

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 13.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

We are indebted to *Housewives Today*, the organ of the British Housewives' League, for the following extract from *The Second World War*, Vol. IV (*Daily Telegraph*, October 23, 1950):—

"No great portion of the world population was so effectively protected from the horrors and perils of the World War as were the peoples of Hindustan. They were carried through the struggle on the shoulders of our small Island. British Government officials in India were wont to consider it a point of honour to champion the particular interests of India against those of Great Britain, whenever a divergence occurred. Arrangements made when the war was expected to be fought out in Europe were invoked to charge us for goods and services needed entirely for the defence of India.

"Contracts were fixed in India at extravagant rates, and debts incurred in inflated rupees were converted into so-called 'sterling balances' at the pre-war rate of exchange. Thus enormous so-called 'sterling balances'—in other words British debts to India—were piled up. Without sufficient scrutiny or account we were being charged nearly a million pounds a day for defending India from the miseries of invasion which so many other lands endured."—The Right Hon. Winston Churchill.

We count this appraisal of the facts by Mr. Churchill for Righteousness. Courage, of course, he has never lacked. The situation to which he refers is perhaps the most outrageous chapter in British history, and it was planned and executed, not by British Government officials in India, who at no time had the necessary powers, even if they had the will. The traitors are those friends of Mr. Churchill to whom he has pinned his political career, and the objective is the ruin of this country by draining it of its economic production, inflating its currency, and maintaining a financier-backed Socialist Government in permanent power.

It should be realised that this fantastic "debt" to "India" is exactly the same in essence as the Marshall plan, with the initiative placed in the hands of Pandit Nehru's advisers and the onus of "obligation" placed in both cases on "Britain."

The impeachment of Warren Hastings took place in times and under circumstances which were by general consent the high-water mark of British official corruption. Compared with the proceedings lightly touched upon by Mr. Churchill, Warren Hastings was as Cæsar's wife.

• • •

DIVINE RIGHT

"An old professor of mine once said: 'The doctrine of the divine right of the majority is far more dangerous than the divine right of kings . . . you cannot behead a majority.'" —David Brock in the *Vancouver Province* (Canada).

"The problems of the world are never to be solved by majority votes. The shibboleth of collective security is impotent in the face of over-population and the drive to a greater share of the fruits of the earth. The word "aggression" is but a soporific so long as the real causes of a war are concealed. U.N.'s presuppositions about the world are illusory and fanciful."—Montgomery Beligon.

• • •

"We have absolutely abandoned any idea of nationalist loyalty. We are deliberately putting a world order before our loyalty to our own country."—(Clement Attlee speaking at Southport, October 2, 1934).

Having experienced eleven years of attending to everyone's business except our own, it appears to us that it is more than time that we made a few enquiries as to the Interests which brought Mr. Attlee to power and enabled him to put loyalty to a world order before loyalty to the country which allegedly elected him.

• • •

It is related of Socrates that one of his disciples asked him how it was, if wisdom was so much more desirable than riches, that philosophers sought after rich men, while the wealthy continued their pursuit of gain. Socrates replied that wise men knew what they needed, while rich men did not.

It may be that here we have an explanation of the new type of politician, such as Mr. Aneurin Bevan. It is not, as some of us too hastily conclude, that the scum, however malodorous, rises to the top in our New Order. What we have failed to realise is that Mr. Bevan is a philosopher and acts according to the law of his being. This should be of great assistance in reconciling us to the inscrutable ways of providence.

• • •

We plead guilty to a mild curiosity in regard to the object to be attained in the "flying saucer" hoax. It is not without an object, even as the stories of the Russian troops who passed through Willesden Junction in 1914, and thousands of people saw them, and knew they were Russians because they had snow on their boots. Nothing could be more boring than the circumstantial accounts appearing in two Sunday newspapers except the salacious literature they have, we hope permanently, displaced.

Communists in Public Positions

The following resolution was passed unanimously at the Ross-on-Wye Civil Defence Meeting on November 11:—

"That this Meeting supports the Civil Defence Corps for Ross but at the same time protests against the retention of known or suspected Communists in public positions."

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 8, 1950.

Teaching Profession (Communist Activities)

Major Tufton Beamish (Lewes): . . . Another example is the "Bureau of Current Affairs," a biased Left-wing organisation. [HON. MEMBERS: "Oh!"] Oh, yes. It was the successor of A.B.C.A. which did so much to get the party opposite into power. . . . I am glad to say that, after frequent attacks from this side of the House from myself and my colleagues, the publications of the "Bureau of Current Affairs" are no longer used in any of the three Services unless they are vetted by a committee set up for that purpose. I have some examples of their pamphlets in my hand. I challenge anyone to say that "Western Germany Today," written by Basil Davidson, is anything but biased, inaccurate and partisan. I was very glad, when I asked all three Service Ministers what use was made of it in the Services, to learn that it was not being used at all.

Another pamphlet, which is equally biased and partisan, is called, "Human Rights," by Mr. G. T. Hankin. I have checked up on these things and have read them. Are we really to be told that it is more important to protect grown-up soldiers against partisan and biased publications than it is to protect children in our schools? Everybody knows that the Bureau of Current Affairs is one of the main sources by which teachers of our schools brief themselves for their current affairs lectures.

An Hon. Member: Nonsense.

. . . *Major Beamish:* Frequent use is made of the Education Section of the Society for Cultural Relations with the U.S.S.R., of which a well-known Communist, Mrs. Beatrice King, is the chairman and on which are represented a large number of teachers' organisations all over the United Kingdom, including until December, 1949, the National Union of Teachers itself.

In order not to speak for too long, I will not give hon. Members more details, but they can easily look this up for themselves. These publications produced by the S.C.R., as it is called, are undoubtedly widely used by teachers in their current affairs lectures.

Group Captain Wilcock (Derby, North): Name one school.

Major Beamish: Name, rather, one school where it is not used. There are numerous books in use provided by an organisation called Central Books, a notorious Left-wing bookshop; I have a number of pro-Communist books with me. Then there is the Educational Bulletin issued by the Education Advisory Committee of the Communist Party, and the International Bulletin of Education, published quarterly by the World Federation of Trade Unions (Teachers' Section), and which is handled, incidentally, by Central Books. There are many other sources of Communist propaganda, quite a number of which come directly from the Soviet Union and from other Communist-dominated countries, and many of these find their way into the hands of teachers.

. . . The point is this. The man to make suggestions is the Minister of Education. He is in charge of these things, and it is for him to do something to still the anxiety of British parents. I have in my hand a pamphlet called "Russia Today," published by the British-Soviet Friendship

Society. I have an idea that that is one of the proscribed organisations . . . proscribed by the Labour Party. . . . This particular copy was sent to a schoolmaster. It is addressed on the back, under cover of a penny stamp, to "Schoolmaster, Llangarron, Ross-on-Wye, Hereford." It went through the post addressed like that, and thousands of others have been sent out similarly addressed to schools all over the country.

. . . To take one example—and this is the worst I know—there is one school, not very far from here, Acton County School, where 16 teachers admit themselves as being members of the Communist Party. Sixteen teachers in one school. Admittedly it is the worst case I know. The headmaster is Mr. Giles, who has high academic qualifications. Not long ago that school sent a telegram of congratulation to Communists who were striking against the legally elected French Government. Sixteen Communists in one school—is that evidence? Now laugh. When this occurred a Conservative motion was moved on the local council asking for an inquiry to investigate the reason why the school's name was used in the telegram and it was defeated by the Socialists on the Council . . . who, incidentally, unsuccessfully attempted to exclude the Press from the Debate which took place. . . .

. . . The absurdity of the present situation seems to be underlined by something which has occurred to me—that apparently we cannot trust a clergyman to teach our children in a State school but we can trust a Communist. That bears thinking about.

Mr. Henry Brooke (Hampstead): . . . Perhaps I have more knowledge of the London schools than many hon. Members of this House. I have been leader of one of the political parties in the greatest local education authority in the country for the last five years, and, consequently, when a girl named Geraldine Chalmers made a foolish speech at a peace gathering, the daily Press immediately got in touch with me and asked whether this was confirmation of widespread Communist infiltration into the schools.

I replied that so far as I know, that particular case showed no evidence whatever of undue political influence by any member of the teaching staff of that school upon the girls. In that case, there certainly is or was a strong Communist group among the girls, but that had been created not by any wrongful behaviour on the part of the teaching staff, who, I think, were as concerned as anybody when they discovered the facts. The influence on those girls had come entirely from outside.

There are Communist forces in the country which are extremely anxious to get a hold on the minds of boys and girls in schools, but they are not just going to rely on the teaching profession and on what they can do through the teaching profession to achieve that end. On the contrary, I fancy that these forces are trying to work at the present time much more through these various apparently harmless bodies with the mendacious names which try and get the support of boys and girls. They know certain boys and girls who are already active members of the Young Communist League, and through them those other organisations, which conceal their Communist origin, manage to persuade a number of boys and girls to step in that direction.

We have got the National Student Peace Council, the International Youth Council, which publishes a magazine called "Youth for Peace" from 174, Uxbridge Road, and there is the World Federation of Democratic Youth which

awarded what it calls its "Peace Badge" to a girl in my constituency. Then there is the British Peace Committee, about which we all know, which decided to initiate a Peace Week in this country, starting, I thought not inappropriately, on Guy Fawkes Day.

As regards the London County Council, the Education Officer of the Council called together the secondary school headmasters and headmistresses in London in September to discuss with them measures to protect children in school against insidious propaganda of all kinds. I trust that hon. Members on all sides would agree that that was a perfectly proper action for him to take, and that it is most undesirable that teachers should not be fully aware of the kind of influence that may be exerted by ill-intentioned people. I cannot stress too strongly the danger that exists if these peace bodies with the harmless sounding names are getting hold of boys and girls, and if the teachers themselves are not aware of the evil forces which are working through these so-called peace committees.

As to the London schools generally, it is public knowledge that there are a number of Communist teachers in the London schools. Frankly, I do not think that we are going to further this inquiry at all by arguing whether or not 2,000 is the correct number of Communist teachers in the whole country. It may be 2,000 plus x , or it may be 2,000 minus x . But it is common ground that there are a number of Communist teachers. I want to say with a full sense of responsibility, as leader of one of the parties of the London County Council, that in these last five years I have had no specific evidence of Communist indoctrination of children by teachers in London schools. I am not saying that there has been none. I say there is no evidence in my hands of such a character that I would think it right to take it to the education committee and say that action must be set on foot.

I trust that if such specific evidence was produced, the London County Council, under its present rulers, would take a serious view of the matter. But, having said there is no specific evidence, let me add that I have heard stories, and we have all heard stories, that are such as to cause anxiety. Anxiety exists, particularly regarding those schools where it is not just a matter of one individual member of the staff being known to be a Communist, but where a kind of Communist cell has been built up. We are all aware that these are the normal Communist tactics—to try to get a group of people thinking similarly and working in the same place.

The stories one hears are usually about history being taught with a twist. Frankly, any of us who know the Communist Party and the Communist method must feel some sense of concern when an avowed Communist is teaching history. At the last General Election my Communist opponent in Hampstead was a member of the teaching staff of a London secondary school. I say nothing whatever against his teaching in that school, because I have no evidence on that point. Whether he is likely to teach history in an unbiased way I must leave hon. Members opposite to judge, for in his election address he told the electors of Hampstead that:

"The five years of Labour rule have been a betrayal of Socialist policy."

and that:

"The Communist Party is the only party fighting for peace and Socialism."

Can we all agree that a firm duty rests upon all parents or teachers or managers to report the fact instantly if they do receive evidence, even if it may be tenuous evidence, of something having been done wrong in a school? It is not going to be easy to get anything firm, concrete and definite in these matters; but we must watch any indications that a particular individual is misusing his position. Members of the teaching profession, themselves, must be as jealous as anybody on that point.

I hope I can carry the House with me also when I say that it is not only a matter of safeguarding the freedom of a teacher but also of safeguarding the parent—the parent who has a duty to send his children to school, who may have no choice as to the school to which his child goes and who may be most deeply concerned if he should find enforced on him by our educational system that his children are being subjected to an influence which he profoundly deplures.

Mrs. Middleton: The hon. Member for Hampstead (Mr. H. Brooke) said just now that he had no evidence of any Communist indoctrination in any of the schools under the London local authority. He also mentioned Communist cells within the staffs of schools. Has he any evidence to show that such cells have been established in any London schools?

Mr. Brooke: Yes, I certainly have that.

Mrs. Middleton: Will the hon. Member give it?

Mr. Brooke: I am not going to throw the names of schools about in this House, because I do not think it does the schools any good. The hon. Member for Southampton, Itchen (Mr. Morley), a few minutes ago asked my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Lewes (Major Beamish) whether he could give any evidence of teachers trying to get children to sign the peace petition. Let me say that there has been evidence of that kind in London, as the Minister himself is aware. I know that the teachers who were at fault were firmly dealt with. I hope I shall not be asked to mention the names of those schools, because I think that schools where that kind of thing has happened have probably received too much publicity already.

May I, in conclusion, turn to this question of Communist influence in the training colleges? I may or may not be right, but in my own mind I draw a definite distinction between the presence of a Communist on the teaching staff of a school and the presence of a Communist specifically chosen to train young men and women to become teachers. The latter seems to me to be a point of far greater danger than the former. My view is that at the present time the directive from Communist headquarters is that members of teaching staffs should take the greatest care not to put a foot wrong in the classroom, but that they should, at the same time, do all they can to bring other teachers round to their way of thinking, and I fancy that those tactics have been applied in the training colleges.

In July I made a statement in this House which was a perfectly true statement. The Minister has said that I have produced no evidence. It was not for me to produce evidence. I stated a fact and gave him a number of names, some of which I think must have been well known to him already, as corroboration of my assertion that a number of Communists had managed to get themselves appointed to key posts in emergency teaching training colleges after the war. I was not speaking of the permanent training

(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. 25. No. 13.

Saturday, November 25, 1950.

Five Hundred New Readers

Some time has passed since we made any explicit request of our supporters; but we think the time has now come to ask them to assist us in obtaining another five hundred readers before next March.

We do not think we are overestimating either their now almost untaxed energies or their abilities in making this modest request. And we make it at a time when the every day experience of most observant people tells them that a strong undercurrent of change is at work affecting the emotional tension of their fellows in the community—in the right direction, raising it to a pitch pleasanter in Social Credit ears than the meaningless mumbles of several years past. This symptom is not only emotional; it is at least potentially e-motive. It has many signs of its being quite soundly based in a realistic appreciation of at least some of the factors of our national decadence, to which it is a healthy reaction.

Also we appeal for this co-operation at a time when our own experience affords evidence of the disappearance of some difficulties which have been alleged to intervene between our older supporters and the attainment of an objective which we well know to be one they would all claim to be their own. The plea has been that the desired new reader comes to *The Social Crediter* as to something strange, forbidding, uncompanionable and to-be-resisted. We reassert our experience that this is not true of all such contacts. Those of whom it is true are, for whatever reason, not for us. But there are others. Quite possibly these others are far in excess of five hundred in this country alone. For the present we put the target at five hundred. We shall, as heretofore, refrain from adjusting in the slightest degree the style and content of *The Social Crediter* to an easier attraction of our supporters-to-be. That would altogether defeat our aim, which is a modest reinforcement of our ranks by folk of equal quality. As we surmount one difficulty after another (and we rise superior to many of which we by no means fully inform our present readers), we are fortified in the opinion that our usefulness in a naughty world does not wane. We know our strength. We know that it has been enough to have led us to the point where we stand, still unyielding, but not yet overcoming visibly or sufficiently (although even here our gain measured against the resistance may be greater than we know). All we are saying is that we will have to move faster and farther.

If any reader will suggest how—without hostages—we can help him to help us, we promise a willing ear to his words.

Communism in America

A special correspondent of *The Scotsman* in New York writing in that newspaper on November 13 gave information about Communism in America. The American public, he said, "knows the numbers and distribution of the Communist Party. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, told a Congressional Committee last February that there at 54,174 members of the Communist Party in the United States.

"Their distribution, he said, was as follows: New York State, 25,000 (10,000 people attended a Communist rally in New York City earlier in the year); California, 6,977; Illinois, 3,361; Pennsylvania, 2,879; Ohio, 2,834; Michigan, 1,250; Massachusetts, 1,022; Nevada, 23; Wyoming, 10; Tennessee, 27; Alabama, 141; New Hampshire, 43.

"The great bulk of the Communists are thus in New York City, around Los Angeles, and Chicago. Add a few for the industrial cities in Ohio and Pennsylvania, between the East Coast and the Middle West, and there is practically none unaccounted for. Mr. Hoover reported that 48 per cent. of America's Communists were employed in basic industry.

"Mr. Hoover also provided some other facts about the Communists. He said that party cards were now no longer issued, that Communists had secret printing works in different parts of the country, that they identified each other by secret signs and spoke in special language which seemed innocent to the bystander but had a double meaning."

The correspondent says further, that in 1947, the F.B.I. investigated the activities of 4,984 "militant" Communists. It was noted that 2,202 of these or 44 per cent., were of Russian stock, that is born of Russian parents, having a Russian parent or—in the case of eleven per cent.—married to a Russian.

Another 614 or 12.5 per cent., came from or were of stock from countries adjacent to Russia. Less than two per cent. of the whole American population is of Russian stock, while 44 per cent. of the F.B.I.'s top suspects were Russian.

Israel and Spain

The Jewish Chronicle on November 3 published a short telegram from its Lake Success correspondent stating that Israel was one of ten countries which voted against a proposal in the Special Political Committee of the United Nations, to revoke the ban on diplomatic relations with Franco Spain.

The resolution was approved by 37 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.

Why "New"?

"An essential feature of the new economics is that, while all this shortchanging and market manipulation is going on, a propaganda campaign must be conducted simultaneously. This consists of speeches, public statements and press releases by Government officials explaining that high prices are the work of 'the interests' and 'speculators.'

"The planners demand greater power to deal with these rascals. When a planner can jack up the cost of living by his own planning, and then turn around and jail a reactionary for 'profiteering,' he has reached the ultimate of earthly bliss."—*Saturday Evening Post*, November 11.

Loose Screws

By H. SWABEY

Miss Faith Thompson's *Magna Carta: Its Role in the Making of the English Constitution, 1300-1629*, gives a detailed account of the application of the Charter to the affairs of those years, and needs a professional lawyer to examine. The text of 1225 was that usually referred to. I merely wish to point to a curious twist in the work, and to its probable reason. For Coke and other common lawyers used the charter against the King, yet Charles I, we know was opposed by a suspect coalition of whigs and defended with his life what he thought was liberty. The clue is given only in the last forty pages or so of the work. The purchasing power of money had declined rapidly since Henry VIII's day, and the King needed a financial grant to do his work. Parliament refused to renew this grant. They had manœuvred the King into a choice between surrendering his position and levying taxes without their consent. The King chose to levy the taxes, and so broke the law. But the constitution had *already* been violated when the King's independence was withheld.

Coke, who glorified exports and work, said: "So dangerous a thing it is to alter any of the rules or fundamental points of the Common Law, which in truth are the main pillars and fabric of the Common Wealth." It was his view that the Charter was fundamental law, but "within the scope and meaning which judges and parliament have given it." If any rule of common law was fundamental, it was the King's position.

In 1643 there appeared, by order of the Commons, Prynne's *Sovereign Power of Parliament and Kingdoms*. Prynne quoted with approval Coke's view, "that the Principal Liberties, Customs, Laws, in these great Charters and ratified by them, are FUNDAMENTAL, PERPETUAL and UNALTERABLE," but proceeded to argue against the King's right to withhold his assent to a bill that had passed the Houses of Parliament, "because it is point blank against the very letter of Magna Carta, ch. 29, WE SHALL DENY, WE SHALL DEFER TO NO MAN, JUSTICE OR RIGHT, a law which *in terminis* takes clean away the King's pretended absolute negative Voyce to those bills we now dispute of." This disreputable confusion of legislative and judicial functions was part of the whig policy to destroy King and Church.

We may compare the anxiety of these disturbers of the peace to have their lawless and unconstitutional behaviour legalised with the concern displayed by their modern counterparts to be the *legal* party. The Spanish communists claimed that they were the legal government; the Nuremberg 'trials' had all the trappings of impartial justice; and doubtless the murder of Milhailovitch was preceeded by a solemn court martial. Desire to corner the law is no less evident in "Legal Aid" measures in Britain. The Chinese and of course the Soviet regimes are the 'legal' representatives of people. The point is not that it cannot happen here, but that it has happened—the abrogation of our constitution—and it would be as well to follow out the pattern to its next stage.

McIlwain (*High Court of Parliament*) is the authority Miss Thompson uses for Lilburne's words: "The greatest mischief of all and the oppressing bondage of England ever since the Norman yoke is a law called the common law." That, then, is the next step after a part of the law has been used to clear obstructions. Miss Thompson continues: "From another pen, directed against the new tyranny of parliament and army, came a satiric parody . . . Against the

'new despotism' of Cromwell, the Charter was cited only to be met with the Protector's contemptuous ridicule."

But although it was assumed that Statute Law could now do a great deal more than define and supplement the common law, the Charter was found useful once again, and brought out from its pigeon hole. "Bémont points out that it was left for Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, to use the insurrection at Runnymede and chapter 61 of John's Charter, to justify to contemporaries the events of 1688-89." Once the constitutional fabric was destroyed, the country could be played off one part against another, until the ideal arrangement of its being divided into "Two Nations" was reached, and such people could be exalted to high office as would never have attained pre-eminence in anything, by means of financially conditioned 'elections.'

I should like to examine two political tracts which illustrate the quickening of the process. W. E. Gladstone wrote *A Chapter of Autobiography* in 1868 to explain that "the great and glaring change in my course of action with respect to the Established Church of Ireland connects itself with silent changes, which are advancing in the very bed and basis of modern society." There was a general loosening up, in fact. He adds, "The present century has seen a great increase in the instances of what is called political inconsistency. If we go back to the day of Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox, or even to Mr. Canning and Lord Liverpool, we must be struck with the difference. If we have witnessed in the last forty years a great increase of the changes of party, the explanation is to be found in this, that the movement of the public mind has been of a nature entirely transcending former experience and that it has been more promptly and effectively represented than at any early period . . . as the nation passes from a stationary into a progressive period, it will require that changes in its own condition and views should be represented in the professions and actions of its leading men." Gladstone describes a period of flux but appears to approve of movement for its own sake. He notes "The gradual transfer of political power from groups and limited classes to the community . . . the constant seething of the public mind."

Yet Gladstone said (*Our Money*—"Peta"): "The State held, in face of the Bank and the City, an essentially false position as to finance. The Government . . . was to leave the Money Power supreme and unquestioned. I was tenaciously opposed by the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank; I had the City for an antagonist on almost every occasion." In spite of this experience as Chancellor, he could maintain that power had passed from "groups and limited classes to the community." But, he adds, "the public mind is largely unconscious of its own progression, and would resent, if offered to its immature judgment, the very policy which after a while it will gravely consider, and after another while enthusiastically embrace."

Gladstone describes the history of the Irish Church in some detail but fails to mention Bishop Berkeley of Cloyne who, a century earlier, had resented the existence of "poverty in the midst of plenty" in Ireland, and the powers of a banker who could "create £100 with the dash of his pen," and prescribed a national bank. Such, evidently, was not the sort of progress that Gladstone desired. This, rather than the position of the Irish Church, should have been "the question of the future." He adds, "My personal opinion was that it would be best to retain the Episcopal

Element from Ireland in the House of Lords, lest its withdrawal should lead to other changes, of a kind to weaken the constitution of that important branch of the legislature . . . I had not yet perceive(d) that the inconvenience of removing the Irish bishops must be faced."

He asks, "What has been, since 1838, the direction of public sentiment, the course of law and administration, the general march of affairs?" Affairs, plainly, had been on the move, or on the march. "At that time, Jews and others not bearing the Christian name were excluded from civil office. . . . The Establishment of Scotland was still entire, animated with the strength of the eminent men who afterwards led the Free Church Secession. . . . In popular education in England nothing was granted except to schools of the Church." He describes the "frozen indifference" of the Church of England before the thirties: "the richer benefices were a suitable provision for such members of the higher families as were least fit to push their way in any profession requiring thought or labour"; but then "the transformation made a progress altogether remarkable." He gives a curious reason. "As the French Revolution had done much to renovate Christian belief on the Continent, so the Church of England was roused by political events which arrived in a rattling succession. In 1828, the Repeal of the Test Act. In 1829 the emancipation of the Roman-Catholics. In 1831-32 the agony and triumph of Reform. In 1833, the Temporalities Act for Ireland . . . the altering spirit of the clergy seconded and even outstripped the laws. . ." This rather suggests that the Church was in the swim if not on the run. A veteran remarked to Gladstone that any clergyman of his age was a bad clergyman. "Party spirit within the Church was reduced to a low ebb."

But Romanism and Rationalism stepped in during the forties, and "Since, the Church of England may be said to have bled at every pore." Gladstone does not go as far as Lord Macaulay who asserted, "We consider the primary end of government as a purely temporal end, the protection of the persons and the property of men," for the upshot of that theory "may be comprised in three words: Government is police." He argues, "If the primary end of the State is to protect life and property, so the primary end of the family is to propagate the race. But around these ends there cluster a group of moral purposes, inhering in the relation. The action of man in the State is moral. . . ." He commended "the whole of that process by which Christianity became incorporated with the action of the civil authority and with the framework of public law." But he makes no mention of a common law or of a constitution that cannot be tampered with. Rather the contrary.

Two causes, working together relax or dissolve the union of Church and State. "One is the establishment of the principle of popular self-government as the basis of political constitutions. . . . As long as the State holds, by descent, by the intellectual superiority of the governing classes, and by the goodwill of the people, a position of original and underived authority, there is no impropriety in its commending to the nation the greatest of boons. But when, either by some Revolution of institutions from their summit to their base, or by a silent and surer process, analogous to that which incessantly removes and replaces, the constituent parts of the human body, the State has come to be the organ of the deliberate and ascertained will of the community expressed through legal channels—then the inculcation of a religion can no longer rest upon its author-

ity." In the case of the human body, however, the changes have the purpose of *preserving* the same body. The changes in the body politic were of a very different nature from the natural process, and tended to wreck it. Gladstone appeals to the last thirty years when the State's "consciousness of moral duty has been notably quickened and enhanced." He was not unprincipled, he was full of principles, but such words as law and constitution had only a fluid meaning for him, and—as has turned out—he was building all the time on sand, and quicksand as well.

Lord Rosebery in *Lord Randolph Churchill* (1906) remarks, "Strange is the fate that has bound the Tory party to leaders of uncongenial faith or suspicious antecedents. . . . Peel will live by the two great Liberal measures that he passed." On the other side, "Russell was the golden exception, for he was a Whig from the cradle to the grave."

Lord Randolph had a brief career. He emerged in 1880 as the leader of the "Fourth Party," and in 1886 resigned his Chancellorship. For "Lord Salisbury had realised that he himself was a Tory and his young partner was a Radical, constantly urging Radical measures." Winston Churchill (*Life*) said that his father's views on foreign policy "were rather those of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright. He might be described as a thorough and convinced radical of the old type."

Lord Rosebery asks what Toryism and Tory Democracy are, and the answer he gives himself is significant: "The Toryism associated with the names of Eldon and Sidmouth has long been dead. The Toryism of Lord Derby died under him in 1867 . . . the old Tory *non possumus* was impracticable. *Since then Toryism has become more flexible; it has been a singularly adaptable creed.*" (My italics). He concludes that Tory Democracy is a contradiction in terms. It was "an imposture and had nothing Tory but the name."

Lord Randolph made some fine speeches: "Our rule in India is, as it were, a sheet of oil spread out over a surface of, and keeping calm and quiet and unruffled by storms, an immense and profound ocean of humanity." No socialistic *non possumus* ("We can't") is evident here. There still remained in him "something of the old hostility of the patrician to the moneyed and mercantile classes." He called the Liberals "children of revolution, robbers of churches, plunderers of classes, destroyers of property, friends of the lawless." And the Church, "An institution which elevates the life of the nation and consecrates the acts of the State." Yet, his son said, (*Life*) "In these latter years, Lord Randolph Churchill was drawn increasingly towards a Collectivist view of domestic politics . . . he favoured a doctrine and tendencies before which Liberals recoiled and stalwart Radicals paused embarrassed." His budget contained "graduated death duties." (Rosebery). He gave his blessing to the Labour Party and urged their assimilation by the Tories, which might have been a bright idea. (1892). And he called the House of Lords "that bulwark of popular liberty and civil order." (1884). To many he was one "who, to serve the personal ambition which was his sole motive, would stick at nothing." (Rosebery). He was certainly in as much confusion as George Smythe, the original of Coningsby who ended "by claiming the sanction of Tory principle for free trade, secular education for the masses, disendowment of all the establishments." On hearing of Smythe's speech, the Duke of Hanover remarked: "It was, though beautiful in language, diabolical in substance. I am glad if you can see (in it) conservative principles or any

principles but such as are dictated by the accursed apostate and traitor Peel."

Rosebery did not compare Churchill so much with Lord George Bentinck—"a man of splendid presence, marvellous industry and a tragic vindictiveness"—as with Charles Townshend. Although he is careful to add: "Nothing could have tempted him into the incredible fatuity of being taunted on the spur of the moment into a pledge to tax the Colonies, a few months after he had repealed the Act for that purpose. Townshend left a sinister memory in the loss of the American Colonies . . . Churchill was the instrument of adding Burmah to the Empire."

We may conclude this study of shiftiness, or what others would call Progress, by quoting the Primrose League Manifesto of 1910: "At the bidding of an Irish Dictator, the temporary master of an over-represented portion of the United Kingdom, which holds fortuitously the balance of power between our two great historic parties, we are plunged into a General Election for the second time in one year. Supported by dollars, subscribed to a large extent by the avowed enemies of this country, he presumes to dictate to us a fundamental change in the constitution of our country and our Empire."

"The price to be paid for passing the so-called People's Budget, which lost the present Government 100 seats in the last Election, is the destruction of the Second Chamber, the gagging of the House of Commons, the establishment of a Radical-Socialist Oligarchy, the passing of a Home Rule Bill which has never been submitted to the people of Ireland, but which threatens that country with bankruptcy and civil war, and the absolute surrender of the British Government to a small party of Irish politicians, financed principally by those who own no allegiance to this country."

Politicians, of course, will always be unprincipled: the only safeguard the people could have against them would be a Law and a Constitution with which the politicians could not tamper. In America, the Supreme Court checked Roosevelt when he tried to violate the Constitution—much to his annoyance—but in Britain the House of Lords should, apparently, perform the functions of both Senate and Supreme Court, and is allowed to accomplish neither set of functions.

From what has been said it is possible to trace the outline of a strategy: (1) A false fixation, hold up, applied through finance—gold standard, credit monopoly, usury. (2) A legalised move away from the old principles of law and constitution. 3) Tyranny. We appear to be between (2) and (3), fast approaching the third stage.

Social Credit Secretariat

Reports from Groups

The Director of Organisation would be glad if the Secretaries or Deputies of Groups listed from time to time in *The Social Crediter* would kindly report to him concerning the recent activities of their Groups, if they have not already done so this year.

Order the book you need from:—
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., LIVERPOOL.

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3.)

colleges. In addition to that, a number of Communists undoubtedly managed to get themselves selected as students in the training colleges and all that, I believe, was a well thought-out plot to infiltrate into the profession.

Mr. Tomlinson: Again I would say that I am still waiting for the evidence to back up the assertion which was made. I have waited in vain up to now.

Mr. Brooke: I was about to deal with a letter which the Minister was good enough to write to me. After that speech which I made in the House I, like my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Lewes, came in for a great deal of correspondence, and it was interesting to note how, in these letters, the lines all crossed on certain particular training colleges—and in most cases they were the same training colleges which I had had in mind when I spoke in the House. May I read this letter to the House:

"I have read the Report of your speech in the House of Commons last night and decided to write to you about such-and-such a training college which I have just left. Several of the students there last year were Communist Party members and had the nerve to get up and say so. They did not believe that the majority of the people had the ability or time to study the facts of a situation and then form a judgment. They therefore thought that important decisions should not be made democratically. These are dangerous people to let into our education system, and yet these are some of the people who will be in charge of classes in September."

That is all I want to say on that point—

"These are dangerous people to let into our education system."

Mr. Cove rose—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is reading a letter. Surely he can read it to the end without interruption.

Mr. Brooke: May I now turn to the point about which I was speaking to the Minister? What I said in the House was:

"There are men and women coming out of training colleges who have passed under Communist influence, because the Communists were quite skilful enough to see that some of their numbers were appointed to key posts in emergency training colleges when the war was over."

Later on, I added:

"Will the Minister make his own investigations and come back to the House after the Recess and give us a firm assurance that no member of the Communist Party, no one who is spreading the Communist doctrine, holds any post in any teachers' training college?"—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 17th July, 1950; Vol. 477, c. 1893-5.]

In substantiation of the first statement I sent the right hon. Gentleman a number of names. I am not sure what further evidence he desired me to submit, because the emergency training colleges in question were closed at that time, for the most part, and unless his Inspectors had not been doing their work, he could not have been ignorant about some of the individuals I mentioned.

Mr. Tomlinson: I was waiting, and I am still waiting, for evidence of the exercise of Communist influence in training colleges.

Mr. Brooke: I think that the Inspectors may be able to get that evidence if the Minister asks for it. This is really the one point on which I am at issue with the Minister. He wrote me a letter, which I am sure he will not object to being read to the House, because it is obviously a statement of policy.

Mr. Tomlinson indicated assent.

Mr. Brooke: The letter states:

"Unless and until Parliament decides that no member of the Communist Party should be employed in a teaching post or in teaching posts of certain kinds, I do not agree that it is my responsibility to assure the House that no member of that party holds any post in any teachers' training college."

The difference between this side and the other may be that we consider that in times like this the Minister of Education has a responsibility to give the House an assurance that people who hold Communist views are not selected for training men and women for the teaching profession. That is an assurance which I still hope he will give us. He has his own sources of information through the inspectorate and elsewhere, and if he will give us the promise that he has informed himself as fully as he can about the state of the teachers' training colleges, then I, for one, will be satisfied.

Mr. Hollis (Devizes): . . . The only point that really has not been made, and which does worry me—I should be grateful if the Parliamentary Secretary could give us some observations upon it—is the opposite of that made by many hon. Members. The Debate has been very much on the question of whether or not teachers indulge in improper political propaganda in the classroom. I have no doubt whatever that in only an infinitesimal number of cases does that happen, but I think there is a certain danger in that very tradition of honour in the teaching profession for the opposite reason.

We have had a lot of talk tonight about the phrase "Communist propaganda," but no one has yet analysed what we mean by it. It seems to me that there are at present extremely few schools in which people are teaching the economic doctrines of Karl Marx. I wish there were more. I think it would be a good thing if more was taught both in schools and the universities about the economic doctrines of Karl Marx so that people would know more about what they were. What Communist propaganda means at the moment is not talking very much about Communism in a scientific sense, or even about Russia, but of talking a great deal of dangerous, bogus and over-simplified stuff about peace. That is the card the Communists are playing, and the great danger at the moment is that children may be got at by over-simplified propaganda about peace, and that the very tradition of honour of the profession may prevent teachers from countering that bogus propaganda. My fear is not that which some other hon. Memmbers have felt. . . .

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Education (Mr. Hardman): . . . A number of questions were asked which I would now like to try to answer. As regards the members of the teaching profession who are also members of the Communist Party, we have no evidence at all. Nor do I consider it our duty to seek information on this point. In my opinion, the political views of teachers are their own private affair, so long as they do not use their position to propagate those views in the schools.

Now we come to the crux of this Debate. If any evidence of a teacher abusing his or her position were brought to my notice by anybody, either outside this House or in this House, then immediate investigation would take place. So far, however—and surely this must be regarded as a remarkable and significant fact—not a shred of evidence that this is happening has been brought to our notice at the Ministry of Education.

Major Beamish: Would the hon. Gentleman address himself to the text book "Inside the U.S.S.R." written by a well-known Communist, Mrs. Beatrice King of which 25,000 copies are in circulation, and other Communist literature which is used by school teachers throughout the country in their current affairs lectures.

Mr. Hardman: I did not know that it was illegal for school teachers or adults in any profession in this country to read what they like. . . .

Mr. Harmar Nicholls (Peterborough): Is the Minister aware that one of the test papers used in a classroom was one where a sentence had to be split up in a grammar lesson, and the sentence was:

"It costs a lot to keep a king."

Does the Minister think that that is a good platform for anyone with Communist leanings to take advantage of in a classroom?

Mr. Hardman: If that is the only evidence that can be given of so-called Communist progaganda in the classroom, then Members of the Opposition have no case whatever tonight.

Mr. Nicholls: Does the Minister approve of that?

Mr. Hardman: As far as I know, that is a statement which may have been made at any period in English, or any other, history.

Mr. I. O. Thomas: Is not that a quotation either from Shakespeare or another classic?

Mr. Hardman: I certainly approve of quotations from the classics, even if they happen to be quotations that deny my own faith or my own political beliefs. I should have thought that there was nothing at all harmful in a quotation of that kind, or any sentence of that kind, appearing in a grammar paper. . . . We get periodic reports from His Majesty's inspectors, and their inspections are extremely thorough. We have as yet had no proof whatever, or even the suggestion, that in the training colleges or in the schools there has been any evidence of training college teachers or teachers in the schools influencing students along party lines.

REALISTIC CONSTITUTIONALISM

(Notes for an Address to the Constitutional Research Association at Brown's Hotel, Mayfair, May 8, 1947)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

K.R.P. Publications

SIXPENCE (Postage 1d.)

ESPIONAGE.

Report of the Royal Commission.

(Order in Council, P.C. 411, Feb. 5, 1946).

(Espionage in Canada).

" . . . we considered it of paramount importance that there should be available for all to read as complete an account as possible of the illegal activities which had already so seriously affected, and were designed even more seriously to affect, the safety and interests of Canada."—*The Commissioners.*

7/- (postage extra).

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

Liverpool.

Published for the Social Credit Secretariat by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton.