

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 21. No. 7.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

"Socialism is a disease of a state of society in which a true science of society scarcely exists, in which false notions of life, of the relation of the individual to society and the state, are widespread, and in which all ranks are honey-combed by sentimental notions of what ought to be, and can be, in this world. Since Rousseau, a certain set of doctrines has been permeating modern society, which have no truth in history or fact at all, but which flatter human nature and are sure to be popular, because they make light of education, culture, capital, breeding, and all the excellencies which, *being very hard to get*, raise him who has them above him that has them not. The same doctrines teach, *per contra*, that the untrained man is the *norm*, and type, and standard, so that men, instead of being urged to seek the excellencies, are encouraged to believe themselves superior, without them, to those who have them. Such is the outcome of the doctrine of equality, and, as it has spread, it has only grown more popular, has propagated more and more fallacies, and shifted more and more distinctly into a thirst and demand for (equal) enjoyment of material luxury. Socialism is an effort to gratify the thirst in some other way than by using it is an incentive to industry and economy. Obviously, there is no other way, unless it consists in taking away the means of material enjoyment from those who have produced and saved them, and giving them to those who have not produced and saved them. Every step in that direction, is a step towards universal impoverishment and barbarism, and every step will have to be won by war. The socialists assume that their victory in that war is certain, but it is certain that they are entirely mistaken."—*Scribners*, New York, March, 1880.

We abominate assassination, and it may be supposed that the threat to "do him in" which is said to have been levelled at Mr. Strachey, is a threat of assassination. But if Providence, in its inscrutable wisdom, and during the prevalence of the present high winds, should cause a particularly heavy chimney-pot to fall on him, we could temper our sorrow with resignation. Mr. Strachey is an example of the human being (we suppose that is a correct description) who has been given opportunities of upbringing for which he is unfitted; and it is notorious that nothing is more certain to produce something undesirable by even Marxian standards. Mr. Strachey belongs to, but does not come from, what the Americans call "the lower income brackets"; by the peculiar workings of our present institutions (perhaps) he is a Minister of His Britannic Majesty's Government. We do not grudge him his £5,000 per annum; but we do object strongly that his type should be invested with powers over the essentials of life greater than those possessed by Peter the Great.

In these days of paper restriction and consequent pressure upon our space, we should not mention Mr. Strachey if

he did not exemplify a matter of fundamental importance. We have in mind the automatic relationship of character to particular social and economic forms of organisation and may recall that it was examined at some length thirty years ago in *Economic Democracy*. Professor Hayek has put similar views in his much discussed *Road to Serfdom*, under the heading "Why the worst get on top." To quote him: "If we wish to find a high degree of uniformity and similarity of outlook, we have to descend to the regions of lower moral and intellectual standards, where the more primitive and 'common' instincts and tastes prevail." (p. 69 abridged—*Ed.*)

Since the prevalent political theory is that the majority must not merely be represented, but that their views must prevail, we obtain quite automatically by a ballot box democracy, the government of the whole by the worst.

Couleur de *Rose*. "We record with deep regret the death of Mr. John Nixon, B.B.C. Correspondent in the Middle East, at the age of 31. He was *killed* when the *Arab* airliner in which he was travelling from Beirut to Amman *crashed* near the Transjordan frontier."—"B." B.C. periodical, *The Listener* (our emphasis).

The aeroplane in which Mr. Nixon was murdered was *shot down* by a Jewish-owned fighter, variously described as a Russian "Yak" and a British "Hurricane."

There is a certain body of opinion which is under the impression that we have abandoned the financial aspect of Social Credit. In this connection, we are reminded of a pungent criticism made some years ago, that the great disadvantage under which the Social Credit movement then laboured, was that it was largely composed of Socialists who wanted nationalisation of banking.

People who hold this type of opinion have not taken the trouble to grasp the fundamental subject matter with which we have always been concerned, which is the relationship of the individual to the group. Thirty years ago, that relationship was predominantly a financial relationship. Quite largely through the exertions of Socialists, strongly assisted by the highest powers of International Finance, the Central Banks have become practically impregnable, and the sanctions which they exert have shifted from the bank balance to the Order-in-Council.

It ought to be, but unfortunately it is not, apparent to everyone who takes an intelligent interest in these matters, that the fundamental problem has been greatly complicated by the developments of the past twenty years; and that the immediate issue is in the realm of Law and military power, not of book-keeping. That does not mean in the least that book-keeping is one penny the less important than it was when we directed attention to it; but it does mean that it is the second trench to be taken, not the first. For that, we

have to thank in great part, the obsession with "nationalised" banking.

The problem presented by the centralised ("majority") political vote is the same in its fundamentals as that of which it is only another manifestation—the monopoly of credit.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: September 22, 1948.*

### Enforcement Officers (Powers of Search)

*Major Guy Lloyd* asked the Minister of Food how many hotels and boarding houses have been searched by his enforcement officers during the past three months.

*Mr. Wadsworth*: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister deal with Questions Nos. 75 and 76 on the same subject?

*Mr. Speaker*: We have not yet reached Questions 75 and 76. I hope we shall, but we must wait until we do.

*Dr. Summerskill*: I regret this information could not be obtained without making special inquiry of each officer.

*Major Lloyd*: Is the Minister aware that there is grave dissatisfaction in many parts of the country over this procedure which does not savour of anything but something which comes from Germany?

*Dr. Summerskill*: I am not aware of that, but if the hon. Member can give me any specific case where an officer has abused his powers I will be only too willing to investigate it.

### Biscuits (Exports)

*Mr. De la Bère* asked the Minister of Food whether, in view of the inability in many parts of the country of the public to secure supplies of most varieties of biscuits due to large exports, he will reduce the volume of biscuits exported so as to make available more adequate supplies for the home consumer.

*Dr. Summerskill*: No, Sir. Biscuits exported earn much more currency than their ingredients cost and therefore they help to pay for other food imports.

*Mr. De la Bère*: Is there never to be an end to this sort of answer about dollars and currencies? Is it not a fact that biscuits cannot be obtained in most parts of the country? Why not downpoint them, make them more plentiful and use common sense for once?

*Dr. Summerskill*: We feel it is common sense to export biscuits to Canada in order to get bacon and eggs in return.

*Mr. Harrison*: Would the Minister consider accepting responsibility completely for the distribution of biscuits in this country, thereby overcoming disproportionate distribution?

*Dr. Summerskill*: Yes, Sir.

### Inspection Officers

*Mr. Wadsworth* asked the Minister of Food how many officers of his Department have powers of search.

*Dr. Summerskill*: The number of officers in my Department at September 15, 1948, who have been issued with warrants under Regulation 55AA (2) of the Defence (General)

Regulations, 1939, authorising them to enter and carry out an inspection of any food undertaking is 1,989; 982 of them are enforcement officers, and the rest inspectors of food production and storage.

### Income Tax (B.B.C.)

*Mr. Ernest Davies* asked the Postmaster-General why the sum of £1,200,000 was provided for Income Tax by the B.B.C. in its accounts for 1947-48.

*Mr. Wilfred Paling*: As is indicated in the report of the B.B.C. this provision is to meet Income Tax on the excess of income over revenue expenditure on the home services for the period of the account.

### Major-General Glubb Pasha

*Mr. Platts-Mills* asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs why no action has been taken against Brigadier J. B. Glubb in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Enlistment Act, 1870.

*Mr. Mayhew*: The Foreign Enlistment Act does not apply to persons who accepted service in the armed forces of a foreign State at a time when that State was not at war. Brigadier Glubb was an officer of the Arab Legion for many years before it became engaged in hostilities in Palestine. I am therefore advised that the Act has no bearing on his case.

### U.S. Loans

*Mr. Platts-Mills* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will now make a statement on the amount, the rate of interest and the conditions attaching to U.S. loans under the Marshall Plan.

*Mr. Jay*: Negotiations on the terms of these loans are still going on and I cannot yet make any statement.

### German Study Group (Inquiries)

*Mr. J. Lewis* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if, in view of the fact that the German group named Ostara, though purporting to represent a study group for psychology, astrology, graphology and spiritualism, also includes Nazi-ism in its curriculum, he will arrange for German representatives of this group now in this country to be returned home.

*Mr. Ede*: Inquiries are being made into the conduct of the persons claiming to be members of this group.

*House of Lords: September 23, 1948.*

### Parliament Bill

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*The Lord Privy Seal and Paymaster-General* (Viscount Addison): My Lords, the matter that is before us to-day has been discussed at great length in this House during recent months, and I do not propose to weary your Lordships by attempting even to repeat what I said myself. I will only remind you of certain leading facts, and confine myself to that. . . .

*The Marquess of Salisbury*: My Lords, . . .

. . . The only semblance of an attempt to justify the  
(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. 21. No. 7.

Saturday, October 16, 1948.

### Darwin's Competency

Occasional reference has been made in these pages to the Darwinian theory, particularly concerning its political affiliations, its history, and the philosophy which inspired it. Since *The Social Crediter*, in so far as it is a 'technical' journal at all, confines itself to those matters of technique in which it claims expert status, we have not hitherto recorded current arguments about the doctrine of evolution, in its special or general applications, except to draw attention to the fact of their appearance and to the conclusion which could justly be drawn from it, that a certain prematurity of conviction has been forced upon the general reader, who is always the object and far too often the victim of so-called 'scientific' theorising. Our self-consistency in this matter has, we know, distressed some who believe (as we do not) that technical disputes offer a 'free-for-all' battle ground upon which everyone may play, whether he is acquainted with the terrain or with the rules of the game or not. So far as we are concerned, our repudiation of this position is uncompromising, if for no other reason than that the loot invariably falls to the stake-holder (as is doubtless intended).

It is, of course, incontestable that the progressive staffing of the 'learned' institutions of this and other countries with mediocrities who are incompetent to relate their special activities to any philosophical background, or who, indeed, recognise, in any real sense, that there is a philosophical background to either their own thoughts or to thought, makes it increasingly difficult to exclude from participation a 'public' increasingly indistinguishable from themselves in every respect but what we may call their uniforms. For the moment, the 'scientists' appear to be quite happy about that, relying, perhaps, upon a certain hang-over of prestige to facilitate the writing up of a 'score' which is not directly related to superiority, inborn or acquired. Thus the way is prepared for the transference of the higher intellectual interests of mankind to the care of the State. The broadcast 'brains-trust' set-up is an almost perfect model. When no one knows, opinion may not acquire relative importance, but it receives relatively more attention; when everyone knows, there is no room for opinion. That the entertainment of false opinions by large numbers is more generally disastrous than a false opinion here and there is ignored whenever it is not accepted as an inevitable accompaniment of 'progress' (which, of course, consists solely in increase in size; as though even bigger errors were better errors).

Professor F. Wood Jones, who is the Sir William Collins Professor of Human and Comparative Anatomy in the Royal College of Surgeons of England, is, we believe, the senior practising anatomist in this country. He and Sir Arthur Keith are the only two surviving anatomists whose names

are at all widely known to the public through their published original work. Wood Jones's *Arboreal Man* is now an old book. At the Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association at Cambridge in July, Professor Wood Jones opened a discussion with a paper on "The Present State of Our Knowledge of the Anatomy of the Primates." This paper is published in full in the *British Medical Journal* for October 2. It is significant and important. It is heavy artillery brought to bear on the reputation of both Charles Darwin and Thomas Henry Huxley. Since the ferocity of the attack, which is palpable, can hardly be attributed to personal animus at this distance in time, and since it calls for some explanation, it is, perhaps, permissible to suggest that it is intended to fall, and in fact it does fall, upon the surviving ubiquitous, but unnamed followers of Darwin and Huxley now living. That is its significance. Why Professor Wood Jones has waited until 1948 and the eve of disruption to marshal his forces is a matter the explanation of which has not been confided to us. Lest we may be convicted of over-emphasis, we may remark that the demolition of the reputations of Darwin and Huxley is quite consistent with adherence to the doctrine of evolution. At the same time, if this is what Professor Wood Jones has achieved, and if his particulars can be substantiated (as we should say, as a matter of personal conviction, they can), current doctrines concerning man's ancestry are thrown into the melting pot.

What this may mean for the intellectual pabulum of the 'trainees' for the State Medical Service we cannot say. That such a connection is incidental to the explosion of Professor Wood Jones's bombshell we have no doubt at all. In truth, evolutionary biology has not been, for rather a long time, if it ever was, the philosophical foundation of Medicine. Despite strong mechanistic tendencies (indefatigably exploited) the background of modern Medicine seems completely vacuous where it is not chaotic. Anything can, of course, fill a vacuum; and since the philosophy of current politics is Entropy, Entropy seems likely to be the Philosophy of future Medicine, through the instrumentality of Politics: whether or not "Descent" is a more appropriate word than "Fall" to describe Man's direction, there must on no account be any provision for his rise, a process which has been assigned, together with the Resurrection, to the realm of superstition. The trouble is not so much that, like Mivart's of Darwin himself, such criticisms fall "for the most part on deaf ears," (a bullet fired into a bale of cotton wool does not travel very far); but that even the bystanders fail dismally to draw any useful conclusion from these encounters. There is, in any case, every sign that opportunity to correct this deficiency will expand in the near future. We shall, as heretofore, do all we can to point it out as it occurs.

The following are extracts from Professor Wood Jones's paper:—

"Were we, following the modern fashion of testing public opinion by means of a questionnaire, to ask a generally informed set of people, 'What British scientific man was a great authority on coral islands and reefs?' the answer would probably be, 'Charles Darwin' . . .

"When Darwin elaborated his erroneous theory of coral-island evolution he had never seen a coral structure of any kind, even from the deck of a passing ship. . . ."

"Which British zoologist was the great authority on the relationship existing between men and monkeys?' The answer would inevitably be, 'Charles Darwin' . . . But most of those who gave this answer would do so entirely unaware

that Darwin had no first-hand knowledge whatever of the anatomy of monkeys, apes, or men, that he was unacquainted with or ignored much readily accessible current literature on the subject, and that such information as he possessed at second hand consisted largely of ill-assorted and ill-assimilated odds and ends culled, often enough, from the writings of the anecdotal period of natural history. This is the conclusion regarding Darwin's competency to adjudicate on the relationship existing between man and apes to which any impartial reader of his works must come."

"Any comparative anatomist who reads the *Descent of Man* with an open mind can only dismiss the whole thesis as one lacking any factual basis in primate anatomy."

"For this piece of information [concerning one of the smaller bones of the face] Darwin gives a reference to the work of Canestrini; but it is obvious to any anatomist that the account, erroneous as in this case it is, actually relates not to" that bone but to another.

"It is obvious that so little was Darwin acquainted with the cranial characters of the primates that he translated the whole story . . . It can hardly be claimed that Darwin wrote 'malar' for 'premaxilla' by a mere slip of the pen, for the statement is repeated in a footnote added to the same page and again upon the page following."

"On the whole the malar bone suffered considerable injustice at the hands of the Darwinians, for Thomas Henry Huxley also took unwarranted liberties with it."

"If then it must be admitted that Darwin made no contribution to our knowledge of primate anatomy and that he had in fact assimilated very little of the knowledge that was current at the time, it might be supposed that those zoologists who so strongly supported his claims had supplied the anatomical details so conspicuously lacking in his own work . . . Huxley . . . *Man's Place in Nature* is divided into three parts, between which there is little continuity. Part I is entitled 'The Natural History of the Man-like Apes.' It occupies 56 pages, quotes over 30 authorities, mostly of the anecdotal type, on the history, habits and appearance of the anthropoid apes. It is a mere compilation and contains no original observations. Part II . . . may be said to prove what Darwin also proved—that man is an animal . . . It is astonishing that Huxley should stress the fact that both man and the dog were developed from an ovum as though it was a crucial point in testing the truth of Darwin's hypothesis . . . Judged by the state of embryological knowledge at the time, Huxley's account of human development can only be described as out of date . . . Part III . . . ends in what appears, following the previous note of high assurance, as somewhat of an anticlimax: 'In conclusion, I may say, that the fossil remains of Man hitherto discovered, do not seem to me to take us appreciably nearer to that lower pithecoïd form, by the modification of which he has, probably, become what he is.'"

"Huxley is not to be ranked as a primate anatomist. Nor, as is commonly assumed, can he be regarded as the authority who supplied the facts of anatomy necessary for the full acceptance of the Darwinian hypothesis."

"The fact that Darwin was only very imperfectly acquainted with primate anatomy, even at second hand, and that Huxley's contributions added but little to fill in the gaps in Darwin's knowledge, is all the more remarkable when it is remembered that in 1863 Richard Owen was 59 years old, that St. George Jackson Mivart was 36, and that the one was a master of the comparative anatomy of the verte-

brates and the other a leading authority on the anatomy of the mammals and especially of the primates."

Prof. Wood Jones ends his paper with a note of satisfaction that the period of dogmatism is passing. From 1871 to 1948 is seventy-seven years, or slightly longer than the lifetime allotted to man by the Psalmist. It allows for the contemporaneous maturity of three, if not four concurrent generations. Is it not material to enquire what forces sustain for so long such incompetency as Professor Wood Jones alleges?—T. J.

## Work Making

The *Courier and Advertiser* (Dundee) of October 7 has the following extraordinary story to tell in a report of a meeting on the previous day of the Lanarkshire County Council:—

The Board of Trade had proposed to the Council that it should shift a bing (heap, tip) at Bellshill by manual labour at a cost of £51,000. A tender to do the work by mechanical means for £17,000 had been received. The Council, by 20 votes to 14 approved the project suggested by the Board of Trade and rejected the tender.

Progressive members, says the newspaper, characterised the scheme as "ludicrous and insane."

Moving that the county reject the recommendation of the Board of Trade, Mr. D. P. Smith said—"If it is a question of gulling the public on the question of unemployment they are doing it in the most farcical way. Psychologically it is the very worst thing that could be done."

There might be some argument for the scheme on the ground that it ranked for 100 *per cent.* grant, and would not thus affect the ratepayers, but it did affect the people who paid taxes.

Mr. John Mann, county convener, said the dollar question came into this matter because of the oil that would be used by mechanical plant. That was why so many mechanical shovels were idle at present.

The trouble in Germany, involving substantial expenditure on oil, was aggravating the position.

Mr. John M'Connell suggested that if there was any point in the argument that manual labour should be used, then they ought to be using teaspoons instead of picks and shovels.

Mr. Edward Daly, housing convener, said it could not be maintained that the loss on the job was the difference between the two tenders if 200 men who would otherwise be drawing the dole for nothing were given jobs on the scheme.

## Whitby and Scarborough

Mr. W. A. Barratt would welcome communication with anyone in the Whitby and Scarborough districts who may be interested in Social Credit. Letters addressed to Mr. Barratt, c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2, will be forwarded.

## Self Assessment

Forms to suit the convenience of readers who wish to subscribe regularly to the support of the work of the Social Credit Secretariat are again available and may be obtained from 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2.

## The Roman Catholic Attitude to Social Credit

Our Canadian contemporary, *Vers Demain*, in its issue of September 15, publishes the text of a highly important letter written by the late Father Coffey, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics at Maynooth, to a Canadian correspondent, himself a Jesuit Father, then in Montreal, who had written to Father Coffey concerning an article published over his signature in the journal *Catholic Mind*. The letter is as follows:—

(Translation)

Maynooth College,  
March 23, 1932.

My dear Father N—,

Thank you for your requests for an account for the 20 sold. I do not know *Catholic Mind*, but I suppose that this organ has reproduced my article published in the *Clergy Review*.

The difficulties raised by your questions cannot be resolved except by the reform of the financial system of capitalism, conformably to the lines suggested by Major Douglas and the Social Credit school for the reform of credit. It is the accepted system of finance that is at the root of the evils of capitalism.

The analysis effected by Major Douglas and his disciples in England was elaborated independently by Foster and Catchings in their books, *Profits and Business Without a Buyer*, published by the Pollack Foundation (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass., U.S.A.)

The exactitude of this analysis and the plan of reform proposed by Douglas have been boycotted with persistence, or falsely represented, by the capitalist press of the whole world, throughout the last fifteen years. Douglas gave evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of Enquiry on Banking in Canada in 1923; and, in spite of the boycott, his propositions have come to the knowledge of the public, particularly in Australia.

Unhappily, our Catholic theological censure has such fear of the novelty of credit reform that its ecclesiastical adherents (myself among them) are prohibited from espousing it publicly. And that, despite that *Quadragesimo Anno* insists on the evils of world monopoly of financial credit, and by implication invites Catholics to explore it and to study it.

Personally, I am convinced that capitalist finance is bound inevitably to generate wars, revolutions and the artificial starvation of millions of human beings in a world of potential abundance. I do not see any prospect of the adoption of a sane system of finance in any country. And for all that such a reform is essential for the re-establishment of a Christian economic system of widely distributed property, and is, in consequence, the only alternative to a revolutionary, violent and atheistic Communism.

I have studied the whole subject for fifteen years, but I am not yet free to publish the results of my investigations. That may lead you to believe that I am not a guide on the matter. Very well, I can at least tell you that I am honestly convinced that the Douglas proposals are not socialistic and that they do not contradict the teachings of the Church concerning private property. I believe that with their famous price-adjustment formula they constitute the only reform which goes right to the root of the evil. I know, with certitude, that the exactitude of the analysis (likewise in the

Pollack books) has never been refuted.

Concerning the possibility of a realisation in the concrete of the constructive proposals envisaged by Douglas—with the mass psychology of a doped public and with all the power of propaganda of the capitalist press aligned against them—that is the secret of the gods! But the only alternative that I see to their adoption is the chaos of Communism.

In finance is now centred exclusively all interest in the tragic transition from capitalism to communism.

With apologies for this desultory scribble, I remain, my dear Father N—,

Your wholly devoted,  
P. COFFEY.

## Hyderabad

Two items concerning Hyderabad merit attention.

The first is the Associated Press telegram from New Delhi printed by *The Daily Mail* on October 6, recording that the Nizam has asked the Indian High Commissioner in London to institute and conduct legal proceedings on his behalf to recover "more than £1,000,000" from the Westminster Bank, London.

"The Nizam," said the newspaper, "alleges that the money was 'unauthorisedly' transferred by his former Finance Minister, Moin Nawaz Jung, the day before the cease fire in Hyderabad.

"Correspondence published . . . between the Nizam and Mr. Rajagopalachari, Indian Governor-General, discloses that a total of £1,007,940 9s. was transferred to the account of Mr. H. I. Rahimtoola, Pakistan High Commissioner in London.

"According to the correspondence, instructions to the Westminster Bank to effect the transfer were despatched by Moin Nawaz Jung on September 16, the day before the Nizam ordered the cease-fire against Indian troops.

"The actual transfer was effected in London four days later.

"On September 22 the military governor of Hyderabad requested banks throughout the world not to allow withdrawals from Hyderabad accounts.

"The Westminster Bank, it is stated in the correspondence, accordingly advised the financial secretary of Hyderabad that about £1,000,000 had already been transferred.

"Five days later the Nizam informed the Indian Governor-General of the 'unauthorised' transfer and asked India to use its good offices with the British Government to have the money retransferred and if necessary frozen."

The second item is an article which appeared in the *Irish Independent* for September 20 by Gerard Daniels describing Hyderabad and its ruler. He mentions that the State is the seat of "the most famous cultural institution in Asia, the Osmania University. Education there embraces all the departments and faculties of a Western University, with one difference—all subjects, including medicine and engineering, are taught in the Urdu language, and all modern textbooks are translated by the special State Bureau of Translations. In many ways Hyderabad is far ahead in education and industry compared with many parts of India—which means that it would not benefit if it were to lose its individuality by being absorbed into the surrounding territory."

It seems that Hyderabad is receiving more attention in Ireland than in England.

## Cullercoats Householders

"How much longer are we going to stand by and take everything that comes our way without effective protest and action?" asks the *Cullercoats Householder*, which is the organ of the Cullercoats Householders' Association. This is the seventh issue of the journal.

"Several people who should know have prophesied that the rate for next year will probably be increased by at least 3s. to 17s. 6d. in the £, the reasons being that since nationalisation the British Railways is no longer liable to pay rates for its considerable property in the Borough, also that the National Grant will be less than hitherto under the equalisation scheme.

"Has any indication or information regarding this serious situation been released to the electors by their representatives?"

"Was any protest registered by our Council to 'Higher Authority' regarding these losses of revenue, or are they satisfied to sit back and watch the sovereignty of their electors and their own authority taken from them piece by piece until we are ruled from afar by unapproachable bureaucrats?"

"The same conditions prevail in national Government, where our pseudo statesmen sit and dream out-dated ideals, meanwhile authorising something like 200 Orders in Council per month."

The *Householder* quotes Edna Lonigan in *Human Events* for August 4:—

"... the system of providing welfare through Government aid to certain classes is not a success; it is a total failure. It has been tried in many places, and it has always lowered the well-being of the nation which tries it... this system would substitute the 'Continental form of 'democracy' in which embattled classes struggle to the death for control of an all-powered government."

And it gives the following advice:—

"Do not be lulled into a false sense of security by a probable Conservative victory at the next General Election for 'Under the two-party system, if one major party turns Socialist... then political contests tend to become a race between the two parties in the direction of State dictatorship.'"

## A Workhouse Meal in 1901

A reader has sent us a copy of the *Liverpool Echo* for January 22, 1901, recording the death of Queen Victoria. The issue contains besides the following interesting information:—

"In proposing the adoption of a new workhouse dietary table, at a meeting of the East Ward Guardians, held at Kirby Stephen, the chairman (the Rev. W. Lyde) said it was proposed that the breakfast for children should consist of 2 ozs. of bread, two pints of milk, two pints of porridge and 2 ozs. of sugar, and if they wanted more they could have it. A guardian inquired whether there was not some mistake in the quantities, and if new milk was intended—. The Chairman said the quantities given were correct and

new milk was intended. The children were not forced to take the full quantity, however, and there would be no waste. The new table was adopted; but the impression prevails that the chairman was in error as to this truly extraordinary meal."

Even the advertisement columns provide food for (political) thought. Silk umbrellas were re-covered for 5/-, "Fine Old Irish" was 3/1d. a quart, a saloon fare to New York was purchasable for £10, and a third class fare for £5 15s.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 2.)

introduction of this Bill was that put forward by the Lord Chancellor, I think, at an earlier stage, which has since been repeated by the Lord President of the Council. As I understand it, that argument is as follows. It is perfectly true that your Lordships' House have behaved with perfect propriety and moderation throughout the last three difficult years; but, though you have shown consistent wisdom and statesmanship—under conditions of considerable embarrassment to many of us—the Government could not be absolutely certain that that situation would always continue; and to prevent the possibility of any irresponsible behaviour, however unlikely, they thought it desirable to effect a further curtailment of the powers of the Second Chamber to prevent any possible interference with the Government programme.

As I understand it, that is the argument. But that argument, as I think Mr. Eden pointed out in the earlier stages of the Bill's progress, is, in fact, the doctrine of preventive arrest, with which the world is already painfully familiar in totalitarian countries. In those countries, as your Lordships know, it is a common practice to proceed against individual citizens, not because they have committed any offence but because it is conceived possible that they might become inconvenient to the Party in power. It appears that this totalitarian procedure is now being brought into operation in this country. The structure of the Constitution is to be radically altered in order to prevent any interference with the despotic power of the Executive. If that is the explanation, then it is worse even than iron and steel. In that general form it is, I suggest, an open, blatant attack upon the liberties of the British people, who are henceforth to be deprived of an essential safeguard against hasty or irresponsible action by an extremist or—what seems at the present moment far more possible—a timid or incompetent Government with a temporary majority in the House of Commons.

I had imagined that the existence of some such safeguard as a Second Chamber was universally recognised as being necessary. But now we have an entirely new doctrine. The Leader of the House expounded it in a speech which he made in your Lordships' House on June 9 of this year. I hope he will forgive me if I quote his words. He then said:

"The fact is that we have agreed in this country to live under a system whereby Governments are elected every five years; and they are expected during that time to discharge their duties as well as they are able, according to the pledges they have made to the people, or according to the principles for which they stand. Then, at the end of five years, there is a General Election and, if the people do not approve, they select somebody else. That is the system."

The noble Viscount seemed to assume that it was universally accepted that during the whole of that period of five years a

Government with a majority in the House of Commons, though not necessarily in the country, should have an absolutely free hand to introduce and pass into law anything they liked, without check of any kind. The same view has been expressed, with, if I may say so, parrot-like reiteration, by the Lord President of the Council. He, too, at heart is a single-Chamber man. That is the inner meaning of the argument which he constantly repeats, and which was repeated by the Leader of the House just now, that unless this Bill is passed in its present form the Government's legislative programme will be hamstrung during the last two years of the Parliament.

To most of us that argument is utterly irrelevant. For if a certain period of delay is required during the first three years of a Parliament to enable the British people to make up their minds on a complicated issue, on what logical grounds should they be given a shorter period during the last two years? The only conceivable reason is that the Government fear that during the last two years the period of delay might run over into a General Election. But what is so very dreadful about that? After all, what would be the practical result? The British people, who, of course, are the rulers of this country under His Majesty the King, would have an opportunity themselves of deciding on the disputed issue. If they re-elected the Government, then the measure in question would most certainly become law. If they rejected the Government, it would be conclusive proof that they did not want the measure in question. . . .

. . . The absolute veto of the Second Chamber was destroyed by the Parliament Act of 1911, and all that is left to this House is a certain delaying power to enable the views of the people—who, after all, are the sovereign power under the King in this country—to crystallise and express themselves upon issues of vital importance, upon which they have hitherto not been consulted or upon which their views are uncertain. We, who oppose the present Bill, do not seek, in spite of what I think the Leader of the House suggested this afternoon, to override the views of the people or even to interpret them. But we do think it vital that some machinery should exist to ensure that an adequate period should be provided to enable the British people to come to their own conclusions. Otherwise we might easily get in this country, as in so many others, pure minority rule.

Take even the present Parliament. This Government, as your Lordships know, never had a majority of votes in the country. Even at the General Election in 1945, in the full flood of their success, the votes cast against them considerably exceeded the votes cast for them; and I think it is generally admitted—and it would be true, I think, of nearly all Governments within modern history—that they have lost ground since then. They have indeed a majority in the House of Commons; they are quite safe there. Either the Back Benches follow the Front Benches, or the Front Benches follow the Back Benches. Anyway, they all stick together. But is it really argued, in such circumstances, that a Government which represents only the minority of the nation have an absolute right, or should have an absolute right, for the whole five years of the Parliament, without any check of any kind, to pass far-reaching legislation which may never have been considered by the British people at all?—well, no effective check; I am quite prepared to amend my remark to “no effective check.” The harm done by that legislation might well be irreparable. It might be quite impossible

afterwards to unravel the tangle they had made. That is not democracy in the sense in which we have always understood it in this country.

. . . if the Government really fear that the present membership of this House acts unfairly against the Parties of the Left, if that is their real pre-occupation, surely their proper course is not to reduce the powers of the House but to reform its composition. Noble Lords on this side of the House have never opposed this. On the contrary, we have consistently pressed for it . . .

. . . Personally — and I believe I speak for the vast majority of the members of this House—we do not want to see a Second Chamber biased violently, either one way or the other. What we want is a wise, experienced body, able to throw in its weight against extreme action either by the Right or by the Left. That, we believe, is the only justification for having a Second Chamber at all.

But for such a purpose, the House must have certain effective powers. In a speech on the subject of the House of Lords which was delivered by my grandfather when he was leading the Conservative Party sometime in the 'eighties, he used these words:

“You know that sometimes people put two locks upon their safe, and give separate keys to separate people. If they had the same keys and gave them to the same people you would think they were very absurd persons. But that would be exactly the absurdity of having two legislative assemblies which were bound to follow exactly the prescriptions of the Minister of the day. The one would be no check upon the other.”

And he went on to say in the same speech:

“To my mind there is no danger to liberty greater than would be involved in leaving the House or Lords destitute of real power, but possessed of that pretence of it which would lull the people into security, and induce them to allow the Prime Minister to have sway without supervision or control.”

That is exactly our case to-day. . . .

*The Earl of Glasgow:* My Lords, I propose to keep your Lordships not longer than seven minutes. In my opinion, the Bill before the House is the most vital domestic question that this country has had before it for many years. I fear that the public do not sufficiently realise the magnitude of the disaster for them if it passes. What is the reason for it? In spite of the denials of Ministers in another place, it is just this. The Constitution of the country is to be altered because Mr. Aneurin Bevan wants the nationalisation of iron and steel. In order to satisfy the ideologies of Mr. Bevan and his fellow travellers, the Government propose to drag down the bulwark which for hundreds of years has protected the people of this country against tyranny and oppression. Your Lordships' House will become like a trussed fowl, the only difference being that a fowl is trussed after it is dead. Symbolically, we are to be trussed alive and must be prepared to suffer a lingering death.

With one or two exceptions, I do not believe that, in their hearts, the leaders of the Government are in favour of the nationalisation of iron and steel, or of this Bill. I believe that few, if any, of the noble Lords opposite believe in these things. They know that it is fear, fear that the Labour Party will be torn apart, which has forced their leaders into the betrayal of the constitutional rights of a free people. The façade—a fake façade—of a united Labour Party must at all costs be shown to the world. The Prime Minister has received praise for the way he keeps his team together, but that aspect of his leadership need not present any difficulties for him if

he is prepared to give way on matters which are detrimental to the country—for this Bill is not only an attack upon the constitution it is an assault against the principles of free democracy, which are that the will of the people shall prevail. There comes a time when the mandates from the electorate exhaust themselves. With what is practically abolition of the powers of the Second Chamber, any Left Wing demagogue with the heart of a Red Fascist and a lust for power can, by Orders in Council, change our form of Government and tear to pieces everything which we hold dear; and the will of the people would be the last thing that such a man would wish to consult.

The reported statement by a responsible Minister of the Crown (to which I have already alluded) on May 17 of this year, that there was a moment when the Labour Party had to choose between revolution and constitutional Government, cannot lightly be passed over. It shows more than ever the necessity for a Second Chamber with reasonable powers. Surely, the Party opposing the Government should, before the Election, explain to the voters the dangers of single-chamber Government and ask for a mandate for the protection of the people. If that were done, one of the matters which should, in my opinion, be taken into consideration is our unwritten Constitution which, in the opinion of many people, has out-lived its time.

What is it that these planners, these intellectuals to whom the noble Viscount, Lord Samuel, alluded behind the Government, have in mind? Do they want Britain to have a general set-up and an economic plan based on the ideas of the Kremlin? Already there are 10,000 snoopers at work with powers to enter into every shop and every industrial establishment, and it is stated that a school for these people is to be established. Is this the beginning of the Secret Police? It seems that we are gradually being made to discard our own clothes and put on garments made in Russia—a hard singlet here and an iron jacket there. Soon we shall be so constricted that the only incentive to march forward will be the crack of the whip. If this Bill passes, no longer will the people of this country, when their liberty and way of life are threatened, be able to say, "Thank God, we have a House of Lords." Never before has the danger of the emasculation of the powers of this House been so apparent.

Finally, let me read to your Lordships a short extract from the letter of a Czech, which appeared in a certain review well known to some of your Lordships. This is what he says:

"You know what has happened in our country, and your worst conceptions cannot come up to the reality. All personal security is gone. There is no law to protect us. Those who are not Communists are outlaws. One is liable to arrest at any moment. Imprisonment means being buried alive, and methods are used which make a man a wreck, having nothing in common with a human being. They do exactly as they please with one, and the worst of all is that one never knows who is one's enemy."

In this reminder I do not intend for one moment to imply that such conditions will come to Britain in the immediate future, but I do wish to emphasise that that is the hell towards which we are steering if this Bill passes.

*Lord Calverley:* My Lords, I promise to speak for no more than a few moments, if only to reply to the noble Earl, Lord Glasgow, because I think his fears are unfounded. This House will never be destroyed by an outside body. If it ever does go, it will be because it has committed hara-kiri, or suicide in some form or another. . . .

On Question, Whether this Bill shall be now read a

second time?

Their Lordships divided: Contents, 34; Not-contents, 204.

Resolved in the negative, and Motion disagreed to accordingly.

## 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 .....	6/6
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.
Realistic Constitutionalism .....	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

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/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit.....	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...	7/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	5/-
Odlum v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Communism in Action U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
Protocols of Zion.....	1/6
The Smear Terror .....	1/3
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W....	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.
This Freedom .....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...	8d.
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 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/-	
"Pages from <i>The Social Crediter</i> ".....	1½d.
"Private View" for Industrialists .....	1d.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
(Please allow for postage when remitting).  
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.