

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 27. No. 14.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.  
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

"The Beaverbrook newspapers which show a crusader on the front page greeted the onset of the general election by placing that figure in chains. It seems probable that the symbolic action had a private as well as a public significance. One purpose, perhaps, was to remind Mr. Churchill, should he be returned to power, of the day when Lord Beaverbrook arrived at the Atlantic Charter meeting to reinforce him when he was under intolerable pressure from the Americans to submit to economic proposals which would have meant the destruction of the British Empire. That process having been carried far towards completion under Mr. Attlee's auspices, most people who understand the urgency of securing a reversal of policy look with confidence to Mr. Churchill to rebuild Britain upon a firm Imperial foundation. They must have been perturbed to discover that, despite the Conservative victory, the crusader remains in chains—Lord Beaverbrook's presentiment perhaps."

The *Daily Express* has condoned the article by Mr. A. K. Chesterton in *Truth* of which the above is the first paragraph by quoting it to the extent of half a column, but we have not seen the issue in which this appeared.

It may be that Mr. Chesterton's advocacy on behalf of the half-dozen Members of Parliament mentioned with approval by "Cross-Bencher" (*T.S.C.*, November 24, page 2.) and of Lord Beaverbrook himself as "one of the sturdiest patriots the Empire has known" has earned the added publicity for the Crusader in Chains. At the same time, the Phi Beta Kappa boys of the Washington clubs are linking together the "terrific" British financial crisis and the forthcoming visit of Mr. Churchill "to ask for a loan to save Britain." Bernard Baruch has been paving the way. Nor is Mr. Chesterton silent on the point that Mr. Baruch's intention is that Mr. Churchill might thus the more effectively serve as General Eisenhower's fogleman. Says Mr. Chesterton: "There has been, extending over many years, a close study of the internationalist affiliations of all parties. As a result, I have long been convinced that the destruction of the British Empire, and the abandonment of national sovereignty in favour of a supranational junta of power-addicts, is the dominating motif of modern world policy, and that the would-be world-governors have now manoeuvred themselves into a position where they can use the wealth of America's all too innocent taxpayers to finance the entire conspiracy." Truly it seems as though something were moving. The silly chorus that "the cure for inflation is hard work" (and still harder work) still goes hand in hand with what is moving. But, perhaps it is "one thing at a time," though, in this case, one thing at a time just won't do.

Lord Radcliffe has been quoting the seventeenth-century

Marquis of Halifax:—"The best party is but a kind of conspiracy against the rest of the Nation. They put everybody else out of their Protection. Like the Jews to the Gentiles, all others are the offscourings of the World." Says Lord Radcliffe, "Of course we have changed all that long since." He admits, however, that "Parliament is turned into the instrument of power instead of being its holder."

### A World Police?

A correspondent draws our attention to an article, "The British Police," by Brigadier O. D. W. Dunn, C.B.E., D.S.O., M.C., Commandant, Police College, Ayton-on-Dunsmore, being "The Basis of a lecture delivered at the Royal United Service Institution, Thursday, Feb. 9, 1950" and appearing in the *Journal of the Royal Artillery*, Vol. LXXVII, No. 4. October, 1950.

On page 290 it is stated:—"Under the present British system it would be completely impossible for any government in this country to become totalitarian because the first essential for such a government is some form of police force under their direct control. . . ."

A few lines later follows:—"The last thing that this country wants is a nationalized police force, although it would bring in its train many advantages from the individual policeman's point of view."

On page 289 there is reference to findings of the "Oaksey Committee" and future modifications in accordance with its findings. In the last paragraph on page 294 there is speculation on the modelling of an international police force on the lines of the British police force, *i.e.*, Getting the idea of an International Police Force established.

### Meat Consumption

In the House of Commons on November 13, Mr. Black asked the Minister of Food how present meat consumption per head in this country compared with pre-war.

*Major Lloyd George*: The consumption of meat (including bacon) in terms of edible weight was 82.2 lb. per head of the civilian population in the 12 months ended June, 1951, compared with an average of 109.6 lb. before the war.

### On Planning The Earth

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

6/- (Postage extra).

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 13, 1951.

### King's Speech

#### DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS

#### GOVERNMENT POLICY

*Mr. Herbert Morrison* (Lewisham, South): I beg to move, as an Amendment to the Address, at the end, to add:

But humbly regret that the Gracious Speech discloses such an absence of well-thought-out and constructive policy that Your Majesty's Government do not propose to give adequate time during the next three months to the House for discussion of many immediate problems, thus depriving themselves and the nation of the advice and counsel of the House.

. . . We are not surprised at the lack of legislative intentions in the Gracious Speech. It is typical of the Conservative Party that that should be so. The Conservative Party are a party designed to conserve, to leave things as they are, not to change and not to alter; and one does not need much legislation to do that. They wish to preserve the *status quo*, and therefore in their minds legislation should mean no change either forward or backward, although, at any rate, there is promised in the Gracious Speech some legislation which would go backwards—that is to say, legislation to undo valuable legislation which has already been passed. There is, however, a limit even to the Conservative capacity to turn back, and therefore, there is limited legislation.

But I impress upon the House that the Government are also master of the administrative organisation of the State, especially when the House of Commons is in Recess. In the old days, to which the Conservatives are mentally acclimatised, the Government were responsible for very little. These problems of trade, balance of payments and this other business of economic problems did not exist in the minds of the Governments of the 19th Century. Therefore, there was little administration. There were short Sessions, and there was at that time plenty of fox-hunting. But today Governments are concerned with trade and commerce and a wide variety of social and economic problems, and administrative decisions will be taken in the next few months to deal with the situation.

Having refused adequately to outline their policy here in open Parliament, the Government now realise that they will have to do things and they are contemplating doing things by administrative action, by Order in Council or, as we heard yesterday, by Ministerial direction, against which no Prayer can be submitted in this House at all. That is a very serious state of affairs. One of Parliament's jobs is to supervise administration by Questions, Motions, debates on the Adjournment and by Prayers. When Parliament is not sitting, we are denied this right, and I say again that I think the precedent which was set yesterday is exceedingly dangerous in respect of the Iron and Steel Act, and, although it has been done in a different way, in respect of the Transport Act as well.

What has happened to the Iron and Steel Act? There was in that Act—we put it in; we must take that responsibility and we do—a provision whereby the Minister had power to give general directions on various matters. It is under that power of general direction that this action has

been taken. But these powers of general direction in the Act of Parliament were put there by Parliament for the purpose of operating the Act and developing and expanding the iron and steel industry.

Remember this is a direction, and I think I am right in saying that it is not susceptible to having a Prayer against it in this House; it is a direction. This direction is being used not for the purpose of implementing the Act, not for the purpose of developing the iron and steel industry, but for the reverse purpose of holding up the operation of the Act and the proper development of the industry under that Act. . .

*The Minister of Housing and Local Government (Mr. Harold Macmillan)*: The right hon. Member for Lewisham, South (Mr. H. Morrison) has presented the case for the Amendment in a speech of great skill and with his usual ability in debate. It is now just over 11 years since, as his Parliamentary Secretary, I received from him my first lesson in the art of political and Parliamentary management. He was a fine teacher, for he was a master of his craft, and if I had been a more apt pupil I might be better equipped for my task today. The right hon. Gentleman has certainly erected a remarkable edifice of argument on a very slender foundation of fact and with very scant material. He has made a lot of bricks with very little straw, and if I could apply his methods to my Departmental field, then I should be correspondingly encouraged in my task.

The Amendment deals with the alleged absence of policy and the proposed date of the adjournment of the House. The right hon. Gentleman, however, wandered over a very wide field, dealing with the functions of Government, the particular tasks of particular Ministers, the place of the peerage in our national life today—although he and his party have not shown any undue dislike for it, judging from the number of creations which have taken place—and a number of other matters. If I do not try to answer them in detail, but refer him to my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister on specific points, I hope he will not think me discourteous.

Many people seem to believe that a well thought-out and constructive policy means a large number of complicated Bills to be passed into law. Indeed, the right hon. Gentleman almost seemed to indicate that he thought so himself. We have had a great many Bills passed into law during the last six years and, at the best—and this is a charitable judgement—they are like the curate's egg good in parts. Some of them were very bad, and these will have to be annulled or repealed; and that we propose to do.

This at any rate, will be legislation in pursuance of a well thought-out and constructive policy. It will also be legislation which, as the right hon. Gentleman has said, will require considerable attention from the House by day and perhaps even by night. Apart from the legislation of previous Parliaments which we shall have to annul or repeal, there is some legislation which we shall have to amend, and I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman would not seriously hold that such amending legislation can be devised or drafted without detailed study, apart from the general principle involved; and that study we are now giving, with the help of our advisers, and in due course the results will be presented to the House.

Moreover, I think there is a general feeling in the country that what we need now is not more legislation but better administration. . . .

*Mr. Charles Fletcher-Cooke (Darwen):* . . . I wish to follow a point made by the President of the Board of Trade in his speech in this House last week. He said that he looked to the textile industry for a large expansion in our exports. The town of Darwen, in Lancashire, which I have the high honour to represent, is still predominantly a cotton town. The smoke from the high chimneys pours out over the terraced houses, as it has poured out for a hundred years. . . .

. . . So far from the prospect of a large increase in the export of textiles, the outlook at the moment is unfortunately very much the reverse. Order books are dwindling. There is talk in the weaving sheds of short-time. The explanation—a cloud which is a good deal bigger than a man's hand has descended on Lancashire—is the old explanation of Japanese competition. I have no doubt that years before I came to this House, years before I was capable of thinking of coming to this House, the arguments relating to Japanese competition were canvassed to and fro, over and over again. But they have to be canvassed once more, for although the argument may be the same, I feel in my bones that there is a somewhat different attitude; that in some quarters it is now thought that, somehow, Japan is right and Lancashire is wrong.

I was most interested in the observations of the hon. Member for Nelson and Colne (*Mr. S. Silverman*) last week, when he said that the Asiatic peoples are on the march, and that it is the duty of us and the people of Europe to help them along that road. Those are noble sentiments with which we all agree, but I am wondering, and I think that all the people of Lancashire, including those who sent him to this House are wondering, how one applies these noble sentiments here and now to the question of the under-cutting by the Japanese, using standards very much lower than we can possibly compete with, and again threatening our people in Lancashire with the evils which they have so bitterly experienced.

There is one thing certain in this difficult problem, and that is that in the effort to help the yellow man it is no good depressing the standards of the white man. We do not make a yellow man rich by making a white man poor. In applying these noble sentiments I hope that due regard will be paid to the effect of unfair competition from peoples whose standards of life, though they should be raised, as we all agree, cannot be raised here and now. Therefore, in the immediate problem we shall not allow sentiment, however noble, to cripple us in our endeavour to play our proper part in the world.

The people of Darwen are great people. They work extremely hard, perhaps because they are largely on piece work, and by and large, they own their own houses. There is an old saying in those parts that everyone owns his own house and the house next door. Just how that truth is to be expressed statistically by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government I do not know; but there is a truth in it, and I think that it gives the lie to a certain amount of feeling that there is in all quarters that, somehow, the landlord is a big person. In the north, and certainly in my division, the landlord is a small man. He is as small, and in many cases smaller, than the tenant. . . .

*Mr. Harmar Nicholls (Peterborough):* . . . I believe that we can deal with this housing shortage, and at the same time make a substantial contribution to the solution

of the financial difficulties that surround this country today. I accept at once that in allocating the houses once we have got them, need must be the real basis. Need must come first. But it does not necessarily mean that the people who are in need of houses because of physical conditions are necessarily the people who cannot afford to build themselves or, at any rate, to make a contribution towards building them themselves.

Having said that the need should come first, it means that we accept the need for a ratio between renting and selling. My suggestion is that the ratio should be settled by the local authorities instead of there being a rigid settlement by Whitehall. A ratio of one to five may well suit some areas, but there are other areas where one to two would be better, and who should know better than the local representatives who have to answer to their electors when they have their elections, which are usually more frequent than ours, although our Elections have been rather abnormally frequent over the past two years. If we can leave the ratio to the local authorities, we shall be saving the cost of the subsidy, administration and supervision which are part of the local authorities' expenses, and we shall still be providing the houses. That is my first suggestion, that the ratio should be settled by the local authorities.

The point has been made that in Birmingham and other places where questionnaires have been circulated to find out how many people would build their houses, it has been discovered that only one in five and sometimes one in 10 could afford to do it. I can well understand the terrific number of people in this country who would prefer to build their own houses but who are not able to afford the present high cost of building. They would not be able to afford to rent them if they didn't have the benefit of the subsidy.

I believe that in between the house builder and the council house tenant there are some little halting places where we can help. I suggest that, providing there are people well up on the housing lists, we may be able to capitalise half of the annual £22 subsidy in order to bring the purchase price down to a level that they can pay. Let me give an example of what I mean. Take a post-war house the market price of which is £1,450. If we capitalise half the £22 subsidy, that helps to the extent of £304. That means that the selling price to the tenant would be £1,146, which to a building society or under the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act they could repay at the rate of £1 2s. 6d. a week.

The advantage would be that the tenant would be getting his house, the council would be saved the maintenance costs and we should be saved half of the subsidy over 60 years. That would mean that the Exchequer would save £495 over the 60 years and the local rates would save £165. In an authority like the one which I know well, where the allocation is about 200 houses a year, if we applied my suggestion to half the houses and if half the houses were taken up in this way, the Exchequer would save £49,500 and the local authority would save £16,500.

If the local authorities want some money to pay the extra rate of interest which they may have to pay for a short time, then we should encourage the sale of the pre-war houses that were built at £475. They could be sold now quite honourably at a market price of £1,100 [AN HON. MEMBER: "To whom?"] To the people who are in those

(Continued on page 7).

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*

One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

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

Vol. 27. No. 14.

Saturday, December 1, 1951.

### The Australian Referendum Defeat

The decisive No Vote at the Australian Referendum was not only the result of electors' opposition to the proposed Constitutional amendment; many electors who feel that the vote they gave the present Government at the last two elections has been betrayed, took the opportunity of registering a protest. This journal\* has since its inception fought the Communist conspiracy. But it has always stressed the fact that this conspiracy cannot be defeated while present political, financial and economic policies are pursued. These policies produce such disastrous results that it is not surprising that a great number of people are more concerned about the problem of inflation than they are about Communism. This fact must be resolutely faced if the Communist challenge is to be halted.

The Menzies Government's approach to the Communist issue has been futile and disastrous. The referendum defeat has forced its leaders to admit that it is possible to deal with the Communists without a Constitutional amendment. We have consistently stated that the Federal Government has all the power necessary in order to deal with Communism. But we repeat that no real anti-Communist victory is possible while totalitarian financial and economic policies are imposed upon the people. Repressive measures against Communist trade union leaders will be disastrous if, at the same time, the Government furthers a credit policy which, if continued, must inevitably result in a depression. Unfortunately, the Budget proposals, announced last week, make it clear that the Government's economic "advisers" are determined to undermine still further the independence of the Australian people. "Bread-and-Butter" problems are now becoming so acute that electors are more concerned about living standards than they are about Communism. We believe that the referendum vote revealed that many electors blame the Government's policies for most of their economic problems, and not the Communists.

The last Federal elections, and two subsequent by-elections, revealed that the Menzies-Fadden Government had lost electoral support since the victory of December, 1949. The referendum result indicates that another Federal election would probably result in the defeat of the Government. It is certain that the Budget has alienated many who supported the present Government at the last two elections. If the referendum had been held after the Budget was announced, the No majority would have been even greater than it was.

Although Mr. Menzies says he accepts the electors' verdict at the referendum, he claims that they were victims

\*The New Times (Melbourne).

of a campaign of lies. We suggest that Mr. Menzies and his colleague should be the last people to talk about lies and fear campaigns. They promised, before December, 1949, that they would attack and abolish Socialist controls, including high taxation. And now they are trying to justify the imposition of the very policies they promised to attack. If the rank and file members of the present Government are really concerned about staying in office, they should face the fact that it was Liberal Party voters who played an important part in defeating the referendum. Large numbers of business men voted against the Government, not because they support Communism, but because they refused to accept the Government's proposition. They also felt that the Government were abusing the powers it already possessed, by implementing the "Defence" Preparations Act and similar Socialist legislation. Many wool growers cynically asked what was the difference between the Communists and a Government which deprived them of their money allegedly because they were helping inflation? Many of those who played a leading role in opposing the referendum, men like Mr. J. T. Lang, have been fighting Communism over a long period of time. If Mr. Menzies believes that these anti-Communists were the victims of lies and fear propaganda, it serves to confirm our view that, if the Liberals desire to survive the next elections, they should start rejecting Mr. Menzies, his policies and his "advisers" immediately. If Liberal Members persist in supporting present policies, they will have played a decisive role in having Dr. H. V. Evatt elected to the Prime Ministership. Anti-Socialist electors should point this out to them.

### U.S. and Britain

The *Daily Telegraph* on November 16 reported Sir Ronald Storrs as saying that if the Americans had come out more strongly in support of Britain at the time of the Persian oil crisis our problems there and in Egypt might have been easier. Sir Ronald, an authority on the Middle East and a former military governor of Jerusalem and Governor of Cyprus from 1926 to 1932, was speaking at a meeting of the English-Speaking Union in London.

America's attitude of being a third party, he said, was interpreted by the Middle East mentality as hostility to the British case.

## THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

By

C. H. DOUGLAS.

The Revised and Enlarged Edition published in 1937 is again on sale.

12/- net.

"The standard literary instrument for the correct information of the public concerning the technical aspects of Social Credit"—*The Social Crediter*.

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

## Huxley versus Lamarck.

by GEOFFREY DOBBS.

Although the controversy between the Soviet and 'western' geneticists has now been in progress for some years, and has been much reviewed and commented upon from the points of view of both sides of the argument, the technicalities involved have somewhat obscured the limited nature of the disagreement, and the significance of the situation revealed.

It is a curious fact that in recent years geneticists have been notorious among biologists for the uniformity of their left-progressivist-materialist outlook. 'Evolutionary humanism' is, I believe, the preferred name for it. At any rate, no considerable disagreement can be found within their ranks on the general thesis that it is the purpose, or task, or maybe destiny, of Man to hoist himself higher and ever higher in the path of Progress by means of his own boot-laces (as well as the rest of his material environment) making for himself larger and ever more magnificent Boots as he grows too big for each pair in succession, until the Whole Universe lies beneath his feet. (And then? Well, it is a long time ahead!) Meanwhile the only possibility of disagreement is about the facts; just what sort of hereditary boot-laces is Man provided with, and how can they best be used to bring about this remarkable effect of evolutionary levitation?

It must be conceded that they do not, perhaps, express their beliefs in exactly this way, but such an excellent expositor as Dr. Julian Huxley, in his popular book on the subject\*, makes it abundantly clear that the quarrel is fratricidal within the ideological fold, between the Soviet geneticists on the one hand, who will not submit to the limitations of any real mechanism of heredity, but maintain that what seems to be largely imaginary boot-laces will do the job much quicker, and the 'western' geneticists (Mendelist-Morganist-Weissmannite-bourgeois deviationists) on the other, who insist in their reactionary way that the real mechanism of the chromosomes, so laboriously discovered, and so suggestively shaped and adapted to being pulled about and tied into knots, is the only thing for the purpose!

Of course, it is a serious matter, and one at which Dr. Huxley is rightly perturbed, that scientists should be able to ignore, or deny, a fairly well-established body of facts, and particularly that they should be forced to do so by political pressure. But his protests would be a good deal more convincing if they were not directed exclusively against the end-term in the process of progressive Governmental interference with science; that in which people like Dr. Huxley, and, in his humbler way, the present writer, are told what facts they may and may not take account of, and what interpretation they may, and may not, put upon them, and are punished by deprivation of livelihood, of freedom, and even of life, for any signs of hesitation in toeing the prescribed line.

We western scientists heartily agree that this is going just a little too far, though it is unlikely that our feelings in the matter are quite as deep as those of our opposite numbers in Russia; but we are also unanimous, if we are to believe Dr. Huxley, in agreeing that it is only this last

step which is so objectionable, and, until they committed this deplorable blunder, the Soviets were merely pursuing the admirable, and indeed inevitable, path of increasing social control of science, in which we should make haste to follow them if we do not want to be left far, far behind in the Path of Progress. After all, it is only the end-stage of a fall which does any damage, and it is merely reactionary to refuse to jump over an attractive, and indeed inevitable, precipice when one has been given an assurance (or perhaps even a Charter!) that one will be allowed to stop the journey a couple of inches from the ground, and on no account ever be forced to complete it.

Just how far Dr. Huxley is prepared to go is made clear on page 199:

"Can they (men of science) accept the existence of an official scientific policy? Can they accept the possibility that the majority of men of science will be paid by the State and that the major cost of scientific work will be borne by government funds? Can they accept official direction as to what subjects shall be investigated?"

"I think that they can (indeed, that they must)—but with certain clearly formulated provisos. A government is at perfect liberty to embark on a large-scale and comprehensive official scientific policy. It can legitimately decide that that policy shall be predominantly practical—designed to raise the standard of life, to improve health, to increase production, or to promote military efficiency. It can legitimately demand that the scientific curriculum throughout all stages of education should be adequate and should be framed so as to give the best possible understanding of nature and man's place in nature, of the social functions of science and of its intellectual and practical importance. It can legitimately insist on large-scale educational campaigns outside the school and university system to help the general population to understand the value and importance of science as a whole or of this or that branch of scientific work, or to make people feel that they are actively and intelligently participating in the nation's scientific effort. It can legitimately do everything in its power to check superstition, to combat unscientific or anti-scientific attitudes of mind, and to promote an understanding of scientific method, of its value and importance.

"Probably all men of science would agree that it is legitimate, and most of them that it is desirable, for a Government to embark on such a policy. But they would assuredly only agree on certain conditions."

Anything more fatuous than this it is difficult to imagine, and the contempt which the author must have for his readers is abysmal. Government scientific employees, working on a Government scientific policy under Government direction, after being Government educated at all stages, and Government propagandised out of school, so as to achieve the Government's understanding of the scientific method, of nature and of man's place in nature; not to mention having had what the Government regards as superstition, or chooses to call unscientific or anti-scientific attitudes of mind, checked by every Government-legitimised means; these people are to lay down provisos and conditions to the Government about the autonomy of science, and the exerting of pressure regarding the acceptance or rejection of "scientific facts, laws or theories":

\**Soviet Genetics and World Science*, Chatto and Windus, 1949.

"It must not subordinate the intellectual autonomy of science to any other criteria, whether religious, philosophical, or political, nor seek to impose upon scientific truth standards other than its own, nor relate scientific activity to any orthodoxy or authoritarian principle, nor, most of all, impose a scientific orthodoxy."

This sentence, so easily acceptable along the lines of current thought, has implications which are obvious the moment they are looked for. To use the words 'truth' and 'facts' is meaningless unless the writer believes that truth should prevail over error, facts take precedence over non-facts. To say, therefore that other standards must not be imposed upon 'scientific' truth is merely to say that 'scientific' truth is truth, and other 'truth' is untruth; 'scientific' criteria and standards are those which enable men to arrive at the truth, and those of religion, philosophy and politics do not. Or if we admit that these things have a valid place in life at all, then science is claimed to be in itself the only true religion, philosophy and policy.

In fact it is a matter of general knowledge that this is the view copiously set forth in the writings of Dr. Huxley and others of what, if we wished to insult them, we might call the Wellsian School. What is relatively new and dangerous is the increasing centralisation of science and the prevalence of this view among holders of high official positions in the 'scientific' world. The disapproval expressed of the imposition of a 'scientific orthodoxy' does not include the views of the disapprover, which are, as usual, felt to be purely impartial, merely the truth; but the amount of Government control envisaged surely must involve the application of some accepted principles, standards and criteria, which will inevitably constitute what is regarded as an orthodoxy. The insistence on the autonomy of science is in fact an insistence that this shall be the 'scientific' orthodoxy, which is just the sort which, thinking of Lysenkoism, Dr. Huxley says 'most of all' must not be imposed. What in fact he means is that the Government ought to impose scientific orthodoxy but must not impose a scientific heresy, *i.e.*, any view not held by most important scientists, and particularly by its chief scientific advisers.

But since the Government appoints its own scientific advisers, and increasingly controls all those appointments the tenure of which makes a man an 'important' scientist whose views it is advisable for his juniors to treat with respect, it can, and inevitably will, select and encourage the 'scientific' opinions which best suit its policy, and these will naturally tend to become a 'scientific orthodoxy' within a short time, though the thing need not always be done as crudely as the Soviet Government has done it in the Lysenko case. But to expect scientific opinions to remain independent of the official view in any country where the Government pays the majority of men of science, and finances the major part of scientific work, is not reasonable.

If science is to be autonomous, especially as regards political considerations, and yet is to be under State control to the extent that Dr. Huxley regards as inevitable and desirable, it can only mean that policies must be determined by scientists, and we are back again at H. G. Wells's open conspiracy of scientists to rule the world. The official view and the scientific view will then coincide, and it is quite clear that that is what is intended, and that any unofficial competition can then be combatted as unscientific or anti-scientific.

Just to make it all quite clear, it is explained that the coherent system of evolutionary theory based on neo-Mendelism and neo-Darwinism, in fact the orthodox genetics of the Western World, rejected as the Morganist-Mendelist *etc.*, *etc.*, heresy in the Soviet political Hemisphere, is the great unifying concept which ought to be made the basis of State biological education in the west. In a footnote on p. 207 we read:

"It should be pointed out that the Russians do insist on a unified point of view in biological education. Michurinism is now to be taught in all schools and universities . . . The west needs to consolidate its own scientific position through its educational system."

Obviously it is not the imposition of scientific theories or beliefs by the State which is objected to, but merely the imposition of theories which are regarded as untrue.

If ever a theory was purely a matter of philosophical speculation, impossible, owing to the time-scale of human life, to put to the test of critical experiment, it is the theory of evolution. Twenty years ago orthodox neo-Darwinism was moribund. It was beginning to be recognised by many of the younger scientists that the diversion of biological science into fruitless speculations about phylogeny had largely sterilized it, and with some notable exceptions their interest had very largely departed from the subject which had so enthralled the minds of their elders. The philosophic battle between the evolutionists and the spiritual descendents of Archbishop Usher had ended in a famous victory for the former. The world was not created in 4004 B.C., nor peopled by a species of divine conjuring in six days of 24 hours each. Continuity was restored to life and to the Universe after a temporary and rather absurd aberration of the human mind; but the suspicion was already beginning to arise that it had been replaced by another aberration which was capable of absurdities quite as extreme.

The idea that the conflict had been between fact and fancy, between science and religion, even between one scientific theory, and one particular cult of religion, is of course, nonsense. It was a conflict between two faiths, neither of which was much concerned with the mere facts beyond the necessity of using as many as possible to justify itself. The evolution theory was no lightly held scientific working hypothesis; if it had been so it would have been lightly and easily discarded when Darwin's simple explanation of the mechanism of evolution fell to the ground, and again when the Mutation Theory failed to provide a convincing alternative. If the theory of the Descent of Man from an Ape-like ancestor had been a scientific hypothesis it would have been discarded when most of the proofs convincing to an earlier generation turned out to be compounded of an unalterable faith in the theory, a vivid imagination, and a few selected bits of bone. But as fast as one set of 'proofs' becomes valueless another set is erected in their place.

(To be concluded).

**Grand Orient**  
**FREEMASONRY UNMASKED**  
by MGR. GEORGE E. DILLON, D.D.  
From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD. 5/-

## PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from page 3).

houses and who would be willing to take advantage of purchasing them. On a house costing £1,100, a reduction in respect of the capitalised subsidy would amount to £231, so that that house could be bought for £869 at weekly payments of 17s. 1d. That would mean that the local authorities would have a balance of £395 from the pre-war houses which would help them out of their difficulties.

I do not think that this is the last of the methods that could be used to get house ownership. I fully appreciate that some people could build homes without any assistance, whereas others would want the help of half the subsidy; but why not encourage some of the builders and farmers to build houses for their workers? They could be given half the subsidy for 30 years, providing they built the houses for their workers. We all know from our experience that quite a number of people who figure on council housing lists work in one or another of the big works in our areas, and they would be prepared to enter this scheme. I am not suggesting that the houses should be made tied houses.

I know from the contacts that I have made with industrialists and farmers that they would be prepared to build these houses and would undertake to rent them at the same level as council house rents, with the help of half the subsidy for 30 years, provided they had the choice of the first tenant. In many parts of this country the security of tenure in employment is such that people know that as long as they do their job they are going to be there for a good number of years. . . .

## Coinage

*Mr. Peter Freeman* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will now alter the present coinage system to allow for 10 pennies to a shilling and so take a preliminary step towards a decimal system.

*Mr. R. A. Butler*: No, the replacement of the existing bronze coinage by new coins of different value would involve an impossible burden on our present resources of material and labour. The alternative of increasing by 20 per cent. the value of the bronze coinage now in circulation is likewise unsatisfactory.

## Private Building

*Mr. Alport* asked the Minister of Housing and Local Government if he will take steps to ensure that those who are anxious and able to build houses for their own occupation with their own labour are given special facilities and encouragement to do so.

*Mr. H. Macmillan*: I am considering in what ways house ownership can most appropriately be encouraged.

## Scotland (Self-Government)

*Mr. Grimond* asked the Secretary of State for Scotland when it is intended to announce the Royal Commission on self-government for Scotland.

*Mr. J. Stuart*: The Government will consider the terms of reference of a Royal Commission in the light of the report

of the committee presided over by Lord Catto which is investigating the economic and financial relations between Scotland and the rest of the United Kingdom.

House of Commons: November 14, 1951.

## Transitional Powers and Emergency Laws

(Continuance)

*The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Major Sir David Maxwell Fyfe)*: I beg to move,

"That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty under section eight of the Supplies and Services (Transitional Powers) Act, 1945, praying that the said Act, which would otherwise expire on the tenth day of December, nineteen hundred and fifty-one, be continued in force for a further period of one year until the tenth day of December, nineteen hundred and fifty-two."

. . . I come now to the case for renewal, and it is a perfectly short and blunt case. In the short time since we have come into office, it has been impossible for the Government to examine the situation in detail and to go through all these Regulations. We cannot imagine, and we do not believe that each and every one of these enactments and Regulations should be continued indefinitely or even continued for a year. But the need to continue some of them is obvious. Therefore, we ask the House of Commons to maintain the *status quo* for a time by renewing virtually the whole of this body of legislation. We will then carefully review the whole of this legislation and also other powers which are not due to expire in December.

We shall conduct the review with four possibilities in mind. First, we may be able in the course of the present Session to propose that some of these powers should be abolished. Secondly, we may propose that some should be embodied in legislation requiring annual renewal by Parliament. This will be appropriate where powers are needed for some time ahead but where Parliament should have the opportunity to discuss them in detail and examine the need for them at annual intervals.

Thirdly, we believe that it will turn out that a few of the enactments concerned should be embodied in permanent legislation. For example, the probabilities which appear to me are the arrangements for the marketing of bacon, livestock, meat and wheat. Fourthly, we think that some regulations may be continued where powers are required for a time to complete the winding up of war-time activities or to provide for the emergency needs of the defence programme.

We now come to the period of extension. We are asking Parliament to pray for the renewal of the enactments and Regulations for one year. In some cases the period is laid down by Statute. In other cases the period could be shorter because the relative enactments provide for renewal for periods "not exceeding one year," but in our view it is clearly sensible to adopt the same period of renewal in all cases. Nothing in the present proposals binds the Government to a fixed period of continuance.

Regulations can be revoked at any time, and decisions reached during our review can be put into operation as soon as they are reached. The revocation of enactments in the sense of Acts of Parliament requires legislation, but legislation will almost certainly be needed sooner or later to deal with the matters covered by the Acts now being reviewed

and the renewal for 12 months does not, therefore, prejudice any course on which we may decide as a result of the review. . . .

*Mr. Ede* (South Shields): . . . It will be necessary to ensure that our incoming trade shall be drawn from the most suitable quarters and that our outgoing trade shall be directed towards the most suitable quarters, and that the internal distribution of supplies that can be made available, whether they be of food or of raw materials, are controlled so that they will not be dissipated or flow surreptitiously into channels which will not serve the over-riding national interests.

There is no doubt that, for the moment at any rate, the Chancellor of the Exchequer is reconciled to that point of view. No matter whether the reconciliation has been easy or not, he contemplates the use of this type of power to at least as great an extent as, if not a greater extent than, anything that we have seen during the last six years. We believe it is an illusion, in the altered circumstances of the world, to think that in a year or two, or in four or five years, the need for this type of legislation will pass, and we shall therefore very carefully scrutinise all the proposals that may be made to abolish some of these controls. Some, I have no doubt, can disappear, but I am quite certain that any large holocaust of them is impossible, and we think it only right now to make that position quite clear. . . .

House of Commons: November 15, 1951.

## PUBLIC HEALTH

### Cancer Cure (Experiment)

*Mr. Peter Freeman* asked the Minister of Health whether the inquiries into the claims of Mr. Rees Evans for curing cancer have been concluded; and when a report may be expected.

*The Minister of Health* (*Mr. Harry Crookshank*): I understand that the Committee have not quite completed their investigation and are unable to say how soon they will be able to report.

*Mr. Freeman*: Are not the Committee taking rather a long time to prepare this report? Could anything be done to ask them to expedite it?

*Mr. Crookshank*: No, Sir. I think they are more anxious than anybody else to get the report out, but it requires a good deal of investigation.

### Food Improvers

*Mr. Peter Freeman* asked the Minister of Health what steps are being taken to implement the recommendations of the Report of the Government Advisory Council on Scientific Policy for a closer check on the use of chemicals as food improvers some of which have a poisonous effect even in small doses if taken over long periods.

*Dr. Barnett Stross* asked the Minister of Health whether he will consult with the Minister of Food as to the desirability of creating in Britain an organisation similar to the food and drug administration of the United States of America, so that the public may be protected from the harmful effects

of chemical substances added to food, which have not been adequately and fully tested

*Mr. Crookshank*: It is true that a report on these matters was prepared for the previous Government by the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy, but I am not in a position to state what action, if any, can be taken on it until the extent of the problem and the cost involved in manpower and money has been fully investigated.

*Dr. Stross*: Would the Minister not agree, however, that many substances formerly used have had to be forbidden because they were discovered to be dangerous, and does not this imply that the public, in the past and today, are used as guinea pigs for some of these new substances? Will the right hon. Gentleman not do whatever is possible as soon as he can?

*Mr. Crookshank*: I could not accept without further consideration all the statements that the hon. Member has made, but I cannot make any statement now about it.

### Identity Cards

*Mr. C. J. M. Alport* asked the Minister of Health when he anticipates that the system of personal identity cards will be abolished.

*Mr. Crookshank*: This is not a matter on which I have any statement to make at the present time.

*Mr. Alport*: Would I be right in supposing that that does not in any way detract from the Home Secretary's undertaking yesterday that the matter would be very carefully reviewed in the months ahead?

*Mr. Crookshank*: Yes, Sir. The Home Secretary was, of course, speaking for the Government.

### Delegated Legislation

*Mr. Leslie Hale* asked the Prime Minister what steps he proposes to take to reduce the volume of delegated legislation.

*The Prime Minister* (*Mr. Winston Churchill*): We may expect that as soon as the war-time controls prolonged by the Socialist Governments are progressively removed or relaxed, the volume of delegated legislation will also dwindle.

*Mr. Hale*: I appreciate that the cuts in hospital building and in public building announced recently may involve less immediate delegated legislation, but cannot the right hon. Gentleman, having said so much on this subject, now tell us that the matter is under active consideration, that every avenue is being explored, that no stone will be left unturned and that something will be done within a measurable period of time?

*The Prime Minister*: I will gladly repeat the famous utterance of the party opposite, that every avenue is being explored and no stone is being left unturned.

*Mr. E. Shinwell*: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the first Bill promoted by His Majesty's Government the Home Guard Bill—provides for delegated legislation?

*The Prime Minister*: Yes, Sir. We had to start from the point where we began.