

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 10.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

"That the peoples may become accustomed to obedience it is necessary to inculcate lessons of humility, and *therefore to reduce the production of articles of luxury.* . . .

"Unemployment is a most perilous thing for a Government. For us, its part will have been played out the moment authority is transferred into our hands."—*Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, No. 23.* (Emphasis added).

But of course the relationship works both ways. The moment "unemployment" has played out its part, and the production of articles of luxury is reduced, it will be obvious that authority has been transferred into "our" hands.

• • •

THE DAY'S LITTLE JOKES: "The flag of the United States . . . er . . . Nations was hoisted over Woolwich Town Hall."

"Lord Justice Cohen has been appointed Chairman of the Committee on Taxation. The remainder of the Committee will be published later."—"B" B.C. News Bulletin, 6 p.m., October 24.

" . . . encroachments on the freedom and dignity of men were so habitually ignored in the storm of wars that by the opening of Victoria's reign England had become the Two Nations of Disraeli's novels. It was not so in 1688. Real wages were then far higher than in 1939, cottage industries were the basis of the economic order, and the completely landless labourer was still the exception rather than the rule. One hundred and eighty thousand families, a sixth of the entire population, were yeomen [freeholder] farmers. . . . Of the town dwellers, about a million and a half in all, the overwhelming majority were free men economically."—*England: Past, Present, and Future.* Douglas Jerrold, p. 102.

The Bank of England was founded in 1694, and the rise of the Rothschilds practically coincided with the consolidation in England of the Hanoverian dynasty.

• • •

"The appointment of Marshall was a complete and total victory for the secret government and the Acheson gang.

"However distinguished and bedecorated a citizen Marshall may be, his entire career in later years has been one of subservience to the secret government and the political gang. It must have galled him considerably as a man, deliberately to have lied—under orders to do so—about his lack of knowledge of the impending attack on Pearl Harbour. He was as guilty of that outrage as F.D.R. or anyone else.

"Later on he sold out to Chiang Kai-shek and China at the order of 'his bosses.' A fact that is not generally known is that at the conclusion of the war against Japan, tens of

millions of dollars' worth of equipment destined for Nationalist China, including tons of badly needed ammunition, was destroyed — blown up or sunk — by direct order of Marshall. As a result of this unforgivable destruction, thirty-nine of Chiang's crack divisions were immobilized and put on garrison duty. Chiang ran out of ammunition, which, more than anything else, is why he lost the war.

"Coupled with this, of course, was the fact that the same State Department gang, bent on turning China over to the Soviets, gave mountains of ammunition, weapons and munitions of every sort to Russia and the Chinese Communists. They got practically all of the huge supplies that the Japanese had in Korea, Manchuria and China.

"To-day's war in Korea is directly due to F.D.R., the secret government and 'the gang,' through their giving the Soviets the right to occupy the northern half of Korea. Had it not been for the senseless, the totally unnecessary gift to Russia of Manchuria and North Korea, we would not now be in war there. The considerable cost in American lives and blood, and the tremendous cost in wealth, can be blamed directly on the wreckers in our government.

"No matter how quickly or how completely MacArthur defeats the North Korean Reds, we will incur the undying enmity of Koreans, both North and South. The people will not consider us as liberators. . . ."—*American Intelligence Agency, N.Y.*

• • •

"Neither he [Gladstone] nor his rival and enemy Disraeli appreciated one half as clearly as the queen the implications of the liberal sentiments with which they decorated their perorations. With every gesture of austere wisdom, but with virtually no understanding of the issues involved, they raced each other down the slope which was leading to the impossible experiment of an unlimited democracy operating an unwritten constitution."—*England, Past, Present, and Future,* Douglas Jerrold.

### The State of Belgium.

An "intelligence digest" which is widely circulated discusses in its October issue the recent crisis in Belgium stating *inter alia* that the Belgian police are badly informed about "these undesirables who were the hard core of anti-Leopold action. *Internal security* is very badly organised."

Compare the following from *The Jewish Chronicle* for August 14, 1950:—"It is noteworthy that the King was met at Levère airport on his arrival from Geneva by General A. Rosenbaum, a Jew who commands the Belgian forces of the Interior and who was responsible for all security measures."

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Lords, October 17, 1950.*

### Russian Inspectors in British Factories

*Lord Vansittart:* My Lords, I beg to ask the Question which stands in my name on the Order Paper.

[The Question was as follows:

To ask His Majesty's Government for what precise and specific reason Soviet inspectors are allowed into British factories when no reciprocal facilities have ever been or are ever likely to be given.]

*The Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Transport (Lord Lucas of Chilworth):* My Lords, Russian inspectors are allowed into factories in this country where the firms concerned have agreed to extend the facilities for inspection which are normal commercial practice in the case of machinery which has to be built to a particular specification. It is often to the advantage of the firm to allow inspection because it makes easier agreement about alterations to specification during manufacture, and it avoids disputes later about the condition of the goods before despatch. These arrangements are a private affair between the firm and the Russian purchasing organisation concerned.

The only justification for intervention by His Majesty's Government would be to ensure that special precautions were taken in establishments where Government orders of a secret nature were concerned. In such cases His Majesty's Government have made arrangements, which are very tight indeed, with a view to ensuring that no visits made by Russian agents or any other representatives to any firm which has such Government contracts involve access to information of a secret nature. The question of reciprocity does not arise because we do not buy goods from Russia where inspection of this kind is necessary.

*Lord Vansittart:* My Lords, I should like to ask the noble Lord one other question to clarify my own mind and, I think, that of the public too. Is it a fact that any firm can refuse the facilities in circumstances where it deems that they may be dangerous?

*Lord Lucas of Chilworth:* As I have said, these arrangements are a private affair between the firm and the Russian purchasing organisation concerned. Any firm is quite at liberty to refuse not only Russian inspectors but any other kind of inspectors.

*Lord Vansittart:* That, of course, is much more satisfying. I thank the noble Lord.

*House of Commons: October 18, 1950.*

### Non-Self-Governing Territories

*Mr. Russell* asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies why His Majesty's Government has changed its policy towards the United Nations special committee on non-self-governing territories.

*Mr. J. Griffiths:* Our representative made it clear at the recent session of this committee that we are still unable to accept the view that the Charter makes us accountable to the United Nations for the administration of the colonial territories—other than trust territories—and he suggested that further sterile discussions turning on this question should

be avoided and that the committee should instead concentrate on a constructive interchange of ideas and experience. Other members responded to this suggestion, and our representative was able to make what we believe was a helpful as well as a positive contribution to the ensuing discussions.

*Mr. Russell:* Is the right hon. Gentleman quite satisfied this change of policy will not mean that a number of foreign countries with no interest in the Colonies at all will be able to pry into their activities and administration?

*Mr. Griffiths:* I do not think it can be described as a change of policy.

### Press Advertising

*Mr. Boyd-Carpenter* asked the Minister of Food whether it was with his approval that an advertisement, entitled "Food Facts, No. 528," containing controversial matters, was inserted by his Department in the national Press.

*Mr. Webb:* Yes; but I cannot agree that the information given is controversial.

*Mr. Boyd-Carpenter:* Does the right hon. Gentleman recall that the advertisement has a paragraph headed "Why sugar is short," and that it contained the statement that the present supply is really all that the country can get? Is not the right hon. Gentleman aware from the Debates in this House that that is a highly controversial statement, which should not be financed from public funds?

*Mr. Webb:* I do not agree that it is a controversial statement at all. It is a statement of fact.

*Colonel Stoddart-Scott:* Ask the West Indies.

*Mr. Webb:* What a stupid interruption. We now get every ounce of sugar we can outside the dollar area. Within the dollar area there is some sugar, but we have not got the dollars for it. After all, the Opposition must make up their minds. They cannot close the dollar gap and find dollars for timber for 300,000 houses and for newsprint for newspapers, and still obtain extra sugar.

*Mr. W. Fletcher:* As the right hon. Gentleman is profiteering in cocoa by selling it to the monopolists at the highest possible price for dollars could he not get a few dollars out of it to pay for more sugar?

*Mr. Boyd-Carpenter:* Arising out of the right hon. Gentleman's initial answer, may I ask whether he does not consider that he is in a very difficult position in judging whether or not such an issue is controversial? Is it not quite wrong that the Minister should have to decide whether an issue affecting his own Department is controversial or not?

*Mr. Webb:* If we entered into an argument at Question time as to what is fact and what is opinion I would be ruled out of order, but I should like to debate it with the hon. Member any time he likes.

*Mr. Osborne:* Is it not the case that if production were increased generally we could have more timber for houses and more sugar?

*Mr. Speaker:* This seems to be becoming more of a Debate than the asking of questions for information.

### Sugar

*Sir Ian Fraser* asked the Minister of Food when he

anticipates he will be able to abolish sugar rationing and sweet rationing.

*Mr. Webb*: I see no early prospect of doing this, I am afraid. But when it is possible, nothing will give me greater pleasure.

*Sir I. Fraser*: Is there not plenty of sugar now?

*Mr. De la Bère*: The position is thoroughly unsatisfactory.

### Sugar Ration

*Mr. Morley* asked the Minister of Food when the sugar ration will be increased.

*Mr. Webb*: The effect of the Korean crisis on the world sugar markets has been virtually to exhaust supplies of sugar from sterling and dollar sources alike. I am buying all available supplies from the Commonwealth and home sources but for the time being I can hold out no prospect of increasing the ration.

### Aliens

*Mr. Proctor* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that many aliens, particularly from Eastern Europe, who came to the United Kingdom during the war years and subsequently, arrived in parties and were not interviewed individually by immigration officers at the port of arrival; and what steps he is taking in the interests of security to review the position.

*Mr. Ede*: For security purposes, arrangements are being made to obtain at a personal interview by immigration officers further information about the aliens who, for the most part, came to this country during and since the war in large groups and were not given a personal examination at the ports of landing.[\*] The collection of this information will take some time and each individual concerned will receive a notice telling him where the interview will take place.

### British Transport Commission

*The Minister of Transport (Mr. Barnes)*: . . . I now turn to the actual balance sheet figures. The deficit for 1949, as everyone is aware, is £20.8 million. Last year there was a deficiency of £4.7 million, which means that the cumulative deficiency has now reached £25.5 million. The main causes of this deficiency can be found in two large items, the decline in railway passenger receipts of £8 million and a decline in general merchandise receipts of more than £4 million, making £12 million in all. If my previous arguments have been followed, we can see the connection between the two considerations. It has been the expansion of road transport services on the public service vehicle side that has reacted on the passenger receipts and it has been the enormous growth, particularly of the C licence fleet, which has reacted on general merchandise. . . .

*Mr. Peter Thorneycroft (Monmouth)*: . . . The right hon. Gentleman said, quite truly, that the technical side of the railways was being very well done. I agree with him. I think they have got some fine technicians in our railway system. They are absolutely first-class men. I do not think it is the technical side that is wrong. It is the commercial

and administrative side that is wrong. Let me take two points to which the right hon. Gentleman himself referred; I will take the railway passenger side to start with. I can remember my right hon. and learned Friend and myself making speeches over a year ago when we said that the key to the problem was on the railway passenger side, and prophesied that the railways would go on losing money as long as they were carried on with those charges. We did not get an answer. The matter was not even referred to in the Minister's speech. But we were right.

This is what happened. They had a further decline of £8½ million in their receipts per loaded train mile, and they have since fallen by another 12.2 per cent. I said that they had priced themselves out of the market, and I still think they have done so. The Commission say that it is due to a decline in the number of persons willing to spend their holidays away from home. I would beg the Commission to "Come off it," if I may use that expression. The answer is that everybody likes to spend his holiday away from home, but everybody cannot always afford the railway fares to do so.

Then I come to the question of the uneconomic line. We want to know what the Government are going to do about that. I know the difficulties about the uneconomic line. But is the right hon. Gentleman satisfied that there are only 36 miles of uneconomic line? That is all he closed. I agree there has to be a full local inquiry. Great efforts have got to be made to supply the alternative means of transport, but the worst thing to do is to do what the right hon. Gentleman and the Commission are doing—continuing to spend money on the uneconomic line and sitting and dithering instead of making up their minds. That is how they are losing their liquid capital. The right hon. Gentleman has only got to read the Report to realise that it is no good just leaving the matter as it is.

There is a whole page in the Report which says what measures are being taken to attract passenger traffic. What are they? A Press conference is held to initiate the winter campaign. Of what interest is that to the passengers? What the passengers want are lower fares. I do not think there will be an improvement until there are lower fares. I think the passengers are right about that. They cannot afford the fares.

My next point relates to freight, in which there has been another decline of £4 million. I know the difficulties which the railways face, but I have talked to many industrialists—as many as I can—on the question of how their goods are carried. I find an increasing disposition on the part of industrialists to say that they cannot risk their goods on the railways. I argue the other side [*Laughter.*] Of course I argue the other side. Who will be able to handle the transport problem until the railway problem is solved? An industrialist was talking to me the other night; his goods had been delivered in Grimsby instead of Southampton and he lost an important export order in America. . . .

. . . I pass to an Executive which the right hon. Gentleman did not refer to. It is quite a big one—the Hotels Executive. I must say that I am sympathetic to the Hotels Executive, for they have a certain charm. They have just carried out a full and detailed survey of their problems

[\*] They are said to number 200,000 (Editor, T.S.C.)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*  
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.  
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTral 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFTon Park 435.

Vol. 25. No. 10.

Saturday, November 4, 1950.

### Security.

Gustav V, King of Sweden "and of the Goths and Wends," was, says *The Times*, great-grandson of the Marshal Prince of Ponte Corvo, founder of the house of Bernadotte.

• • •

Bruno Pontecorvo left Italy in 1936 "to escape Mussolini's anti-Jewish persecution (*vide Daily Express*, October 27). This is the only suggestion we have seen that the vanished Liverpool professor is Jewish. Also we have not seen elsewhere than in the *Liverpool Daily Post* a photograph of the professor taken during his holiday in Italy, which might be said to represent him "shielding his face with his hand." This photograph we take to be one of the signs of a certain hesitation on the part of newspapers concerning the "line" they should take in front of the public.

• • •

Press reports do not afford a wide variety of choice; but, if asked to enumerate the points of interest concerning the newspaper treatment of the case, in order of their importance, we should do so as follows:—

(1) The universal acceptance of the theory that academic refugees from Hitler's tyranny (or Mussolini's) are, as a class, exceptionally able scientific investigators, surpassing in number and quality, actual or potential, the indigenous supply available.

(2) General acceptance of the implication to be drawn from the fact that only minor officials of the University of Liverpool are quoted—*e.g.*, for the statement that on his first visit to Liverpool the professor displayed great anxiety to find a house, but on the second waived the matter aside by saying that it could wait until nearer January. The public doesn't expect universities to know much about the people they employ—how can they, since the matters they are engaged upon are secret?

(3) Complete absence from all the comments of those matters which the compilers of the Canadian Royal Commission Report on espionage in Canada thought to be of major interest and importance — namely the psychological background of treason among intellectuals.

(4) Loyalty?—"Either a man is a foreign agent or he is not. You just have to accept his word" (A statement attributed by the *Sunday Express* to "one of the most eminent of the foreign-born atom scientists in Britain"). We couple the assertion with the official proposal to interrogate the immigrants admitted to this country in recent years with-

out their being asked any questions. They are said to number 200,000. Even at its present rate of increase, the number of professors in Great Britain cannot greatly exceed two thousand, which is a hundredth part of 200,000. What would be the good of interrogating them? Very little, as the newspapers seem to be agreed.

Having disposed of the more trivial comments in our mind, may we return to point (1) of our inventory?

"Top-ranking" physicists (called 'atom scientists' in the newspapers) are now being produced by the dozen if not by the hundred—or, for all we know, by the thousand, from stock which was in former times certainly not more prolific in the commodity than our countrymen. In past times a genius or two was more than enough for a generation; and now dozens do not suffice for a decade. The notion of a sudden 'mutation' in favour of greater intelligence in the human community is one which, frankly, we dismiss, as we do all those we meet whom we deem to be sensible and observant people. The phenomenon calls for examination and full and free expression of the results. We cannot but think that we should have the approval of the wise and witty Francis for our assertion that it is more than probable that the more intelligent, as well as the wiser, among the moderns are not to be found among the so-called scientists, and that, in fact, their cleverness is a very superficial thing, and far less productive of results, not merely good results but results of any distinct and positive kind, than is supposed. For it was he, the wise and witty, who said: "for my way of discovering sciences goes far to level men's wits, and leaves but little to individual excellence; because it performs everything by the surest rules and demonstrations. And therefore attribute my part in all this, as I have often said, rather to good luck than to ability, and account it a birth of time rather than of wit. For certainly chance has something to do with men's thoughts, as well as with their works and deeds." So far from being the rarest, we suggest that enquiry would soon reveal the sort of ability that goes with the engineering of atomic bombs (or atomic motor-cars) one of the commonest in our own as in other modern communities.

And then about item (2): We suggest to the "security police" that a simple perusal of a collection of university minutes, following a selected thousand of recent appointments to their source, would, without a single interrogation, automatically reveal that source (one source) This result would scarcely be secured, of course, if the security merchants were obsessed with the notion that mathematical physics is the only subject with dangerous potentialities. It is possibly the most narrowly dangerous.

### SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of *annual* subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.

### Dr. Levy's Letter to Mr. Pitt-Rivers.

Dr. Oscar Levy's letter from which extracts appear below is probably the most complete reply to the enquiry, why do we attack the Jews: *i.e.*, why do we defend the gentiles? The date of the letter is in July, 1920, when the writer, a Jew of standing and well-known in literary circles, so replied to Mr. G. Pitt-Rivers who had sent him, in manuscript before publication, his brochure *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution*. We commend Dr. Levy's words to the study of all our readers:—

"Dear Mr. Pitt-Rivers: When you first handed me your MS. on *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution*, you expressed a doubt about the propriety of its title. After a perusal of your work, I can assure you, with the best of consciences, that your misgivings were entirely without foundation. No better title than *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution* could have been chosen, for no event in any age will finally have more significance for our world than this one. We are still too near to see clearly this Revolution, this portentous event, which was certainly one of the most intimate and therefore least obvious, aims of the world-conflagration, hidden as it was at first by the fire and smoke of national enthusiasms and patriotic antagonisms.

"It was certainly very plucky of you to try and throw some light upon an event which necessarily must still be enveloped in mist and mystery, and I was even somewhat anxious lest your audacity in treating such a dangerous subject would end in failure, or what is nearly the same, in ephemeral success. No age is so voracious of its printed offspring as ours. There was thus some reason to fear lest you had offered to this modern Kronos only another mouthful of his accustomed nourishment for his immediate consumption.

"You rightly recognise that there is an ideology behind it (the Russian Revolution), and you clearly diagnose it as an ancient ideology. There is nothing new under the sun, it is even nothing new that this sun rises in the East. . .

"For Bolshevism is a religion and a faith. How could these half-converted believers even dream to vanquish the 'Truthful' and the 'Faithful' of their own creed, these holy crusaders, who had gathered round the Red Standard of the prophet Karl Marx, and who fought under the daring guidance of these experienced officers of all latter-day revolutions—the Jews? . . .

"There is no race in the world more enigmatic, more fatal, and therefore more interesting than the Jews. Every writer, who, like yourself, is oppressed by the aspect of the present and embarrassed by his anxiety for the future, *must* try to elucidate the Jewish Question and its bearing upon our Age. For the question of the Jews and their influence on the world past and present, cuts to the root of all things, and should be discussed by every honest thinker, however bristling with difficulties it is, however complex the subject as well as the individuals of this Race may be.

"For the Jews, as you are aware, are a sensitive community, and thus very suspicious of any Gentile who tries to approach them with a critical mind. They are always inclined — and that on account of their terrible experiences — to denounce anyone who is not with them as against them, as

tainted with 'medieval' prejudice, as intolerant Antagonist of their Faith and of their Race.

"Nor would I deny that there is some evidence, some *prima facie* evidence of this antagonistic attitude in your pamphlet. You point out, and with fine indignation, the great danger that springs from the prevalence of Jews in finance and industry, and from the preponderance of Jews in rebellion and revolution. You reveal, and with great fervour, the connection between the Collectivism of the immensely rich international Finance—the democracy of cash values, as you call it—and the international Collectivism of Karl Marx and Trotsky—the Democracy of any by decoy cries. . . . And all this evil and misery, the economic and political, you trace back to one source, to one *fons et origo malorum*—the Jews.

"Now other Jews may vilify and crucify you for these outspoken views of yours; I myself shall abstain from joining the chorus of condemnation! I shall try to understand your opinions and your feelings, and having once understood them . . . I can defend you from the unjust attacks of my often too impetuous Race. But first of all, I have to say this: There is scarcely an event in modern Europe that cannot be traced back to the Jews. Take the Great War that appears to have come to an end, ask yourself what were its causes and its reasons: you will find them in nationalism. You will at once answer that nationalism has nothing to do with the Jews, who as you have proved to us, are the inventors of the international idea. But no less than Bolshevist Ecstasy and Financial Tyranny can National Bigotry (if I may call it so) be finally followed back to a Jewish source. . . .

"The great question, however, is whether the Jews are conscious or unconscious ones, but please do not think that I wish to exonerate them on that account. . . . A conscious evildoer has my respect, for he knows at least what is good; an unconscious one—well he needs the charity of Christ—a charity which is not mine—to be forgiven for not knowing what he is doing. But there is in my firm conviction not the slightest doubt that these revolutionary Jews do not know what they are doing; that they are more unconscious sinners than voluntary evildoers.

"I am glad this is not an original observation of mine, but that you yourself have a strong foreboding about the Jews being the victims of their own theories and principles. On page 39 of your pamphlet you write: 'It may be that the Jews have always been instrumental in bringing about the events that they most heartily disapprove of; that maybe is the curse of the Wandering Jew.' If I had not the honour, as well as the pleasure of knowing you personally, if I were not strongly aware of your passionate desire for light and your intense loathing of unfairness, this sentence, and this sentence alone, which tells the truth, will absolve you in my eyes from the odious charge of being a vulgar anti-Semite.

"No, you are not vulgar, you are a very enlightened critic of our Race. For there is an anti-Semitism, I hope and trust, which does the Jews more justice than any blind philo-Semitism, than does that merely sentimental 'Let-them-all-come Liberalism,' which in itself is nothing but the Semitic Ideology over again. And thus you can be just to the Jews without being 'romantic' about them.

"You have noticed with alarm that the Jewish elements

provide the driving forces for both Communism and capitalism for the material as well as the spiritual ruin of this world.

"But then you have at the same time the profound suspicion that the reason for all this extraordinary behaviour may be the intense Idealism of the Jew. In this you are perfectly right. . . . From Moses to Marx, from Isaiah to Eisner, in practice and in theory, in idealism and in materialism, in philosophy and in politics, they are today what they have always been; passionately devoted to their aims and to their purposes, and ready, nay, eager, to shed their last drop of blood for the realisation of their visions.

"'But these visions are all wrong,' you will reply. . . . 'Look where you have led the world to. Think, that they have now had a fair trial of 3,000 years' standing. How much longer are you going to recommend them to us and to inflict them upon us? And how do you propose to get us out of the morass into which you have launched us, if you do not change the path upon which you have led the world so disastrously astray?'

"To this question I have only one answer to give, and it is this: 'You are right.' This reproach of yours, which—I feel it for certain—is at the bottom of your anti-Semitism, is only too well justified, and upon this common ground I am quite willing to shake hands with you and defend you against any accusation of promoting Race Hatred: If you are an anti-Semite, I, the Semite, am an anti-Semite, too, and a much more fervent one than even you are. . . . We (Jews) have erred, my friend, we have most grievously erred. And if there was truth in our error 3,000, 2,000, nay, 100 years ago, there is now nothing but falseness and madness, a madness that will produce an even greater misery and an even wider anarchy, I confess it to you, openly and sincerely, and with a sorrow, whose depth and pain an ancient Psalmist, and only he, could moan into this burning universe of ours. . . . We who have posed as the saviours of the world, we who have even boasted of having given it 'the' Saviour, we are today nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, its incendiaries, its executioners. . . . We who have promised to lead you to a new Heaven, we have finally succeeded in landing you in a new Hell. . . . There has been no progress, least of all moral progress. . . . And it is just our morality, which has prohibited all real progress, and—what is worse—which even stands in the way of every future and natural reconstruction in this ruined world of ours. . . . I look at this world, and I shudder at its ghastliness; I shudder all the more as I know the spiritual authors of all this ghastliness. . . .

"But its authors themselves, unconscious in this as in all they are doing, know nothing yet of this startling revelation. While Europe is aflame, while its victims scream, while its dogs howl in the conflagration, and while its very smoke descends in darker and even darker shades upon our Continent, the Jews, or at least that part of them and by no means the most unworthy ones, endeavour to escape from the burning building, and wish to retire from Europe into Asia, from the sombre scene of our disaster into the sunny corner of their Palestine. Their eyes are closed to the miseries, their ears are deaf to the moanings, their heart is hardened to the anarchy of Europe; they only feel their own sorrows, they only bewail their own fate, they only sigh under their own burdens. . . ."

## PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3).

—a kind of national "pub crawl"—and the effect upon their moral fibre has been considerable, because they have adopted a royal blue flag for their Executive, with a gold steering wheel in the centre. One cannot help liking them. But that has been a very expensive tour because it has reduced the net receipts last year from £103,000 to a net deficit of £47,000.

I would say to the right hon. Gentleman, for heaven's sake wind up the Hotels Executive. What good does it do? Why put this added burden on the industry? Either sell the hotels out to private enterprise or give them back to the railways to run. There is no need to have a separate Executive to make a loss on the restaurant cars. The railways will do that for us. I leave the Hotels Executive with that plea that they should be wound up—or some reason for their existence advanced before the conclusion of the Debate—and turn to the London Transport Executive.

All I want to say about them is that I have never known anything more complacent than their report. They start by saying,

"The year 1949 was one of steady progress. . . . But if one reads on—and by that time, they seem to expect one to have become rather weary—one finds everything was worse. They went much further; they carried fewer passengers; their passenger traffic receipts were down; their receipts per car mile were down; and the whole dismal process resulted in a whacking increase on the travelling public in London. If that is a year's steady progress, let us have a reactionary Executive.

I apologise for mentioning all these Executives but I feel somebody must deal with them, however briefly, and I also feel that somebody must deal with the Docks Executive. I turn to that next. Their report is a very unsatisfactory piece of work. Their job is not just to carry out executive functions on the old railway docks. Their job, which I think, they have forgotten, is to get in revenue from the trade harbours of this country. What I want to know is—what any reasonable man would want to know—whether we are turning the ships round as quickly as we can in the trade harbours. That is one vital question the answer to which everybody wants to know who is interested in trade prosperity.

I have received some figures on this matter from the National Chamber of Shipping. I have got figures which are for bulk cargoes of wheat, barley, and maize, and comparative tonnages, and the times given are for the times from the commencement to the completion of the discharge. The English figures are for Hull, Avonmouth, Manchester, and Liverpool. The German figures are for Hamburg, Bremen, and Emden. The times are three and a half days, five days, seven and a half days, four and a half days, seven and a half days and four and a half days. The German times are one day, two days, and one and a half days.

These figures mean that a certain investigation is worth while. This is only a narrow cross-section. I do not put it forward as any more than that, but I have been given the assurance that the greatest trouble was taken to compare like with like and to get comparative cargoes. In next year's Report, if the Docks Executive are still there—and they may be—let us have the official figures on this matter. Let us

see if we are competitive in fact with those ports on the German coast, because if we are not effectively competitive in docks efficiency we are not going to be competitive in much else. . . .

*Sir Austin Hudson* (Lewisham, North): . . . To come to the London Passenger Transport Executive, the first thing which strikes everybody is the point made by my hon. Friend the Member for Monmouth (Mr. P. Thorneycroft) about the extraordinary opening sentence in the Report on the Transport Executive. It states that the year 1949 was one of steady progress in the work of the London Transport Executive. That is followed, less than a page later on, by Table I., which shows that in every respect London Transport has got steadily worse. The passenger journeys are down .8 per cent.; the passenger miles are down .9 per cent.; traffic receipts are down 1.5 per cent.; and only miles run are up, .7 per cent. Actually what has happened is that there has been a fall of about £1 million in London Transport receipts, and the net traffic receipts of the London Transport Executive road services were 2.9 per cent. compared with 4.3 in 1948. That loss was due to a drop in total gross receipts and a rise in working costs. I cannot see how that can be called a year of steady progress.

Of course, the truth of the matter is that the ordinary man in the street is not now getting the money to spend. That is mentioned in the Report itself, and is covered up by saying that he spends his holidays at home instead of going away. The truth of the matter is—and this appears in this section of the Report—that the profitable journeys which used to be made on London Transport by the ordinary Londoner are not now made. The unfortunate thing is that London Transport are not preparing, as far as one can see from the Report, to do the only obvious thing, which is to try to economise. Instead, they have made the fares still more expensive.

Since we last debated the Transport Commission's Report the Transport Tribunal has given its judgment. The London Transport Executive asked for an increase of £3,691,000, and have been granted an increase of £2,680,000 or 3.53 per cent. This increase will be a very serious one for the people of London. It is spread over a variety of services, which is called "ironing out the anomalies." But the anomalies are still there. The increase which is going to hit the people of London more than anything else is the rise of the 2½d. fare to 3d. That, according to the Report, is ironing out the anomaly, and they will be better able to spread out a uniform rate in London of 1¼d. a mile. But this 2½d. fare was 1¼d. a mile, and the 3d. is creating another anomaly and an additional burden on the person who has to travel. The Londoner is glad that the Tribunal let him off £1 million of the £3 million which had been asked.

Travelling in London is one of the most serious burdens that the Londoner has to bear. London is now so vast, and so many people have to lives miles outside it or upon its fringes, that any increase in London transport fares is bound to act as an additional tax upon the ordinary man or woman who has to work in the centre of London whilst living outside. . . .

*The Parliamentary and Financial Secretary to the Admiralty* (Mr. Callaghan): . . . Let us consider for a moment what has been happening in connection with this question of costs and charges. The Commission made a loss of £4.7 million in the first year. I want to run through the

results without mentioning for the moment any of the factors. They made a loss of £20 million in the second year, and in the year we are now in, the third year, the expectation is that the loss will be £15 million. Given the same level of prices and wages as to-day, the Commission estimate that they will be able to break even in 1951. Members will have noticed my conditions—given the same level of prices and wages as exist at the present time. Does that indicate to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the sort of picture he was painting to us a little while ago?

*Sir D. Maxwell Fyffe*: Yes.

*Mr. Callaghan*: With great respect, it is entirely different from the picture he gave us last year when he told us that by 1952 the Commission would be running into a loss of £100 million.

*Sir D. Maxwell Fyffe*: They would if they had not put up the charges.

*Mr. Callaghan*: What I am dealing with is the situation as it exists, and whether the financial results of this Commission are likely to yield a result which will enable them to break even. If I may give my honest opinion whether I think they will break even, I am bound to say I do not think they will [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen opposite think that is very funny, but I should like to ask them a question. There are wage claims to the various Executives totalling £25 million. [HON. MEMBERS: "Why?"] Let me just deal with the facts. Those wage claims are there. How would hon. Members opposite, who find this amusing, propose to give satisfaction to the railway workers who have put in these claims, assuming they are met, and at the same time make a profit on the undertaking? [*Interruption.*] All I can hear is a babble of replies, but nothing coherent. . . .

### Freemasonry and Spanish America

The following are extracted from *Bolívar and the Independence of Spanish America* by J. B. Trend (Professor of Spanish in Cambridge University). (Page 168-70).

" . . . San Martin was a soldier first and last . . . Born . . . on the Argentine bank of the river Uruguay, he had been educated in Spain for a military career, and served in the Spanish army. In the Peninsular war he met Lord Macduff (afterwards Earl of Fife), who saw his uncommon military genius and became a firm friend. It was through him that San Martin was able to get out of Spain, when he decided to take 'French leave' from the Spanish army and offer his services to the new government of the River Plate.

"He sailed from London in January 1812. Some of his fellow-passengers had been members of a Masonic Lodge at Cadiz; and San Martin resolved to found something of the same kind in Buenos Aires. He had seen how valuable it could be for patriotic purposes, in the group which gathered in London at the house in Grafton Street where Miranda had once lived, and which was afterwards occupied by Andres Bello. San Martin was not exactly the man for fantastic notions and queer ritual; but the discipline and the silence in the group impressed him, as

did its mathematical and military symbolism, and he resolved to make use of them in America. Promoted Colonel and given command of a regiment of mounted grenadiers, he found himself posted with two of his travelling companions who had sailed in the same ship from London. They formed a 'triangle' and a 'workshop' and the movement soon spread its cells through the provinces of the River Plate. They took the name of 'Lautaro' for their 'Lodge,' Lautaro being a character in La Araucana, Ercillo's epic poem on the conquest of Chile, the Indian who proclaims the liberty of his country from the Spaniards and begins the struggle for independence.

"Doubt has been thrown on the Masonic character of the Lautaro Lodge, but the Masonic symbolism is evident, even if the Lodge was not a strictly Masonic foundation. There were already Masonic establishments in Buenos Aires, dating back to 1795; and in 1806, and after the British invasions, there were three lodges of British origin, which certainly helped to spread the idea of independence from Spain. It is worth remembering that Miranda and Bolivar were both Masons—though the latter took it no more seriously than Pierre in *War and Peace*. So too were Washington, Franklin, Adams, Hamilton and Lafayette; San Martin's Scottish friend, Macduff; Popham, Cochrane, and other Englishmen concerned with the emancipation of South America. The political implications of Freemasonry as a force against oppression and bigotry had been illustrated in various ways during the eighteenth century; the most striking instance, perhaps, is Mozart's masonic opera, *The Magic Flute*. The sense of initiation, universal brotherhood and liberal idealism would have appealed strongly to a man of the noble simplicity of character of San Martin. The Lautaro Lodge, whether it was masonic or not, kept up the discipline and mystery of the 'craft,' and made use of Masonic symbols to such an extent that in 1816, Pueyrredon, at that time head of the government of Buenos Aires, requested San Martin not to employ those symbols in official correspondence, though there is no document actually proving that San Martin was a Mason himself."

### Nationalisation of Steel and the British Constitution.

Under the above heading the following appeared in *The Scotsman* for October 25:—

Feadan, Lawers, by Aberfeldy,  
October 20, 1950.

SIR,—That the fate of the British steel industry, which is as much to say, the fate of British economic power and war potential, should, ostensibly be decided, by the counting of noses most of the owners of which are profoundly incompetent to hold any opinion on the issue at stake, is so fantastically absurd that it seems incredible. But as some of us realise, the real position is far worse than absurd. With a slow, cunning patience, extending over many generations, the inspirers of the alien "-isms" which dominate our lives have centralised the threads of control into a mock-democratic Parliament (*cf.* Professor Laski's dictum that the core of the British constitution is the supremacy of Parliament), so that, sooner or later, with mathematical certainty, all power must come, as it has, into the hands of our mortal enemies. Once there, they feel

confident that they will never let go, and their astonishing success in partly wrecking the British Empire in the space of five years is evidence that they have grounds for confidence.

If there is any genuine historical analysis of the era through which we are passing, the amazing swindle of "acquiring" property by paying for it with money robbed either by taxation or inflation (what our forefathers called coin-clipping and punished with death) from the owners of the property so acquired, must attract close attention.

Bearing in mind the type of individual dominant in effective politics to-day, it is not remarkable that a trick of this nature should be attempted. It would be remarkable if it were not. But what does verge upon the miraculous is that hardly a word is said to emphasise the nature of the fraudulent prospectus, or the absolute certainty of its detonation of British credit.

And the remedy? Quite simple: a complete reversal of all current "nationalising" (*i.e.*, centralising) policies, beginning with the Bank of England. In addition to certain proposals (mentioned by me in earlier correspondence) which were designed to make the elector responsible for his political actions—the introduction of an open and recorded vote was advocated—the following suggestions might be found of interest in some quarters:—

(a) The Bank of England should be de-nationalised.

(b) The shareholding should be distributed to individuals as a basis of pensions.

(c) The Ways and Means account should be abolished, and Supply voted directly by means of deduction from wage rates (P.A.Y.E., accompanied by an analysis of the destination of the deducted money).

(d) All Government expenditure to be audited by accountants paid by local councils.—I am &c.

W. L. RICHARDSON.

### REALISTIC CONSTITUTIONALISM

(Notes for an Address to the Constitutional Research Association at Brown's Hotel, Mayfair, May 8, 1947)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

K.R.P. Publications

SIXPENCE (Postage 1d.)

### ESPIONAGE.

#### Report of the Royal Commission.

(Order in Council, P.C. 411, Feb. 5, 1946).

#### (Espionage in Canada).

"... we considered it of paramount importance that there should be available for all to read as complete an account as possible of the illegal activities which had already so seriously affected, and were designed even more seriously to affect, the safety and interests of Canada."—*The Commissioners*.

7/- (postage extra).

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

Liverpool.