

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 30. No. 4.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, MARCH 21, 1953.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Mr. L. J. Cadbury's statement in a letter to *The Times* (March 10) that "This country is the only one outside of the 'iron curtain' which finds it necessary to ration sugar" raises the question whether this country is outside of the iron curtain, or which iron curtain. Sugar, he reminded us, is not one of the food products of the world which are in short supply; "there is, in fact, a surplus." The present domestic ration at 10 oz. plus four bonuses a year is equal to about two-thirds of the domestic pre-war consumption.

• • •

"According to the statistics 22 Members of Parliament have either resigned already or announced their intention of not standing at the next Election. According to informed surmises, many more are likely to withdraw from the political scene.

"Apparently the job is becoming too much for them. The duties of a member have increased beyond all recognition. The greater the scope of the Welfare State, the greater the range of Parliamentary obligations. Parliamentary service is now a full-time job, and the ordinary M.P. must consider himself a professional politician or quit.

"One horrifying thing about this is the unalloyed satisfaction it gives to me. You would think that as a man of understanding, forbearance and sensitivity, it would cause me a pang. Nary a pang. They've asked for it and they've got it. This is the nemesis of excess of government, of over-centralisation, of inordinate State intrusion into the ordinary affairs of life. It's breaking their backs and their spirits. Three rousing cheers.

"What Government has done on an increasing scale is to supersede the free economy and the price mechanism, with the inevitable result that the government machine has had to take over much of the work previously performed by the unobstructed citizenry."

So Mr. George Schwartz in the *Sunday Times* this week. He fears, with what degree of seriousness we do not know, that the 'remedy' which will be proposed will be the provision at public expense of more secretaries, go-betweens and 'research-assistants.' But why occupy one's mind with wrong remedies?

• • •

The answer to the question just asked seems to be that this perverse occupation is what naturally ensues from studious avoidance of attention to the point at which a remedy would be effective. The head is turned so violently away from the thing which must on no account be seen

that a certain vertigo is produced and the visual field is occupied solely with a confusion of objects. In the present case, what must on no account be seen by either writer or reader is "the price mechanism." Mr. Schwartz says it has been superseded. Nothing of the sort. But, for Mr. Schwartz, mere mention of the price mechanism is a stimulus to head-turning away from it. What is the price mechanism? The price mechanism is the machinery, and all the machinery, for collecting financial costs from the public. They cannot be so collected, because they exceed the means of payment distributed to the public in respect of them, *i.e.*, in respect of the production which bears them as costs. It does not matter whether new-fangled or old-fashioned machinery is engaged in an attempt to do the impossible; whether tax-machinery or subsidy-machinery, or pay-over-the-counter machinery, it is all price machinery, and nothing has yet been allowed to supersede it. It is time it was.

• • •

Advertisements persuade the shivering public to buy coke and slack off the ration. If one is registered with A, A hasn't got any; if with B, B hasn't got any; if with the Coal Board itself, the Coal Board itself hasn't got any. And so two months go by; but all the time "somewhere in the Region" (the North-Western Region) there are, or were, so we are told, 56,000 tons of coke which could not find a customer.

• • •

"Truth Has Been Murdered" is the title of an Open Letter to Mr. Ronald Staples by Mr. A. K. Chesterton, for the past nine years Deputy Editor of *Truth*. The publishers are the Britons Publishing Society.

Then

To the West, to the West, to the land of the free
Where the mighty Missouri rolls down to the sea
Where a man is a man if he's willing to toil
And the humblest may gather the fruits of the soil
Where the young can exult and the aged may rest
Away, far away, in the land of the West.

Now

To the West, to the West, to the land of the gun
Where shooting is pastime and knifing is fun
Where a man gets the dough if he's willing to kill
And the humblest may finger the cash in the till
Where the young can get dope and the aged stop one
Away, far away, in the land of the gun.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 3, 1953.

(As stated last week the sequence of our extracts from the Official Report is interrupted because of the Constitutional interest of this Debate.)

Royal Titles Bill

Order for Second Reading read.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir David Maxwell Fyfe): I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

This Bill is the fourth Measure authorising an alteration of the Royal titles which has been introduced into Parliament in the present century. Each Bill has been necessary to enable the title of the Sovereign to be brought into line with the constitutional position and constitutional arrangements within the Commonwealth current at the time the Bill was introduced. Thus, under the powers given by the 1901 Act, the words

"and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas" were introduced to recognise the growth of what we used to call the Dominions into full membership of the Commonwealth.

In 1927, a further alteration was authorised, following upon the creation of what was then called the Irish Free State, which was a Dominion on much the same lines as our Dominions but was not "beyond the Seas," and the creation of the Government of Northern Ireland which remained part of the United Kingdom. In 1947, in Section 7 (2) of the India Independence Act, Parliament authorised the deletion of the words "Emperor of India" from the title of the Sovereign when India became independent. Today, I move the Second Reading of another Royal Titles Bill which, like all previous Bills dealing with the Royal title, including that of 1876, authorises the Sovereign by proclamation to appoint the Royal title.

I think that the House will be aware that the terms of the Royal title were among the matters considered at the time of the meeting of the Prime Ministers and other heads of delegations at the Commonwealth Economic Conference which met in London last December. Those present at that meeting agreed that the existing title of the Queen did not reflect the existing constitutional position under which other members of the Commonwealth are full and equal partners with the United Kingdom in our great family of nations. The existing title is incorrect in its reference to Ireland and in that it does not reflect the special position of the Sovereign as head of the Commonwealth.

These Commonwealth countries and the United Kingdom are full and equal partners, united in their allegiance to the Crown; and the Sovereign is Queen of each of them. The Commonwealth, therefore, has moved beyond the Statute of Westminster; and today, rather than that legislation on the title of the Sovereign should be undertaken only by the United Kingdom Parliament with the assent of the Dominions as recited in the Statute of Westminster, it is more appropriate that each Commonwealth country

concerned should take the action appropriate to its own constitutional requirements.

The Prime Ministers and the heads of delegations agreed that the appropriate action in the established constitutional relationship would be for each member country to use for its own purposes a form of title which would suit its own particular circumstances, but that all should retain a common element. They agreed that the common element in the title of the Queen should include a reference to Her Majesty's other realms and territories and her title as head of the Commonwealth. The titles in the other Commonwealth countries are matters on which it will be for those countries to take the appropriate constitutional action. In this country the normal procedure is for Parliament to authorise the Sovereign to issue a Royal proclamation setting out the Royal titles, and that is what this Bill does in Clause 1. . . .

Mr. Gordon Walker (Smethwick): As the Home Secretary has told us, the Government, in moving this Bill as a member of the Commonwealth, are acting in accord with the agreement reached at the recent Prime Ministers' Conference. Moreover, the change which has been introduced in the Bill is one that it has been long recognised ought to be made at the next convenient opportunity. This, clearly, is a convenient opportunity and we therefore welcome and support the Bill from this side of the House. I am personally very glad that it is being introduced because I have been long an advocate of the principle of the Bill—the principle of a locally variable title, as it used to be called, adapted to the local needs of the various members of the Commonwealth.

This Bill may come to be an important landmark in the constitutional development of the Commonwealth. The Bill has two aspects, both of which must be borne in mind. The first is that it accepts completely the idea of the divisibility of the Crown, and we ought to realise that this is the first occasion on which that principle and idea have been fully accepted in a formal document. It is the idea that the Queen is equally Queen of each of her realms, that she acts only on the advice of her Ministers in each of the realms, and that in a certain sense there are seven Queens and not one Queen, or, at any rate, seven Crowns and not one Crown. . . .

The Bill will have very important consequences. It will usher in a period in which there will be a steady rise in the dignity, the stature and the status of the Crown. Because the Queen is Queen of each of her realms and, at the same time, head of the Commonwealth, she will have ranged about her in a new way Ministers not only in this country but in other countries in the Commonwealth. She will not be advisable only by one set of Ministers, and certainly not in any special or peculiar way advisable by Ministers in this country. We in this country have to abandon—and this is what the Bill says—any special sense of property in the Crown. The Queen now, clearly, explicitly and according to title, belongs equally to all her realms and to the Commonwealth as a whole.

For example, it would no longer be appropriate for the Queen's movements about the Commonwealth to be determined only by the advice of Ministers in this country, and it would be quite wrong to do as was done in 1912, when

His Majesty's Ministers in the United Kingdom advised him not to visit a Commonwealth country because it would involve the prolonged absence of the head of the State from the United Kingdom. Today, the Queen is head of the State of all her realms, and that sort of argument cannot apply in the future.

Finally, there are changes and developments which would be appropriate to this new role of the Crown which I think it important to mention. It would be appropriate if the Queen's personal staff were drawn from all countries of the Commonwealth and not only from this country. It would be appropriate too if the Queen spent periods of time in other Commonwealth countries. . . .

. . . The Bill is of much greater importance than it appears to be at first sight. It will usher in a period in which there will be a new development of the role of monarchy not merely as the centre and symbol of Parliamentary democracy but in the new function as a symbol of the free association of independent nations.

Mr. J. Enoch Powell (Wolverhampton, South-West): My right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Glasgow, Kelvingrove (Lieut.-Colonel Elliot) referred to the embarrassment which the House had felt in dealing with this Bill. I confess that I feel more than my own share of embarrassment in rising to agree with those hon. Members who have opposed it. But there my agreement with them ceases, because my objection to this Bill relates to the central fact of what it does and what, when it is passed, will be done by virtue of the Prerogative.

My right hon. and learned Friend the Home Secretary said in his speech that this Bill departed in a substantial point from the Statute of Westminster. I think that it was a matter of perhaps more importance than he devoted to it. When the Statute of Westminster gave statutory recognition to the legislative independence of the Parliaments of the Empire it recognised in its Preamble two voluntary limitations upon that independence. Those two limitations were that any alteration either in the succession or in the title of the Crown would be made, if at all, only by the agreement of all concerned.

It is important that the House should have the words of that Preamble in its mind.

" . . . it would be in accord "

said the Preamble,

" with the established constitutional position of all the members of the Commonwealth in relation to one another that any alteration in the law touching the Succession to the Throne or the Royal Style and Titles shall hereafter require the assent as well of the Parliaments of all the Dominions as of the Parliament of the United Kingdom: . . . "

Mr. Glensvil Hall (Colne Valley): Surely the hon. Member has read the Bill. The second paragraph of its Preamble makes it quite clear that agreement has been reached.

Mr. Powell: If the right hon. Gentleman had listened to me for a little longer there would have been hardly any need for that shallow intervention.

The Statute of Westminster preserved what was then considered to be the two essential unities—the unity of the person of the Monarch, by maintaining that the succession, if changed, should be changed simultaneously and in the same way—and the unity of the identity of the Monarch

by maintaining that the title if changed at all, should be changed simultaneously and in the same way. The second of those two unities, the unity of title, is deliberately departed from by the agreement which this Bill implements. Agreement there has indeed been; but that agreement is only an agreement to differ.

It is a consequence of that agreement to differ that whereas in the only previous case since the Statute of Westminster where the Royal style has been altered, that alteration was specified and written into the Statute which made it, the alteration has here been left unspecified both as regards time and as regards nature. Therefore, to see what alteration is proposed in virtue of this Bill we have to look to the White Paper.

The new style for the United Kingdom which is foreshadowed in the White Paper is not quite the first attempt at a new style which has been made. Over a year ago, on 7th February, when Her present Majesty was proclaimed, she was proclaimed by an unknown style and title and one which at that time had no statutory basis. It is not quite the same title as is proposed in the present White Paper. I am not quibbling over whether the use of a title in a proclamation requires statutory authority or not. I would only remark in passing however, that it is remarkable that we should have this necessity for Commonwealth agreement and for legislation by the Parliaments if upon that solemn moment of her accession the Queen could be proclaimed by a title unknown to the law. I notice that the other Dominions proclaimed her by her existing style.

Mr. Gordon Walker: No.

Mr. Powell: With only an addition, following that style, equivalent to the asseverance of loyalty which followed our own expression of the title in the Proclamation. I think that the right hon. Gentleman will find that that was the case if he makes the comparison.

When we come to the proposed new style for the United Kingdom, I find in it three major changes, all of which seem to me to be evil. One has been very clearly and correctly pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Smethwick. It is that in this title, for the first time, will be recognised a principle hitherto never admitted in this country, namely the divisibility of the Crown.

The second feature of the new title is the suppression of the word "British," both from before the words "Realms and Territories" where it is replaced by the words "her other" and from before the word "Commonwealth," which, in the Statute of Westminster, is described as the "British Commonwealth of Nations."

The third major change is that we have a new expression and concept—the "Head of the Commonwealth." I shall deal with these three major changes in order.

The term "Realms," which is to appear in the new title, is an emphatic statement that Her Majesty is the Queen of a considerable number of separate Kingdoms. Hitherto, that has not been this country's acceptance of the term. For example, in introducing the corresponding Royal and Parliamentary Titles Bill in 1927 the then predecessor of my right hon. and learned Friend said:

" . . . the word 'Realm' is constituted an alternative expression for the 'Dominions of the Crown.'"—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th March, 1927; Vol. 203, c. 1265.]

(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. 30. No. 4.

Saturday, March 21, 1953.

Victory Without War Campaign in U.S.A.*

We feel certain that all Australians concerned about developments in the East will be vitally interested in the campaign, Victory Without War, recently launched in America by Major Robert Williams, former Counter Intelligence Office. Major Williams publishes the *Williams Intelligence Summary*, which has exposed the Zionist-Communist conspiracy. In his Summary of November, 1952, Major Williams writes:—

“The time has come for Americans to act. Force . . . (the Administration) to repudiate the . . . Korean mess and to adopt such a solution as this one or we shall become individually and severally a party to this insane destruction of our most precious asset: our courageous fighting men.

“In an interview at the Hollywood Roosevelt Hotel just after the first ‘Victory Without War’ advertisement appeared, General Chennault told me that Chiang would cross the Formosa Strait and invade the China mainland within six months if America would begin at once supplying his troops. It was obvious that the Administration has been lying in giving the impression that it is supplying Chiang. It is simply trying to let him die on the vine.”

“General Chennault said Chiang’s landing would rally more millions to his banners than could possibly be armed and more than would be needed. He said Chiang would take back all of China south of the Yangtze River ‘before the dust could settle.’

“We believe the ‘Victory Without War’ project will snowball into a powerful pressure campaign, perhaps saving millions of American youths. We are hopeful that it will carry its own financing.

“The Victory-Without-War Campaign was launched, October 20, with a full page advertisement in the *Los Angeles Herald Express*, largest evening paper west of the Mississippi, one or more reprints of which were mailed to each subscriber late in October. We ran the second big advertisement of this campaign in the *Chicago Herald-American* (with about a million readers), October 31; and in the *Santa Ana Register* and three Middle West dailies early in November.

“The response to these advertisements can not yet be fully measured but the votes are running 120 for this programme to each vote against it.

“We are getting a stream of endorsements from persons high and low, including a wholehearted endorsement from Gen. Claire Chennault, of Flying Tiger fame, and another from Lieut.-General P. A. del Valle, illustrious Marine Corps officer of the South-West Pacific.

“Here are brief excerpts from these two letters. From Gen. Chennault’s letter:—

“I am in complete agreement with your plan for ending the conflict in Korea and for liberating the Chinese people from Communist enslavement, as explained in your full page advertisement in the *Los Angeles Herald Express*, October 20, 1952.

“I have repeatedly urged that the United Nations—or the United States acting alone if necessary—take exactly the same steps which you advocate.

“The Chinese Communists cannot conceivably sustain major military operations in both Korea and South China, below the Yangtze River. As a matter of fact they would lose all interest in Korea suddenly if they were even threatened with invasion by the Nationalists under Chiang Kai-shek.

“As substantial evidence of my endorsement of your campaign for Victory-Without-War, I am enclosing a contribution to assist in paying the expenses of that campaign.’

“And from General del Valle’s letter:—

“I have read your advertisement in the *Los Angeles Herald Express*, of October 20, entitled ‘We Can Have Victory Without War,’ and I subscribe 100 per cent. to what you have to say, and the sooner the people of these bewildered, confused and misled United States get after their leaders and make them do the things that Douglas MacArthur said were essential to put an end to the Korean conflict and to Soviet aggression generally, the sooner we shall be restored to peace and freedom. . . .

“Because the administration has ordered the Fleet to keep Chiang from annoying the Chinese Reds, and has failed in any effective way to support the millions of anti-Communists on the mainland; because this same administration failed to arm the South Koreans properly in the first place, thus inviting the Red invasion of Korea and then failed to arm, organise and equip the millions of South Koreans of military age offered by Syngman Rhee, our young men are being slaughtered by the thousands in a war which the same administration says it cannot win. Either this is treason, or it is the sorriest exhibition of incompetence this country has ever experienced.”

Time for Repeal

“Libertarians have long nourished a dream—during the oppressive days of the New Deal and the Fair Deal—of a happy time when a legislative session would be entirely devoted, not to passing laws, but to repealing laws. There’s never a good law—they would wisecrack—which could not be made better if it were repealed. In fact, the word ‘repeal’ rings well in the ears of all opponents of the all-

(continued on page 8.)

*From *The New Times*, Melbourne, of January 23,

Ambassador Page

By H. SWABEY.

Burton J. Hendrick's *Life and Letters of Walter H. Page* tells at some length the story of the man who was American Ambassador in London from 1913-1918.

Page came from North Carolina, at that time of preponderantly English descent, and worked as a journalist who only touched politics incidentally. Garfield's assassination shocked him; he supported Cleveland enthusiastically; called the Spanish War a "necessary act of surgery for the health of civilisation," and endorsed McKinley's annexation of the Phillipine Islands. T. Roosevelt and W. Wilson contributed to his magazines.

In 1899 the publishing house of Harper ran into difficulties, and by that time "the banking house of J. P. Morgan & Company practically controlled this property." Saying that the failure of Harper "would be a national calamity," Morgan tried to protect his property by calling in Page and others, but they did not stay with him long. Page was soon remarking that "the second—and third-rate essayists have been bought by mere Wall Street publishers."

Page then tried to bring education to the "forgotten man" of the South. Hendrick says, "There was no acceptance of that fundamental American doctrine that education was the function of the state." Page complained that since King George's day, "the politicians of North Carolina have declaimed against taxes." In fact, he formulated a new creed, "I believe in the free public training of both the hands and the mind . . . I believe that by the right training of men we add to the wealth of the world . . . I believe in the perpetual regeneration of society, and in the immortality of democracy and in growth everlasting." The change that resulted, says Hendrick, was "tinged with the miraculous." Ogden, ("a great New York merchant") embodied the miracle: each year he chartered a train, which carried a hundred or so "lawyers, editors, bankers, and the like" to the South on a kind of educational mission or invasion. At length Rockefeller organised the General Educational Board, and parted with some 53 million dollars. This, incidentally, was a year or two before the Standard Oil scandal. By 1906, in the South, "there was now a general acceptance of the doctrine that the mental and physical training of every child, white and black, was the responsibility of the state . . . no politician who aspired to public office would dare to take a contrary view."

Taft's administration depressed Page, but he considered Wilson a "leader of fine intellectual gifts," and brought him and House together. He advocated 'rural credit societies,' saying that the land was the proper use of "much of the money that now flows into the reach of the credit barons," and he advocated restoring country life and independence. Taft had set the stage admirably in 1909, but then "he let the villain run the play." Page hoped that, with Wilson in office, the town man would no longer be able to "tax and to concentrate power." Yet he had doubts regarding Wilson, whom he had known for some forty years, and who appointed him Ambassador to Great Britain in 1913.

Page found that the American Ambassador had not even a residence in London. The King commiserated with him. Page admired the English "high art of living. When they make their money, they stop money-making and cultivate their minds and their gardens and entertain their friends." Yet, he wrote to Wilson, "The future of the world belongs to us. . . . The American people are taken most seriously here. . . . But the American Government is a mere joke to them. . . . We need courtesy and frankness, and the destinies of the world will be in our hands. . . . The English and the whole English world are ours, if we have the courtesy to take them—fleet and trade and all." (To Houston.)

All sorts of people came to see him, including "Jews who are excited about Rumania." He felt that the English were "a fine race to be sprung from," adding, "And whenever we choose to assume the leadership of the world, they'll grant it—gradually—and follow loyally." He added, "The really alert people are the aristocracy."

In the same year, Huerta seized power in Mexico. He was said to favour Lord Cowdray's oil company, and not Standard Oil. Wilson, and Page, took a high moral line. It was, they said, a question of principle as opposed to policy. "And you know what it would lead to—even in our lifetime—to the leadership of the world: and we should presently be considering how we may best use the British fleet, the British Empire, and the English race for the betterment of mankind." (Page to House.) The Englishman Tyrrell asked Wilson what his Mexican policy was. Wilson replied, "I am going to teach the South American Republics to elect good men." House wrote to Page, "Revolutions and assassinations in order to obtain control of government are instituted almost wholly for the purpose of loot," but of course did not apply his remark to Wilson's counter revolution. In the event, Huerta was traded for the Panama tolls, it appears, although Page called the idea "a common gutter lie." Page held that, "Our dealing with Cuba was a new chapter in the history of the world." Mexico would be chapter 2. "We shall have to Cuba-ize the country, which means thrashing 'em first." Albert Edward, long before he was Edward VII, had written about thrashing zulus, but Page meant to thrash the Mexicans into good little Wilsonian democrats. Wilson thought an article by J. Reed "sums up as well as they could be summed up my own conclusions with regard to the issues and personnel of the pending contest in Mexico." Reed later championed the Bolshevik regime in Russia. As for Cuba, I understand from someone who was stationed there that it is not particularly happy or attractive, even after decades of being Cuba-ized. Mexico escaped the thrashing.

When the United States exempted their ships from Panama tolls, (1909), they violated a treaty between that country and Great Britain. Wilson set this matter to rights, but "the Hearst organs, in cartoon and editorial page, shrieked against the ancient enemy," Britain. At about this time, Page introduced House to Sir Edward Grey, as "the silent partner" of President Wilson.

As war threatened, Page wrote to House, "Work on a world-plan." He wanted the powers to use their armed forces in cleaning up the tropics, as a gigantic Cuba-izing operation in fact. ("Mexico may give us an entering wedge

for this kind of thing?") He misunderstood what was happening in the background, writing, "My love to McAdoo," while House informed him that "The President is now crystallizing his mind in regard to the Federal Reserve Board." They failed to perceive any of the facts recently assembled by E. Mullins in his *Federal Reserve Board*. Page wanted Wilson to visit Europe, but House came instead, to further Churchill's idea of a "naval holiday." House found difficulty in seeing the Kaiser alone: "The effects were still felt of the famous interviews of October 28th, 1908, which, when published in the London *Daily Telegraph*, had caused the bitterest resentment in Great Britain." House did not so much fear the Kaiser, with whom he spoke on June 1st, 1914, as the "military oligarchy."

When what he called the Grand Smash came, Page wrote, "You needn't talk of decadence. All their great qualities are in them here and now. . . . It isn't an accident that these people own a fifth of the world. Utterly unwarlike, they outlast anybody else when war comes. . . . This invincible race is doing this revolutionary task marvellously. . . . There's no telling the enormous advantages we shall gain if we are wise," But in a few months the slaughter so nauseated him that he wrote, "Europe is ceasing to be interesting except as an example of how-not-to-do-it." But he became sicker still of the President's demands for moral or thought neutrality, resenting the insistence upon "the moral quality of neutrality." House was commissioned by the President to warn Page against expressing "any unneutral feeling:"

The House of Lords had rejected the Declaration of London, which listed contraband articles; Kipling denounced it in a poem. The U.S. Government tried to force Britain to accept it. Page called the controversy "academic," and asked House to "get us out of these incompetent lawyer-hands." If the matter was brought up again, he added, he would resign. His resolution smoothed over a touchy situation.

Germany made four peace moves before the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and Page wrote to the President of the English determination "to destroy utterly the German bureaucracy" and militarism. In the first move, the German Ambassador in America met the bankers Speyer and Vanderlip, and the diplomat Oscar Strauss. Page warned against the "German-Hearst publicity bureau," and told House to "put the President on his guard." House wrote in October, 1914, "It is manifestly against England's interest and the interest of Europe generally for Russia to become the dominating military force in Europe, just as Germany was." In the same letter House outlined several provisions which were later embodied in the Covenant of the League of Nations. "Every nation in Europe guaranteeing the territorial integrity of every other nation" practically became Article 10. House wrote in December that the States would not favour a policy "that held nothing but the complete annihilation of the enemy." Wilson went so far as to hold the conviction that "a decisive victory on either side would be a misfortune for mankind." He wanted Germany to abandon her army and Britain to abandon her navy.

House wrote to Page in January, 1915: "I believe the Dual Alliance is thoroughly ready for peace." He was in

touch with Zimmermann, German Under Foreign Secretary, and Page learned from Field Marshall French that the Kaiser had approached the President to send a suggestion to Britain. This shews "the unofficial way in which diplomacy was conducted in Washington," as the author remarks. It means that the States were wide open to irresponsible power. Both sides at the time had reached a "trench stalemate." Sir John pointed out that it was the fourth proposal. House came to London in February and visited Berlin in March. He wrote from there of the dangers of permitting a people "to be misled and their minds inflamed either by the press, by speeches, or otherwise." He suggested the Freedom of the Seas—politics was to be conducted on catch phrases evidently. But in May the *Lusitania* was torpedoed.

(To be continued).

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3).

That had come to be the case by a well-recognised historical process. If you look back at the Act of Succession, Mr. Speaker, you will find a reference there, in respect of England, to the Imperial Crown of this Realm and France and Ireland. By the process of events the claim to the throne of France was dropped and by the successive Acts of Union the three Kingdoms of England, Ireland and Scotland, each with their separate historical origins, were merged into one. There was one realm, over which was the Imperial Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the territories thereto belonging.

Mr. Gordon Walker: Henry VIII also referred to the Imperial Crown, meaning of this kingdom alone.

Mr. Powell: I am not dealing with the word "Imperial." Of course, Henry VIII was referring to England; but when he used the word "empire" he meant it in the medieval sense and was proclaiming the independence of this country from the Holy Roman Empire. But that is a by-way.

Within this unity of the realm achieved by the Acts of Union there grew up the British Empire; and the unity of that Empire was equivalent to the unity of that realm. It was a unit because it had one Sovereign. There was one Sovereign; one realm. In the course of constitutional development, indeed, the Sovereign began to govern different parts of that realm upon the advice of different Ministers; but that in itself did not constitute a division of the realm. On the contrary, despite the fact that he or she ruled his or her Dominions on the advice of different Ministers, the unity of the whole was essentially preserved by the unity of the Crown and the one Kingdom.

That unity we are now formally and deliberately giving up, and we are substituting what is, in effect, a fortuitous aggregation of a number of separate entities. I have not deliberately exaggerated by using the word "fortuitous." Here we find these different entities defining the identity of their Sovereign differently. By recognising the division of the realm into separate realms are we not opening the way for that other remaining unity—the last unity of all—that of the person to go the way of the rest?

Mr. Godfrey Nicholson (Farnham): My hon. Friend

may recollect that when the Dominion of Canada was set up there was a proposal that it should be called the Kingdom of Canada. If that is the case his claim that this diversity of realms is an innovation falls to the ground.

Mr. Powell: I did not say it was an innovation; I said it is an innovation in the view of this country. Hitherto, in the United Kingdom, the view has never been held that there were separate kingdoms. It has been held that there was one single realm.

Incidentally, I notice that I am not alone in my repugnance to this change. Unless the proceedings in the Australian Parliament have been misreported the same feeling was alive in Australia. In "The Times" of 19th February the Australian Prime Minister is reported as saying:

"He had strongly opposed the suggestion that the Queen should be named Queen of Australia without first mention of the United Kingdom, because this would tend to work against unity."

The report goes on:

"It was unnecessary anyway, as the Queen was, under strict law, Australia's Queen, because Australia had never made an Act of secession."

As I read those words they bear witness to the same sense of repugnance to the recognition of a division of the realm.

I come now to the second major alteration which will be made by the eventual use of the Royal Prerogative—the suppression of the word "British" from the description both of Her Majesty's territories outside the United Kingdom of the Commonwealth. Incidentally, and as a minor by-product, this suppression of our nationality has resulted in what is really nonsense. Strictly speaking, to describe the Queen as Queen of the United Kingdom and "Her other Realms and Territories" is meaningless.

We describe a Monarch by designating the territory of which he is Monarch. To say that he is Monarch of a certain territory and his other realms and territories is as good as to say that he is king of his kingdom. We have perpetrated a solecism in the title we are proposing to attach to our Sovereign and we have done so out of what might almost be called an abject desire to eliminate the expression "British." The same desire has been felt—though not by any means throughout the British Commonwealth—to eliminate this word before the term "Commonwealth." I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition in Australia also said that:

"He thought the time had come to change the description of the Commonwealth in the Statute of Westminster as the 'British Commonwealth of Nations' into the 'British Commonwealth.'"

Why is it, then, that we are so anxious, in the description of our own Monarch, in a title for use in this country, to eliminate any reference to the seat the focus and the origin of this vast aggregation of territories? Why is it that this "teeming womb of royal Kings," as Shakespeare called it, wishes now to be anonymous?

When we come to the following part of the title we find the reason. The history of the term "Head of the Commonwealth" is not a difficult one to trace. I hope I may be forgiven if I do so very briefly. The British Nationality Act, 1948, removed the status of "subject of the King" as the basis of British nationality, and substituted for allegiance to the Crown the concept of a number—I think it was nine—separate citizenships combined together by statute. The British Nationality Act, 1948, thus brought about an im-

mense constitutional revolution, an entire alteration of the basis of our subjecthood and nationality, and since the fact of allegiance to the Crown was the uniting element of the whole Empire and Commonwealth it brought about a corresponding revolution in the nature of the unity of Her Majesty's dominions.

The consequence of that Act immediately followed. If the British dominions were not those territories which acknowledged the Queen, but were an aggregation of separate countries enumerated in a statute, it might be possible not only to add or to subtract, but for any of those territories to throw off their allegiance without any consequential result; and that was, in fact, what happened.

In the following year, India declared its intention to renounce its allegiance to the Crown and become a republic. Because of that change in the whole basis of unity of this great entity, that intention did not involve the consequences which would have followed as little as a year before. The declaration of the Prime Ministers, of 28th April, 1949, included the following passage:

"The Government of India have declared and affirmed India's desire to continue with her full membership of the Commonwealth of Nations and her acceptance of the King as the symbol of the free association of those independent member nations and as such the Head of the Commonwealth."

It was accordingly enacted by the India (Consequential Provision) Act, 1949, that the law of this country should continue to apply to India as it would have done if India had not renounced its allegiance to the Crown. The result of that is, as we have found in a queer way in the only definition of the term "Commonwealth" on the Statute Book—it occurs in one of the sections of the Finance Bill, 1950, because a Member of the then Opposition put down an Amendment to draw attention to the omission—that the Commonwealth consists of

"Her Majesty's dominions and India."

The status of India resulting from these changes and declarations is an ungraspable one in law or in fact. The Indian Government say that they recognise the Queen as the head of the Commonwealth. Well, I recognise the right hon. Member for Walthamstow, West (Mr. Attlee) as the Leader of the Opposition, but that does not make me a Member of Her Majesty's Opposition.

Mr. Frederick Messer (Tottenham): Thank God.

Mr. Powell: I see, Mr. Speaker, that any serious remarks on this subject must be addressed to hon. Members on this side of the House.

When we endeavour to ascertain into what relationship with Her Majesty's dominions this recognition of the Crown as Head of the Commonwealth has brought India, we find ourselves baulked. It was intended that this relationship should, in fact, be uninterpretable. It is, therefore, necessary to inquire what is the minimum content which entitles us to recognise unity at all, and then to ask whether that necessary minimum content is applicable in the case of India.

I assert that the essence of unity, whether it be in a close-knit country or in a loosely-knit federation, is that all the parts recognise that in certain circumstances they would sacrifice themselves to the interests of the whole. It is this instinctive recognition of being parts of a whole,

which means that in certain circumstances individual, local, partial interests would be sacrificed to the general interest, that constitutes unity. Unless there is some such instinctive, deliberate determination, there is no unity. There may be alliance, indeed. We may have alliance between two sovereign Powers for the pursuit of common interest for a particular or for an undefined period; but that is not unity. That is not the maintenance or the creation of any such entity as we refer to by the name "Empire" or "Commonwealth."

I deny that there is that element, that minimum basic element, of unity binding India to Her Majesty's dominions. I deny that there is present, in that former part of Her Majesty's dominions which has deliberately cast off allegiance to her, that minimum, basic, instinctive recognition of belonging to a greater whole which involves the ultimate consequence in certain circumstances of self-sacrifice in the interests of the whole.

I therefore say that this formula "Head of the Commonwealth" and the declaration in which it is inscribed, are essentially a sham. They are essentially something which we have invented to blind ourselves to the reality of the position. Although the changes which will be made in the Royal titles as the result of the Bill are greatly repugnant to me, if they were changes which were demanded by those who in many wars had fought with this country, by nations who maintained an allegiance to the Crown, and who signified a desire to be in the future as we were in the past; if it were our friends who had come to us and said: "We want this," I would say: "Let it go. Let us admit the divisibility of the Crown. Let us sink into anonymity and cancel the word 'British' from our titles. If they like the conundrum 'Head of the Commonwealth' in the Royal style, let it be there."

However, the underlying evil of this is that we are doing it for the sake not of our friends but of those who are not our friends. We are doing this for the sake of those to whom the very names "Britain" and "British" are repugnant—

Mr. Gordon Walker: Would the hon. Gentleman—

Mr. Powell: We are doing this for the sake of those who have deliberately cast off their allegiance to our common Monarchy.

Hon. Members: Who are they?

Mr. Nicholson: They died in thousands during the war.

Mr. Hector Hughes (Aberdeen, North) rose—

Mr. Nicholson: I appreciate my hon. Friend's giving way, and I thank him. I beg him to measure his words and to remember the vast sacrifices and the oceans of blood that India has poured out in the past, and to recognise the deep affection and feeling that exist throughout India towards this country.

Mr. Powell: I am obliged to my hon. Friend. I, who have had the advantage and privilege of serving with the Indian Army in the war, am not likely to be unmindful of it; but it was an army which owed allegiance, an enthusiastic allegiance, which was its very principle of existence and its binding force, to the Crown. That allegiance, for good or for evil, has been cast off, with all that follows.

Now, I am not under any delusion that my words on this

occasion can have any practical effect, but, none the less, they are not perhaps, necessarily in vain. We in this House, whether we are the humblest of the back benchers or my right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury himself, are in ourselves, in our individual capacities, quite unimportant. We have a meaning in this place only in so far as in our time and generation we represent great principles, great elements in the national life, great strands in our society and national being.

Sometimes, elements which are essential to the life, growth and existence of Britain seem for a time to be cast into shadow, obscured; and even destroyed. Yet in the past they have remained alive; they have survived; they have come to the surface again, and they have been the means of a new flowering, which no one had suspected. It is because I believe that, in a sense, for a brief moment, I represent and speak for an indispensable element in the British Constitution and in British life that I have spoken. And, I pray, not entirely in vain. . . .

TIME FOR REPEAL—

(continued from page 4.)

powerful State. When the Mother of Parliaments erased the Corn Laws in 1846 (thereby creating a partial free trade system), when in 1933 America repealed Prohibition, and when a few years ago the 80th Congress did some rescinding—good was performed and the common weal bettered.

"So today we can report a new and unexpected development of this nature on Capitol Hill.

"It sounds almost weirdly paradoxical to say that conservatives in Congress are actually considering whether they should give their backing to repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Nevertheless, it is true—with some qualifications. Most people forget that this piece of labour legislation was passed to provide controls counter-balancing controls of an earlier pro-labour bill, the Wagner Act. The latter clamped controls on employers and gave birth to the bureaucratic monster known as the National Labour Relations Board (NLRB). Since then employers have writhed from the ministrations of NLRB, and have found some, but inadequate relief from the Taft-Hartley Act.

"Now in the corridors and cloakrooms of Congress, there is serious talk of a movement to put over repeal of both the Wagner and Taft-Hartley Acts, to wipe the slate clean of all labour legislation. This is no idle fancy. It is gravely being examined by many who have devoted much of their Congressional careers to the study of the labour problem.

"Oddly enough, at least one labour boss, Mr. John L. Lewis, has for many years entertained the same notion. . . . But John L. this year has had nothing to do with the thesis that both statutes should go. It is a purely conservative development. Some conservatives say: 'Let's repeal both—and start all over again.' But others amend this, as follows: 'Let's clean the decks, and let them stay clean.'" (*Human Events*, February 11.)