

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 9.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

Does any reasonable person suppose that "the Americans" would pour dollars into this country, fully aware that they are financing Socialism, if they were not also aware that Socialism everywhere but in the United States insures the supremacy of the United States? Are we really so soft in the head after previous experience that we suppose "Washington" is actuated by Christian charity to the extent of giving away fifteen hundred billion dollars? Of course not. What the people of this country cannot visualise is that, just as, at the end of the eighteenth century, a gang of traitors-cum-venomous enemies had control of the country's policy; that Jewish influenced French aid to General Washington was primarily to ensure the success, in England, of the Whigs and their backers the Jews, "American" aid to "British" Socialism is primarily, *via* Aneurin Bevan and his Zionist backers, to repeat that success and to ensure the ruin of everyone else?

"What the Socialists want is not progress in the world as we know it but destruction of that world as a prelude to the creation of a world of their own imagining. In order to win that end, they have to seek the support of every force that makes for disorder and to appeal to every motive that stimulates class hatred. Their ethical outlook is the direct reverse of that which has inspired all the great religions of the world. Instead of seeking to attain peace on earth and goodwill among men, they have chosen for their goal universal warfare, and they deliberately make their appeal to the passions of envy, hatred and malice."—Harold Cox.

Lord Beaverbrook is an unaccountable person, and we should not wish to put him forward as a representative British statesman, but he has qualities which are immensely valuable to a politician, as well as the control of agencies which reinforce them. Amongst these can be counted political prescience.

For this reason, we attach quite special importance to his proposal of a basic *income* (not, be it carefully noted, a basic *wage*) of £6 per week, *i.e.*, a national dividend.

The method suggested is far inferior to a compensated fall in the price level, but that is typical of politicians. If a good thing is to be done, let us do it in the worst way possible. But the vital principle is there, and that is the important matter.

For the rest of Lord Beaverbrook's programme much the same kind of comment is applicable. It is politics not statesmanship. But we are inclined to think that much of it is quite good politics, in the sense that it will draw votes, and the so-called Conservative Party will be well advised to move warily in regard to it.

The closest approach to complete security is in jail, and

that is where collective Socialists would like to see us. And the real powers behind Socialism intend that our sentence shall be for life, with hard labour.

The *Estate Book and Diary* lists forty-one Government Departments with powers of interference in some aspect of agriculture and land ownership.

You notice, no doubt, that when it comes to doing any actual fighting against the Communists in China, General McArthur is busy with other matters and the British at Hong Kong are, as usual, landed with the job.

"Mr. Dennis termed the 1860 election of Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency a good example of a social revolution. He said it was supported by American Marxists and international Marxists and consisted of a new coalition party of capitalists, workers and pioneer farmers brought together by their opposition to chattel slavery."—*New York Herald-Tribune*.

"Mr. Dennis" is one of the Reds on trial for un-American activities. When thieves fall out, we hear a little truth by accident. The defeat of the South in the American Civil War was the direct precursor and preparation for the defeat of "Britain" now nearly complete.

### Lilienthal

"Yesterday, Senators rebuffed the President by refusing to recommend confirmation of Leland Olds of the F.T.C. The Commerce sub-committee vote, resounding as a slap in the face, was 7 to 0. In the wake of this event, observers are wondering if such examples of Senatorial independence are due, and—in particular—if even that Presidential favourite, David Lilienthal, is threatened. Lilienthal's reappointment comes up before the Senate early in the next session of Congress. It is reported that the members of the atomic sub-committee are almost as solidly opposed to Lilienthal as the Commerce sub-committee was opposed to Olds. Such Democratic leaders as Johnson of Colorado and Russell of Georgia are said to distrust the head of the Atomic Commission. But the factor which might well kill Lilienthal's chances is the rising ambition of Senator Brian McMahon. The Connecticut Democrat has tasted a good deal of palatable public attention as a result of his activities as head of the Senate Atomic Committee. Like Lilienthal himself, McMahon has been obtaining quite a few lecture engagements. It is believed that the Senator would now like to have the spotlight all to himself, and—while formally defending Lilienthal—privately would not be averse to retiring the latter to private life. Such motives, such manoeuvres are not exactly unknown on Capitol Hill."—*Not Merely Gossip*, (Washington, D.C.)

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: October 18, 1949.*

### British Aid (Foreign Countries)

*Major Bruce* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the total amount to date of aid granted by Great Britain to other countries since the end of the war, distinguishing between amounts loaned, outright gifts or grants, and grants made under the Intra-European Payments Scheme.

*Sir S. Cripps*: Aid by the United Kingdom to other countries in the form of gifts or loans of cash, goods and services, has amounted to £950 million since the end of the war. Of this, £65 million represents drawing rights exercised on us under the Intra-European Payments Scheme, £400 million is in gifts or grants, and £485 million is recoverable aid.

### New Forest Bill [Lords]

Order for Second Reading read.

*The Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture (Mr. George Brown)*: I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

. . . It will, of course, be common knowledge that there has been for many years conflict and disagreement in the New Forest, at times greater than others, between the Crown and the commoners who have various rights over the Forest, the most important of these being the right to depasture their animals over unenclosed parts of the Forest, more generally known as the open forest. In more recent years, it has been considered desirable to bring the general position in the Forest under consideration in the light of present day conditions, and to this end a Committee was set up under the chairmanship of the Rt. Hon. Harold Baker.

. . . I do not think that I need at this stage, go through the main conclusions of the committee, but there are some important issues which have been the subject of discussion as the Bill proceeded on its way in another place, which, perhaps, ought to be referred to now. The first matter is that of the Constitution of the Ancient Court of Verderers. At the moment, the Court consists of an official verderer appointed by His Majesty and six verderers elected by local residents and the commoners, by personal voting which involves no element of secrecy. The Baker Report recommended that there should be a chief verderer to be appointed by the Lord Chancellor, four verderers to be elected by the commoners, and six to be appointed by interested parties.

I do not think that we need at this stage go into the various considerations which led us to feel that this recommendation could not be wholly accepted, but following discussions between the Forestry Commission and the local interests, provision has been made for an official verderer to be appointed by His Majesty as heretofore, five elective verderers, and four to be nominated, one by my right hon. Friend, one by the Forestry Commission, one by the planning authority and the other by a body concerned with amenity, such body to be designated by my right hon. Friend.

There was a fear in the minds of some of the local interests that in certain, although possibly remote, circumstances the elected verderers would be outvoted by the combined votes of the official verderer and the nominated verderers, although this would only happen on the assumption

that the chairman had the casting vote. . . it is my right hon. Friend's desire in this, as in all other matters, that there should not be any possible chance of the elective verderers being outvoted on the important matters for example, of enclosures for afforestation and for agriculture. The verderer nominated by the Forestry Commission will not be allowed to vote on the afforestation issue and, similarly, the agricultural verderer will not be allowed to vote on the agricultural issue. . . The effect will be quite obviously that the five elective verderers will have the final say on these matters, if they so wish, but my right hon. Friend has no doubt that after considering the pros and cons of any issue put before them they will exercise this power in a wise and statesmanlike manner. Clause 5 provides that elections in future will be by secret ballot instead of by the present provision. . .

*Colonel Crosthwaite-Eyre* (New Forest and Christchurch): . . . Now I come to the Bill. If one reads the Baker Report, one is given the impression that the New Forest is a sort of miraculous survival, something which, despite the changes of fortune, has managed to survive all the vicissitudes of encroachment and enclosure by the various Governments that this country has had. That is not true at all. The only reason the New Forest has survived is because the people there have for centuries been willing to fight to protect not only their own rights, but the rights of the general public to ensure that the New Forest shall survive as an entity.

If one goes back—and I must trouble the House with this—two or three centuries, one finds that during the 18th century one Royal Forest after another was dissipated by Acts of Parliament, in which a certain percentage of the Forest concerned was granted to the Crown because of its rights and a certain percentage to the commoners because of their rights. Both sides were allowed to enclose their areas, and within a very few years the Forest so apportioned disappeared. The same thing would have happened to the New Forest if it had not been for the fight made by the inhabitants.

I must quote in evidence one of the renowned Prime Ministers of my party, Mr. Pitt, who, in 1792, introduced a Bill to try to enclose the New Forest. That Bill was stopped in this House and in another place by the action of the residents of the New Forest. In the 19th century the same thing happened. A Bill was introduced in 1851 by a Government with a large majority, and the Government said frankly: "We can get the Bill through, no matter what anybody says." The Bill was designed to reduce the New Forest to nothing. It gave the Forestry Commission, in exchange for taking away the deer, the right not only to enclose 20,000 acres of the Forest but, once those 20,000 acres had grown up to a height at which the trees could not be damaged by cattle, to enclose another 20,000 acres. By that kind of rolling power it was proposed to take away the whole of the New Forest. A member of the Office of Woods at that time said: "It is right for the Crown to try to exercise their power in this way. The sooner they take away the open forest the sooner will the commoners' rights be found of no avail."

It was only by the Act of 1877 that the New Forest was preserved. The inhabitants of the New Forest had fought the matter for 26 years, between 1851 and 1877. The Act of 1877 said that the Forestry Commission should have no more than the acreage that they then enjoyed, and that

the rest of the open forest would stay permanently unimpaired, not only for the benefit of the commoners but for the benefit of the people of the country. What was the answer of the Office of Woods? They said merely: "It happens that you have won this fight in Parliament, and we cannot enclose any more. So far as the open forest is concerned, we therefore have no interest whatever. We will not spend any money upon it because we have lost interest in it. We shall confine our activities to those bits that we have been allowed to enclose." When the hon. Member for Preston said that another Bill was necessary because the verderers' finances were inadequate, he said what is true. When Parliament passed the Act of 1877, it did not envisage that the Forestry Commission—or the Office of Woods, later called the Forestry Commission—would take the view which they did, that, having been defeated in their attempts to enclose the New Forest, they would take no further interest in its maintenance. That is why another Measure was necessary.

When the verderers asked for a further Act they asked for one that would put them in an independent position and would enable them to do their duty properly as representatives of the commoners and the public. Their task was to maintain a just balance between the Crown, the commoners and the public. When the present Bill was first produced, it was a Bill of blackmail, and blackmail only. Its clauses were so designed that the verderers would either have had to agree to further enclosures or they would not get any revenue. It is as a result of the action taken by the residents of the New Forest in fighting the Bill in another place that the Bill has been so altered that now the verderers are to be put in an independent position, so far as maintenance of the open Forest is concerned, by seeing that duty of maintenance firmly placed on the shoulders of the Forestry Commission. . . .

*Mr. Shackleton:* The hon. and gallant Member said that the Bill was deliberately framed as a piece of blackmail, but I am sure that he does not really mean that. The Bill may have given that impression and it may have been clumsily worded, but I am certain that my right hon. Friend had no intention whatsoever of bringing undue pressure to bear on the people and the commoners of the New Forest.

*Colonel Crosthwaite-Eyre:* I am very glad to receive that assurance from the hon. Member. I would ask him to study the evidence given in another place by Lord Robinson, Chairman of the Forestry Commission, on this very point. He said that it appeared to him unfortunate—that was the word he used—that the verderers should be faced with the conflicting interests of either getting no further revenue or surrendering the lands concerned. . . .

That is, briefly, the history of the Bill. When the hon. Member for Preston said that he regretted the suspicion—I think that was actually the word he used—I would point out that it is entirely due to the fact that Governments, not only this Government but many other Governments, have seen in the New Forest something easy to seize, something from which they could get immediately a tangible reward, if only they could do away with the rights of the commoners and of the public as a whole.

I ask the House to consider this case. We shall have time later in Committee to go into it in detail. Let us take into consideration the powers under which the Forestry Commission are now asking for 5,000 acres of forest. In another place, in a Select Committee, Lord Robinson was

asked to state whether he knew that the 5,000 acres could be taken and whether he had any idea exactly from where they could be taken. To both of those questions he replied "No." All that he said in defence of asking for those powers was: "There are 40,000 acres of unenclosed forest, and if I cannot take one-eighth of them I shall be very surprised." What a reason for asking for a Clause of this nature. There was no reference to the needs, the rights or the requirements of commoners and public—simply a bald statement: "I must be able to take with advantage one-eighth of what remains."

Those people who know the New Forest must be aware that the best land has been taken from the forest and that the enclosures are all of the better, low-lying ground. In many cases watering has been taken away and land that was most suitable for immediate profit by afforestation has been taken by the Forestry Commission. Were the Commission to substantiate the taking of a further 5,000 acres—this question was thoroughly debated in another place—the Commission should have been able to show from where they could be taken without doing grave permanent injury to the rights of the commoners. I hope that the Minister will say something more on this point.

Then there is the question of the 3,000 acres suggested for agriculture. I have not only discussed this matter with soil experts, but have listened to the evidence given in another place. From where do the Ministry of Agriculture think that these 3,000 acres will come? They say that that is the maximum, and that they probably will not need so much. If they do not need it, why should they put it in the Bill? If they put it in, surely before asking Parliament to give them this power they should have taken the trouble to see that that acreage was available. So far as I know, no survey has been made.

I should be the last simply to condemn out of hand all that the Ministry of Agriculture have done for the New Forest. As a verderer I could not do it, having agreed to the temporary enclosures which they now hold, but I believe that for any real benefit to agriculture in the New Forest they are going about it in the wrong way. We do not want large reseeded areas. Such areas, very naturally, because of the nature and the newness of that grazing, congregate all the cattle upon them, and the ancient feeding places tend to go back. The new feeding places tend to be over-grazed and very quickly deteriorate. Instead of this producing any lasting benefit, I think it is upsetting the balance of the agricultural position in the New Forest. All the people with whom I have talked say that what really counts is to try to get back the small traditional grazing places and once more make them the natural habitat of the cattle of the district.

I was horrified that the hon. Member for Preston knew something which I did not, due entirely to my ignorance, namely, that the right hon. Gentleman had said that he thinks £1,500 a year will be required to maintain the open forests. . . . It was laid down [in another place] that the Forestry Commission should become responsible for the maintenance of the open forest. In evidence which was not challenged, that maintenance was set at a minimum of £3,000 a year. In this Bill the expenditure is put at £1,500. I ask the right hon. Gentleman why that discrepancy has arisen, and I hope that he will say why when he replies. . . .

The final matter I wish tonight to raise concerns the Court of Verderers. Some people may not quite appreciate

(continued on page 7)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Offices: (*Business*) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: *CEN*tral 8509; (*Editorial*) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone *SE*Fion Park 435.

Vol. 23. No. 9.

Saturday, October 29, 1949.

### Australian Statesman Attacks The Fetish of Bigness

In view of its interest, we make way this week for the following report of a speech by Sir Earle Page, of the Australian Country Party, in support of a resolution that "New States are indispensable to the rapid peopling and development of Australia, and will provide safeguards against totalitarian tendencies":—

"A federal system with numerous partners is more likely to preserve the democratic system of Government. Democratic Government, to be efficient and to give content, must not only be government of the people and for the people, it must be within sight and hearing of the people.

"The history of the British Empire and the United States of America shows clearly that the extension of local self-government to communities as soon as they are able to shoulder its responsibilities, stimulates development and keeps democracy alive. The British Empire has not hesitated to give local self-government even to small units such as New Zealand, South Rhodesia, Tasmania, etc. This decentralised administration secured informed control on the spot, and mobilised local knowledge and patriotism.

"The United States began with 13 States, each roughly the size of England. Progressively, as outlying territories were settled, they were converted to self-governing States as soon as their population was sufficient to give them one representative to the Lower House of Parliament.

"It was found that each new government, as soon as formed, mobilised local knowledge and local enthusiasm in utilising and developing local resources, with the result of the rapid, many-sided development of the United States of America.

"For instance, California, which is half the size of N.S.W., became a part of the United States territory 100 years ago, and later a full-fledged State. It has now as many people as the whole of Australia, although its natural resources are no greater than those of N.S.W. . . .

"The very real impediment to our following these examples in Australia is our obsession with, and worship of, the fetish of large size. A large area of a State and a large population of a city seem to fascinate the Australian people and politicians like a boa-constrictor fascinates a bird. What really matters in a State or a city is not its size, but its social functioning.

"A moment's reflection shows that mere size militates against proper functioning; in fact, it brings about all sorts of social diseases and the ultimate extinction of the State

or city through difficulties in transport, distance of men from their work, troubles with supplies of water, fresh milk and fresh vegetables, distance from points of recreation and entertainment, and the absence of personal contacts between classes.

"Let us look in detail at Australia's trends in the illuminating stories told us by the Government Statistician. First, take the population trend in N.S.W. as disclosed by the 1947 census. N.S.W. has an area of 310,000 square miles—roughly six times the size of England and three and a half times the size of Victoria. Let us contrast the development and population of the area within 100 miles of Sydney—100 miles long by 60 miles wide, say roughly 6,000 square miles—with the development and population of the remaining 304,000 square miles of the State. This smaller area nearest the capital city is roughly one-fiftieth of the area of the State. It is not any more fertile than many other areas of the same size in the State of N.S.W., yet this small area has over two-thirds of the people and nine-tenths of the electric power of the State.

"Let us consider these figures, which are typical of each State, alongside the following facts:—

"The tradition of personal freedom in Australia, as elsewhere in the world, is largely dependent on the feeling that a man has some chance of setting up in business on his own account, and need not always be dependent on an employer. In Australia the proportion of all working males who own their own businesses was 22% in 1947, 24% in 1933, and 27% in 1901. In Canada the percentage was 33 in 1947.

"Colin Clarke, a distinguished economist, says it is possible to trace in different countries some connection between the independence of outlook and the proportion who are economically independent through owning their own businesses.

"Rural areas and reasonably sized towns are above the Australian average, while big cities are below the average in independent owners. Our lack of balance is exemplified by Australia now having a substantially larger proportion of its working population engaged in manufacture than has the United States of America. Because of the large size of our States and the concentration of their facilities, especially transport and power, into a limited area in the State, Australian manufacture has been developed at the expense of rural industry on the one hand, and on the other of service industries, both of which offer far more opportunities to the independent proprietor. . . .

"The creation of new smaller States in Australia can restore balance. Such action can marry again the town and the country. Out of this union may spring a new hope, a new life, and a new civilisation in Australia that will call a halt to class warfare and unite us as a democratic community into a homogeneous nation through homogeneous culture and identity of interests."

### Maynooth

More than local interest attaches to the statement issued by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Ireland concerning the world response to their appeal on behalf of Maynooth. A total of £642,567 has been contributed, which "in addition to relieving pressing needs, will enable the College to pay its debts, meet its annual deficit and do various repair works."

## Planning the Earth

By C. G. DOBBS

X

The one advantage which an open dictatorship has over a so-called 'democracy,' whether of the Eastern or Western model, lies in the clear acceptance of responsibility by the rulers. At least the power and the responsibility are not divided. Mr. Lilienthal makes the same point about the T.V.A.; it is essential, if the job of developing a large area such as the Tennessee Valley is to be done properly, that responsibility should not be divided, but should rest squarely upon one unified Authority—which means ultimately upon one man, its Director. That is, of course, true of any job or undertaking; what is wrong is not the principle of responsibility, but the size and nature of the job.

Divided responsibility means chaos and muddle, but what is always forgotten, or else carefully not mentioned, is that unified responsibility at a 'high' level means either divided responsibility or else the total surrender of responsibility at all 'lower' levels. If, as in slavery, or war, it is openly admitted that to serve his rulers the individual must surrender his own will and purpose, if necessary his own life, and simply obey orders, the system may, at any rate, function efficiently from the point of view of the Managers; but that is not the point of view which is conventionally supposed to prevail in a 'democracy.' And if it be admitted for a moment that there are any fields in which the individual ought to have, or indeed must have, responsibility for his actions, and, at the same time, some centralised Authority claims power over those same fields, immediately we have divided responsibility 'at the grass roots' as Mr. Lilienthal would put it; which means that the very foundations of life, and of society are disrupted.

For, when it comes to it, we all know that, at a pinch, we can do without the 'Big Jobs of the Century,' but we cannot do without the little jobs of the ages, nor allow undue interference with the men who do them, without returning to chaos and misery. Humanity could have got along quite well without the Great Pyramids of Egypt and the Colosseum at Rome, and the Great Lakes of Tennessee, and the Great Skyscrapers of New York, and Giant Rallies in the Red Square, and Immense Liners, and Monster Aircraft, and Autobahns, and the International Chemical Cartel, and U.N.O., and the World Bank, and the Atom Bomb; without all these Great Things which need so much *organising* by important People. But if a man cannot plough or sow, keep a few hens or pigs, bake or brew, do a bit of carpentering or building, on his own undivided responsibility, then indeed the situation is becoming desperate.

And of all the jobs which require that undivided trio of knowledge, power and responsibility to be decentralised, in individual, local hands, the care and cultivation of the land is the most essential. The very word 'local' is tied up with the nature of the land—of course every piece of land is local, and every locality is a particular piece of land.

If we agree with Mr. Lilienthal that modern management requires undivided authority and responsibility, in whose hands shall we place the unified and undivided responsibility for the development of the resources of farmer Jones's five-acre field? If the answer is not 'in farmer Jones's' there is no answer, except that the responsibility must be divided

between him and other people who, whatever they may or may not know about Agriculture in the abstract, cannot have either the knowledge or the experience of that particular field that he has, nor do they stand to gain or lose as he does by the results of its management.

It is commonly supposed that centrally placed officials in Whitehall or the World Food and Agriculture Organisation, having a superior knowledge of the needs and wants of the people, are therefore in a better position to Plan the production which is necessary to satisfy those needs, and hence, through a suitable delegation of powers to people with local knowledge, such as the members of the County Agriculture Committee, to Plan the production of each productive unit, such as Jones's farm, if necessary over-riding or modifying his own plans from time to time as may seem necessary in view of the General Requirements.

This is but an important special case of the general Planning argument, which has now gained such general acceptance through sheer repetition that rational thought is seldom applied to it. It possesses that superficial convincingness and fundamental complete falsity from premises to conclusion which characterises so much induced mass-ideation to-day. Its persistent exposure is essential to a return to health in society.

To begin with, the nature and productive capacity of a five-acre field are not affected by the 'demands' either of Society or of officials upon it. It cannot change from beef to milk, from stock to wheat and back again in a year or two just because the Government wants it to. Of course, in response to threats of fines and dispossession and so forth the attempt can be made, but this is where the Planning literally has to come down to earth, often with the most ludicrous, or tragic, results. It is unquestionable that the person nearest to this particular piece of earth is farmer Jones, and he alone is in a position to realise its actual nature, and the limitations which it sets upon human planning in relation to it. Certainly it is desirable that he should also take account of the inducement offered by the requirements of other people for the potential products of a five-acre field, as they may be expressed by the efficient mechanism of the economic vote, but the survival of the soil, and hence of humanity, may be said to depend upon a correct relationship between the 'demands' of the people and of the land. Above all the 'demand' for any particular use of the land which may conflict with its nature must never be backed by a force which will over-ride the farmer's judgment of what is due to the land. He may be a good or a bad farmer, but natural bad farmers soon eliminate themselves so that they are always a minority, and the harm they do is limited by the size of the area under their control. A Planner on the other hand, can ruin the World, if he can get it as his Planning Area. One might have thought that the ruinous effects on the land of absentee landlordism and of financial pressure would have resulted in the determined rejection of every argument for the even more remote landlordism of the Planner using the even more powerful force of direct legal compulsion.

When we turn to the idea that the central Planner can form a more accurate estimate of the needs and wants of other people than they can themselves common sense has completely departed. As an alternative to the provision of the necessary 'means of payment' and of effectively expressing their requirements, the immense undertaking of unified central Planning of the total resources of large areas and ultimately

of the World, in order to supply the estimated needs of their inhabitants, particularly when taken in conjunction with the similar Planning of populations in order to accommodate the number of people to the resources Planned, passes the bounds of sanity and enters the domain of pure megalomania.

In fact the central Planner knows the needs and the wants of one person only—himself—or of one family—his own—that is, if he is not too pre-occupied with other people's affairs even to make a sound judgment of his own. The 'data' which he uses to justify his Planning, on the basis of social surveys and so forth, exist in the form of ideal mathematical units, having at the most favourable estimate a childish crude, and at the same time tenuous and hypothetical relationship with anything in the real world. There are a few narrowly functional purposes for which it is permissible to regard people as mathematical units, e.g. in designing a lift or vehicle to carry them, and even that, only on its purely engineering side; and equally where, as in Social Planning, the people themselves constitute the unit quantities which are being used, they can be so regarded only in some narrowly functional aspect. Thus, a commandant of a concentration camp may need to know how many 'people' it will take to fill a pit of given size, a Builder of the Pyramids may have had to know how many people can drag a rock of given size up a ramp of given height, and a modern population expert may have good reason to find out how many people should be bred in order to fulfil some function desired by his paymasters, e.g. to provide an age-class of such and such a size for military purposes, or to fill the schools to reasonable capacity, or on a more local basis, to provide workers for a factory producing tin-tacks for export.

It is commonly forgotten that *statistics* was, from the first, as the word implies, a technique developed to serve the purposes of State Planning. Before there could be statistics, there were 'statists'<sup>1</sup> (i.e. State Planning Experts).

"It is about forty years ago," says Zimmermann, "that that branch of political knowledge, which has for its object the actual and relative *power* of the several modern states, the *power* arising from their natural advantages, the industry and civilisation of their inhabitants, and the *wisdom* of their governments, has been formed, chiefly by German writers, into a separate science . . . . By the more convenient form it has now received . . . . this science, distinguished by the new-coined name of statistics, is become a favourite study in Germany." The emphasis on the words 'power' and 'wisdom' is mine. 'About forty years' before Zimmermann would bring us to the early years of the reign of Frederick II of Prussia, called 'The Great,' who ascended the throne in 1740 and died in 1786, so that his reign just about covers

the period of the rise of Statistics in Germany to the position of an accepted science. Since Frederick may be regarded as the first and the father of all modern Planners this is not surprising. The basis of his Planning was no doubt the sort of Planning known as logistics, the science of moving, lodging and supplying troops in war (or, one might add, in threat of war) at which he was so undoubtedly proficient; but that is the ultimate basis from which all Planning springs, and to which it returns when ever the supply of non-military crises and emergencies as justification threatens to fail. To trace the connection between Frederick and Voltaire, Freemasonry, Encyclopaedism, the French Revolution, and modern Prussianism and National Socialism would be to turn aside too far; but in the light of the later use of statistics in Planning, the fact that it was first developed in Germany during Frederick's reign must be regarded as significant.

At first it was not even necessary that statistical data should be in numerical form, but this soon became essential, and later the technique was borrowed by other sciences not directly concerned with Social Planning, particularly the biological sciences, so that, its origin having been forgotten, statistics is now widely regarded as the very essence of 'pure' science, the technique whereby the bias due to human will and purpose may be eliminated by the use of the pure impartiality of numbers. But a method cannot escape from its origins, nor from its ends, since means and ends are inseparable; and in every case in which the word 'statistics' is legitimately used it will be found that the essence of the method is the treatment of a population of individuals as if they were *functional* units, i.e. each individual is conceived of as a unit possessing a function which it may be desired to use in some way. The symbols representing these abstract individual-fragments are then manipulated, and the resulting conclusions applied to the real, total, individuals. Statistics is thus seen to be a mechanism essential to totalitarianism in Planning, but incompatible with the treatment of individuals or even things, as whole persons or things having a total nature of their own, and, in the case of human beings, a will and purpose involved in that nature, as real as the Planner's or the Statistician's.

There is an attempt to pretend that a Statistician is merely doing the same thing (on a larger scale) as a hostess who counts her guests before dinner, just as, in another field, Atomic War is supposed to be merely an enlargement of a fight between two small boys in the school playground; but in both cases the relationship, such as it is, between the small and the large thing is inverse. It is not the pugnacious small boy who makes the War Planner, and when the hostess counts Mr. Brown among her guests she is in no danger of forgetting his qualities as a whole individual, or reducing him to the status of a functional unit (unless, indeed, she is the sort of female Planner whose sole aim in inviting Mr. Brown was to fill a place at table or to get rid of some unwanted food). But when a 'statist' includes Mr. Brown in some 'data' compiled on the basis of filled-in forms, a unit he is to the Planner, and can be no other, by the nature of things. Yet it is the whole and individual Mr. Brown who has to carry out the Plans and conform with the regulations, not the unit functional Brown.

It should be noted in passing that Finance constitutes a very critical sort of statistics in relation to the control of human purpose, since the units of which it consists are actually accepted as a means of expression of the will of the individual in all economic affairs; yet, being completely

<sup>1</sup>See *Cymbeline* (1610 or 1611) Act II, Scene IV:

I do believe,—  
Statist though I am none, nor like to be,—  
That this will prove a war; . . .

See also *Hamlet* (1602) Act V, Scene II:

I once did hold it, as our statist do,  
A baseness to write fair, and laboured much  
How to forget that learning; . . .

The progressive Educational Statist does not seem to have progressed far since Shakespeare's day!

One of the earlier references to Statistics occurs in the preface to *A Political Survey of the Present State of Europe* by E. A. W. Zimmermann, issued in 1787.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Cited from *An introduction to the Theory of Statistics* by G. Udny Yule, 9th Edition, 1929, p.1.

abstract, they impose no natural limitations whatever upon the manipulations of the financial Planner. The results upon the behaviour and integrity of character of almost everyone are appalling.

Of course, Finance ought not to be statistical at all, *i.e.* it ought not to be capable of being used as a means of Government; it ought to be a useful mathematical accompaniment of human affairs as automatic as the flow of water through the soil—not a means of power pent up and controllable behind a dam. Neither a central banker nor the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to have more power to manipulate policies and people's lives by means of the money mechanism than an accountant or a bank clerk. It is fantastic that professional integrity should be expected of the small banker but not of the big one; that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should be permitted to manipulate our finances, denying beforehand what he is about to do, while the local firm of accountants would be ruined if it were detected in any such treatment of its clients' accounts. There is not the slightest hope of recovery or security while the purchasing power of every pound we earn or possess is subject to the arbitrary fiat of a few centrally placed persons.

Just how long the economists and financial writers will continue to use phrases like 'economic blizzards' and so forth, implying that the consequences of financial manipulation are a part of the world of nature, is a secret known only to them; but in view of recent events it merely exposes them to ridicule, and with them the whole argument that it was free enterprise which failed during the financial depression. Yet it is merely a special example of the theory that statistics constitute an impartial view of reality, and that in turn is a part of the attempt to substitute the pseudo World of the Planners for the real World in which, in the last resort, we find that we exist.

(To be concluded).

### PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

what a Court of Verderers is, as it is an archaic body descending through the centuries. From the time of William the Conqueror, verderers were officers appointed with the sole job of seeing that the Crown rights in the forests, paramount as they were, were not used to such an extent that they acted against the legitimate rights of the small commoner and the small farmer. The duty of the verderers was, while maintaining the prerogatives of the Crown, to ensure that justice was done to the small man.

In this Bill, for the first time in history, it is proposed completely to alter the composition of the verderers. Instead of being an independent body with the very well-defined job of maintaining the balance between the various rights, the verderers are now to become a body half of which is to be elected and half to be nominated. In all the discussions I have had, I have not heard one reason from the Government why that should be so. Why is it that, in this year in which we are alleged to have a Government which believes in democracy and all the rights of the small people, the Government want to take this independence from one of the few bodies which have functioned well throughout the centuries? I hope to hear something more about this from the right hon. Gentleman.

The Minister wishes to have in this Court a member of the Forestry Commission, and a member of the Ministry of Agriculture for the grazing and the enclosures sides of the

verderers' work. Also a member of the Ministry of Town and Country Planning and members of such bodies as he may consider it necessary to consult for amenity purposes; and, instead of being an elected body to deal impartially with all the rights of those concerned in the Forest, the verderers will now become a Court half composed of nominees of the Minister. Why does the Minister wish to do this? In the Acts of Parliament throughout the last century and this century, he has complete powers to maintain the rights of the Crown which have now devolved upon his Ministry. Why does he therefore wish to put his representatives on the Court? What good will they do? What purpose will they serve? They cannot help in the administration of the Forest. By their very nature they will be people concerned purely with the interests of afforestation or temporary enclosure for catch-crops of some seven years. They can add nothing to the deliberations of the verderers. As to the representative of the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, I should like to know what the Minister thinks he will do.

As the hon. Member for Preston said, we in the Court of Verderers have always said, I believe rightly, that there are a very great many interests, particularly of the wild life, which must be preserved in the New Forest. We have always said—and we asked in the petitions in another place—that we should be given power to co-opt two members to the Court of Verderers who would advise and help us on these problems of wild life. I am certain that that would be an advantage, but I can see no reason whatever for all these stooges of the various Ministries to come on to the Court. If I were evil minded—I must admit that I sometimes personally feel the suspicions mentioned by the hon. Member for Preston—I could see only one reason for this, to try to invalidate the independence of the Court and to obtain sufficient nominees on it to secure the power to sway the decision of the Court.

In the New Forest we are proud that, of all the Royal Forests and of all the heritages of the small farmer and the commoner, we alone now remain. We have done that, quite honestly, by fighting and by making it clear to every Government that we will not tolerate an invasion of our rights. The Bill as originally drafted was an invasion of those rights on a major scale. Many of the things to which we objected have been taken out in another place. I hope the Government will realise the value of the New Forest; of its tradition and the part it can play in English agriculture, and will remove other matters which I have mentioned. If the Government do that, we shall have a Bill which will be a worthy successor to the Act of 1877 and will enable the New Forest to go on not only as a pleasure to countless thousands of holiday-makers but also as an invaluable centre of the small agriculturist.

[The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas Williams), replying, said that the £1,500 proposed was in addition to the £2,000 to £3,000 already spent by the Forestry Commission on the maintenance of the Forest.]

### Development Rights (Claims)

Mr. Douglas Marshall asked the Minister of Town and Country Planning if he will give further consideration to extending the time in which claims for loss of development value can be made.

The Minister of Town and Country Planning (Mr. Silkin): I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given

to a similar Question on 31st May last by the hon. and gallant Member for Brixton (Lieut.-Colonel Lipton).

*Mr. Marshall:* May I ask the Minister whether in cases where there has only been a matter of a few days' delay, arising out of the heavy rush of work at that time, he will—even in those cases—reconsider this matter?

*Mr. Silkin:* I am sorry but I have no power to grant any latitude, apart from making an entirely new order.

*Colonel Dower:* Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the number of particulars which are asked for and which have to be sent in is very large and that in a few months' time all these claims and other charges may be so much waste paper?

*Mr. Stokes:* What is the legal position of a person who does not listen to the wireless and does not read the Press and who then finds himself dispossessed? What happens?

*Mr. Silkin:* I am afraid that he is a very ignorant man.

*Mr. Stokes:* No, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, does my right hon. Friend know that I never listen to the wireless and rarely read the Press?

*Mr. Silkin:* My answer still holds good.

*Mr. Hopkin Morris:* Following upon that question, might I ask the right hon. Gentleman what happens to the person who believes that this is a matter for the local authority?

#### Employment (Labour Controls)

*Mr. Blackburn* asked the Minister of Labour how many people have been directed to work since the coming into force of the Supplies and Services (Transitional Powers) Act, 1947.

*Mr. Isaacs:* Nineteen men and 10 women since 6th October, 1947, the date of coming into force of the Control of Engagement Order, 1947. In addition, directions have been given since that date to 581 men to remain in their normal employment in agriculture or coal mining.

*Mr. J. Langford-Holt:* Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, in many hundreds of cases, the mere threat of direction has the same effect?

*Mr. Isaacs:* There is no threat of direction.

*Mr. Blackburn:* Has not the Minister given an undertaking to all hon. Members of the House that he will personally investigate any cases of victimisation due to the threat of the use of this power, and has the Minister had a single case of victimisation which has been proved?

*Mr. Isaacs:* The only case was in the early days of the scheme, when one of the exchange managers made a mistake and we promptly put it right.

*Mr. Langford-Holt:* Can the Minister give an undertaking that on no occasion in the past or in the future has the threat been used or will be used?

*Mr. Isaacs:* I can give that undertaking. We have never threatened anybody.

*Mr. Mellish:* Is not my right hon. Friend aware that direction into labour is a new thing in this country, and that in the past it was the policy to direct people out of labour?

#### Outhouses, Coastal Villages

*Mr. Thornton-Kemsley* asked the Secretary of State for Scotland if he will authorise the erection of outhouses for council tenants in coastal villages where the provision of

shelter for line baiting and of storage facilities for fishing gear is essential.

*Mr. Woodburn:* Yes, Sir. I am prepared to consider any plans submitted by local authorities in which provision is made for special accommodation for fishermen's gear. I have already agreed to this in several cases.

*Mr. Thornton-Kemsley:* Why should there be this long delay? Is the Minister aware that a great many of the Cruden houses and others erected long ago by county councils have no outhouses because they are prevented from putting them up by his own Department of Health and that, as a consequence, the fishermen are baiting their gear in the houses themselves?

*Mr. Woodburn:* I think the hon. Gentleman must be mistaken. For instance, in his own constituency where the county council have put forward these propositions, my Department have agreed to them. I would like the hon. Gentleman to give me details of any contrary decision.

### REALISTIC CONSTITUTIONALISM

(Notes for an Address to the Constitutional Research Association at Brown's Hotel, Mayfair, May 8, 1947)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

K.R.P. Publications

SIXPENCE (Postage 1d.)

### 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/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England .....	8d.
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

Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson .....	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster .....	20/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit, 6/-..... (Cloth Edition)	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage	7/-
Introduction to Social Credit by Bryan W. Monahan .....	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Odlum v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
The International Jew by Eric D. Butler .....	2/6

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

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