

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 15. No. 24.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

No, Clarence, we have not heard that *Punch* is to be re-named *Judy* (my, we nearly said re-christened!).

Mr. Caldwell, the Leader of the C.C.F. (London School of Economics Socialist) Party in Canada, is Member of Parliament for Rosetown-Biggar.

The one "Labour-Progressive" (Communist) is the Member for the Cartier Division of Montreal. His name is *Rose* (Rosen *geboren*).

General Spears, giving evidence against Zionism to the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine, said that the Zionists were introducing many of the most objectionable features of "Nazi-ism"—i.e., National Socialism. Now isn't that odd? Just like England in 1946! Do you remember how determined the Socialists were not to arm against Germany, and the steady pro-German Coalition underground between Bank "of England" policy, Dr. Schacht, and the Fabian P.E.P. contingent? Having "nationalised" the Bank "of England," it is now hardly necessary to keep it underground.

Mr. Randolph Churchill is commending the House of Lords to the patronage of the "American" public because it contains such Labour Peers as Lord Rothschild. In his opinion, "the House of Lords has learnt a great deal since it threw out Mr. Lloyd George's Budget in 1909, thus provoking a major constitutional crisis." In the language of what is obviously Mr. Churchill's adopted country, it sure has! That is why the Socialists prefer to tell it to "lie down, or else" rather than try to abolish it.

The *San Francisco Chronicle* of January 11 has a leading article in which it points out, "with no invidious intent," the obvious plagiarisms from Lincoln contained in Mr. Artlee's opening speech to UNO.

What interests us is that the leader-writer goes on to refer to "Britain's" greatest nineteenth century writer, by which Charles Dickens is indicated. Shades of Scott, Jane Austen, Anthony Trollope, not to mention Kipling. It would be absurd to deny to Charles Dickens the possession of ability of a high order—chiefly of the nature of social caricaturism. It is equally true that numbers of people are fanatically attached to him, and like Carlyle, Darwin, Marx, Wagner, and, in another sphere, Abraham Lincoln, he has been systematically boomed. The reason is not far to seek. His England, which never existed, or could have existed, was a synthetic composition idealising the lower middle class;

by implication placing the centre of gravity of the country in that class, and as a consequence inferring that other classes, and particularly the upper classes were parasitic and useless. This power of depicting an ideal out of all relation to reality is common to Carlyle, Dickens, Lincoln, and, in later days, Lloyd George. It has always been recognised by the World Plotters as an invaluable aid to World Revolution, and rewarded accordingly. We have previously referred to the dominance of the lower middle class in Hitler's National Socialist Germany.

It should be remembered that Dickens was the first editor of the powerful London newspaper, the *Daily News* an invaluable organ of Liberal Finance. It is absurd to suppose that the general nature of the disease afflicting society was not known to him; but he was outstandingly successful in directing attention to the pimples, (surrounded by a border of Christmas cards).

Notice in a Kirkaldy shop: "Never have so many been served by so few with so little."

The world's potentially most dangerous cartel is not I. G. Farben, but Schmueel Gilman's (Sidney Hillman) World Federation of Trades Unions. There is no argument which can be brought against monopoly of materials which is not twice as valid in reference to monopoly control of labour, and Alfred Mond, to whom monopoly was a much more potent God than monotheism, made no mistake when he endeavoured (was it only an endeavour?—ask Mr. Bevin) to combine a labour monopoly with that of essential raw materials. It is little short of miraculous that the true nature of Trades Unions has been successfully presented as beneficial, and, if there were no other indication to the contrary, the insistence of Big Business on Collective bargaining ought to have aroused suspicion. The obvious fact is, of course, that, under a cartel-monopoly combined with our insane financial system, wage increases mean little or nothing to the Managerial Kahal. They have no intention of paying dividends to the public in the future; and labour charges (wages) are merely costs to be passed on to the silly consumer in prices. Monopoly is all they care about; with monopoly, the world is theirs—they think.

If UNO survives long enough to take possession of its proposed headquarters on Long Island Sound, there is a funny spectacle coming to a jaded world. Whatever may be said of the Congress and Senate of the United States, it is not an enfeebled debating society like the House of Commons or a pale ghost such as the House of Lords, and the idea of being pushed into the position of a County Council by an upstart organisation peopled with what it will no

doubt call dagoes, will be viewed without enthusiasm. Taken all in all, the outlook for the World Parliament seems about that of a single bottle of whisky at a Highland Gathering.

There are over 8,000 officers and men in the *Occupation Headquarters Staff alone*, in Italy. Generals are two a penny. Do you wonder that we present a picture of a rich country every where but in "Britain"?

It really is difficult to withhold a certain kind of admiration for Sir Stafford Cripps. A man who will go round the country lecturing manufacturers and engineers on their own businesses, without the most elementary knowledge of either manufacturing or engineering other than that curious ability to simulate knowledge which is the stock-in-trade of every barrister, and will round off the performance by tackling Socialist workmen to work harder, because Nationalisation doesn't mean a thing, cannot be denied a certain greatness. As Dr. Johnson (Samuel, not Hewlett) said of the performance of the dog who walked on two legs, "the wonder is not that he does it so badly, but that he does it at all."

How long he will be permitted to do it before someone's self-restraint breaks down, is a question to which quite a short time may provide an answer.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: January 28, 1946.

BORNHOLM (RUSSIAN OCCUPATION)

Professor Savory asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the continued occupation by Russian forces of the Danish Island of Bornholm; and whether he proposes to make representations to the Government of the U.S.S.R. with a view to the speedy evacuation of this Danish territory.

Mr. Noel-Baker: Yes, Sir, my right hon. Friend is aware that Soviet forces are still on the Danish Island of Bornholm. He considers that the question of their departure is a matter for direct settlement between the Governments of Denmark and of the Soviet Union.

Professor Savory: Is the Minister aware that there is acute distress not merely in Denmark but in every Scandinavian country with regard to this violation of Danish neutrality, and is it not so urgent that the right hon. Gentleman should bring it before the Security Council of the United Nations Organisation?

Mr. Noel-Baker: If either the Soviet Union or Denmark had asked for our help or advice in any regard we should have been very glad to give it. I think we may safely trust the Danish Government to do what they think right.

Mr. Sydney Silverman: Will the Minister bear in mind that if it had not been for the Russian troops there would be a lot of German troops still occupying the whole of Denmark?

Vice-Admiral Taylor: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the immense strategic importance of the Island of Bornholm and that the continued presence of the Forces of a foreign Power in Bornholm must be a threat to peace, and will some action be taken?

Mr. Noel-Baker: No relevant consideration will escape our attention.

Mr. Pickthorn: Is not the last answer but one of the right hon. Gentleman, completely irrelevant with regard to Indonesia and Greece?

OUTER MONGOLIA (PLEBISCITE)

Major Digby asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the plebiscite in Outer Mongolia on the question of the future status of this territory provided for in the Sino-Soviet Treaty of 1945 has yet taken place.

Mr. Noel-Baker: Yes, Sir. The Soviet Press announced that the plebiscite in Outer Mongolia was held on October 20 last. It further reported that 487,409 persons had taken part, and that all of them voted for the independence of Outer Mongolia.

AUSTRALIA (BRITISH HIGH COMMISSIONER)

Mr. Scott-Elliott asked the Under-Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs whether, in view of the long time that has elapsed since the resignation of Sir Ronald Cross, he expects to be able to name a new British High Commissioner for Australia at an early date.

The Under-Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs (Mr. Parker): Yes, Sir. The question of making an appointment is under active consideration.

WOOLWICH ARSENAL

(COURT PROCEEDINGS, NULLIFICATION)

Mr. Hicks asked the Minister of Supply and of Aircraft Production if he will make a statement on the conviction, during the war period, of certain persons employed at Woolwich Arsenal, particulars of which he has in his possession.

Mr. Wilmot: Yes, Sir. I regret to inform the House that during the period 1941 to 1944, 77 persons employed at the Woolwich Arsenal were charged at the magistrates court and convicted, of offences against a Direction which was made under Emergency Powers by the Chief Superintendent of Ordnance Factories in January, 1940, but which had been revoked before the alleged offences occurred.

On the matter being brought to my notice I made as full inquiries as were possible so long after the occurrence. The mistake originated in a failure to notify the revocation of the Direction to the War Department Constabulary, who are responsible for policing the Arsenal. I reported the matter to my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department for his consideration. My right hon. Friend informs me that he has advised the court that the proceedings in question should be regarded as null and void, that a suitable entry should be made accordingly in the court's records, and that the fines should be returned to the persons concerned. It has also been decided to make an *ex gratia* payment to two of the three persons who were sentenced to three weeks' imprisonment. In the case of the third person, the question of an *ex gratia* payment does not arise, since he was properly convicted at the same time of an offence against the law and sentenced to a concurrent term of imprisonment.

I take this opportunity of expressing to those concerned my very deep regret for the occurrence. I am satisfied that the mistake is one which could not occur in normal times of peace.

January 29, 1946.

RATIONING

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Thomas Moore asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what is the total petrol at present in this country; the average weekly import; and the quantity required to double the present basic ration for all private motor-cars and motor-cars for hire.

Mr. Shinwell: As the answer contains a number of figures, I will with the hon. and gallant Member's permission, circulate it in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Sir T. Moore: What figures can there possibly be in those three simple questions?

Mr. Shinwell: The hon. and gallant Gentleman would be surprised.

Following is the information:

As regards the first part of the Question, I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the last paragraph of the answer I gave on December 18 to the hon. Member for Orpington (Sir W. Smithers).

Imports of motor spirit, which include military requirements, during the four months ended December, 1945, as published in the Trade and Navigation Accounts, were:—

	Tons
September	220,000
October	375,000
November	345,000
December	268,000

These quantities represent an average of 70,000 tons per week.

The present basic ration issued for all private cars and motor cycles represents an annual requirement of 530,000 tons, on the basis of cars now registered. If the basic ration were doubled it is probable that more cars would be registered and adjustments would also have to be made in the allowances granted for hire cars and taxis, allocations for which are on a different basis than for private cars. The additional requirement would therefore be considerably in excess of 530,000 tons per annum.

MANPOWER

Squadron-Leader Sir Gifford Fox asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury how far he anticipates that the number of persons in the Civil Service is likely to fall below the 600,000 level during 1946; what is the present approximate annual cost of the Civil Service after allowing for the recent increases in pay; and how this cost compares with that in 1939.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: I hope that substantial reductions in the number of non-industrial Civil Servants will be achieved during 1946. But I am unable to say whether the number will fall below 600,000 during 1946. As to costs I would ask the hon. Member to await the completion of the Estimates for 1946.

Sir G. Fox: There is no difficulty on earth. Is the Minister aware of the reception in certain areas of the recent announcement regarding the increase in pay of civil servants announced on the same day that the farm workers' application for increased wages was turned down?

COAL INDUSTRY NATIONALISATION BILL

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Cuthbert Headlam: ... The human element is entirely disregarded in this Bill, and I cannot understand why it should be expected that the miners will be perfectly content to carry out their work in a better spirit simply because they have got rid of the private owners. What is the difference, really, to them? When you come to think of it, what is the difference? Very likely the same men who have been employed in managing them for the last 20 years will be continuing to do so when the Bill is passed. Where else are you going to get all the managers for the pits? Are you going to find them from other activities? Has the Minister of Fuel and Power got a secret supply of these eminently capable and specially trained men? I have not heard of it. I cannot understand what is to be done with all the officials who are now managing the pits if they are to be kept in employment? Are they to be put out of employment? It is perfectly absurd to suggest anything of the kind. What does it really matter to the miners whether they are employed as State servants or as servants of private owners? The only difference I can see is that the managers when they become State officials may have greater authority over them than they had in the past. I believe that many miners in their heart of hearts fear that this may be the case.

Miners are quite ready to obey their leaders—I mean their own leaders—up to a point, but hon. Members who live in mining areas know very well that the power of the accredited leaders is nothing like what it used to be; and even if the accredited leaders are willing to accept this Bill and are willing to work with this new body that the Minister of Fuel and Power hopes to bring into existence to run the mines of this country, it does not, by any means follow, that the men are going to obey them. When Lord Sankey wrote his famous Report he advised that under the plan for nationalisation the right to strike should be limited. The three miners' members on that Commission and three Socialist Members wrote a separate report, which is sometimes confused with, or called, the Sankey Report. In this report they advocated the maintenance of the right to strike even if the mines were nationalised. I am perfectly certain that, when public ownership is established, when grievances arise in the mining industry, strikes will come, whether the union officials want them or not. I foresee exactly the same kind of thing going on after this Bill becomes law as is going on at the present time, unless the nature of the miners can be entirely changed; and I do not think any one will be able to do that.

I am opposed, therefore, to this Bill because I do not think it is going to meet the requirements. If I thought it was going to produce more coal or to make the miners more happy, if I thought it was really going to bring peace in the industry, then I should feel it very difficult to vote against it. It is because I am certain it is going to do none of these things that I shall go into the Lobby against it.

January 30, 1946.

COAL INDUSTRY NATIONALISATION BILL

Mr. David Eccles (Chippenham): ... There is a certain animosity for the State bred in our bones. How many of us would feel the same compunction about slipping some-

(Continued on page 7)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 15. No. 24.

Saturday, February 16, 1946.

Credit

There are two factors in the real life—the spirit, the culture—of a nation in which any real deterioration is ultimately fatal. The first is its spiritual credit, its integrity. And the second is its language, its contact with the rest of the world. Both are being fiercely, if insidiously attacked, now, in England.

An instance of the manner in which English words are becoming blurred in outline, the first and most dangerous symptom of decay, is afforded by a speech of Lieut.-General Sir Wilfred Lindsell at a lunch of the Engineering Industries Association on February 1 on the subject of "Government" surplus stocks. He said, "It had to be remembered that the surplus stores belonged to the taxpayer..." That is clear and unequivocal. He then went on to make nonsense of it by saying that the Government scheme was admirably designed to protect the interests of all parties—the general public, the manufacturer, and the distributor or retailer. "The manufacturer would like to see the surplus thrown into the sea, the retailer wanted the surplus stores in his shop windows for disposal," *i.e.*, sale. What Sir Wilfred did not say was that the one person whose interests received no consideration whatever was the person to whom he had just stated the property in question belonged. We have referred to the property thrown into the sea.

Now the simple fact is that all taxes are paid by individuals. Centuries of Jewish ingenuity have been devoted to cultivating the illusion that taxes are paid by "land," by "excess profits," by "corporations," *etc.*, so that an individual who *owns* land pays sums of money which are said to come from "ownership of land" (Schedule A) "occupation of land" (Schedule B), *etc.* Neither land nor industry ever produced one penny with which to pay taxes in money.

If "Government" surplus belongs to the taxpayer (as it does in equity) the manufacturer and the retailer, as such, have no legitimate interest in it whatever. If they wish to acquire an interest, they can legitimately do so by negotiation with the owner, the taxpayer. Who, in his right mind, ever consented to allow of the adjustment of his "interests" without requiring an account of what they represented, and on what principles they were being adjusted?

Nearly a year ago, we referred to a question asked by Mr. Kirkwood the Socialist Member for Dumbarton Burghs, in the House of Commons, in which he asked for an assurance from Mr. Churchill that "Government" surplus would not "be thrown on the market to cause unemployment." If Mr. Kirkwood were judged on the merits of that question and its implication, his proper place is, not in a legislative body, but in a School for those of defective mentality. But worse than the elemental foolishness in-

volved is the idea implicit in all Socialism and most Socialists, that any "association" whether a Trades Union, a political party, or a Socialist Government, inherits the Divine Right of Kings, and that the King can do no wrong. It was this Thing that Lord Hewart saw so clearly in *The New Despotism* and to which Kipling referred in his inspired lines *The Old Issue*:

Howso great their clamour, whatso'er their claim
 Suffer not the old King under any name
 Long-forgotten bondage, dwarfing heart and brain
 All our fathers died to lose, he shall bind again.

National Socialism

THE RIGHT TO CONTRACT OUT

The following Petition has been drafted and is being circulated over signatures of which the first is that of Dr. C. G. Dobbs, 21, Hampstead Hill Gardens, N.W.3., who will doubtless be glad to receive support and assistance from Social Crediters and others in London and elsewhere:—

PETITION

We, the undersigned, humbly petition our Sovereign Lord the King, whose loyal subjects we are; appeal to the House of Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, whose duty it is to be the Guardians of the wholesome traditions of this Realm; and require, as our just right, our representatives in the House of Commons, whose duty it is to serve us faithfully in such a matter; to protect all those personal liberties which we have inherited as subjects of the British Crown, and which the recent most grievous War against the King's enemies was fought to preserve.

We ask for ourselves, and for all others, rich and poor, freedom to choose, without pressure or coercion, financial, legal or in other forms, whether or not we shall participate in any National Insurance Scheme (including Health Insurance Scheme) which may be set up; that is to say, *freedom to contract out completely*, whether by exemption from all relevant taxation, as well as contribution, or by refund of the total amounts paid.

We would point out that if financial participation is *enforced* upon objectors, only those who can afford to refuse the benefits will escape subjection to the numerous conditions, penalties and interferences which are attached to the return to members of the community of their own money at time of special need, and which may be altered unilaterally by regulations from time to time.

We base our objection to compulsion in this matter also upon the following considerations (among others):

1. Insurance is a contract between two parties; but a contract which the weaker party (the individual) is not free to refuse, and in which he is compelled to accept whatever conditions may be made at any time by the stronger party (the State), is a tyrannous and immoral proceeding, and a travesty of civil justice.

2. Insurance is a contract willingly entered upon by free people only in proportion to their fear or expectation of financial loss leading to penury through sickness, accident, unemployment, old age, *etc.* It follows that the imposition of compulsory insurance upon all can only be justified if the Government expects so to conduct the affairs of the Nation that the fear of such penury will be, and will remain, great and universal.

(Continued on page 7)

The Political Problem

By C. H. DOUGLAS

It is a curious commentary on our carefully directed educational system that what is perhaps the most quoted phrase of that useful tool of international Finance, Abraham Lincoln—"Government of the people, for the people, by the people"—is an exposure and condemnation of Lincoln himself. What is a people?

The United States in 1861 consisted broadly of two Anglo-Saxon settlements, the "Yankees" or new Englanders, in the North, the descendants of the bitter Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Settlement, and the Southern landowners, very much of the George Washington type, the Lees, Randolphs, the cadets of many Scottish Lowland families. Hereditarily, these were a "people" in any usual sense of the word. The rest of the population was an undigested mass of Dutch, German, and Mid-European elements, the disappearing "Red Indians," and the negro slaves.

It is only necessary to contemplate these unquestionable facts to be convinced that Lincoln's words are "a tale told by an idiot, all noise and fury, signifying nothing." Two parts of the only recognisable whole led the two sides of the American Civil War: Lincoln's actual policy (*i.e.*, the policy of which he was the visible executive) contradicted almost every one of his spoken statements—as for instance, his declaration that any country had a right to secede if it had the power—and a cold analysis of his most publicised apothegms indicates that they can bear any meaning which it may appear desirable to read into them.

If the orbit of the ideas for which Lincoln's verbiage was supposed to be the expression were bounded by the North American Continent, they might be left to work out their true meaning, as they are doing to-day, on the graveyard of the noble redskin. But of course, they did not originate in America, and they are not confined to it. Lincoln's travesty of "Democracy" is the sheet anchor of the Supreme State; *vox populi, vox Dei* is the travesty and blasphemy of the Immanence of Good; and Tool Power Politics is the Incarnation as manifested in the Coming of the Prince of This World, the False Messiah.

Nothing is more remarkable in matters of politics than the sheer inability of even thoroughly honest and well-intentioned people to realise the consequences of their opinions.

There are as many definitions of "democracy" as there are men; yet, in fact, as has been admirably expressed in an Australian Broadcast, the key to democracy is to reduce a problem to the limits of interest and understanding of those concerned. That is to say, democracy is not so much a question of the mechanism of voting (although that is not of negligible importance); but rather a rigorous exclusion of matters for which the franchise is too wide: and at present the number of persons who think they understand everyone's business, but cannot manage their own, would suggest very simple electoral issues.

It is not too much to say, I think, that anyone who cannot grasp this simple idea, or, having understood it, will not admit its validity, is unworthy of a vote and is a public danger if in possession of it. In the light which it throws upon the limitations of democratic theory, it is perfectly

understandable that the condition of the world in general and Great Britain in particular has deteriorated in proportion to the extension of the ballot-box plot. No one would give a child of six a ten-pound note, turn him loose with a box of matches in a firework shop, and tell him to set off the pretty rockets. But that is exactly what has been done by giving the initiative to an uninstructed—worse, a mistaken—electorate, and allowing it to provide something claimed to be a mandate to interfere in the business of everyone having "a vested interest."

There are many matters which require attention; but interference with them will only deliver us from bad to worse until we can admit that power without understanding is the tool of the Devil. There is only one worse thing than the fool in politics and that is the technical expert who knows everything about his business except its legitimate object. We have often miraculously survived the former; but the latter shows signs of writing our epitaph.

Population

It is the purpose of this note to draw attention to the probable importance of certain psychological factors in connection with the decline of the birth rate in Western Europe.

The rise and fall of populations, animal or human, is a matter of great biological interest and in recent years much effort has been devoted to attempts to determine the causes of variation in numbers. In general, the theories which have been elaborated are based upon a materialistic philosophy. For example, the extraordinary increases in the number of voles, mice or lemmings which have been observed periodically in different parts of the world (including Great Britain), and which may constitute such a menace to human food crops have been put down to (a) the naturally high reproductive rate of the species in question, (b) favourable meteorological conditions in successive years and (c) the weakening of natural checks upon the rate of increase (*e.g.*, the destruction of predatory animals). In the course of two or three years the numbers of some species may increase beyond the point at which the population can be maintained by the available food supplies. The individuals become undernourished and in the over-crowded conditions prevailing diseases which are latent in the population become epidemic and destroy vast numbers so that the population is reduced to a low level again.

The late Professor Raymond Pearl carried out some experiments with the well-known banana fly, *Drosophila*. He prepared a closed environment represented by a large milk bottle containing banana-mould as food supply. He then introduced a pair of flies and studied the growth of the population which developed. He was able to show that the population number-time curve which he constructed was identical in form with the curve representing the growth of the human population of Western Europe during the last century. From this he drew the conclusion that the chief factor influencing the growth of human (as all animal) population, was the food supply: that whenever some advance was made in the technique of food production so that the available supplies of food were increased the population might be expected to grow until a saturation point was reached again: that thereafter numbers would decline or remain stationary.

Most politicians to-day would probably consider these

theories largely true. We are told that people do not have children at the present time because of the cost of bringing them up, or because the advent of a family would restrict the freedom of the parents. Parents prefer a baby Austin in the garage to a baby Bill in his pram, and so on.

But even in the case of lower animals it is simply not true that the provision of an adequate food supply is followed by an increase in the reproduction rate. It is well known to all who have had experience that the domestic cat can only on very rare occasions be induced to breed while living in a cage whatever the food supply. The animal demands a very considerable measure of freedom of movement. Until recently the common hedgehog had never been bred in captivity. It is found, however, that if the animal is provided with a certain rather large minimum of space and with a dense cover in the form of undergrowth it will breed: *i.e.*, it will only breed in conditions resembling its natural habitat.

It is a far cry from mammals to birds, and it is only with extreme caution that any hypothesis based upon the study of birds should be applied to higher mammals. Yet certain aspects of bird behaviour do find a close parallel in the case of mammals. For example, many birds have a well-developed territory sense (that is, at certain seasons of the year, the male, or the pair, claim a certain territory as a feeding ground and drive all intruders of the same species from it); and this has been found to be a characteristic of many mammals and of man in the food-gathering stage of culture. A few years ago Dr. Fraser Darling, the Scottish naturalist, when studying the behaviour of certain species of sea-gull was struck by the curious way in which new nesting colonies were established. Large colonies existed on certain islands off the mainland coast, and these colonies tended to establish off-shoots on smaller islands. The particular birds in question, gulls, exhibit a certain pattern of social behaviour involving both the males and the females in groups as the breeding season approaches, and this culminates in nest-building and egg-laying. In some spots a number of gulls would, in certain seasons, seem to be about to establish a colony. They would work out much of the pattern of activity preceding egg-laying, including nest-making, but no eggs would be laid in that season. In the next year this group would reappear in the same spot and be joined by others. Only when the group reached a certain size did the pattern complete itself by egg-laying and the rearing of young. It appeared that the production of offspring was a *social act involving the activities of individuals other than the parents.*

From a very remote period in the history of man we have evidence that forms of activity which had no obvious connection with the business of food getting because of great significance to him. To take only one example, the cave-paintings of southern France and northern Spain would seem, in view of the immense care lavished upon their production, to have been of considerable importance to the men who made them. In recent times it has been possible to observe, up to a point, the integration of the various kinds of activity which men engage in to form a cultural pattern. For various reasons it has been possible to do this more successfully among peoples who are commonly termed primitive. Dr. W. H. R. Rivers in his classic studies of the populations of Melanesia was able to observe the effects of the disintegration of such a cultural pattern

upon the reproduction rate of the community. The impact of European culture upon the peoples of Melanesia had curious consequences. Many features of the simpler culture, for example, head-hunting, seemed revolting to the European of the last century. By the use of superior force such customs were suppressed. But, as Rivers pointed out, such customs were not isolated, they influenced every detail of the daily life of the community. The building of the war canoes, the gathering of provisions for the voyage, the performance of the succession of magical ceremonies considered appropriate to every stage of the preparation took up a large part of the year and provided a motive for the life of each individual. When all this collapsed, the natives lost interest in life and ceased to reproduce. Many of them told Rivers they did not want to produce children just to work for the white man. A spectacular depopulation of Melanesia resulted. There is no doubt that other factors were involved but Rivers ascribed the greatest importance to the loss of interest in life.

There is much information available concerning a great decline in population in another and more complex culture, that of Rome under the Empire. All authorities are agreed that from about 70 B.C. up to about 300 A.D. the population of Italy was dwindling rapidly. How far this reduction was compensated by the importation of slaves, is a disputed point; but there seems little doubt that the native Roman and Italian population died out and was replaced by a population of non-Italian origin. The evidence on this point is accessible in numerous standard works. A useful summary is presented by M. P. Nilsson, *Imperial Rome*, 1926.

We need not for the moment consider the causes of this decline in population. What is of importance for our present purpose is to see how measures based upon the materialistic approach to the problem failed, and how like they are to the measures proposed to-day to deal with the same problem.

Under Augustus, attempts were made by legal enactment to limit luxury and reduce the frequency of divorce, to limit adultery and protect chastity. Augustus imposed severe penalties upon celibacy and assigned precedence in offices of state to married men with children. The parents of large families received special distinctions and preferences, and the children were subject to certain special disabilities in connection with legacies. Augustus also founded the Alimentary Institutions, organisations which assumed greater importance under his successors. They originated as municipal funds which were augmented by state grants and private gifts, which served to provide corn and money for the maintenance of a certain number of children. Nerva, in the last years of the first century, expanded these funds, so that they could maintain the sons and daughters of all poor people in Italy. Trojan attempted to make the funds serve a double purpose by ordering them to be invested as mortgages on landed property at 5 *per cent.* (a low rate for the time). In this way he hoped to foster native agriculture as well as support needy children. Further he burned the records of the heavy arrears of taxation which had accumulated, in order to raise the standard of living. The Institution spread under Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, but finally disappeared in the fourth century owing, it is said, to the fall in the purchasing power of money.

It would appear then that economic factors could not

be primarily responsible for the decline in population, since neither self-interest fostered by the legal privileges attached to the family man, nor financial bribes and the transfer of responsibility for the care and maintenance of the children to the state, sufficed to increase the number of children.

This period, comprising the first three centuries of our era was a period of rapid change in Rome. The influx of foreigners from the newly acquired provinces of the Empire produced a ferment of ideas in Italy which led to a destruction of the old republican culture. The way of life changed completely, and the responsibility of the various classes for the maintenance of certain fragments of the total cultural pattern was destroyed. It would seem likely that a careful examination of the writings of the men of the period might reveal a certain psychological dissatisfaction, or sense of some incompleteness in life which as one of its manifestations led to an unwillingness to produce children.

It is likely too that psychological disturbances of this kind would be more likely to develop in those who are most conscious of the cultural pattern of their civilisation. To-day it is the middle and upper classes of Western Europe who mainly fail to produce children. Significantly enough among the professional classes the clergy alone still produce large families. Is this evidence of the mental culture which deep religious conviction can confer upon the individual?

A decline in the numbers of that portion of the population which is most conscious of the total cultural pattern is inevitably followed by the total disintegration of the culture, since the culture of a society is an organic *whole*, no part of which can be destroyed without involving all other parts. So in Imperial Rome if the assumptions already made are sound, the disturbance of the pattern by influences entering from without led to the failure of reproduction in those classes who alone might have preserved the culture. In Western Europe to-day the same phenomenon is manifesting itself. Christian culture is disintegrating as those who transmit it from generation to generation decline in number. Again if the assumptions made earlier are valid, once the process has advanced beyond a certain point it is impossible to arrest it. Certain elements of the older culture may be incorporated in the new; but a new culture there must be, and a process of adaptation of the individual to it must occur, before it can maintain itself. This process of adaptation of the individual to the culture of which he is a part raises issues of a complex nature, the consideration of which cannot be undertaken in a single article.

H. H.

THE PETITION

(Continued from page 4)

3. We note that in the National Insurance Bill (Clause 5) exemption is to be allowed to those whose income is not over £75 a year. This means that the extremely poor, who cannot possibly pay the contributions, will be excluded from the benefits; which disposes of the contention that all alike must be made to contribute in order to provide freedom from want for all.

4. The idea of compulsion applied to State Insurance is completely alien to the British tradition of freedom and responsibility. It came, as did other forms of totalitarian thought, from Marxism to Nazism, from our recent Enemies, and was increasingly applied in the German State from Bismarck (1883) to Hitler. In this country it has been persistently propagated by certain agencies, which have also

been permeating the Government and the Civil Service, and have been working to undermine the Sovereignty of the Nation as well as of the individual. The best known of these agencies are the Fabian Society, the London School of Economics, and P.E.P.

5. At a most critical phase of the War, the Beveridge Report, a document having obvious connections with the above agencies, was produced at the taxpayer's expense, and a favourable view of its main proposal, compulsory State Insurance for all, was imposed upon the public mind by overwhelming propaganda, including compulsory lectures for the Services, at a time when effective opposition was impossible. It is admitted that the Government pressed this propaganda upon the public as a War measure intended to stimulate morale.

6. At the General Election 1945, by agreement between the Party Leaders who had previously been colleagues in the Coalition Government, no opportunity was given to the electors of returning a Government not committed to compulsory State Insurance. It follows therefore that no mandate has been, or could have been, given in favour of it.

7. Even had such a majority mandate been given, at a time when public opinion had not been biased by one-sided propaganda, it would confer no right upon a Parliament to infringe the personal liberty of any minority. In the case of military service, when the State is in danger, exemption is allowed in all cases of genuine objection, based upon moral convictions, although the arguments in favour of compulsion are much more powerful than they can possibly be in the case of National Insurance, which is not a matter of desperate emergency.

We declare, therefore, that, bearing in mind the nature and origins of *National Insurance*, and the way in which it has been, and is to be, imposed upon this people without freedom of choice, we regard it as an immoral and unjust piece of legislation, liable to bring the Law into contempt, and repulsive alike to the British tradition and to the Christian Faith. Accordingly we desire to have no part in it whatever, and we call upon all loyal subjects of the King to join us in exposing the facts of the case, to exert themselves to obtain freedom for all to contract out of National Insurance (including Health Insurance), and to press for the Repeal at the earliest possible moment of any legislation which may infringe freedom.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

through the Customs or leaving out a little item from our Income Tax return as we would about deceiving a private person? The fact is that it is folly to found an economic policy on a change in human nature for which no warrant exists in experience, and that is what the Socialists do, because they wish to introduce their system into a free society. Apart from a handful of idealists whose existence I have admitted and whose devotion I admire, ordinary British men and women will not worship at the altar of the State or tumble over each other to serve unselfishly a monopoly of political creation. Rather will they try to extract from that monopoly a whole series of benefits and advantages which a weakening loyalty and loosening discipline will make them think are theirs by right. That has already happened and it will happen still more.

What will the minister do then? He will have two choices in front of him. He can make the public pay. He can resort to high prices for coal and coal products or to subsidies by the taxpayers. In this way he can bribe the coal industry with earnings out of line with the rest of the community. He has said that he will not do that. Very well, then, he is driven along the other road. He will be forced to impose controls and directions over labour which will make the Essential Work Order look like freedom. There is no third way to bolster up an inefficient monopoly. Either he must rob the consumer or conscript the worker. us would feel the same compunction about slipping some—I am not going to forecast to which of these two choices the right hon. Gentleman will first be driven. . . .

February 4, 1946.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN (TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS) BILL

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby): . . . It is perfectly clear that, under Clause 2 (b), if I, as an individual citizen with the right to sue, say, the Minister of Works, have, as at the date when the Order is made under this Measure, begun proceedings against the Minister of Works, I may continue those proceedings, against the Minister to whom the functions of the Minister of Works are transferred. On that I am quite clear, and I imagine the hon. Member opposite would be clear also. What I am not clear about is this. Suppose I had an appeal against the first Minister, the Minister of Works, and some of his functions are transferred to—

The Solicitor-General: The hon. Member is wrong.

Mr. Brown: No Minister shall have the temerity to say that I am wrong, until he has heard the end of my argument. If he does, there is the possibility of violent conflict between us. I am perfectly clear. What I want to know is this. Suppose I, as John Citizen, have a right of action against the Minister of Works in respect of certain functions he now exercises. If his functions are transferred to the Minister of Health, against whom, at the moment, I have no right of action, and I want to start an action after the date of the Order, will the Solicitor-General assure me that I, as a citizen, will have the same rights against the Minister of Health, in respect of those functions, which have been transferred from the Office of Works, as I would have had, if these functions had remained with the Office of Works. Behind this point, which does relate to Clause 1 (b) and Clause 2 (b), there is another very important matter with which I hope the Solicitor-General will be able to help us. It is the question of regulating generally the situation with regard to the right of the citizen to deal with the Crown. I hope I may say, without being out of order, that these difficulties show the necessity for the very early introduction of the Crown Proceedings Bill which deals with the right of the subject *vis-à-vis* the Crown.

The Solicitor-General: The question raised, I must repeat, does not in any way relate to Clause 2, but I do not want, in answer to what the hon. Gentleman has said, to give him merely a narrow answer. I will, if the Committee will bear with me, answer the question he has raised though it does not come under this Clause. As he is aware,

some Ministers are made expressly liable in tort, some are not. It is impossible *a priori* to give an answer which would fit all circumstances but generally speaking, the position would be this. Supposing a Minister, who by statute is liable in tort for actions committed by those persons who act on his behalf, commits a tort or a civil wrong against a citizen and, thereafter, the function in the exercise of which he committed the tort, is transferred to some other Minister, the right of action in respect of that tort would continue to exist against the original Minister who committed the wrongful act. That would be, I should say, a correct statement of the law, generally speaking. But I must repeat that it does not arise out of this Clause which deals only with names.

Mr. Brown: I am quite clear that if a Minister has committed a tort in the past I can still proceed against him, even though, under this Bill, his functions have been transferred to someone else. What I want to know is this. Suppose the new Minister commits a tort next week, after the introduction of this Bill, shall I have the same rights against him as I have had against the other before the functions were transferred?

Hon. Members: Answer.

The Lord Privy Seal (Mr. Arthur Greenwood): May I say a word? We are dealing, in this Clause, with a change of title. Suppose we were, in our wisdom, to change the title of the Minister of National Insurance to "Minister of Social Insurance"—which was the title I should have preferred in the last Parliament. That is all that is dealt with and therefore legal proceedings would continue under the latter title. It is quite irrelevant to deal with the question of the transfer of functions. Hon. Members have been a little slow on this. We have already passed Clause 1 in Committee, and I suggest that it is wholly irrelevant to bring it in now. The right time to raise the point would have been on Clause 1. In Clause 2 we are dealing with a narrowly confined problem, and I suggest that the Committee must appreciate that point. I am sorry if hon. Members have "missed the bus" but we really cannot alter irrelevance into relevance.

Mr. Brown: The Front Bench are going from bad to worse. Clause 1 (b) provides for the possible transfer of functions from some Minister to others. That Clause has been passed but what is now being raised is quite different. Granted the exercise of the powers under Clause 1 (b), is the effect of the transfer to be to take away the rights of some members of the public?

DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT: BELFAST GROUP

A PUBLIC ADDRESS
in Grand Central Hotel

Tuesday, February 19 at 7-30 pm.

Subject: Internationalism.

Questions and Discussion.