

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 8. No. 15.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 20, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

THE FLOWING TIDE

Captain J. E. Crowder, secretary to the 1922 Committee and a Conservative, is not the first member of Parliament to protest against the exploitation of the circumstances of the moment to prepare for a Socialist revolution. It is, however, rare for the 'Free' Press—free to pursue such lines of propaganda as its financial masters dictate—to give publicity to protests of this nature, and it is therefore refreshing to read an all too brief account of Mr. Crowder's words to a Finchley meeting. He said Conservative members of Parliament were getting restive, and that they were 'tired of all the Left-Wing propaganda, especially that generated by the B.B.C.'

There is now nothing very 'British' about the "B." B.C. It is a "quasi-autonomous" body (*vide Planning*) over which the public has less control (if that is possible) than Mr. Brendan Bracken claims to have, but that does not mean that a little stiffening of the back of Members of Parliament would not lead to some improvement. We have reason to believe that it would. Readers of *The Scotsman* may remember the flagrant instance of the sort of thing to which Captain Crowder referred reported there on April 21. Mrs. A. E. Forbes Dennis, better known as the novelist Phyllis Bottome, had addressed a meeting in Edinburgh under the auspices of the Ministry of Information. The subject was "Our New Order." We understand that Mrs. Forbes Dennis was on this occasion expressing her own opinions. Mr. Bracken is wont to claim that "B." B.C. script writers are also expressing their opinions, or the opinions of script dictators independent of the Government. The concluding paragraph of *The Scotsman's* account of Mrs. Forbes Dennis's address was the statement that 'our new order must be founded on a wide, open, true education.' It was "not quite fair," she said, "to give one person an education until he was 14, and another until he was 24, and then call it democracy. We must change our education."

"We must change our education." Mr. R. A. Butler, the President of the Board of Education, will have delivered himself of this important topic by the time these words appear in print. But it must not be inferred that it was his visit to the Arnold Centenary celebration at Rugby last week that was the pivot upon which his opinions turned. Other speakers have been going the rounds. Lord Bennett (former Prime Minister of Canada) has spoken at Queenswood School, Hatfield, of which those well-known socialists Lord Macmillan and the late Lord Stamp, are respectively president and ex-president. Such visits are mere intimations that 'great' men are not uninterested in the preparation of the little hands which applaud them (if their owners survive for this purpose).

Captain Crowder and his friends have a busy and a difficult time ahead of them if they really mean to scotch

the pernicious tendencies and subversive activities of which, none too soon, they have grown tired. A story is current concerning a butcher whose shop was infested with flies. He unwisely offered a considerable reward to any one of his attendant customers who would rid him of the nuisance, an invitation which an astute loafer within hearing was quick to turn to account. Having sealed his bargain with the butcher, he took his stand by the door armed with a stick. "Now," he cried, "drive them out, one by one!" If Captain Crowder desires to be taken seriously, these are the tactics we should recommend him to avoid. The modest paragraph in *The Times* announcing the reluctant 'permission' given by the General Medical Council to the demand for a reduction in the total period of medical study conceals a victory, which may well be short-lived, of an established statutory body of experts (though growing a bit 'mixed') against the pressure from war inflated Departments pursuing a policy which has a long history behind it. The General Medical Council has a staff only just large enough to prepare an annual volume (sold to defray expenses) called *The Medical Register*.

Education and international socialism are at least as near to one another as Dartington Hall School and Federal Union. In his book *The School*, Mr. W. B. Curry reveals his opinion that the primary aim of education is the creation of civilised communities. He admits that the nature of the civilised community remains a matter for dispute, but what the internationalists are doing is to seek means for stopping the argument.

On April 7, 1942, *Planning*, the P.E.P. Broadsheet, published a list of British Reconstruction Agencies. In view of the claims made by P.E.P. to exceptional influence over governmental departments, in conjunction with the known activities of many of the 'agencies' listed, it would be well to know what this phrase actually means. But, in any case, it may serve a useful purpose to give here the 'educational' agencies in the P.E.P. catalogue. They are:—

ASSOCIATION OF DIRECTORS AND SECRETARIES OF EDUCATION, *County Hall, Wakefield*. The association has been working on a scheme for post-war education. The programme is completed and will shortly be published.

Surely 'directors and secretaries of education' are officials answerable to individual public bodies? Do these bodies in all cases know what their directors and secretaries are up to? How is the Association constituted?

ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATION IN CITIZENSHIP, 19, *Wellgarth Road, London, N.W.11*.

This Association seems to specialise in the 'preparation' of evidence, not only on the 'reform' of curricula but (for the Beveridge Committee), on Family Endowment.

BRITISH INSTITUTE OF ADULT EDUCATION, 29, *Tavistock Square, London, W.C.1*.

LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE, *The Hostel, Peterhouse, Cambridge*. It is publishing a quarterly journal on reconstruction called *Agenda*.

NEW EDUCATION FELLOWSHIP, *St. Ermys, Ashover, Derbyshire*.

The Fellowship was to have called a conference in April last "to secure adequate consideration of the needs of children and young people in post-war planning."

Does Captain Crowder know the history of P.E.P.? Has he seen the document *Freedom and Planning* secretly circulated in 1932 by the inner councils of the members of the Political Economic Plan? The then chairman of the organisation, Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, was the reputed author of the plan. It has been said that notwithstanding this ascription of authorship to the vice-Chairman of Marks and Spencer in England, France and America, no statement to the contrary was made until after Sir Basil Blackett's death on August 15, 1935, the day before he was to deliver an address at Heidelberg expressing views some of which were contrary to those expressed in *Freedom and Planning*. An article in the *Nineteenth Century and After* was a summary of them. After Blackett's death, authorship was attributed to him. We have not seen the *Jewish Daily Post* for July 21, 1935, which is said to contain the assertion that the whole idea of the vast work done by P.E.P. originated in a chance meeting in a railway carriage in Germany between Messrs. Chaim Weizmann and Israel Moses Sieff.

But cannot these matters be decided on their merits? Yes, certainly! Who will make a start? It is within range of practical politics to stop a tap by sticking a cork in it, but you can't stop a river by floating a cork on top of it, and what Captain Crowder is concerned about is a mighty stream.

T. J.

"The Emotion of the Ideal"

By B. M. PALMER

Lord Elton speaking at the Beaufoy and Mortimer Prize Day of the City of London School on June 10, said that after the war:

"Once more there would be the danger of supposing that civilisation meant making ourselves more comfortable. But Christian civilisation was based not upon what a man could get but upon what he could give up. Too many of them in the past, from top to bottom of the economic scale, had remembered their rights and forgotten their duties, and had seemed to suppose that the greatest nation was that in which the largest number of citizens enjoyed the highest degree of comfort."

How is it possible to give up what one does not possess? These extraordinary remarks, if they were remembered by many of the boys present (but it is most unlikely that they were) could have left nothing but confusion in their minds. But let us be thankful that most children pay scant attention to sermons of all sorts. For if they thought much about the matter, they would inevitably be struck by the following facts: —

(a) That those who speak most feelingly of their conviction that the life after death is so much better than this one, are also highly concerned about gas-masks and air raid shelters, and do not seem at all anxious to leave their present state.

(b) That those who advocate sacrifice of comforts, somehow or other, still to be pretty comfortable themselves. Not so long ago a broadcaster painstakingly explained why it would not be expedient for Mr. Churchill to sacrifice his cigars. And yet, you know, a cigar is a product of civilisation, and is only made to be sacrificed.

It is easy enough to be flippant about such absurdities, but it is not so often recognised that deep in the heart of such a fearful philosophy, masquerading as Christianity, is a cruelty worthy of Moloch. But this is a Moloch who does not so often swallow the young—he swallows the old and "useless." The young are to be trained as his good servants. They are to have priority in regard to vitamins (whatever these may be), their lives are to be saved whenever possible, everything is to be done for their bodily health.

I have often wondered how many a mother asks herself at what point in her son's life will he cease to be of much importance, and just become one of the useless burdens? If she accepts the current puritan philosophy he will be of no particular importance as soon as his usefulness to the state is over—in chronic ill-health or in his old age, which she will not live to see. Is she prepared to think of that baby in the cradle as an old, *unwanted* man? I know there are women who can only love children, but surely there is no real mother who does not see the baby in the man throughout the whole of his life. But, you see, it is old fashioned now to use the word soul. The emotional experience of later years, properly co-ordinated with the wisdom of life—the greatest gift—is designated as a "subliminal uprush," if it is recognised at all—the old are useless.

Several poor old people have written to *The Times* recently, signifying their willingness to become victims. An example of the lengths to which they may go is this letter:

"Children are vital to the nation; the future of England depends upon them, but the old have no value except sentimentality. At 73 I protest against the idea that one extra seaman should risk his life to get additional comforts for me and others like me. The young and the middle-aged do not expect to be easy and comfortable during the war; why should the old? If we cannot walk, let us stay at home; if the national loaf disagrees with us we are still better off than tens of millions of people, and perhaps the failure to digest will the sooner relieve the community of the burden of our maintenance. There can be few among us who desire an undue prolongation of life, to be a tax on the energy and forbearance of people who are needed for more urgent work. We can give nothing except perhaps a little money—let us at least not take."

Pity takes precedence over indignation when one realises the fruits of the dreadful belief that civilisation is based "not upon what a man can get but upon what he can give up." Lord Elton is responsible for much, if he persists in spreading this pernicious philosophy. The origin of it dates back to the blood sacrifice. But I am wondering whether Lord Elton and others like him have not been influenced by Benjamin Kidd and his *Emotion of the Ideal* (*The Science of Power*, page 125) where he states: —

"The Individual of the past has of necessity been the individual efficient in the struggle for his own interests. But in the *social integration* which is proceeding, the eternal law of efficiency cannot be stated in terms of reason. For it can only be summarised in one word—Sacrifice.

"In this stage the law of efficiency is always sacrifice—that sacrifice of the unit, the capacity for which in man proceeds from the emotion of the ideal alone. The power of sacrifice and renunciation is the first and last word in that kind of efficiency which is deepening in the social era of the race."

And we add, in all reverence, from principalities and powers, Good Lord deliver us.

Points from Parliament

JUNE 2.

MINISTER OF WORKS AND PLANNING BILL

CLAUSE 6.—(*Provisions as to Orders in Council.*)

[*Extracts from the earlier part of this discussion by the House in Committee appeared in "The Social Crediter" of June 13.*]

Mr. Strauss: I have mentioned a considerable number of Acts where a power of this kind has been given, and I do not think any Member can quote an example of any such abuse as has been hinted at.

Sir Herbert Williams (Croydon, South): Is not this Sub-section in complete conflict with the Minister's Powers Report of 1932? From time to time Governments have tried to over-rule it. There was an exhaustive investigation into the principle involved, and why not accept the Amendment and do away with the trouble?

Mr. Strauss: I am afraid I have not examined the Clause with reference to the matter alluded to by my hon. Friend.

Sir H. Williams: . . . I would point out what happens when His Majesty does something in Council. We read in the papers that a Council has been held, and we see a small list of those who were called to this Council and on whose advice His Majesty signed the documents. It is a very ceremonial way of making an Order, but when it has been made then, so far as I know, it cannot be challenged in any court. I think I am right with regard to that. If a mistake has been made, there is no power on earth to correct that mistake. If this were done by Order in Council, then not only would it be published in the *London Gazette*, but it would be laid before Parliament. If it were a good Order no one would object and no more would be heard of it. If, on the other hand, a mistake had been made, this court of appeal would be available to correct the mistake. That is all that is asked. It involves very little trouble. Why Departments are so anxious to seize these autocratic powers and take away from us our democratic rights I cannot understand.

Mr. Denman: . . . the powers are very directly limited by the terms of the Bill. They can only do what is necessary or expedient "having regard to any transfer under the Act." That gives no power to modify to such an extent as to create fresh powers.

Mr. Maxton: Did not the hon. Member hear the list, which was read out to us by the Parliamentary Secretary, of previous Acts in which the House had allowed this sort of thing, with its inference that there was no harm in adding just another little bit of legislation on the same lines? The essence of the objection is that Parliament is handing

away its own powers. Every time it is asked to do so the statement is made, "It is only a very little thing, it does not matter." That is the point of view which the hon. Member is putting now. But this is going on and going on.

Mr. Denman: I am sorry to differ from my hon. Friend on this point. I should agree with him if there were any question of giving the Department new powers of legislation, new powers of adding to the planning powers already possessed by Departments, but this is merely consequential to what is involved in the transfer. No new power is created.

Mr. Davidson: But if we are not giving them power to make legislation, we are giving them power to repeal legislation which has already been enacted by this House, and surely that is just as important as the power to make legislation.

Mr. Denman: Only in so far as it is consequent upon the transfer—

Mr. Davidson: But who decides that?

Mr. Denman:—and that is why it has seemed to me to be a little pedantic that we should trouble ourselves with so small a point. Let me add that I do not think the hon. Member for South Croydon (Sir H. Williams) was correct in saying that an Order in Council cannot be challenged. Such an Order in Council would rest on this Bill—or Act—and if anything is done by the Order in Council which goes beyond the authority given by the Bill then surely a court would declare the Order to be *ultra vires*.

Sir H. Williams: Does the hon. Member suggest that His Majesty could be haled before one of his own Judges and told that he has done something wrong?

Mr. Denman: I certainly think that His Majesty's advisers could be haled there for putting before him an Order which went beyond the powers authorised under the law. . . .

Sir Percy Harris (Bethnal Green, South-West): I must confess that I am a little surprised to find that my hon. Friend the Joint Parliamentary Secretary, in one of his early appearances in his new capacity, should come with a proposal which is against the whole spirit of his former attitude to these matters. We have looked upon him as rather the champion of Parliamentary control as against the pretensions of the bureaucracy, and I am a little concerned to find that the draftsman has vested in him such very considerable powers, powers which enable him to modify or adapt any Acts or Orders which the late deceased and much-lamented Commissioners of Works have had.

Perhaps it is taking him a bit by surprise to ask, but could he not find some other words which will protect the rights of the House of Commons? . . . I suggest that the very fact that the hon. Gentleman has been able to quote precedents to justify his action in putting these words into the Bill makes the case stronger for some modification. We have got into the bad way during the war of rushing things through on the ground of emergency. We have granted powers which in normal times we should not have thought of granting. This is not a war Measure. It is an important Measure involving important repercussions in our post-war policy. It is one thing to give such powers in a Bill setting up a Ministry of Supply, but quite a

(continued on page 7 at the foot of column 1)

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: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 8. No. 15.

Saturday, June 20, 1942.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

ANOTHER IMPENDING APOLOGY: "Admiral Nimmitz, the United States Officer Commanding the South Pacific twelve thousand miles from the scene of action..."

— "B" B.C. News Bulletin, 6 p.m., June 7.

The *Saturday Evening Post* of Philadelphia, U.S.A., claims, as a sub-title, to be "An American Institution." Its circulation is considerably over two million copies.

It would be difficult to term it, and it would probably not claim to be, an organ of culture, but it is probably one of the leading exponents of that portion of American opinion known as "the regular fellow"—the Rotary Club member. As such, it is a real power, and within the limits of its philosophy, might be expected to express its views with some freedom. In general, it has done so, and has thus, incidentally, been a valuable indication to anyone familiar with middle-class America (and not otherwise) as to the way the mind of that naive community was moving.

Possibly fortified with this knowledge, the Editor, Mr. Wesley Winans Stout, who has sensibly raised the tone and influence of his paper in the last year or so, decided to publish three articles, all by Jews, on the Jewish question. They were good reasonable articles, eminently readable and mainly remarkable for cancelling each other out completely. The first said there was no Jewish question, the second that there was, and the third that there wasn't enough Jewish question.

Result—exit Mr. Wesley Winans Stout, and the most abject crawl in journalistic history on the leader page by the new Editor, whose "Christian" name is Benjamin.

"Miners will now work directly for the Controllers."
— *Cavalcade*.

—Whereas before they worked for those who couldn't altogether control them.

Mr. Justice Stable at Liverpool Assizes:—"This is an appalling position for you, and it is not a very pleasant one for me. You have a long and honourable record of work behind you. I have no doubt that until you made contact with men whose names I won't mention, who attracted you by their display of wealth and perhaps dazzled you, you were really worthy of the extraordinarily high character your employers gave you. . . . How deep and how widespread these matters are in the commercial life of this city I do not know, but the corner of the curtain that has been lifted in these proceedings shows a system of graft and corruption

of which every citizen of Liverpool and Lancashire should be absolutely ashamed."

Hard lines that you and I won't be able to be on our guard as we might be, because we don't know who the dazzlers are.

ECONOMISTS AT LAW

A libel action out of a book entitled *Appeasement Before, During and After the War*, written by Dr. Paul Einzig, of the Ball, Minehead, and published by Macmillan and Company, Limited, was heard before Mr. Justice Asquith in the King's Bench on June 11.

The plaintiff was Dr. Frederick Charles Courtenay Benham, of Paton Street, Cambridge. Mr. W.L. Raeburn (for Dr. Benham) said his client was a distinguished economist and Dr. Einzig also was a well-known economist. The alleged libel was contained in Dr. Einzig's book.

The words complained of were: "A volume on South-Eastern Europe contained a chapter which made a valiant effort to persuade the South-Eastern European countries that in reality they had to be thankful to Germany for the blessings of her trade with them. The author of this chapter, Dr. F. Benham, rendered an invaluable if unintentional service to the German South-Eastward trade drive and to German propaganda. That he did not receive the Iron Cross, 1st Class, is just another example of Hitler's ingratitude."

The alleged libel continued: "Even after the outbreak of war Dr. Benham continued his self-appointed task of the Devil's advocate. . . . The worst of it is that all these writers (on economics) are thoroughly honest and, therefore, much more dangerous than they would otherwise be. Their attitude can best be described by misquoting (with apologies) J. C. Squire's famous epigram:—

You cannot hope to bribe or twist,
Thank God, the British economist:
But seeing what the man will do
Unbribed, there's no occasion to."

Counsel said the contention of Dr. Benham was that these words meant that he had taken on himself the task of assisting the enemies of his country. Further, the words suggested that Dr. Benham, in his capacity as an economist, was so lacking in intelligence and in discretion as to be incapable of appreciating the nature and extent of the service that he was rendering to the enemy at the expense of his own country, and that the value of his economic theories was of no greater account than it would have been had he been bribed by the enemy to expound them.

Dr. Benham, giving evidence, said the allegations that he had made it his life work to vindicate German economic methods was utterly false. "I have been against the methods of Germany all the time," he said.

Cross-examined by Mr. G. O. Slade (for defendants), Dr. Benham said that since the publication of the book he had obtained a temporary official appointment in the British West Indies at a salary considerably higher than he enjoyed before.

Mr. Slade said the main defence to the action was that in law the words complained of were incapable of a defamatory meaning. There was no evidence of malice.

Judgment was reserved

FIGS FROM THISTLES

By GEOFFREY DOBBS

It is a significant fact that Marx wrote to Darwin and asked to be allowed to dedicate his major work, *Das Kapital*, to him. The doubtful honour was declined, but the letter is important because it was a confession that Marx believed himself to be applying the Darwinian theory of evolution in the field of political economy. Now Marx was the son of a lawyer, and his first study was law, followed by history and philosophy. He was a journalist, a pamphleteer, and a voracious reader in the British Museum. His work bears a certain resemblance to Darwin's in its piling up of a formidable mass of detail, but it is a different sort of detail, written, quoted, verbal detail, not the results of observation and experiment, as a large part of Darwin's was. Marx had the formal, lawyer's mind, so it is not surprising that he misunderstood, as so many did, the workings of the empirical mind of Darwin.

It must be admitted, however, that Marx's knowledge of a certain type of economic fact was encyclopaedic, and that he marshalled these facts in an overpowering way in support of the theory of change in response to a material environment, which he had taken over, with only verbal comprehension, from Darwin. His Materialist Conception of History is a clear sign of a theory taken over without making the necessary changes, since he dismisses as of secondary importance the critical difference between men and other organisms, namely the vastly greater development of conscious thought and language in the former, a difference which is obviously of the utmost importance when we are considering, as he was, not physical, but political and economic organisation.

The chief value of Marx's contribution to thought, reduced to its simplest terms, seems to have been that he collected a mountain of evidence to the effect that something extremely evil, which he called Capitalism, was at work in the society of his day, and that this something must develop inevitably into something else which he called Socialism. Had he had any appreciable understanding of living organisms and their processes he would have realised the implications of this statement, which are still not appreciated by his followers.

To establish this important point it is necessary to insert here a longish quotation from Marx's 'Capital', Vol I, pp. 788-9; from the Chapter entitled *Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation*:

As soon as this process of transformation has sufficiently decomposed the old society from top to bottom, as soon as the labourers are turned into proletarians, their means of labour into capital, as soon as the capitalist mode of production stands on its own feet, then the further transformation of the land and other means of production into socially exploited and, therefore, common means of production, as well as the further expropriation of private proprietors, takes a new form. That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the labourer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many labourers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalist production itself, by the centralisation of capital. One capitalist always kills many. Hand in hand with this centralisation, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop on an ever extending scale, the co-operative form of the labour-process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of instruments of labour into instruments of labour only usable in common, the economising of all means of production by their use as the means of

production of combined, socialised labour, the entanglement of all people in the net of the world-market, and with this, the international character of the capitalist regime. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.

Here we have a statement, expressed with all the dogmatic emphasis of which nineteenth century repetitive prose was capable, of what Marx, and his followers, believed to be nature of the changes which society has been undergoing. It is a continuous process of expropriation, of the people, of the small capitalist, of the large capitalist, finally of everyone. It corresponds convincingly with the realities, both before, and since, it was made. Even the division of Marx's followers into the orthodox, revolutionary, Marxists, who believe in the violent 'bursting of the capitalist integument,' and the evolutionary Marxists, following Bernstein, who maintain that the one stage can merge gradually into the other; even this has been borne out in practice, as seen in the development of socialism in Russia and the 'democracies'. It is true that the precise form which the process of expropriation and centralisation would take in Germany and Italy had not been foreseen, but the statement remains a surprisingly accurate picture of the historical tendency of our age.

Though the statement, therefore, must be granted as true, the interpretation placed upon these facts by Marx, and now almost universally accepted without question by socialists, and even others, seems wildly and incredibly nonsensical to anyone who has escaped, or recovered from, the effects of a verbalistic and non-biological education. Anyone who has so much as grown mustard and cress in a window-box, which I doubt that Marx ever did, knows that a mustard seed gives a mustard plant, a cress seed gives a cress plant, and in the world of living things you will never get a 'good' plant out of a 'bad' seed though you work till doomsday. Yet it is now a commonplace of everyday thought that 'Capitalism' is bad, but that by its own 'immanent laws' it must give rise to 'Socialism', which is good. Thistles are 'bad', but when they have completely filled the field and have no more room for expansion, they will inevitably produce a crop of figs! The analogy may be crude, but at least it must be admitted that some type of biological analogy is appropriate. We are dealing, in political and economic matters, not with abstractions, but with organisms, human beings, and their activities and in particular the changes in their response to their environment. There is no possible shadow of justification for supposing that a continuation of the treatment which has been producing increasingly bad results will, when it reaches its possible limit, start producing good results; as well believe that, if drought is killing your cabbages, the complete desiccation of the soil will revive them!

Doubtless Marx's training in Hegelian philosophy, with its emphasis on 'dualism' conditioned him for thinking that 'bad' could automatically develop into 'good'. This idea seems to me applicable enough in the realm of words,

but it is quite alien to the world of real, or at least of living, things, though in the inorganic world we are familiar with sudden changes of one substance into another in response to external conditions, e.g. temperature and pressure.

There is also here some psychological 'kink' which I have not completely analysed, an escapist belief in the magic powers of the end term of a series which drives the weak-minded onwards to the practical limit of any course of action in the tragic belief that their difficulties will then automatically solve themselves. The drunkard who believes in a 'thorough blind' is a case in point, the chain smoker another, in the field of politics the internationalist who thinks the World State is the solution to 'national' problems which are already too large to overcome, and in religion, with a slightly different twist, the Adventist who believes that an increasingly disastrous flow of events will end with the introduction of the Kingdom of Heaven by an external Agency. Indeed I am inclined to think that this 'kink' is associated with most of the unfavourable mass tendencies of the day.

However, to return to Marx, it was the verbal splitting of what was admittedly *one* process, and an admittedly evil process in its earlier stages, into two parts, the later one of which was represented as desirable, which has worked such damnable confusion on the minds of the people. The obvious corollary is, of course, that it is wrong to oppose the process, which is inevitable in any case, the thing to do is to hasten it towards its longed for conclusion; and if the 'collective ownership' which is to be the end-product of a long process of 'expropriation' prove to be verbal figment more tenuous and elusive than thistledown, there will be nothing to do about it, except, indeed, to reverse the whole business, to grub up patiently and laboriously all the thistles, which is a bigger job the longer they are allowed to grow, and to plant figs, if that represents what is wanted.

There is no getting away from it that the whole beastly process, which first came into prominence with the Industrial Revolution, is *one*; the enclosure, the creation of a landless proletariat, the prey of any tough small capitalist, the wage-slavery both in town and country, the ousting of the small by the large employer, amalgamations, combines, trusts, international cartels, pyramids of power with fewer and fewer people in control, rationalisation, followed by nationalisation, the class struggle for power on the part of the small groups controlling the classes, the ousting of the semi-official Corporation employee by the complete bureaucrat, the State employee, the assumption of the powers of government by the winning power-group, the increase in the area controlled by such governments, with its logical conclusion in the World State; I say the whole thing is one, whether you denounce it as 'Capitalism' with the socialists, or as 'Socialism' with the anti-socialists.

Whatever you call it, and I prefer Cobbett's name, 'The Thing,' not forgetting its personal application, it is *one* process and it has got to be reversed if any fundamental solution is to be found to our difficulties.

It is a common gibe, in which the mass of socialists have been duly instructed by the literature on the subject, that Social Credit is a superficial 'quack' remedy, treating the 'spots' instead of the disease, while Socialism goes to the heart of the matter. Yet on Marx's own showing all the Socialist has to do is to swim with the tide of the

'immanent laws of capitalist production.' At the mere suggestion of swimming against them he is horrified, evil as he admits them to be. The thing, he says, is impossible, against evolution, against progress. This does not look like going to the heart of the matter!

There is here another misconception about 'evolution.' Natural Selection, as applied in the human economic and political sphere is childishly interpreted as favouring the survival of the strong, the cruel, the cunning and the generally anti-social, since those types have been seen to be encouraged by our economic 'system.' According to this view, in a state of nature the animal world would soon be dominated by tigers, cobras, tarantula spiders and the like, whereas it is a fortunate fact that these creatures are far from biologically 'successful' on the whole, compared with the less offensive types.

Instead, therefore, of blaming a state of '*laissez-faire*' for the encouragement of anti-social human types, the fact of their predominance in positions of power is clear evidence of the absence of *laissez-faire*, i.e., of a natural environment, and the presence of some unnatural interference with that environment.

Now, so far as our experience takes us, there is only one sort of unnatural influence in the World, and that is the influence of a wrong idea, i.e. an idea that is out of touch with 'nature' or 'reality.' It is nonsense for people to point to material influences such as machines, solar energy *etc.*, and to blame them for the trouble. There is absolutely nothing about a flying machine, for instance, which makes it essential for it to be used for dropping bombs rather than for providing transport for people. There is nothing about coal, which has been lying there in the earth for geological ages, which forces it to be used for making a Black Country, or turning out shoddy mass-produced goods. There is nothing about the immensely increased power which has become available to the human race during the last 150 years which inevitably tends towards centralisation, beyond, at any rate, a very moderate stage which has been passed long ago. On the contrary, it is not only equally available for decentralisation, but for the first time, by its vast multiplication of human power, it makes decentralisation compatible with the comfort of a high standard of living. The Marxian assumption that the changes in the 'forces of production' are alone sufficient to account for the historical process of centralisation and expropriation is shown to be false, in the light of the knowledge that these forces could equally well have been used in the opposite direction. I am afraid that the Distributists will not like to be told that they also have not freed themselves from this Marxian superstition!

If we are looking for an unnatural idea we have not far to seek! Now that Monetary Reform is all the rage in the 'best' circles, and even *The Times* refers to money as a ticket system it is perhaps possible at last to direct attention to the matter without being greeted by shrill cries of 'crank!' The absurdity of the idea that the tendencies of the Nineteenth Century were the product of '*laissez-faire*,' 'free enterprise,' or 'individualism' should at last begin to be obvious even to socialists.

I do not know why people still have the impertinence to use these terms to describe a state of affairs in which anyone can do what he likes provided he has a permit from the creators of credit. It is like saying that anyone

in a prison is free (omitting mention of the proviso that of course he must have a permit to do what he likes from the Governor). Even so, that state of affairs, as it occurred in the Nineteenth Century, in which there was laissez-faire for all (subject to a generalised Banker's permit) must be admitted to have contained a greater element of free choice than this, in which, not only the generalised money-permit is required, but also, superimposed on it, a variety of tickets, coupons, passes, licences, each limited in its scope, and covering between them nearly the whole field of human activity. These last have all the disadvantages and dangers of the money-ticket, in that they confer power to restrict freedom of action, and centralise it in the issuers, and none of its advantages, the chief of which is that, once it is in the hands of the consumer, the money-ticket permits freedom of action in any direction.

When the restrictive powers of paper and ink, backed by legal penalties, have reached their limit, as they have long ago in the first home of Marxism, Germany, and its adopted home, Russia, their place is taken by direct methods, such as barbed wire and machine guns. The end of the process is universal slavery, which is already well on the way. The Nazis' effort, however, to establish it more or less openly under its own name, appears to be doomed to failure; it will have a better chance under the names of universal Liberty, Equality, Fraternity *etc.*, in which guise it may deceive people longer as to its nature, and so survive longer at the bureaucratic stage.

At whatever stage this increasing interference over people's lives is operating, whether at the monetary, the bureaucratic, or the military or police level, and they are all well mixed up in this country at present, it is clear that there has been no question of the operation of *natural* selection for many generations. That is to say, we are emphatically *not* up against 'the trend of evolution,' the 'inevitable outcome of natural law,' as the Marxists would have us believe. There is nothing inevitable about it, except, of course, that so long as it is believed to be inevitable no attempt to reverse it is likely to succeed.

What we are facing is a series of actions on the part of certain people whose purpose is to centralise power in their own hands, and a vast aura of confused ideas, put about by them, with the aid of their control of the reiterative propaganda mechanisms which has enabled them to carry out their programme so far with impunity. The task of combatting these ideas, and the people behind them is by no means impossible, and has already been undertaken with some success. I find, however, that the majority of people, not merely professed socialists, are now inhibited from seeing the situation as it is by some or all of the Marxian misconceptions which I have been dealing with.

Points from Parliament

(continued from page 3)

different thing in a Bill relating to the reconstruction and planning of the country after the war. We ought to hesitate before putting these words into an Act of Parliament.

[*The Solicitor-General (Major Sir David Maxwell Fyfe) then showed from the wording of the Bill that the powers given were limited to concern the transferors or their functions or property as they exist, and secondly, to making any change which is necessary for the transfer.*]

Sir H. Williams: I agree with all that, but suppose the officials decided, in common parlance, to chance their arm—they sometimes do so—with their existing powers. Suppose they administer them in a way which is, in fact, illegal. If somebody goes to court and they are challenged, all is well, but suppose somebody puts in something which is an addition to the powers of the transferors, saying, "This is our chance to get this little power," and they put it in. Can it then be challenged in the courts?

The Solicitor-General: I want to be quite frank with regard to challenge in courts. Since the case of *R. v. the Controller of Patents*, as reported last year, it seems very doubtful whether it can be challenged. The Committee will bear in mind that I am not giving an absolute opinion, because it is very difficult to know whether exactly the same principles apply in regard to different subject matters. I would say, for the benefit of my hon. Friend the Member for Central Leeds (Mr. Denman), that this is quite a recent view and that the view which he put to the Committee, although it has great authority, is not the view in favour in the court's latest decision. He need, however, feel no regret about having misled the Committee. . . .

Mr. Davidson: . . . while I agree that there must be considerable sympathy in the House for the suggestion that we do not always want to discuss trivial or inconsequential arrangements, the argument cuts both ways. It would not be right for Members of this House to hand over the very important act of repealing or in any large sense modify or adapting any legislation or enactment that we have passed. But that is exactly what is asked in this Clause. I would like to point out to the Parliamentary Secretary that the Measures to which he referred as "minor legislation," such as the London green belt and other local legislation, are not minor legislative enactments at all. They are very important to Members of this House and to the community as a whole. The Government are to-day asking powers that have not been asked for in any previous Bill. For instance, in his own statement the Parliamentary Secretary accepted the Amendment and said he had given an assurance that under no circumstances would anything be done which would in any way seem to be infringing upon the powers of the House, or words to that effect. But that is exactly what Hitler said to the German people when he was asking for powers in Germany. . . .

I am . . . suggesting to the Government that they are placing themselves in a very weak position in asking the Members of this House to accept any such proposal. Why cannot they simply accept the Amendment? What does the Amendment ask? It asks that within a reasonable period, whenever the Government make any serious decision—the hon. Member for Maidstone (Mr. Bossom) has not asked the Government to bring forward any trivial or inconsequential points, but only serious points involving serious factors, such, for instance, as the complete repeal of a large part of an enactment—that decision should be brought forward to the Members of this House. Surely the Government have confidence in themselves. When they bring forward such proposals, a short explanatory speech by the Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary would suffice for the common sense of the Members, and would also keep the legislation in this particular matter within the orbit of the democracy which we all desire. . . .

The Solicitor-General: . . . the course I suggest, if I may mention it now, would be to add another Sub-section (8):

"Any Order in Council under this Act repealing, modifying or adapting any enactment shall be laid before Parliament as soon as may be after it is made:

Provided that no such Order in Council shall be deemed for the purposes of Section one of the Rules Publication Act, 1893, to be a statutory rule to which that section applies."

The proviso means, as the hon. Member for South Croydon knows, that the additional six weeks' delay and the publication of many hundreds of copies so that public bodies and persons may get a copy if they want it, are avoided. I am sure that none of my hon. friends would desire that that cumbrous machinery should operate in times of stringency like the present. If that appeals to my hon. Friend as a reasonable way of meeting the situation, then I suggest that he might withdraw his present Amendment on the understanding that this Amendment will be moved in due course to take its place— . . .

Mr. Bossom: On the assurance that has clearly been given to the Committee, I beg leave to ask to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment made: In page 5, line 6, at the end, insert:

[The text as suggested by the Solicitor-General]—

[*Mr. H. Strauss.*]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

JUNE 3.

Oral Answers to Questions

NEAR EAST DEPARTMENT, B.B.C. (MR. HILLELSON).

Captain Alan Graham asked the Minister of Information whether, in view of the need to prevent further exacerbation of anti-Semitic feelings among the Arabs and in view of the complaints already received from Moslems both in the Near East and in this country, he will reconsider the advisability of the retention as the official in charge of the Near East Department of the British Broadcasting Corporation of Mr. Hillelson, a Jew of German origin?

Mr. Bracken: No, Sir. I cannot accept my hon. and gallant Friend's suggestion. Mr. Hillelson was born in Germany, and educated at the University of Oxford. He became a British subject in 1908. He was a distinguished member of the Sudan Civil Service from 1911 to 1933. High tributes have been paid to his work in Sudan by a succession of Governors General, and, indeed, by all who worked with him. Mr. Hillelson later served for some time in the Foreign Office, and became a member of the staff of the B.B.C. in 1937. I cannot believe that the House will for one moment accept my hon. and gallant Friend's suggestion that a man who has been a faithful public servant for 31 years should be removed from his appointment on the ground that he is a Jew of German origin. I should regard myself as being a most unworthy servant of this House were I to approach the B.B.C. to suggest to the Governors that they should absorb Hitler's loathsome anti-Semitic prejudices.

Captain Graham: Is my right hon. Friend aware that he has totally mistaken the purpose of my Question and my objection? I have no objection in the slightest to the character

or attainments of the distinguished public servant whom he is so unnecessarily leaping to defend on those grounds. The objection is solely—

Mr. Speaker: Mr. McNeil.

Captain Graham: On a point of Order. May I not be allowed to defend myself?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member was giving information not asking for it.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Economic Democracy | (edition exhausted) |
| Social Credit | 3/6 |
| The Monopoly of Credit | 3/6 |
| Credit Power and Democracy | (edition exhausted) |
| Warning Democracy | (edition exhausted) |
| The Use of Money | 6d. |
| "This 'American' Business" | 3d. |
| Social Credit Principles | 1½d. |

ALSO

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold | 4/6 |
| Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson | 6d. |
| Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report | 6d. |
| Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne | 4d. |
| How Alberta is Fighting Finance | 2d. |

Leaflets

| | |
|--|---|
| The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell | 9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6 |
| Taxation is Robbery | 50 for 1/9; 100 for 3/- (Please allow for postage when remitting). |

FROM K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

Information about Social Credit activities in different regions may be had by writing to the following addresses:

- BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
- BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
- BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 73 Manor Rd., Blackpool.
- BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
- CARDIFF S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 8, Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
- DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.
- LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.
- LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
- Lunch hour re-unions on the first and third Thursdays of the month at 12-30 p.m., at The Plane Tree Restaurant, Great Russell Street, W. C. 1. Next Meeting July 2.
- NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE D. S. C. Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.
- SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.