

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 17. No. 17.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

## Incorporate Knowledge

*"When the triple world is surveyed by the Bodisattva he perceives that its existence is due to memory that has been accumulated since the beginningless past, but wrongly interpreted."—LANKAVATARA.*

The above quotation taken from among the invaluable collection presented by Mr. Aldous Huxley in his latest book, *The Perennial Philosophy*, serves admirably to support the contentions I feel bound to raise concerning Mr. Huxley's own attitude. Further, it has a very definite bearing on a matter which, for lack of a better title, I called historic reality in a recent article in these pages. What I say here does not purport to be a review of Mr. Huxley's excellent book, which deals with the recorded fruits of men's search for Reality (God) throughout the ages. What I have to say is quite separate. For the book, I simply recommend it as a magnificent anthology, and more than an anthology, as a literary work; for if, as has been said, Art is selection, then here is one of the finest to be met.

I am not, however, a reviewer in the strict sense of the word. Carrying with me, as I always do, this unanswered query as to the persistence of the prevailing economic blindness, I tend rather to treat all writers of any weight who come my way, particularly if they are influential and popular, as phenomena, exhibits to be analysed, in the hopes of discovering the cause of it. That, however, is not the spirit, in which the author, as artist, likes his work to be approached. But Mr. Huxley, who wields very considerable influence all over the English-speaking world as a thinker and writer, must be prepared for a very close scrutiny of what he has to say on this most vital and important subject, that of man's view, his picture, of reality and the meaning of the universe, and of his own position in relation to it. In the process of his construction Mr. Huxley quotes from many of the world's searchers after Reality, East and West, from Confucius and St. Catherine of Siena, to the Seventeenth Century Englishmen, Thomas Traherne and the Quaker, William Law. As might be expected, these provide stimulating reading. Why, then, is the net result so ineffectual and impractical as it is; so unsympathetic, it almost seems, to the present plight of Christendom, in which, presumably, Mr. Huxley is personally involved, and which every thinking individual feels so keenly?

Perhaps the finest chapter in his book is that on Charity, in which Mr. Huxley defines it as understanding. Yet in his opinions and deductions regarding the immediate universe he, himself, appears to me surprisingly uncharitable, and—what would naturally follow—lacking in sympathy and understanding. I will give one excerpt so that those who read this journal can judge for themselves. "Our present economic, social and international arrangements are based on organised lovelessness. . . . We begin by lacking

charity towards Nature, so that instead of trying to co-operate with Tao, or the Logos . . . we try to dominate and exploit it." That is only too obvious and true. But Mr. Huxley does not stop there, he continues and mounts through "mass-production" and "minority-capitalism", and his plaint swells into a personally-directed diatribe. Where, oh where has charity gone—that cosmic, historical charity, that is so much needed—and love, and understanding? "This coercively controlling minority is composed of private capitalists and government bureaucrats." It produces, among other things, "exploitation of coloured minorities; coloured majorities governed by minorities of white imperialists; hatred of Jews, Catholics, Freemasons, or any other minority." And the culmination of all this iniquity and its source, is to be found in the axiomatic assumptions of national sovereignty "that it is right and natural for national organisations to behave like thieves and murderers." All of which is what Stuart Chase calls "blah", not thought, but vain repetition. Neither true, nor untrue, but entirely unauthentic.

In fairness to Mr. Huxley it must be said that the proportion of that sort of thing in the book is negligible, and might well be ignored, did one not sense a subtle extension of this uncharitable fractiousness of spirit to cover the whole of what might be termed Christianity—a word, by the way, in dire need of definition—in its phenomenal sense. In his introduction, in speaking of the sources of his quotations, Mr. Huxley writes: "Unfortunately, familiarity with the traditionally hallowed writings, tends to breed, not indeed contempt, but a kind of reverential insensibility, a stupor of the spirit, an inward deafness to the meaning of the sacred words. For this reason, when selecting the materials to illustrate the Perennial Philosophy, as they were formulated in the West, I have gone almost always to sources other than the Bible." I know exactly what he means. I myself have the same intellectual impulse, and for the same reason, and yet I have invariably found that in proportion as I get down to bedrock in a subject, the sheer necessity to resort to the Gospels becomes more and more compelling. There is a feeling almost as though one were coming down to matters that had been only once, and perhaps once for all, adequately dealt with. Mr. Huxley, however, succeeds almost completely in his resolution to avoid the Gospels, as I had occasion to note some time ago did Dr. Temple, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, in his "Christianity and the Social Order," which dealt with the collective needs of a Christian society from Professor Harold Laski's (for him not unnatural point of view) that Jesus of Nazareth had nothing of outstanding value to say on the subject. Here, unexpectedly enough, the official Anglican Church man, and the Contemplative Philosopher, and the political Jewish Professor are all in agreement, and all, from the Social Credit point of view of economic reality, equally wide of the mark. On this subject surely their minds are not free? They are bound

and sick slaves to a syndicated formula, and their sickness is shared by the whole of Christendom today.

As I attempted to show in my previous article\*, the cause of this sickness is to be found in the fact that Western society has lost touch with the realistic basis of its own era, which however partially and indifferently projected it may have been, is the Christian Era—an historical period, ushered in by an historical event of the first magnitude. The significant fact for Mr. Huxley is that embodied in the title of his book, that the object of religious effort and thought all down the ages has been the same—to discover the nature of Reality, God, and the correct relation to it of the individual consciousness. I agree in the significance of that. But, in spite of the feast of fine Christian quotations he provides, he leaves no doubt in the mind of his readers that his preference, like that of Intellectualist Bloomsbury generally, is with the East, rather than the West. In his opinion, what he calls Historic Christianity is responsible for our present discontents, and he finds the Eastern exponents of the Perennial Philosophy the wiser counsellors. They have never advocated persecution, and their direct advice has led to comparatively little bloodshed; whereas Christianity, on the admission of its founder, was from the first destined to promote lethal scrapping, or its modern equivalent, the firing squad. I find him rather obsessed with the historical record of Christianity—so to speak, primed with it—just as so many intellectuals are, with the record of British Imperialism. But where Eastern philosophy is concerned he is careful to quote the warning of the native authority Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, “that Buddhism is not history, but a process forever unfolding in the heart of man—that matters of historic fact are without religious significance.” If that is true—and in a sense it is profoundly so—why is it true of Buddhism and not of Christianity? Is Mr. Huxley, as undoubtedly Professor Laski is, biased *against* Christianity? And if so, why?

It appears to me that there can be no road to Truth except that of facts (knowledge) correctly interpreted. The whole applicable body of facts we call natural science is an historical record of the behaviour of organic or inorganic matter, *correctly interpreted*. As Francis Bacon confidently foretold, the material results of this inestimable acquisition have beaten belief. The same conditions must surely apply with equal force to the progress of events we call history, which consists of records of human behaviour. That it has not produced similar results suggests—as indeed the quotation at the beginning of this appreciation states to be the case—that it is the interpretation that has always been at fault. And the secret of that correctness, as Bacon made quite clear, depends on the spirit of the approach to one's subject. In laboratory research this is known as “the scientific spirit,” and consists ultimately and simply in an open mind. “In the West,” Mr. Huxley writes further on with illuminating candour, “the mystics went some way towards liberating Christianity from its unfortunate servitude to historic fact,” adding as a qualification, that he doesn't mean real events, but “. . . various mixtures of contemporary record with subsequent inference and fantasy . . . which have been accepted as historic fact.” All which means that, in company with the great majority of modern Christendom, not excluding the Churches, saturated as it has been with the Judao-Marxist dialectic, he does not accept the gospel story

as history, any more than he accepts Christianity as an advance on the philosophy of the East.

What is it, I keep asking myself, that is at the root of this aversion from Christianity? Is it not an avoidance of Reality itself? Does it not show an entirely unrealistic preference for a half-world of thinking without being, and a refusal to attempt to fuse them into a single whole? For in his heart every thinking individual knows that the road to Reality lies by the way of reconciliation, the tangible reconciliation within himself of two apparent incompatibilities. This requirement is at the core of every conceivable problem, individual or collective, and constitutes the reality of what Christendom terms the Incarnation. For incarnation is the “historic fact” of every system of philosophy, East or West—Mr. Huxley acknowledges that when he says, “All knowledge is a function of being.”—The fact of a reconciling consciousness embodied in an individual, and the tangible fruits of that inner harmony expressed in action and the events of a life. It is my guess that the lives of the Eastern philosophers were not so challenging as was that of the precipitator of Christianity; just as that of Socrates was not. But the difference is one of degree and not of kind; degree of completeness of incarnation, of approach to Reality. In the case of Jesus of Nazareth, this approach was so nearly absolute as to produce a phenomenon of such real simplicity as to present a particular problem to the sophisticated mind. “Except ye become as little children . . . !” It was never easy; but surrounded as we are today by such a multiplicity of material distractions and educationally stuffed so full of undigested data, we are in serious danger of becoming incapable of the childlike simplicity which Christianity demands, and which I have come to see as the only possible basis for realistic and constructive thought. Here, from Mr. Huxley's book, is Augustine's formula for living, “Love, and do what you like.” It really is as simple as that!

But how is our Hollywood-educated youth to achieve it?\*

Mr. Huxley describes the popular ox-herding pictures of the Zen-Buddhists a kind of strip-series in which the wild ox, representing the unregenerate self, is caught and made to change its direction and gradually transformed from black to white, until it disappears altogether. Ultimately the herdsman returns riding his ox: “Because he now loves . . . to the extent of being identified with the divine object of his love, he can do what he likes, because what he likes is what the Nature of things likes.” In short, we see the restoration, for which Francis Bacon laboured, of “that commerce between the mind of man and the nature of things, which is more precious than anything on earth.” And as heaven is difficult of approach for the rich by reason of the multiplicity of their trappings, so it can be difficult to the student of philosophy because of his excess of mental furniture. The problem is one of digestion; to load the table with more dishes in the modern manner, no matter how good, only increases the

\* *Dilige et quod vis fac*, love and do what you will, is taken from the Augustinian commentary on St. John, (vii. 8). The later, popular, version, *Ama et fac quod vis*, love and do what you will, enforces our contributor's point. He remarks that ‘love’ is a nearly ruined word. “Love demands a subject, and the understood subject is Truth, Reality. To esteem [*dilige*] (i.e., to be able to judge of) Reality and choose it is to be safe. ‘Perfect love casteth out fear’. It is certainly hard to see how such judgment is to be learned from Hollywood.”—Editor.

\* *The Social Crediter*, No. 2, Vol. 17.

general dyspepsia. I have long harboured the suspicion that all, and more than all, we are presently, or perhaps ever, capable of knowing—and by that I mean incorporating—has been thought and recorded long ago. And this book of profound and sustaining sayings only reinforces my conviction. Mere intellectual consciousness can do no more. Theoretically, the world has been overcome. It seems as if the end has been reached; for it is a fact that philosophers repeat and repeat and never vary in essentials, while dissatisfaction continues unmitigated, and global wars break out, and Reality, and even common sense, seem to be in almost total eclipse. I feel grateful that my reading has been so comparatively limited, and so excessively narrow and concentrated as it has been; particularly so when I find an individual of Mr. Huxley's intellectual stature, so at a loss and as it seems to me, so irritably frightened and inconsequent, when it comes to applying his philosophy to current problems. I have stated by belief as to the reason for this. In the current psychological jargon, it amounts to an anti-Christian complex. Somehow this has got to be overcome. Is it a problem for Social Crediters, I wonder? If philosophic man cannot face Christian realism, how can economic man be brought to face economic realism? Or is the first attained by way of the second? —N. F. W.

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 5, 1946.

### Exchange Control Bill

*Lieut.-Commander Gurney Braithwaite (Holderness):* . . . We on these benches feel that the scope of those permitted to act as authorised depositaries should be widened. I gave one instance last night of the City Safe Deposit. I think that is a reasonable example, and the proviso in the Amendment moved by my hon. Friend last night would enable the Government to deal with this matter on a rather broad basis. I hope the Solicitor-General has now had time to give this matter a little further consideration, and I hope he will agree that to confine these duties to the banks would not be the most satisfactory method of dealing with the subject.

*The Solicitor-General (Sir Frank Soskice):* . . . This Clause is so drawn as to enable the Treasury to prescribe any other institution other than a bank as an authorised depositary, if it seems good so to do. They are not excluded. There is a power to include any other institution which it seems proper to include. All I say is that the authorised depositaries which those responsible have in mind as the natural institutions are the banks. They certainly would be suitable . . .

[Later]:

*The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Dalton):* . . . Those who are holding securities for others and who are not bankers are only a small number; certainly there is not a numerous aggregate of them. It is a rather specialised function and I am still inclined to the opinion that the majority of people who hold securities, keep those securities, including bearer securities, at their banks. However, the matter is not worth any heat at all, and I am quite prepared to look into it and see whether we could devise some rather wider category. . . .

### Hospital Staffs (Trade Union Membership)

*Mr. Boyd-Carpenter* asked the Minister of Health what action he is taking to prevent the breakdown in hospital services threatened as a result of the action of the Willesden Council in directing that all nurses of that hospital who do not join a trade union will be dismissed.

*Mr. Byers* asked the Minister of Health what steps he proposes to take now to make good the deficiencies of doctors, nurses and other staff who refuse to comply with the demand of local authorities that such persons should join a trade union on pain of dismissal and to prevent a breakdown of health services.

*Mr. Bevan:* I hope that there will be no such breakdown. I am sending a circular to local authorities pointing out that their primary duty as health authorities is to maintain the efficiency and smooth running of their health services and to ensure the welfare of the patients for whom they are responsible. All other considerations must be regarded as secondary. While I am anxious that doctors, nurses and members of similar professions should join a trade union or appropriate professional association, this is a matter which should not be determined by unilateral action of local authorities.

*Mr. Byers:* May I ask the Minister if we can take that as an assurance that the Government deprecate the action—which can only be described as irresponsible—of local authorities in these matters at a time when the nursing and medical professions are so short staffed?

*Mr. Bevan:* I think that the answer I have given is sufficiently clear and we do not now want to exacerbate feelings. I certainly hope that there will not be a repetition of the incident.

*Mr. W. J. Brown:* Is the Minister aware that his reply will be received with immense satisfaction by everybody who has both the welfare of the health services and the welfare of the trade unions at heart, and may I ask him to do his best to see that a similar lead is given whenever the necessity arises?

House of Commons: December 6, 1946.

### Agriculture (Legal Action, Cost)

*Sir E. Graham-Little* asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he will now give the figures for the expenditure, in addition to the sum of £500 paid for damages, incurred by the defendants in the action *Odlum v. Stratton*, and defrayed by his Department.

*Mr. T. Williams:* Mr. Odlum's solicitors have not yet submitted their bill of costs and consequently it is not possible to state the total sum payable by my Department in respect thereof.

House of Commons: December 9, 1946.

### Locomotives (Output)

*Mr. Scott-Elliot* asked the Minister of Supply what was the total output of locomotives in each of the first three quarters of 1946; how many of these were allocated for use at home and how many exported; and, in view of the needs

(continued on page 6)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*  
*One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.*  
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 17. No. 17. Saturday, December 28, 1946.

### From Week to Week

As our readers have probably gathered from previous comments, we attach more importance to the question of wine and spirit supply and distribution than might be expected from Social Crediters. The basis of this interest is primarily inductive.

Anyone can confirm, by a little investigation, the association of (a) Puritanism with the attack on "wine-bibbing", associated with the Cavaliers, and the wholesale corruption which ensued; (b) the very dubious Wilson Administration with Prohibition and with the attack by some of the most mischievous elements in British inter-armistice politics on the use of "alcohol"; and in each case, enormous fortunes were amassed by the twin devices of monopoly and bootlegging or black-marketing, with their disintegrating social effects.

There is room for much more elaboration on this aspect of the question; but at the moment, we wish to concentrate on the flagrant scandal of Scotch whisky. There has been too much crocodilian lachrimosity from the distillers, their Trade Associations, and their agents, the wine and spirit merchants, who have made immense sums without the necessity to adjust themselves to the ordinary difficulties, or even courtesies of business, and whose only anxiety, obviously, is that the present happy position, in which they dispense their wares at fantastic prices, as a favour, may not be permanent. There is collusion with the authorities; and it should be exposed.

Experience ought to have taught us that nothing breaks an economic racket so quickly and effectively as a buyers' strike, and we offer the following preliminary suggestions:—

In every district and club an *ad hoc* group should organise a demand that either (a) The export of whisky should be totally and publicly prohibited until the home demand is met; or (b) Distilling should be finally and permanently prohibited, the distillers closed down and the whole of the stocks both in bond and with spirit merchants bought by the Ministry of Food *at cost*, and auctioned to overseas buyers in public, the sums realised to go to the reduction of income tax.

At the same time, the duty on foreign wines and spirits should be reduced, and they should be sold direct from bonded stores.

We are absolutely confident that a serious effort along these lines would produce an astonishing improvement in the psychology of the whisky trade and the lot of consumers; but if undue recalcitrance is shown, we can suggest further measures.

This matter has nothing whatever to do with "temperance" or otherwise; it is stark political racketeering.

Amongst the inveterate enemies of the British in India, and the channel through which a good deal of the seditious propaganda against us has been financed and distributed are the Birlas, Hindu millionaire textile manufacturers, and the Tatas, Parsee steel and hydro-electric monopolists. The latter have been the most venomous, and have been intriguing with Wall Street for fifty years at least.

The Tatas have concluded an agreement by which they become the local producers for Imperial Chemical Industries—I.C.I. The first Communist M.P., Shapurji Saklatvala, was a cousin and *protégé* of the Tatas, and a born intriguer.

The Birlas are taking over the local production of a large British automobile cartel. They probably control the so-called Congress Party.

Americans are exempt from British tax on business profits, dividends, tax on interest paid by a British firm, 50 per cent. of tax on rentals, and no surtax, royalties similarly except for films, which are totally exempt, salaries for first six months, and death duties.

The effect of this is to more than double earnings of the debts paid to U.S., to increase British costs without contribution to British revenue and to provide more than 50 per cent. preference to American "capital" in this country over that provided by the British investor.

There is a small amount of reciprocal provision which would have been substantial if the Americans had not taken care to acquire practically all our U.S. interests before "agreeing" to the arrangement.

It is clear enough that Mr. Churchill, and his unseen supporters, are angling for a coalition again, and it is important to realise that the intention is to transfer the Mond-Turner Conference into the Governmental, as distinct from the industrial, sphere. It is this intention, to which the so-called Conservative Party evidently subscribed in 1931, which explains the incredible ineffectiveness of the present Parliamentary Opposition, and the clear intention to confine criticism of the Socialists to mild lack of praise for their administrative ability.

We have no doubt of the fatal defects of the Party idea; it is one degree less vicious than the totalitarian state to which Mond and Churchill turn in preference to it. But to suppose that there is only a choice between these two seems to be estimating the public even more contemptuously than its present apathy would warrant. But perhaps not.

Amongst the organisations in the U.S.A. known to be controlled from Moscow are: American Friends of India; American Committee for Indonesian Independence; Episcopalian Church League for Industrial Democracy; Jewish Peoples Committee; American Committee to Free Spain Now; American Committee for Spanish Freedom; North American Spanish Aid Committee; Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. Strachey is going (?) to Bermuda for Food Talks. There are few pleasanter places at this time of year, and as it caters mainly for Canadian and American millionaires the cooking is superb.

After all, the weather of the last few days in London has been very unpleasant, and one never knows how long a good thing will last, do you.

Before leaving, he kindly diverted half-a-pint of milk per week from the umbrella handle trade to the humble home, so that we shouldn't fret for him while he's away.

Mr. Emanuel (God with us) Shinwell says that telling you the current will be cut off, and then cutting it off, is not rationing. He also says it has nothing to do with the miners or the coal output but is "shortage of plant." So, you see, if we had more electrical generating plant and more boilers under which to burn more coal, the miners would produce more coal. Just like nationalisation, in fact.

But we still await an explanation of the main puzzle. We are generating nearly double the output of 1938 and at least half-a-million house and shop consumers are either without premises or using much smaller buildings. It is probable that the load factor is worse than in war-time but the domestic load can hardly be much greater than is counter-balanced by the drop in military camps and many other wasteful war-time uses. What is happening to the load? What are we making, and who is getting it?

When, if ever, the true history of these times comes to be written, there can be no doubt as to the feature which will mystify the writers of it. It is the surrender, without the consent, so far as we are aware, of Parliament, and certainly without the knowledge of the people, to a nearly anonymous body in Washington, known, we believe, as the Food Board, of the food supplies of these islands. The thing is so amazing that it beggars description. There has never been anything remotely approaching in its history, except perhaps Joseph's corn racket, and to say that the negotiators of the arrangement for and on behalf of Great Britain deserve instant impeachment for High Treason is not an opinion, it is a simple consequence of the definition of treason. We have been sold to the enemy, and are at the mercy of a bloodless war in which our conquerors do not need to lose a man.

We can quite imagine that those extraordinary exhibits with whom we were cursed during the period in which the Oxford Union voted not to fight for King and country, and Mr. Attlee informed the Labour Party that their loyalties were to neither, suppose that they are showing a superior sense of world politics, but we feel fairly sure no American, still less Mr. Bernard Baruch, would agree, although the latter would do everything possible to encourage them in their belief. It has not taken eighteen months to demonstrate that the United States has every intention of reducing us to an inferior status to that of the Philippine Islands. Whether the ultimate idea is to force us into the outstretched arms of the Bear, or alternatively, to fight one more war for the benefit of Wall Street is not yet clear. But 1947 shows every sign of resolving the dilemma.

These notes are not written for political illiterates or we should repeat more often the statement we have frequently

made, that there are two United States, just as there are two clearcut populations of these islands, Great Britain and "Britain." But it is, nevertheless not easy to indicate the line of demarcation, because it does not follow any traditional classification, least of all a political party label, and even such a word as "Socialist" or "Communist" does not allow for the high percentage of delusion which would be dispelled under strain. What has to be borne in mind is that "Wall Street", "Russia" and the "B.B.C.-London-School-of-Economics" and "Christian Civilisation", "Decency" and "Self Respect" have no geographical boundaries, and in the very nature of things, the central control which characterises the first group, is *apparently* paramount at this time.

We are inclined to believe that the senseless repetition of Central Electricity Board warnings of voluntary breakdown of supply is part of a technique to train the population to take its orders purely on faith from the "B."B.C. Why anyone should substitute a certainty for a possibility of going breakfastless by shutting off the cooker, takes a little more explaining than has so far been vouchsafed. How many times has the supply to the Cartels been curtailed?

## ODLUM v. STRATTON JUDGMENT

(Royal Courts of Justice, July 29, 1946.)

Before:

Mr. JUSTICE ATKINSON.

(Publication of this Judgment will be continued next week.)

### Social Credit Library: Change of Address

Members are asked to note the change of address of the Library:—

**Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.**

### "The Times" and the Canadian Report

*The Times* of December 5 contained the following under the heading "December Reviews: Russia, India and China": ". . . The *Nineteenth Century* reprints in full Mr. Churchill's address to Zurich University, 'Let Europe Arise'—said to have been imperfectly reported in the Press. Another document is quoted in full summary for a similar reason. This is the disturbing report of the Royal Commission on espionage in Canada by officials of the Russian Embassy and Canadian Communists."

### Correction

T.S.C. page 4, column 1, December 14: the last line of the column should be deleted, while the previous line should read: standard of living and an increase in exports; and also . . .

## PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

of the British railways, if he will consider making a greater proportion of locomotives available for home use.

*Mr. Wilmot:* As the answer contains a number of figures, I will, with my hon. Friend's permission, circulate it in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

*Following is the answer:*

The output of steam locomotives from railway and privately owned shops combined was 164 in the first, 220 in the second, and 181 in the third quarter of 1946. In the first quarter, 63 were for the home railways, 13 for home industrial firms and 88 for export; in the second quarter, 87 were for home railways, 21 for home industrial firms and 112 for export; in the third quarter, 74 were for home railways, 13 for home industrial firms and 94 for export. As regards the second part of the Question, I would refer my hon. Friend to the reply which I gave to the hon. Member for Orpington (Sir Waldron Smithers) on 26th November.

House of Commons: December 10, 1946.

**Export Receipts**

*Colonel Crosthwaite-Eyre* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the total balances of hard and soft currencies, respectively, earned by this country through exports in the first 10 months of 1945 and 1946, respectively.

*Mr. Dalton:* With permission, I will circulate in the OFFICIAL REPORT figures of our estimated receipts from exports to certain groups of countries in the first six months of 1945 and 1946. Figures for the third quarter are not yet available.

*Mr. Gallacher:* When the right hon. Gentleman is circulating the details in the OFFICIAL REPORT, would he consider circulating to Members a sample of the hard and soft currencies?

*Following are the figures:*

ESTIMATED RECEIPTS FROM EXPORTS AND RE-EXPORTS  
OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

| Country                       | 1st half,<br>1945<br>£ millions | 1st half,<br>1946<br>£ millions |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| U.S.A. ....                   | 18                              | 22                              |
| Canada .....                  | 11                              | 14                              |
| Central and South America...  | 8                               | 17                              |
| Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal | 3                               | 17                              |
| Sterling area .....           | 93                              | 192                             |
| Rest of world .....           | 35                              | 97                              |
| Total* ...                    | 168                             | 359                             |

\*Excludes exports and re-exports to Germany or on account of U.N.R.R.A.; excludes exports of equipment, etc., from U.K. to British companies operating abroad; includes diamonds.

**National Health Service (Scotland) Bill**

*Sir John Graham Kerr* (Scottish Universities): The Bill now before the House is not, of course, a product of Scotland, nor on the other hand is it a product of that great host of selfless people who constitute the main health service of our country at the present time, the ordinary general practitioners. It is, in fact, a replica except in detail of the English Bill which was before the House some months ago. It is the product of diligent Bill artificers, working in the murky

recesses of a Whitehall office. The right hon. Gentleman, in an eloquent speech in introducing the Measure, referred to his desire to keep the best of the past, and perhaps I may be pardoned if I say something of that great past, and something of the history of such things. Great Britain, in the past, has occupied a leading position in the progress of medical science, and some of the brightest stars that shine in the firmament of medical history have shone from universities and voluntary hospitals of Scotland. I should like to speak at some length on that glorious history of British medicine, but there would be a revolt on the part of my fellow Members if I did anything of the kind.

Perhaps I may be allowed to say a few words, and recall one or two points concerning a particular section of medical history, namely, surgery. The historians of surgery, all over the world, divide that history into two parts, firstly, the dark ages of pre-Listerian days, and, secondly, the development in the whole field of modern surgery. Scotland played its part, even in the Dark Ages. Was not the very first text-book in English, upon surgery the work of Peter Lowe of Scotland; and did not operative surgery in those dark days rise to great heights under Liston and Syme of Edinburgh? These pre-Listerian workers were terribly handicapped. Even the simplest operation in those days meant a deadly danger to the individual operated upon. All hospitals were infested by the microbes which give rise to what were called hospital diseases—hospital gangrene, erysipelas and so on. To get onto the operating table, even for a simple operation like an amputation, meant a very serious probability of death. All that was changed by the work of a young professor in the University of Glasgow, working in the wards of its great voluntary hospital, the Royal Infirmary. It was that great man Lister who was able to see beyond the work of Louis Pasteur, who showed how putrefaction and fermentation was due to living microbes. He was able to see beyond that work and visualise the microbic cause of hospital diseases and indeed of all kinds of wound infection. He tackled the problem, and he worked it out with some of his great assistants like William MacEwan of Glasgow. The result was the foundation of modern surgery. Without this marvellous development, there could not have even been contemplated those complicated abdominal operations which are now an everyday occurrence, and which have jerked many persons back from the very edge of the grave. I might have gone on at length on this subject, and I might have spoken about other aspects of medical science, such as obstetrics in which again, Scotland gave a great lead; and medicine too in the restricted sense. One of the great divisions of medicine is that which comes under the name of "tropical medicine," of which the very founder is acknowledged to be Patrick Manson, who hailed from the University of Aberdeen.

What has all this to do with the Bill before the House? It has a great deal to do with it, because these great figures, these great leaders in medicine and surgery, were the inspired teachers of the generation of doctors that was to come. The success or failure of any enactment, however good or bad, is tremendously influenced by the character of the men who have to carry its provisions into effect. We have at present the very finest material coming into the science of medicine. I know something about that, because among the 7,000 or so students who passed through my laboratory, were to be found those belonging to practically every one of the faculties, except perhaps law. I have not the least hesitation in

saying that it was the medical students who were the pick of the whole lot.

It is sometimes said that the young man is an idealist, and that he is attracted into a particular profession by his ideals. That is not my experience of the young student. He is a thoroughly practical young person. He is looking ahead, and he tries to feel that there lies before him something great by way of a career. This is the raw material which is coming forward, but what about training? It is the leaders of the professions who are at present doing that training in the voluntary hospitals. Why do they do it? It is because they realise that if they take a teaching post, even if it is an honorary post, in a great hospital, they will have the opportunity to inspire the students they train, and they will be paid back, indirectly, by forming a great clientele of practitioners who will come back to consult them later on. It is worth while at present for the great leaders to play that part in teaching, and it is worth while for the able young men to enter that profession. The type of man who goes into a university, or other school of medicine, and, later, into the profession, is not the type of person who is interested in a salaried service, in which promotion goes merely by seniority. He is a young man who is ambitious, who has a good idea of his own capacity, and who will only go into a profession in which he thinks there is a fine future.

Before I sit down, perhaps I might correct, or modify, one point. I have been speaking of the great voluntary hospitals as being the laboratories in which leaders of the sciences such as Lister, in the Royal Infirmary, Glasgow, are carried out. But we must not forget that all over the country there is a vast amount of modest research being done by the ordinary country practitioner. The ordinary general practitioner, perhaps with the aid of his local cottage hospital, is working away quietly and modestly, doing work which, in the aggregate, is of the greatest importance. I would quote one case, that of Edward Jenner, a general practitioner in a great dairy district in Gloucestershire. He had the wit to look beyond a remarkable fact, namely, that dairymaids do not die of smallpox. He saw beyond that strange fact, and he invented vaccination, which has not only been adopted in every civilised country in the world, as a remarkable preventative of a disease which in the old days was so deadly but, has, in its turn led to immunisation which today protects us from such other diseases as cholera, typhoid and diphtheria. Edward Jenner made that great step in the science of medicine and public health and I would recall that he, unlike many in more recent times who have rendered great services to our people, did not go without any financial recompense from the Government of the day. He was given, I think, £30,000 for his services. I will go on no longer, except to say that in the few words I have spoken there has been perhaps the hint that I consider that if the Bill before the House is passed into law, it will become one of the greatest disasters to the health of our people.

*Lieut.-Colonel Elliot* (Scottish Universities): . . . I would beg the right hon. Gentleman and the Under-Secretary of State to devote their attention, if they will, to the point that they are here erecting orthodoxy into a system into which it will be impossible for unorthodoxy to break through. . . .

. . . The hon. Gentleman, my colleague in the representation of the Universities, referred to the great advance which had been made in the University of Glasgow, with which the hon. Member for the Gorbals is also well acquainted—his

own brother being a distinguished student. In those wards experiments were carried out by Lister in the teeth of medical opinion of the time. When Lister came to London he was greeted with every kind of abuse and contumely. That is the history of advance. . . .

. . . The danger is not that we shall not have research. We shall, but we may get differing interpretations of research and certainly the orthodox interpretation is not always the right interpretation but is very often the wrong one. That is the danger of frozen systems such as that which we are clamping upon medical education and medical practice in Scotland. It has been mentioned by more than one hon. Member—and by the right hon. Gentleman himself—that the hospitals of Scotland train a third of the doctors of this island—one of our greatest invisible exports, medical skill. But then the right hon. Gentleman says that because of that it is difficult to fit our hospitals into this scheme. "Well, then," he said, "so much the worse for the hospitals. Let the scheme go through; we will jam the hospitals into it." Might he not have thought of the other thing? If the hospitals are difficult to fit in because of their very orthodoxy his case for—

*Mr. Westwood*: In my consultations I have reached complete agreement with all the authorities I have consulted—universities, doctors, local authorities—and that so far as that side of my hospital proposals are concerned, the only objectors have been the representatives of voluntary hospitals.

*Lieut.-Colonel Elliot*: The right hon. Gentleman is proving my case. He says that all the orthodox people agree with him, but it is the rebels he has to consider. Where are they? That is the question of officialdom and bureaucracy in every age.

*Dr. Morgan* (Rochdale): Is the right hon. Gentleman now pretending to say that unorthodoxy is found in the voluntary hospitals? Is it not rather the case that the voluntary hospitals have become absolutely the home and basis of orthodox medicine?

*Lieut.-Colonel Elliot*: Surely, the hon. Member for Rochdale (Dr. Morgan), who himself has been a rebel in his time, knows that it is not to the people at the top that one looks for rebellion, but to the people below. I am saying that the Government are making an arrangement by which it will be impossible for the rebels to find any space or any access to the great systems of medicine or treatment which this Bill purports to set up. I know that many other hon. Members wish to speak on this Second Reading, and I do not wish to take up too much time, but let me simply quote as my last word the provisions under which the distribution of doctors is to be effected, and under which some people seem to think more doctors will be provided although, as the Secretary of State has rightly said, these are not provisions for producing more doctors but for putting a brake upon the distribution of those who are already here. Read the Seventh Schedule of the Bill which says:

"1. The Scottish Medical Practices Committee shall consist of a chairman, who shall be a medical practitioner, and five other members of whom three shall be medical practitioners actively engaged in medical practice.

2. The chairman and members shall be appointed by the Secretary of State after consultation"—

"consultation," let it be noted, not "agreement"—

"with such organisations as the Secretary of State may recognise as representative of the medical profession.

3. The Secretary of State may make regulations—

(a) with respect to the appointment, tenure of office and vacation of office of the members of the Committee;

(b) for the payment to members of the Committee of remuneration or travelling and subsistence allowances.

4. The Secretary of State may provide the services of such officers as the Committee may require.

5. The proceedings of the Committee shall not be invalidated by any vacancy in the membership of the Committee or by any defect in the appointment or qualification of any member thereof."

We might add to that final statement that there shall be no appeal from a decision of the Secretary of State. . . .

*Mr. Niall Macpherson (Dumfries):* . . . I turn now to the question of the private citizens' approach to his medical practitioner. What are the ordinary citizen's requirements of his doctor? First, I should say is availability of doctors; secondly, sympathy; thirdly, skill; and fourthly, privacy. With regard to availability, the Bill will not increase the number of doctors or dentists. The White Paper states that the Bill imposes no limits upon availability, but, in fact, it imposes very practical limits, and I want to mention some of them. It reduces the doctor's time for attending to patients. There will be an immense number of regulations, and forms to fill up, and there will be many more doctors engaged on administrative duties.

. . . There will be a great deal more routine work for doctors. Far more will be employed in administrative duties. Let hon. Members look at the Schedules and see how many doctors will be involved in executive councils, boards of management, and so on. Moreover, a salaried service is being set up. I would like to quote from a letter that I received from a doctor, which says:

"The Bill takes away all incentive to become a good, or even a conscientious doctor. A wholtime salaried doctor, being a human being, will be no better and no worse in the matter of work than any other wholtime salaried officer. There is no doubt that he, too, will demand his eight-hour day and will down tools when the clock strikes the eighth hour each day. At the worst, he will not bestir himself to answer an emergency call out of hours; at the best he will not bestir himself mentally, and the standard of medicine throughout the country will fall to that of other totalitarian countries."

. . . That is a doctor's opinion on this matter. He is not a very old doctor, and has not very long been out of the student stage. Let us now consider the question of sympathy. With regard to the very important point about the choice of doctor, I would like the Joint Under-Secretary of State to say something about that in his reply, since it is not clear in the Bill and the White Paper. It is obvious that the doctor can choose his patient, just as the patient can choose a doctor, and there is also, of course, an arrangement with the executive council whereby a patient may be directed to a particular doctor. What is not said is whether the doctor is then obliged to take that patient.

*Mr. Gallacher:* Does the hon. Gentleman suggest that a poor working-class resident in the East End of London can choose the doctor he wants?

*Mr. Macpherson:* I do not see the relevance of that interruption. A poor working-class man can change his doctor, and I doubt very much whether, under this Bill, that will be possible. There seems to be no provision for it. There is a prevailing idea—and it is a very good one—that medicine is a calling and not a career, but once it is made a salaried service, there is bound to be all the normal wire-

pulling of a career. There will be doctors place-hunting and seeking promotion, and this will destroy the relationship between the family and the doctor.

There is also the very important question of privacy. Health centres are to be set up. There is a great deal to be said for clinics in which doctors may be in partnership and each of them specialise in some aspect of medicine. Perhaps, in Scotland, we are not quite as advanced in that respect as other parts of the country, although I believe that Aberdeen, in this as in many other things, is very well advanced. Surely, the privacy of the patient will be mightily affected in several ways. He will go to the health centre, which, incidentally, will not be under the local authority, but one of the services provided by the Secretary of State. Probably he will have a medical history card filed away, with no guarantee that it cannot be seen by eyes that he would not wish to see it. The only eyes that he would wish to see his medical history card would be those of his own doctor, but once there is a medical history card, it may be called for on all kinds of occasions. Surely, it is a natural instinct, when one is sick, to crawl into a corner rather than to go round to a great public place for health services.

Lastly, with regard to the executive councils, I agree fully that there is far too much control throughout by the medical profession. The person who is really interested, and should have the control, is the patient, through his local authority, and, if you like, through an advisory council. . . .

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

|   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| The Brief for the Prosecution .....             | 8/6                 |
| Economic Democracy .....                        | (edition exhausted) |
| Social Credit .....                             | 3/6                 |
| The Monopoly of Credit .....                    | (reprinting)        |
| Credit Power and Democracy .....                | (edition exhausted) |
| Warning Democracy .....                         | (edition exhausted) |
| The Big Idea .....                              | 2/6                 |
| Programme for the Third World War .....         | 2/-                 |
| The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket ..... | 2/-                 |
| Money and the Price System .....                | 7d.                 |
| The Use of Money .....                          | 7d.                 |
| The Tragedy of Human Effort .....               | 7d.                 |
| The Policy of a Philosophy .....                | 7d.                 |
| Security, Institutional and Personal .....      | 6d.                 |
| Reconstruction .....                            | 6d.                 |
| Social Credit Principles .....                  | 1½d.                |

### ALSO

|  |      |
|--|------|
| The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart .....                  | 21/- |
| Secret Societies and Subversive Movements<br>by Nesta H. Webster ..... | 20/- |
| The French Revolution by Nesta H. Webster .....                        | 10/- |
| The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster .....                   | 7/6  |
| The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster .....                        | 5/-  |

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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