

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 18. No. 11.

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

SATURDAY, MAY, 17, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

Panic Legislation II.

by NORMAN F. WEBB.

In the first part of this critical article dealing with Mr. Robert Ardrey's book,* which outlines his scheme for an industrial Commonwealth, I indicated that an attempt would be made in another article to analyse the thought processes by which he arrived at it. It is worth trying, for the conclusion he comes to, and I feel sure without any conscious attempt to do so, constitutes what amounts to a completely Closed Shop for the whole of the United States, and by implication for the world, as the new dispensation—the World's Beginning of his title—to replace a run-down Capitalism. In the process we might, too, discover why Socialists who all deplore the excessive centralisation of power represented by Big Business and Cartelism, cannot be got to support any project—particularly that of Social Credit—for decentralising power.

To serious-minded social students today, Society appears to be without aim or direction or sense of going anywhere. What the contemporary world seems to lack, and what these semi-earnest searchers are trying consciously or unconsciously to find is Purpose, the impulse behind co-operative activity. To find that, or rather to discern the reason for its almost complete absence, requires time and patience and quiet confidence. But all about them they see modern society visibly running down, and feel acutely the threat to all of us of its faltering economic functioning, and their faith is overcome by a sense of panic, and dries up prematurely, causing them to abandon the object of their search, which was the principles of human motivation, and give their busy, and potentially mischievous minds to devising *means*—plans really, and inevitably compulsive—in place of their search for *ends*, i.e. the Truth, the true facts of the matter. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness . . ." They fail in the economic field because they have never straightly asked themselves the crucial question, What is the end of Production? let alone of Life.

Before anyone can begin to lay down any economic rules, he needs to be quite sure in his own mind as to whether the object of functional association is *primarily* moral and disciplinary, a means of social correction, and therefore a code administered by a governing bureaucracy or priesthood, such as is unquestionably the Judao-Talmudic concept of the Socialist Work State. Or on the other hand whether it is not in the first place intended to be naturally and individually satisfying in the broadest sense, consumptively, creatively, expressively, and only in a secondary sense disciplinary, which is the Christian concept.

This brings us right back to Adam Smith and his axiomatic statement, "The sole end of production is consumption," which, like so much else with genuine Anglo-Saxon, or Christ-

ian ring, is for some reason anathema to all Left Wing intellectuals and economists. No better definition, however, of the reason why men co-operate functionally has been forthcoming; for a comprehensive and satisfactory answer to that question is not easy, since it must include at least a suggestion of its own impulse. It has, so to speak, to be self-acting, like the description of the fruits of the earth in the Creation, "whose seed is in itself." This statement of Adam Smith's is fundamental to Social Credit. But Mr. Ardrey, and those like him,—an outstanding, and yet typical example was the late Archbishop of Canterbury,—well-meaning Socialists, who look, without any justification at all, for the effects of individual freedom to spring from the coercive causes they espouse, cease to probe the problem, or to use their brains long before they reach this point. As I said, their faith and their patience prematurely desert them, and they begin to listen to the voice of the tempter, audible everywhere up and down the land, on the air, in the press, and even in their own hearts, with that ceaseless propaganda against their brothers' and neighbours' integrity, his independence and privilege.

In the prevailing circumstances there is only one thing to be done, and that is to fight ourselves free from the influence of this pervasive mental pressure in favour of *compulsion*. Whoever exercises it, the idea is Judaic and not Christian, and it is to be found always in association with the concept of Production as primarily for *control*—the philosophy of Cartelism,—and only in a secondary degree for consumption and increment. If we yield to that pressure, no matter how we dogmatize about individual and democratic freedom, all we do makes inevitably for further restriction, and every step we try to take towards what we want, leads inescapably in the opposite direction. In the case of Mr. Ardrey and his story, this frustration is peculiarly noticeable. What he sets out to achieve in his Trans-Pecos Commonwealth is a free-running impulsive economy, in which the individual will *feel* impelled, instead of having to be compelled, to participate. But owing to the "socialisation" of his thinking and his consequent prejudice against individual ownership and its entirely logical projection in joint stock enterprise, he allows himself to come to the shallow and premature conclusion that identifies legitimate thrift and investment with Cartelism and the evil desire for control which inspires it, as the arch-enemy of a functioning economy. And so we find his Commonwealth ingeniously designed to liquidate the independent investor and create a society of wage earners. This hasty and panic-stricken closing of the mind—loss of Christian faith—leads inevitably to the Communist condemnation of the idea of Private Property, which has been the theme-song of Left propaganda ever since the French Revolution, to go back no further. And so we progress, by declension, to the condemnation also of independence and leisure, which have always been the goal, declared or undeclared, of every aspiring individual. For the spur and

*"World's Beginning," by Robert Ardrey, Hamish Hamilton.

impulse of almost all worth-while creative and productive effort, which experience shows can be effectively stimulated by no other means, is the prospect of some day being in a position to do what we like to do, which constitutes the only tangible evidence an individual can get in this world of the success of his activities. There lies the direction in which is to be found the motivation, the Purpose, for which Mr. Ardrey is in search, but owing to his biased and hasty conclusions, it is just that stimulation that he is tempted—as are all Socialists,—to destroy in his project.

As we saw, it was George Davis's idea in the story, by continuously paying out all the investors of the Trans-Pecos Chemical Commonwealth at the end of five years, to keep his organisation independent and self-financed by its own active members. The case was specific, but as I pointed out, its general application to society in conditions that required above everything a dispersal and dilution of power, could only have one result, *i.e.* that of ultimately merging *all* political and functional power and control in one immense national, or more likely international cartel, in which the powerless individual must either participate (work) or else starve. For since the legitimate investment market has been effectively liquidated, he has lost his one chance of becoming economically independent through savings, and therefore of being in a position to contract out of the Industrial machine should he so wish. Multiply the Trans-Pecos Commonwealth set-up to cover all Industry, as Mr. Ardrey envisages in his story, and the individual citizen whom he set out to make free and independent, and responsible, is left without any choice at all; and what freedom there can be without choice only Mr. Ardrey and the Socialists know! One is not suggesting that Mr. Ardrey consciously harbours any such diabolical plot against the individual. The diabolism is inherent in the inverted line of thought he has adopted—or been persuaded by the prevailing Socialist propaganda to adopt—with its envious condemnation of Property and of the Dividend as the symbol of leisure and independence.

Social Crediters, on the other hand, approaching this same problem that exercises Mr. Ardrey and all well-meaning Socialists with him; that of the return of power and responsibility usurped by the cartels to the individual, from the opposite and Christian angle, and in an open-minded and scientific spirit, see in this concept of the dividend, which it is the inevitable impulse of Socialism to tax out of existence, the hope of individual freedom. And since it is not the Work State, but the Leisure State, that is their aim,—or rather the State of increasing leisure and freedom, and decreasing organised function,—instead of nationalisation of industry in its aspect of jobs and wage-distribution and the elimination of the thrifty individual stock-holder, they advocate the nationalisation of the dividend (the National Dividend) and the progressive replacement of the wage-earner by labour-saving machinery as the solution of the social problem.

Again, Mr. Ardrey under the influence of Socialistic thought, confuses functional and political power; the mere irresponsible exercise of delegated control over one's fellows, with the free and responsible ordering of *one's own* life within the natural limitations imposed by the similar needs of one's neighbour. Infected by the prevailing confusion of thought on this matter, he sees the individual member of his Commonwealth controlling his own destiny as he conceives it, dismissing inefficient bosses and department heads,

and deciding productive policy. But that, as we have seen, is a complete mis-conception of political power—which is the only power that is of any spiritual value to the individual, as such—and its identification with an altogether baseless pseudo-democratic “right,” supposed to belong to everyone and anyone, to interfere in technical process; really, the ridiculous claim to regulate and alter the natural laws of physics, which it is the function of the trained technician to translate and canalize for the benefit of society. *It is this wholly false idea of power, the bureaucratic delirium of coercive functional control, that actually constitutes the sickness of modern society and the threat to this present age.* And it is the effects of it, in only one of many directions that are already beginning to be felt in the post-war shortages of commodities.

Within the limitations of the natural law, *i.e.* the conditions inherent in any situation, to have any real claim to the control of their own destiny, individuals must, as Douglas says, be free “to choose or refuse one thing at a time.” And whatever else that axiom may lead to, or whatever else it may demand in the working out, its minimum requirement is a technically functioning productive system and a national dividend, without which freedom in any real sense can only be sectional, or non-existent. This basic condition Mr. Ardrey's ingenious Commonwealth does not fulfil. Starting out, in spite of its author's marked protestations to the contrary, in a reformative, instead of a truly analytical spirit, it arrives inevitably at a universal compulsive work-or-starve economy, fundamentally similar to German totalitarianism and Judao-Russian Communism, in which the State represents a merging of all political and economic rivalries and alternatives in one huge monopoly or Cartel, from which the element of individual choice is entirely eliminated.†

It can hardly be said, then, that Mr. Ardrey, for all his imaginative ingenuity, has solved the socio-economic problem; unless, that is, we regard Germany in the past tense, and Soviet Russia potentially, as having done so. I fear Mr. Ardrey, no more than any other Utopian, has got to the truth of the matter—the Truth that was, and I firmly believe is, to make us all free. But, for all that, his story is immensely interesting, if for no other reason than that it shows how the outer defences of the High Financial fortress are crumbling, and economic realism, at least in secondary matters, gaining ground. There are passages in the book that make one feel that all the author lacks is to find and read the book *Economic Democracy*. And then again others, when one wonders if he has not already met it, and come, or been persuaded, to the conclusion that it does not suit his personal requirements, or possibly, that time is short, and the risk too great. In most cases it is panic that

†Incidentally, one might legitimately add to the above two systems what is known loosely as Capitalism as represented during the last century by the Manchester School and in this by American Free Enterprise, as long, that is, as it persists in functioning in a world of increasing mechanisation with no radical alteration in its accepted method of price-fixing. For without such changes in national cost-accountancy as are advocated by Douglas, the Socialist jibe flung at Capitalistic Free Enterprise, “Yes, freedom to starve,” is, in practice at least, unanswerable. Admitting those superficially opposed, but fundamentally similar systems—Prussianism, Sovietism, and (unreformed) Capitalism,—it is interesting to observe that each of them connotes a geographical civic point; Frankfurt, Moscow, Manchester, New York, which either has been, or is, a focus of Jewish political and financial, and mercantile activity.

induces us so readily to devise or endorse plans to put our neighbour under restraint; for that it what Socialism amounts to, the impossible attempt to put everyone else under restraint to work for us and, incidentally, society as a whole. So that, however sincerely in theory Mr. Ardrey may desire power and authority for the individual, in practice his ingenious Commonwealth proves to be only another way round to the Judao-Socialist Work State, popularly known as the Planned Economy, so sedulously propagated everywhere today. Inevitably it is the negation of individual freedom; for it is the fruit of a nihilistic political philosophy, without faith in the future or admiration for the past, and profoundly suspicious of, and opposed to, Christianity; one that utterly ignores the injunction to "Consider the lilies of the field . . .", and whose ideal Provider comes much nearer in conception to Mr. Montagu Burton and his mass-produced "ensembles", than to the God of the New Testament, "who so clothes the grass of the field . . ."

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: April 30, 1947.

Cooking Fats

Mr. Joynson-Hicks asked the Minister of Food what does standard cooking fat consist of; whether he is aware that it has a tendency to turn blue and explode when used for cooking; and what steps he proposes to take to improve its quality.

Mr. J. Strachey: Standard cooking fat consists of soft vegetable oil, palm kernel oil and hardened whale oil. The palm kernel oil makes it a little more liable to spit in the pan but has to be included because of the extreme shortage of soft oils. The hon. Member may rest assured that everything possible is being done to improve the supply of soft oils, for instance, by the East African Groundnut Scheme.

Mr. Joynson-Hicks: Does not the right hon. Gentleman consider this most unmannerly conduct on the part of standard cooking fat? Will he take steps to try to improve it so that it does not spit in the pan?

Mr. Gallacher: Is the Minister aware that the hon. Members on the other side are likely to turn blue and explode tonight?

Mr. Keeling: Would the Minister say whether he can guarantee any cautionary interval between the fat turning blue and starting to spit?

Mr. Scollan: Is it not the case that this fat is supplied by I.C.I.?

Mr. Strachey: Not in all cases.

Mr. Drayson: Would the right hon. Gentleman agree

COMMUNISM IN ACTION:

A documented study and analysis of Communism in operation in the Soviet Union.

Prepared at the instance and under the direction of Representative Everitt M. Dirksen of Illinois. United States House Document, No. 754.

Price 2/- (Postage 2d.)

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

that a little palm oil is a feature of all Socialist administration.

Mrs. Manning: May I ask my right hon. Friend, in the interests of good cooking, whether the vapour that comes up in the pan between the fat turning blue and spitting in the pan is a real indication of the heat of the fat, or is it a spurious vapour?

House of Commons: May 1, 1947.

Electricity Undertakings (Coal Ash)

Mr. Stanley Prescott asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether his attention has been directed to the Annual Report of the Central Electricity Board and the statement that freight handling charges of inert material in coal, together with subsequent ash handling charges, resulted in an annual financial burden on the supply industry and consumers of over £2,000,000 and a loss in output capacity arising from the use of inferior coal of 380,000 kilowatts; and what steps he is taking to remedy this position.

Mr. Shinwell: I have received the report in question. The National Coal Board inform me that they are giving urgent consideration to the quality of coal marketed both as part of their long-term policy and as part of their shorter term arrangements.

Sir W. Smithers: Is the Minister aware that under free enterprise any manager who sends out bad stock would be dismissed, but under nationalisation there is no discipline which will prevent the consumers being exploited?

Mr. Shinwell: I should not care to enter into a discussion on the merits of private enterprise.

Sir W. Smithers: There is no answer.

Mr. Prescott: Is it not a scandal that the public should have this inefficiency put on them?

Mr. Shinwell: This so-called inefficiency, if it is inefficiency at all, is a spill-over from private enterprise.

Mr. Hobson: Will my right hon. Friend consider allowing the electricity undertakings to buy coal according to its calorific value, as they did before, because it would prevent this gross wastage?

Mr. Shinwell: Shortly I shall set up an industrial consumers' council, as provided for in the Act of Parliament, and they can deal with these matters.

South African Offer

Major Roberts asked the Minister of Fuel and Power why an offer of coal made by the South African Government to this country during the last 12 months was not accepted.

Mr. Shinwell: Apart from a proposal to exchange South African coal for United Kingdom cement made last December, which on investigation was then found to be impracticable, I am not aware that any offer of coal from South Africa has been rejected.

Major Roberts: Is the Minister aware that an offer was made? Is he further aware that it was made not so much on the question of cement but on the question of wagons, and are we to assume from his reply that the matter is still under consideration?

Mr. Shinwell: Certainly not.

(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. 18. No. 11.

Saturday, May 17, 1947.

From Week to Week

Mr. Harper Prowse, M.L.A. (Alberta) is one of the Members of the Alberta Provincial Legislature elected by Albertans serving in the Army and not, as such, committed to any political party, but he writes a daily column in the *Edmonton Bulletin*, which, while describing itself as independent, has generally displayed a "Liberal" bias.

Mr. Prowse was gently heckled in the Legislature towards the close of the recent Session on preparing himself to assume the Leadership of the Liberal Party in Alberta—at present more or less defunct.

This background to Mr. Prowse makes his defence of the Secret Ballot, and his obvious annoyance that its virtues should be questioned, all the more interesting, because in Canada, as elsewhere, an anonymous electorate has been manipulated by High Finance perhaps more effectively under the Liberals than under any other Party.

There is always a danger—in fact it is its greatest danger—that a genuinely liberal (without a capital) outlook will degenerate into Whiggism, and there are evidences that this tendency is a potential danger in Alberta. *Corruptio optima pessima.*

Dr. Etheridge, a well-known fossilologist employed by the British Museum, is credited with saying: "Nine-tenths of the talk of evolution is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation and wholly unsupported by fact; this museum is full of the proofs of its falsity."

AGRICULTURAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES AS EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS AND FREEDOM:

"Now copyholders stand upon a sure ground, now they weigh not their lord's displeasure, they shake not at every blast of wind, they eat, drink and sleep securely, only having a special care of the main chance, *viz.* to perform carefully what duties and services their tenure doth exact and require. Then let the lord frown; the copyholder cares not, knowing himself safe and not within any danger"—Sir Edward Coke, Lord High Chancellor: *The Compleat Copyholder*, 1612.

"There is only one way of breaking down economic pressure: the establishment of competitive order and the destruction of the existing powerful combines. Even amongst Trades Unionists and Socialists this opinion is gaining ground. Several new decisions, for instance, taken by the Commission for Socialising Industry of the Hamburg Senate show how cautious people have become in this matter of State control and organisation and how much the importance of establishing 'competitive order' is now recognised.

"What then, is the value of the new anti-monopoly laws in the British-American Zone? Not very much. For the

dissolution of the cartels makes no difference worth mentioning within the framework of a 'Planned Economy'."

Professor Walter Eucken.

OUR PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICERS:

"A third World War, in which the United States [... States] and Russia would be the principal belligerents and in which Britain [*sic*] would not survive, was forecast by Professor Arnold Toynbee, Director of Studies in the Royal Institute of International Affairs, who is on a lecture tour in Canada. In this conflict Canada would be a tremendous bloody battlefield.

"Professor Toynbee opined that what was happening in Britain [*sic*] in 1947 would have happened in 1997 anyway. Two world wars had hastened her fall, he said."

—*Canberra Times*, April 12, 1947.

We like the word "opined." It more or less rhymes with "designed."

"Realistic Constitutionalism"

MAJOR DOUGLAS'S ADDRESS TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

On Thursday, May 8, Major Douglas addressed the Constitutional Research Association under the presidency of the Right Hon. Lord Sempill, A.F.C., at Brown's Hotel, Albemarle Street, Piccadilly, on "Realistic Constitutionalism."

The full text of Major Douglas's notes for this important address will be published in a single instalment in the issue of *The Social Crediter* for May 24.

Readers who may desire extra copies of the issue are advised to notify the business agents of the Secretariat, who are also publishers of *The Social Crediter*, at 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2.

Letters to the Secretariat bearing upon the political aspects of the address should *in all* cases be addressed to The Social Credit Secretariat at 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

To save the time and trouble of special enquiry, it may be stated that publication of the Notes in pamphlet form is already in hand; but some advantage is in many cases likely to arise from circulation in the journal. The price in pamphlet form will be sixpence a copy.

Mr. Walter Elliot and P.E.P.

We are pleased to give publicity to the disclaimer of membership of P.E.P. contained in the following letter, "opened in error at London" and delayed in transmission from the Right Hon. Walter Elliot, M.P.:—

House of Commons,

London, S.W. 1.

29 April, '47.

Dear Sir,

In your issue of Saturday, April 26, you state that I am or was "an enthusiastic member of P.E.P." The statement that I am or was a member of P.E.P. is entirely erroneous and I should be glad if you would withdraw this in your next issue. I am not of course in any way discussing the merits or demerits of P.E.P.

Yours sincerely,

WALTER ELLIOT.

An Introduction to Social Credit*

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

Part III.—POLITICS.

(9) (continued).

The payment of a dividend out of credit thus establishes in practice the status of the citizen as a shareholder in his country in the sense we have already discussed.

There are sound technical reasons why the whole of the available credit should not be issued as a dividend.

In the first place, inflation would, *exactly as it does at present*, ensue. There is a very simple way to overcome this. A proportion of the credit may be set aside for the purpose of paying subsidies to reduce prices. This merely means that the consumer receives his credit through a different channel; it is paid to the seller of goods as part of the price, but it is only paid to the order of the consumer. Happily, a system of subsidies to reduce prices to the consumer is already in operation, so that it is unnecessary here to go into the theoretical considerations which prove its practicability. But there remains the question of the extent to which such subsidies should be applied.

In Part II, Section 5, we have referred to the fundamental law of real, as apart from financial, cost. Nevertheless, the financial cost, as arrived at in respect of particular goods by the standard methods of accounting, is a perfectly valid and real measure of financial transactions, and therefore can be related to the real cost. If the financial cost of an article is multiplied by the ratio which expresses real cost, and this figure is taken as the selling-price of the article, we have a figure which is less than cost, and is mathematically and impartially related to the actual processes of production and consumption.

This reduced price was originally termed by Major Douglas the Just Price, but it is now known as the Compensated Price. It is the price at which goods should be sold so as correctly to relate that price to the physical facts of production and consumption. Its theoretical justification can be demonstrated mathematically, and students are referred to *Social Credit*, Part II Chapter 3 for particulars; here it is worthwhile to examine some of the general considerations.

The ratio $\frac{\text{consumption}}{\text{production}}$ is measured in terms of monetary units over a selected period. It is therefore determined absolutely by the actual facts of production and consumption, and reflects the activities of the community. It is of exactly the same character as, for example, a bank statement which records the totals of deposits and withdrawals over a selected period—figures which could, of course, be recorded as a ratio.

Since production normally exceeds consumption, the ratio is normally less than one. Now the more production exceeds consumption—as in the building of permanent assets, *etc.*,—the greater becomes the capacity of industry to produce goods and services. If we assume, for the sake of demonstration, that the community holds the same total of money at the end of the selected period as at the beginning, but that the prices of all goods available for sale are reduced to the figure cost-price (including profit) $\times \frac{\text{consumption}}{\text{production}}$, we have the

purchasing power of the money available increased to correspond to the increase in the real credit. This is exactly the opposite of what obtains at present, when the money paid out for a relative increase in the production of capital goods is accompanied by a rise in prices, and consequently a decrease in the purchasing power of the unit of money.

On the other hand, when the rate of consumption relative to the rate of production rises—as it does, for example, in war, since shells fired and bombs dropped count as consumption—the application of the “price factor” results in a rise in prices as compared with normal times, which again is a correct reflection of the physical facts.

Again, as we have already seen, the physical facts of production are dominated by the rapidly increasing capacity of industry to produce goods with (say) a constant amount of human effort. A falling price-level is a correct reflection of this situation. Now if we assume a constant wage and salary structure, which, we may also assume, reflects the differing importance of different operatives in technical and other processes, a rising purchasing-power of the units of money with which these wages and salaries are paid renders the differences of less importance as a cause of social friction. A falling purchasing power (rise in prices), on the other hand, leads to friction and demands for higher rates of pay which again raise prices still further.

The use of credit to reduce prices by the payment of subsidies—the “compensation” of prices in accordance with the physical realities—therefore overcomes inflation, benefits the *whole* community, and minimises the risk of social friction.

(To be continued).

Before The Big Idea

... there is queer quality in that time; which while it was international, was also internal and intimate. War, in the wide modern sense, is possible, not because more men disagree, but because more men agree. Under the peculiarly modern coercions, such as Compulsory Education and Conscription, there are such very large *peaceful* areas, that they can all agree upon War. In that age men disagreed even about war; and peace might break out anywhere... If anyone wishes to know what is meant by saying that action was more individual, and indeed incalculable, he may well note some of the stages in the story of the great feudal house of Aquino, which had its castle not far from Naples... Landulf of Aquino, a heavy feudal fighter typical of the time, rode in armour behind the imperial banners, and attacked a monastery, because the Emperor regarded the monastery as a fortress held for his enemy the Pope. Later, we shall see, the same feudal lord sent his own son to the same monastery; probably on the friendly advice of the same Pope. Later still another of his sons, entirely on his own, rebelled against the Emperor, and went over to the armies of the Pope. For this he was executed by the Emperor, with promptitude and despatch. I wish we knew more about that brother of Thomas Aquinas who risked and lost his life to support the cause of the Pope; which was in all human essentials the cause of the People. He may not have been a saint; but he must have had some qualities of a martyr. Meanwhile, two other brothers, still ardent and active, apparently, in the service of the Emperor who killed the third brother, themselves proceeded to kidnap another brother, because they did not approve of his sympathy with the new social movements in religion...

—G. K. Chesterton: *St. Thomas Aquinas*.

*Now appearing in *The Australian Social Crediter*. The commencement of Dr. Monahan's essay, publication of which has been interrupted, appeared in *The Social Crediter* on January 25.

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3)

Consumer Fuel Restrictions

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter asked the Minister of Fuel and Power if he will state the names of the women's organisations with whom he has now had discussions on the subject of domestic fuel cuts.

Mr. Shinwell: Discussions with women's organisations took place at a meeting in my Department at which 17 organisations were represented. As the list is a long one, I will, with the hon. Member's permission, circulate it in the OFFICIAL REPORT. Invitations are being issued to a much larger number of organisations to attend a meeting next week.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: Can the right hon. Gentleman state in what capacity Miss Mary Sutherland, the chief woman officer of the Labour Party, was present, and whether similar invitations were issued to this lady's opposite numbers in the Conservative and Liberal Parties?

Mr. Shinwell: I imagine that Miss Mary Sutherland would represent the Women's Co-operative Guild.

Mrs. Leah Manning: No.

Mr. Shinwell: She was present in consequence of her membership of the Standing Joint Committee of Working Women's Organisations. As regards the other organisations, while I say nothing about them, I have no doubt that they have all got their political views.

Mr. Skeffington-Lodge: Can my right hon. Friend assure me that the list excludes the Tory controlled British Housewives League?

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: Is the Minister aware that the organisation to which he referred—the Standing Joint Committee—consists only of representatives of the "Co-op", the trade unions and the Labour Party?

Mr. Shinwell: I am well aware of that. Why should they not be permitted to represent them?

Sir W. Smithers: Is the Minister aware that the female of the species is more deadly than the male?

Mr. Shinwell: If it is any satisfaction or consolation to the hon. Member, I can tell him that among the organisations who advised us was the Good Housekeeping Institute.

Sir W. Smithers: They are still more deadly.

The following is the list:

- Association of Teachers of Domestic Subjects.
- Church Army Women's Section.
- Citizens' Advice Bureaux.
- Electrical Association for Women.
- Good Housekeeping Institute.
- National Council of Women.
- National Federation of Women's Institutions.
- National Union of Townswomen's Guilds.
- National Union of Women Teachers.
- Scottish Women's Rural Institutes.
- Standing Joint Committee of Working Women's Organisations.
- Women's Advisory Committee on Solid Fuel.
- Women's Advisory Housing Council.
- Women's Co-operative Guild.
- Women's Gas Council.
- Women's Group on Public Welfare.
- Women's Voluntary Services.

(A number of other organisations were invited but did not send representatives to the meeting.)

Electronic Calculator

Mr. John Foster asked the Lord President of the Council, whether, in view of the intricate calculations involved in modern planning and the difficulties of evaluating all the relevant factors, any giant electronic calculating machines are being constructed for use in Great Britain similar to the Mark I operating at Harvard University in the U.S.A. or the Mark II which is under construction for the U.S. Navy.

The Lord President of the Council (Mr. Herbert Morrison): The two machines referred to are, in fact, not electronic, but are operated by relays, and no similar calculator is contemplated for this country. An electronic calculator, which will operate at one thousand times the speed of these machines, is being planned now at the National Physical Laboratory. When completed, its services will be available to Government departments, research establishments and industry for calculations to which it may suitably be applied.

Control of Fuel (Restriction of Heating) Order

Mr. R. S. Hudson (Southport): I beg to move:

"That the Control of Fuel (Restriction of Heating) Order, 1947, (S.R. & O., 1947, No. 765), dated 25th April, 1947, a copy of which was presented on 28th April, be annulled."

... I suggest that the first question to be put to the Government is this: Is this Order necessary? The second is: Is there any reasonable alternative to it? If it is finally decided that something like a cut of this nature, is required, the question arises: Is this the best way to do it, and are there any inherent defects in the Order? So far as the first question—the necessity or otherwise of the Order—is concerned, until today, when we heard what the President had to say, we understood that there was a prospective gap of 10 million tons between the amount of coal available, or expected to be available, this year, and the prospective demand, and it was suggested that 7,500,000 tons out of that 10 million tons could be made up by cuts in industry, 250,000 tons by the railways, and the remaining 2,250,000 tons by the domestic consumer.

All I have to say about that is that I do not think there is anybody who knows anything about the coalmining industry today, including, I believe, Members of the Government, members of the National Coal Board and most responsible leaders of the miners, who would not be prepared to admit, privately, if not publicly, that it is within the capacity of the existing numbers of miners to produce, not only the 200 million tons required, but to go above it. My opinion is that they could produce 220 million tons, and, probably, even get it up to 235 million tons, if the necessary enthusiasm were inspired and instilled into them. So that it is because the Government has failed to inspire the miners with the necessary enthusiasm that they are now saying that this cut is necessary. So much for the first question, as to whether it is necessary. I believe increased production could be got —[HON. MEMBERS: "It has been got."]—No, it has not been got, because, hitherto, we have been told—we may be told something else today—by the Prime Minister this year that domestic consumers must produce a saving of 2,500,000 tons this year. If hon. Members look at the Prime Minister's speech, they will see that for themselves.

Is there any alternative? Until this statement was made by the President of the Board of Trade today—and

I do not profess to understand and appreciate it fully at the present time—industry has been expected to make a cut of 7,500,000 tons. I do not want to discuss that today, because a much wider and better opportunity will be afforded later of discussing whether it is possible for industry to make a bigger cut or not. At all events, there is one obvious alternative, which, again, I do not want to discuss in detail, but merely indicate in passing, by which a saving could be made, and that is miners' coal. The figures are so striking that I think that hon. Members, and, I am quite sure, the public outside, will be interested in them. I do not propose to go into the history of miners' coal beyond indicating these figures. In 1938, 782,000 miners or wage-earners on colliery books drew 88,000 tons of coal per week. In 1946, 697,000 wage-earners on colliery books drew 93,000 tons of coal—a reduction of nearly 100,000 miners and an increase of 5,000 tons of coal per week. Now let us look at what the domestic consumer did by comparison. In 1938, the domestic consumption of coal, including anthracite and boiler fuel, was 887,000 tons—

The Minister of Fuel and Power (Mr. Shinwell): On a point of Order. This is all very interesting, and I make no complaint about it, but I would like your Ruling, Sir, on whether it is in Order. . . .

Mr. R. S. Hudson: . . . I was saying that the domestic consumption of coal had dropped from 880,000 tons a week to 599,000 tons a week, while the consumption of miners' coal, for the same period, rose from 88,000 tons a week to 93,000 tons. It is clear that at present, miners as a whole are getting 5 million tons of coal a year, and that these same miners, if they used no more than the ordinary householder gets, would be using something less than 2 million tons a year. In that way alone, there could be made available for general use more than the 2½ million tons, which this Order is directed to save. I doubt whether the miners realise the situation. We have been reminded by Members opposite, particularly by the Minister of Food, of the Labour slogan, "Fair shares for all." We have been told that whereas before the war certain sections of the population ate a great deal more than others, and others ate less, we are now, more or less, all on the same level. If it is a good thing that there should be fair shares for all in food, I suggest that there should be fair shares for all in coal, so that the necessity for these present cuts would be avoided.

Mr. Tiffany (Peterborough): Does the right hon. Gentleman accept that in the case of agricultural workers?

Mr. Hudson: That point will be dealt with.

Mr. Beswick (Uxbridge): Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether he thinks that the prewar allocation was sufficient?

Mr. Hudson: I would point out to the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Tiffany) that the miners, at present, get approximately four times as much coal as the ordinary householder, and that if he applied that principle to agricultural workers, those workers would get four times as much food as an ordinary person.

Sir Arthur Salter (Oxford University): Should not my right hon. Friend have added one further fact to indicate the scope of this problem? He has shown that if miners got no more than other members of the community, there would be a saving of about 3 million tons of coal, which would be greater than that effected by the new sacrifices, now

being imposed on the whole of the population. Is it not the case that miners and their families number only one twentieth of the population?

Mr. Hudson: I could develop this point at considerable length, but I do not want to transgress the Rules of Order. Actually, there are 708,000 miners, as compared to a gainfully employed population of 18 million. . . . Let me turn to the scheme itself. Broadly speaking, it prohibits space heating, and when the Minister announced it, he said that in addition to the saving due to the prohibition of space heating, he hoped that housewives would succeed in making a voluntary overall saving of 25 per cent. this summer, including the saving to be made from space heating. In our view, the scheme is a good deal better than a rationing scheme, but we take no responsibility for it because it does not follow the advice we have given from this side, namely, that the proper way to deal with this problem is to tell the people of the country the facts, and ask them for a voluntary saving if it is necessary. This Order does not follow that advice. It mixes up compulsory and voluntary saving. . . .

. . . The plea I make this afternoon is on behalf of the British housewife. I should say that she is rather like a pack-horse, so over-burdened that it can hardly struggle along the flat, and now she is being suddenly asked to climb a hill, the summit of which is not in sight. We have heard a lot from hon. Members opposite, about incentives to further production and incentives to effort. What incentives are there for the housewife today? All that is offered her is more rationing, longer queues, higher prices, and a still further cut in the inadequate warmth which she requires in her home. That is not fair. If I had to sum up our position, I would say that we believe this fuel consumption cut is unnecessary. It is still within the capacity of the present number of coalminers to increase production to a point where this saving in this Order would not be necessary, and if the Government are unable to persuade the miners to make the necessary effort, there is the alternative available of the miners' coal. If the miners consume no more coal than the ordinary household, the coal thus released would be adequate to save this cut. If the Government admit that they are not in a position to do either of these things, and still say that some saving is necessary, then we say that this is a bad way of doing it. We say that this Order is a bad one because it mixes two incompatibles, namely, voluntary and compulsory saving. If the right hon. Gentleman and his friends insist on carrying out this Order, my belief is that before long they will come to the House and say that it has failed and that they have not achieved the saving they require, and they will ask us to agree to some far more drastic scheme of rationing. If so, the fault will lie not with the people but with the Government. We believe that the Government could have got the saving by a purely voluntary scheme and that they will not get it by a mixture of compulsory and voluntary saving. We think that the Order is a thoroughly bad one, and that is why I move that it be annulled.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter (Kingston-upon-Thames): . . . Hon. Members opposite did not like it when the hon. Member for Cheltenham (Mr. Lipson) pointed out that they had no mandate for this, but that is perfectly true. Let hon. Members opposite speculate as to what their electoral fortunes would have been if there had been displayed at the General Election the statement, "Vote Labour and abolish domestic heating during the summer months; own the coal industry and have

less warmth in your homes than you have ever had in history." If hon. Members have the honesty to do it, let them speculate how many of them would then have been here, and let us discuss the Order, not as the hon. Lady the Member for Rushcliffe seemed to, as a kind of political tit-for-tat, but on the basis that it is a savage blow at the comfort of a great many homes and can only be justified if its necessity is abundantly and manifestly proved. . .

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Fuel and Power (Mr. Gaitskell): We have listened to a series of characteristically irresponsible speeches from quite a number of hon. Members on the opposite benches.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Thomas Moore (Ayr Burghs): Including the hon. Gentleman's own supporters.

Mr. Gaitskell: Some of those speeches came from hon. Members who normally I should have regarded as being very responsible in their attitude, and some came from those from whom I do not expect responsible opinions at all. The basic assumption, of course, on which this discussion proceeds, and on which this Order is framed, is that it is necessary to impose some restriction on the use of gas and electricity in domestic premises this summer, and that, so far as possible, general fuel economy measures should be carried a stage further in non-residential premises. I am not quite clear whether the Opposition really accept those premises or not. . .

Words

"To teach the meaning of a word thoroughly is to teach the nature of the spirit that coined it; the secret of language is the secret of sympathy, and its full charm is possible only to the gentle. And thus the principles of beautiful speech have all been fixed by sincere and kindly speech. On the laws which have been determined by sincerity, false speech, apparently beautiful, may afterwards be constructed; but all such utterance, whether in oration or poetry, is not only without permanent power, but it is destructive of the principles it has usurped. So long as no words are uttered but in faithfulness, so long the art of language goes on exalting itself; but the moment it is shaped and chiselled on external principles, it falls into frivolity, and perishes. And this truth would have been long ago manifest, had it not been that in periods of advanced academical science there is always a tendency to deny the sincerity of the first masters of language. Once learn to write gracefully in the manner of an ancient author, and we are apt to think that he also wrote in the manner of someone else. But no noble nor right style was ever yet founded but out of a sincere heart.

"No man is worth reading to form your style, who does not mean what he says; nor was any great style ever invented but by some man who meant what he said. Find out the beginner of a great manner of writing, and you have also found the declarer of some true facts or sincere passions: and your whole method of reading will thus be quickened, for, being sure that your author really meant what he said, you will be much more careful to ascertain what it is that he means.

"And of yet greater importance is it deeply to know that every beauty possessed by the language of a nation is significant of the innermost laws of its being. Keep the temper of the people stern and manly; make their associations grave, courteous, and for worthy objects; occupy them in just deeds; and their tongue must needs be a grand one. Nor is it

possible, therefore—observe the necessary reflected action—that any tongue should be a noble one, of which the words are not so many trumpet-calls to action. All great languages invariably utter great things, and command them; they cannot be mimicked but by obedience; the breath of them is inspiration because it is not only vocal, but vital; and you can only learn to speak as these men spoke, by becoming what these men were."—John Ruskin, (Inaugural Lecture as Slade Professor of Fine Art, Oxford, 1870.)

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 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/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	
Protocols of Zion	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.	1/-
Aberhart: Manning	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards ...	8d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick	6d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	4d.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson	4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson ...	6d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson	4d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne	3d.
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
Social Credit: An Explanation for New Readers 1½d. each, or 50 copies for 5/-.	

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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