

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 25.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 24, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Blah, blah,—wanna see the moon, coon, loon, mommas gonna swoon, soon, June, *whirree, rah, rah*, cahmon good, September 1st biscuits thin wine clearly marked, wine (not really) penalty £5,000 no inflation, prices will be higher save Europe, Asia, Africa, America, Mars, Venus now, our Russian allies *whirree rah rah* quit India, Palestine, Egypt, Australia, West Indies, Canada, *now, whirree rah, rah*, I 'ave one ambition no more war, *rah, rah*.

This is the "B".B.C. Home Service. You have been listening to a recording in the "B".B.C. Light Programme.

*This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England,
This nurse, this teeming womb of royal kings, feared by
their breed, and famous by their birth,
Renowned by their deeds as far from home, for Christian
service and true chivalry,
As is the sepulchre in stubborn Jewry
Of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son,
This land of such dear souls, this dear, dear land,
dear for her reputation through the world,
Is now leased out, I die pronouncing it,
Like to a tenement or pelting farm. . . .
With inky blots and rotten parchment bonds;
That England, that was wont to conquer others,
Hath made a shameful conquest of itself.*

—Richard II, Act 2, Scene 1.

The identity of the forces which ruined first Russia, then Austria and Germany, and are now ruining Great Britain is demonstrated, if further demonstration were necessary after Sir Ernest Cassel's gifts to the London School of Economics and his explanation of them, by the monotonous repetition of financial tactics fitted to the overriding strategy, which is to deprive the individual of spontaneous initiative and make him into a pliant tool of imposed policy.

In Russia and Germany, crude and unlimited inflation transferred power almost overnight to the bankers and big industrialists (just as truly in Russia as in Germany, except that they lived in Wall Street as well as in Berlin). In Great Britain, what the international rogues have christened "controlled inflation" superimposed on punitive taxation and a purposely starved consumer market, together with the organised police state, is elevating the "coupon" and the "point" into the equivalent of the *rentenmark* and debasing the pound towards its value as wallpaper. There is nothing new about it—it has been done before, and by the same people. It has never been stopped by words or ballot-boxes; and we are not sanguine that anything but rough methods will induce our Etonian world-rulers to abandon their vision of one great

Russia, with themselves as the controllers of a puppet Stalin. But the Zionists may be getting out of step.

In our issue of August 10, we quoted a forecast of the British wheat crop which appeared in the *Edmonton Bulletin* and converted it to tons on the basis of the Winnipeg bushel. It appears that the figures were in fact a British estimate, and the English wheat bushel of about 63 pounds should have been employed to convert them to tons. On this basis, the yield on the figures given is about 18.8 cwt. per acre under the Executive Committee's and subsidised prices, as against 19.1 cwt. per acre under free farming and bad price inducement in 1935. To obtain this inferior result many thousands (the number is disputed) of farmers have been roughly dispossessed of their farms, millions of pounds in capital "improvements" much of it almost useless have been spent, and the land has been mined with artificial chemical stimulants which will take decades to eradicate.

The "B".B.C., in its bulletin of August 14, 8 a.m., announced that the Canadian wheat crop "was expected to reach half a million tons." It also said that a considerable quantity of last year's wheat was being shipped. Since (a) in 1936 we imported from Canada nearly two million, nine hundred thousand tons of wheat, (b) the Canadian wheat crop is considerably larger than 1936, unless some very large damage occurs to it, and (c) we have been repeatedly told by Mr. Strachey that Canada had no last year's wheat for export, it would appear that no reliable information on which to base a judgment of the vagaries of the Ministry of Food is available to the general public. Which is exactly the conclusion to which we had arrived by consideration of the U.N.R.R.A. racket.

"Unburdened"

" . . . When it is all dry, get a nice flat panel, covered with black cloth or silk; and have a little study of your own, where no one will cause you any sort of interruption, and which has just one cloth-covered window; and you will put your table in this window, as if for writing . . . Take a needle, fastened in a little stick as if it were a little brush, and have it quite sharp pointed. And, with the name of God, begin to draw lightly with this needle whatever figure you wish to make . . . And do you want to be convinced that you need to have a light hand, and that it should not be tired?—(Know) that the strongest shadow you can make consists in penetrating to the glass with the point of the needle, and no more . . . it is as delicate as that, and you must not work with haste—rather with great enjoyment and pleasure. And I give you this advice, that the day before the day you want to work at this job, you hold your hand to your neck, or in your bosom, so as to get it all unburdened of blood and weariness."

—Cennino Cennini.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons, July 26, 1946.

British North America Bill

[Lords]

Order for Second Reading read.

The Solicitor-General (Major Sir Frank Soskice): I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

The object of the Bill is to give effect to an Address which has been presented to His Majesty by the Parliament of Canada praying that certain alterations in representation in the Canadian House of Commons shall become effective. To give effect to this request it is necessary to repeal Section 51 of the British North America Act, 1867, and to substitute the provisions set out in the Bill. That Act is expressly excluded from the provisions of the Statute of Westminster, 1931, by Section 7 (1) of that Act. Accordingly, in order to effect the necessary change in the British North America Act, it is necessary to pass the present Bill through the United Kingdom Houses of Parliament.

The Bill comes to this House from another place. It deals, of course, with a matter which is primarily within the discretion and judgment of the Canadian Legislature. The Canadian Legislature has decided upon this change, and is desirous that legislation in the terms of its Address to His Majesty should be enacted as speedily as possible by the United Kingdom Parliament. I hope that the House will agree that it would be proper to accede to the desire of the Canadian Legislature, and I accordingly ask that this Bill may be accorded a Second reading. I would add that, in view of the wish of the Canadian Legislature that the matter should be dealt with expeditiously, I hope that the House will be able to see its way to pass the Bill through its remaining stages this morning.

Mr. Eden (Warwick and Leamington): I think that it is quite clear to the House that this Bill deals with a matter which is entirely within the discretion and judgment of the Canadian Legislature. In a sense, therefore, this is a purely formal Bill, and, in the circumstances, I hope that the House will join in agreeing with the Government to accede to the request of our Canadian friends.

Mr. Beverley Baxter (Wood Green): While all of us agree that this is a request by the Canadian Government which will automatically be agreed to by this House, I want to point out one or two things, which, I think, we might bear in mind. When the Statute of Westminster was passed it was laid down that after the passing of that Statute no Act carried in this House could have effect upon any Dominion. That is the very essence of the Statute of Westminster. As the Solicitor-General has said, the British North America Act is exempted from that but nevertheless I put it to the House that the very fact that we in the Imperial Parliament are today passing an alteration in that Act is an anachronism in itself. True, it is only formal and it is automatic what we do to-day, but it is something which does affect the constitution of the Dominion of Canada. Therefore I say it is an anachronism.

... I can visualise the possibility developing in Canada—this is not a prophesy; it is merely a theory—where we might find a Government out of sympathy with the will of the people on some constitutional issue. It is quite possible for a Government with a big majority, as we know in this

country, not to be expressing the will of the people, because, after an election, the will of the people might change, though it has not changed as rapidly in this country as we had hoped.

In such circumstances the people in Canada might make an appeal to this Parliament over the heads of their own Government, and if we automatically acquiesced in the suggestion of the Canadian Government we might mistakenly be thought by the people of Canada to be siding with one party or the other. I should like to make this serious suggestion to the Solicitor-General. It should be possible to pass a resolution in both Houses here and in Canada that in future any alteration or amendment to the British North America Act should be done solely by the Canadian Parliament, that the Canadian Parliament should itself make any alteration in the Canadian constitution, and that this House should forego for ever any further passing of any Act or Measure affecting any of the Dominions.

House of Commons, July 30, 1946.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill Housing

Commander Gabraith (Glasgow, Pollok): Housing, in the light of present needs, is, in my opinion, the greatest human problem with which this Parliament is called upon to deal. It is, as the right hon. Gentleman the Minister of Health is recently reported to have said of it, the biggest source of misery in Great Britain. . . .

The Minister of Health is reported to have said, in a speech delivered at Durham on 20th July, that,

"The Tories have got the impudence to ask us to define our policy."

Since when, I would like to ask, has it become impudence on the part of His Majesty's Opposition to ask the Government to define their policy? . . .

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health (Mr. Key): The speech to which we have just listened started off with, to me, a most remarkable statement—that, in the years before the war, the Tory Party had solved the housing problem, and everybody in the country had a house to live in. I have always thought that the Tory Party lacked the power of vision; that they must have gone about entirely blind in the working-class areas of this country.

Commander Gabraith: The hon. Gentleman seems to suggest that I have misquoted something. I told him that I was quoting from the White Paper on Housing, Command 6609. If he will look at paragraph 2 of that White Paper, he will see that, in 1939, the number of houses was, approximately, equal to the number of separate families. That document was issued with the authority of many of his right hon. Friends.

Mr. Key: But a number of the things put down in that White Paper as houses were an absolute disgrace to the Tory Party, and to the people who were responsible for their use by the working people of this country as places in which to live. . . .

Mr. Medland (Plymouth, Drake): . . . I want to ask what arrangements are going to be made for blitzed cities to have priority in respect to plant? The story of our attempt to obtain plant is a very sad one. We began in 1945 by suggesting that we might acquire American plant. We had meetings in London and we were promised that we should

receive the American plant. Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer stepped in at the end of 12 months, and told us that, owing to the arrangements in connection with the American loan, the American plant would be taken over by the Government. What did we find? We found that the very plant for which we asked for the rebuilding of our city eventually went to U.N.R.R.A. to rebuild German and Italian cities, as well as other cities on the Continent of Europe.

Mr. Bevan indicated dissent.

Mr. Medland: The Minister may shake his head, but we have other evidence to show that this plant went the way I have suggested. We have made every effort to get plant, and the procedure we have now to follow is, that we have to get, through agents, plant which we ourselves have asked for and have endeavoured to buy direct from the Government. Agents have actually offered to hire us plant which we ourselves wanted to buy. I have here a long list of correspondence running into hundreds of letters, first to one Department and then to another. Still we require plant for the rebuilding of our city. I ask the Minister of Health and the other Ministers concerned, how much longer will it be before they settle this matter and give some priority to the blitzed cities of the country?

Brigadier Prior-Palmer (Worthing): For nearly a year now we have watched the ineffectual floundering of this Ministry concerned with housing in a mire which is the result of two things: first, Socialist ideology run riot, and second a machine—a cumbersome machine—which was never designed to deal with the sort of task which has been imposed upon it. It is the declared policy of the Government, as we know, that local authority building shall take precedence over private enterprise, and what is the result? We have frustration, muddle and very few houses, for the simple reason that local authorities are not capable of coping with the enormous task which has been placed upon them. They say it themselves. They say that their quantity surveyors are not the type of quantity surveyors to tackle the work involved, that their architects are not the sort of architects who are competent to cope with the task. They say they want far more staff, they are overburdened, they cannot get on, they have much too much to do. That is one of the reasons; it is not a question of not trying to back up the Minister or the Ministry, it is a question of the machine not being adequate to the task. . . .

. . . It is, however, becoming increasingly clear that the screw which is being still further applied to the small private builders will have the effect of crushing them completely and squeezing them right out of business. The hon. Member for North-West Hull (Mr. R. Mackay) and another hon. Member representing one of the Manchester Divisions have made very excellent speeches on behalf of big business, and the hon. Member for North-West Hull said that he was getting all the materials he wanted. If so, he is a very lucky man. He is one of those anomalies, as far as I can see—a Capitalist-Socialist who can get all the material he wants when he wants it, but I could give him the names of dozens of small builders who are quite incapable of getting anything. . . .

Another example is of a small builder who started some houses before the war. They are partially erected, and he has been endeavouring for nearly six months to get a licence to complete them. The first pretext was that they were too expensive. He said he wanted to build them for £1,100; so he came down to £1,000. It was then pointed out that

another builder, quite close, was building a similar sort of bungalow for £923. When he pointed out that that builder had got his land for £80, whereas he had had to pay £250, he was still not issued with a licence. These houses are still standing half finished, and nothing has been done about it. There is an example. Someone said it was the acquisition of the sites that was the difficulty in a great many areas. It may have been in the areas quoted, but it was not here. Those, I suggest, are two typical examples of how Socialist theory is over-riding and taking precedence over the vital needs of the people. There surely must be a little more latitude, and there must be directions given to regional officers that licences on this basis should be issued at once. They will not be doing any harm to anybody, and not preventing the so-called working classes from having houses. They will be doing exactly the reverse, because if people do not get these houses they will have to go to local authorities and enter their houses, and so deprive working men of the houses they ought to have.

There are two other examples of the sort of hindrance and difficulty being put in the way of local authorities who are trying to do their best. We have a case of the acquisition of some American temporary houses. It has taken nearly five months of writing and re-writing to get permission for the erection of those temporary houses on a certain specific site. I should like to go quickly through the sort of thing that has happened. It all started about 1st April.

Captain Crookshank (Gainsborough): A good day.

Brigadier Prior-Palmer: It was an auspicious day, and the result has been what might have been expected. By the end of April, further requests came from the district valuer for the plans and for the site. That was a month later. He had already had them in his possession before that. Early in May the plans were sent to the regional officer, at his request. By the middle of May the regional planning officer stated that the matter was being referred to the Ministries, and asked for the number of houses to be erected on the site, although he was given the number of houses in the original statement in the middle of April. By 31st May the principal housing officer said there would be no objection to the houses being built on that site. On 3rd June plans were asked for by the estate surveyor. On 4th June the plans were sent again to the district valuer, who had had them twice already, and who asked for them for the third time. By 15th June the principal housing officer asked what were the particulars of the various services which were available. He had already been informed, in the middle of May, that the services were all there, electric light and water. He then on 15th June, asked what were the services that were available. By 26th July, 14 months later, the district valuer stated that they could have the site at a cost of £380 on a 10 years' lease.

As that was something like five times the value of the land, the local authority have had to refuse to put the houses on that site, and the whole thing is now completely at a standstill. Think of all the passing of paper and the interminable writing that went on, and the mistakes and the muddle. That is only one example of the sort of thing that is happening the whole time. I earnestly suggest to the Minister that he should listen to people like us, who have our ears slightly nearer to the ground, who know what is going on; and I would earnestly suggest that he should issue
(continued on page 6).

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 16. No. 25.

Saturday, August 24, 1946.

Relief

If Plato was right in asserting that the revolutionary spirit always makes its first appearance in innovations on established musical form, is a stricter tendency a sign of impending resistance to revolution? The revolutionary movement has been likened to the observed course of events in physical nature—a persistent de-grading process, whereby energy falls constantly from a higher to a lower potential level, the ultimate end being imagined to be a state in which everything has reached the same “dead” level—the uniform temperature level of all matter, in which nothing is warmer than anything else, and nothing colder: a universe which has “run down”. Life opposes this principle. The Christian Era is exceptional in historical movements: it alone seems to embody the characteristic features of anti-revolution, to bring “Life more abundantly.” Apart from this unique movement (of which Social Credit is, organically, a manifestation) we cannot see anything in history but revolution; not a succession of ‘revolutions’, but one revolution, one de-grading movement, changing its velocity periodically, and its outward appearances, but not its effect or direction. We picture something resembling a human procession moving for centuries in the same direction, blindly, sometimes quickly, sometimes more slowly, changing nothing but, occasionally, its clothes.

The only relief to this melancholy spectacle lies in the creative accomplishments of those times in which, under what seems to have been a single inspiration, Life and Art flourished together, magnifying each other. Attempts have been made to explain the inception of such times mechanistically. An example is that of Brooks Adams; but all the ‘economic interpretations of history’ have the same origin: a revolutionary origin. They are absurdities, like the mechanical conception of perpetual motion. We are satisfied that the ‘up-hill’ movements begin as ideas. In no single instance is the internal evidence of the authenticity of the ‘Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, stronger than in their testimony to the power of ideas, and their ridicule of the simpletons who imagine them to be unimportant.

So we see some significance in the increasing number of references to which our attention is drawn to a change in the attitude of individuals here and there to ‘form’ in Art. They are doubly evidential: they reflect both the referrer and the reference. The Left Book Club is no longer having it all its own way. Good and important books can be heard of, and people are seeking them. (They don’t seem yet to have developed optimum skill in finding them.) Cennini (*Il Libro dell’Arte*), “all unburdened of blood and weariness”, is cited

on another page. And there lie before us passages from the lectures delivered by John Constable at the Royal Institution in 1836, and (very unexpectedly) the essay, “Hand and Soul” by Rossetti. One correspondent writes: “The enclosed may be of interest—it seems to fit in with August, and some of Constable’s remarks have a far wider application than the limited [*sic*] subject of Landscape painting.” (Everything but Social Credit is limited to a Social Crediter). We mustn’t keep all these good things to ourselves:—

Says Constable: “The art of painting may be divided into two main branches, history and landscape, history including portrait and familiar life. Landscape is the child of history, and though at first inseparable from the parent, yet in time it went alone, and at a later period (to continue the figure), when history showed signs of decrepitude, the child may be seen supporting the parent . . .”

Constable pointed to a copy of a small evening winter-piece by Ruysdael. “This picture” he said, “represents an approaching thaw. The ground is covered with snow, and the trees are still white; but there are two windmills near the centre; the one has the sails furled, and is turned in the position from which the wind blew when the mill left off work, the other has the canvas on the poles, and is turned another way, which indicates a change in the wind; the clouds are opening in that direction, which appears by the glow in the sky to be the south (the sun’s winter habitation in our hemisphere) and this change will produce a thaw before the morning. The occurrence of these circumstances shows that Ruysdael *understood* what he was painting . . .”

“There has never been an age, however rude or uncultivated, in which the love of landscape has not in some way been manifested. And how could it be otherwise? For man is the sole intellectual inhabitant of one vast natural landscape. His nature is congenial with the elements of the planet itself, and he cannot but sympathise with its features, its various aspects, and its phenomena in all situations . . .”

“At a time when Europe was agitated in an unusual manner; when all was diplomacy, all was politics, Machiavelian and perfidious; Cardinal Bembo wrote thus to the Pope, who had been crowning the Emperor Charles V at Bologna. ‘While your Holiness has been these last days on the theatre of the world, among so many lords and great men, whom none alive have ever seen together before, and has placed on the head of Charles V the rich, splendid, and honoured crown of the Empire, I have been residing in my little village, where I have thought of you in a quiet, and to me, dear and delicious solitude. I have found the country above the usage of any former years, from the long serenity of these gliding months, and by the sudden mildness of the air, already quite verdant, and the trees in full leaf. Even the vines have deceived the peasantry by their luxuriance, which they were obliged to prune. I do not remember to have seen at this time so beautiful a season. Not only the swallows, but all other birds that do not remain with us in the winter, but return to us in the Spring, have made this new, and soft, and joyous sky resound with their charming melodies. I could not therefore regret your festivities at Bologna. Padua, April 7, 1530.’

The Rossetti essay is an account of the painter Chiaro dell’Erma. In this case perhaps there can be no “wider application.”

T. J.

The History of World Revolution

BY THE LATE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND, K.G.

[We cordially acknowledge the kind permission of THE NATIONAL REVIEW to republish, from its issue of July, 1931, the following article. Originally intending to introduce the article by a brief commentary, we have thought it preferable to print it on its own very considerable merits.—Editor, T.S.C.]

A book was recently published entitled *The Jewish Peril* or *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. It was first published by a Russian Professor, Nilus, in 1905, and contains, according to him, a true statement, compiled from original documents, of the aims of the secret government of the Jewish race for the overthrow of Christian civilisation. The book has raised a storm of protest in Jewish circles; they have pointed out that this publication bears a remarkable resemblance to others which are known to be forgeries, that Nilus's account as to how it came into his possession is highly unsatisfactory, and that all revolutionary outbreaks in the past have been put down to the Jews. The matter has been fully discussed in a book called *The Cause of World Unrest*, in which, while leaving the authenticity of the Protocols an open question, the evidences of a world-wide conspiracy aiming at the destruction of all institutions and beliefs on which civilised society rests are examined, and the conclusion is reached that such a conspiracy has certainly been in existence for some 140 years and probably for long before that.

It is not proposed to consider in this article either the authenticity of the Protocols, the question of whether there is or is not such a conspiracy as is mentioned above, or the possible part played therein by a section of revolutionary Jews, but to examine the main thesis of the Protocols, namely, that the adoption of democracy as a form of government by all European nations is fatal to good government, to liberty, to law and order, to respect for authority, and to religion, and must eventually produce a state of chaos from which a new world-tyranny will arise. It is often asserted that Bolshevism, Communism and Socialism are inconsistent with democracy, since they involve tyranny and absolutism. This may be true, and yet such may be the inevitable result of democracy.

Sir Henry Maine long ago pointed out that democracy was only a form of government devised by man and not a Divine revelation, that it had only existed for a comparatively short time, and that its defects were such as to render it doubtful whether it would continue very much longer, but he contented himself with examining its effects on the governments of various countries, not on European society as a whole, nor did he have the opportunity of considering it in the light of the unparalleled disasters of the Great War and the advent of Bolshevism. Many writers of to-day are more or less impartial critics of democracy, but their purpose is to warn the public of the weaknesses of the system and the necessity of bolstering it up rather than to demonstrate the essential fallacies on which it is based and the catastrophe which must result from building a house upon the sand.

To understand the nature and the effects of democracy it is necessary to review briefly the past history of Europe. There have been three principal factors in the building up of European policy, the institutions and customs of Rome, the institutions and customs of the barbarian tribes which

overwhelmed Rome, and the Christian Church. The first event of importance which we have to consider is the alliance between Church and State in the time of Constantine. This profoundly altered the character of the Church. Originally the Church was considered to consist of an elect people chosen out of an evil world with whom they had nothing in common, but by whose means that world was to be redeemed. This result was to be achieved not merely by a belief in Christian principles, but by certain institutions, a certain organisation through which alone Christian principles could be expressed. It is not intended to discuss whether this was or was not a true conception of the nature and purpose of the Church, but to draw attention to facts and their consequences. The result of the absorption of the Church into the machinery of the Roman Empire was an abandonment of this conception. Henceforth it became as much an official part of the Roman Empire as had been the priests of the gods, the vestal virgins and all the paraphernalia of heathen worship. The Emperor became the supreme arbiter in ecclesiastical matters, the final authority both in Church and State; the Church, instead of consisting of an elect people chosen out of an evil world, became in time itself the principal world power. But no sooner had it assumed this position than a great disaster occurred; the barbarians swept over the Western world and for some five centuries civilisation was almost obliterated.

When Europe emerged from the Dark Ages the only unifying and civilising influence was the Church. The alliance between Church and State became stronger than ever and the Roman Empire was revived with the prefix of "holy," under the world-monarch Charlemagne and his successors, and the world-priest, the Pope and his successors. At the same time there arose out of the welter of petty kingdoms, dukedoms and princedoms, into which Europe was divided, certain forms of government common to all. The smaller States gradually became grouped into larger federations of larger States and definite principles of government and administration became adopted. New historians differ as to how these principles originated. Some years ago it was the fashion to attribute them to what was alleged to be the free and enlightened procedure of the Gothic tribes, but latterly grave doubts have been cast on the ideal state of life and the institutions of the primitive Teutonic races. In any case a common principle was recognised throughout Europe in the division of the community into grades, each having its share of representation in the government and each acting as a check on the others. There were three principal grades, the King, the nobles and the representatives of the commons.

Considering the paramount influence of the Church on Europe in the period immediately following the Dark Ages, it is curious that the possibility of this organisation having originated in the Church appears to have been overlooked. Nevertheless, the parallel to the orders of the hierarchy in the Church is exact, the Bishop, the priests and the deacons (originally the representatives of the congregation) corresponding exactly to the various orders of laymen in the political government. There then arose in Western and Central Europe a community of nations, essentially a religious community, constituting Christendom which possessed a degree of stability, order and good government such as no other community of nations had ever before displayed. All other great empires, for such in reality it was, had been

subject to perpetual changes, to decay, to periodical revolutions, to conquest by more virile neighbours, but owing to the strength of the institutions upon which government was based in Europe, these nations have continued in spite of every vicissitude to preserve their independence and to develop their peculiar form of civilisation for 1,000 years.

The constitution of Europe in the Middle Ages was essentially a religious one; all power and authority in Church and State were regarded as Divine; the institutions upon which society was based were decreed by Heaven; they represented final and absolute truth. Mankind might abuse them; they might become the engines of tyranny and oppression, but they still remained the only ordinances through which Christendom could be governed. This profound faith in the foundations upon which society rested gave that society a strength and solidity such as is now almost impossible to realise. And it gave men a degree of freedom, a power in resisting unjust authority, of which they were necessarily deprived in later times, for, so long as popes, emperors and kings held offices which were in essence and origin Divine, individual popes, emperors and kings could be resisted with impunity. The history of England before the Reformation is the history of continued resistance to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, but this did not affect the principle of the papacy in the eyes of Englishmen. The nobles and the commons, in contending for their rights, had but scant respect for the Sovereign who infringed them. He might be murdered, imprisoned, deposed or compelled by *force majeure* to respect the liberties of his subjects, without affecting in the slightest degree the popular veneration for Monarchy.

In the course of time, however, the foundations of medieval society were sapped by the growing corruption in Church and State. It would take too long to trace the reasons for this corruption, but the *forts et origo mali* was the alliance between Church and State, the usurpation of the civil power in ecclesiastical matters, and the even greater usurpation of the ecclesiastical power over the civil, which not only led to an ever-widening breach between Church and State, but corrupted both; the Church whose "kingdom was not of this world" became a fabulously rich corporation whose power was to a great extent based not on its spiritual, but on its temporal character, while the State sought and obtained the support of the spiritual power in exercising its political authority. It is easy to dwell on the evils of medieval society; they were indeed patent, but those evils were not inherent in its institutions, but in their abuse by those in authority.

The papal schism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was the last and the worst of many blows dealt at the medieval constitution of Europe. The revolutionary forces had long been gathering headway, and this pollution at the very fount of all authority gave them a lever they were not slow to avail themselves of. The Reformation was the beginning of the great revolution which has been at work ever since, for it was not merely a religious revolution, but a political one. Up till then political authority had been unquestioned because it rested upon ecclesiastical authority, both were in origin and in character divine, and "rebellion was as the sin of witchcraft," but if the Church was a usurper, the Monarchy might be one also. It was not merely that the Pope absolved the subjects of heretical monarchs from their allegiance. Even if the subjects sided with the King against the Pope, the question still arose by what authority the King governed.

It was obvious that the Protestant Church stood in a wholly different relation to the Monarchy than that of the universal Church. Their authority was indeed derived from the King. Instead of the Church being the sanction for the principle of monarchy, monarchy became the sanction for the principle of Church establishment. The latter became the servant of the King and of the nation. Thus all authority in both were undermined. Erastianism wrecked the one and the theory of popular government the other.

This theory really arose out of the religious differences that followed the Reformation. The right of private judgment, the right of the individual to choose his own faith, was a principle which inevitably arose from the overthrow of the old ecclesiastical authority. If the Pope were a usurper, why not Bishops and Priests? If the Bible was the only criterion, the only final authority, and if every man was privileged to read it, he was also privileged to draw his own conclusions from it. There arose a swarm of sects and Christendom became split into innumerable fragments. But if private judgment were supreme in religious matters, why not also in political affairs? The King was an oppressor who levied illegal taxes and persecuted men for their religious beliefs. By what authority did he hold his crown? It was then that Monarchy, faced with this growing danger, promulgated in self-defence the theory of "the divine right of Kings." In a sense this was new, and in a sense it was very old. Indeed, it was so old, so universally recognised, that nobody would have in earlier times thought it worth while to put it into words, but when it was put into words it assumed a new meaning, it raised new pretensions which never entered into men's heads in former ages. The theory of divine right, as explained by James I, would have been incomprehensible to the subjects of Henry VI, and would probably have been resented as absurd, exaggerated and distorted. To them as to the early Christians, "the powers-that-be were ordained of God," and as such their offices were to be revered, and to the King, as being the supreme form of those powers, special reverence was due; but to state that the King was the direct representative of God on earth, and that, being such, it was supremely wicked to resist him even if he trampled on the privileges and the rights of his subjects, was in effect a new doctrine. There was not only a crudity about the manner in which this claim was stated which outraged popular feeling, but it set up pretensions which had never been accepted by Englishmen.

(To be continued).

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3)

instructions to his regional officers, and to people of that sort, and give them a crack of the whip, and tell him he will not stand for this sort of thing. It does not matter if all the directions are complied with provided the houses are built. . . .

The Minister of Health (Mr. Aneurin Bevan): . . . Far from failing to enlist every agency for building, we are indeed reaching out for every single instrument on which we can lay our hands. It is hon. Members opposite who are doctrinaire; they want to rely upon private enterprise entirely. I am not doctrinaire. [Interruption.] On the contrary, if we did not restrict the issue of licenses, all building labour would be drawn into the building of houses to sell, and hon. Members opposite are afraid to admit they would restrict building

licences. Otherwise, they would be getting into real trouble. . . .

. . . By the end of the year—hon. and right hon. Gentleman opposite need not worry—there will be a sharp acceleration in the number of houses occupied, both temporary houses and permanent houses. They will not be sufficient; of course, they will not; I never said they would be sufficient. I refuse to provide a target because I know that that target will be even more unrealistic than the ex-Prime Minister's speech about 500,000 Portal houses, not one of which has ever been built. I refuse to give a target because I am content rather to rest upon performance than promise, and I am satisfied that, as the months go by, the houses will come along, although not as quickly as we would like. . . .

House of Commons, July 31, 1946.

PALESTINE.

The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison): I am opening this Debate in the unexpected absence of my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister. As the House knows, the Prime Minister has gone to Paris for the Peace Conference. We also deplore the absence of the Foreign Secretary from this Debate. . . .

The greatest obstacle to success in these operations has been the refusal of the Jewish population in Palestine to co-operate with the forces of law and order. Jewish settlers have resorted to passive resistance of the most determined kind against searches for terrorists. . . .

The shock of the King David Hotel explosion has surely aroused us to a fuller understanding, if that were needed, of the horrible and monstrous nature of those "evil things"—to borrow a phrase used on a famous occasion—against which we are fighting. The curse of Hitler is not yet fully removed. Some of his victims fleeing from the ravaged ghettos of Europe have carried with them the germs of those very plagues from which they sought escape—intolerance, racial pride, intimidation, terrorism and the worship of force. We are reminded that, in discussing the Palestine problem, we are dealing not only with the question of the displaced persons in Europe—though as I shall show, we have given most anxious attention to that aspect—but also with the clash of political forces, deeply rooted in history and stirring strong and, if unwisely directed, terrible emotions. Zionism is regarded by its supporters as the expression of a profound and splendid impulse in the soul of the Jewish people, and its purpose as transcending the material needs of the immediate present. Let them beware, however, lest this modern perversion of their faith brings ruin upon them and it. Sane and healthy nationalism has inspired many of the finest achievements of mankind; its perversion spells only degradation and depravity.

The leaders of the Jewish community in Palestine have, we feel bound to say, failed to preserve their movement from the contagion of those false ideals of which I have spoken. Many of them seem to have been drawn into courses which their own consciences must at first have condemned. The death of Lord Moyne in November, 1944, came as a startling proof of the evil nature of Palestinian terrorism and the lengths to which it would go. After that for a time the Jewish Agency co-operated with the Government in a campaign against the illegal organisations, the Irgun Zvai Leumi

and the Stern Gang. There was, for some months, a lull in terrorist activities, but in May, 1945, following threats by the Irgun Zvai Leumi that V-Day for the world would be D-Day for them, there was a renewed outbreak of violence.

The Anglo-American Committee have recorded how the Jewish Agency ceased to provide that co-operation with the Mandatory which is the duty expressly laid upon them by the Mandate. Indeed, after the attacks on the police headquarters and police stations in December, 1945, when eight lives were lost, Mr. Ben Gurion, the Chairman of the Executive of the Jewish Agency, in a statement issued to the Press by his authority, describing an interview which he and Mr. Shertok had had with the High Commissioner, indicated that the Agency could not assist in preventing such acts, excusing themselves on the ground that, in the words of the statement, it was difficult to appeal to the Jewish community to observe the law at a time when the Mandatory Government was itself consistently violating the fundamental law of the country embodied in the Palestine Mandate.

Mr. Pickthorn (Cambridge University): Can we have the date of that?

Mr. Morrison: I am afraid I cannot say. It was some time towards the end of last year; I am told it was in December. On this, the Anglo-American Committee comment:

"So long as this kind of view is put forward by the leaders of the Jewish Agency it is impossible to look for settled conditions."

Several leaders of the Agency had already become directly implicated in the terrorist campaign. . . .

I have now completed my outline of the recommendations of the expert delegations. His Majesty's Government, believing that these recommendations represent the best line of advance towards a solution of the problem, informed the United States Government of their willingness to accept them as the basis for negotiation. We had hoped before the Debate to receive from President Truman his acceptance, but we understand that he has decided, in view of the complexity of the matter, to discuss it in detail with the United States expert delegation who are returning to Washington for the purpose. . . .

Meanwhile, however, the situation in Palestine will brook no delay. We are inviting the representatives of the Jews and Arabs to meet us for discussion of these problems, and we hope that we shall be able to bring before them as a basis for negotiation the plan recommended by the expert delegations. . . .

Mr. Oliver Stanley (Bristol, West): . . . It has been obvious from the Press in the last ten days that there has been in existence this agreement, document, or whatever it is called, of this committee of experts to which the Lord President has referred. Almost every day, in one or other of the journals, here, in America or in Jerusalem, there have been references to the document and to its contents. Of course, we do not know how they came there. If they came there by way of leaks, all I can say is that this has been the father and mother of a leak; it has leaked in such quantities, and so simultaneously all over the globe that it must hold an all-time record. If it is merely journalistic anticipation, then I would say, in view of what the Lord President has told us today, that anticipation has been so intelligent as almost to make one believe it has also been inspired—and those things do happen; even Governments which abuse the Press in public sometimes use the Press in private.

Mr. Morrison: I appreciate that the right hon. Gentleman is speaking purely in a humorous sense. However, if he is seriously suggesting that His Majesty's Government have deliberately inspired Press anticipations of what I was going to say, or of the nature of the report, that would be a serious accusation and might involve us in difficulties with the United States. I do not want to get cross about it; I only wish to say to the right hon. Gentleman that it is quite untrue, and I ask him to accept my assurance on that.

Mr. Stanley: I certainly accept the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman. In turn perhaps he would allow me to say, that being so it is necessary for him to inquire into the source of this leak. . .

We feel that during a period of European reconstruction, the complete abandonment of Europe by Jewry, the complete exodus of the Jewish race from the Continent, could only have upon that reconstruction a damaging effect. They have much to contribute in the task which lies before Europe.

Mr. Sydney Silverman (Nelson and Colne): Would the right hon. Gentleman compel them to stay there?

Mr. Stanley: No, but I think the whole House would feel it a matter of regret if, in fact, every Jew felt that there was no future life for him in Europe. . .

I and many others have, over the last two or three years, been forced to consider whether the dreams with which people started this great experiment in Palestine—it is now nearly 30 years ago since the Balfour Declaration—may not have been proved incapable of attainment. . .

I see that some leading Jewry spokesmen in America talked about this as bringing the Jews back into the ghetto, but that kind of exaggerated argument really defeats its own ends. It is a smaller State, but I think that the important future function of the Jews in Palestine is not agricultural but industrial. I know that the right hon. Gentleman can go through all his usual contortions, but I am supported in that belief by the Report of the Anglo-American Commission and by the fact that 85 per cent. of the Jewish community in Palestine do, in fact, live in the towns. If it is to be, as I believe it is to be, an industrial economy, then the mere size of land does not matter nearly so much. It certainly does not matter nearly so much as the friendliness of the natural markets upon which their industry might have to depend.

For the Arab it offers one real advantage. The Arab territory in Palestine, if joined, as it might be, with Transjordan, would make a solid sovereign State. As such a sovereign State, it might well become part of a greater Arab federation in the future. They would have within that State, complete power to prevent any further encroachment of the Jews, and no longer would they have to feel that the only barrier which stands between them and further Jewish immigration into their own area, is a Mandatory Power which may be subject to political pressure from outside. I have often been asked by those who support the Arab case, whether the disadvantage is not this: That partition might secure two or three years of peace, but during that time the Jews would bring immigrants in large numbers into their own area and fill it to overflowing, and then immediately begin pressing for elbow room outside and the demand for living space would be heard once more.

My answer always has been that under partition there would be a fundamental difference. Such pressure in future, would not be pressure between two communities, both subject

to our authority—perfectly legitimate pressure upon the political authority—because in the new circumstances it would be pressure by one sovereign State upon another, and any encroachment would be an encroachment by one sovereign State upon the other. It would not be merely a matter for discussion in Parliament on the Colonial Office Vote, but would call into question not only the treaties under which we would naturally guarantee the frontiers, and the treaties with which any other great Power might be prepared to enter into as a guarantor, but would also call into play all the machinery of the United Nations. . . .

Mr. G. Lang (Stalybridge and Hyde): . . . As one who is not a member of the Jewish race but who is just—God help me!—attempting to be a practising Christian, I believe that it is the Divine Will of Almighty God that Palestine should be the National home of the Jewish people. . . .

(Further extracts from the Debate will appear next week).

United States Attorney General Tom Clark says 2,000 refugees and aliens are entering America illegally every day.

FOR SALE

Secondhand. *Cobbett's Rural Rides* (Reeves and Turner, 1885), Volumes I and II £1 10s. 0d. from K.R.P. Publications Ltd.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Money and the Price System	7d.
The Use of Money	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.

ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart...	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster	7/6
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster	10/-

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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