

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No 17.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

“ . . . the Welfare State . . . has its own particular difficulties, of which the chief is that there is in it no automatic or self limiting principle to determine how much the individual may demand from the State or, alternatively, how much the State may demand from the individual. The limit comes in fact, and can only come from the need for private enterprise to continue in efficient production, and so able to support the Welfare State, and the principle is effective because private industry cannot afford to run at a loss, or to incur recurrent losses. The condition of the Welfare State is that it shall rest on industry which, because it is free, is solvent. Hence Socialism will destroy the Welfare State, because it is transferring industry out of this setting into a political one where losses can be indefinitely concealed in the frantic political determination that whoever suffers it shall not be the working class consumer. Even if the politicians, goaded by their anxious permanent advisers, seek to respect economic realities, the pressure through the Unions can prevent the achievement of any equilibrium which conflicts with the basic attempt to over-value unskilled or semi-skilled physical exertion, if performed in this country.”

(*The Tablet*, December 16).

It is, of course, beyond our power to say whether or not the writer of this passage could, if asked to do so, write down the *financial-economic* propositions upon which his extraordinary paragraph rests; but, for what it disguises, not for what it seems to be intended to reveal, and with an understanding of the special meaning of the word in ecclesiastical quarters, we stigmatise the passage as *scandalous*.

While we quite well understand that such matters as are discussed (and how!) claim immunity from authoritative correction on the score that they are matters not of doctrine but of opinion, this in itself is more and more assuming, in our view, the characteristics and proportions of a concerted plan to shift authority's bench-marks “while men slept.” We shall doubtless be under the necessity of returning to this question again. In the meantime, we may perhaps usefully cite two short passages in an article by the Editor of *The Tablet* published in the May, 1949, issue of *Blackfriars*: “Then I think of the two directors of *The Tablet* who concern themselves with public questions and have made their impress in particular on our treatment of domestic issues. One is Mr. Richard O'Sullivan The other is Mr. Christopher Hollis.” The second passage is a reference at the close of the same article to Cardinal Tisserant's observation about some Italian Christian Democrats, “that ‘they want to be neutral in a conflict which is about their own survival.’” We adhere to the view that this is *not* the intention at the seat of Authority in the Church.

The Times shuts the stable door:—

“Older generations thought of Parliament chiefly as a

committee of review, appointed to keep a continuous watch upon the actions of the executive, and occasionally exercising its power to alter the law when altered times made some adjustment of old customs necessary.”

(*The Times*, December 13).

“The whole force of our principles and methods will lie in the fact that we shall present them and expound them as a splendid contrast to the dead and decomposed old order of things in social life.” (*Protocol*, XIV, 3).

Marshall ‘aid’? But more dollars than ever are to be pumped into making war materials, “with no direct benefit for industries supplying civilian needs” (our emphasis). And, we may add, no benefit at all for civilians or consumers of any kind.

Ten Years Ago

(From *The Social Crediter* of December 21, 1940).

“I always heard,” said Alice, “that the Greek City States owed their happiness to their complete local independence.”

“Of course,” said the Mad Hatter, “that's why we're making all the States larger and larger.”

“But—” said Alice, looking puzzled, “I thought—”

“It's the Law of Squeers,” said the Mad Hatter, looking profound, “it's called after W. Squeers, our Great Leader into the New Garden of Eden-which-will-be-built-through-war-just-the-same. It says that if a thing's good, one twice as big is four times as good. That's Science, that is,” said the Mad Hatter proudly.

“Y-e-s,” said Alice, doubtfully. Do you mean that a tiger's a million times as attractive as a kitten?”

“I knew you'd agree,” said the Mad Hatter. “Have an O.B.E. NO? Then be a Cabinet Minister.” Alice said she'd think it over.

“Civil Defence”

Two Epsom newspapers print the following:—

Sir,—I suggest that Civil Defence Committees would do well to follow the example set at a Civil Defence meeting on November 11 at Ross-on-Wye, where the following resolution was passed unanimously: “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.”

If we are to arm against outward aggression, it is vital that we should first rid ourselves of the enemy within our gates.

Yours, etc.,

EDWARD ROBERTS.

Higher Green,
Ewell.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 29, 1950.

Foreign Affairs

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Ernest Bevin): . . . I understand the urge towards European unity and sympathise with it and, indeed, I did much to help bring the Council of Europe into being. But I also understand the new paradox that European unity is no longer possible within Europe alone but only within the broader Atlantic community. It is this great conception of an Atlantic community that we want to build up. This union of 12 free, equal and independent nations, organised for the defence of peace and for the growth of prosperity, comprising most of the free nations of Europe and working in harmony with the aims and purposes of the United Nations, is a great new force in the world. It includes two Commonwealth countries, Canada and ourselves, who will always work in the closest association with the other members of the Commonwealth.

We have set our hopes on this conception. We want it to develop far beyond its immediate purpose of defence into a lasting association of like-minded nations. That is why, I am sorry to say, we cannot accept the French proposal. . . .

We are trying to reconcile the different approach caused by our geographical position, our international responsibilities, our Commonwealth connection and every other factor concerned, and we are not at loggerheads with the French. If the French, with their long tradition and their European view, take one line regarding Europe and if they will not try to force us into an awkward position, we certainly will put no pressure on them with regard to their desire for a European Army. But I repeat what I said, and I appeal to them to let us get on. We are anxious to avoid delay. The situation in the world is very dangerous. All peoples can combine on this problem of security and peace. It is in the interests of all of us in Western Europe that the solution should be found promptly, and security assured.

The only thing I can say in conclusion is, that whatever controversy may arise on the judgments that the Government have arrived at and which I have enumerated today, there is, outside this House, a grave anxiety about world peace. All of us feel it, whatever party we belong to. I hope that the result of this two-days' debate will be such that it will contribute to the solution of these grave problems. I shall keep an open mind, as anybody must who occupies the position of the Foreign Secretary of this country. I shall listen with great care to suggestions. I think it will be a pity if the debate devolves into sultry criticism. I think this House, this country—all of us—are at a point when the best constructive brains of this Parliament are needed in order to preserve peace, the most precious thing mankind is praying for.

Mr. Somerset de Chair (Paddington): . . . I have on many occasions tried to study the Treaty with Egypt which was drawn up in 1936, and I sincerely ask any Egyptian politician to what feature of that Treaty he can possibly take exception. If they are now considering negotiating a new Treaty, one is bound to ask in what way any new Treaty can differ from the one signed in 1936 without departing to a degree to which we would never assent, from the essential clauses. It is perfectly clear that in this Treaty great attention was paid

to the importance of Egyptian sovereignty and independence. Article I stated that

"The military occupation of Egypt by the forces of His Majesty the King and Emperor is terminated."

That was put in to make it perfectly clear that from then onwards any defence arrangements included in the Treaty would not be regarded as an occupation of Egypt, and would in no way infringe Egypt's national sovereignty. In discussing the actual provision for the Canal Zone base, the Treaty went on to say very specifically that

"The presence of these forces"—

that is the British forces—

"shall not constitute in any manner an occupation and will in no way prejudice the sovereign rights of Egypt."

There again, it was recognised by the leading Egyptian statesmen who signed this Treaty, including Nahas Pasha himself and Nokrashy Pasha and others, that our Forces in the Suez Canal in no way constituted an occupation of Egypt, and could not be regarded as a threat to the rights of Egypt.

What were to be the circumstances in which British troops were to go to the Canal zone? It was to be

"until such time as the High Contracting Parties agree that the Egyptian Army is in a position to ensure by its own resources the liberty and entire security of navigation of the Canal, authorises His Majesty the King and Emperor to station forces in Egyptian territory in the vicinity of the Canal, in the zone specified in the Annex to this Article, with a view to ensuring in co-operation with Egyptian forces the defence of the Canal."

To put it bluntly, could we, as one of the High Contracting Parties, agree that Egypt was now in a position, in the present state of the world, to ensure the defence of the Canal zone? The answer must be clearly stated that we could not take that view at this stage. It may well be that, as the years go by and the international situation improves, the Egyptian Army may be able to take over some of these responsibilities, but the war which has lately taken place between Egypt and the State of Israel was not conducted in the military sphere by the Egyptian forces in such a way as to give us any assurance that they could cope with a Russian invasion coming down through Turkey or the Caucasus. I put it no higher than that. The fact of the matter is that under the terms of Article 8, we cannot possibly accept that the time has arrived when the Egyptian Army can take responsibility for this area.

It has been well pointed out by my right hon. Friend

To be published very shortly:

On Planning The Earth

by

Geoffrey Dobbs

with a foreword by

Major C. H. DOUGLAS.

5/6 (post free in U.K.)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.,

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

the Member for Warwick and Leamington (Mr. Eden) that this is no longer a question merely of British defence of the Canal area. We are dealing here with an advanced position for the United Nations as a whole. When the invasion of Korea took place, we were very fortunate in the fact that the Americans had a base in Japan within striking distance of Korea, and were able to react violently and immediately to this sudden and unexpected threat. That is precisely the situation which would arise if a threat developed in the Middle East. The existence of a powerful British zone in the Canal area would be comparable with that which enabled General MacArthur to react vigorously to the threat from North Korea. Without such a base it would be quite impossible to mobilise the forces of the Western world and hold a position in the Middle East long enough to be effective.

It is extraordinary, when discussing this problem with Egyptians, to discover their attitude. I have friends in Egypt. I have sat with Bedouins settled in the Delta and discussed with them, during long evening talks, the problem of the revision of the Treaty and their attitude to the Canal zone. They take the most extraordinary point of view that we can just dump our forces across the Canal in the Sinai desert. They say, "Why do you not put them in the Sinai desert for a change?" First of all, the hydrographers assure us that there are not sufficient water supplies in the Sinai desert to allow us to build a base there.

But, as "The Times" correspondent pointed out, to think that the British base in the Canal Zone is a sort of suitcase that can be picked up and put down at any convenient spot in the Middle East is a ridiculous misunderstanding of the importance of a base of that nature. This has been built up under the assurances we received in this Treaty, and it has become a secure base in the sense that it has its base workshops, its reconditioning plant, all the camp facilities and messes, and the various features which go with a large military establishment. It is quite inconceivable, with the threat from Russia being what it is now, to think that we can simply abandon all this and move it somewhere else.

I am bound to say that I think all that could have been made much clearer to the Egyptians three or four years ago than it was. The Government are to a large extent to blame for the state of Anglo-Egyptian relations today. It was a statement made by Lord Stansgate, when he went to lead the delegation for the revision of the Treaty, that all British troops would be withdrawn from Egypt which has led to so much acrimony on the part of Egyptian statesmen in dealing with this issue.

It was the Bevin-Sidky agreement, which the House has never seen, but the terms of which are fairly well known, and which is said to have been initialled at the Foreign Office, under which a promise was made to withdraw troops from Egypt and to establish the joint defence of the Sudan. It is a fact that the Government never thought out the position in the Middle East sufficiently clearly when they made these announcements. They did not, apparently, realise then that they would have to evacuate Palestine. That was the time when the Foreign Secretary was staking his political reputation on the solution of the Palestine problem.

The history of the last four or five years in the Middle East has been one of gradual disintegration, and I am afraid that the Foreign Secretary has sacrificed his reputation as a statesman in handling Middle East affairs. Not only has he had to retract statements made about the withdrawal of British

troops from Egypt, not only has he had to retract the Bevin-Sforza agreement about handing Tripolitania over to the Italians again, not only has he lost his way over the future of Eritrea, but he is now confronted with a complete impasse in Anglo-Egyptian relations. They have broken down because of the insistence on the part of Egypt that they should have the Sudan.

Many of us hoped that when Nahas Pasha and the Wafdi returned to power, this would lead to an era of better understanding, and that as he was the Prime Minister with whom we negotiated this Treaty we might be able to revise the Treaty on some more practical footing. Our hopes were disappointed. That may be due to the fact that there is now a strong man in Egypt. The Minister of Finance and of the Interior, Sireg el Din, is now the strong man behind the scenes, who is driving the pace in relation to us.

What, first of all, is Egypt's claim to the Sudan? I do not wish to go into its long history, but it is essential to realise exactly how far Egypt's claim to the Sudan can be substantiated in history. It dates back to 1821, when Mehemil-Ali sent his son to conquer the Sudan, and the Sudan under Egyptian rule became so notorious for the slave trade that European opinion was inflamed on this subject and Ismail Pasha, who became Khedive in 1863, decided that something must be done to allay European anxiety about the slave trade under Egyptian rule in the Sudan.

He appointed General Gordon as Governor of the Equatorial Provinces of the Sudan in 1874. General Gordon spent two years trying to clear up the slave trade that existed, without much success. It was not until he was made Governor-General in 1877 and spent two years as Governor-General of the Sudan that some progress was made in suppressing the slave trade in the Sudan. After General Gordon's resignation in 1879, the Sudan quickly relapsed under the conditions of Khedival rule into a state of slave trading and the whole situation disintegrated after the rising of Arabi Pasha in Egypt in 1882.

The Mahdi set upon the Egyptian garrison in the Sudan and the rising of the Mahdi occurred. The House will be familiar with the circumstances in which Mr. Gladstone's Government sent General Gordon to the Sudan in an attempt to evacuate the Egyptian garrisons there. Gordon was not the best man to evacuate anything and we all know the tragic circumstances in which he was assassinated two days before help arrived from Egypt.

I have mentioned these facts because I think that they are not known generally to the public and that Egypt's claim on the Sudan dates from a very short time ago. Her rule in the Sudan ended when the condominium was established in 1899 after Kitchener reconquered the Sudan. Her record of rule was exceptionally bad and since the condominium the Sudan has prospered particularly under the British influence in the rule.

I was delighted to hear the speech of the hon. Member for Swindon (Mr. T. Reid) which, I felt, showed a real understanding of the problems in Egypt and the Sudan. He pointed to the situation developing there where we have the rival parties of the Ashigga, who want union with Egypt and the Umma who want independence of the Sudan eventually but are quite happy for this to work itself out under British protection. There is a religious element to this which it is

(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. 25. No. 17. Saturday, December 23, 1950.

Babel

In a work published in New York in 1886, not an important work, though one which forestalled "scientific discoveries" in anthropology boosted as "new" in England in the years 1919-28, we read pathetically that "There is no money in the publication of such books; American readers do not care for this subject." So the author printed it himself, rather confusedly reciting as he did so the verse from the sixth chapter of St. Mark's gospel. "And whomsoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet . . ." although, so far as we can judge, one, if not the main intention of the work was to reduce the doctrine of the Trinity to "its proper level" among the notions of mankind.

Our cogitations concerning this (not by any means singular) exhibition of the psychology of faithlessness, was interrupted by the postman, to whose messages we customarily give immediate attention, and so we read, from our bookseller:—"Dear Sir, This year we are faced with the prospect of twenty thousand new books to list; a prospect to make the stoutest heart and duplicator quail . . ." etc.

Leaving the duplicator to its own devices, let the quailing start. Twenty thousand! Of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh. A man may live happily with only what others tell him about the wisdom of books, and even the very-much-educated commonly get along with a bare half-dozen, while we ourselves are fast approaching the time when picture books alone will invite us successfully to open them. Remembering the Sabbath, to keep it holy, a book a day would last a man over sixty-four years to read, and these, says our bookseller, are but "new books to list." The world must be quite mad. It need have no fear of atomic bombs or any other weighty product in short supply: it is already bombed and buried under the weight of the vast library of letters strung together pretending to reduplicate it, to reconstruct it, to embellish it, to reform it, to damn it. The husk of life has usurped the functions of the kernel, and the seed is smothered in its case, a case of its own contriving. The tomb wins. How true that the letter killeth! Another instance "the delusion of super-production." Our American of the eighties may nevertheless have been right (his own book possibly excepted) in thinking, as it seems he did, that the really worth-while books have a bad start. We have ourselves experienced serious difficulty in getting those whom we criticise to pay us for criticising them, ably as we do it. And without payment where are we—we could scarcely manage a book a week on short commons, and the shorter our "commons" the less time and inclination we should have for the effort?

Another case of diminishing returns: the larger the avalanche of books the more the lambs cry out that they are not fed, and even the Montagu Normans confess there are

things beyond their understanding (though not the things we know are beyond their understanding).

Two lines of Greek come back to us: (*In a barbarous alphabet*) "Aipsa podes me pheroien es aidion polin andron ton gar kai thymos prophron kai metis ariste."—Speedily may my feet bear me to some town of righteous men; for their hearts are generous and their wit is best."—Or just "Happy Christmas."

Naturalisation of Aliens

The following is from the official report of the House of Lords Debate of December 13:—

Lord Vansittart rose to move to resolve, That more stringent and effective precautions should govern the bestowal of British nationality upon alien applicants. The noble Lord said: My Lords, in submitting this Motion to your Lordships I will be as brief as possible and, I hope, entirely practical. Our system of naturalisation has never worked entirely perfectly, nor would any fair-minded man expect that to be the case—and I wish to be entirely fair. Before the First World War some of us in the Foreign Office felt that the system might be bettered, and that the subject was too important to be remitted entirely to the Aliens Branch of the Home Office; and we thought that the basis of judgment might with advantage be broadened. After the First World War there was no change that I know of. During the eight years that I was Permanent Under-Secretary I was not consulted in these matters; nor, indeed, again to be entirely fair, if I had been should I have had any comment to make in nearly all cases. In one or two perhaps I might have suggested caution; in one or two I might have objected.

But I still adhered to the idea that my friends and I had had for a long while—namely, that we should broaden the basis of discussion. Therefore, I thought it would be a good idea if final judgment on questions of naturalisation, particularly in any borderline case, were remitted to a committee which would comprise not only representatives of the Home Office but also those of the Foreign Office, the three Fighting Services, the Board of Trade and, of course, all branches of our security services. None of us had the least desire to deprive the Home Office of its primacy in the matter. It would have gone without saying that the Home Office should be in the chair. Our idea, however, never caught on, and there has been a certain reluctance to change with a changing and ever more dangerous world. When I was a free man I brought up that idea in this House, in a Motion which contained a good deal of other controversial matter, and in consequence when the Government came to reply they omitted to cover that point at all. So I am going to press it upon them again to-day, and I hope they will give it very serious consideration. That is one point.

The second is that the regulations prescribe that any applicant for naturalisation must have four well-accredited sponsors. I should like to be quite sure that no exceptions are ever made to that rule. I think it might be worth the Government's while to look back into the past a little, and to see whether a case has not sometimes occurred, because those in authority deemed it to be a special case, where a man was passed on rather fewer than the regulation four sponsors. However high the authority might be in such a case, I think that would be a dangerous practice. We have only to look at the cases of Fuchs and Pontecorvo. Were there the full eight sponsors in those cases?

(to be concluded)

The End of England

by H. SWABEY.

Readers of this review are familiar with the great speech the Earl of Chatham made in 1770, and so an extract will suffice: "Lord Mansfield assures us that he knows NOT in what code the law of Parliament is to be found . . . Are all the generous efforts of our ancestors reduced to this conclusion, that instead of an arbitrary Power of a King, we must submit to the arbitrary Power of the House of Commons? If this be true, what benefit do we derive from the exchange? Tyranny, My Lords, is detestable in every shape, but none so formidable as when it is assumed and exercised by a number of tyrants. But, My Lords, this is not the fact, this is not the Constitution, we have a Law of Parliament . . . We have MAGNA CARTA . . ."

Junius, incidentally, said that Mansfield was "fond of introducing into the Court of King's Bench any law that contradicts or excludes the common law of England; whether it be *canon, civil, jus gentium* or *levitical*." For, said Junius, "both liberty and property are precarious, unless the possessors have sense and spirit enough to defend them . . . The power of the Legislature is limited, not only by the general rules of natural justice, and the welfare of the community, but by the forms and principles of our particular constitution." (1771).

It appears that at about this time a successful assault was made on the English system, based as it still was on classicism and common sense and giving rise to mother-wit and wisdom. The "reforms" to which it had been subjected were not pushing things ahead fast enough. Indeed there had just appeared a most "reactionary" treatise which omitted any reference to prime Minister or Whig cabinet system. Blackstone, discussing the judicial aspect of the House of Lords, had written (1765): "The House of Lords is composed of prelates selected for their piety, and of nobles advanced for personal merit, or deriving honour and merit from an illustrious train of ancestors: who are formed by their education, interested by their property, and bound upon their conscience and honour to be skilled in the laws of their country . . . the English juridical system [was] designed by the masterly hand of our forefathers . . . if any of its minuter strokes are at all obscured or decayed, they may be with ease restored to their pristine vigour: and that not so much by fanciful alteration and wild experiments (so frequent in this fertile age) as by closely adhering to the wisdom of the ancient plan, concerted by Alfred and perfected by Edward I., and by attending to the spirit without neglecting the forms, of their excellent and venerable institutions."

The attitude of romantic folly is fully stated by G. M. Trevelyan in his *English Social History* (1942): "It is a 'classical' age. . . Such an age does not aspire to progress . . . It is true that the men who were the least content were those who looked closest at the realities of English life—Hogarth, Fielding, Smollett, and the philanthropists; they indeed exposed particular evils as unsparingly as Dickens himself. But even their strictures kept within the limits of the classical and conservative philosophy of the time. Nor was the self-complacency of that age altogether unjustified, though it was unfortunate because it sustained an atmosphere inimical to any general movement of reform. . . . Jeremy Bentham, the father of English law reform, regarded Blackstone as the arch-enemy, who stood in the way of change by teaching people to make a fetish of the laws of

England. . . . The first blast against Blackstone was blown by young Jeremy Bentham in his *Fragment on Government* in 1776. . . . When the octogenarian Bentham died in 1832, the laws of England had only just begun to be altered from what they had been when he first denounced them in Blackstone's day. . . . Onward from that time, our laws were rapidly changed."

The last quarter or so of the eighteenth century was, further, a time of feverish *underground* activity. H. E. Jacob wrote (in *Joseph Haydn—His Art, Times and Glory*), "The Bavarian order of Illuminati bluntly declared, 'Prayer is laziness and religion is fraud.'" This view could be called neo-Puritanism, and would be saluted by many a ferocious clenched fist today. The link between the Old Testament and Puritanism is clear enough, but at the period we are considering, Puritanism had died down and was being succeeded by a new type of cant which has developed into socialism and communism. At bottom, it was a theological question. The classical kind of thinker tends to look back to a 'mythical' past from which there has been degeneration: the Greeks mourned the loss of the Golden Age, Blackstone traced English law back to Alfred; the Babylonian Garden of Eden is the most familiar example. And Christianity taught that Christ came to *restore* Man to his true position. This view depends on the belief in the Mind of GOD, whose Thought is Truth and whose Will is Justice. But the "romantic" dispenses with such a guarantee, and that dispensation is very useful for the tyrant: there is no absolute Justice to check him, he can make it up as he goes along, and if genius arises (as it does occasionally in each generation) he can brush it aside as an aberration from his plan. The attack on God is usually *political*.

This profound change in outlook gave Revolution an entirely new look. I think one must be grateful to Ezra Pound for shewing that the marked improvements in government that took place from time to time in the ancient Chinese world were not "reformations" but were an effort to conform more closely to Chinese wisdom. The events in Henry VIII's reign were said to be the *restoration* of the primitive purity of religion. With their tongue still more obviously in their cheek, the opponents of Charles I. and James II. claimed that they were reviving the common law. The American revolutionaries cried, "No Taxation without Representation" which was an appeal to law. But the French revolution became a complete break with old values, and could not even be called a reformation. The doctrine that the end justifies the means was openly applied, as it has been in all subsequent revolutions. The industrial revolution—which let in so many undesirables—was of the new type.

The English scene changed quickly enough from one of which its people were proud to one of which the best citizens were often ashamed. In 1769, Goldsmith wrote *The Deserted Village*; and Crabbe's *The Village* of 1783 describes a rural slum:

"Can poets soothe you, when you pine for bread,
By winding myrtles round your ruin'd shed?"

The unhallowed union between English and alien produced a type that was both unscrupulous and stupid, unable to see that poverty amid plenty is *ridiculous*. Seed and stock were greatly improved, but like the advances in industrial arts were used to further yet another revolution, as Goldsmith noted. These forces greatly swelled the "proletariat;" and

served to divide the nation against itself. Possibly Britain was shaping for another 'classical' age at the beginning of the present century. But there is little evidence now of mental balance, and the poise this gives to life, or of the grace which shews in building. The stupidity that succeeded persists, and the British frontier, once said to be on the Rhine, has now done a flit to or beyond the 38th parallel. Chatham, I dare say, would have known how to describe this imposition.

PARLIAMENT.

(continued from page 3).

important to note. There are rival religious sects in the Sudan. There is the religious sect headed by Sayed Sin Ali al Mirghani, head of the Miranist sect, and the sect led by Sayed Sin Rahman al Mahdi, a posthumous son of the Mahdi by a woman from the West, a Hausa woman. Mirghani says, "I am no politician"; but he has been working in with the Egyptians. Sayed Sin Rahman al Mahdi is in favour of independence for the Sudan, under British guidance. I was very glad to hear that the authorities in the Sudan have undertaken the rebuilding of the tomb of the Mahdi which was destroyed and which Kitchener forbid to be rebuilt.

I hope that I have said enough to make it clear that we cannot in this House agree to the Sudan being handed over to Egypt. I think that it should be said quite unequivocally to the Foreign Secretary of Egypt that discussion on the Sudan is out, and that the terms of the 1936 Treaty, which were worded as carefully as possible to meet the other point of Egyptian nationalism which has been raised, must in substance be maintained. If they want another Treaty embodying precisely the same conditions, for the sake of having a new Treaty signed in 1950 as opposed to 1936, then I suppose that is permissible.

In conclusion, I should like to take up in this matter of the Middle East a point made by the Foreign Secretary. He rather poured cold water on what he described as old-fashioned ideas of spheres of influence. The Middle East has been predominantly for many years a sphere of British influence. In a world which still recognises the existence of Great Powers and the existence of great blocks of Powers within the framework of the United Nations organisation, it is important to realise that the solidarity of the United Nations can be maintained and resistance to Communist aggression effectively prosecuted only if these Great Powers within it are effective Great Powers. It is no use being a sham Great Power.

I know that there are these new forces of nationalism which resent any suggestion of the days of Cromer, when indeed we did great things for Egypt. I remember as a young Member coming into this House and hearing an elderly gentleman talking about the Assuan dam. I said to my neighbour, "What does he know about it?" He replied, "He built it, so he ought to know." We did things like that for Egypt, and improved the whole standard of life for the Egyptians. I think that we have nothing to be ashamed of in our record in Egypt.

We had our part to play in the world as a Great Power,

For correct information concerning the Constitution of
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
 Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for
 the Statement published in July, 1949, (postage 1d.)
 K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

and we could not have played that part without being a powerful State. We have only to consider what would have happened in 1940 if Britain had not been a Great Power, with bases built up through the centuries in Malta, Gibraltar, Egypt and elsewhere. What would have happened then? All the barriers were down—Austria had gone, Czechoslovakia had gone, Norway had gone, Poland had gone, Belgium had gone, Holland had gone, France had gone and nothing remained between Hitler and the domination of civilisation but the English Channel, with Britain on the far side as a citadel of a large overseas Empire built up throughout the centuries.

I do not say we have never abused our power. It is inevitable, where a nation is ruling a quarter of the races of the world, that there will be abuse in some spot by some individual, but I am confident that, by and large, we have used our power in the interest of humanity. I am certain that if we are to continue effectively to play our part, we must retain our sphere of influence in the Middle East. The Suez Canal is to us what the Panama Canal is to America. If I were in the position of Foreign Secretary, I should not hesitate to declare a Monroe doctrine for the Middle East, making it clear that we intend to maintain a position of strength in that area, without which we cannot make an effective contribution to world security.

Mr. Donner (Basingstoke): . . . All along it was claimed that the Government were aware of what they were up against. Yet what, in those circumstances, did they do? They sold the British invention of the Rolls Royce Nene jet engine to the only quarter from which, in the words of the Minister of Defence, "aggression might possibly come." On 26th July, the Minister of Defence said:

"It is our purpose to show here and now that aggression does not, and cannot, pay."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 26th July, 1950; Vol. 478, c. 470-473.]

Was that the policy in 1945 and after 1945? If so, how do the Government justify the inconsistency of selling the jet engine, which revolutionised aerial warfare, to Russia, the only country "from which aggression might come?" In the same speech the Minister of Defence said that the introduction of jet engines into the R.A.F. involved what amounted to a complete revolution in operational training and maintenance. That is perfectly true. So the Government, who boast that they were cognisant all along of Russian hostility, decided to present as a gift to Russia the invaluable knowledge which only actual experience could provide of how to revolutionise operational training and maintenance.

Five times in the last Parliament I raised the matter of the sale of the Rolls Royce Nene jet engine—on 22nd November, 1948, and 6th December, 1948, and on 7th, 21st and 23rd February, 1949. I asked the Minister of Supply whether he could deny that by selling that jet engine to Soviet Russia he had saved the Soviet years of research. I received no answer. That was hardly surprising because officers in the R.A.F. and others in a position to know had assured me that that sale had saved the Russians 15 years of research.

I asked the Minister of Supply how he could justify that sale. He replied that the engine had been taken off the secret list and put on the open list, and that to have refused a licence would have been contrary to the export policy of that time. But these were Government decisions and the Government are and remain responsible for them. On 5th December, 1948, I asked the Minister of Supply why he thought it was his duty to facilitate Russian rearmament. I got no reply.

On 15th February, 1949, I asked whether the Dominions had been consulted or whether the right hon. Gentleman had been in too great a hurry to facilitate Russian rearmament. Again, I got no reply. When I put down the question yet again on the 23rd February, I was informed that the Dominions had never been consulted.

... As a result, we now read that in Korea Russian jet fighters are as fast, if not faster, than British and American jet fighters. The point which I think should be emphasised is that, but for the sale of those engines by this Government to Russia, Russia today would not be in a position to contemplate war against anyone.

Mr. J. Hynđ: The hon. Member has suggested that if Russia had not been provided with certain war equipment from this country, and probably from other countries, she would not have been in the position in which she is today. Would he agree that that applies mainly in regard to the equipment with which she was provided during the war from America and ourselves, but not by this Government?

Mr. Donner: No, not at all. The sales to which I referred were the sales which took place in September, 1946, and March, 1947. They were the sales of the Rolls Royce Nene jet engine and the Rolls Royce Derwent V jet engine—an invention which revolutionised aerial warfare. That was my point. [*Interruption.*] It is really no good the Secretary of State for War saying that that is completely untrue. Those are the facts.

The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Strachey): I was commenting on the suggestion that these engines revolutionised the Russian position. Their sale took place after consultation with the Air Staff and because the Air Staff had taken them off the secret list and put them on the open list. It is a complete misrepresentation to say that the Russians did not possess jet engines which, in the opinion of our expert advisers, put them in a position where these engines could give them little information which they had not then got.

Mr. Donner: ... The officers in the R.A.F. who were in a position to know and whom I consulted on this matter—[HON. MEMBERS: "All the officers."]—all the ones I consulted; and they were in a position to know. I will not give names so that the people concerned cannot be victimised. All, included those connected with the design, gave as their individual opinion, which tallied one with another, that Russia had been saved 15 years of research. . . .

Mr. Mikardo (Reading, South): ... I feel that the real division of the world today is not one between Left and Right, between East and West, between Europe and Asia, between those who want war and those who do not—because, except for a few lunatics, there is no one in any country who wants war—but between those people who accept the fact that a third world war is inevitable and those who refuse to accept that fact.

If one believes in the inevitability of war, one unwittingly makes one's own forecast come true. What one does when one believes in the inevitability of war is to devote oneself, not to the *nth* degree to try and get discussions and negotiations, whatever the discouragements, but to defeating the other fellow in a cold war; militarily, politically, economically, and in the field of propaganda, and, by doing that, one creates the very situation which has, in itself, a pre-disposition to the war which one has forecast and believes to be inevitable.

The dangerous people in the world are not the war-mongers, because they are few and are lunatic. The dangerous

people in the world are those people—and they are many and often well-meaning—who are busy making war inevitable by believing it to be inevitable. One can will things. At the time of Dunkirk, when all the odds looked incredibly against victory for this country, our people willed themselves to victory by a passionate belief in victory. I believe that they are now ready, if given the right leadership, to will themselves to permanent peace by a passionate disbelief in the inevitability of war. It is that leadership we have to give them. . . .

... It is not what is said but what is done that matters.

What are the Chinese to think of this? A week or two back they pushed down south a bit until they got towards what the right hon. Member for Warwick and Leamington called the "wasp waist." Then they immediately fell back. For several days every morning we read in our newspapers about the great mystery: "Where are the Chinese? Advance patrols put out by the United Nations Forces have failed to make any contact with the enemy. The enemy has fallen right back"—not pushed back—"and deliberately left a wide no-man's land between themselves and the United Nations Forces. Immediately they did that they proceeded to release some of their prisoners, including some American prisoners.

... I speak strictly as a non-expert and as a layman, but I should have thought, as a non-expert, that if the Chinese fell back a long way without being pushed, and deliberately left this great no man's land, and then proceeded to release some prisoners, they were ready to sit down and talk to somebody. Instead of anybody going along and sitting down and talking with them, General MacArthur chose that moment to launch an enormous attack bang in the middle of a first-class blizzard.

I am not competent to pass an opinion upon whether that was militarily wise, and I do not think I should pass one even if I were competent. All I am saying is that it was not a military action—it was a political action. It was a political action to launch an attack at the very moment when the other chap had given some indication that he was prepared to sit down and talk. . . and the United Nations Commander . . . having been the victim of a sharp counter-attack, having translated political decision into military action and having come un-stuck in the process, he now passes the baby back to the United Nations Commission and is willing to spend more time listening to them than ever before.

The right hon. Member for Warwick and Leamington urged us to remember the importance of not straining Anglo-American relations. I think we all agree with him, as we all agree with almost the whole of his speech. I take it that what he had in mind was that we on this side of the Atlantic should not overstrain the patience of our American friends. But this cuts two ways. Our American friends should bear in mind that the Anglo-American connection is as valuable to them as it is to us—and they should not overstrain Anglo-American relations by overstraining our patience. . . .

Colonial Empire (United Kingdom's Gifts)

Mr. T. Reid asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will make a statement showing the cash value of gifts made, or promised, by Britain since April, 1938, to each British Dependency, including liquidation of Dependencies' debts by the British taxpayer.

Mr. J. Griffiths: The total gifts made or promised by

His Majesty's Government since April, 1938, to British Dependencies may be classified as follows:

(a) Cash	£
Colonial Development and Welfare*	131,000,000
Grants in aid of administration 1st April, 1938, to 31st March, 1951	25,000,000
Grants in aid of reconstruction and rehabilitation to 31st March, 1951	6,700,000
Grants to Malta for War Damage	30,000,000
Far East War Damage Compensation Schemes	21,000,000
Grants for internal Security 1949-50 (Malaya, Africa, Jamaica)	10,260,000
Food subsidies, etc.	2,567,000
Miscellaneous items, including cost of troops in Malaya (£4,000,000)	6,008,000
Total	£232,535,000

* Excluding the £20,000,000 to be provided under the new Bill now before Parliament.

(b) Claims waived	£
Loans written off under Colonial Development and Welfare Act, 1940	10,150,000
Cost of military administration in Far East	10,000,000
Defence expenditure in Fiji	2,000,000
Total	22,150,000
Grand Total	£254,685,000

This figure does not include assistance in cash or kind made to the territories of Transjordan and Palestine.

It has not been possible in the time available to subdivide the total assistance between individual territories.

In addition, certain assistance in kind has been given to various territories, for example, installations by the Service Departments. It is impossible without prolonged investigation to give a complete list of these and it would be extremely difficult to set a precise valuation upon them.

"High Court of Injustice"

Commander Geoffrey Bowler contributes the following letter to *City Press* (City of London) for December 8:—

"Sir,—The House of Commons is the High Court of Injustice. There, vote-hungry power maniacs do injustices to large or small numbers of Englishmen. The Commons constantly deprive us of the protection of the High Court of Justice. The Union Jack on the Victoria Tower signals injustice probably being done under it to some Englishman or Englishmen without benefit of judge or jury. Once again, after 300 years, arises the issue: People versus Parliament.

"Englishmen hold the remedy in their hands, in active ballot boycott of the vote-hungry until they give us back justice, whose first-fruit is liberty. Parliament harms people, so people should vote against Parliament.

"They should mark a large 'X' right across the face of ballot papers to cross out all party candidate names, until one party stands against the injustices of stateism instead of standing for them, as all parties now do. Cross out the lot!

"A vote should be a reward for services rendered *after* they have been rendered; not a five-year advance blank cheque in return for politicians' pie-crust promises. Any society avowedly boycotting the ballot would be wooed as the most powerful factor in politics, the floating vote that sways elections. As long as Englishmen, or bodies of them cannot find spirit enough to boycott the enslaving ballot, they deserve injustice done them by the Commons. 'X' for Justice."

Lowenthal

Reviewing *The Man of Independence* by Jonathan Daniels, *Newsweek* says:—

"The chief influence on Harry Truman in his early years as senator was 'a self-effacing but ubiquitous man named Max Lowenthal,' Daniel's story: in 1937, Truman still known only as a Pendergast-machine politician, was serving on Senator Wheeler's sub-committee on railroad financing. After the court-packing fight, Wheeler returned to Montana for a rest and Truman (who had supported the President) moved into the chairman's seat. On the staff of the committee was Lowenthal, author of a book muckraking the reorganization of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway.

"One of the few early New Dealers who genuinely had a passionate desire for anonymity, Lowenthal was almost unknown to the general public. Born in Minnesota, he was graduated from Harvard Law School at the age of 24, in 1912, one of the earliest and reputedly the most brilliant of Felix Frankfurter's protégés. He served as a law clerk to a Federal judge, worked in a New York law office, founded his own firm, was secretary to Herbert Hoover's Wickersham Commission, played an important part in the Pecora stock-market investigation, and was known as an experienced aide and adviser to Frankfurter's 'boys' in the early New Deal days. Nervous, brainy, and shrewd, with a record of 38 years government service behind him, he lived comfortably on his farm in Bridgewater, Conn.

"Lowenthal (says Daniels) was surprised to find in Truman promising signs of hostility to big business. He introduced Truman to liberal justice Brandeis, and at Brandeis's open houses, every other week, Truman met 'intellectuals or theoretical students . . . unlike those he had been accustomed to knowing in the politics and public service of Missouri.' In the spring of 1944, Lowenthal urged Truman to run for the vice presidency. In general, Lowenthal acted as Truman's guide and ambassador in liberal and labour circles . . ."

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

FROM K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.