

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 26.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 31, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

If the usual procedure has been followed, it is safe to place the casualties in the Calcutta rioting at two or three times the figures which have been given to the Press, in which case, the deaths amount to at least one thousand, and the wounded to three times as many—the casualty figures of a major battle.

The severity of these so-called riots has been rising steadily for years, as the prestige and authority of the British in India has declined, and there is every reason to assume, what everyone who knows India has always predicted, that the departure of the British Raj will mean the entry of anarchy. This will, of course, provide the excuse for a new conquest of India by the agents of the forces now active in the expulsion of "Britain." The Russians are already penetrating Afghanistan.

If tools can have moral responsibility, the guilt for the thousands of deaths and the tens of thousands of injuries sustained in senseless and objectless conflict in Calcutta alone, in the past forty years lies squarely on two groups—the alien-inspired British Labour Party and the half-baked pseudo-Puritans of the American Middle West and Pacific Coast. Neither of them able to contribute one single constructive idea to the solution of their native problems, as witness their slavish adoption of monopolistic restriction at every opportunity, and without any insight into the Eastern mind, both, but particularly the Americans, have fed their self-righteous bigotry by attacking Imperial administration, perhaps the most admirable, not excepting Rome at its best, while encouraging by lavish finance from shady sources, the perennial Oriental intriguer. As we have said, and as its members agreed, it was by its nature transitional; but the nature of the transition and its miseries, lie at the door of people who have usually failed, where they have attempted, to run the traditional wheel stall.

The leaders of the Arab States are probably right in their cynical attitude to the present British methods in Palestine. What could be nicer for the offscourings of Central European ghettos than a holiday at the expense of the British tax-payer, with everything found, on the beautiful island of Cyprus? No one seriously supposes that Cyprus is anything but a transit camp or that any European country, having got rid of them, will take them back except at the bayonet's point (we except England, of course). Nevertheless, a country has to be found for them—that becomes more obvious, if possible, with every day that passes. And if any land other than Palestine (which is hopelessly inadequate, apart from the

triviality that it belongs to the Arabs) is under discussion beyond mere immigration, which will never solve the Jewish problem, we have not heard of it.

Mr. Aneurin Bevan, Minister of Health, is conducting an investigation into Swiss hotels *de luxe*. After all, there may be some hints on the housing problem to be picked up in Switzerland, given plenty of time, and no avenue shall be left unexplored, even if a regrettably small number of stones are being turned. The Directors of the Bank of International Settlements know cooking when they meet it, and they meet it at its best in Switzerland.

The fact that the first Labour Government of "Britain" with a decisive majority should coincide with the return of serfdom, and the success of the Party of International Socialism with the abrogation of all the decencies which governed the hard lot of prisoners of war, should cause no surprise to students of egalitarianism, from the times of Cromwell, or earlier, to the revolting piety of the nonconformist Whig manufacturers of the early nineteenth century. As the Editor of *Truth*, no doubt somewhat nauseated by the "B."B.C., remarks of the late H. G. Wells, they are gifted with a "strong reforming zeal which is as much a mood of vindictiveness for the thwartation of his own youth as a mood of philanthropy and altruism towards his fellow men."

Utopianism and Planning simply consist in robbing your neighbour either materially or psychologically under the cloak of a mandate. In less sophisticated days, it came from Mount Sinai: nowadays, it is *vox populi*—the common good.

Our Socialist Ambassadors of Peace and Goodwill, Captain Abramovitch Popemoffsky, M.P., son of the Kommissar for Thisnthat, has just returned to Moscow from an underground tour of England, conducted *incognito* with the aid of forged documents. He has been in touch with most of the revolutionary elements who wish to turn out the Government, and is satisfied with their organisation, on which he will report to the Kommissars.

In order to show how completely indifferent he is as to who ruins England, he announces that he is prepared to go back at the invitation of the King, if provided with unforged documents, so as to gather more information for the same purpose.

"For forty years, Abraham A. Heller has moved unobtrusively in the shadowy half-world of the U.S. far-Left Wing. Born in Minsk, Russia . . . The money he made

from his jewel-importing business he poured into the Socialist New York *Call* . . . When the infant Bolshevik regime started its climb to power, Abraham Heller was quick to give a helping hand. Again Radicalism paid off. In 1919 he set up as Russia's purchasing agent in the U.S., claimed \$200 million (£60 million) in gold to start trade relations rolling. Next year he visited Russia, won the rights for the sale of liquid gases to Russia.

"Back in Manhattan he organised the International Publishers' Association (51 per cent. Comintern owned), spent 115,000 dollars in the next decade in publishing Left Wing books and pamphlets."

—*Time*. N.Y., June 26, 1946.

The maximum weight of food parcel which can be sent from Australia to friends in England is 11 lb. The United Jewish Relief Fund, which arranges the sending of parcels from Australia to Jews in England, is, however, allowed to send parcels weighing 10 kilos (more than 20 lb.)

Mr. Allum, the Mayor of Auckland, New Zealand, characterises the diversion of food parcels from the persons to whom they are addressed in Great Britain, to unknown recipients, apparently by Government agencies, as "Just plain theft." Now, Clarence, you guess who is getting the parcels.

"General MacArthur's Headquarters bans any criticism of 'the American way of life,' but passes any criticism of Britain [*sic*] however fantastic and ill-informed, while definitely anti-British material, from United States sources, appears frequently in the Japanese papers. One correspondent reports that the Japs' ignorance to-day on points of view other than American—and even on the British part in winning the war—is almost complete."

*A.B.C. Weekly*, Sydney, N.S.W., June 22.

Never mind, Clarence. Digestive biscuits have been re-named.

Mr. Clifton Uttley, the American Commentator, broadcasting from New York on August 16, said that American wheat crops were nearly fifty per cent. above normal, and other crops in proportion. Sir John Boyd-Orr, one of those political professors who are sent to try us, warns us that if we aren't careful there will be such a glut of food that prices will fall.

God give us patience.

There is no sounder military maxim than that if you can find out with certainty what your enemy doesn't want you to do, it is worth taking big risks to do it.

Our enemy is now primarily, even if directed from Wall Street, within our gates, and it is clear for anyone to see that he is determined to raise prices—he calls it "controlled inflation", so as to tax you without calling it taxation, and to tax you by taxation, as well. The object of this is to transfer increasing buying power from the silly sheep he is shearing, to the inner clique which is playing world politics.

The situation calls for immediate and venomous action. We want falling prices, compensation to producers and

shareholders and the rapid reduction and early abolition of taxation and interference with property and initiative. And if the Etonian Communists don't like it, they'd better emigrate while there is yet time.

Dundee *Courier*, August 21, 1946:—

"Kiltie" writes—A Ministry of Food advice service is announced at S.C.W.S. shop in Aberfeldy. Is S.C.W.S. a branch of the Ministry or is the Ministry of Food a branch of the S.C.W.S.?

S.C.W.S.: Scottish Wholesale Co-operative Society.

The correct name of Sam Carr, the organiser of the Canadian Labour-Progressive Party [Communist] who is wanted by the Canadian police for continuous espionage since 1924, on behalf of the Soviet Government, is Schmucl Cohen.

Ex-Mayor La Guardia, head of U.N.R.R.A. has appointed Mr. Meyer Cohen to replace General Morgan as Chief Executive. Asked a question regarding the migration of Jews to Palestine, Mr. La Guardia replied "If I could answer that, the peace conference could close up."

We leave it at that.

"The recent international attack on France [*sic*] was so ill-contrived that some cynics have suggested that the Kremlin, despairing of creating a Communist Spain, would rather have a Franco Spain than one that was truly democratic. This point of view is not so far-fetched as might be supposed. The Communists have great need of Fascists. . . . If Franco were not there, they would call someone else "a Fascist beast."

—Randolph Churchill in *Edmonton Bulletin*, July 17, 1946.

By a large majority, the Alberta Convention of C.C.F. [London School of Economics Socialists.—Editor, *T.S.C.*] urged affiliation with the Communist Party of Canada.

—*Edmonton Bulletin*, July 17, 1936.

"It is impossible not to feel an increasing dismay over the prospect of any enduring peace for the European peoples. Indeed, the century of the common man promises, as of the present outlook, to be an epoch of the most hopeless misery and oppression for the common people, in whose name, to add hypocrisy to injury, everything nowadays is being done."

—Dorothy Thompson, the American Columnist.

Miss Thompson (Mrs. Sinclair Lewis) was a socialist. Unlike our home brands she can notice the impact of a fact.

The fact that Mr. G. D. H. Cole has resigned his membership of all Socialist organisations has been prominently featured overseas, but not in the press of this country.

We can hardly imagine a more ominous indication of the outlook for Socialism. Whatever opinion may be held of the views which Mr. Cole has popularised from time to time, no one has ever accused him of failure to keep himself informed on "trends."

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons, July 31, 1946.

### Palestine

[The Debate continued]

*Major Legge-Bourke* (Isle of Ely): . . . It seems to me rather important that the hon. Member for East Coventry should know that in "The Scotsman" of 8th July, the following appeared. It was a report from the "Daily Telegraph—Scotsman" correspondent, T. S. Steele, in Jerusalem on the Sunday before. It reports a statement made over the "Voice of Israel"—"Kol Israel." It finishes, up by quoting the statement:

"We cannot promise Mr. Crossman (Labour M.P. for Coventry and a member of the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry on Palestine), that we will use only passive resistance. We shall use all the means at our disposal at the time we choose."

When I raised that matter about the hon. Member for East Coventry, it seemed that he should be given an opportunity to explain it. [Interruption.] I am quite prepared to accept his word that he never made the statement which he was reported as having made in the "Jewish Standard" of 12th July.

*Mr. Turner-Samuels* (Gloucester): What has that to do with this Debate?

*Major Legge-Bourke*: I should be only too happy to give way if the hon. Member wishes.

*Mr. Crossman* (Coventry, East): It might be shorter if I said that I never stated the thing, and I was preparing to make a personal statement, as the hon. Member well knows. . .

*Major Legge-Bourke*: The hon. Member will, I hope, have the good fortune to catch your eye later on, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. What is most important is that although I respect the honour and feelings of the hon. Member opposite, there is something which is far more important at the present time—that is, the reaction which anything that takes place in this House is going to have amongst British troops in Palestine. For that reason it is only right that I should draw attention to the effect of that statement, but I will not read it again. I am perfectly prepared to accept what the hon. Member said about it. What I say is that if "Kol Israel" reacted to the hon. Gentleman's speech in the way they did—in fact they referred to him and said that they could not adopt passive resistance—it seems very hard for the hon. Member to explain how it comes about that there is that impression in Palestine if he did not make a speech recommending passive resistance. It surely is utterly wrong for any hon. Member of this House or, indeed, any British citizen to go out and advise any people to adopt passive resistance against British troops.

*Mr. Crossman*: Hear, hear.

*Hon. Members*: Why not?

*Mr. Crossman* [later]: I want first to deal with the statement made by the hon. and gallant Member for the Isle of Ely (Major Legge-Bourke) with regard to myself. He raised this matter first in a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. I am not a regular reader of "The Jewish Standard," and at that time I had not read the article in question. . . .

I have looked at the paper, of which I now have a copy, and I want to say emphatically that I never said, and never

could have said the words attributed to me, in which I was alleged to advise the Jews of Palestine to go underground and to oppose an airborne division by all means other than violence. It would be strange to advise 600,000 Jews to go underground, and oppose an airborne division, and I think I can safely assure the House that that was not what I said and that the reporter—I regret I have to say this of a journalist—must have been someone who knew Hebrew better than English.

The whole burden of the speech which I made on that occasion at St. Pancras, as hon. Members who were present will confirm, was a very strong appeal to the Jews of this country to use all the influence they conceivably could at this time of crisis to prevent violence in any form or resistance to the British troops, whatever provocation the Jews of Palestine may have felt. That was the purpose of that meeting. . . .

It is highly unlikely that more than a small percentage of the terrorists will be found by the methods which are now being adopted in Tel-Aviv. . . .

I think it was 12 months ago that the Hagana came to the police authorities in Jerusalem and told them that the Irgun had developed a new rocket weapon for shooting at the King David Hotel. The pipes, from which the rockets were to be shot, were placed in a field 400 to 500 yards from the King David Hotel in a position so deep in the earth that they could not be seen. It was thought that there were two bombs there. The British police, I believe, sent out mine detectors, but failed to find the bombs with mine detectors. They came back to the Hagana and asked for more accurate information. The Hagana thereon, with great risk to themselves, kidnapped a member of the Irgun and extracted from him—by means which I cannot indicate, as I do not know them—the precise location of one of these things. With the British, they discovered the thing, and took it to pieces. I am told that the British G.O.C. admired the mechanical ingenuity of the instrument. That particular outrage was in fact prevented owing to the assistance given to the British by the Hagana intelligence service. I am putting these things forward for check. I do not know whether they are wholly true. . . .

Indeed, one might say that the British C.I.D. regularly reckoned to set a Jew to catch a Jew, as Arabs were set to catch Arabs. In the autumn of last year came the fatal decision—I described it as fatal every time I spoke of it to the Jews—that it was futile to continue collaboration with us against the terrorists. It was a criminal thing to say, but my own view is that it was impossible at that time, and that that was literally true. The men of the Hagana were despairing of the situation in Europe, and convinced, rightly or wrongly, that the Labour Government were not carrying out their pledges. In those months, none of them was prepared to go on kidnapping further members of the Irgun. . . .

If we want co-operation we cannot say that anyone whose hands have in any way been sullied by any contact with violence must not be excluded. . . .

May I turn to General Barker? I am not so much concerned with him as with anti-Semitism. I was a little shocked at the roars of applause on the Benches opposite when the right hon. Member for West Bristol defended General

(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. 26.

Saturday, August 31, 1946.

### The Art of Association

The Parties are very much like rival dealers in a standard proprietary brand of article. Each of them wants to do the selling. That the consequences of buying from them are highly unsatisfactory to anyone but themselves (and the 'Proprietor' of the proprietary brand), and not even to themselves in the long run, is not prominently before their minds. They take a short view, which, they hope, is just long enough to serve their turn. By 'they' here, we mean, of course, the people prominent in running the Parties and also the people willing to play the Party game for the negligible inducements offered. They set their own standard and assess themselves.

This theme is familiar to readers of this paper, and there is no need to enlarge upon it. Social Crediters (although it is not primarily their job) have set themselves the task of assisting in the surmounting of the initial difficulty constituted by the general circumstances to which reference is here made, and what guidance they can give in this matter becomes a matter of priority, though not of primacy for them because their fate depends upon it.

The writer of a letter which we have been permitted to see, says: "... I was surprised to find how little attention was paid by Social Crediters here to the principles governing association. Having on one occasion quoted Major Douglas's remark about the principles governing association being capable of exact statement, one Social Crediter retorted, 'Well, what are they? I've never seen them!' ... Now if, as it was said in 'From Week to Week', 'thermo-dynamics is meaningless without heat-engines', may it not be that the principles governing association will not be generally accepted and applied, even by Social Crediters, until we are able to say (the 'magic word'?) 'Here is a design of a suitable mechanism for any association.'?"

Besides stating that "The general principles which govern association for the common good are as capable of exact statement as the principles of bridge building, and departure from them is just as disastrous" (a true statement, if there ever was one), Major Douglas has also said that "There is probably no more subtle and elusive subject than the consideration of the exact relation of the group in all these and countless other forms, to the individuals who compose the groups." That 'these and countless other forms' had a particular reference does not affect the argument. There are (to our knowledge, although we are not engineers) 'subtle and elusive' features of heat-engines, and, if it were not so, the first heat-engine would probably have been as efficient as the last. It wasn't—quite. Nor was it nearly as handsome to look at. "The aesthetic and the practical senses", (to

quote a passage full of meaning cited elsewhere on this page) are, as the writer suggests, identical rather than complementary in highly endowed personalities. That is really the only possible complete answer to the letter-writer. And we, alas, have to deal with individuals who vary considerably from one another and within themselves from time to time and place to place in regard to their endowments. And so we are often asked, or pushed, or (if possible) trapped—very urgently desired, certainly—into compliance with the demand: "You write it all down, please. Make it snappy. And, by the bye, perfectly clear. And give me the book of rules; and then, don't you look at me while I'm doing the job, because that will make me nervous; but at least I shall be able to say the result's your fault." Now we don't resist this persuasion because we discern any unfairness in the last requirement (usually unexpressed)—although there is obviously something unfair—but because it is inherently unsound.

There is scarcely any difficulty (thanks to Douglas) in stating the principles which should govern association if success is envisaged. They are expressed with brilliant lucidity in *The Tragedy of Human Effort* (which, we discover, some Social Crediters have never read!). It is always the case that the application of a principle is as important as the principle itself. Historical study gives the key to the heart of this matter, namely that *the principle can only with the greatest difficulty and by the most capable minds be discerned in any instance of outstandingly successful association for a common end; but it can be discerned there and nowhere else.* We have not contrived such an instance, but our objective is nothing short of that, and we are advancing towards it unmistakably.

T. J.

### "La Vie se Reprend"

"When I was in Paris for a week before Easter, I had an impression of a people powerless before their political machine. I do not have that impression any longer. The scepticism persists, but it is not a sterile or a despairing scepticism. I remember with a special pleasure a day spent in the valley of the Loire with a young engineer who had directed the rebuilding of many of the bombed bridges. He was a young man in his early thirties, and he spoke with a strong Pyrenean accent. There was a striking contrast between the diffidence of his manner and the remarkable feats of reconstruction for which he was, in the main, responsible. As we walked over the magnificent new bridge at Mont Louis, where the railway line to Bordeaux crosses the river, the workman on duty had difficulty in believing that this shy and inexpressive young man was in fact his chief. We had motored past several of the Chateaux which I had never seen, and I observed that, as with the builders of the great Cathedrals—a William of Sens or a Pierre de Craon in Claudel's *L'Annonce Faite à Marie*—his aesthetic and his practical sense went hand in hand. I should rather say, perhaps, that the two senses were identical. . . . As we motored along the left bank of the Loire, we discussed the problems of his country and time and again he repeated the same phrase, "*Nous manquons des chefs*". Yet this young man, I was told afterwards, would undoubtedly rise to an immensely important position in the French railways. . . . He was a man in whom the imaginative and the practical instincts were remarkably combined, and when I have said that he was a devout Christian, I have said that he was, in a more

"La Vie se Reprend"—(continued on page 8)

## The History of World Revolution

BY THE LATE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND, K.G.

(From the National Review of July, 1931, by courtesy of the Proprietor.\*)

(continued)

The doctrine of non-resistance in its extreme form was incompatible with Magna Charta and all the popular rights gained since then, which had been secured by determined resistance to monarchical encroachments. Thus the theory of divine right became for two centuries a battleground for warring political parties. It was an endeavour to restate, to re-establish a principle of political government which belonged to a former age, and which was only defensible if supported by allegiance to a universal Church. The difficulty may be explained thus. The powers-that-be are ordained of God, but the Church of Rome is an imposter and is therefore not ordained of God at all; the medium through which God communicates His wishes is corrupt and has been judged and found wanting by man, and there is, therefore, no sanction for any other form of authority; all are, or may be, equally corrupt and are equally subject to man's judgment. Now this was an inevitable outcome of the Reformation. And the first result of these principles was seen in the Great Rebellion in England, the execution of Charles I, and the Commonwealth. These events created extreme consternation throughout Europe, for this rebellion was different from all others. Kings had frequently been dethroned and murdered by their subjects, insurrections were of every day occurrence, but never before had a people publicly repudiated the principle of Monarchy, sat in judgment on the King and officially condemned him to die the death of a traitor to the community he governed. The mere killing of a king mattered little if "Amurath to Amurath succeeds," but the killing of a king in this manner meant the rejection of principles which formed the very basis of civilised existence. If these ideas were to spread, chaos must result. Then the inevitable reaction set in and Charles II was restored. Although the principle of monarchy had received so severe a shock that he found himself unable to resort to the unconstitutional methods of his father, although he felt there was a spirit abroad which might in an emergency become dangerous, yet the theory of divine right still remained unquestioned in the hearts of the great mass of the people and the Church of England reaffirmed the doctrine of non-resistance in as uncompromising a manner as had Laud. Nevertheless, the revolution had had a far greater effect than appeared on the surface. The revolt against Charles I had been a microcosm of that revolutionary movement which assumed 150 years later a world-wide character. The Anabaptists, the Fifth Monarchy men and the other wild fanatics of 1649 were the prototype of the political dreamers of the Paris Clubs. Their ideas and their methods of attaining them were the same with this difference, that the language of the former was couched in theological and the latter in political form. The one looked for "the reign of the saints" and the other "the reign of the people," "the saints" and "the people" being in each case a small minority of revolutionary fanatics. And the analogy with present revolutionary ideas is equally evident. "The reign of the saints" has now become "the dictatorship of the proletariat." But the difference in phraseology is important, for it shows how a revolt which began with the Reformation

and was originally aimed at ecclesiastical dominion became, under the influence of the disintegrating principle of the right of private judgment, a revolt against all forms of authority, all institutions in Church and State.

But in order to understand this development we must turn back again to English history. It was in England that popular and so-called liberal conceptions first developed, it was in England that they ran their course unhampered, and achieved certain forms which became a pattern for the world. We have seen that the Church and the Monarchy were reestablished under Charles II on an apparently strong foundation. To question them was a crime. Algernon Sidney was executed for no other offence than a belief in republican principles, and Quakers and Covenanters suffered the extreme rigour of the law for questioning the authority of the Church and that of the King as head of the Church. The Test Act was an effort—one of many efforts—to re-establish the principle of the unity of religious and political power. It is easy to condemn it as an act of tyranny, but our ancestors saw certain things which we do not see. If authority was to be respected it had to rest on some universally recognised principle as in the Middle Ages. Failing a universal Church as the sanction for political authority, there must be a national Church, and those who would not recognise the national Church were potential rebels against government; their theories were a danger to the State, and if persisted in ought to debar those who professed them from the rights, if not of citizenship, at least of access to official positions. Moreover, it is undeniable that many of those who refused to take the oath were really disloyal. Plots were actually hatched by Catholics on the one hand, and by the Sectaries on the other. But this attempt to lay again a firm foundation for authority in Church and State failed, as it was bound to fail, once the authority of a universal Church had been repudiated. The "glorious" revolution of 1688 ushered in a new era. The very people who had urged the doctrine of non-resistance most strongly, the Clergy of the Church of England, were the first to repudiate the principle when their own rights were threatened, and confronted with an attempt on the part of James II to restore Catholicism, declared themselves in favour of his deposition and invited William III to assume the Crown.

After 1688, the extreme theory of divine right was no longer tenable, and the advent of the Hanoverians knocked the bottom out of it altogether. Not that many people ceased to believe in it as a true theory of government, but that it became more and more a mere theory, a counsel of perfection which had become unworkable in practice. None the less the inherited spirit of veneration for authority, a legacy from earlier ages, survived throughout the greater part of the eighteenth century, and the volcano which was working beneath the surface was not perceived until the great eruption took place in France.

The French Revolution has been generally recognised as one of the chief landmarks of history; it is often said to be the beginning of modern history, but this is hardly correct. Modern history begins at the Reformation, and it is impossible to understand the French Revolution without reference to the earlier event. The course of French history since the Reformation has been the direct converse of the course of English history. The principles of representative and constitutional government have been recognised in England from the earliest times, and absolute monarchy was unknown except for a short period under the Tudors. After them constitu-

\*The commencement of this significant article appeared in our issue of August 24.

tional government developed gradually and in a comparatively speaking, orderly and peaceful manner. The institutions of the Middle Ages persisted, and through them the liberties of the people were preserved. In France these institutions were swept away. While in England the Monarchical principle was growing weaker and weaker, in France it was growing stronger and stronger, and its strength lay not only in the fact that representative institutions had been crushed, but that the Reformation had been crushed by the counter reformation, and thus the question of Church and State had never arisen in the form it assumed in Protestant countries. In England there had been two successful revolutions, one religious and one political; France had had neither, and so the political and religious revolutions took place at the same time. But the real importance of the French Revolution lies in two things; firstly, that from it there emerged the principle of popular sovereignty, which is the basis of modern democracy. Of course, this was not an entirely new theory; indeed, the government of the ancient Greek Republics had been based on the same conception, as had also even in medieval times that of the Swiss Cantons, and, later still, that of the Commonwealth in England, but after the revolt of the American Colonies, followed immediately by the French Revolution, it assumed a world-wide significance. This principle was the inversion of that of the Divine right of kings. Instead of power coming from above, it came from below. It was the direct result of the right of private judgment, the logical conclusion of which is that the people are the rulers, the governed are the governors. So universally recognised has this principle become that it is almost as great a blasphemy to question it as it would have been in the Middle Ages to assert that "by the People Kings reign and Princes decree justice."

But in another respect the French Revolution was equally catastrophic. It challenged not merely the principle of monarchy, of sovereignty, but of all other forms of authority. And it challenged them not merely on the grounds that they had usurped functions which did not of right belong to them, and that they had become oppressive in their operation and a bar to progress and enlightenment, but that these forms of authority were based on illusions, on false principles, that they had been *ab initio* wrongfully constituted by means of force and fraud. The French nobility were not French at all according to this theory, but the descendants of Frankish robber chieftains who had enslaved the original inhabitants of the country; they were aliens to whom the French owed no respect. The priesthood was not merely corrupt; its members were votaries of an antiquated superstition which had enslaved the minds of men. And since these authorities were wrongful and illegal in their origin, their property was not theirs and must be confiscated. And thus the first great blow was struck at the right of private property. Now all this was new; it is true that the germs of such doctrines had been seen at various times and in various countries since the Reformation, but they had been almost universally condemned. The general sense of the community was outraged by them, they were seen to lead straight to anarchy, but in France they were welcomed with the enthusiasm of a new revelation, so inspiring that the united efforts of Europe to crush the new republic were unavailing, and the seeds of the new gospel were spread broadcast throughout the earth.

There is no single one of all the multitudinous forms of Socialism and Communism at present in vogue which did not

have its origin in the French Revolution; it may be expressed in different words, but the idea is the same.

(To be concluded).

## PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3)

Barker from the point of view that there was a great strain in Palestine, and that little errors of tact must be explained or excused. . . .

. . . Why I hate this war in Palestine is because of the bad effect it is having on our own troops. I have had letters which are openly anti-Semitic in sentiment—"Why can't we wipe out the Jews?" It is a terrible thing. We should not assist the prevention of it by condoning General Barker's unfortunate letter to his officers. . . .

Mr. Thomas Reid (Swindon): I did not intend to depart an inch from the statement made by the Lord President with regard to the solution before the House as "a basis of this discussion," but I could not let pass some of the statements made by the hon. and learned Member for Montgomery (Mr. C. Davies). After all, he is the leader of the Liberals in this House and therefore holds a responsible position, and I am sorry to say that he has made statements which are not historically correct. He began by referring to the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and saying practically that it meant nothing if it did not mean a Jewish State. I have studied this thing very minutely and it is a fact that before the Balfour Declaration was issued the political Zionists placed before the British Government various drafts in which they explicitly demanded a Jewish State or Commonwealth. The British Government rejected these drafts and passed the Balfour Declaration which gave a promise of a Jewish National Home. The hon. and learned Gentleman then went on to base on that the plea that a Jewish State could be legally established in Palestine—at least that was the gist of his remarks. In the first place the Balfour Declaration was illegal and immoral if anything ever was. It was made without the knowledge of the Arabs, who were the inhabitants of Palestine and our loyal allies in the war, but worse still the people who framed the declaration had purposely concealed their intention that the Jews were to be allowed in until they formed a majority and thus to set up a Jewish State in fact.

The hon. and learned Gentleman mentioned only the National Home, and I wish the National Home all success. When I was out in Palestine I often discussed the question with that fine Jew, Dr. Magnes, the principal of the Hebrew University, and although I argued against him he at least convinced me that cultural and religious Zionism can be a noble endeavour indeed, and I wish it all success. But from 1938 up to date, I have opposed in and out of season the proposal to set up a Jewish State in Palestine. No such State was ever promised by the British Government and indeed the British Government had no right to make promises about Jewish emigration to Palestine, and we have no right to try to set up a Jewish State in Palestine because Palestine never belonged to us and does not belong to us today. . . .

## Points Rationing Order (Oatmeal)

Mr. Snadden (Perth and Kinross, Western): I beg to move,

"That the Food (Points Rationing) Order, 1946, dated 18th July, 1946, S.R. & O., 1946, No. 1143, a copy of which was presented on 22nd July, be annulled."

I and my hon. Friends have put down this Motion because we feel that the Government's decision to place oatmeal and certain other foods on points for the first time cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. . . . It is a serious blow, particularly to Scotland, for no less than 80 *per cent.* of the total oatmeal output of this country is produced in Scotland. . . .

. . . In the rural areas oatmeal is bought, not by the pound, but by the stone, or even by the sack of 140 lbs. In the hills and the glens, a sack of meal is laid in after harvest to carry over the winter. This is a matter of sheer necessity, as these people may be cut off for weeks by heavy snowfalls or icebound roads. The farm workers consume porridge twice a day, and it is estimated that 70 *per cent.* of the Scottish agricultural workers, including no less than 8,000 shepherds, draw meal as a perquisite under their contract of service. This amount varies from 140 lbs. to 1,120 lbs. in the case of a shepherd per annum.

Hence this Order, putting oatmeal on points, cuts right across a centuries old system of farm perquisites, for such a system cannot be maintained if oatmeal is controlled at anything like two points per pound on the existing allocation of points. . . .

May I give one example of what happens to a single ploughman. He will consume, according to the perquisite system, 450 lbs. of oatmeal per annum. Hon. Members may be astonished at that amount, but many of our farm servants in Scotland live upon what is called "brose", which is oatmeal and water, and they consume it several times a day. They consume 450 lbs. of oatmeal per year. Against that the worker receives 416 points, but he requires 900 points to meet his normal consumption. Where are those points to come from? It is no good for the hon. Lady who is to reply saying, "Bring the farm workers all under the oatmeal perquisite system, so that they may get their oatmeal off points." The answer to that is very simple: Their contracts were entered into in many cases in May, 1946, and if you interfere with that, you interfere with the whole wages structure.

The other case I want to put is this: What is to happen to the farmer himself? [*Interruption.*] I know hon. Members opposite do not care a hoot what happens to the farmer. At present there is nothing to prevent the farmer grinding his own meal on his own farm, or sending oats to the local miller in order to have it returned to his farm as meal. Is that practice to be allowed to continue? I want an answer to that, because the farmer is not a farm worker; he is under no system of perquisites. If the hon. Lady says, "Of course, we cannot allow that," she will be faced with the ludicrous position of the farmer being able to feed oats to his cattle and horses and not to his wife and family. I think we have said enough for it to be realised, what an awful mess this thing is.

*Mrs. Jean Mann* (Coatbridge): Does the hon. Member refer to porridge when he says what an awful mess this thing is?

*Major McCallum* (Argyll): This Prayer against oatmeal rationing appears to cause a great deal of amusement to hon. Members opposite. I know quite well that many of them, probably all of them, would rather have left the Chamber long ago. It is not our fault, nor the fault of our constituents in Scotland, that they are obliged to wait here at the

command of their Whips. It would be more fitting, at any rate to Scottish hon. Members opposite, if they were to listen to the arguments put forward in support of this Prayer instead of treating the whole thing as a matter of ridicule. . . .

*Mrs. Jean Mann* (Coatbridge): I do not propose to detain the House for long at this hour of the morning, but there are quite a few ghosts walking about, and it is time they were laid. To begin with, the hon. Member for West Perth (*Mr. Snadden*) has told the House that it has come as a shock to Scotland that oatmeal should be put on points. It has always been rather a surprise to me as a housewife that porridge oats have always been on points and oatmeal has not been on points: many housewives have asked each other how it was that porridge oats have always been on points and oatmeal never. The more I see of hon. Members opposite, and the more I hear them, the more I conclude that a Tory politician is the lowest form of animal life. They have carefully concealed the fact that this month oatmeal has been put on a two points per pound basis but that there has been an extra issue of eight points to the housewife. How does that work out? Can any Member opposite stir a pot of porridge or make one? I am very much aware that some Members opposite are experts in cooking tripe. Anyone in the West of Scotland who reads the *Sunday Mail* will know that the hon. Member for West Renfrew (*Mr. Scollan*) is an expert on tripe.

*Major Guy Lloyd* (Renfrew, Eastern): It must be most interesting to the hon. Member for West Renfrew (*Mr. Scollan*) to know that the hon. Lady thinks that of him.

*Mr. Scollan* (Renfrew, Western) *rose*—

*Mr. Deputy-Speaker* (*Mr. Hubert Beaumont*): Hon. Members must not continue to interrupt every speech. After all, we are still debating, and not having a lot of fun. . . .

*Mr. McKinlay* (Dumbartonshire): I want to deal with the assumption of hon. Members opposite that rural areas should be excluded. The hon. Member for Banff (*Mr. Duthie*) has given me a cue to something I always wanted to know. If oatmeal has all the virtues claimed on its behalf by my hon. Friend in generating heat, I have solved the problem of all the sulphur and treacle syrup which my mother made me take to cool my blood. I think that the industrial workers are just as entitled—

*Mr. McKie*: Speak up.

*An Hon. Member*: Wash your ears.

*Mr. McKie rose*—

*Hon. Members*: Speak up.

*Mr. Deputy-Speaker* (*Mr. Hubert Beaumont*): I would like to hear what the hon. Member for Galloway (*Mr. McKie*) is saying.

*Mr. McKie*: On a point of Order, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Is it in Order for an hon. Member opposite—I cannot say which one—to say audibly, "Wash your ears"?

*Mr. Deputy-Speaker*: The hon. Member has placed me somewhat at a disadvantage. Apparently his hearing is better than mine. I did not hear the alleged remark.

*An Hon. Member*: The remark was, "Wash your ears."

*Mr. McKie*: Further to that point of Order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the noble Lady the Member for Norwich (*Lady Noel-Buxton*) emphasised what the hon. Member said.

*Mr. Deputy-Speaker:* I thought the noble Lady was trying to help the hon. Gentleman.

*Mr. McKinlay:* I do not know why the hon. Member for Galloway should pick on me—

*Major Guy Lloyd:* On a point of Order, Sir. Are we discussing soap or oatmeal?

*Mr. Deputy-Speaker:* I rather gathered, or, shall I say, assumed that up to now hon. Members have been discussing oatmeal.

*Mr. McKie:* On a point of Order, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. I appeal for your protection. I understood the hon. Member who was addressing the House asked you, as far as I understood him, whether the noble Lady the Member for Norwich was in Order in asking whether my ears were clean.

*Lady Noel-Buxton (Norwich):* I did not say a word.

*Mr. Deputy-Speaker:* That being the case, the hon. Member, who asked for a Ruling and guidance, has been guilty of false information.

*Mr. McKie:* I distinctly heard the noble Lady.

*Mr. Deputy-Speaker:* The noble Lady has stated that she did not speak. . . .

*The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food (Dr. Edith Summerskill):* I assure the hon. Member for South Edinburgh (Sir W. Darling) that it is because I recognise that the Scots are a great people that I am surprised that this Prayer was put on the Order Paper.

*Mr. McKie:* Why?

*Dr. Summerskill:* Perhaps the hon. Member will exercise a little patience. I listened carefully to the speeches of the hon. Members who moved and seconded the Motion and to their Scottish supporters. While I recognise that they are justified in making a plea for certain categories of workers who, I know, have been accustomed to certain long-established practices in Scotland—and I intend to deal with them later—I do not believe that the fine, proud people of Scotland want privileges that are denied to the rest of Britain. The arguments to which we have listened tonight could all have been used in the Debate on bread rationing. Hon. Members have said that oatmeal is the filler for the Scottish people. Bread is the filler for the English and the Welsh, but the English and the Welsh do not present a united front in this House and ask for special privileges. . . .

On the subject of animals, I was very surprised to hear that the mover of the Prayer did not know his case. He told the House just now that it was customary in Scotland for the farmers to feed their sheepdogs with oatmeal. I hope that he will give me the names of those farmers because they have all been guilty of an offence against our Regulations. I should like to tell the hon. Member that he should go back to Scotland and tell his friends the farmers that they can have, if they like, a special ration of animal feeding stuffs—and the dogs qualify for that as well as the other animals—

*Lord William Scott:* Will the Parliamentary Secretary say what the feeding stuff is?

*Dr. Summerskill:* I should like to tell the noble Lord that it is not the stuff that he would like to eat and that animals reject. It is a different kind. I think it will be found even more palatable—

*Lord William Scott:* What is the name of it?

*Dr. Summerskill:* The noble Lord and I exchange letters at least three times a week. I will let him have the recipe tomorrow.

*Lord William Scott:* Will it be precise?

*Dr. Summerskill:* It shall be precise. If the noble Lord had accepted my invitation to come to the Ministry today, he could have had the information, but unfortunately he could not accept it. Hon. Members sneer at semolina, but it is an excellent food. . . .

“La Vie se Reprend”—(continued from page 4)  
than material sense, a builder of the new France. He had found time to organize the Christian Trade Union movement in Tours, and he showed me the social centre, with its Chapel, dining-rooms and library, which he had planned and built. All this work, so concrete, so harmonious, and so well-considered, had no political implications. It was an example—one of many—of the French people resuming confidence in themselves.”—Robert Speaight in *The Tablet*.

#### READY SHORTLY

#### ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL CREDIT

An introductory course of Lectures published with the authority of the Social Credit Secretariat.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

6/- net.

#### 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 .....	14d.

#### 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.