

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 7.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 17, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

It is a weakness of the immature mind, to which world-plotters pander, to regard every problem in the light of "either" and "or". Either Capitalism or Collectivism, either Socialism or Communism; either war or peace. The convenience of this concept is that it can be narrowed to the simple issue: Will you be shot, or boiled in oil?

An instance of this manoeuvre, by which peoples are induced to accept outrageous conditions under the impression that they are the only alternative to those which make life impossible, is the widely held notion that we have to choose between vassalage to Wall Street and Washington, and serfdom under Stalin, with, say, Mr. Aneurin Bevan as the local Kommissar.

In the first place, as usual, the "alternative" itself is imaginary. It may be quite true, and it probably is quite true, that ninety-nine out of every hundred Russians and Americans imagine that their Governments represent irreconcilable policies. But we do not think Mr. Aneurin Bevan and his frequent hosts would think so. Mr. Israel Moses Sieff is, if we are not mistaken, a Russian Jew by descent, but has, or has had, the closest connection with the New Deal in U.S.A. Mr. Aneurin Bevan, a Minister in a Government which, like its predecessor, is rightly attacked for its slavish obedience to Washington, is regarded by those who ought to know as the next step on the road to Moscow. As usual, however, there is a major, and several minor, policies which are carefully kept from public discussion.

It is not possible to become conscious of this until we recognise and accept the present conflict as one of cultures. Once that is understood, and we believe that it is indisputable, we are released from the thralldom of labels. Communism, Socialism, Hitlerism, can be seen as different approaches to a fundamentally identical end, and we understand without difficulty that a nation under the thrall of P.E.P. or the New Deal cannot possibly defeat a national group whose manipulators are actuated by similar motives.

A, by fighting B, simply insures the victory of C.

• • •
"There is abundant evidence that the United States, for all its tremendous physical power, is accomplishing nothing that can be called beneficial to mankind . . .

"It is not unnatural for a ward politician to be President of the United States. But it becomes grotesque when a man of parochial outlook, inferior training and deficient ability, attempts to rush a reluctant people down the dangerous road of imperial rule . . .

" . . . It is a bitter pill for Americans to realise that this country, during the past few years, has led the world in smashing the fabric of civilisation; has accomplished virtually nothing outside its borders towards the rebuilding of some-

thing better."—"Here let us stop," Felix Morley, in *Human Events*.

Who controls the N.Y. Jewish vote controls New York; who controls New York, controls U.S.A.

GREAT BRITAIN, 1897.

With the foregoing appreciation of the American Scene in mind, let us roll back the film of Time to the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, fifty years ago.

It is a blazing June, and London, the unquestioned Capital of the world, is packed with visitors of every nation and none, as though to mark the apex of the greatest Empire in history, symbolised by The Longest Reign. Sir Henry Irving and Ellen Terry play to packed houses; George Edwardes is just entering on a long series of musical comedy successes which mark, if it had been realised, the end of a cultural period. All the great county families, many of them patrons of that sure passport to 'Society', country-house cricket, are entertaining lavishly. Hansoms clip-clop down the unwidened Strand, and, in the numerous but soon-resolved traffic blocks, the cabbies, perched well above the crush, bandy caustic witticisms.

Some of the crowds have forsaken the pavements for 'the River'. Cookham Lock, as seen from its parapet, is a bed of giant, blazing, mushrooms—the silken parasols vital to the preservation of delicate complexions from vulgar tan.

Hampstead Heath is crowded. Costers, effectively publicised by Chevalier, sometimes dressed in 'Pearlies', but always cheerful, drive a roaring trade in cherries at a penny a pound. Beer, real beer, is twopence a quart, whisky is 3/6 a bottle, a first class, six-course dinner, with a bottle of Chianti, can be had anywhere in Soho for 3/6. Passports

NOW READY

THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By

C. H. DOUGLAS

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

(Postage 1d.)

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

are curiosities, and hundreds of Lancashire mill-hands spend Friday-to-Tuesday in Paris for £5.

Down at Spithead, the world's greatest Navy lies at anchor. In the warm June evening, it will be blazing with light, and the bands of the big ships will play-in to dinner the hundreds of guests from the visitors, including the modest German Navy, moored near-by. The German Emperor is dining with his grandmother, the Little Old Lady, at Windsor; later, he will fare North to stay at stately Lowther with the Earl of Lonsdale, whose latest exploit has been to administer a sound thrashing to a costermonger who challenged him to a fight on the road to Epsom. The rent of a good cottage, which can be had, is £10 *per annum*.

MINISTRY:

Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury; Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Home Office, Sir Matthew White-Ridley; Foreign Office, Lord Lansdowne; Secretary of State for the Colonies, Joseph Chamberlain.

GOD OF OUR FATHERS, KNOWN OF OLD,
LORD OF OUR FAR-FLUNG BATTLE LINE
BENEATH WHOSE AWFUL HAND WE HOLD
DOMINION OVER PALM AND PINE
GOD OF OUR FATHERS, BE WITH US YET,
LEST WE FORGET.

R. Kipling, 1897.

"BRITAIN," 1948: FIFTY YEARS ON.

The Cheese ration (cheddar style) has been reduced. Civil war in India and Palestine.

MINISTRY:

Prime Minister, Clement Attlee (Jew); Minister of Food (Rations), J. Strachey (Jew); War Office, Emanuel Shinwell (Jew); Minister of Civil Aviation, Lord Nathan (Jew); Minister of Town and Country Planning, Rt. Hon. Lewis Silkin (Jew); Minister of Supply, G. R. Strauss (Jew); and twenty-five others of Cabinet Rank, including Mr. Aneurin Bevan.

Leader of the Liberal Party, Lord Samuel (Jew); Labour Party, Lord Rothschild (Jew).

TEN YEARS ON

? 1957.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 24, 1948.

Post Office Opened Letter (Inquiry)

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter asked the Postmaster-General for what purpose and by what authority officers of his Department opened a letter sent by Miss R. Browne-Clark, 54, Ancaster Crescent, New Malden, on February 20, to the Hotel National, Grindelwald.

The Postmaster-General (Mr. Wilfred Paling): In the absence of further details, I am not in a position to say in what circumstances the letter was opened, but if the hon. Member will kindly furnish me with such particulars, including if possible the envelope of the letter itself, I shall be glad to have inquiry made.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: Does the Postmaster-General

mean by that answer that this tampering with the mails of private persons is on so large a scale nowadays that his Department do not even keep a record of when they do it?

Mr. Paling: It is not on a large scale at all. The answer merely means that if the hon. Member wants to know about it and will let me have the evidence, I will tell him.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: Just the usual Gestapo.

Representation of the People Bill

Again considered in Committee.

Mr. Churchill (Woodford): . . . I am sure that this outlook and the conduct of this Bill has definitely lowered the whole standard of our political life; it has certainly greatly affected in these matters the relations between the two parties.

Discussions are proceeding now for the reform of the Second Chamber, but we cannot any longer feel assurance that, even if agreement were reached, the Government would keep the agreement. We cannot feel sure that they would not use any admissions or concessions which their opponents had made as a jumping off point for further argument, without on their part fulfilling honourably the counter-concessions which were part of a general settlement. I deeply regret that the Prime Minister, the Lord President, and other important Ministers opposite should have stooped so low at a time when it seems especially important that the reputation of a British Government in these matters should stand high in the world.

This new proposal of the Home Secretary not only flouts and destroys the agreement of the Speaker's Conference in the last Parliament; it is a flagrant breach of the usage which the Government have established in this Parliament after they became possessed of their great majority. It is an argument which is superimposed on all the complaints we made about the departure from the Speaker's Conference. The excuse that one Parliament cannot bind another, and the promulgation in electoral matters of the principle of "catch as catch can" as between one House of Commons and another, does not cover in any way the usage which His Majesty's Government have themselves practised and enjoined in this present Parliament.

As a result of the Speaker's Conference and other statutory Measures passed by the late Parliament, the Boundary Commission was set up to make a fresh and fair redistribution of seats with the object of approaching, subject to the many inherent difficulties of the subject, nearer to an equal representation of the people to one vote, one value, and to redressing the grave inequalities which grow up from time to time in consequence of the movement of the population, especially during great wars. This Boundary Commission was set up under the National Coalition, and it was confirmed in its work by the present Government. After it had laboured for several months, the Commission published its proposals in, perhaps it may be said, a tentative or preliminary form, and then engaged upon many local hearings and inquiries, where the evidence of all parties could be taken. At this stage the Commission represented to the Government that the rules under which they were working were unduly rigid, and asked whether some further latitude might not be given.

The Government did not, I think, much like these proposals when they saw them, and thought they might be perhaps somewhat unfavourable to them. I myself viewed with great suspicion their wish to alter the rules on which the Boundary Commission were to work. However, on examin-

ation this suspicion was removed. It cannot be denied that some of the limits imposed upon the Commission led to inconvenience and hardship when it came to applying them to the varied conditions of particular constituencies.

Therefore, in December, 1946, the Home Secretary came to the House and presented us with proposals to alter the rules for redistribution and to allow wider limits of toleration. The right hon. Gentleman resented any suggestion that gerrymandering in any form was intended; all was to be fair and impartial, and the Boundary Commission were to be given more latitude in discharging their task. Discussions were then entered into between the two parties, through what are called "the usual channels" . . . The whole field was surveyed, and we agreed to the new proposals of the Government, and allowed them to pass through unopposed.

Thus the principle was maintained and reaffirmed in the new Parliament of joint agreement on these matters. It is not a question of the old Parliament but of this Parliament, and it is the direct and immediate responsibility of hon. Members opposite. Let me put the following question to the Home Secretary or to the Lord President: if it was right and proper to come to us in December, 1946, and obtain our agreement to altering the rules for the Boundary Commission, why was it not right in this same Parliament to come to us on this occasion when a far more serious departure is intended? On what grounds of principle is there differentiation between what was decent conduct in December, 1946, and what the Government have tried to pass off as decent conduct in March, 1948? . . .

. . . It was the duty of the Boundary Commissioners to lay their Report before Parliament through the Secretary of State. We hear a lot now about private reports and private negotiations first with the Boundary Commission as a whole, and, after they had ceased to function in this matter, with individual members. But here was a statutory obligation that the Report of the Boundary Commissioners should be laid in its integrity, and as a whole before Parliament by the Secretary of State. We are not told anything about all kinds of reservations, private negotiations, and hypothetical schemes. They were not mentioned at the time. More especially should they have been mentioned in a matter where we were by way of proceeding by agreement.

When this Bill was introduced a month ago, the new proposals of the Boundary Commissioners were recommended to us by the Home Secretary. He proposed those new proposals as set forth by the Boundary Commission in their Report of October 27. These were the proposals the Government introduced to the House. We were confronted with the abolition of the university representation and the abolition of the City of London representation, with the object of excluding from the future House of Commons a number of independent or opposition Members—with that object and effect if it were to continue after a General Election. But no mention or even whisper was heard of any proposal to violate the Report of the Boundary Commission. All this is an afterthought, all this fine story about the hypothetical secret reports, about "how you would do it if you had to"—all that has been produced today. I am not saying it is not true, but it is irrelevant to the matters which have been brought before Parliament, and has nothing to do with the matter, that the Government go behind the scenes and have private negotiations with those discharging an official duty. . . .

As the Debates proceeded, the Government came to the conclusion that the new Report of the Boundary Commission, which was drawn up in accordance with recognised principles, and in accordance with the new rules which the Government had proposed, and we had accepted, was even less favourable to them than the original Report. That they kept in the background. All they told us was that this was the right scheme and this is what they proposed to Parliament. The Home Secretary even paraded the fact that this Report was less favourable to Socialist Party's interests than the previous one. He even paraded it to the House as proof of the high and detached spirit in which the Government were conducting the Redistribution Bill. . . .

. . . but the party pressure proved too strong. . . . The tops which had been thrown to party feeling in destroying university representation, and City of London representation were not sufficient. It was a case of "our fellows wanted more," and more they had to have. There is the explanation of all these Amendments and Schedules, and the talk and explanations which are given—"our fellows wanted more."

So we come to this Amendment, which proposes to add another 17 seats to the representation of England which, added to the five the Commissioners in their exercise of their latitude had used, makes 22 in all. . . .

. . . We are to have a Redistribution Bill—and I am glad that my words will go out, as they will do, far and wide throughout this country—which is deliberately based on no principle except that of party advantage, and which has no sanction behind it except the party majority, obtained on false pretences and with an electorate utterly disproportionate with the results produced in the House of Commons.

I come to these proposals, which are in two parts, both of which have been carefully devised to favour the Government party, whose majority, as I have said already, goes far beyond what the voting strength exhibited even under the artificial conditions of the General Election produced. Sixteen new seats are to be created by the division of the eight big boroughs. I am dealing first with the eight big boroughs. It is no mere coincidence that these eight big boroughs are, with one exception, now held by the Socialists. Consequently they are doubling the representation of these constituencies in which they themselves have almost a monopoly. We have heard the Boundary Commission on this matter, and the Home Secretary this afternoon said a little disingenuously—he had to extend it in more detail afterwards—that the Boundary Commission had drawn attention to the case of these big boroughs. Why did the Commission do so? [An HON. MEMBER: "They were too big."] On the contrary. The hon. Member cannot have read the Report. It was in order to express their reasoned opinion—this Commission that hon. Members applaud—why no change in them should take place. I will read paragraph 15 of this Report:

"Of the 44 constituencies with electorates of over 70,000, eight have electorates exceeding 80,000. These are the Parliamentary Boroughs of Battersea, Blackburn, East Ham, Gateshead, Hamersmith, Norwich, Paddington and Reading. We have considered very carefully whether we should increase the allocation of seats to each of these boroughs to two, thus increasing the total allocation of seats by eight. We are not unmindful of the disadvantages of such large electorates to the Members called upon to represent them in Parliament, and we are aware that the communities contained in such electorates may claim to be under-represented. We are, how-

(continued on page 7.)

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. 7.

Saturday, April 17, 1948.

The Wood Carver

A wood carver made a post to hang bells on. When the post was finished, all people admired it as a miraculous work of art.

Also the Prince of Lu looked at it and asked the carver: "What is your secret?"

The carver answered: "I am a simple artisan and do not know of secrets. There is only one thing to be considered. When I was about to make the post, I was on my guard not to allow my energy to be diverted to any other idea. I fasted in order to bring my mind to balance. When I had fasted for three days, I did not dare any longer think of reward and honour, after five days I dared no longer think of praise or blame; after seven days I had forgotten my body and my limbs. At this time I did not even think of His Majesty's court. In this way I identified myself completely with my art, and all temptations of the outer world had vanished. After that I went into the forest and looked at the natural shape and growth of the trees. When I happened to see the right one, the post for the bells stood ready before my eyes, and I could go to work. Otherwise I would have failed. And the people hold my work divine because my innermost nature became merged with the nature of the material."—Chung Tzu. (trs: Robert Ulich).

Tactics and The Canon

Readers will not be surprised to see *The Times* (or as that discerning Socialist, the late Mr. Maxton, called it 'the three-penny *Daily Worker*') adding to their alarm, if not despondency, by giving currency, on behalf of the Archbishop of York and Mr. Kingsley Martin, to the notion that there are *kinds* of Communism, e.g., the 'Christian' and Anti-Christian (camouflaged as 'Marxist')—the Archbishop; or Eastern and Western—Mr. Martin. Is *The Times* henceforth the spearhead of 'Western' Communism? We are glad to see that Mr. Gordon Dale, writing from Davos Platz, has asked for an account of the teachings of these to-be-accepted Communists. So far this follows the traditional lines of the argument about wolves in sheep's clothing. Shall we get the Christian or the 'Christian-Communist' answer? The mere admission of Mr. Dale's question to *The Times* is not, unfortunately, the end of the matter. Nevertheless, it does yield the recognition of Mr. Dale. So, also does a letter from Mr. Wilfrid King, of Merton College (*The Times*, April 9), reveal another, and one from Mr. James Wright (*The Times*, April 10), another individual in the community who recognises the existence of what, in Social Credit circles, has come to be known as The Canon.

"Regarding the Canon" was the title of the first article in the first number of *The Fig Tree*, the Douglas Social Credit Quarterly Review founded in 1936 and as yet un-

revived following its disappearance in an intervening tempest. Douglas there wrote that while Realism, "dissociated so far as is possible from either qualification or pose," and Idealism, "as inseparable from Realism as one end of a stick is from the other," were claims upon consideration, "there is a third factor, to which I have on occasion referred as the Canon. Probably none of us knows what it is, but nearly all of us recognise it when we meet it. Adam the architect had it, as anyone who knew the disappearing Adelphi Terrace would admit . . . An apt phrase, a racing yacht, the Quebec Bridge, all in their special way may have it. They are right in the sense that the engineer speaks of having got it right, because they are as nearly as possible the embodiment of the ideal in the mind of their creators, and they do their job." More and more evidently and disastrously and violently (because the inherent evil of violence is needed to effect the separation) our civilisation departs from this Canon, and we begin to wonder whether "nearly all of us do recognise it when we meet it," at all events on any but a low plane. But the whole point that concerns us is that *some* do, and they are at once recognisable by this sign. They admit an impulsion to be "right": they admit (or discern) that all relationships are under a like impulsion to be "right", and that this impulsion cannot ultimately be thwarted or resisted except at the cost of extinction of the terms forced into false association. So Mr. King protests against the (false) assumption that the purpose of education is the production of "candidates successful at the Civil Service Commissioners' house party" and waits to see whether selection succeeds in anything besides the satisfaction of Commissioners; and Mr. Wright sees that it does not matter whether man loses his soul the 'eastern' way or the 'western' way, by curtailment of individual liberty by democratically elected majorities 'in the public interest,' or by Communist minorities also 'in the public interest.' What does matter is that he shall keep his soul not lose it.

These are glimpses of The Canon, and all who glimpse The Canon have already, so far, Truth in their grasp. "Therefore whosoever hearest these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him to a wise man . . ."

"And doeth them . . ." Pursuit of The Canon, or non-pursuit of The Canon; obedience to The Canon, or disobedience to The Canon, is what distinguishes the living from the dead. "The debasing illusion that man works, produces, creates only in order to preserve his body, in order to secure food, clothing, and shelter, may have to be endured, but should not be diffused and propagated. Primarily and in truth man works only that his spiritual, divine essence may assume outward form, and that thus he may be enabled to recognise his own spiritual, divine nature and the innermost being of God. Whatever food, clothing, and shelter he obtains thereby comes to him as an insignificant surplus. Therefore Jesus says, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of heaven,' i.e., the realization of the divine spirit in your life and through your life, and whatever else your finite life may require will be added unto you."

It may surprise our readers, as it surprised us, that an army of young persons in this, as well as in other countries, is today being certificated in the name of, and going forth into the world to communicate (so they suppose) the ideas of the author of that passage. They are the words of Friedrich Wilhelm Froebel! The slave state and the Kingdom in conjunction! The detection of such absurdities grows commoner, and here lies the door to the reunion of those who pursue The Canon, the door to Social Credit.

City of Demons

A Canadian correspondent sends us the following from the *Novoscotian Colonial Herald* of January 3, 1828, where it appeared with the brief introduction: "The following Eastern story by William Maginn, Esq., is from the *Literary Souvenir*, one of the splendid annuals which do so much honour to British literature." —

In days of yore there lived in the flourishing city of Cairo a Hebrew Rabbi, by name Jochonin, who was the most learned of his nation. His fame went over the East and the most distant people sent their young men to imbibe wisdom from his lips. He was deeply skilled in the traditions of the fathers and his word on a disputed point was decisive. He was pious, just, temperate and strict but he had one vice—a love of gold had seized upon his heart and he opened not his hand to the poor yet he was wealthy above most, his wisdom being to him the source of riches.

The Hebrews of the City were grieved at this blemish on the wisest of their people but though the elders of the tribe continued to reverence him for his fame, the women and children of Cairo called him by no other name but Jochonin the miser. None knew so well as he the ceremonies necessary for initiation into the religion of Moses and consequently the exercise of those solemn offices was to him another source of gain. One day, as he walked in the fields about Cairo, conversing with a youth on the interpretation of the Law, it so happened that the angel of death smote the young man suddenly and he fell dead before the feet of the Rabbi, even while he was yet speaking. When the Rabbi found that the youth was dead, he rent his garments and glorified the Lord but his heart was touched and the thoughts of death troubled him in the visions of the night. He felt uneasy when he reflected on his hardness to the poor and he said, "Blessed be the name of the Lord. The first good thing that I am asked to do in that Holy Land may I perform," but he sighed for he feared that someone might ask of him a portion of his gold.

While he thought upon these things there came a loud cry at his gate. "Awake thou sleeper," said the voice, "Awake. A child is in danger of death and the mother hath sent for thee that thou may'st do thine office." "The night is dark and gloomy," said the Rabbi coming to his casement, "and mine age is great. Are there no younger men than I in Cairo?" "For thee only, Rabbi Jochonin, whom some call the wise, but whom others call Rabbi Jochonin, the miser, was I sent. Here is gold," said he, taking out a purse of sequins. "I want not thy labour for nothing. I adjure thee to come in the name of the living God." So the Rabbi thought upon the vow he had just made and he groaned in spirit for the purse sounded heavy. "As thou hast adjured me by that name, I go with thee," said he to the man, "but I hope the distance is not far. Put up thy gold." "The place is at hand," said the stranger who was a gallant youth in magnificent attire. "Be speedy, for time presses."

Jochonin arose, dressed himself and accompanied the stranger, after having carefully locked up all the doors of his house and deposited his keys in a secret place, at which the stranger smiled. "I never remember," said the Rabbi, "so dark a night, be thou to me as a guide for I can hardly see the way." "I know it well," replied the stranger with a sigh. "It is a way much frequented and travelled hourly by many,

lean upon my arm and fear not."

They journeyed on; and though the darkness was great, yet the Rabbi could see when it occasionally brightened that he was in a place strange to him. "I thought," said he, "I knew all the country for leagues about Cairo, yet I know not where I am. I hope, young man," said he to his companion, "that thou hast not missed the way," and his heart misgave him.

"Fear not," returned the stranger, "your journey is even now done," and as he spoke the feet of the Rabbi slipped from under him and he rolled down a great height. When he recovered, he found that his companion had fallen also and stood by his side.

"Nay young man," said the Rabbi, "if thus thou sportest with these gray hairs of age, thy days are numbered, woe unto him that insults the hoary head."

The stranger made an excuse and they journeyed on some little further in silence. The darkness grew less and the astonished Rabbi lifting up his eyes found that they had come to the gates of a city which he had never before seen, yet he knew all the cities of the land of Egypt and he had walked but as an hour from his dwelling in Cairo. So he knew not what to think, but followed the man trembling. They soon entered the gates of the City which was lighted up as if there were a festival in each house. The streets were full of revellers and nothing but a sound of joy could be heard, but when Jochonin looked upon their faces they were the faces of men pained within and he saw by the marks they bore that they were mazikin. He was terrified in his soul and by the light of the torches he looked also upon the face of his companion, and behold, he saw upon him too the mark that showed him to be a demon. The Rabbi feared excessively almost to fainting, but he thought it better to be silent and sadly he followed his guide who brought him to a splendid house in the most magnificent quarter of the City. "Enter here," said the demon to Jochonin, "for this house is mine. The lady and the child are in the upper chamber." And accordingly the sorrowful Rabbi ascended the stairs to find them. The lady, whose dazzling beauty was shrouded by melancholy beyond hope, lay in bed. The child in rich raiment slumbered on the lap of the nurse by her side.

"I have brought to thee, light of mine eyes," said the demon; "Rebecca light of my soul, I have brought thee Rabbi Jochonin the wise, for whom thou did'st desire. Let him then speedily begin his office, I shall fetch all things necessary for he is in haste to depart." He smiled bitterly as he said these words, looking at the Rabbi, and left the room followed by the nurse.

When Jochonin and the lady were alone she turned in the bed towards him and said, "unhappy man thou art, knowest thou where thou hast been brought?" "I do," said he with a heavy groan, "I know that I am in the city of the mazikin." "Know then further," said she, and the tears gushed from eyes brighter than the diamond, "know then further that no one is ever brought here unless he has sinned before the Lord. What my sin has been imports not to thee and I seek not to know thine, but here thou remainest forever—lost, even as I am lost." And she wept again. The Rabbi, dashing his turban on the ground and tearing his hair, exclaimed "Woe is me, who art thou, woman, that speakest to me thus?"

"I am a Hebrew woman," said she, "the daughter of a

doctor of the laws in the City of Bagdad, and, being brought hither, it matters not how, I am married to a prince among the mazikin. Even him who was sent for thee and that child whom thou sawest is our first born and I could not bear the thought that the soul of the innocent babe should perish. I therefore, besought my husband to try to bring hither a priest, that the law of Moses (blessed is his memory) should be done, and thy fame which has spread to Bagdad and lands further towards the rising of the sun, made me think of thee. Now my husband, though great among the mazikin, is more just than the other demons, and he loves me whom he hath ruined with a love of despair, so he said that the name of Jochonin the wise was familiar unto him and that he knew thou would'st not be able to refuse. What thou hast done to give him power over thee is known to thyself." "I swear before heaven," said the Rabbi, "that I have ever diligently kept the law and walked steadfastly after the traditions of our fathers from the day of my youth upwards. I have wronged no man in word or deed and I have daily worshipped by dutifully performing all the services thereto needful."

"Nay," said the lady, "all this thou mightest have done and more, yet be in the power of the demons; but time passes, for I hear the feet of my husband mounting the stair. There is one chance of thine escape." "What is that, O lady of beauty?" said the agonized Rabbi. "Eat not, drink not, nor take fee or reward while here, and if thou can'st do thus the mazikin have no power over thee, dead or alive. Have courage and persevere." As she ceased from speaking her husband entered the room followed by the nurse, who bore all things requisite for the administration of the Rabbi. With his heavy heart he performed his duty and the child was numbered among the faithful; but when, as usual at the conclusion of the ceremony, the wine was handed round to be tasted by the child, his mother, and the rabbi, he refused it when it came to him, saying, "spare me, my Lord, for I have made a vow that I fast this day and will not eat neither will I drink." "Be it as thou pleasest," said the demon, "I will not that thou should'st break thy vow," and he laughed aloud. So the poor Rabbi was taken into a chamber leading to a garden where he passed the remainder of the night and day weeping and praying to the Lord that he would deliver him from the city of demons, but when the twelfth hour came and the sun was set, the prince of the mazikin came again unto him and said, "Eat now I pray thee, for the day of thy vow is passed," and he set meat before him. "Pardon again thy servant, my Lord, in this thing. I have another vow for this day also. I pray thee be not angry with thy servant." "I am not angry," said the demon, "be it as thou pleasest. I respect thy vow," and he laughed louder than before. So the Rabbi spent another day in his chamber in the garden weeping and praying, and when the sun had gone by the hills the prince of the mazikin again stood before him and said, "Eat now, for thou must be an-hungered, it was a sore vow of thine," and he offered him daintier meats, and Jochonin felt a strong desire to eat but he prayed unsteadily to the Lord and the temptation passed and he answered, "Excuse thy servant, yet a third time, my Lord, that I eat not. I have renewed my vow." "Be it so then," said the other, "arise and follow me."

The demon took a torch in his hand, and lead the Rabbi through winding passages of his palace to the door of a lofty chamber which he opened with a key that he took from a niche in the wall. On entering the room Jochonin saw that it was of solid silver—floor, ceiling, walls, even to the thres-

hold and the door posts, and the curiously carved roof and borders of the ceiling shone in the torchlight as if they were the fanciful work of frost. In the midst were heaps of silver, many piled up in immense urns of the same metal, even over the brim.

"Thou hast done me a serviceable act Rabbi," said the demon, "take of these what thou pleasest; aye were it the whole." "Again, my Lord," said Jochonin, "I was adjoured by thee to come hither in the name of God and in that name I came, not for fee or for reward." "Follow me," said the prince of the mazikin and Jochonin did so, entering an inner chamber.

It was of gold as the other was of silver. Its gold roof supported by pillars and pilasters of gold reached up on a golden floor. The treasurers of the kings of the earth would not purchase one of the four and twenty vessels of gold coins which were deposited in six rows along the room. No wonder, for they were filled by the constant labours of the demons of the mine. The heart of Jochonin was moved by avarice when he saw them shining in yellow light like the autumnal sun as they reflected the beams of the torch, but God enabled him to persevere. "These are thine," said the demon, "One of the vessels which thou beholdest would make thee richest of the sons of men and I give thee them all."

But Jochonin refused again and the prince of the mazikin opened the door of a third chamber which was called the hall of diamonds. When the Rabbi entered he screamed aloud and put his hands over his eyes, for the lustre of the jewels dazzled him as if he had looked upon the noon day sun. In vases of agate were heaped diamonds beyond numeration, the smallest of which was larger than a pigeon's egg. On alabaster tables lay amethysts, topazes, rubies, beryls, and all other precious stones, wrought by the hands of skilful artists, beyond power of computation. The room was lighted by a carbuncle which, from the end of the hall, bored its ever living light brighter than the rays of noon tide but cooler than the gentle radiance of the dewy moon. This was a sore trial on the Rabbi, but he was strengthened from above and he refused again.

"Thou knowest me then, I perceive, O Jochonin son of Ben-David," said the prince of the mazikin, "I am a demon who did tempt thee to destruction. As thou hast withstood so far, I tempt thee no more. Thou hast done a service though I value it not, is acceptable in the sight of her whose love is dearer to me than the light of life. Sad has been that love to thee, my Rebecca, why should I do that which would make thy ceaseless grief more grievous. You have yet another chamber to see," said he to Jochonin, who had closed his eyes and was praying fervently to the Lord, beating his breast.

Far different from the other chambers, the one into which the Rabbi was next introduced was a mean and paltry apartment without furniture. On its filthy walls hung enumerable rusty keys of all sizes disposed without order. Among them, to the astonishment of Jochonin, hung the keys of his own house, those which he put to hide when he came on this miserable journey, and he gazed on them intently.

"What dost thou see?" said the demon, "that makes thee look so eagerly. Can he who has refused gold and diamonds be moved by a paltry bunch of rusty iron." "They are mine own," said the Rabbi, "them will I take if they be offered to me." "Take them, then," said the demon putting them into his hand. "Thou mayest depart, but Rabbi, open not thy house only when thou returnest to Cairo but thy

heart also. That thou did'st not open it before was that which gave me power over thee. It was well that thou did'st one act of charity in coming with me without reward for it has been thy salvation. Be no more Rabbi Jochonin, the miser."

The Rabbi bowed to the ground and blessed the Lord for his escape. "But how," said he, "am I to return, for I know not the way." "Close thine eyes," said the demon. He did so and in the space of a moment he heard the voice of the prince of the mazikin ordering him to open them again and behold when he opened them he stood in the centre of his own chamber in his house at Cairo with the keys in his hand. When he recovered from his surprise and had offered thanksgivings to God he opened his house and his heart also. He gave alms to the poor. He cheered the heart of the widow and lightened the destitution of the orphan. His hospitable board was open to the stranger and his purse was at the service of all who would need to share it. His life was a perpetual act of benevolence and the blessings showered upon him by all were returned bountifully upon him by the hand of God. But people wondered and said, "Is not this the man who was called Rabbi Jochonin the miser. What hath made the change?" And it became a saying in Cairo. When it came to the ears of the Rabbi, he called his friends together and he avowed his former love of gold, and the danger to which it had exposed him, relating all which has been above told. In the hall of the new palace he built by the side of the river, on the left hand as thou goest down the course of the great stream. And wise men who were scribes, wrote it down from his mouth for the memory of mankind that they may profit thereby. And a venerable man with a beard of snow who had read it in these books, and at whose feet I sat, that I might learn the wisdom of the old time, told it to me. And I write it in the tongue of England, the merry and the free, on the tenth day of the month of Nisan, in the year according to the lesser computation, five hundred, ninety and seven, that thou mayest learn good thereof. If not, the fault be upon thee.

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

ever, of opinion that the creation of eight additional seats in these cases would do little to solve the general problem of equal representation, since it would merely serve to reduce slightly the gap between the lowest and highest electorates, while it might well give rise to claims for similar treatment from boroughs with electorates slightly below 80,000. Moreover, if those boroughs were divided the resulting electorates would compare favourably with the majority of the rural constituencies having electorates of under 50,000 including those created in virtue of their sparse population and difficulty of access."

It is this last reason which is the most important; the main reason is the last, so that what is nakedly proposed, I beg the Committee to note, by the Home Secretary in his Amendment, contrary to the advice of the Boundary Commission, is to double the representation of these big boroughs, all of which but one is held by Socialists, and to create 16 urban seats which will be among the smallest in the whole country. For the party advantage, and for party advantage alone, they are to make seats which will be in the neighbourhood of 40,000, smaller than in many cases is thought right in regard to sparsely populated agricultural and mountainous areas. . . .

The second new proposal is to add a seat to each of the nine big cities. These two proposals together involve tampering with the boundaries of 65 constituencies. How is this process to be carried out? I am at a loss to know. We know

that the Boundary Commission had ceased to function in these matters after October 27. We know, by the revelations made today, that a private or secret request was made to them to deal with a hypothetical case, and that they gave advice on that. Now we know that when they had ceased to function the Home Secretary nevertheless went to individual members of the Commission, through the chairman, but when they were no longer acting within their statutory duties, and asked them to say so and so. He told us how they think the constituencies should be divided.

I cannot think that the process by which these constituencies have been divided can claim any impartial or disinterested authority. . . .

The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison): . . . What the Committee has to do is to decide whether these proposals are fair and equitable, all things considered. We think they are, and we recommend them to the Committee. As far as we are concerned, my right hon. Friend submits the proposals to the House on their merits. It is for the Committee to decide. As to the wild, partisan, unfair and irresponsible charges of the right hon. Gentleman, we return them to him, we throw them back at him, and we say that they in themselves reveal the naughty things going on in his own mind.

Mr. Quintin Hogg (Oxford): . . . the delineation of constituencies in this country, or in any Parliamentary democracy, is far too much a matter which can be made the subject of gerrymandering and log-rolling for it to be left to any single majority party in this House of Commons, of whichever party that majority is composed. The peculiar nature of these merits is that the proposition which I have just enunciated is not—or was not until this week—a matter of party controversy at all.

It was a principle which was admitted and generally accepted by every single responsible body of opinion in this country. It was recognised at the time of the Speaker's Conference; recognised after the General Election when the proposal was first put forward by His Majesty's Government that the work of the Boundary Commission should be continued; recognised when this Bill was printed, and recognised on the Second Reading of the Bill when the Home Secretary announced his proposals. The principle which I have just enunciated, and which has been frankly and admittedly violated by the Amendment which is now put forward, was not for a moment held in question until party pressure was brought to bear from a single political quarter in order that an Amendment might be made with the undoubted effect of benefiting a particular political party.

The merits of the case to which the right hon. Gentleman paid such attention are simply these: the principle that the boundaries of parliamentary constituencies in a democracy can be delineated at the whim of a party majority is utterly vicious and ought not to be tolerated for a moment. On the contrary the matter ought to be referred to an impartial body—call it a Boundary Commission, or what you will—in order that the whole question may not simply be viewed impartially, may not simply be decided rightly, but may be seen by the whole world to be viewed impartially and decided rightly. It is that principle which the right hon. Gentleman has chosen to violate by his present Amendment. . . .

. . . The matter, however, does not rest there, because the right hon. Gentleman has not in any sense referred this

matter to the Boundary Commission. On his own showing, the right hon. Gentleman has said in substance to the Boundary Commission, or to its individual members—because that is a more accurate description—“We, the Government, have decided to give the Labour Party another 12 seats. Tell us how we can best divide up certain constituencies so as to achieve that result.” They have deliberately departed from the findings of the Boundary Commission on this very subject, after it had been made apparent that the Boundary Commission had considered the very arguments which were put forward in the Second Reading Debate. They have ordered the Boundary Commission to reverse their findings as a matter of Cabinet decision, and the only question which they left to the Boundary Commission was as to which particular red lines should be drawn down which particular streets. To pretend that that is consultation with an impartial body, that that is doing something that is fair or above board, or leaving things to an impartial authority, is hypocrisy and Phariseism, and nothing else.

The Government have come to their decision by pressure from their own party. They have told the Boundary Commission that they want another 12 seats, and now they have asked the Boundary Commission to tell them exactly how those seats shall be delineated.

Mr. Ede: Let us get the mathematics right. The Boundary Commission themselves sent the first eight seats to us before they sent the Report with an indication as to what we should do if we thought that the eight boroughs should be divided. They clearly did not regard themselves as having the last word on the subject. The other number is not 12, but nine.

Mr. Hogg: I really am not concerned with whether the right hon. Gentleman told the Boundary Commission that the Government wanted nine Labour seats or 12. What I am concerned with is the whole principle by which they ask the Boundary Commission's advice on exactly where the division or boundary is drawn, and not on the principle whether any new seat shall be created at all. . . .

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede): . . . I want now to refer to what I regard as the most objectionable part of the speech made by the right hon. Gentleman. He suggested that the Boundary Commission are not now operating, but I would draw his attention to Section 4 (3) of the House of Commons (Redistribution of Seats) Act, 1944:

“Any Boundary Commission may also from time to time—”
This is not limited in any way—

“submit to the Secretary of State reports with respect to the area comprised in any particular constituency or constituencies in the part of the United Kingdom with which they are concerned, showing the constituencies into which they recommend that the area should be divided, and the number of members which they recommend should be returned by each of them, in order to give effect to the rules set out in the said Third Schedule.”

That is a continuing obligation on the Boundary Commissioners. It is true—and I give the right hon. Gentleman this point—that it presupposes in the Subsection that the initiative will be taken by the Boundary Commissioners. They will be looking round at the country and saying, “Here is a group of constituencies requiring some adjustment, so that reasonably appropriate representation can be given to them.” What was the harm, when the Government had taken the decision—which they had a perfect right to take, having listened to the

arguments in the House—to increase the representation of these nine cities, going to these gentlemen officially, through their Chairman, and asking them to divide these nine cities into the number of constituencies that the Government had decided they would recommend to the House? . . .

Aliens (Naturalisation)

Mr. Shephard asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department the number of persons naturalised during 1947 and the countries of origin.

Mr. Ede: 17,739 certificates of naturalisation were granted during 1947. The following summary sets out the more important countries of origin; but it is not, of course, to be assumed that the individuals in question were prior to naturalisation, regarded by those countries as possessing their nationality.

Summary of Certificates of Naturalisation in which Oaths of Allegiance were Sworn and Registered during 1947

Country of Origin	Total
America	178
Austria	3,237
Belgium	191
Bulgaria	15
Czechoslovakia	1,767
Denmark	144
Holland	226
Estonia	44
Finland	40
France	196
Germany	6,850
Greece	87
Hungary	484
Italy	706
Latvia	61
Lithuania	56
Norway	68
Palestine	60
Poland	1,330
Portugal	23
Roumania	172
Russia	704
Spain	124
Sweden	46
Switzerland	58
Turkey	41
Yugoslavia	36
Other nationalities	256
Uncertain nationalities	13
No nationality	526
Total	17,739

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL CREDIT

by

BRYAN W. MONAHAN.

PRICE 5/-.
—

TIDAL PUBLICATIONS (SYDNEY).
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., LIVERPOOL.