

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 5.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 3, 1948

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

THE SYSTEM (CONSTITUTION) WHICH GOT US INTO THIS MESS WILL NEVER GET US OUT OF IT. WHY SHOULD IT?

• • •

"In the objectivised world, there are only necessary functions; nothing more than that . . . The State ought to defend freedom and Right. That is the justification for its existence. But every process by which the State is made absolute, is a great evil . . .

"The State should be limited, it should be brought within the bounds which it ought not to go beyond."—Nicholas Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, pp 140 *et seq.*

• • •

We are completely sceptical, and to use an Irishism, more completely sceptical daily, of any remedy for the world's ills of which the pre-requisite is that it should be understood by a political majority. Yet, equally, one of the most urgent matters is the substitution of the fantastic syllabus of our elementary schools by a most carefully prepared foundation of general principles which can be stated in simple language. Even amongst people whose tutorial curriculum has comprised most of what is called "higher education" (apart from specific preparation for the legal profession) what proportion is aware and conscious of perhaps the most important single fact in the British social system—that much of the Law which governed daily conduct until twenty years ago was "Judge-made", not Parliament-made? It was out of this, (largely a consideration of "custom") that Common Law moulded by Moral and "Natural" Law grew, and a little consideration will make it obvious that there is a striking similarity between the legal process involved, and the economic democracy of the monetary vote, by which the shopper expressed his preference for Mr. Dobson over Mr. Jobson for the supply of his groceries. It is not accidental that both democracies with their choice of quality have disappeared together. Intelligence has become so debased that it appears to require re-education to appreciate that there is no difference in principle between a political and an economic monopoly—that a man who has to accept a Party Programme even if he votes against it, is in precisely the position Mr. Henry Ford designed for him in relation to motor-car colour schemes thirty years ago: "They can choose any colour they like, so long as it's black."

• • •

It will be interesting to see how long the general, world, public will require to grasp the fact that Wall Street and Washington, more than Germany, though perhaps in continuation of it, have plunged the planet, and particularly the Middle East and Asia, into half a century's turmoil and destruction. The technique of meddling in foreign affairs, gratuitously and without legitimate reason, either or both

diplomatically or financially, in the (frequently realised) hope that they can fish profitably in troubled waters, without any risk or loss, is strikingly emphasised by the *volte face* on the question of Partition in Palestine. Evidently, encouraged by "Britain's" abject folly or worse, over the past thirty years, it was expected that the American Zionists (a convenient name for World Dominion plotters) could light the fire, and the silly English would fight another war to put it out, and still further eliminate themselves. The idea that they should shoulder the responsibility for their policy is plainly so frightening to what we are constantly told is the world's greatest Power, that, after a display of the most astonishing blackmail in order to get a vote in the United Nations in favour of Partition—the only occasion on which their views and those of "Russia" appear to coincide—the . . . States have ratted once again.

We should not be in the least surprised if Pandit Nehru adopted much the same attitude in regard to his *ersatz* "India" as that being assumed by the Jews in regard to the National Home. In both Japan and China the American myth is being detonated, and it is doubtful whether the Presidential Election next November is not too far away to allow General MacArthur ("The Magnificent") to run for President with the catcalls from his satrapy still unheard by the American elector.

• • •

THE NEW DIPLOMACY. "According to this file [U.S. State Department Secret File on Palestine] since September 15, 1938, each time a promise had been made to American Jewry regarding Palestine, the State Department promptly sent messages to the Arab rulers discounting it and reassuring them, in effect, that, regardless of what was promised publicly to the Jews, nothing would be done to change the situation in Palestine."—*Behind the Silken Curtain*, Bartley C. Crum. p. 36.

Notice the date—just after Mr. Chamberlain had apparently averted the war, and the "American" Jews were foaming with fury.

The Work State

"The formidable judgment industrialism has to face is that of reason, which demands that the increase and specification of labour be justified by benefits somewhere actually realised and integrated in individuals. Someone must live better for having produced or enjoyed these possessions. And he would not live better, even granting that the possessions were in themselves advantages, if these advantages were bought at too high a price and removed other greater opportunities or benefits. The belle must not sit so long prinking before the glass as to miss the party, and man must not work so hard and burden himself with so many cares as to have no breath or interest left for things free and intellectual."—*Reason in Society*, George Santayana.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 10, 1948.

Palestine Bill

(The Debate continued:—)

Mr. Sydney Silverman (Nelson and Colne): . . . the whole objection on which this Amendment is founded is the failure to put into the Bill—as could and should have been put into the Bill—something to show what my right hon. Friend had in mind as to what would remain as the law of the country, in some sense or some form. The United Nations organisation, with all its fault and inadequacies, is doing its best very quickly with a job we, at any rate, have resigned after some 30 years, and did not in the way they dealt with it leave the questions unanswered that this Bill leaves unanswered? They provided for the interregnum, a series of recommendations, leaving it to Great Britain to say that they would go out, and on what date, and then providing a series of steps for the transfer of partial power and culminating in the end in the transfer to the United Nations Commission on the day our jurisdiction ended that some jurisdiction should continue.

The amazing thing is that in this Bill neither the United Nations nor the United Nations Commission on Palestine ever appear at all. Not one word of them. Not one word to show there ever was a Mandate. Not one word about the League of Nations. Not one word about the United Nations decision. That is why I say to the Government: "Do you accept this decision or not, because this Bill will be taken all over the world as evidence that you reject it and are prepared to sabotage it?" I am not saying that my right hon. Friend wants to do that. I am saying that, in fact, that is what the Bill will do, and all over the world everyone will say it is the policy of the British Government, or of the British Foreign Secretary, because this is the personal policy of the British Foreign Secretary; this man never wanted partition; he had not the courage or the guts to go to the United Nations and say so; he kept out and said nothing, but everybody knows he never wanted it. Since the United Nations have decided it, in spite of that fact, so long as he retains the power he will do nothing to help and this Bill is the evidence of that.

Sir P. Hannon: I hope the hon. Member will forgive me if I interrupt again. I hope the hon. Gentleman will not exercise the faculties of his imagination too far. He is making a speech tonight which may make great difficulties all over the world, and may arouse many difficulties in the United States of America, and I would suggest that the hon. Gentleman should restrict his observations in making any commenting criticism on the right hon. Gentleman the Foreign Secretary.

Mr. Silverman: I hope the hon. Member will do me the justice of recognising two things. On this subject I always try to speak with a sense of responsibility, and it would be an impertinence to say anything I do not mean when I address the House. I believe there is great danger in what I am discussing, as suggested by the hon. Gentleman, but the danger does not lie in what I say. . . .

Mr. Thomas Reid (Swindon): My hon. Friend the Member for Luton (Mr. Warbey) suggested that the Government are being disloyal to the United Nations unless they

take a hand in implementing the decision of that organisation. In spite of what the Attorney-General has said about the difficulties of international law, I should like to draw attention to a few points in the Charter of the United Nations. Section 14 says that the Assembly which dealt with this matter may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any dispute. Section 4 says that members of the organisation shall refrain from using the threat of force or from the use of force against the integrity or the independence of any State. And yet this Assembly of the same organisation is proposing to interfere with the integrity of and to disintegrate a State. I certainly say that is immoral, probably illegal and certainly unjust. The Assembly may make recommendations. The Government say that they will not necessarily accept the recommendations, and they are not bound to accept them. The South African Government recently refused to accept such recommendations in regard to South West Africa, and no one has been able to prove that they acted illegally in doing so. What all Governments must do is to accept decisions of the Security Council, but in this case the Security Council has as yet given no decision. So far, our Government have done nothing wrong in relation to the United Nations. There has been no decision by U.N.O. as a whole. There was, however, a recommendation by the Assembly, which has very properly been sent as a recommendation to the Security Council, but the Security Council has made no decision on that yet. If our Government should reject a decision of the Security Council, then it must quit U.N.O. As regards the recommendation of the Assembly, we know that it is a matter of public knowledge that the State which was largely responsible for that decision is America. An American party got this unjust and disastrous recommendation passed in order to win the next election. That we all know is true. That is an additional reason why our Government are not bound to implement that wicked decision which was not made on legal or moral grounds.

My hon. Friend the Member for Luton suggested that we should take a hand in implementing the decision, and that we should make it possible for the Commission to function. I do not think that it will be possible for the Commission to function, even if they ever go to Palestine, because the Assembly, by its wicked decision, has set the whole of Palestine aflame, with the possibility of setting the whole of the Middle East aflame. I do not know how the hon. Member thinks it is possible for us to make it possible for the Commission to function. He also suggested that we should let in the Commission before May 15. If that is done, we know that the balloon will go up, and that we shall then be left to carry the baby. We shall have let the Assembly turn Palestine into chaos, and we shall be left there to keep order. It cannot be done. If this decision of the Assembly is accepted by the Security Council, and the United Nations try to enforce it, I predict—and my predictions on this subject since I came to this House have all proved to be realised up to date—that we shall then have war which will last 10, 20 or 50 years. The Arabs will not submit so long as their sovereignty is to be taken away from them.

I was a member of the Partition Commission. We sat for six months on this job, and we decided then that partition was utterly impracticable on every ground, strategic, economic, fiscal and other grounds, and, I would add, on moral grounds. It is quite unworkable. The reason I am opposing the Assembly's Palestine policy is because an unlawful, immoral

and disastrous decision was made by the Assembly. The matter must be remedied by the United Nations organisation. The Security Council must refuse to accept that recommendation and U.N.O., through the Security Council or otherwise, must find a new solution to the problem. The solution which has been suggested will be disastrous to the Arabs and Jews and to Britain. I will repeat what I have said before: I am a much better friend to the Jews, as they are now beginning to realise, than the political Zionists. . . .

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided: Ayes, 240; Noes, 30.

Bill accordingly read the Second time.

NOES—Acland, Sir Richard; Austin, H. Lewis; Baird, J.; Bramall, E. A.; Cocks, F. S.; Collins, V. J.; Comyns, Dr. L.; Cove, W. G.; Crossman, R. H. S.; Delargy, H. J.; Edelman, M.; Field, Capt. W. J.; Janner, B.; Lee, Miss J. (Cannock); Lever, N. H.; Levy, B. W.; Lewis, J. (Bolton); Mack, J. D.; Mackay, R. W. G. (Hull, N.W.); Mikardo, Ian; Millington, Wing-Comdr. E. R.; Orbach, M.; Piratin, P.; Platts-Mills, J. F. P.; Pritt, D. N.; Silverman, J. (Erdington); Thomas, George (Cardiff); Vernon, Maj. W. F.; Wilkes, L.; Zilliacus, K.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES: Mr. Warbey and Mr. Sydney Silverman.

House of Commons: March 16, 1948.

Representation of the People Bill

Order for Committee read.

Bill considered in Committee.

[MAJOR MILNER in the Chair]

CLAUSE I.—(Constituencies and electors.)

. . . The first Amendment which I propose to call is that standing in the name of the right hon. Member for Woodford (Mr. Churchill).

[Mr. Peake (Leeds, North) in moving this amendment for the retention of the University vote put again even more forcibly and with further evidence the charge made against the Government on the second reading of the bill, of a dishonourable breach of faith].

Mr. Pickethorn (Cambridge University): . . . I want to come to the so-called bargain, and to this point of whether there was a bargain, and whether the bargain is being kept. I really do not think that there can be any doubt, after listening to my right hon. Friend's speech today, or to his speech on Second Reading, certainly anyone who has studied both those speeches cannot doubt it, that there is a conclusive proof that there was a bargain, an agreement, an accommodation, or call it what you will, to which both great parties were bound. I do not think that there really can be any doubt about that at all. I do not think that any candid mind—please note both words, "candid" and "mind"—leaving out prejudices and even hearts, can really doubt that he demonstrated that this agreement was intended to last for more than six months or a year—until a new Parliament had been elected. I think that the case can be put even higher than he has put it. I beg hon. Members opposite to listen to me on this point. A constitution is the mode in which a State is organised; a body of fundamental principles according to which the State is governed. I know that, because I found it in the dictionary.

Hon. Members opposite are anxious to be social democrats. They are anxious that we should not confuse them with some of the supporters whose votes they had at the last

election, and with the two whose votes they still have in this House of Commons. I should be the last to complain of that. If they are anxious to be constitutional, I ask them to consider what is the constitution of this country. It almost boils down to this: that anyone who can get 51 *per cent.* of the House of Commons on his side, at any given moment, can do anything he pleases, the only limit being that the House of Lords may hold it up for a few months, if it is something legislative, and secondly that in a barely conceivable set of circumstances the Crown might think it right to risk its very existence by refusing the desire of the majority, and trusting to get an alternative majority.

I do not think that anyone will question me so far as I have gone. I have forgotten what is exactly the proportion of hon. Members opposite in this House. I think it is 65 *per cent.*, on receiving 47 *per cent.* of the votes at the last General Election. What is the very last thing with which a House of Commons, so near to the point of extreme uncontrolled omnipotence, can interfere with without avowing itself unconstitutional in any sense of the word "constitutional" which was current before 1945? That this majority in this House should be used for the purpose of altering the constitution of this House of Commons, is the most extreme of all exercises of constitutional power. It is contrary to all precedent and habit that this House should ever arrange for alterations to its constitution, except after great, and I think always successful, efforts have been made to get a wide degree of agreement between the main parties beforehand. [Interruption.] 1832 is quite a different thing. If it is the "flapper" vote, that, I think, was sufficiently dealt with by my right hon. Friend from the Front Opposition Bench. This is a very extreme thing to do. Therefore, I say that not only was there a bargain or accommodation at the Speaker's Conference, but that there was something more than a bargain; this is much more nearly an Original Compact, on which everything legal and constitutional depends: that this House should not itself arrange for a change of its own constitution by a transitory majority.

The Lord President of the Council must be very familiar with the things he has said on this point. I can give him the references if he likes. Not only was this a sort of compact, but it was more than a compact—something almost amounting to the Original Compact of Locke. Why on earth did the Conservative majority make any concessions at all? The Lord President of the Council said that he could not imagine how, unless it was for the British genius for compromise and the desire for compromise at the Speaker's Conference, how the Conservatives had come to do certain things, including adding six million votes to the municipal franchise. If the intention was all along that whoever has a majority at the next election does exactly what he chooses about the composition of the House of Commons, why did not whoever had a last majority then do what suited them—that was us?

There is really no room for argument; if there were, the argument of my right hon. Friend was unanswerable. But there is really nothing to argue about; the whole nature and essence of the Speaker's Conference was that there should be some degree of permanence; it has no meaning whatever without that. Hon. Members who light-mindedly, without taking the trouble to look into it doubt that, are making quite certain of disaster, apart from more important entities, to their own party. You cannot for long get away with intellec-

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. 20. No. 5.

Saturday, April 3, 1948.

An Open Agenda

Most of our readers probably think, with us, that the Debate on the Representation of the People Bill to which we have sacrificed so much valuable space, makes pretty poor reading, judged by any but the lowest standard of party political disputation. Poor stuff as it has been we have at least placed it on the record with a strong desire to give attention to any argument from any quarter which might suggest comprehensive understanding. What imp of doctrine made the executive bring up this question at the present moment may be known to its 'higher' members, unless somnambulism is the only possible explanation for their wanderings. Whether that is so or not, the task before someone is to show them where it is they have walked. It is one thing to have raised the question of the Constitution and quite another, though not unrelated, to bring it to a conclusion. The Planners have at least done us the service of introducing it to the agenda. There is now a wide-open door for addition to the agenda of a lot which does not appear to have been intended. The inspiration to do this is particularly our business, and, at a moment of greatly increased attention to what this journal exists to clarify, the Open Vote in conjunction with the attachment of a money responsibility to its use is a ready weapon to our hand.

Here we find two keys to our door in the same pocket, and whenever we display them it is very noticeable that no one makes more than a token plea against applying them immediately to the lock which is the avowed object of most people in their senses to turn. Following the impressive list of references to the Constitutional issue in *The Social Crediter* of a fortnight ago, none can say we are not well-prepared. Anyone who chooses to argue against us on this point has a hard task, made harder because most if not all his private inclinations are with us.

The larger development of this line may take some time. Finally what we have to effect is a complete realisation of what attaches to the word *law*. The original meaning, without question, was something very closely associated, if not solely and exclusively, with the establishment of men in their rights; and from that it has come to mean, in our time, the exact opposite, the alienation of all from their rights, the taking of all rights away. It is now understood, in most quarters where anything at all may be said to be understood in even a verbal and literal sense, that Communism is the enemy: that what we are fighting is Communism. What is not so clearly understood is that Communism is a Constitution—and, moreover, a World Constitution. So it is a Constitution that is in dispute: a question of one Constitution or another. The 'opposition' (which does not oppose) in the House of Commons is not yet alive to that.

The Communist "Smear"

(A Broadcast by Mr. Norman Jaques, M.P., from Edmonton, Alberta).

On January 20, last, Prime Minister MacKenzie King said:—

The world is in an appallingly dangerous condition today, let us not speak of having entered upon an era of peace, where all about us are evidences of strife. Today, a new tyranny seeks world domination. Communism is no less a tyranny than Nazism. It aims at world conquest, and hopes to effect its purpose by force. Communism seeks to create unrest in all quarters of the globe by devious underhand, and underground methods. It seeks to undermine, where it does not openly defy, the authority of government itself. Let us not allow another wolf-like menace to masquerade in sheep's clothing, seeking all the while whom it may devour.

Now, either Mr. King was talking sense, or he was talking nonsense. I have every reason, and many proofs, to believe that Mr. King did not in any way exaggerate the nature, or the dangers of the situation.

Further, I have every reason to believe that the vast majority of people fail to realise our appallingly dangerous position, still less do they recognize the devious underhand, and underground methods by which Communists seek to undermine all who stand against their plans for world domination. THAT is the sole reason for this broadcast. I shall say nothing but what already has been said, or published, and from this record I shall leave you to draw your own conclusions.

Now, the Communists always seek to undermine those opponents whom they fear by "smearing" them with Fascism, and anti-Semitism.

This "smear" is the Communists' method of undermining, and is the main reason for their success as wolves in sheep's clothing. I, and certain other Social Crediters, have every reason to realize this fact. For years we have been the victims of this Communist smear because for years—long before Mr. King awoke to our appalling danger, we have led the fight against Communism. But, the political Zionists, have actually persuaded some Social Credit leaders to regard Communist wolves in sheep's clothing as dear little pet lambs, while Social Credit watch-dogs have been muzzled.

According to Canadian Press news of December 16 last:—

Norman Jaques, M.P., would be banned from the Canadian Social Crediter because of his anti-isms attitude, in particular his anti-Semitic attitude, said the new editor of the paper.

Note the "anti-isms," which includes Communism.

Again, last month, according to a statement given to the press by a top party advisor, some Social Credit leaders have publicly dis-associated themselves from Mr. Jaques's more extreme racial views. I am not anti-Semitic, but, for good reasons, I am opposed to political Zionism, and I shall quote eminent Jewish authorities to prove that it is the Zionists who are the extreme racialists, and I shall submit evidence to prove that Communists and Zionists are working together to gain their own ends.

First, the opinion of the late Henry Morgenthau, Senior, as recorded in his autobiography: "ALL IN A LIFETIME":—

Zionism is the most stupendous fallacy in Jewish

history. I assert it is wrong in principle, and impossible of realization, it is unsound in its economics, fantastical in its politics, and sterile in its spiritual ideals. Zionism is a surrender, not a solution. It is retrogression into the blackest error, and not progress toward the light. I will go further and say it is a betrayal; it is an Eastern European proposal, fathered in this country by American Jews, which, if it were to succeed, would cost the Jews of America most of what they have gained of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

That was the late Henry Morgenthau's considered opinion of Zionism. Was he anti-Semitic? He was a very eminent Jew.

And now listen to *Mr. Benjamin Freedman*, another distinguished American Jew:—

The threat of political Zionism to the welfare, and security of America is little realized. It is a dangerous mistake to think of it as a localised Arab-Jewish struggle. There may soon take place in Palestine an explosion that will set off another world war. Every American citizen, every head of a family, all members of Christian Churches, every non-Zionist Jew, should be brought to understand that the consequences can be fatally disastrous.

The influence of the Zionist organization reaches into the inner policy-making groups of nearly every government in the world—particularly into the Christian West. This influence causes these groups to adopt pro-Zionist policies which are often in conflict with the real interests of the people they govern. This condition exists in the United States. Its extent is so great as to make it a threat to our future.

It has always been a cardinal principle of American policy that all civilized people have right to enjoy their own freedom. No free people would hesitate to resist forced immigration of aliens across their borders. The United States would never permit it, yet our President has demanded that Britain should, by the exercise of military power, and against the wishes of the present inhabitants, force into Palestine hundreds of thousands of immigrants from Eastern Europe to set up their own national state. This utterly immoral, and unjust policy is producing an unanticipated result. An explosion is brewing and, as it approaches, Christian supporters of Zionism in our Government are almost panic-stricken. Yet they fear to reverse their position lest they be stigmatized by Zionists as anti-Semitic. The ability of Zionists to have things their own way stems from the organized pressure they can bring upon people who do not agree with them.

By holding the threat of being called anti-Semitic over men in public, and business life, they have been able to stifle opposition—even among American Jews.

It will take courage for Americans, of what ever origin, to think these facts through, and take public positions upon them. They will be smeared. They will be slandered. Already Zionists have been able to bring about economic ruin of many Christians and Jews who have dared to challenge their right

to claim Palestine for a national Jewish state. We stand at the crossroad. The majority of Christian Americans must decide whether it will longer submit to being the tool of a small, but ruthless minority of a minority people. The great majority of American Jews also must choose. Will they follow political Zionism to its inescapable consequences? If we do, we shall be walking the road to ruin.

I could quote many more Jews to the same effect. How can these Jews be labelled anti-Semitic? The Arabs are purely a Semitic people. It is the political Zionists who really are anti-Semitic. The British Government refuses to be a party to a Jewish state, the partition of Palestine, or to the use of force against Arabs, or Jews. Does this make Mr. Bevin anti-Semitic? According to Zionists, it does.

Mr. Albert Kahn, a leading American Zionist, says that the British are worse than Nazis, and should be driven into the sea, that anti-Semitism is raging in U.S.A. and Canada, and that Jews must look to Soviet Russia for protection through the labour Unions.

Another Zionist, *Ben Hecht*, tells Americans that:

Every time a British soldier, policeman, or civil servant is shot, or bombed in Palestine the Jews in America make a holiday in their hearts.

Who are the racial extremists?—people such as Morgenthau, Freedman, and Bevin? Or, Zionists such as Albert Kahn, and Hecht who, like so many Zionists, are Communists, which explains why the partition of Palestine is the only "U.N." policy with which Moscow agrees. (The C.C.F. back capitalist America for partition against Britain's Labour Government's opposition to it.)

According to an official report, the 1946 Communist Convention in Alberta condemned the members of the Social Credit Board; the policy of the Social Credit paper in general; and me in particular. All these objections have since been removed. Why? Well, according to the Canadian Jewish Chronicle of January 9 last:

Social Credit leaders, following conferences with Joseph H. Fine, chairman public relations committee of Canadian Jewish Congress, have banned publication of anti-Semitic articles in the Social Credit paper, and have forced the resignation of its editor, and sub-editor. Chiefly affected will be Norman Jaques, who has used the paper for anti-Semitic propaganda.

So, now we know who really controls the policies of our Social Credit paper, and movement. As Mr. Freedman says:—

The Zionists reach into the inner policy-making groups of nearly every government,—particularly the Christian West. Their influence is often against the real interests of the people. Soviet Communism will succeed in its attempt to conquer the world in direct proportion to the support given to Zionism.

Zionists demand an international army to enforce partition of Palestine. If Russia sends a Red Army to Palestine, it will be there to stay. In the face of this appallingly dangerous world situation, why does Mr. King's government agree to start another war in Palestine?

Ask the Zionist leaders. But "*Ye shall know the truth, and the Truth shall make you free.*"

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

tual nonsense, or with a plain and obvious neglect of elementary fairness. . . . If the Speaker's Conference was intended to last only six, 12 or 18 months, how long is the present Conference about the relation between the two Houses intended to last? Is that also intended to last only to the next General Election? I am not going into that question, Major Milner. I am merely asking how long it will last, because that question blows away the whole argument we have had from the Treasury Bench. . . .

. . . Do not let us throw away this safeguard for academic freedom. It is a great safeguard of academic freedom. One of the drawbacks of treating the withholding labour as the strongest of all economic and political forces—one of the drawbacks to that habit of mind is that it acts in a disgenic manner. If academic liberty were seriously infringed, it would not be so obviously inconvenient in three days' time as if all the dustmen went off, or all the liftmen, or all the furnacemen. That is true, but in a short period, whether we were conscious of it or not, we should be extremely inconvenienced. If we must throw away this safeguard of academic freedom, do not let us pretend that we do it because it is intolerable on arithmocratic grounds. That can be shown to be a piece of hypocrisy. And do not let us say that it is done because the universities in fact at the last General Election tended to swing the opposite way to the general population and because most university members are not such as would be nominated by Transport House. That is not really a respectable argument, and I hope that it will not be used any more.

Do not let us pretend this is not a blow at learning and the learned professions, because it is. We had the argument, when talking about the health service from two hon. Members and I think from one right hon. Gentleman opposite, that of course medical men could not be expected to have valuable opinions about politics because they were so busy being medical men they had not the time for politics. If we are now to be told that graduates in general are not such that the community ought to make sure of their having a small representation—I do not say that 12 is the right number—chosen by themselves—I have forgotten how many miners there are in the country and how many graduates; there are more miners than graduates but not so very many more; someone told me there were 50 miners' Members appointed directly by miners' lodges and another 50 indirectly; assume that that is an exaggeration and that the total is 60 or 70—is it too much to say that graduates, who do not happen to be conveniently or properly organisable on a trade union basis and do not happen all to live together and are scattered about—to say that it is desirable in the interests of the community that in this Chamber which has become so extremely sovereign over all our activities, that they should have some representation here? To say that that cannot be accepted clearly deals a blow at learning and the learned professions.

Sir Arthur Salter (Oxford University): . . . There is one other reason, my fourth, why I consider that not Parliament, not private hon. Members, but Ministers are personally bound, and it is what the Secretary of State for Scotland said on Second Reading. Now, the Secretary of State speaks with rather a special authority, because he was the one Minister who was both a member of the Conference and was also chosen by the Government as one of their principal spokesmen to defend the proposal on Second Reading. What the

right hon. Gentleman said was not that there was no agreement, but that, on the contrary, the Labour Party was released from the agreement by the fact that the Conservative Party had broken it. When we asked him how, he said in two ways, first since the General Election, two universities had elected Conservatives; and second, some of the hon. Members who already represented universities had voted against the Government. He referred in particular to the senior Member for the Scottish Universities (Sir J. Anderson) and myself. Those were the reasons why the agreement could be broken—because it had already been broken by the other side. They are extremely interesting reasons, and I will come back to them in a moment. I quote them now merely as recognition of the fact that there was indeed an agreement, and an agreement intended to operate not only in the previous Parliament but in this Parliament. . . .

. . . Let us examine what those reasons mean, and what they imply. They mean that when the Secretary of State was deliberating with his colleagues at the Speaker's Conference, he thought that he was binding himself, and that they were binding themselves, not merely to make some changes in an electorate, but binding themselves also as to what Members the electors would afterwards elect. This is a most extraordinary theory as to what members of a conference do and can do, and a very interesting constitutional theory. It is worth inquiring, too, what was the nature of the offence committed. It clearly was not that a party Member stood for a university constituency because Mr. G. D. H. Cole stood as a Labour candidate and as my opponent in a university election; and that his first supporter in that election was the Prime Minister. That therefore is not the offence. Is the offence, not that they are party candidates, but that they are Conservative Party candidates, or is the offence that they are elected? Anyhow, it is a very interesting theory.

The other part of the right hon. Gentleman's doctrine is even more interesting. He not only said that it was an offence for Conservatives to stand as candidates, and to be elected; he said that my right hon. Friend and myself, in some way or other, justified the Labour Party in breaking this agreement because we had sometimes spoken and voted against the Government. That is to say, he thought that he and his colleagues were binding themselves at that time to secure that my right hon. Friend and myself, and other hon. Members, should vote in a particular way, or should not vote in a particular way. This, again, is an extraordinarily interesting constitutional theory. It is also extremely interesting as a candid and honest exposition of the reasons which apparently guided the Government in coming to this decision.

I asked the right hon. Gentleman in the Second Reading Debate whether he seriously meant that the Government's reason for the permanent abolition of University seats, some of which have been in existence for over three centuries, was to be found in the fact that he disliked the party complexion of some of the dozen present incumbents of these seats, or the personality or the votes of some of the actual individuals at this time. That, apparently, was his position. Is not such a reason petty, personal and perverse? I have no doubt that we shall now be given certain other reasons, and more respectable reasons, for this change as they have been given by the Government's back bench supporters. But these are the reasons given by the Front Bench. . . .

. . . Just a word on the arithmetic principle, on which opponents of the university franchise chiefly rely. I am much

intrigued by the metaphysical subtlety of the Labour Government's application of this arithmetic principle. In its relation to the university franchise it has an absolute sanctity; in relation to Scotland and Wales, and those other constituencies in each part of the United Kingdom where the recognition of some kind of special community has been allowed to lead to more than the arithmetic representation—in such cases, this principle has not an absolute sanctity but a qualified sanctity; and when we come to electoral procedure and such a question as proportional representation, it has no sanctity at all. This principle is the reason, the main and almost the only reason which is relied upon by people opposing the university franchise on merits; and in view of the exceptions I have quoted, it is really too much to regard it as sacrosanct in this one case.

. . . There is one other point I would suggest to the Government. I think if they go on with this proposal there will be very considerable political consequences. This will be regarded, whether rightly or wrongly, as another blow at the professional middle classes, who constitute a very considerable part of the floating vote which determines one Election after another. Over the last two and a half years this class has suffered one material injury after another. Many members of it, who supported the present Government at the last Election, have been wondering, and wondering more and more, whether these injuries were only the incidental and inevitable result of the Government's general Socialist policy, or whether there was not, sometimes, something like sectionalist malice as well—not, indeed, consistent hostility by the Government or by the mass of their supporters, many of whom, of course, belong to precisely this class, but a suspicion that now and then, here and there, the policy was in fact deflected by a certain incursion of political forces in which there was an element of malice. This suspicion has been mounting. It was because it existed that the silly phrase, "Tinker's cuss," which would otherwise have been quickly forgotten, had such importance. It seemed to reveal and to confirm that suspicion. But this proposal is not just a silly phrase; this is action, this is a wanton and unprovoked blow. It is neither required nor justified by any mandate. It is not required by the general Socialist policy of the Government; it is a wanton, unprovoked blow without warning and, as I have argued, against what could properly be regarded as pledges by those who strike the blow. . . .

House of Commons: March 17, 1948.

Representation of the People Bill

Considered in Committee . . .

CLAUSE I.—(Constituencies and electors.)

[*Captain Crookshank (Gainsborough) moved an amendment for the retention of the Business vote and the City of London representation.*]

Mr. Quintin Hogg (Oxford): . . . This leads me to a discussion of the principles upon which we ought to proceed in considering these Amendments. . . . But, in point of fact, it is simply not true that a principle is involved in this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman sought to base his arguments upon a suggested principle, that all Parliamentary representation should be based upon "one man, one vote"; or, in other words, slightly borrowed from a right hon. Friend of mine, "one vote, one value." But that is simply not the principle upon which this particular Bill is or could be based.

There are, in fact, two or three different principles of representation which are necessarily involved in any Representation of the People Bill. It is precisely at this point when we come to deal with the business vote, or the separate representation of a community like the City of London, or the communities which we were discussing last night—it is at this point at which these principles meet and have to be reconciled that the matter becomes of crucial importance. The truth is that the representation of the people by a General Election really involves the application of at least three principles, not inconsistent in all their respects, but which sometimes diverge.

The first, of course, is the election of a House of Commons broadly representative of the votes of the people. The logical application of that would be, from the mathematical point of view, to reduce the country to a single constituency and have party lists as they do on the Continent. In that way a completely mathematically accurate reflection of political opinion in the country could undoubtedly be obtained—to our infinite disaster: because the truth is that this is only one of the purposes for which we hold a General Election.

The second purpose is this. Quite apart from the first purpose, which is to elect a House of Commons representative of the individual opinions of the electorate, our second purpose is to elect a House of Commons which is representative of subordinate communities within the electorate. That, in fact, is applied in this Bill, and applied on a most extensive scale. Why is the representation given to Scotland by this Bill so much better than that given to England, or that given to Wales better than that given to England? Why is it that some constituencies are relatively small in the numbers of constituents while others are relatively large? In each case the principle involved is the same, namely, that, quite apart from the general purpose of electing a House of Commons, which is representative of individuals, it is sought to elect a House of Commons which is truly representative of living communities within the State. That is why different constituencies of different sizes are made. . . . there is a third purpose which we have to consider in a General Election, namely, the election of a Government. . . . it is for that reason that the principle of proportional representation is not accepted. The Home Secretary sought to pretend that his case against the business vote and against the separate representation of the City of London—indeed, he pretended last night that his case against university franchise was based on similar grounds—was based upon an alleged principle of the Labour Party, namely, "one man, one vote," which should be applied rigidly to the whole electoral system of this country. I have sought to point out that this is sheer nonsense; that it is not proposed to apply any such principle, and that if it were the proposal would meet with very little approbation from any source whatever. . . .

. . . At the moment I am not arguing that there is any advantage in plural voting; nor, I suppose, should I be permitted to do so were I to attempt it.

What I am suggesting is that there is every reason, in principle, why there should be a business franchise and separate representation for the City of London. I am bound to add—I think I can do this within the rules of Order—that I am not in the least impressed by the fear that there might be a few plural votes cast if that representation were given. . . .

... In the few minutes remaining to me I wish to pay a little attention to the business vote, because it seems to me that the Government have failed to understand that the principle they ought to apply to this case is, not only the principle of the representation of individual opinion, but the principle of the adequate representation of subordinate communities. I believe that their failure to apply that principle has led them into precisely the error which they have committed. . . .

... This leads me to the position of the City of London. It is, of course, true that the separate representation of the City of London on anything like its present basis depends on the preservation of the business vote. Some kind of amalgamation would almost certainly be necessary if that were taken away. If we apply the principle I have sought to suggest as a valid principle of our constitution—and it has its application even in this Bill proposed by the Government—that is, the principle of adequate separate representation of subordinate communities, then it seems to me that the case for the separate representation for the City of London is overwhelming. There is a body of men and women in this area who, whatever we may think about them, are a separate subordinate local community. It is true that they do not happen to sleep there, and in that respect they are practically unique, although the Home Secretary may have it, if he likes, that there are other towns in the country where the dormitory element is outside; nevertheless, the City of London in that respect is unique. It is a great local community with a population during the day which would otherwise be considered worthy of separate representation, quite apart from its historical traditions. It is to be denied separate representation in this House, not for any intrinsic reasons of its unworthiness, but because of the accident of modern civilisation, whereby those who live and work there do not happen to sleep there. To attempt to apply a principle, which never had universal validity, universally over our electoral system, can lead to nothing but anomalies.

I only want to add this: that our great Parliamentary life has not developed solely by the rigid and legalistic application of mathematical principles, but it has sought to adapt itself to the living, continuous traditions of a vigorous

and vital community; it has sought to get the substance of what was required by applying principles, not universally but generally, and by demanding always exceptions where exceptions were required. . . .

(To be continued)

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	6/6
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.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit.....	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...7/-	
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	5/-
Protocols of Zion	1/6
The Smear Terror	1/3
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W....1/-	
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
This Freedom	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...8d.	
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
Social Credit: An Explanation for New Readers 1½d. each, or 50 copies for 5/-.	
"Pages from <i>The Social Crediter</i> ".....	1½d.
"Private View" for Industrialists	1d.
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Communism in Action U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp. 1/6	
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson...6d.	

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

NOW READY

THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By

C. H. DOUGLAS

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, LIVERPOOL.