

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 24. No. 13.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

(Conclusion of Lord Vansittart's Speech in the Debate of May 2)

(NOTE: The material which follows concludes the selections we have made from the Official Report of two recent Debates in the House of Lords, the first on Communists in the Public Service and the second on a motion by Lord Stansgate which sought ineffectually to gain the support of the House of Lords in condemning Lord Vansittart's use of the Privilege of Parliament in the earlier Debate.)

Our references to these matters have been as follows:—

April 8, page 4: "University Principal and Lord Vansittart."

April 22, page 4: "Communism and the 'Bodies'".
page 1: Editorial note.

May 6, page 1: First instalment of full text of Lord Vansittart's speech in the House of Lords, March 29.

May 13, page 1: Continuation.

May 20, page 1: Conclusion of Lord Vansittart's speech.
page 5: Report of Debate on Lord Stansgate's Motion.
page 4: Editorial note.

(Lord Vansittart continued:—)

I come next to the bodies I criticised. The first one I mentioned was the Cominform—I assume that I may pass without further comment on that; nobody has taken up the cudgels for the Cominform. I commented next upon the B.B.C., and I would preface my remarks here by saying to the noble Viscount opposite that I have the greatest admiration for most of the work of the B.B.C., though I cannot pretend that it is perfect, or anything like perfect. It is my legitimate right to say so and, as he said, it may be a help to him if I do. I said there were Communist influences in the B.B.C., and occasionally they "peeped" out—and so they do. "Peeped out" is a moderate expression. As a matter of fact, there is a long list of "peepings" published by the noble Viscount, Lord Craigavon, in the April 15 issue of *Everybody's* magazine. I think that everybody who wishes to understand this question should read and ponder that article. It will be seen that the list of shortcomings is no mild one.

I do not think, either, that the noble Viscount, or any other noble Lord in this House, would seriously advocate that we should go on broadcasting "Soviet Views" without any comment. If they were broadcast and then riddled with ridicule, that would be a very different thing. But they are not. In some quarters that has the effect of broadcasting Communist propaganda gratis—that is the way it is taken.

Nor would anybody deny that insufficient use is made of the leading exiles here. If anybody did deny it, the whole body would rise up against him. The B.B.C. have given their reasons for not employing them, thereby admitting exactly what I say, and I find the reasons unconvincing. Quite apart from that, there are other lapses to which I think I ought to draw the attention of the House. Just before I broadcast there was a broadcast about India from the B.B.C. and this is the last sentence

"I asked the venerable Muslim scholar whether he thought that Communism would come. He replied 'If it does it will be, I think, the best solution of our problems.' Looking at these vast tracts of humanity where disease and ignorance and under-nourishment are the rule one might feel inclined reluctantly to agree with him."

I ask you my Lords: Is it really sensible that the Foreign Secretary should go out to Colombo to combine measures against Communism in the East, when broadcasters here are allowed to say that Communism may be the only solution for India? I do not think it makes any sense at all. Nor, indeed, does another recent example make much sense. I refer to a broadcast by a Professor Hyman Levy, in which he said that class war is inevitable. I do not think that is a very good way of fighting a cold war—to put people on the air to suggest that civil war may be inevitable. It is not a policy, and what we need is a policy.

Finally, I made some critical comments on the equipment of the Russian section of the B.B.C. I said that I had affidavits from distinguished Russian scholars to that effect, and here they are. One says:

"Apart from scholastic faults these texts also contain a number of grammatical mistakes, and my general opinion is that the text has been written by people who cannot easily write Russian without the aid of a dictionary."
The next one says:

"Translations of news items, talks and Press Reviews shown to me left me with the impression that the translators make a persistent and somewhat hopeless attempt at translating texts too literally at the expense of idiomatic Russian. At the same time they betray a regrettably low standard of linguistic understanding and in some cases elementary syntactic mistakes have not been eliminated. The result of such a treatment of the original texts is of course not to the advantage of the whole broadcast. The sentences are too involved and require repeated reading to be understood. I cannot help thinking that such translations may even provide listeners with undesirable matter for mirth."

Lord Simon of Wythenshawe: Would the noble Lord be good enough to send us copies of those affidavits with the names of the people?

Lord Vansittart: Yes.

Lord Simon of Wythenshawe: Can we have the names

now?

Lord Vansittart: Except in one instance, where, for various reasons, the man prefers not to give his name. One is Professor Korostovitz and the other Professor Meyerndorff. Here is the other affidavit:

"It requires too great an effort to follow the Russian broadcasts. A lot of jargon is being used. From the grammatical point of view the broadcasts are full of mistakes. Non-existent expressions are often used. I have carefully studied different idioms of Slavonic languages on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Nowhere have I come across such Russian as I hear in the Russian translations of the B.B.C. Perhaps it is used as a parody."

I am not vouching for that, because I am not a Russian scholar, but I use that in justification of what I said the other day. I said I had these affidavits, and so I have.

Lord Simon of Wythenshawe: May I ask the noble Lord what he means by an affidavit?

Lord Vansittart: We will not split hairs about it—I mean these statements.

Lord Simon of Wythenshawe: Are they under oath and with witnesses?

Lord Vansittart: They are statements of opinion by distinguished scholars. Shall I call them "statements"? If you prefer that I will make the change. I have other criticisms of the same kind. Another, for instance, from Czechoslovakia says that the best broadcast is that by Sir Robert Bruce-Lockhart on Friday night and that the others are mainly dull and have not sufficient punch. I think these things should be ventilated.

I then went on to education, and I mentioned the figure of 1 per cent. of Communist infiltration. Since then I have had a number of letters from various teachers saying that I put it much too low because I in fact omitted the fellow travellers. That is perfectly true; I admit that I made an understatement. I mentioned one particularly leading Communist, and as no question has been raised about that I will pass on. I also mentioned Birmingham University, and said that there was a clique of Communist professors in Birmingham University. So there are, and I have their names. But they have relieved me of all responsibility in that way, because I evidently got under the skin a little, and one of them, Professor George Thompson, Professor of Greek, wrote this letter to the *New Statesman*. He said:

"As a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party, let me point out that there are Communists, of whom I am proud to be one, in all our universities, and that their numbers are steadily growing."

That is exactly what I said, and I cannot thank the *New Statesman* and Birmingham University enough for having weighed in with such timely confirmation. The University itself has made no secret of it. It admits fully that there are Communists there. It says that they exercise no discrimination or inquiry. Of course, that sounds fine if you are really foolish enough to believe that Communism is a Party and not a conspiracy. We all know the contrary. Perhaps that works very well in theory but in practice it sometimes works quite differently.

I should like the House to pay some attention to the next sentence, because I make it after full consultation with those concerned. I know of one university where some of the anti-Communists are rather afraid at times that their political opinions may be less of a help than a hindrance to

them, and I think that is an unhappy state of affairs. Moreover, that tolerance works in very curious ways in other directions. For example, here I have a protest signed by hundreds of citizens of St. Ives in Cornwall because they do not like their small children being taught scripture by a militant Communist atheist. They have got no change out of it so far, and some are saying that they will not send their children to school, if this is to go on. Before the war I had a great friend who was a leading wit of his day. He was invited for a week-end to Leicestershire, and he very soon found out that he did not like hunting. The first day he fell off at the meet, and on the second day he came home straight from the meet. Being asked to inscribe something in the visitors' book, he gave some umbrage when he wrote: "One man's 'meet' is another man's poison." And the blood sport of Communism is also poison to other people.

Now I come to the matter of the Church. I began by saying that I intended no criticism at all of the Church as such, but that what I was reproaching was the apathy with which some of the suggestions and writings of ecclesiastics of the Church were received in public. I said that very clearly, and I shall come back to that point later when I deal with the matter of the Reverend Mr. Weatherhead. In the lull before this storm in a tea cup, with a touch of saccharin, I have sometimes been sorry that I made my picture so complete, because it has given an opportunity to those who will not face any major issue to ride off on minor ones. Now, I attacked this S.S.C.M., as it is now called. I am aware that its first pamphlet was published in 1942, because no sooner had it come to my notice than I attacked it strongly—this was in 1943—publicly and outside this House. Well, my Lords, I find this on April 25, in the evening Press:

"The Birmingham Branch of the Association of Tutors in Adult Education has passed a resolution saying that it is very concerned that the privileged position of a Peer should have been used for a personal attack on a Branch member Mr. Cope."

That is completely disingenuous, because everybody knows I have attacked the pamphlet outside this house quite often.

I might have been disposed to do nothing more on this matter had it not been that the people responsible for these pamphlets have gone straight on in the same key. I have here, for instance, a letter addressed not to me but to a friend, from the Reverend L. J. Bliss, who appears to act in some secretarial capacity to the organisation and to be on the Executive Committee. He says:

"The Society has not shifted one iota from its position taken when it was formed in 1942." That refers to the pamphlet, which the noble Viscount has in his hand and which I will deal with faithfully in a minute or two. He also says:

"We number with lay associates at about 250." I was going through their membership last year and I found it came to about 129, plus thirty-eight associate members. The noble Viscount will see that the organisation is increasing. It is not to be treated with disregard because some of its members are engaged in trying to push Communist literature in our schools, and I have had several complaints from Headmasters on that score.

Now I come to the pamphlet which is the cause of much argument. Mr. Belloc has written:

"The nuisance of the tropic is
The sheer necessity of fizz."

The intoxication of the Single Party and Common Owner-

ship seems an equally sheer necessity to Mr. Cope:

"Beneath an equatorial sky,
You *must* consume it or you die."

said Mr. Belloc. Mr. Cope says that, in our temperate climate an unpleasant death is reserved for us if we do not swallow his medicine. On page 14, he says:

"One group must impose its will upon all others by precisely that measure of force which is found to be necessary in order that economic life may proceed . . . For one group to wrest power from another has always involved armed conflict, the intensity and duration of which depend not only upon the relative strengths of the antagonists, but also upon what help they receive from outside intervention . . . If a revolution is attempted . . . while the existing dominant class is still strong enough to resist for a long time or when the rising class has not sufficient understanding and singleness of purpose, then the struggle is likely to be bloody indeed." "The existing dominant class is still strong enough to resist for a long time or when the rising class has not sufficient understanding and singleness of purpose, then the struggle is likely to be bloody indeed."

The noble Viscount carefully forbore to quote those passages. I ask your Lordships, if that does not mean murder, what does? The writer goes on to say:

"The pacifist can never really be a Socialist. . . ."

Well, my Lords, we know a good many instances to the contrary; and I think the right reverend Prelate said something about that. But the argument which follows on page 15 is something extremely different. He is apparently trying to get Christian pacifists in on this question of liquidation. He says:

"If, in the name of righteousness, they believe that God's will is done by taking up arms against some of their fellow men, solely on account of the beliefs which the latter seek to put into practice, then the nationality of their opponents has no relevance to the justification they claim for their action. If it is right for English democrats to fight against German Fascists, precisely the same sort of justification is involved when fellow nationals become opposed to each other in the world struggle to abolish capitalism."

We were fighting against the Germans at that time, and, in other words, this man says it was equally right to go out after your fellow countrymen.. That seems to me a truly infamous argument. Then on page 17, he says:

"Full democracy can be established only by a single Party. Is it conceivable that common ownership could be established if in Parliament there were a permanent opposition? . . . all the fundamental opposition must be liquidated."

Well, my Lords, I think those are rather alarming sentiments, and if they are not murderous I should like to know what is.

Viscount Stanagate: Will the noble Lord read the ensuing sentence?

Lord Vansittart: Which sentence does the noble Viscount desire?

Viscount Stanagate: About the definition of "liquidation."

Lord Vansittart: The noble Viscount has the book in his hands, and I am going to make my speech in my own way. I have dealt with liquidation in that book. The writer of the pamphlet from which I have been quoting says that the struggle will be long and bloody indeed, and that is a definition of what liquidation would mean. In various trials in Russia it has been said that liquidation meant shooting and hanging. Mr. Cope says that the amount of bloodshed will depend upon the amount of resistance.

"How opposition is to be nullified depends upon the methods adopted by the opposition itself. . . . The degree of force and the actual methods of enforcement would depend upon the strength and general policy of the counter revolutionaries."

I hope we shall stop splitting hairs henceforward and get

down to our subject—a thing which the noble Viscount seems singularly reluctant to do. On page 19, the pamphlet says:

"The workers must be led and organised by a single Party which tolerates the existence of no other Party fundamentally opposed to it."

Now comes a sentence which offends me more than any other:

"Class collaboration . . . contributes to the continuation of international war."

That is a pretty sentiment, is it not? He adds:

"Common ownership excludes all other solutions."

I do not think there is much more to be said about that.

I do not wish to dwell upon the preface written by the right reverend Prelate, because that has already been quoted; but he did say that he commended this pamphlet as a "lucid and penetrating analysis of the class struggle." I am bound to say, speaking as a Churchman and on behalf of a great many other Churchmen who have communicated with me on this matter, that we were all profoundly puzzled at the time. I mentioned another pamphlet written by the right reverend Prelate himself. I quoted only one sentence and I am going to justify that quotation. I said it contained the phrase:

"Communism in Russia is in fact delivering Christ's message."

Again he speaks of

"the challenge which God has raised up Communism to deliver to the Church."

I have never said the right reverend Prelate was a Communist, or anything like it. I am bound to say, however, having read this pamphlet, that I thought that perhaps he differed slightly from Gilbert and Sullivan:

"Hearts just as pure and fair
May beat in Belgrave Square
As in the lowly air
Of Seven Dials"—

but I do not go very much further than that. I was particularly afraid of the effect of some of the right reverend Prelate's sentences on the minds of the unwary; for if I thought that a ruthless system which had liquidated 30,000,000 people in peace time was raised up by Providence, I believe I should, like Job, "curse God and die." I do not believe in such things. As I say, I thought merely that the Bishop was keeping rather dangerous company. As he has now resigned from that body, it is evident that we have both come to the same conclusion.

There is one more little touch by Mr. Cope, with which I should like to deal before we part company. He wrote another pamphlet. It is pamphlet No. 4—I do not suppose the noble Viscount has read it. At page 9 there is a nice little touch:

"The Church as it now exists is on the edge of a precipice, and all that remains to be decided is whether it will jump over or wait to be pushed over."

When I look respectfully at the Episcopal Benches I do not think that they look very much like jumping, and I hope they will not permit themselves to be pushed. I further mentioned pamphlet No. 6 by a man called the Reverend Mr. Worledge. I am justifying what I said there. I said that he called Marx and Lenin: God's instruments. And there it is, at page 13. At page 12 he also says:

"Russia, in spite of its professed denial of God is nearer to His Kingdom than any Western nation is."

Finally, to show your Lordships the sort of stuff that is written, the last sentence is this:

"Russia is marching towards the Kingdom of God and the ultimate recognition of Christ as her King."

(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. 24. No. 13.

Saturday, May 27, 1950.

From Week to Week

As the city of Winnipeg, Manitoba, is largely submerged by the greatest floods in the history of Canada, it is an opportune moment to plan still bigger dams on the Red River to control the havoc caused by the smaller dams. Bigger and better T.V.A.s "under floods, or threat of floods."

"The more I think of the London School of Economics in the early nineteen-hundreds the harder I find it to believe that any such place can ever have actually existed. So I shall blame no one who chooses to take my account with as big a pinch of salt as he likes. I should have done the same, if I had not been there. *Credo quia impossibile*. . . . What struck me most forcibly about these young men was their capacity for combining an extreme intransigence of revolutionary theory with the utmost docility of mind.

"What they got in the lecture-room they swallowed as meekly as that which they got in the 'Defectory.' The whole of the rather woolly abracadabra that passed for economic and sociological science was as much infallible dogma for them as that of the Church to a peasant of Old Spain. . . . Of education, apart from the specialised or technical information that directly subserved the purpose of qualifying for a living, few of them had or even desired to have, the least smattering. . . . After you had been a little time among them, you could get to know almost exactly how any fair sample of the species would react verbally to any given stimulus.

"... The School was to all intents and purposes an ideological annexe of the Fabian Society."

"Mrs. Sidney Webb, unlike the official Director, took the utmost possible pains with individual students. She had soon drawn me out enough to sense a political bias rather different from that in fashion at the School, and she at once began to confide in me—or so she flattered me by letting me imagine—that the Fabian standpoint was essentially that of enlightened Toryism; and added that the efforts of the Trades Unions to set themselves up as independent Powers within the State, were, between ourselves, disruptive reaction.

"Almost, in fact, she ended by persuading me to enlist myself as a Fabian. Fortunately, . . . I had seen something of other Fabians; and theirs was a galley in which nothing would have induced me to pull an oar."—Esmé Wingfield-Stratford, D.Sc. *Before the Lamps went out.*

We have the highest regard for Dr. Wingfield-Stratford as historian and assessor of social and political phenomena. With this in mind we would ask our readers to consider

in all seriousness:

(1) The arch-plotter of the Edwardian Era, the German-Jew Sir Ernest Cassel, left £475,000 to the London School of Economics "to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State." A large proportion of the teaching staff consisted of Russian and other revolutionary Jews.

(2) "I am told that at least 90 per cent. of the Members of the Government are on the rolls of the (Fabian) Society, and that contrary to regulations, so are many highly placed Civil Servants." — *Evening Standard*, November 1, 1930.

(3) P.E.P. (First Chairman Israel Moses Sieff) is a direct offshoot of the Fabian Society, and has dominated (for reasons which are difficult to prove) "British" Government High Policy since 1931.

The Crimean War (Palmerston) was the beginning of the use of the British as cannon-fodder in the Plan which developed through the Egyptian War of 1882, ("Capitulations"; Loans) the South African Gold War of 1899-1902 and the two World Wars of 1914-18 and 1939-45 to bring Great Britain under the rule of "International Finance." We have lost the flower of our manhood, our pre-eminence in world affairs, our standard of life and our political and economic liberty as the result of "our policy" for which the product of the London School of Economics, the quality of which Dr. Wingfield-Stratford has correctly assessed, has been a major administrative agency.

Every traitor has prospered in his degree, and none is so mean that he should do reverence to the native-bred. And we couldn't care less.

The combination of the Divine Right of Kings, Papal Infallibility, and the political and financial morality of a three card expert in public affairs (we have no doubt that in private matters he is a model of Puritan propriety) are combining to make Sir Stafford Cripps (Mrs. Sidney Webb's nephew) rather too much for the stomach of the British proletariat. It is becoming widely recognised that Socialism is sufficiently unpleasant but that Socialism and Socialists both at once are too much for anyone to stand.

The trap involved to the Conservatives is obvious.

Privilege

In the House of Lords on May 16, Lord Saltoun asked His Majesty's Government whether there was "any Committee of Parliament which will hear persons wronged by an inaccurate privileged statement, and if necessary arrange for correction. In this matter of privilege," he said, "both Houses of Parliament stand, and ought to stand, on exactly the same footing. . . . if inaccurate statements are made by noble Lords speaking for the Government, . . . any statement then made issues with the whole weight and credibility of the Government behind it and the privilege, although nominally the privilege of the House, in fact becomes the privilege of the Department. . . ."

The Lord Chancellor said there never had been such a Committee, and he would be entirely opposed to the setting up of any such Committee. He was satisfied that complete and absolute freedom of expression is essential to the working of this and any other legislative body.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: May 5, 1950.

SUPPLY

Education

(The Debate began on May 4)

Mr. Hollis (Devizes): I have great sympathy for those hon. Members who complain that whenever we have an educational Debate, we never seem to be able to talk about education. There is a great danger in this continual talking about the machinery of education without considering what it is that education is about.

The other day I read of some exuberant boys and girls in the City of Glasgow who met at a conference and demanded that they should be taught something useful. "Oh, yes," said the masters at the conference; "What would you like to be taught?" They said, "We should like to be taught astrology." They thought that then they would be able to pick the winners of the Derby. As I have said, there is great danger if we ignore altogether the consideration of what it is that education is about. I have great sympathy with that Fiji chief who came to the United States and was horrified to find the children of that benighted country incarcerated in institutions from the age of 6 to 16. He said, "That is just the time in life when they ought to be learning something."

Nevertheless it always comes about that there is some important matter of machinery that we have to discuss, and I will therefore ask the pardon of the Committee in speaking about the question of denominational schools, about which we have heard so much. . . . if we look around the world we find what completely different solutions are found for this problem in almost every country.

We see that free countries vary in their solutions, from such countries as Canada, Scotland and Holland, which give the fullest financial support to denominational schools, to such countries as Australia and the United States which give no financial support to the denominational schools. If we look at the Protestant bodies, we find that in some countries they claim the fullest financial support. Other Protestants, taking the point of view of the hon. and learned Member for Carmarthen (Mr. Hopkin Morris), think it a danger which they would reject even if it were offered to them. If we look at the Catholics all over the world, we find in some countries, such as Alsace, that they are content to work in an inter-denominational school system. In other countries they want their own schools, but are prepared to have inter-denominational universities. Again, in other countries we find they want both denominational schools and denominational universities.

I say that not to criticise other countries, but merely to prove that the situation is indeed an extremely complex one, and the hon. Member for Southampton, Itchen (Mr. Morley) was, of course, perfectly right in saying that in this country that matter was settled by a compromise. Who could argue otherwise? My right hon. Friend the Member for Saffron Walden (Mr. R. A. Butler) would be the first to agree that we pay 50 per cent. of the maintenance of the schools. That figure of 50 per cent. was not a divinely revealed truth precluding it from being 40 per cent. or 60 per cent. Of course, the hon. Member is perfectly right. It was settled by compromise. He is also perfectly right when he says that in that compromise there is a large number of

things for which the denominations have every reason to feel grateful, and no instructed supporter of the denominational schools is in any mood to challenge that.

But there are two things to which the Government are committed in this respect. For one thing, they are committed to give to the voluntary schools the privileges which are granted to them by the 1944 Act and the other Acts of Parliament on the Statute Book. I do not think there is any sort of mentality in any part of the Committee which wishes to challenge them in those rights. Beyond that, the Government are also, I think, committed to this very important thing, that by no mere accidental change of circumstances shall the voluntary schools be administered out of existence. . . .

Therefore, what we have to consider is whether such circumstances are in existence or are likely to come into existence. Of course, it is obviously true that anyone whose conscience imposes upon him an obligation to support denominational schools is, in a sense, under a certain handicap in doing so. I do not think it is necessarily a bad thing that there should be the handicap, because I think it would be a very bad thing for any Christian denomination if the circumstances were such that it was entirely to anyone's financial advantage to belong to it. Therefore, I do not think that the handicap is necessarily a bad thing. The question is whether or not it is, or is likely to prove, a crushing handicap that is likely to make the situation impossible and unworkable.

As hon. Members know, at the time of the 1944 Act there was, of course, a good deal of debate and estimate about what would be the cost of this settlement to the denominational schools. As far as the Catholic schools—I simply mentioned them in passing, because I do not for one moment think the subject should be approached simply as a Catholic problem or as an Anglican problem: I agree with hon. Members who say we must approach it as a general problem of the denominations—but as far as the Catholic schools are concerned, the right hon. Gentleman who is now the Minister of Works, and who then occupied a less responsible and more vociferous position in this Chamber, challenged that figure very violently. . . . and whatever may have been the rights or wrongs of the matter then, we have to face the fact that building costs in these years since the war have proved to be most crushing heavy.

To my mind, that does provide . . . a new circumstance which at any rate merits consideration. What should we do about it? I quite agree that the solution is not to scrap entirely the legislation of 1944. If I were to advocate that, I should be out of order in this Debate. In any case, it is the very last thing I wish to advocate, for very obvious reasons. First, there is obviously a particular political situation at the moment which would clearly make it not practical politics to do that; and there is a particular financial situation at the moment which would also clearly not make it practical politics to do it.

Those are two important and weighty arguments, but more important even than those arguments, in my opinion, is the argument of the climate of opinion. That is to say, the hon. Member for Southampton, Itchen, was again perfectly right. We may agree or disagree with his point of view, but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that he was speaking for a very considerable body of opinion, and it would be quite impossible to re-open this settlement without splitting the nation from top to bottom on sectarian lines in

a way which, in my view, would be extremely undesirable. That is why I would not favour the total re-opening of the settlement today, even if the political and financial situations were different from what they are.

Although that is the situation today, and although no man can foresee the future, particularly in such times as these, I very much doubt whether it will be the situation in some years to come. I think that we are moving into a new world. I think that these old sectarian differences are to a very large extent based upon social problems of the 1870's which are becoming increasingly unreal. I think that partly for happy reasons and partly for unhappy reasons. It is hardly a sane opinion any more to believe all sorts of things which our grandfathers could have believed. It is hardly sane any longer for any Catholic to believe in the modern world that Protestantism is the main enemy of the Christian religion, as for any Protestant to believe that Catholicism is the main enemy of the Christian religion. [Laughter.] I do not know why hon. Members should laugh; it was an opinion that it was possible to hold—at any rate, many people did bring themselves to hold it in the middle of the 19th Century—but it is an opinion which it is not possible to hold today.

These sectarian differences did, as has already been said, bedevil all educational politics right up till at any rate the 1914 War, greatly to the disaster of religion, politics and education. If we read the Debates of Mr. Balfour's day, when the House was discussing very important educational schemes, including setting up secondary schools, we find that hardly anything was said about these things. The whole thing was entirely dominated by this sectarian issue. Then came the 1914-18 War and a Coalition Government—they called it a Coalition Government then not a National Government—and Mr. Fisher was made Minister of Education. That, apparently, gave an opportunity to settle, or at any rate to try to settle, these matters on a non-sectarian basis. . . . those days are not wholly passed away, but if this Debate has proved nothing else it has proved how near they are to passing away, and how we can discuss these problems in a very different temper from the temper in which they were discussed in the days of Mr. Fisher, or Mr. Balfour, or still more in the early days when Joseph Chamberlain was still a member of the Radical Party.

The hope is that if we do not re-open old wounds now but allow a little more time to elapse, we shall come into a world when all sorts of things can be done by general agreement which cannot quite be done by general agreement today. In 1970 all sorts of things may have happened. There may be a General Election by then, or some hon. Members opposite may be in another place. For that reason, I seriously favour postponing the attempt to deal with the general long-term philosophical issue at this moment. People will then say: "Why bring it up?" Anyone who has sat through this Debate knows the answer to that. Something has got to be done at the moment, because there is an immediate financial problem and there is this obligation put upon the managers of the voluntary schools to maintain those places.

Hon. Members have spoken about the matter and I need not tell the story all over again, but we must deal with the short-term problem in such ways as we can, because of compromises the worst compromise would be if we tried to satisfy the friends of religion by helping them to keep the voluntary schools open and satisfied the friends of economy

by making the voluntary schools the worst of all schools. We want to avoid that. It is important that we should examine what should be done within the boundaries of the present settlement in order to improve the position, and I think a good deal more can be done than some people think.

I am not dictating terms, but am merely throwing out a kind of suggestion, and I should be very grateful if the Parliamentary Secretary could tell us whether the Government are willing to concede the point. . . .

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Education (Mr. Hardman): . . . In my reply to the Debate which we have had today, there are these two major issues of which I have spoken. I am going to be frank, in facing them, in telling hon. Members of the Committee that I do not intend to say much about them. There is the question of the denominational schools, and there is question of the salaries of members of the teaching profession. In regard to the first of these, I echo very warmly the sentiments of the hon. Member for Devizes (Mr. Hollis) who spoke last for hon. Members on the other side of the Committee. I applaud the general tolerance and desire to make the Act work, because I am certain that we can find a workable solution. I believe that we can do it without disturbing the general compromise reached in the Act of 1944.

I am certain, also, that whatever changes may be made, either immediately or in the years ahead, they must be changes agreeable to all denominations. That is the pledge which I gave in the election, and that is the pledge I shall stick to, should the matter arise at any future election. I was interested in the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Oldham, West, and by the hon. Member for Devizes about the possibility of calling together the various interested parties. . . .

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE (continued from page 3).

This is the sort of stuff being put about by priests.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury: May I have the date of that pamphlet? —

Lord Vansittart: Certainly, it is 1945.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury: The noble Lord said "is being put about."

Lord Vansittart: It has not been withdrawn or denied. This pamphlet may have gone out of print, but here is exactly what I said. This is why I am falling foul of this particular body of men. I went on then to the case of Mr. Evans, and said that he had written a pamphlet called *Christians and Communists*, which was much more about Communism than about Christianity. There it is. Anybody who likes to read it can satisfy himself that I told the truth. I will give your Lordships one example. He reproaches the Fathers of Lambeth with saying that Communism is contrary to the Christian faith, and he adds:

"The Foreign Office could not have asked for more." I think that is treating the Lambeth Fathers with great disrespect. I said that Mr. Evans had gone out to report the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. He went out on behalf of the *Daily Worker*. I have all his reports, and they are pretty nauseating. I will give your Lordships one of the reports:

"The trial was conducted with scrupulous fairness. . . . The wild stupid and vicious stories of drugs and ill-treatment should be absolutely discounted. . . . Two things stand out in the trial. The first is the extent of foreign espionage activity against Hungary and the readiness of the Western Powers to gamble with the future of Hungary and the lives of Hungarian citizens whom they were prepared to use as tools. . . . If today the Prince Primate of Hungary faces life in prison both

politicians and prelates abroad, who gave him advice and knew his plans, must take the blame. The crime is his. The guilt is not his alone."

Trials in Hungary are not held in English. So far as I know, the Reverend Mr. Evans does not know Hungarian, certainly not well enough to follow the whole proceedings. Yet he comes home and sells this sort of stuff to the British public.

Then a Mr. Chambers went out and did a similar job in the trial of the Bulgarian parsons. He said he was an independant observer, but his trip was organised by the Bulgarian Communists. He said the trial appeared to be quite normal to the average Englishman, apparently including the fact that these unfortunate men had been in jail *incommunicado* for more than a year. He said that the Bulgarian Communist authorities

"were fully justified from the evidence in framing the indictment."

The "evidence" was about a million words of confession in Bulgarian. The Reverend Mr. Chambers knows no Bulgarian and he was in Bulgaria for less than a week. Yet he comes home again and tries to sell this stuff to the British public. It really is an utter scandal. He said:

"There is no support for the hostile contention that acknowledgement of guilt was forced, extracted or given under any unlawful form of compulsion."

If your Lordships want to know how these confessions are extorted, I advise you to read an admirable article by a distinguished Bulgarian in the *Manchester Guardian* of April 12, where you will see how these abominable tricks are played. These confessions are also sometimes extracted by electrical shocks to the brain. Your Lordships see how low these people will go.

I will quote again from the *Daily Worker*, an utterance of the Dean of Canterbury about the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. He said:

"I cannot forget that Cardinal Mindszenty said that Socialism and Communism ought to be exterminated."

The Cardinal never said anything of the kind, and yet the Dean says this. I quote again from Mr. Padev:

"The Red Dean did not hesitate to produce this sheer fabrication out of his imagination, knowing full well that it would worsen the condition of the imprisoned Cardinal. A perfect example not only of contempt of court but of contempt of Christian decency and Christian morality."

I endorse every word of that. While we are on that subject, I must take up the point made by the right reverend Prelate the Lord Bishop of Bradford. He talked of opposition to Socialism. I never said a word about that. I have never been a Party politician. What I am opposed to is sheer bloody cruelty, whether it be Nazi or Communist. It is just the same to me and I intend to fight it tooth and nail as long as I can stand up in this House. Internal politics have nothing whatever to do with it. They never have had and never will have, so far as I am concerned. I say that with all respect to the right reverend Prelate.

Now for the case of Mr. Weatherhead. I said at the beginning that I was not criticising the Church but the apathy of the public to certain things that were said and done. That is why I used the phrase that I did in reply. In no way have I said that this is a matter of Communism. I have never said that. Noble Lords can look up *Hansard* if they like. I have never said that Mr. Weatherhead was a Communist. I know that he is not and that he has spoken out most courageously against it. My point was about the public apathy in regard to the suggestion he made which I thought was a most deplorable one—that members of our Royal

Family should be sent out to Moscow to express good will to Stalin. That would have been repugnant, I am sure, both to the Royal Family and to the British public. In any case, I think it was questionable taste to bring the Royal Family at all into this matter. But the real reason why I said that was because such a proposal was appeasement to the full. I wanted to bring home to all those in authority that it is not by appeasement in any form that they can win a cold war or avert a hot one. That is all.

After that I criticised a number of people who had been sent out on cultural missions—those who had all "ratted" on us and gone over to the enemy and spent their time abusing this country. Apparently, the noble Viscount opposite thought I had been too hard on several of them and so, out of an immense mass of their output, I have brought along an extract which might cause some amusement to the noble Viscount. This is Miss Rider speaking. She "condemned the Labour Party for betraying the British working classes and drawing Britain into the camp of the war-mongers."

That is what these renegades are doing all the time. I think it will be agreed that no particular sympathy is due to them. After all, we are in a form of war, in many parts of the world. People were hanged for doing that sort of thing in war time. Though I do not suggest anything of this sort in this case, we cannot pass over these things lightly. It is a grave offence.

I come next to a matter not mentioned by the noble Viscount, on which I should be glad to make a correction. In the course of my remarks I said that a Mr. Molnar was a member of the Communist Party. I was rather surprised to see in *Hansard* that I had said that, because I had not intended to say it. I did not, and do not, think that he is. I had been speaking for a long time and my attention flagged a little. I had intended to say that he and a Mr. Roman, to whom the noble Viscount alluded, were both employed by a Communist-dominated agency of the Hungarian State—the Hungarian Foreign Trading Company. This company started off under apparently better auspices but fell under the domination of the Hungarian economic dictator, a man called Vas. He was born a Hungarian but became a Russian subject and a Russian officer. Mr. Roman was one of its prominent officials, and Mr. Molnar represented it in this country. I am happy to make clear exactly what I meant in this matter. I did not ask that the case of either these two people should be reconsidered; indeed you will find in *Hansard* that I said that this may be quite all right. I think, indeed, that in the case of Mr. Molnar it is all right, and I might say the same in the case of Mr. Roman, provided that I have my way in the future. After all, I was looking to the future, and what I said was that we have reached a point where we must be cautious with regard to people who leave the Communist Party having held high or lucrative positions in it. We must carefully scrutinise that matter in the future. I hope we shall do so because I have known of cases (not the two that I mentioned the other day) where I have reason to believe that the British public has not had the benefit of the doubt which it was entitled to have, and where sufficient investigation has not been carried out. I repeat that we are virtually in a sort of war, and we cannot be too careful about the future.

I now come to the point that was particularly dwelt upon by the noble Viscount opposite—namely, the case of Mr. Syers. I mentioned these people who had been in Yugoslavia. There were three men and a woman. All that

came up in the House of Commons on April 5, and of course my facts are incontestable; I spent a good deal of time in verifying them. As the noble Viscount did not refer to the other people I mentioned, I will not waste the time of the House either. He mentioned Mr. Syers, and I think it is obvious that he had not read the broadcast of the Yugoslav Government which dealt very stringently with these people, particularly Major Klugman, who writes for *World News and Views*. What the Yugoslav Government say is that all these people were actively Stalinist, and working against Yugoslavia as loyal friends of the Soviet Union, and that undesirable elements have infiltrated into the various Communist Parties and are now playing an active rôle in the infiltration campaign. I then went on to say, as the noble Viscount also mentioned, that Mr. Syers had written a pamphlet for the Bureau of Current Affairs. The noble Viscount appeared to defend it. I do not know whether he is saying that he would care to defend some of the statements in it. For instance the pamphlet says that the fact that they, the States of South-Eastern Europe, had to pay heavy reparations to the U.S.S.R. actually contributed to a certain extent to their recovery for it stimulated the recovery of industry. Can a man be stimulated by being skinned?

I am not going to detain the House by calling attention to other matters which are highly challengeable. The basis of this pamphlet is that all is well since the Communists came. I will not say any more about that, but I have plenty of accounts of the activities of Mr. Syers including a lecture which he has given. I maintain that a pamphlet written by a known Communist, and with Communist sentiments in it, and such propaganda as that which I have quoted, is not fit to be issued to our troops. It ought not to have been sent out. I am convinced in that view. I was extremely moderate about it.

I have mentioned one pamphlet. I have here another, written by a well-known Communist, Mr. Ralph Parker, and the whole of this pamphlet is fairly skilful Communist propaganda. The last sentence will give some idea of its point.

"There could be little doubt that the world in whose reconstruction they wish to share is one that we too would wish to see."

That also, I maintain, should not have been sent out to our troops. Again I refer to the correspondence that has taken place in *The Times* in regard to the issue of a map which was full of mis-statements coming from Communist sources. These were challenged by the Greek Embassy, and the Embassy got no satisfaction. I think that map was ultimately rejected by our own military authorities as being completely misleading. But the Bureau of Current Affairs were still unrepentant, and I say that there should be a reform there. Very much more care needs to be exercised in the future than has been exercised in the past.

Finally, I come to my own service. As I told the House, I have been nearly forty years in that service and I feel we all deeply resent the suggestion that anything I said was lacking in care and investigation—because that is what is said in this Motion. I wish your Lordships to read again what I said on March 29. It is highly important that you should do so, because the situation in the public service is anything but satisfactory. I gave your Lordships a meticulous account of the rise of Communism in the public service before and after 1941, and any suggestion from anybody who has not been in the Civil Service that I and all

who work together in the business have been lacking in care is both untrue and offensive. In the course of my remarks I mentioned two, and only two, people. Otherwise I said—and I want to repeat it again:

"I venture to suggest that the Government of its own initiative and responsibility should undertake an investigation into the state of affairs in these various Departments, an investigation which I will do nothing to prejudice."

I meant that. But if the Government want help they must come to me. I will not go to them. My colleagues are grateful to me for what I have said. They wish me again to point it out, because it received very little attention in the Press.

I suggested that the present ineffective purge, as it is called (of course it is nothing of the sort), should be replaced by more effective screening, and that Communists should no longer be allowed on a negotiating level. If we choose to drift as we do at present, then we must take the consequences. But that is small consolation to the people of this country. There are 50,000,000 people in this country, and 10,000 Communists in the public service. Which way is our tolerance to go? One cannot have it both ways. I said that we want to get rid of Communists in the public service. My colleagues and I wish to see that done, and we make no concealment of that.

I will hasten to my conclusion. I do not want to be more pugnacious than necessary, but my veracity has been impugned. I have brought forward incontrovertible evidence, I have given your Lordships chapter and verse of the whole matter. I will not occupy the time of the House longer, except to ask: Does any sane man think that I, about to enter my seventieth year, after a full life-time spent in international affairs, would really be plugging along with my old theme of national security, and nearly always in vain, unless my conscience commanded? Why should I give up the last good morsel of life merely to be insulted? Why should I renounce all that I have longed for many years to mediate and write merely to be pelted like this? I have never expected a word of thanks for anything I have ever done in my life, but I must say that I never expected this sort of treatment in this House, and I leave your Lordships to judge the matter.

The Lord Privy Seal (Viscount Addison): . . . In summarising the position, I want to assure the House that we all here adhere completely to the Resolution which was passed unanimously in this House on March 29:

"That in view of the extent of Communist infiltration into the public service and other important branches of public life in this country, continuous and resolute precautions are necessary for public security."

. . . With the greatest possible respect to my noble friend Viscount Stansgate, whom I have known and loved for forty years, I am going to ask him not to press his Motion. I want this House to shut this business down, and, in accordance with a procedure of this House which is seldom adopted, and in spite of the fact that perhaps it may be very unpopular, I feel it my duty as Leader of the House to move the previous Question.

Moved, That the previous Question be now put, Whether the said Question shall be now put.—(*Viscount Addison*.)

• • •

On Question, Whether the said original Question shall be now put, resolved in the negative.