

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol 13. No. 20.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Games are almost a complete revelation of character; not through the degree of excellence attained in them but the spirit in which they are played. It is well known that there is hardly an existing outdoor game which did not originate in these islands; there is hardly an existing game in which we have not held the championship; and there is hardly a game in which, in a special sense, we are not now excelled by some other country.

Superficial and wishful critics have adduced these facts as evidence of our decadence. It is possible that they supply grounds for considerable optimism. The United States, for instance, could probably put six lawn tennis players into the courts who could win their matches against all comers. But England could put one hundred couples against the same number from any other country who would win seventy five *per cent.* of the games played.

The explanation of this does not lie on the surface, but deep down in character—in a native simplicity which does what it does for the sake of the doing, not to win or “make the headlines.” But it would be a mistake to suppose that because the national tendency is to play the game for the sake of the game, that the score can therefore be manipulated with impunity. “Win, tie, or wrangle” is not the native habit; but welching with the stakes is not popular, either. As a competent American journalist, Mr. Demarree Bess, observed some time ago, we did not ask for the current game, but we have played it for maximum stakes and maximum stakes are what we are going to take. Unless we are much in error, due notice to that effect has been served.

“... and it is indeed offensive to the ruling class that any man should possess wealth which is not a salary from the Government, a mark of Government pleasure, terminable at the first hint of indiscipline. That is the real social offence of the man of property, small or great: that in proportion as he has property, he feels and acts like a free man, and is therefore always a potential political opposition. The greatness of England has been in the abundance, generation by generation, of such men: and our policy in Europe should not be shamefaced towards property, but should proclaim that here and nowhere else is the essential recipe for the maintenance of free political institutions.”

—*The Tablet*, December 30, 1944.

The full text of the Pope's Christmas Broadcast confirms the opinion previously expressed in this column, that it was unsatisfactorily reported in the general press. It is in two parts, and the first part, “On True and False Democracy” appears to us to be the centre of gravity of the address, rather than the highly-qualified endorsement of a

World Organisation to maintain peace—an endorsement, contained in the second part, “On the Machinery of International Security,” which can only be understood in reference to the very difficult premise “... we understand why the authority of such a society must be vigorous and effective over the member States: in such wise, however, that each of them retains an equal right to its own sovereignty.”

This section of the Broadcast concludes with a most peculiar, and, it would appear, studied, slight to Great Britain—unique thanks to the United States and its representative at the Vatican, and “equal praise and gratitude to the Head of the State, Governments and people of Spain, Ireland, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Italy, Lithuania, Peru, Poland, Roumania, Switzerland, Hungary and Uruguay.”

As a correspondent to *The Scotsman* points out, the Russian collective farm, communally worked by peasants (who have also 25-acre crofts of “their own”), and administered by State officials is simply the European Feudal system with all its disadvantages, and none of the advantages of the “barony court” which decentralised the Scottish Feudal Barony. The same correspondent draws attention to the curious contradiction between the much advertised Russian Collectives and the dividing up, under Russian influence, of the large Polish estates into a mass of peasant proprietorships, thus creating a class of “bound serfs,” and asks, with justification, whether in fact the fundamental objective of “agrarian reform” everywhere is not simply to provide offices for hectoring bureaucrats.

Yes, Clarence, we quite recognise that with blood, sweat, and tears, our war production *per capita* exceeds that of any other nation. We also note that we are the only nation which parted with the whole of its accumulated capital to pay for munitions at high prices to the United States, thus saving the New Deal from ignominious collapse. We recollect that we opposed “Germany” single handed while one Ally “made money” and another implemented a pact of non-aggression with our enemy, and that in the East our lost possessions will have to wait until we can take them back ourselves, and a loud chorus say we shan't have them, anyway. We also gather that the standard of living in Moscow and New York is simply marvellous—23 course dinners and unlimited Scotch; or at any rate, rye. (If you don't like spam, try our “luncheon” hams.) We also hear on the “B”.B.C. that the Americans are doing all the fighting, although unfortunately not where the V-2s are launched. Somebody reminded us that we went to war for the rights of Poland, but it would appear that we mustn't insist on anyone's rights either in once Great Britain or Poland or Greece except, of course, those of the Communists. Professor Laski tells us “we” are fighting this

war to ensure the "historic right to victory of the Left." Mr. Sidney Hillman is staying at Claridge's (which avoids spam) for that purpose.

Taking it all in all, Clarence, what do *you* think? Or don't you?

• • •

"The only vehicles which are not being fired on in Athens and Piraeus regions are the Americans' which fly huge American Flags and are immune from snipers' bullets."

— *News Chronicle*, December 18, 1944.

• • •

"Any people, anywhere, being inclined and having the Power, have [sic] the right to rise up and shake off the existing Government and form a new one that suits them better. This is a valuable, a most sacred right—a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world."

— Abraham Lincoln.

So he fought the bloodiest civil war in history up to that date, to prevent the Southern States from exercising their "most sacred right."

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 14, 1944.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Rex Paterson, Hatch Warren, Basingstoke

Mr. Craven-Ellis asked the Minister of Agriculture if the dispute between the Hampshire War Agricultural Executive Committee and Mr. Rex Paterson, of Hatch Warren, near Basingstoke, has been brought to his attention, and, having regard to the findings of the committee appointed to investigate the case, which vindicated Mr. Paterson, what instructions is he giving the Hampshire War Agricultural Executive Committee to avoid similar interference being practised in future and to impress upon them the duty of co-operating with farmers if the maximum of food production is to be achieved and that this purpose will be defeated by adopting a vindictive policy.

DIRECTED LABOUR (MINES)

Sir T. Moore asked the Minister of Labour how many young men have been directed to the mines as a result of his ballot system up to the latest available date; how many have refused; and how the system in general has worked.

Mr. Bevin: Up to the end of October, 1944, nearly 16,000 youths selected by ballot had been directed to coal-mining. Up to the same date approximately 500 ballotees had been prosecuted for non-compliance. The system in general is working quite satisfactorily.

NATIONAL FINANCE

British War Purchases, U.S.A.

Mr. Craven-Ellis asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will inform the House what were the dollar amounts spent by this country for war purposes in the U.S.A. from the outbreak of war up to the effective application of the Lend-Lease Act, 1941; and if there is any possibility of a retroactive working of Lend-Lease or its equivalent.

Sir J. Anderson: As stated in the second paragraph

of the Report on Mutual Aid published in November, 1943 (Cmd. 6483), we had, up to that date, spent some £1,500,000,000 in the United States since the outbreak of war on supplies of all kinds. The greater part of this expenditure was incurred in connection with contracts placed before the application of the Lend-Lease Act. As regards the last part of the Question I have nothing to add to the statement made by the Prime Minister on 30th November last.

RECRUITMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Wootton-Davies (Heywood and Radcliffe): ... I am one of those people who think that this country must make much more use of science, and I hope that, when the time comes, these technical and scientific men will be considered, and not only on the narrow issue as scientific and technical men. I once asked you, Mr. Speaker, if an economist was not a scientist. I want to see more economists in the Civil Service. We must have men who can sell things. We are going to have much more governmental control in our lives, and especially in industry, in the future, and it is essential that we should have the best chemists, the best engineers, the best economists and the best market men. ...

CHARTERED AND OTHER BODIES (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS)

Sir Harold Webbe (Westminster): ... This is the first of three Motions, in my name and in the names of my hon. Friends, the others being. ...

... "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying that the General Medical Council (Temporary Provisions) Order, 1944, a copy of which was presented on 5th December, be annulled."

... I admit that the case of the General Medical Council is a little more difficult, for there are a large number of constituents, comprising all the registered practitioners who number 50,000 or 60,000. I am told that the register might well contain as many as 44,000 names. An election is not an impossible business and is certainly not much more difficult than holding an ordinary by-election. It might be argued that in this case the Council could not get a proper election because so many of the electors, the medical practitioners, are away serving the country in the Forces. I am sure that my right hon. Friend will not use that argument, because the House has already decided that the absence of all these doctors in the Forces is no valid reason for postponing legislation which fundamentally affects the whole medical service and drastically and vitally affects the future of every one of them. Therefore, I submit that in this case also an election should be possible.

I do not want it to be thought that this is really a trivial point. I submit that a serious point of principal is involved. We are a democratic country, and the whole of our government by public bodies is based on the conception of representative bodies freely elected by those whom they serve. We attach great importance to the process known as refreshing those elected bodies by calling on the representatives to show themselves to those whom they represent and to seek their suffrages. I submit that this right, which is an essential feature of democracy and democratic government, which we were obliged to surrender at the beginning

(Continued at foot of page 3)

Australian Bishop Condemns Mothers

We are indebted to the *Melbourne Argus* for the following account of an address by Bishop Burgmann to the University Association of Canberra, and comment published by the newspaper thereon:—

The Bishop said every child should be taken away from the family at the age of twelve. A child was born for future generations and for society, not for its parents.

"I want to get rid of the possessive mother," he declared. "She is one of the most dangerous things in the world. The fundamental heresy is the mother who thinks that because she has borne a child she owns it. We must teach women that motherhood is a vocation, and the first lesson is that they must give up their child.

"The most haphazard thing in our community is motherhood and fatherhood. For them there is absolutely no education.

"At the age of 12 the child enters adolescence and should be born again for society. It should be sent to a boarding school of a completely new type—one situated on probably thousands of acres of the best land in the community, where primary, as well as secondary, industries are represented, and the children should be allowed to share in them naturally.

"At such schools there would be no tremendous intellectual pressure, but the child's interests would be sorted out by psychological tests. Four or five years would be spent in the school as an appraisal time in a living society.

"The next step would be to college. Sets of colleges directly related to the industries of the country should give the student specialist training. These colleges would go on to a standard equal to a bachelor's degree, in present-day university education. Then would come the university itself."

Dr. Burgmann said the fact that some Australians became citizens was accidental. Schools of to-day did not fit people for citizenship.

"Our present university is a dreadful institution," he said. "I would not allow anyone to enter a university until he had got his bachelor's degree. At present you have specialist teachers lecturing to great unwieldy classes and wasting their time on students who might easily be handled by high school teachers."

E. H. Shelley (Canterbury) wrote to the newspaper:—

"Sir: So Bishop Burgmann considers a mother as being 'one of the most dangerous things in the world.' If he has any supporters whatever in such a theory I should think that he must have a very small following. I consider the

bishop's outburst to be an insult to motherhood and to parents generally. It indicates a lack of knowledge of the true meaning of parenthood and all that home influence stands for. One would expect something different from a man who sets himself up as being a leader in the Christian Church."

Other letters were as follows:—

"Sir: Bishop Burgmann's ideas appear to be based on a complete reversal of the relation of man to society, which, essentially, is a voluntary association of individuals for the benefit of the individual. It is, therefore, wrong to assume that society has a claim on other than voluntary co-operation from either child or adult, and compulsion in this respect must be enforced always by some one individual upon his fellows, for "Society" is an abstract organisation which can function solely through the real individuals who compose it. Control of the child or adult by alien bureaucrats, psychologists, and other drivers (as opposed to leaders) ignores the pre-eminent rights of the individual; such external control might be regarded as evidence of arrogated omniscience and usurped omnipotence on the part of (mainly) self-appointed controllers. In due course the controllers themselves should become merged in a "society" which then would have realised the perfect organisation of the ant heap."

"Sir: We mothers would like Bishop Burgmann to explain just what he means by the 'possessive' mother, and just how she is 'dangerous' to society. The thousands of our sons who are giving their lives to fight against ideas very similar to those he proposes for our children's education all have mothers, none of whom could be described as 'possessive.' If by 'possessive' he means that type of mother who indulges her love for her children to their detriment—she is in the minority, anyway—we would point out that the blame for this lies at the door of the Church and its monotonous insistence that once a woman becomes a mother she has no right to expect to be anything else.

We would also like to say, for the benefit of Bishop Burgmann and all the other learned gentlemen who seem so anxious to do our job for us, that the mothers of to-day are not a race of broody nitwits, with no ideas beyond washing dishes and feeding babies, but individual citizens who realise, as perhaps they never have before, the duties and privileges of their State. This we have shown beyond all question during the war, the burden and suffering of which we have borne uncomplainingly for five years, in the hope that we will be able to play our part in the creation of a better world for our children after it."

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 2)

of the war for reasons quite beyond our control, should be restored to us as soon as possible. I ask the Government to make a start now by accepting these Motions and by following a similar line of policy towards any other bodies which ask for further exemption from the obligation to hold elections. I make that plea to the Government, and I hope that any of those friends of democracy who a few days ago were so vocal in its defence will support me in that plea.

The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Attlee): ... I now turn to the General Medical Council of which there are 39 members. There are 32 nominated with the advice

of the Privy Council or chosen by certain colleges and universities, which may be held to be mainly indirect representatives of the medical profession. There are seven who are elected by medical practitioners. The latest available figures show that the electorate numbers somewhere about 65,000. The strain on the medical profession at the present time is immense. The strain on the General Medical Council has been pretty heavy. The fact is that people do not know where a large proportion of those 65,000 members are. A large proportion of them is overseas. A great many of the other doctors have been moved about the country according to the exigencies of the war. Even in normal times this

(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: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 13. No. 20. Saturday, January 20, 1945.

'Other Papers Please Copy'

It is becoming more obvious daily that monetary reform is simply a language—that it is what you say with it that is of primary importance. Or to put the matter more concretely, a monetary system is the policy of a philosophy, and to offer an opinion on monetary policy without having a clear opinion on social and economic philosophy is as sensible as to prescribe a medicine with no opinion on disease

**YOU PAY THEM TO TIE YOUR HANDS
 AND MAKE PAYING HARD:
 (If you must), PAY THEM TO DESIST,
 AND MAKE PAYING EASY!**

In answer to a letter from a Member of Parliament, dated December 15, 1944, the Financial Secretary to the Treasury has furnished the following figures for the number of civil servants:—

1931	Cmd.	3898	315,139
1932	"	4094	316,229
1933	"	4351	312,897
1934	"	4622	311,874
1935	"	4946	327,417
1936	"	5256	338,604
1937	"	5543	356,339
1938	"	5815	376,491
1939	Not	Published	393,832
1940	"	"	444,265
1941	"	"	533,553
1942	"	"	617,836
1943	"	"	666,218
1944	"	"	670,599

The 'published' figures "include part timers (counted as individuals and not as halves) but exclude industrials and certain out-stationed staffs." The 'not-published' figures "are on the same basis (as far as we can make it)."

or conception of a state of health. Like any other knowledge, an understanding of the technique of money is a tool. A workman cannot work without tools: but tools are of no use to him if he does not know what he wants to make; unless someone tells him.

It is not unfair to say that the basic document of the Social Credit Movement is *Economic Democracy* a book which contains a minimum of monetary technique. Such monetary principles as are mentioned in it are of so generalised a character that they require, and subsequently have had,

copious elaboration to give them closer definition. For practical use, *Economic Democracy* requires voluminous dilution.

The whole of the superstructure of Social Credit, as generally understood, rests on the conclusions drawn from an examination of the use and nature of centralised power and decentralised initiative. The techniques of both policies are secondary and emergent. You do not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles.

We re-emphasise this matter because it is obvious that such projects as the nationalisation of banking and credit (as generally understood) the issue of debt-free money, the attack on profit and on dividends are not only not Social Credit, but they are a deadly menace to it. It is one of the most vital and indispensable functions of the Social Credit Secretariat to dis-credit the current and most dangerous heresy, the vicious legacy of the French Revolution, that change and progress are synonymous terms.

Such people as Professor Laski, who openly mouth their desire to destroy "traditional Britain" are at least consistent. They are entropy in action. But the object of Social Credit is not to destroy, but to fulfil—to make more abundant.

Electricity Grid Threatens Collapse

Mr. J. Hacking, Chief Engineer of the Central Electricity Board, as reported in *The Times* of January 2, gave a warning that an overload would bring with it "danger that the supply system of the country, linked, as it is, through the grid, might collapse. This would cut off supplies to war industries as well as houses, and must be prevented." A load of 8,400,000 kilowatts is near the breaking point of the electricity supply system, and this acute danger point has already been reached twice. On both these occasions the Central Electricity Board, after issuing a general warning, has ordered "a discriminating cutting-off of current, in areas where the least injury would be done to war production." Such emergencies always arise during the severest weather, and it is the domestic consumer who is discriminated against, although domestic consumption, even including hotels and restaurants, accounts for only 30 per cent. of the current used.

The Gas Companies are also in difficulties which they have met by lowering pressure, but, as the same article in *The Times* points out, "there is no gas grid as there is an electricity grid," and there is no danger of general collapse. The difficulties are chiefly due to lack of storage capacity and shortage of suitable labour.

The achievement of a real threat of simultaneous collapse of the whole country's electricity supply during bitter weather, and at a vital stage of the war, is a remarkable triumph for those who planned and sponsored the grid system, unless, indeed, we must assume them to be imbeciles. It provides them with a further powerful sanction against the public, as well as a good excuse for developing the technique of "discriminating cutting-off of current" from selected consumers. It is perhaps now more possible to speculate why the Germans left the immensely vulnerable grid almost out of their bombing programme. It would have been a pity to spoil it!

Meanwhile the absence of a gas grid may be due to technical difficulties, but doubtless it explains why the home of the future is advertised as 'all-electric.'

J. E. Grégoire on Action in Politics

The following passages are translated from a "Message to the Social Crediters of the West" by M. J. Ernest Grégoire, Vice-President of the Social Credit Association of Canada, and deal with a vitally important topic with that logical lucidity which the French seem to possess *in excelsis*:—

"It does not seem to us that the electors have reached that stage of maturity necessary for overcoming so many obstacles and steering a course in the midst of so much confusion. They will reach it only when they realise that they themselves, and not the candidates, should be the chief actors in politics.

"It would be a grave error for us, the Social Crediters of Quebec, to make the election the goal of our movement. It would, in the first place, cut off those who are attached to any political label from any approach through Social Credit. In the second place, in our own organisation, it would immediately bring to the forefront the less serious elements which only rouse themselves when they think fame or personal advancement may be obtained by means of a new movement; on the other hand, those who have been truly advancing the political education of the people, those who have awakened minds to new facts and ideals, would be thrown into the background as dreamers and utopians; they would no longer have any means of action and we should witness a new eruption of egoists and ambitious men under the banner of Social Credit.

"Moreover, a movement which thinks only in terms of elections can only step on the accelerator when an election is in sight; the day after the election activity slows down or stops altogether.

"To hang the fate of Social Credit on the result of an election, in the province of Quebec, would be to dig the grave of Social Credit in this province."

• • •

M. Grégoire explains that he is speaking for the province of Quebec, not for the other provinces, and immediately adds,

"We, of Quebec, are 100 per cent. with you of Alberta, and with you of British Columbia for a Social Credit parliament at Ottawa, and for a Social Credit parliament at Quebec too, and we wish, as you do, that it may come about as soon as possible.

"We are inclined to think, as you do, that Social Credit legislation can only come from a Social Credit parliament, or at least from a parliament with a good proportion of Social Credit members.

"But the question becomes: How can we best obtain a Social Credit parliament? By running to repeated defeats at the polls, or by first gradually raising the electorate to a stage where the powerful influences of the electoral machines will lose their effect?

"We believe—and the facts prove it to be true—that the electorate of Quebec is not yet capable of putting up a victorious resistance to the aristocracy of power, money, prestige and influence which weighs so heavily on the masses and operates in full force at election times.

"We believe that the electors should first learn that they can break that force if they unite for results. This

uniting for results is not acquired without practice. It is certainly not acquired in the midst of the unleashed passions of an election campaign. It needs to be exercised beforehand.

"The electors must first bring about their political education by the repeated practice of political action; not by making a cross on paper every four years, but by well-defined and reasoned actions, with a concrete objective in mind; actions in the realm of politics which will make the electors understand that the ordering of objectives is their own business, and that it is they who finally hold the power in a democratic régime which is functioning correctly.

"That is why, in Quebec, we are organising ourselves for pressure politics. The same organisation will obviously serve for election politics when the time comes.

"Pressure politics can be practised at any time and in every field, municipal, provincial, or federal; but for concerted and effective pressure, organisation is obviously necessary.

"Pressure politics are of great educational value, which cannot be said of election politics.

"In an election, your candidate is either elected or defeated. If he is elected, all is well; but if he is defeated, all is lost, and it may be four or five years before you can try again.

"In pressure politics there is always a certain degree of success. For one thing the people exerting the pressure are conscious of being those who are dealing the blows, and not, as usual, being those who receive them; that is a point in itself. Then, if the blows are well directed, there is a reaction on the part of those who suffer them; that is another degree of success; one is conscious of rousing someone from a state of inactivity and forgetfulness of his electors. There may also be tangible results, or at least partial ones, if the electors, thus encouraged, hold firm.

• • •

"These activities are enlivening and help to strengthen people who were very weak. The electors gain confidence in themselves and will not allow themselves to be so easily ruled by the politicians.

"The game is very attractive. Our Social Crediters of Quebec who have taken to it are more and more enthusiastic. They find that, in this field at least, they will not be paralysed or pushed around, as they are too much exposed to being by the powerful organisations of party politics on election day.

"The old parties have, indeed, formidable organisations for elections, but they have none for pressure politics; they cannot have, unless they completely change their spirit and make themselves the servants of the people's interests. Then the battle would be won.

"But they have no such organisation. We are the only people moving in pressure politics; we therefore have a free field, without competition.

"Then there is a certain excitement in pressure politics. There will certainly be in a few months' time. Our M.P.s are not accustomed to this kind of treatment. Already some of them are receiving lively letters. We have, indeed, in our organisation a body of 'épistoliers.' The 'épistoliers' are social crediters who promise to write at least one letter per week to bring pressure on someone for something in the public interest. This free-lance pressure is a preparation

for more collective action on a larger scale, so soon as a sufficient force of pressure is ready and the needs arise.

"All this, in the realm of pressure politics tends to make real men of those whom I would at the moment call children in political action. We hope thus to reach, before long, the stage of development, of strength and of political maturity in which we shall be able to face with success any situation, even in the electoral arena." — J. H.

R. M. MacIver

Mrs. Best has furnished the following 'rough notes' concerning R. M. MacIver's "Community: A Sociological Study" published in 1917. MacIver, formerly of Aberdeen, and later a professor of Political Science in the University of Toronto, was the author of the paragraph quoted by Mrs. Best in her article, "Freedom and Omnipotence," in *The Social Crediter* for December 16:—

MacIver says: "The Teleological law becomes clearer as life develops, and as it becomes clearer it becomes freer, until we can conceive the highest life as one of perfect self-knowledge and of perfect autonomy."

This must result in the development and advent of a community of perfectly harmonious beings, for any conflict whether within individuals or between them must destroy their autonomy.

It is necessary to examine the nature of a teleological law that results in perfect self-knowledge and perfect autonomy. Either this law is purposive and directive, or has arisen by chance. In the second case the autonomy having come about accidentally can as accidentally be disrupted. This can surely be dismissed as absurd. It is reasonable therefore to suppose that this teleological law operating to produce autonomy must be itself autonomous, and in consequence undeterred by opposition, and both purposive and directive. But a law that is autonomous, and both purposive and directive, and is most perfectly embodied in persons must itself be personal. It must also be creative by virtue of its teleological character. In view of MacIver's distrust of abstractionism, and the supreme value he places on personality he would, one might suppose, agree to this conclusion; anyway it seems inescapable.

However, the final important point is that perfect autonomy must involve absolute power (otherwise what becomes of the autonomy?), and for this reason I contend that MacIver's statement quoted at the beginning of these notes is at variance with the one quoted at the beginning of my article.

Incidentally this community of perfectly autonomous perfectly harmonious beings may without danger observe St. Augustine's exhortation to "love and do as you like," for the teleological law that they obey is the one spoken of somewhere in the Bible: "Behold I have writ my law in their hearts."

I find as well a contradiction in MacIver's thought in the section entitled "law of Communal Mortality." He regards the dissolution of a Nation as a catastrophe of nature, and the death of an individual as a fulfilment of nature. He bases this idea of "fulfilment of nature" (in respect of the individual) on the death of the organism. This must involve complete *identification* of the individual with the organism. He says further: "Though every individual dies,

life may go on unabated, but if a people die, a whole area of life is lost." But if an individual dies a whole area of life is also lost; the fact that the area is less in extent is beside the point, unless one estimates value in terms of extent, or mere numbers. Indeed the picture of life advancing like a juggernaut mowing down individuals, and quite content so long as individuals will continue to reproduce themselves *ad infinitum* for its benefit is not an engaging one, and appears quite incompatible with the high value MacIver places on personality.

What MacIver says of the nature of community, and of the proper relation of the individual to it, appears to me impeccable, and in complete harmony with Douglas. It makes one all the more sorry that he had not the advantage of the full light of Douglas when he wrote it, but as it was first published in 1917 that would have been impossible. This 'light' must have modified and altered much of what he says (in particular for instance) in regard to "conflict of interests," as he is unaware of the main cause and artificial nature of the conflict that bedevils man to-day. Also he gives support to the *cliché* of "our ever more complex world" never, apparently pausing to consider *why* it is more complex, or that in view of man's increasing knowledge of and co-operation with nature's laws it should, in fact, be more simple. This *cliché* which I have met with more than once recently is very mischievous, and must delight the planners (who quite possibly started it going) as it gives them a semblance of excuse for their 'planning,' and serves to hide the fact that having created the complexity (or connived in its creation) they are now cashing in on it for their own ends.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

election is fairly costly. A single election costs about £500 and sometimes there have to be two or three a year, according to the changes and chances of this mortal life. The staff of the Council has been very greatly reduced. It would be very difficult and take a very long time and involve an unnecessary amount of time, if the election papers were to reach all members of the profession.

Therefore, I do not think there is a case at present for holding up these Orders as against any other Orders...

House of Commons: December 15, 1944.

NATIONAL FINANCE

Sterling Liabilities Overseas

Sir G. Schuster asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the origin of sterling balances owned by overseas holders and their relation to the National Debt.

Sir J. Anderson: I am glad to have an opportunity of explaining to the House the origin and nature of the accumulated sterling liabilities to overseas countries to which reference is made in this Question, and I hope that in doing so I may remove some misapprehensions. These balances, which it is estimated will amount to some £3,000,000,000 by the end of this year, represent the net amounts of sterling which have been acquired by their holders in a variety of ways, the greater part of which, though not all, is directly connected with the war. There are three main headings contributing to the total.

(1) The accumulation of normal reserves and working balances which overseas governments, banks and enter-

prises were always accustomed to carry in London.

(2) A further accumulation on commercial account due to large purchases of a commercial nature, whether made by the government or by private importers, in the Empire or elsewhere, while our commercial exports have shrunk owing to war conditions.

(3) The sterling counterpart of direct war expenditure incurred in local currencies in many areas abroad.

The total sterling balances so accumulated have been drawn upon in the usual way to meet the sterling requirements of the countries concerned.

Relations between these balances and the National Debt arise in two ways. (a) Government expenditure under heads 2 and 3 above (which will have been duly authorised by Parliamentary Supply Grants) represents a charge on the Budget and since our total Budget expenditure is met partly out of revenue and partly out of borrowings, the expenditure in question contributes to the current increase in the National Debt. (b) A large part of the total sterling balances arising under heads 1-3 above, is, in fact, held in the form of Treasury Bills or other British Government securities (mainly short-dated) forming part of the National Debt. It is only in respect of the cash payable in sterling on the maturity of such securities that any question arises of a direct cash liability on the Exchequer. In many cases, of course, investment under (b) is the counterpart of borrowing under (a).

PAPER SUPPLIES (MOBERLEY COMMITTEE)

Sir H. Morris-Jones asked the President of the Board of Trade the names of the members of the Moberley Committee which advises on the use of the reserve of paper supplies.

Mr. Dalton: The names are: Sir Walter Moberley (Chairman) and Messrs. B. W. Fagan, R. C. Holland, R. J. L. Kingsford and W. G. Taylor.

DEBATE ON MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT POLAND

Mr. Raikes (Essex, South East): ... As regards the offer of German lands to the Oder, it is easy enough to consider on the map depopulating millions of people. But does the House appreciate what that means—4,000,000 Poles east of the Curzon Line dragged from the homes in which they have lived for generations, 4,000,000 Ukrainians left to be Russian citizens, whether they wish it or not, and 5,000,000 Germans again forced from their homes and transferred to Western Germany. What a sum of human misery... It is more important for Poland to be friendly to Russia than it is to Russia to have a friendly Poland but we can, I think, ask that it should not all be given by the small State and all take by the big State...

Mr. Pickthorn (Cambridge University): ... I am not a friend of Poland. I am a friend of England, and if I am a friend of any other country in the world, perhaps Scotland and France might compete for that friendship. I speak in this House not in the least as a friend of Poland. I think it is not the business of this House to consider the interests of Poland as such, and that the specific business of this House is to consider the interests of the British Empire and the British people. I am forced to say that it did ring like a knell in my heart—with apologies to the hon. Member to East Wolverhampton for being emotional—when the Prime

Minister said to-day, for the third time in the last three or four weeks, that this country has two great Allies, "perhaps greater than us." Not greater than us, and if we think them greater than us, greater than us they will be. In my judgment, if they are greater than us, or either or both of them think themselves greater than us, there is no chance of peace in Europe in any time while anyone now present in this Chamber lives...

... The duty of His Majesty's Government is to make quite certain, at very nearly whatever risk, that the world knows that whatever regime is set up in Poland, if it is not obviously on the face of it a wholly independent regime, and whatever frontiers are drawn for Poland, if those frontiers are in any respect unfavourable to Poland, that those unfavourable decisions have not been facilitated by us; and, above all, that we have not been parties to any plan for using the Lublin Committee as a lever for squeezing, putting a squeeze on, the Polish Government, to whom we are bound by every tie of honour, or on the Polish people, for whom our hearts must, even in Wolverhampton, continue to bleed...

Miss Rathbone (Combined English Universities): ... I do submit that making allowance for maximum exaggeration possible, the whole position is decidedly disquieting, and we should be very careful lest we take any responsibility for acquiescing over it.

As to deportations, there are two periods to which I wish to refer, the earlier date being from February, 1940, to June, 1941, at the time when Russia was forced into the war by German aggression. I believe it is not disputed by anyone that during that period vast numbers of Poles and other people besides—the latter I do not intend to discuss—were deported to distant parts of the U.S.S.R. The alleged figures given to me are that some 880,000 civilians plus a great number of prisoners of war—and also great numbers who were forcibly mobilised—in all well over 1,000,000 persons, were affected. The civilians included several hundred thousands of women and children. They were sent to various distant parts of European Russia, to Siberia and to Central Asiatic Republics and elsewhere, and owing to the haste with which they were sent off they were sent with exceedingly inadequate provision of food and clothing and in overcrowded conditions so far as transport was concerned. They are said—all those that were fit—to have been put to forced labour, many in an Arctic climate, in such conditions of underfeeding and underclothing that thousands are said to have succumbed. It is reported that in April, 1943, over 270,000 Polish citizens were benefiting from the relief organisations of the Polish Embassy set up in Kuibishev, including 95,000 men, 98,000 women and 78,000 children, when the work of the Polish relief organisations was brought to an end by the rupture of diplomatic relations between the two countries. After that relief stopped and since then, except during a brief period when the Australian representative had some access, there has been no access allowed to those persons by any impartial persons, and neither the International Red Cross, Quakers, nor any other international body, were allowed access.

The second series of deportations is much later—during and since August of the present year. It is alleged to affect large numbers, including many officers and men who had fought actively with the Red Army in the common fight against Germany, and who were afterwards seized upon, and for one reason or other, deported. The facts about that are rather more doubtful... the U.S.S.R. has so far made

no reply to the request received from U.N.R.R.A. to be allowed to send a delegation and supplies through Russian territory into Poland and to Russian-occupied parts of Poland. Permission has not been refused, but it is delayed...

Captain Alan Graham (Wirral): ... This Debate of course centres round the Russian-Polish situation, and our British attitude towards it, but it seems to me that far bigger issues are involved, namely, the whole future of European civilisation. What is the key-note of our civilisation in contrast with Asiatic concepts? It is surely the infinite value of the individual human soul... To them the individual is next to nothing, but in Europe he is all important...

It is actually said that for the last month—whether or not because of the change in Government I do not know—we have sent no further supplies to the Underground Army in Poland. Can we afford to ignore this organised army of 160,000 combatants against Germany, recognised by ourselves three months ago as combatants? I should like to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether that statement is true, that we have taken the occasion of the change in the Polish Government to refuse to go on supplying these forces of the Polish Underground Army, who, against heavy odds, are still fighting our battle. They will get arms from somewhere, if not from us. Is not such action calculated to drive them into the arms of Germany. If His Majesty's Government do not now stand up for full Polish independence, they will force all Central Europeans to rally around Germany, even in defeat, and to make Germany, as she claims to be Europe's defender against the Eastern invader. Poland is the test-case for European civilisation. If we desert Poland, Europe will desert us; and that will be our ruin... For our own material safety, therefore, as well as for every moral reason; such as honour between man and man and regard for treaties and for the whole fabric of our European civilisation, I say to the Government that the moment has come to say to our great Ally Russia, of whose many services we are abundantly conscious, that she must treat Poland as what she is, a civilised, Christian, European nation, and not as if she was a paltry Asiatic tribe of Uzbeks or Tajiks...

Mr. Ivor Thomas (Keighley): ... It is melancholy to think that after more than five years of fighting, in a war which we entered to defend the independence of Poland, we should be debating whether Poland is to be a State at all. For, make no mistake, that is the issue before us. The frontier question is entirely subordinate...

Mr. Price (Forest of Dean): Would my hon. Friend bear in mind that the Polish population of this territory is quite a minority?

Mr. Thomas: When my hon. Friend says a minority he is speaking of a figure just short of 50 per cent. The question which I would like to put to him is: Why does he assume that the Soviet Union alone has the right to be a multi-national State? There are many nationalities in the Soviet Union—about 200—and why should there not be two or three nationalities in Poland? I cannot see the force of the argument that the Soviet Union has the right to include all Ruthenians and all Ukrainians—

Mr. Price: Is my hon. Friend aware that, not many years ago, there was a rebellion against Poland in these Eastern Polish territories?

Professor Savory (Queen's University, Belfast): Ex-

cited by the Germans and by Hitler's money.

Mr. Thomas: My hon. Friend, the Member for Queen's University, Belfast, has given the answer. [*Interruption.*] My hon. Friend says I am in bad company. Well, there are occasions when we must speak our minds, and I am prepared to do it to-day even if I am in strange company. It was painful to me earlier on to hear the hon. Member for East Wolverhampton (Mr. Mander), who claims to carry the banner of Russell, Palmerston, Gladstone and Asquith, making the speech that he did; his Party was once the champion of the rights of small nations. He is not alone; I note that many hon. Members last week were saying very different things in the Greek Debate from what they are saying to-day about the rights of small nations. Be that as it may, the point I wanted to make, when I was led into a digression, was this. The Soviet Union is asking for a westward extension on strategic grounds. Surely, we have learned by now that no security can be guaranteed by strategic frontiers?

Viscount Hinchinbrooke (South Dorset): Moscow was saved.

Mr. Thomas: Moscow will not be saved by the westward extension now proposed if unhappily any future war should break out.

(After interruptions.)

Mr. Thomas: If it will help to ease matters, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would point out that this is not the kind of speech which is likely to further any personal ambitions I might have; in fact, for all I know, I might be signing a political death warrant for myself. Be that as it may, the point I was trying to make was that in the Labour Party we have had perpetually this problem of working with the Communist Party—not in this House, but outside—and have always been very careful to avoid it. I cannot bring myself now to recommend to another country what I am not prepared to do myself...

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Walter Smiles (Blackburn): ... let us remember those which fought with us and those which fought against us. I have every sympathy with those Polish statesmen who would not sign that agreement. It might have been very much better for this country if many of our statesmen had not signed these various agreements. It might have been better for the right hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty (Mr. Malcolm MacDonald) if he had never signed that agreement giving away the Irish ports, so that 10,000 of our seamen are at the bottom of the sea through him. If I were one of those Polish statesmen I would refuse to sign that agreement unless the United States of America, this country and the British Dominions signed at the same time...

Mr. Martin (Southwark Central): ... The only reason I have dwelt on this aspect of the matter is that we are no longer, after the war is over, if the world is to be a war preparing world again, going to be the deciding factor in the future of the British Empire; that we have to face the fact that major decisions will be taken in Washington; that we, as well as Canada, Australia and New Zealand, must accept the facts of geography; and that the gradual development of the political scene will be in favour of the loss of gravity and of the political importance of this island and of the shifting of the centre of importance to Washington and the United States...