any other town in the Middle East. Although Turkey for more than a generation has suffered under a process of ruthless 'modernization' at the hands of successive 'Young Turk' Wall-Street-advised governments, the Turkish people and, in a smaller degree, the Turkish press have, till quite recently, sided with the Arabs over the current Soviet-Jewish Revolution in Palestine. Turkey, moreover, long withheld its recognition of 'Israel' but *The Jewish Chronicle* (April 9) announces triumphantly that now that "the Turkish Government has granted recognition of Israel, Turkish political circles and the local press have dropped their former pro-Arab attitude and are paying glowing tributes to the new State of Israel . . . the influential *Vatan* said in an editorial. 'The Modern State of Israel is a natural factor of peace and freedom in the Middle East.' It expressed the belief that Turkey's decision would influence the other Moslem countries to take similar action."

That was 'politics'. Now 'culture-politics': we let the London correspondent of *The Scotsman* (April 13) add the finishing touches to the Turkish picture:—

"Inspired forecasts on both sides that Turkey and Israel will collaborate to help establish East Mediterranean relationships as a necessary pre-condition for a possible Mediterranean Pact accompanied Turkey's *de facto* recognition of Israel last week . . . Though Turkey at one time discouraged Jewish emigration to Israel, a gesture of friendliness is now made by banning the British film *Oliver Twist*."

So we see that Israel is to assist Turkey to bring 'Peace' (Soviet-Jewish variety) to the Middle East through a Mediterranean Agreement so obviously modelled on that Atlantic Pact which has just been signed by a number of countries of different sizes and different quality which, as far as one can see, have only this in common that they all have 'recognised' 'Israel.' It is not without interest that the same issue of *The Jewish Chronicle* which we have quoted above, hails, in a leader-article, the Atlantic Pact as an instrument of Progress and Peace. It would be enlightening to know how many of the Atlantic Bloced "Marshall"-aided countries have been permitted to show the British film version of Dickens' famous novel to their freedom-loving and democratic populations.

I am, etc.,

BORGE JENSEN.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

tionary purposes. It is only on the basis of the anticipated revenue and expenditure for the coming year that tax alterations can be made. There is, indeed, a very good argument for imposing some special charge or tax in connection with

the Health Services, both to help to finance them and to bring home to people generally the simple fact that they have to be paid for out of taxation.[*] It is argued, with some force, that this might help to make people more economical in their use of the Services. But, on the whole, I have come to the conclusion that we should await the outcome of another year before taking any such action, and I hope that there will be such economy in the use of the Services as to make it unnecessary. . . .

Mr. Scollan (Renfrew, Western): . . . I wonder when we shall have a Chancellor of the Exchequer with the courage to tackle No. 1 problem which, apart from the problem of armaments over which we seem to have no control, is that of the National Debt. This is a problem over which we have control. Every year we have to raise £500 million for interest on the National Debt. I wonder when we shall have a Chancellor with the courage to say that he will declare a moratorium on the National Debt, and that there will be no payments of interest for the next few years until the country gets on to its feet. That would be a very revolutionary proposal, but what is the Socialist movement but a revolutionary movement?

Mr. George Wigg (Dudley): . . . I am sure that no right hon. Gentleman on the opposite side of the House would have had the courage to introduce this Budget. I am not surprised about that. My view is that it is a Tory Budget; nevertheless it is a Budget which the Tories would not have had the courage to introduce. . . . I will not accept the unemployment figures at the moment as being a guide. I look in other directions, at the physical assets. Take a look at coal. It is clearly becoming increasingly difficult to get rid of certain kinds of coal. There will be a market for some years for particular kinds of coal, but some of the lower quality kinds cannot be disposed of even now.

Let us look at oil. In May, 1947, an event occurred which I thought at the time marked a turning point in the world economic situation. America became a net importer of oil. Today so much oil is being produced in the Sterling Area that we cannot even store it. A few days ago an announcement was made by the Government that oil conversion, which has been held up for a couple of years, should now be proceeded with. That is a straw in the wind. The process of converting to oil from coal will increase the difficulty of disposing of some kinds of coal and there is a likelihood that within quite a short time we may have difficulty in disposing of this poor quality coal.

I have never believed that this country will be able to dispose of the same quantity of coal as raw fuel as we did before the war. I have always thought that this country's prosperity must be based upon the scientific use of its chief indigenous raw material. Having nationalised the fuel and power industries we should now co-ordinate those industries with the chemical industry and develop a great range of by-products based upon coal. That kind of thing has to be done, but I do not want to wander too much in that direction. If I am right and the Chancellor is wrong, then probably before this year is out there will be unemployment in the coal mining industry because we cannot get rid of the coal we produce. I notice that already the Chancellor has lowered the ceiling of manpower to be taken into that industry. I regard that as significant. I know that at one time there was

[*] Compare with the passage so marked above.

a considerable opinion in the House that more use ought to be made in the mines of foreign workers. At the present moment it is becoming impossible to place the E.V.W.'s already in this country.

... I want to turn to another aspect of the Chancellor's policy. Here again this bears upon the policy of the Minister of Fuel and Power. I think that the Minister of Fuel and Power's proposal to institute a price disincentive for electricity was barmy. I think that events have proved that to be so. It never acted as a price disincentive at all. Electricity consumption went on as before. All that it did was to add a burden to the people who pay their accounts quarterly, while those people with slot machines got away with it. Today we have the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, I think, has been influenced by the same reasons as those which influenced the Minister of Fuel and Power, and he is adopting the same policy about telephones. Those people who pay on the dot through the slot machine get away with it. Those people who pay quarterly are going to be hit.

What I think the Chancellor does not understand—and I remember having an argument with him, or perhaps it is presumption on my part to say that I argued with him because I said what I had to say and he listened—is that he must get away from the idea that there is a considerable section of the community of this country who walk around with suitcases stuffed with pound notes. The overwhelming majority of our people have considerable difficulty in making both ends meet; and, therefore, if in fact we add this price disincentive—this tax, because that is what it is—to the cost of the telephone, I do not think that we shall alter peoples' social habits but only make it more difficult for them to do the things which they have been accustomed to do. I want to raise my voice in protest against what I regard as a quite iniquitous burden not only upon the private person who uses the telephone to communicate with his friends, but also upon the business community. What does it matter to the big business firms with a large turnover? After all the Chancellor is paying for this, because it will come out of the money that would otherwise go in tax; but to the small business man, the garage proprietor, the shopkeeper and others this is an added cost on his business and I think that it is wholly to be deplored. . . .

... I want to conclude on this note: I think that today the Chancellor missed a very great opportunity; not an opportunity of giving great concessions because I do not think they were within his power to give, but what he could have done was to make it clear that the policy that produced the amazing results which are shown in this White Paper—hon. Gentlemen should turn to paragraph 10 where they will see that we have an improvement of over £500 million in the course of a year—were not secured by adopting the policy which he is putting forward today. What is that policy in a nutshell? It is to abandon control and return to the price system. My objection is not to the Chancellor's Budget, but to this policy. For 30 years I have held the view that the pricing system never worked as its admirers said that it did and if it did work at all it worked in such a way as to cause poverty, unhappiness and suffering to millions. As a Socialist, I realised that there was a job for the pricing system to do. It was part of a system of an economic organisation which did not leave us to the mercy of the so-called laws of supply and demand. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has thrown all that away. . . .

English Lawmakers and Scottish Lawyers

The telegram sent to the Prime Minister on April 6, urging that the conditions in which resignations from the Haldane Society occurred afforded evidence which justified the withdrawal of the Legal Aid Bill, was passed by Mr. Attlee to the Lord Advocate for Scotland, the Right Hon. John Wheatley, K.C., M.P.

The sender of the telegram, Mr. John J. Campbell has received from the Lord Advocate a reply asserting that the premise on which Mr. Campbell's argument rests is "completely unsound and incomprehensible," and Mr. Campbell has now relied under date April 26, and has published his reply as a pamphlet. After reviewing the Marxist attitude to Law, Mr. Campbell says:—

"You stress the fact that the Bill is based upon the Rushcliffe and Cameron Reports. On first reading its terms I was suspicious that all blame for the Bill would be placed on the Cameron Committee. I warned the Chairman that he would, undoubtedly, be held responsible in the event of public controversy. In a letter in *The Scotsman* of December 14, 1948, Mr. John Cameron, K.C., as Dean of the Faculty of Advocates, deprecated the lack of consultation with representatives of the Faculty and questioned the urgency with which the Bill was being rushed through the House of Commons. He then stated categorically: 'I wish also to make it clear that the provisions of this Bill are in certain important particulars at variance with the recommendations of the Committee over whom I have the honour to preside.'

"The Government has failed to explain the reason or reasons why the recommendations were not accepted, but no doubt the Report was useful, not so much to provide legal aid to the public, as to serve as a smokescreen to liquidate a noble profession whose freedom and independence of action in defence of public rights are anathema to all true disciples of Marx. That, in a nutshell, is the real explanation of the Bill and to attempt to deny it is tantamount to impugning the known truth."

Further extracts are as follows:—

"It is extremely disappointing to read in Hansard that both the Solicitor-General and yourself have persisted in claiming that the legal profession of Scotland had expressed approval of the general principles embodied in the Bill. A definite attempt was also made by you to show that, in consulting the representatives of various Societies, confidentiality was to extend to and not beyond the members of the Society or their Council. This assertion has been flatly contradicted at Special General Meetings by the representatives of the legal bodies who were in consultation with you. It is in this atmosphere of suspicion and distrust that you have now made it clear that, notwithstanding the opposition of the profession, you may find it necessary to impose upon Scotland a Public Legal Aid Service.

"It is perhaps fortunate that the profession should find itself faced with a definite threat from H.M. Government. It must, however, be understood, that such threats will not be sufficient inducement to weaken opposition to the Bill. It is not yet too late for H.M. Government to withdraw the Bill and if it is sincere in wishing to adjust a satisfactory legal aid service with the legal profession, then the latter is willing, as it always has been, to enter wholeheartedly into a scheme which will give the public all the service necessary, and at the same time retain the independence and dignity which it has enjoyed down through the centuries. Recent

attempts by the Government to impose upon workers, without consultation, conditions of work, have rightly been met, on the part of the Trade Unions concerned, by the threat of refusal of co-operation. Is there any good reason why the rights of Trade Unionists should not be shared by the profession to which you and the Solicitor-General belong? . . .

"I do not believe that the vast majority of Labour Members of Parliament and their supporters realize that they are unwittingly paving the way for the seizure of power by revolutionary forces inside the Socialist movement and facilitating the successful establishment of a totalitarian régime which, in its final stages, will effectively destroy the Labour Party of Great Britain as surely as it has liquidated all the Socialist parties behind the Iron Curtain. . . ."

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The following Groups and Associations are registered as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

GREAT BRITAIN

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
- BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. A. Crothers, 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
- BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
- BRADFORD D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
- CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
- GLASGOW D.S.C. Group: W. Forrester, 81 Mitchell Street, Glasgow, C. 1.
- LIVERPOOL D.S.C.A. Hon. Sec., Mrs. Trayler, 67, Caldwell Road, Liverpool, 19.
- LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
- MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
- NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., T. H. Rea, 23 Clarewood Place, Fenham, Newcastle, 5.
- PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., F. G. Feather, 7, Drake Road, Westcliffe-on-Sea, Essex.
- SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19, Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.
- STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.
- Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), WOKING, and in BERKSHIRE. The last mentioned is a Services Group. Enquiries concerning all these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

EUROPE Hon. Secretary.

COPENHAGEN D.S.C. Group. J. P. Gjerulff.

AUSTRALIA

New South Wales

- THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL CREDITER (H. A. Scoular, Editor).
- D.S.C.A. AND ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN OF N.S.W. Miss K. W. Marlow.
- SYDNEY D.S.C. Group Miss Grace Marsden.
- DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH Roy Gustard.
- COWPER D.S.C. Group J. McDonald.
- NEWCASTLE (N.S.W.) D.S.C. Group B. V. Murray.
- BELMONT D.S.C. Group S. H. Morrow.

BATHURST D.S.C. Group.
SUTHERLAND V.P.A.

R. R. Brazier.
W. Prescott.

South Australia

ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group
GLENELG D.S.C. Group

C. H. Ailen.
E. C. Finn.

Western Australia

PERTH D.S.C. Group
EAST PERTH V.P.A.

W. F. Andrews.
F. Jones.

Queensland

QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association

A. W. Noakes.

Victoria

HEADQUARTERS Group
MELBOURNE D.S.C. Groups:

L. C. Hargreaves.

A Group
B Group
C Group

A. J. O'Callaghan.
F. C. Paice.
Miss G. F. Greig.

Tasmania

HOBART D.S.C. Group

James Guthrie.

NEW ZEALAND

PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association
AUCKLAND D.S.C. Group
PEREOA P.O. Box 47

G. J. Billingham.
Mrs. W. James.
H. A. Hamilton.

CANADA

- Honorary Affiliate: The Douglas Social Credit Council of Alberta.
- OTTAWA (Parliamentary) D.S.C. Group
- OTTAWA D.S.C. Bureau of Canada Ralph L. Duclos, Pres.
- VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group J. Vans Macdonald.
- LIVERPOOL (Nova Scotia) D.S.C. Group T. E. D. Watson.
- SOUTH EDMONTON (Alberta) D.S.C. Group R. H. Ashby.

To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

*Associations desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in the following:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members

of Association

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat.†

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy for every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Deputy's Signature.....

To accompany the above form, a brief statement is requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,

Director of Organisation and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.