

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 4.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 1, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

### MODERN SCIENCE XXI

However wayward and fitful these paragraphs may appear, there was nothing desultory about the *policies* behind the movements they are intended to describe. Sombart, the historian of Socialism, has somewhere indicated his belief that there are two, and only two, motive forces in history: love and power. The trouble about such words is that every sane person knows what they mean—and from infirmity of faith proceeds to argue that they mean something else. There is no need to quote Juliet

*I have forgot why I did call thee back.*

to remind ourselves of all we have ever known about the one, nor Lady Macbeth to know all about the other. What this had to do with Sombart's theme I can't imagine, and I have not his book beside me to find out. I cannot argue about *kinds* of love, or *kinds* of power; because they are, to me, like earth and sky, and whatever winds may blow, the earth is always the earth, and whatever mists obscure its face, the sky is the sky. My dictionary says that passion is the 'state of the soul when receiving an impression' which is, for me, a different and an opposite thing from the state of the soul in forcing an impression to be made on something else, or somebody else. In Society we both make and receive impressions, and most of the difficulties arise from the failure of our determination, collectively, to see that a just relationship is established between the giving and receiving. The just price for making impressions is personal responsibility. It is this price which has got to be *paid*. Nature does not seem to have fixed a price for our receiving, and the perception (not altogether dim) of this fact of universal experience, enshrined in the New Testament, is more than the oriental mind can stand. The difference is the difference between Shakespeare and the Song of Solomon. There is something sinister about the conspiracy (and that is what it seems to me) to label the 'dark' ages dark, and keep 'em dark!

The threads which dragged Europe from the so-called 'dark' ages were threads of power, not of love. The 'modern' struggle began with the crucifixion, if not before. It has got thoroughly into its stride with Frederick II, "first of the moderns." On both sides the forces are mixed. The belief that this vast struggle is now coming to an issue, together with the conviction that its inconclusive or unsatisfactory settlement would be catastrophic in the most comprehensive sense, is more and more widely entertained.

The history of the universities is the story of this struggle at the top, and (for the present) the monstrous deformity called 'modern science' is the outcome—but there are others. The progressive decay of a healthy human instinct in every sphere in which instinct operates—and what is instinct but policy with unconsciousness of the roots of policy?—is

perhaps one other and a most terrifying. The university is the totalitarian answer to the college and the library and the monastery and the school. There is all the difference in the world between a gathering together of *men*, of their own will and intention, which is what 'collegium' means, and a collection of books, which is what a library is, and a school, which is a place of instruction, and a university. Like fascism, the word university went from Italy, where it meant a trade guild, to Germany where the idea expanded to that of the whole corporate city, which was as near as they could get in the twelfth century to the corporate state. What it is, however mixed with other ingredients, is an attempt to establish a monopoly of the intelligence, or a monarchy of intellect. Being composed, necessarily, of men of ideas, the centralisation of ideas, though feasible *sub rosa*, was not its long suit. It centralised *reputation*. We see one result in our "reputable" economists. Their peculiarities are not special: they are merely thrown into relief by current events.

I picture what happened in England (this fortunate isle) as the collision between the headstrong waters of the east and the earlier and kindlier wave reflected from the west. Rashdall's editors, "with omissions," devote twelve and a half pages of academic altercation to an appendix on *The Migration from Paris*, and, with the author of their text, apparently succeed in mentioning everything, without, however, disclosing anything. Historians seemingly do not understand that they are *political* experts or nothing; although it has to be conceded that they may be most expert when their art most conceals their art; *i.e.* when, as among the freemasons, their politics (their policy) is to have no politics (policy).

You can measure a bar of iron with a foot rule; but you cannot measure the amount of iron in an ore with a foot rule. And so you cannot assess which side a combatant is on without first knowing what sides there are for him to be on, and what characterises those sides. You cannot measure a policy without first having yourself a clear notion of a policy.

"Up to 1167-70," according to Rashdall, "there were many schools which were as famous as we have reason for supposing Oxford to have been. None of these developed into a *studium generale*; Oxford did so, and that with startling rapidity." Again, "The suddenness of the transition suggests a cause operating somewhat [*sic*] suddenly." What was it that was sudden in the twelfth century? For one thing, the incursion of 'modern science': "the art of seeking, without ever finding, the truth," according to an Abbot of Clairvaux quoted by Lingard,\* who used the phrase to describe the system of the disciples of Arabian masters, the 'modern scientists' of all time.

It is so readily taken for granted that the epidemic of 'learning' spread largely by Jewish agents in the West while

\*LINGARD: *History of England*, 1849, Vol. II, p. 58.

the gentry of western Europe were busy contracting the vices of the East was something inherently superior to the indigenous brand that it may be well to preserve a sense of perspective even here. "Thus we learn from Athelheard, that if he had studied among the Moors the causes of earthquakes, eclipses, and tides, he had also been employed in investigating the reasons why plants cannot be produced in fire, why the nose is made to hang over the mouth, why horns are not generated on the human forehead, whether the stars are animals, whether in that hypothesis they have any appetite, with many other questions equally singular and important." (Footnote concerning Athelheard's *Quaestiones naturales perdificiles*, Lingard, p. 58.) I have already remarked that one of the essentials of a poisoned well is that it should contain water; but anyone who takes in his hand a glass of that water, with the intention of drinking from it had better concern himself with the poison rather than with the water. The historians are for ever busy telling us about the arrangement of the molecules of the water, and when, to show off their erudition, they discourse of the poison it is invariably in terms of embellishment. Thus Rashdall distributes his colouring matter, which leaves the story tuppence coloured the same as the story penny plain. With the introduction of "the art of ever seeking without finding the truth" were laid the foundations of an 'order' which is the complete and final V-for-Victory of death over life: not Life Everlasting and More Abundant, but life permanently subject to a thwarting principle: to a process of Crucifixion: organism constantly being replaced by mechanism. *Bella et seditiones ubique fervent; Mercuriales adeo depressi sunt ut Francia, omnium mitissima et civilissima nationum alienigenas scholares abergerit*—"Everywhere war and sedition rage: the Mercuriales [?] are so depressed that France, of all nations the mildest and most civilised, has expelled the alien scholars." This was in 1167, and it is certain that for many years before and for many years afterwards Europe was split from top to bottom. There were even two Popes, Alexander III, who "found it prudent to quit Italy," and Victor IV. "The emperor Frederick supported with all his influence the cause of his creature Victor" (Lingard). Other things are just as certain. Not by any means last, I should be inclined to mention systematised substitution of words in the place of ideas: "multiplied and unmeaning distinctions bewildered the understanding" (Lingard).

Ignorance? Widespread "educational destitution?" Oh, no! We need not go to the "Romance" tales for news of national cultures. They are merely evidence, in a corrupt idiom, of something corruptible upon which their 'culture' supervened. It is not alone Gerald the Welshman, born ?1147, "the father of comparative philology"; "one of the most learned men of a learned age"; and "the universal scholar" (FREEMAN'S *Norman Conquest*), who testifies to the literacy of the "savages" of twelfth century Wales. Defending the thesis that Oxford had a university earlier than the 'migration,' Mr. A. F. Leach quotes a constitution of Henry II expelling Welshmen from *schools* in England, which, says Leach, could not have been English grammar schools "because they had plenty at home." They must have been Oxford University. Every encroachment of the centralisers, every perversion which they effect, is painted as a marvellous invention, 'brand new,' bringing undreamed-of blessings to a world "destitute" hitherto. Beveridge and Butler and Woolton are heralds of the modern brew! St. Patrick "commenced his labours in the year 432, and after

a life of indefatigable exertion, died at an advanced age in 472. His disciples appear to have inherited the spirit of their teacher; churches and monasteries were successively founded; and every species of learning known at the time was assiduously cultivated. It was the peculiar happiness of these ecclesiastics to escape the visits of the barbarians, who in the fifth and sixth centuries depopulated and dismembered the Western empire. When science was almost extinguished on the continent, it still emitted a faint light from the remote shores of Erin; strangers from Britain, Gaul and Germany, resorted to the Irish schools; and Irish missionaries established monasteries and imparted instruction on the banks of the Danube and amid the snows of the Apennines. During this period, and under such masters, the natives were gradually reclaimed from the ignorance and pursuits of savage life; but their civilisation was retarded by the opposite influence of their national institutions; it was finally arrested by the invasions of the Northmen. . . The national institutions to which I have just alluded as hostile to the progress of civilisation, were tanistry and gavelkind\* . . ."

Then, if not a 'sudden' dawn of enlightenment what was the incursion into Oxford? And (to repeat a pertinent, yet unanswered question of Rashdall's) why Oxford? Oxford, it seems, had been, if not razed to the ground by Stephen in the autumn of 1142, at least set on fire. What was there at Oxford? "To its position. . . must be ascribed the rapid increase in the commercial importance of Oxford after the final cessation of Danish devastations and especially after the beginning of the twelfth century. Its early selection by Jews as a business centre marks this development." (I have seen neither Neubauer's essay on the Jews in Oxford (O.H.S.) nor Friedman's *Robert Grosseteste and the Jews*). It seems, therefore, certain that the Jews were there *first*. The Dominicans "made their appearance in 1221, soon after their first landing in England" and "established themselves in the heart of Oxford on the east side of the street called the Jewry. Though the conversion of the Jews was a prominent part of their work, they early connected themselves with the university by opening a school in which theology was taught by a 'converted' doctor [Jewish?] of divinity, Robert Bacon." (Rashdall). But Oxford University never would have much to do with the orders of the Church. It cold-shouldered the Franciscans. So we can even prove the possibility that the traditional technique of playing both ends against the middle was a possibility; and pass on to the two ends! One was, of course, the familiar. In 1240, Bishop Grosseteste instituted a system of loans to students without interest, "no doubt a wise and useful form of charity at a time when the Jews were the only money-lenders, and when it was necessary to prevent the Jews of Oxford from charging over forty-three per cent. as annual interest on loans to scholars." (Rashdall). In 1244 we see both ends in play: then "the first important extension of the chancellor's jurisdiction took place." A raid was made upon the Jewry; forty-five scholars were imprisoned, and Grosseteste had difficulty in producing their surrender. The Jews, as the King's chattels, were exempt from the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts; and it is curious that the jurisdiction of the

\*The passage is from Lingard's *History*. The institutions cited are of particular interest at the present moment, since they embodied principles of inheritance and land tenure inimical to the establishment of a continuously prosperous order in Lingard's opinion, for reasons which he details.

chancellor was, for the first time, exactly defined in 1290, the year of the expulsion of the Jews from England! When this happened, the Jewish synagogue in Oxford "with other adjoining buildings," was bought by the Archdeacon of Wells and turned into a hall for students—Burnell's Inn. It came into the possession of Balliol College in 1307.

The *fuel* for the fire of centralisation was unquestionably supplied by the Jews in the first instance. In the first years of the reign of Edward I there were "very serious disturbances." The habit once implanted, persisted. Characteristically, there were two answers: Centralisation and Decentralisation. It is important to recognise that of eleven Oxford Colleges, only three, and of six monastic institutions only three, and all of these barely, came into existence before the Expulsion. But "over a great part of Europe university teaching was more or less superseded by college teaching before the close of the mediaeval period." (Rashdall: my italics).

It was not the 'great architypal universities' of Rashdall's imagining that introduced a plan to gather all studies under *protection*, impartially, to synthesise them. Centralisation and protection are not the same thing: they are antagonistic principles, embodying antagonistic policies. Why must we be ridden by the notion that, having once allowed an enemy to plant a upas tree in our garden, everything is possible; but what is *not* possible is to pull the tree out with its roots and burn it? If this notion is right, then the most extreme conservatism ever envisaged is completely justified, and we should on no account depart by a hairsbreadth from the most rigid observance of, each and every established practice, in the hope that each bringing forth fruit according to its kind, the fruit of things living will live and there will be an end to all else.

With great respect, I think that Newman (whose family name was Neumann!) erred when, in contrasting science with poetry,—science whose mission it is "to destroy ignorance, doubt, surmise, suspense, illusions, fears, deceits, according to the *Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas* of the Poet"—he wrote of the poetical frame of mind that it "demands, as its primary condition, that we should not put ourselves above the objects in which it [the poetical] resides, but at their feet; that we should feel them to be above and beyond us, that we should look up to them, and that, instead of fancying that we can comprehend them, we should take for granted that we are surrounded and comprehended by them ourselves. It implies that... at best we are only forming conjectures about them, not conclusions... Poetry does not address the reason, but the imagination and affections; it leads to admiration, enthusiasm, devotion, love... Hence it is that a child's mind is so full of poetry, because he knows so little; and an old man of the world so devoid of poetry, because his experience of facts is so wide..." I think that this is, in the main, right as well as magniloquent; but that it correctly defines an antithesis or diagnoses a point of antagonism I question. Newman himself quotes a string of witnesses to the practical genius of the Benedictines: "The monks were much the best husbandmen, and the only gardeners." "None ever improved their lands and possessions more than the monks." "We owe the agricultural restoration of great part of Europe to the monks." In the procession of the seasons of the personality, which is seed time and which harvest? Policy is engendered in solitude; power in society.

(To be concluded.)

TUDOR JONES.

## A National Health Service FURTHER DEBATE IN PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 17, 1944.

Major Lloyd (Renfrew, East): Unlike my hon. Friend the Member for Central Edinburgh (Mr. F. Watt), I claim to have read the White Paper more than once. In fact, I regret to have to say that the more I look at it the less I like it... I want to get to the background of this White Paper. I wonder who wrote it. I wonder what was the attitude of mind of the people who have been conceiving it. I do not believe it is really the child of my right hon. Friend the Minister of Health, nor, in fact, the child of my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State. I believe that the major influence behind it comes from a very powerful organisation of which I want to say nothing disrespectful. On the contrary, they have done much good and clever work, but their influence in State affairs is very substantial.

I believe that the influence which originated the contents and wording of this White Paper came from the organisation calling itself P.E.P.—Political and Economic Planning, I believe, is the official term. I prefer an expression that I would have used myself to interpret those mysterious initials, "Perfect Examples of Planning." The influence of their work in investigating the position of the health services is most apparent in the White Paper. I had the opportunity of reading their original ideas on this subject many months ago, and the similarities are amazingly striking. The subservient way in which their views have been copied into this White Paper is amazing. It is not the first time that the views of this organisation have been copied in White Papers by Government Departments. Everything apparently depends in modern democracy upon the right atmosphere being created before a White Paper is issued or a Bill is presented to Parliament. This is done by that strange hybrid figure the journalist-cum-public relations officer, who is paid highly, and, I have no doubt, richly deserves his reward for creating the right atmosphere and putting out the right kind of stuff, so that to some extent democracy can be all prepared for the food which is to come to it and which it is requested to swallow with little or no difficulty.

There is a hidden hand here beside that of the organisation of P.E.P. It is, of course, the magic touch of Sir William Beveridge. The atmosphere was created before the White Paper was produced that to say anything against the idea of a national health service or the necessity to reform and improve the present services was akin to blasphemy. This White Paper is rather like the curate's egg; parts of it are excellent. There are many features which are most attractive. The whole of it is most attractively worded. It reminds me of the coloured pictures on seed packets which keen gardeners like I am are buying just now. If we have had a good deal of experience of these things we know that it is difficult to produce anything like the coloured pictures on the seed packets and that we have to take the descriptions in the charmingly worded catalogue with a certain amount of salt. I look upon this White Paper in much the same light. It is most attractively worded. Almost every paragraph is full of bird lime, and I can imagine how difficult it is for an ordinary person to get up and dare to commit the blas-

(Continued on page 7)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*  
*One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.*  
 Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,  
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 12. No. 4.

Saturday, April 1, 1944.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

For sheer fatuity, if not worse, the "Tory Reform" proposal that landowners should pay a license fee equal to three-quarters of the increased value of the development, before they may develop their land, appears to touch high-water-mark. Its working is perhaps best seen by an example.

A man owns an acre of land, the agricultural value of which at 1939 prices might be £20. He decides to build a house worth £2,000 on it. He pays a licence fee of £1,500, so that his house will now cost him £3,500; the economic rent of it will be over £400 *per annum*, his rates will on this basis be about £200 *per annum* and his Schedule A tax at present rates will be £200. Are we really losing our ordinary wits, such as they are?

The rating principle that a man should be taxed for improving the country has previously held the field for lunacy, but this proposal which warns him to do as little as possible puts it well into the shade.

It is becoming increasingly clear that all political parties have lost touch with reality. Without exception, the fundamental idea in all current legislation seems to be to make it almost impossible for the ordinary individual to take any vital part in life. He is to be a mere passenger. To exist, he is to be made to carry out certain duties which it is not necessary for him to understand in any other than a mechanical sense. The inspiration of this kind of thing is identical with that of the National Socialism we are supposed to be fighting. The common man is regarded as "cannon fodder" to be used in the schemes of Planners.

The close connection between Big Business and revolutionary socialism is strikingly indicated by Trotzky in his *History of the Russian Revolution*, p. 29:

"The giant enterprises, above 1,000 workers each, employed in the U.S.A. 17.8 per cent. of the workers, and in (pre-revolution) Russia, 41.4 per cent. . . In Moscow the . . . percentage is even higher, 57.3 per cent."

It is notorious that the large factories of the modern British industrial combines are the primary breeding grounds of Communism, and that revolutionary Socialism favours their establishment, as distinct from the compact, efficient, individually-owned business.

An illustrated news weekly of considerable circulation

has just published the photographs of the Russian Generals.

Yes, yes, we know Clarence. But war is an awful thing, and we have to school ourselves to its horrors.

"Who was entrusted with the preparation of the Social Security Plan for England?

"Sir William Beveridge, Principal of the London School of Economics.

"Who was entrusted with the adaptation of the Beveridge Plan to Canada?

"Dr. Marsh, sent out from the London School of Economics.

"Who has the Federal Government placed at the head of the Reconstruction Council?

"Dr. Cyril James, Principal of McGill, sent out from the London School of Economics.

"Who is the right-hand man of Graham Towers (Governor of the Bank of Canada) and the inspirer of Ottawa financial policy?

"Louis Raminsky, grandson of a Jewish refugee, and trained at the London School of Economics.

"Who has edited the U.S.A. social Security Plan for the National Recovery Planning Board (N.R.P.B.)?

"Dr. Burns, born in England, and trained at the London School of Economics.

"Who accompanied the international financier Niemeyer to Australia, to tighten the grip of finance on Australia?

"Theodore Emanuel Guggenheim (Gregory) Professor of the London School of Economics.

"What institution was established and financed by a Jewish international financier, with the declared object of training the chief bureaucrats of the coming age?

"The London School of Economics."

— Translated from *Vers Demain*, February 1, 1944.

"It should be understood that there is more than one way for a state to control production and trade. The usual complete and direct control of the postal services, which are in most cases a part of the administrative system, is not likely to be the type adopted by governments for the control of other businesses. . . The tendency of direct government operation to slothful bureaucracy has been recognised rather generally."

— *The New Internationalism* by CLARK FOREMAN, p. 126.

The Income Tax (Offices and Employments) Act 1944 is now law. It is so framed that permanent Civil Servants will have to pay more than double the Tax for 1943-44 that they would have paid had they been in private employment. Such 'preferential' treatment of Civil Servants has occurred before. Candidates for a State Medical Service and any other State Service please note.

### MR. NORMAN JAQUES

The following cable has been received from Mr. Norman Jaques, who has recently been visiting this country:

"Arrived Canada safe and sound. — Norman Jaques."

## Sinister, Specious, Disingenuous\*

On buff paper, printed by Vacher and Sons Limited, Westminster, with printed address for return to "The British Institute of Public Opinion, c/o Gainsborough Press, Lattimore Road, St. Albans, Herts," the following is the text of the questionnaire form distributed to doctors at home and abroad by the British Medical Association. It is republished here for public information as an evidential document.

"It is not a bit of use asking democracies to decide upon matters of technique, and it is certain, as has already been demonstrated, that if you throw a plan to a democracy it will be torn to shreds."

— C. H. DOUGLAS: The Nature of Democracy, Buxton, June 9, 1934.

There is strictly no question on the "Institute's" form which does not, directly or indirectly, bear on a method, not on a policy, with the possible exception of some questions of personal detail, and, though addressed to medical experts, the questions concern administrative, not medical matters:—

### THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION

ALDWYCH HOUSE, LONDON, W.C.2

NOTE: All page references are to the White Paper Cmd. 6502. "Principles," refers to the proceedings of the Representative Meeting, September, 1943. Principles are not necessarily quoted in full.

Please put a ring round the number for the appropriate answer. "D.K." stands for "Don't know." Please mark very clearly.

- |   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>1 The Representative Meeting, September, 1943, voted by a majority that any National Health Service should be confined to 90 per cent. of the public—the remaining 10 per cent., the upper income group, being excluded.<br/>The White Paper proposes that the National Health Service (N.H.S.) should include everyone—the 100% proposal—but that no one should have to use it.<br/>Should or should not this basic proposal of the White Paper be accepted?</p> <p>2 The White Paper proposes that complete hospital and specialist services shall be available to everyone in a general ward, free of charge (p. 9). Do you agree or disagree with this proposal?</p> <p>3 Suppose a patient wants to choose his own hospital or go into a private or semi-private ward, should he be able to pay a "hotel charge" and still receive free medical attention under N.H.S.?</p> <p>4 Do you think that an N.H.S. patient should be able to arrange to have private treatment on a specific occasion:—<br/>(a) From his own N.H.S. Dr.?<br/>(b) From another Dr.?<br/>Yes.....1 No.....2 D.K.....3</p> <p>5 Principle D: "The profession rejects any proposal for the control of the future medical service by local authorities as at present constituted."<br/>Do you consider that the White Paper observes or infringes this Principle?</p> <p>6 Principle E: "...no administrative structure should be approved which does not both permit and encourage free choice as between doctor and patient."<br/>Do you consider that this Principle is left intact or is impaired by the provisions of the White Paper?</p> <p>7 The White Paper suggests a Central Health</p> | <p>Should .....1<br/>Should Not.....2<br/>D.K. ....3</p> <p>Agree .....1<br/>Disagree .....2<br/>D.K. ....3</p> <p>Yes .....1<br/>No .....2<br/>D.K. ....3</p> <p>Yes .....1<br/>No .....2<br/>D.K. ....3</p> <p>Observes .....1<br/>Infringes .....2<br/>D.K. ....3</p> <p>Left Intact.....1<br/>Impaired .....2<br/>D.K. ....3</p> | <p>13 (a) "The Board must (also) be able to require the young doctor during the early years of his career to give his full time to the public service where the needs of the service require this" (p. 35).<br/>This provision applies potentially to all young doctors.<br/>Do you regard it as reasonable or unreasonable?<br/>(b) What should be his initial salary, per annum? £ .....</p> <p>14 (a) The White Paper proposes that general practitioners should be under contract with a Central Medical Board (p. 29).<br/>Do you agree or disagree with this?<br/>(b) IF DISAGREE: What alternative do you suggest? .....</p> <p>15 The White Paper says that doctors working from Health Centres should have a contract jointly with the Central Medical Board and the local authority owning the Health Centre (p. 31).<br/>Do you agree or disagree?</p> <p>16 (a) The White Paper suggests that subject to initiation locally and "in the last resort to the decision of the Minister," Health Centres will be set up and maintained by county or or county borough councils.<br/>Do you approve or disapprove of the principle of Health Centres?<br/>(b) IF APPROVE: What form of Health Centre would you most prefer to see:<br/>1 Communal doctors' surgery, the type envisaged in the White Paper? .....1<br/>2 Cottage hospital type, with beds?.....2<br/>3 Purely diagnostic, investigation, Centre? .....3<br/>4 A Centre where both preventive and curative work is done, including, e.g., maternity and child welfare, school medical treatment? .....4<br/>5 Other? .....5</p> | <p>Reasonable .....1<br/>Unreasonable ..2<br/>D.K. ....3</p> <p>Agree .....1<br/>Disagree .....2<br/>D.K. ....3</p> <p>Agree .....1<br/>Disagree .....2<br/>D.K. ....3</p> <p>Approve .....1<br/>Disapprove .....2<br/>D.K. ....3</p> <p>Salary .....1<br/>Small Basic Salary Plus Capitation Fees.....2<br/>Capitation Fees .....3<br/>Pooling of capitation fees 4</p> |
|---|--|--|--|

To column 1, page 6. The line across page 6 of this issue indicates the foot of the first page of the form as distributed.

\*"I have heard the White Paper now before us called a 'sinister' document. Those who have used this word really mean 'specious' or 'disingenuous.'"

— LORD HORDER in the House of Lords, March 21, 1944.

- Services Advisory Council, having the right to offer spontaneous advice to the Minister, who will have to submit his Annual Report of their work to Parliament. The Council will not have the right to publish an Annual Report (p. 13).  
Should or should not the Council have the right to publish an Annual Report?  
**Should** .....1  
**Should Not**.....2  
**D.K.** .....3
- 8 The Central Health Services Advisory Council will not have the right to publish their advice without the consent of the Minister. Should or should not the Council have the right to publish their advice at their own discretion?  
**Should** .....1  
**Should Not**.....2  
**D.K.** .....3
- 9 (a) The White Paper envisages as the central administrative structure, the Minister of Health, the Ministry of Health, plus the Central Advisory Council.  
Do you think that this arrangement is satisfactory or unsatisfactory?  
**Satisfactory** .....1  
**Unsatisfactory** 2  
**D.K.** .....3
- (b) **IF UNSATISFACTORY:** What alternative would you suggest?.....  
**D.K.** .....3
- 10 The White Paper says hospital and specialist services should be planned and partly run by joint boards covering large areas (p. 15). Do you think that this is a good or bad thing?  
**Good** .....1  
**Bad** .....2  
**D.K.** .....3
- 11 (a) The joint boards will represent the constituent local authorities though there will be Local Health Service Councils to advise them (p. 19).  
Do you think that this arrangement is satisfactory or unsatisfactory?  
**Satisfactory** .....1  
**Unsatisfactory** 2  
**D.K.** .....3
- (b) **IF UNSATISFACTORY:** Would you like to see:  
a Doctors and other health workers directly represented on the joint boards?  
**Yes** .....1  
**No** .....2  
**D.K.** .....3  
b Medical faculties of Universities directly represented on the joint boards?  
**Yes** .....1  
**No** .....2  
**D.K.** .....3  
c Voluntary hospitals directly represented on the joint boards?  
**Yes** .....1  
**No** .....2  
**D.K.** .....3
- 12 The White Paper proposes that, subject to conditions arranged nationally, specialists and consultants should be employed whole-time or part-time and paid by the hospital authority (p. 25).  
Do you agree with this proposal or should they be employed by the Central Medical Board?  
**Hospitals** .....1  
**C.M.B.** .....2  
**D.K.** .....3
- 23 Should the principle that all general practices may be sold and purchased be maintained or abandoned, on the assumption that adequate compensation is paid to existing owners?  
**Maintained** .....1  
**Abandoned** ..2  
**D.K.** .....3
- 24 With the introduction of a National Health Service such as is contemplated in the White Paper, do you think that it will or will not be possible for private practice to continue:—  
(a) For a general practitioner?  
**Yes**.....1 **No**.....2 **D.K.**.....3  
(b) For a consultant or specialist?  
**Yes**.....1 **No**.....2 **D.K.**.....3
- 25 It is usual that people being paid by the State are debarred from politics or standing for Parliament. Is it desirable or undesirable for Parliament. Is it desirable or undesirable for Parliament. Is it desirable or undesirable for Parliament.  
**Desirable** .....1  
**Undesirable** ..2  
**D.K.** .....3  
(To column 1, page 7)
- see adopted for doctors working in Health Centres?
- 18 If a doctor is not working in a Health Centre, but in "separate" practice, how should he be remunerated in a National Health Service?  
**Salary** .....1  
**Small Basic Salary Plus Capitation Fees**.....2  
**Capitation Fees** .....3
- 19 (a) "... the doctors taking part in the scheme must be assured of an adequate and appropriate income." (p. 80).  
In your opinion (a) How much (net—with all expenses paid) do you think a general practitioner (of, say, 40) should get from all sources, at 1939 prices?  
i Without a pension, per annum £.....  
ii With an adequate pension at 65, p.a. £.....  
(b) How much (net—with all expenses paid) do you think a consultant or specialist (of, say, 40), should get from all sources, at 1939 prices?  
i Without a pension, per annum £.....  
ii With an adequate pension at 65, p.a. £.....
- 20 "Any practitioner wishing to set up a new—or take over an existing—public service practice in a particular area will seek the consent of the (Central Medical) Board. The Board will then have regard to the need for doctors in the public service in that area, in relation to the country as a whole, and to the general policy for the time being affecting the distribution of public medical practice. If it is considered that the area has sufficient or more than sufficient doctors in public practice while other areas need more doctors, consent will be refused. Otherwise it will usually be given without question" (p. 33).  
Is it reasonable or unreasonable that the Board should possess these powers?  
**Reasonable** .....1  
**Unreasonable** ..2  
**D.K.** .....3
- 21 The White Paper says nothing about the position of doctors in municipal hospitals in relation to medical superintendents. Do you think it desirable or undesirable that they should be clinically subordinate to a medical administrator?  
**Desirable** .....1  
**Undesirable** ..2  
**D.K.** .....3
- 22 "The Government have not overlooked the case which can be made for the total abolition of the sale and purchase of publicly remunerated practices. The abolition would, however, involve great practical difficulty and is not essential to the working of the new service now proposed. The Government intend, however, to discuss the whole question with the profession, to see if some workable and satisfactory solution can be reached" (p. 35).  
Do you think that the sale and purchase of publicly remunerated practices should continue or cease?  
**Continue** .....1  
**Cease** .....2  
**D.K.** .....3

I.P.T.O.

PERSONAL DETAILS

1. Man .....1  
Woman .....2
- 3 Year of registration:  
During the war 1 1910-1919.....5  
1935-1939 .....2 1900-1906...6  
1930-1934 .....3 1890-1899.....7  
1920-1929 ...4 1880-1889...8  
Prior to 1880 .....9
- 4 Single .....1  
Married .....2  
No. of Children:  
Under 16 years of age...  
16 years of age and over .....
- 5 Nature of Professional Work:  
MARK BOTH SECTIONS A and B.  
A Peacetime work: (only one answer is to be given):  
(a) Consultant or Specialist .....1  
(b) General Practitioner .....2  
(c) Other .....3  
B Present work: (only one answer is to be given)

able that special provision should be made to safeguard these political rights of doctors entering a National Health Service?

- 26 (a) Would you care to say whether you incurred a debt in setting up your practice? **Yes** .....1  
**No** .....2  
**Rather Not Answer** .....3
- (b) Would you estimate how much of the debt is outstanding? £ .....2
- 27 Would you care to give the occupation or profession of your father?
- Medicine** .....1  
**Company director, higher professions, Civil Service—higher grades** .....2  
**Salaried—Clerical, salaried—manager, teacher, propr. retail bus., farmer** .....3  
**Skilled artisan, clerical—weekly wages, shop asst., Civil Service—lower grades** .....4  
**Others—weekly wages, factory, transport, mining, and so on** .....5
- 28 If a National Health Service as contemplated in the White Paper is introduced, would you regard medicine as an attractive profession for your child? **Yes** .....1  
**No** .....2  
**D.K.** .....3
- 29 With the introduction of a National Health Service, do you think that the quality of the country's medical service will be enhanced or will suffer? **Enhanced** .....1  
**Unaffected** .....2  
**Suffer** .....3  
**D.K.** .....4
- 30 On the whole, are your reactions to the White Paper favourable or unfavourable? **Favourable** .....1  
**Unfavourable** .....2  
**D.K.** .....3

If not on Service: Classify yourself in the branch of work in which you are predominantly engaged.

If on Service: Classify yourself in the branch of work in which you were predominantly engaged immediately prior to entering the services.

- (1) Consultant or Specialist .....1  
(2) General Practitioner:  
(a) National Health Insurance .....2  
(b) Not N.H.I. ....3  
(3) Whole-time Voluntary Hospital .....4  
(4) Whole-time Local Authority General Hospital .....5  
(5) Whole-time Local Authority Special Hospital .....6  
(6) Whole-time Public Health Service .....7  
(7) Whole-time Government Service (e.g. Home Office, Ministry of Health, etc.) .....8  
(8) Whole-time Teacher .....9  
(9) Whole-time Research .....10  
(10) Whole-time Non-Government Post .....11  
(11) Medically qualified Dental Surgeon .....12  
(12) Retired .....13  
(13) Unclassified .....14
- 6 If G.P.: Method of acquiring practice:  
Build up own .....1 Purchased existing .....2  
Acquired (not purchased) existing .....3
- 7 **Place of Practice:** Mark both Sections A and B.  
A Scotland .....1 Wales .....2  
England .....3 Services .....4  
Abroad (non-Services) .....5  
B Town of 50,000 or more ...1 Other .....2
- 8 Please mark any of these attended:  
A **Elementary** .....1 **Secondary** .....2 **Public** .....3  
B **University** .....1 **Medical School** .....2  
[Not Medical School]

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

phemy of criticising it. There is, however, one sentence in it which appeals to me, in which the Government invite criticism. I propose to take the Government at their word and say what I think about it.

Candidly, I do not like it. It is not that I do not like what is stated and most attractively presented, but I dislike the under-currents in it. With regard to improving the medical profession and the health services, I do not deny that it is possible to improve them. Everything is possible of improvement. We must advance and progress and improve the important health services of the country as we must everything else, but I do not believe that the right way to improve the health services is to put the great free independent medical profession under the control of a thinly disguised bureaucratic organisation. I will not discuss the question of the voluntary hospitals. . . We shall watch the Bill very carefully to see that every form of guarantee and safeguard which will assure the status, autonomy, independence and good administration of the voluntary hospitals is completely implemented, in spite of the fact that we know well that they are bound to lose an immense amount of voluntary financial support.

I am far more concerned with the fact that we have never had sufficient assurance from the front Bench with regard to the status of the medical profession. I believe that the doctors are deeply concerned and anxious about the position in which they will find themselves under the Bill which will arise out of this White Paper. If the medical profession, as I believe, is deeply suspicious and anxious and

is prepared to resist any attempt to place it under a bureaucratic Civil Service, and if that feeling is strong and widely expressed, as it may well be by a big majority of the profession, it will find substantial support in this House, at any rate on this side of the House. If the doctors decide to fight strongly, I would like to assure them of the great support they will receive, not only in the House of Commons, but in the country as a whole. I hope that the medical profession will not too readily surrender their inherited rights and freedom.

I cannot believe that the Central Medical Board which is proposed in the White Paper can do anything but injure, generally speaking, the prestige and freedom of the medical profession. That Board is the central feature of the White Paper and it is the feature which I dislike most. It seems to me quite unnecessary. Why should there be control of the medical profession to the degree proposed? Who will appoint the personnel of the Central Medical Board? Will they be elected freely by the professional bodies or appointed by the Minister, in fact, by the bureaucratic machine, to regiment and order about the medical profession? Hon. Members may think that my fears are unwarranted and that I have perhaps exaggerated the position. I accept the fact that if one reads the White Paper literally there is little justification for my fears, but what worries me is that it is far too attractively worded. I do not like the underlying tone of it. It rouses fears and misgivings in me and, I believe, throughout the medical profession. If to that extent I am representing their views I am proud to have this opportunity of doing so.

I want to say a word with regard to the advisory bodies. I am not satisfied that the advisory bodies, both central

and local, are to have the status which I should like to see them have. In fact, I believe there will be a tendency for them to be ignored to some extent by the executive authorities which, as far as I can see, need not accept their advice at all. They can look at it and put it in the waste paper basket. I want to have an assurance that the advisory bodies shall have an opportunity of presenting an annual report of their views, and that the report shall be published not after it has been censored and blue-pencilled by the Minister or the Department or somebody else, but published untouched as written by the advisory bodies themselves. . .

[Major Lloyd next asked about the position of the nursing profession and of mental hospitals under the new scheme. He concluded:] . . . I hope that the Bill, when it is brought forward, will contain very different proposals from those in the White Paper because if it does not then it will be fought line by line upon matters of major principle, on which many Members feel strongly and in regard to which, I believe, they represent a great part of the people of the country.

### House of Lords: March 21, 1944.

*Lord Geddes:* . . . When I first read this White Paper, I thought that it was the most brilliant White Paper that it had ever been my lot to read. It is brilliant, but what does it mean? It is the merest skeleton so far as anything with regard to health is concerned. It is called *A National Health Service*, but what is outlined in it is something of a medical service, which is not quite the same thing. After I had read it once, I read it a second and then a third and fourth time, and I came to the conclusion that there was some hidden meaning in it. I therefore said to one of those who, according to himself, had been doing a great deal of work in connexion with the formulation of the plan, "What are you getting at in this White Paper?" He replied: "Don't be silly; we have to make Beveridge security safe for the Treasury." Then I began to see something in the Paper which I had missed before.

It is, of course, quite true that social security does make being ill a gainful occupation—that is rather an understatement—and therefore it is probable that a certain number of the baser sort may like to continue in that easy occupation of making an income on the flat of their backs in bed; and therefore there has to be certification by medical people. I had a good look through the White Paper to see exactly where all this came in, and I find that one humble little condition labelled (d) covers the point. It is on page 36 of the White Paper, under the heading "Creation of a Central Medical Board." After saying that it is not for the Paper to suggest the details of the doctors' contract at the present stage, it sets out in (a), (b), (c) and (d) what the provisions should be, and there it is stated that it will be necessary to provide—

"(d) for the observance of reasonable conditions, centrally determined with the profession, respecting certification, and other matters which must arise in any publicly organised service."

That is what a great part of this scheme deals with. It provides that there shall be available—the availability is made clear and distinct here—throughout the country people who can issue certificates. Do not let me misrepresent what these certificates are to be. They are certificates written in connexion with reasonable conditions. That explains, it seems to me, the extraordinary dichotomy that there is in

this Paper. There is at the beginning of it a series of the most admirable principles with regard to a national medical service, and then the whole thing peters out to a tail at the end.

. . . There is no elaboration at all of how the consultant service is to be trained and how it is to be developed, and indeed not very much about how it is to be administered; but one thing is clear, and that is that it is to be administered by, and under the control of, the hospitals and the local authorities concerned. This is an extraordinary position. You have the general practitioners under the control of the Central Medical Board, and the Central Medical Board is, as I read it, a mainly bureaucratic body, controlled by the civil servants of the Ministry of Health acting in the name of the Minister. That is what is set out in this paper and it is what will happen. . . They are to lay down the conditions of certification as to whether those who think themselves sick are to be allowed to continue in the gainful occupation of being sick. And that is the principal part of the great many of the things that are worked out in detail in this White Paper. The general practitioners are under a bureaucratic body. They will have a contract in which are stated the conditions on which they are to certify. That is stated in the White Paper. Until that was pointed out to me it was a point upon which I was being silly, and when it was pointed out to me I ceased being silly, and I saw what would happen.

There must be certification for any Beveridge security plan, and let us make it quite clear to everybody in the country that there has to be a medical inspectorate if there is a Beveridge security plan. It is an essential part of it; and if that does not degenerate before very long into something not very dissimilar from a Medical Gestapo I do not know the way the Civil Service of this country works. What would happen is that you would have this continual supervision of every person who, on medical grounds, is a beneficiary under this plan. I do not think there is any way of escaping that. If you are going to have a security plan, with medical benefit on a great scale, there must be certification. If it is to be safe there must be some way for the wage earners who are caught by the certification to get to independent medical opinion. . .

## Programme for the Third World War

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

This work, which has appeared serially in *The Social Crediter*, is now published in one cover,

Price 2/-

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED  
49 PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL 15.