

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 26.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 6, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket (XIII)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

Considering first the purely agricultural aspect of the land question in the light of the assumption that "we must grow more food"—an assumption which I am inclined to believe has some basis in reality—the policy decides itself. Comparatively small agricultural holdings, of the order of one hundred acres, or so, are at least 30 per cent. more productive than mechanised collective farms. Incidentally, much more information ought to be available regarding Forestry Commission farms. It is, of course, important to distinguish *productivity* per acre, from *financial profit* per acre under an arbitrary financial and wage system. Accurately costed on orthodox (and in a technical sense, correct) costing system, I doubt very much whether any English farming made a legitimate money profit on sound and properly remunerated management. That is merely an argument for better financial methods, not for a different system of administration.

At this point, and anticipating a little such tentative suggestions as it may seem expedient to make at this juncture, it appears desirable to deal with the question of trespass. The Communist idea of a terrestrial heaven is of a land in which the good comrade, for the most part, lives in a town and holds a Works Meeting to make speeches and to criticise the factory management every morning. When the weather is fine he erupts over a fenceless and defenceless countryside to emphasise the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In order to mould the mentality of the rural incumbent so that, as P.E.P. puts it so attractively, "the farmer will be forced by events to submit to far reaching changes of outlook," various branches of the Ogpu in the new Ministries, known as Enforcement Officers, are at present going about the country with "Authorisations" to enter upon any property for practically any purpose, none of which is military, or connected with the prosecution of the war. Already the effects of this are a little unexpected from the P.E.P. standpoint. The farmer is not "being forced by events to submit to far-reaching changes of outlook." He is merely ceasing to farm.

Trespass of various kinds has more importance, I think, than is generally attached to it. In its more flagrant forms it is a nuisance out of any proportion to any possible benefit to the trespasser, but even minor trespass irritates a farmer, partly because he may have to look whether gates have been left open or stock disturbed, and it may involve the unnecessary movement of small implements.

The extraordinary feature of it is that there is an increasingly prevalent idea that anyone ought to have the right to walk anywhere at any time, in the country, and to do

more or less as they please, although it would never be suggested that the farmer ought to be entitled to walk into, let us say, the works of Messrs. Rolls, Royce and to shuffle the blue-prints around. Anyone who feels that the New Socialist Order will include unlimited right to trespass might try trespassing in that idol of the Socialists, the Bank of "England."

I have no doubt that one of the solutions of this problem is the provision of National Parks if the hand of the Planner and his Forestry Commissions can be kept off them. I am more than doubtful whether it is a final solution. But in the meantime it is certain that to obtain the highest value on every plane, both of production and of ethical and spiritual satisfaction from the land, more, not less, individual control of it is vital. I may perhaps repeat that the day of the very large landowner is over, for reasons already to some extent explored in these notes. But amongst many debts, mostly unacknowledged, which the countryside owes to him, is its preservation, until he was dispossessed, from vandalism. Every argument, however, which can be truthfully brought against a large landowner is enhanced when the ownership is impersonal "Public Body."

Whether it is as the result of defective education or from other causes, the power of comparison seems to have deteriorated. Few people appear to notice that, in spite of efforts to bring hotels (as distinct from inns) in Great Britain up to something approaching the standards of civilisation, and the good surface of the roads, the tourist attractions of Great Britain have declined with the substitution of public for private control. In itself, of course, that is a matter of little consequence, but it is an indication of a decrease in the attractions of the countryside which I am confident affects everyone. I have in my possession some books, not so very old as books go, which relate to a town with a history which goes back to Domesday Book, and earlier. This town, the name of which I will suppress in consideration for the feelings of its unfortunate inhabitants, must now be well in the running for pre-eminence as a faithful similitude of Dante's Inferno. Yet two hundred years ago it was a lovely little county borough beside a sparkling salmon river, surrounded by wooded hills with hundreds of modest manor houses within an hour's canter, and half a dozen famous mansions within a radius of fifteen miles, each of them a little community in itself. There are hundreds of such districts in various parts of Great Britain. The general deterioration has been more rapid in the last fifty years than in the previous century, and a wide extension of this deterioration is threatened.

I have little doubt that there is an organic connection between this curious inability to grasp the nature and trend of events, and the failure to derive reliable information from

the words we use. A cognate instance of this is contained in a sentence spoken by Lord de la Warr during the debate on agriculture in the House of Lords, which took place recently. The Editor of a well known weekly described this sentence as "the essence of the whole matter." Whether this was enthusiasm or satire, I do not know.

Lord de la Warr said, "In return for stable markets and prices, the community has a right to demand efficient farming, efficient landowning, efficient distribution, and a fair wage for the agricultural workers."

Who is the community? Are the several hundred thousand aliens in this country part of the community? How does the community demand anything? Through a controlled Press? or through a Parliament which cannot even control its own agenda? Just exactly what bearing have "stable prices and markets" on the community's right to demand anything? If the word "right" has any meaning at all in this connection, the "community" either has it or it hasn't. It doesn't acquire it. How does Lord de la Warr know that stable "prices and markets" which would mean highly artificial and non-realistic prices and markets, are either desirable or practicable? What is a "fair" wage? How do you fix a "fair" wage without that wage defining prices? Who is it to be "fair" to?

I have met Lord de la Warr, who I think might fairly be described as a professional politician who has chosen Socialism as, say, fifty years ago about half the aspiring professional politicians chose Liberalism. I doubt very much whether the sentence quoted meant anything to him. But it is a type of sentence easily recognisable as having come originally from the propaganda department of the international Freemasons.

Its vague abstractions, its subtle appeal to the mob to "demand" something technical, would raise a cheer at any electioneering meeting. But although Lord de la Warr probably used it as stock-in-trade, it would be a mistake to suppose that it has no intention. Let us see what we can translate it into without in any way straining its words.

"Stable prices" mean price rings—the aim of the international financier. "Stable markets" mean rationing in peace time. I don't know what the community means, but from the context it is something which makes a bargain, in theory, with some undisclosed and shadowy power which gives it price-rings and rationing. "Efficiency" means the ratio of the input of what you have got, to the output of what you want, so as we are told elsewhere that we want full employment, "efficient farming" must mean employing as many people as possible. It can't mean maximum production, because that would interfere with our export trade, which we are told is vital. "Efficient landowning" presumably means rack-renting to pay the international bondholders, supervised from Whitehall. Obviously it doesn't mean that the landowner as we know him is to be efficient from his point of view, because his is the only point of view which is inadmissible. Finally it will be noticed that this abstraction, the community, has a "right to demand" these things—not a prospect of getting them in the form in which individuals could use them.

In that curious document *The Protocols of Zion* (Protocol III, para. 5) occurs the remark "All these so-called 'People's Rights' can exist only in idea, an idea which can never be realised in practical life."

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

No, Clarence, we really can't tell you what the Colonel of the Grenadiers said when the troops of the United Nations rushed back fifty miles in Tunisia to cable to mommer stop this orful war we orter bin told me fortharsenal of d'makrazi.

We have the girls in the office to consider. But we understand that a battery mule within earshot gave one strangled "Oh, yeah!" and fainted.

There are signs, faint but unmistakable, that some English have been dropped, probably by parachute, into the "B".B.C. There's nothing these fellows won't do.

The Cooper Report on Hydro-Electric Development in Scotland (P. 33, sec. 84), observes: "*even during the constructional period, few hydro-electric schemes could produce a temporary local disfigurement more remarkable than that which is regularly produced by large timber-cutting operations—a process which will be more common in the future as the work of the Forestry Commission expands.*" (our italics.)

Well, if that isn't getting a bird with each barrel, we've never seen it done.

"Since we believe that a world in which the arts are to flourish must be a planned world, we put ourselves at the disposal of the Government." — Extract from a letter to Garvins Gazette from C. C. MARTIN, of Dartington Hall.

Mr. Elmhirst, the proprietor of Dartington Hall, is a close collaborator of Mr. Moses Israel Sieff, Chairman of P.E.P. and Vice-Chairman of Marks & Spencer, Limited.

For the effect of Art in a Planned World, readers are advised to contemplate the charm produced by the chain stores of Messrs. Marks & Spencer in, for instance, Princes Street, Edinburgh. But almost any town will do.

In the brilliance of the day-to-day and night-to-night achievements of our glorious civilisation, we are apt to forget the remark of the Zoo director who was asked to admire Jack Dempsey, Columbia's Crown, the World's Greatest Bruiser. "We've an orang-outang who could whip six of him," he observed.

Doesn't it prove how small the world is becoming that Mr. Roosevelt can catch dear Mr. Churchill's cold all the way across the Atlantic?

Portugese Utilities

"It is to be hoped," says The Economist, "that Portugal is not to join the ranks of those who hope to achieve prosperity by minimising foreign trade, for that is one effect of banning foreign capital." The remark arises from the proposal to convert six foreign-owned public utility concerns into Portugese companies. The two British-owned companies are Anglo-Portugese Telephone and Lisbon Tramways. The Economist says "it" (whether a fall in share prices or the quasi-autarchic tendency is not clear) "is an inevitable result of the increasing inclination to place the control of public services, if not of all industry, in the hands of the state."

CORRESPONDENCE

Making Parliamentary History

Sir,

I notice that in the extracts from *Hansard* which you publish in your issue of February 13, 1942, Sir Herbert Williams (Croydon South) in discussing Emergency Powers (Defence) Acts (Regulations) refers to the success of the action taken by a section of the paint manufacturers when a deputation to the Minister was so effective that "the whole case for the Ministry was blown sky high and had to be abandoned."

It will perhaps interest and encourage Social Crediters to read the following extracts from a speech made by Major Proctor, M.P., (who introduced the deputation referred to above) on Thursday, February 4, to a national meeting of the Paint Manufacturers and Allied Trades Association.

Major Proctor said he "appeared before the members of the Association that morning with a feeling of great joy for they had created Parliamentary history" "This was the first time a Parliamentary Order, in connection with which the days of grace had passed, and which was past praying for and was in actual operation, had been quashed; and how did it come about? It came about by a body of men who refused to take lying down what they regarded as something that was unjust. *It came about by the use of machinery which was at the disposal of every citizen in this country, if he would use it.*" He ventured to say that, "starting with cotton, had members of Parliament been made use of as they had by the Paint Manufacturers, many of the other concentration schemes would have been quashed."

The first step was "to get together a group of Members of Parliament who agreed that the little men were worth preserving, and some 50 Members of Parliament put a motion down on the paper." "As soon as a motion was put down on the paper, Whitehall began first to cogitate and afterwards it became agitated." After describing the interviews with the Board of Trade and the Ministry of Supply he said in regard to the first, "So utterly confounded were the representatives of the Board of Trade that he had suggested there should be an adjournment on account of the vagueness that was in the Minister's mind, because he was not quite sure what was really happening." With regard to the interview with the latter he said "again confusion was manifest."

But undoubtedly the most significant outcome of this fight is shown by the following remark. "It was satisfactory to know that out of that motion a great deal of good had come, for to-day there was a group of Members of Parliament who were watching every Defence Order that came out and no Order in future would be allowed to go through without the closest critical examination." This, as your issue of February 13 shows, is already bearing fruit.

Yours faithfully,

R. GAUDIN.

Ashdale, Hascombe, Surrey; February 20, 1943.

Mr. R. B. Gaudin, first Chairman of the recently formed Paint Manufacturers and Allied Trades Association, which he did so much to bring into existence, has resigned. Mr. Gaudin's many friends inside and outside of the Social Credit Movement will as deeply regret the severe illness

which has caused him to take this step, as they will take pleasure in the condition upon which his professional friends have accepted his decision, namely that he should become first President of the Association. The letter published above was accompanied by one with the good news that Mr. Gaudin is making steady progress towards recovery and for this he has the best wishes of us all.

"Betterment Values"

The following letter appeared in the "Scotsman" of February 20:—

Sir,

The defence of the Uthwatt Report by your correspondent C.M.M., in your issue of February 12, appears to amount to the claim that the State will buy betterment values from the owner of the land with money it has collected from him in taxation, and then collect from him in taxation the money it paid for the betterment values. His remark that the Government has a very great game afoot would appear to be an understatement.

I am, etc., C. H. DOUGLAS.

The Archbishop of Canterbury

Quotations from the Leicester speech:—

"Over land and water we must establish a social control, whether or not this carries with it national ownership."

"No group becomes effective unless it is gathered about a leader. Hitler's 'Führer-Prinzip' is perfectly sound psychologically."

The Archbishop shows that he has been reading Douglas with painstaking care (or someone has been doing so for him), and tries very hard to say the master's words. Yet, the subordination of the group to the individual is not the same thing as the subordination of the individual to the group, although the two phrases are made up of the same words.

The 'Führer-Prinzip' is only sound for the subordination of the individual to the group. It is a sound principle in administration, where the subordination is voluntary and terminable without penalty for terminating it. The 'Führer-Prinzip' in politics (policy) is dictatorship.

Points from Parliament*House of Lords: February 17, 1943***WORLD BANK PROPOSAL**

Lord Strabolgi: In theory, this idea of an international bank with control over currency and credit throughout the world is a very fine idea. People talk about an international currency and its value to commerce. But unless this international bank is responsible to an international Government or a Super-State, it would be a tremendous danger to the liberties and therefore to the lives of all mankind. . . .

My noble friend referred to the Bank for International Settlements. There is the model—in theory very good; in

Continued on page 8

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. 9. No. 26.

Saturday, March 6, 1943.

“What shall it profit a Man--”

The man who some ten years ago took pains to spread his view that under Social Credit life would be one long summer holiday, was heard, I think, with a polite dismay which rapidly hardened into implacable opposition. The respectable citizen had a use for holidays, but only in their proper place; a perennial holiday, still worse, a *compulsory* perennial holiday, was the last thing he wanted, though he couldn't tell exactly why; and without further ado put up a delaying action against this strange new doctrine.

“Better the devil you know,” said he; and his wife, who hated camping out, and had always wondered who would do the chores, entirely agreed with him.

They were both wondering how on earth they should pass the time. They did not demand the satisfaction of the creative instinct, and the removal of material limitations. But I think one of them said, “I don't want to vegetate.”

That highly complex thing known as “life,” as it is manifested in human beings, seems to me to possess two distinct attributes. There is the organic life which we share with nature, “growing as a tree,” and the dynamic power which enables us to adapt our environment to suit ourselves, a power almost unknown in nature except in a rudimentary degree among certain birds and animals. One way of stating our problem is in terms of providing conditions in which these two manifestations of human life may function in harmony.

A holiday in the modern sense could have had no possible place in mediaeval times, when the rhythm of life with its recurring Saint's days, seed time and harvest, satisfied men's basic needs in their own village. But our times are out of joint.

Major Douglas has spoken of Social Engineering as a vital need of to-day. We cannot return to the time when the small and yet intensely real problems of everyday prevented the divorce of the two sides of man's nature. Hence forth any progress in the required direction will depend on the conscious effort of at least a few. I think the would-be Social Engineer must be thoroughly familiar with the two-fold nature of our problem, which to my mind exists in every individual life, as well as in every human association. I have heard it put in this way:—“trying to build up a reasonably high-grade organisation on correct lines and to use it for the purpose intended while it is being constructed. Regarded as a purely mechanical problem this is an impossibility; you cannot win a race with the car you're building, while you're building it. Yet curiously, the ability to do

something akin to this is what distinguishes organisms from non-organisms; and human associations partake of the organismal in this respect.”

The problem of constant growth and conscious adaptation is also the problem of the individual. Each of us, if you like, is a *living* dynamo; capable of maximum output under the best conditions. And yet all the time we're changing—growing in various ways. But the dynamo must work as well as live. Add to this the present day over-weighting of the purely mechanical side of life, so that men and women cannot live without their “holidays” when for a time they may “vegetate” in a vain attempt to redress the balance—well, the problem is big enough in all conscience. It is not possible to do more than state it. This has already been done, and the writer of this article can do little but point to the significance of each word.

“The interest of man, which is self-development, is above all systems, whether theological, political or economic”—if that is a universal truth it is true here and now. Each of us is, in fact *must* be, looking after his own interest or profit, saving his own soul. We make disastrous mistakes until we find the best means available to us in our own particular circumstances. It is an intensely personal matter made supremely difficult by the fact that a false theological system has produced first a political and then an economic system designed to condemn each of us to a living death.

Nevertheless, we can only add to the Social Credit in proportion as we increase our own. As applied to the Social Credit movement I am quite sure this means that anyone who sets out with the idea of “giving things up” is bound to come a cropper sooner or later.

We are all in this for gain, individual soul-satisfying gain. The first fruit of any worthwhile contribution is an enrichment in markedly increased ratio to the effort expended. A personal enrichment.

Conversely, we shall get nowhere if we approach our individual problem with a preconceived idea of what we “ought” to do. What we “want” to do is nearer the mark, and any disinclination towards activity is a danger signal that needs investigation. There were certain words which Jesus Christ did not seem to find very useful, among them were *laziness, duty, heroic* and *selfishness*. I am suggesting that for us too, such words as these should have no meaning. It would be interesting to know at what period of time they made their appearance in the language. Perhaps one of these fine days they will be found in a dictionary of archaic expressions necessary only to students of 19th and 20th century philosophy.

Meanwhile, if we would only keep our attention on the fact that it is our own soul that has to be saved, not the soul of the movement or of some unfortunate friend, things would be so much simpler for every one concerned.

For each of us is running a race with a car while we are building it. B.M.P.

Alberta

How Alberta is Fighting Finance is now available again, price 4d.

TURN OF THE TIDE

"Human beings do not react to social forces, they react to facts, though not necessarily what are called material facts." — C. H. DOUGLAS in "The Big Idea."

No matter what direction it may take, it seems to me that all genuine inductive research is legitimate and of value. As politicians are wont to insist, Every avenue must be Explored, if it is only to see that it leads nowhere. But that is not to say that research does not tend to follow fashion. It most certainly does. And fashion, like a badly loaded ship, is apt to be all on one side or the other. The Greeks who, among other things, know how to hit nails on the head, were right when they coined the phrase, Nothing too much. I feel sure it was on one-sided research that Medievalism came to grief—too much metaphysics. And this modern world, the culmination of what we are pleased to call the Age of Reason, is sick almost to death of a quite unreasonable dose of physics. But all the time facts, the raw material of Truth, are being accumulated at a terrific rate, and we must rejoice that the reservoir of potential human wisdom is becoming so prodigious.

These reflections are induced by a glimpse of the modern developments in biological research, and its extension, through bio-chemistry into what is called Experimental Psychology, of which the author of this book* is an exponent. It is an immense, not to say disturbing subject, which appears, to me at least, to have got wholly out of hand, with special emphasis on two aspects—American salesmanship, with its sense of strain and tensivity, and European politics as exemplified in Totalitarianism. On the Continent it gives the almost audible impression of a great concerted outcry—a Protest,—which ever since the days of Luther, and on through the French Encyclopaedists and Karl Marx, has been getting louder and more and more raucous, till you can almost imagine its culmination in one of Hitler's Sports Palace screeching-matches of the early part of this war. Poor Europe!

In England, as seems to have been the case with most things, the Age of Reason has had a smoother passage. Inaugurated by Francis Bacon and that sweet-tongued philosopher, Will Shakespeare, it produced on the whole a far more mellow gallery of names than across the English Channel: to list only a few, Newton, and Locke, and Berkeley, and Jeremy Bentham, and Darwin. Men like Locke and Berkeley fearlessly mixed metaphysics with their physics when it came to deduction, and though it may be argued that what we call "Progress" was a trifle delayed thereby, if it was, the world was no worse for it, and considerably more human than we have contrived to make it since.

In nothing is this loss of humanity more evident, I think, than in biology—the study of Life, the living organism. It may be argued that humanity and scientific research have nothing to do with one another, and neither in theory, they have. But first show me a scientist who is not also a human being, even in his laboratory, and I will concede the other point. Therefore I don't find it possible to accept the researches of Professor Pavlov, who was Mr. Chakotin's teacher, into the instinctive reflexes of animals as not having been themselves "conditioned" (to use his own famous term) by the mechanistic bias of the times and place. One is not

casting doubts on the scientific accuracy of his work; but the real test of a man's integrity and of his philosophy comes when he closes his laboratory door behind him and comes out into the active light of every day. No one would deny that the scientist affords a splendid example (the highest) of rigid professional integrity, besides exemplifying in a unique manner the extraordinary results that professional and experimental detachment is capable of producing—a proof that "honesty is the best policy" analogous to Quaker success in trade. But so too, in his functional capacity is every really honest craftsman (expert) a shining light—not excepting the banker.

It is surely, however, a profound mistake to suggest that outside his function, and apart from his whole character as an individual, a scientist has anything more of weight to say regarding the ultimate use to which his labours may be put than Tom or Dick or Harry,—in short, that he understands anything more about policy, or what we all want from life. It is possible indeed that he understands less, for from the very nature of his activities, which must be kept scupulously water-tight, and are not necessarily more cultural or developing than, let us say, the writing up of credit creations on both sides of the ledger, his contact with what we call reality may be very small indeed—less by a great deal than the average farmer's, or industrialist's.

Nevertheless, particularly on the Continent and in the United States, for a long time now there has been a tendency to pay an exaggerated homage to the physicist; due, really, more to the fact that he deals with the fashionable thing, (matter), than to any intrinsic virtue in himself. For, curiously enough, the scientist would seem to leave behind him in his laboratory the one really valuable piece of practical experience it affords; which is the tremendous value of negative results, and of the simplification of life and of the problem of living by a knowledge of the number of things it is *simply not worth while doing*. This I take to be the translation into "voluntary" (positive) terms of the prohibitions and legal negatives of the Ten Commandments. I imagine a great deal is to be attributed to this failure. To it, no doubt, is due the conspicuous inability of the academic Socialist mind to appreciate (except as an abstract symbol: Democracy) the principles of Representative Government as practical, very intermittently alas, throughout the British Empire, and which, as Douglas has said and all real Anglo-Saxons instinctively feel to be so, is government by public veto (negative results): You go and do something, and we'll tell you if we don't like it! Trial and error—the empirical, scientific method of research, actually brought out of the laboratory and put into practice.

Now it appears to me that there is a considerable amount of evidence to be seen here and there that suggests that the tide of Materialism, dialectical and every other kind, is due to turn, if it has not already begun to ebb. A book† by the late Professor J. S. Haldane happened to come under my notice while I was engaged in following Mr. Chakotin's heated mental adventures. Professor J. S. Haldane (not at all to be confused with his son, J. B. S. Haldane, sometime member of the Board of the *Daily Worker*) begins his book promisingly by invoking Bishop George Berkeley, Swift's

**The Rape of the Masses* by SERGE CHAKOTIN.

†J. S. HALDANE: *The Philosophical Basis of Biology*; Hodder & Stoughton.

contemporary, whose speculations on Individual Consciousness (*esse est percipi*) constituted a direct challenge to the absolute materialism of Newton and Locke.

In this book, in controversy with Professor Hogben,—a biologist apparently after the hearts of Mr. Chakotin and Mr. H. G. Wells, who confirms their most cherished, and worst fears regarding themselves and the world they inhabit—he exposes the basic fallacy of Experimental Psychology, or rather the bio-chemistry, *à la* Pavlov, from which it springs. This is the idea that the results of Pavlov's experimentation in "conditioned reflexes" in animals have a positive bearing on human social policy—an absolute value. That is to say, the notion that Pavlov's subject, the thing he actually had managed to isolate, in his dog kennels and mouse-traps and rabbit hutches, and on his operating tables, was Life—the *whole* of it, and all there is to it. The idea that it was, seems to my unprofessional mind simply ludicrous, if for no other reason than that Pavlov and his collaborators did not know what life was to begin with, nor any more at the end of their labours. Who does!

Professor Haldane's small and interesting book, which puts forward his reason for disagreement, is of course, outside the scope of this review; but it comes in for mention as my justification for the feeling already alluded to, that the impulse behind the mechanistic cult for organisation is already on the wane, and giving place, or about to, to an interest in organism—the living cell that is not exclusively *acted upon*, as Mr. Chakotin and Mr. Wells and the rest imagine, but also in its turn acts upon its environment and to a considerable extent makes it its own. What differentiates a biological organism from chemical organisation, the living from the dead, is as Haldane says, that it "maintains itself and its environment," maintains and builds up its own organic structure and identity in, and with its environment. In short, that like Topsy, "it grow'd." No other organism grew it; that is its living uniqueness, which Douglas emphasises in the organic human individual as "the fact that he manoeuvres under his own steam."

That is the obvious truth that is denied by Experimental Psychology, which in appearance at least still holds the field. For we must not forget that all Planners are Experimental Psychologists, and it cannot be denied that they are still visibly triumphant, still in appearance at least, having it all their own way, and able to make their personal desire for centralising power in their own hands appear increasingly necessary and inevitable. But neither must we forget when we tend to be overwhelmed by the pervasiveness of it all, that we are still maintaining in theory at least, a Distributive System which is an integral part of this mechanistic fashion—the mathematics of Materialism it might be called; which while it persists (and insists on persisting) does really make our social manoeuvres appear inevitable. But if the mental impulse behind Materialism is actually waning, as there begins to be evidence that it is, then we may be certain the system which exists to serve the impulse will collapse, and with it all its self-created, artificial necessities.

In that event, the tide may ebb swiftly, more swiftly and suddenly than any of us imagine perhaps, and no doubt we may look to see many strange creatures left stranded by

the receding waters, and futilely and ridiculously struggling: Helpless leviathans; organistic (if one may coin a word) rather than organic, half human, half machine (like Mr. Wells's own Martians), who previously disported themselves freely and at the expense of everyone else in that element. Perhaps, who knows, there are some who have touched bottom already, and it is their tail lashings and strivings to get out to sea again that are churning up the waters round our "island home"?
N. F. W.

The Representative's Job

(A COMMUNICATION FROM THE BRISTOL RATEPAYERS' REPRESENTATIVE LEAGUE.)

"His Majesty's Government ask no favours; we ask only to be judged by results."

—WINSTON CHURCHILL in Parliament, February 11, 1943.

The Bristol Ratepayers' Representative League, which has been trying to make Democracy work by demanding results in local affairs, recently sent the following letter to each of the candidates in the Bristol Central By-election:

Dear Candidate,

We are not interested in politics—in the usual sense—but we are interested in the proper representation of the people of this city. It is no part of our business to advise our members how to vote, but it is to keep them informed of the attitude of those who claim, or seek, to represent them.

In view of the prevalent confusion about the functions of a representative we venture to put forward a common-sense point of view, which we believe it will be impossible in the future to ignore. In doing so we have the advantage that we are trying to practise what we preach.

You are, we understand, a candidate for a paid job at £600 per annum as representative in Parliament for the people of Central Bristol. What, then, is your idea of the job of a representative, and your qualifications for it? Whatever your views, one thing should be clear: you cannot serve two masters! Either you will, if appointed, represent your constituents—or some one else, your party, or some unofficial political body which is supporting your candidature, or, perhaps, merely yourself. In our view, it is practice of representing almost any "interest" but that of the electors which has brought Parliament into disrepute with the "man in the street."

What, then, does it mean to represent a body of some thousands of citizens of very varying needs, skill, knowledge, beliefs and intelligence? The prevalent view seems to be that you should represent their opinions, *i.e.*, the majority view on *how* the country should be run. This is rank nonsense and when taken to its logical conclusion, as in both France and Germany, results in chaos, disgust with "Democracy" and a clamour for dictatorship to clear up the mess.

Clearly a majority view on *how* to do anything is likely to be wrong. In a group of ordinary people, such as electors, there is a minority who understand how to do any particular job, and a majority who do not. Would you, for instance, accept a majority verdict of ordinary citizens on how to build a wireless set, grow onions, or cut out a suit of clothes? In the conduct of the war, would you put it to the vote when, where and how to launch a second front, how to tackle

the submarine menace, or deal with phosphorous bombs? Why, then, should you accept a majority verdict on tariffs, the gold standard, Social Insurance, Nationalisation and so forth? All these things are *Methods* which it is hoped will obtain certain results which are desired. In our view, it is the *results* which should be represented to Parliament, that is the way, the only way, you can represent the *will* of the electors, not their opinions.

This involves *finding out what they want*. You cannot do this by using all the tricks of eloquence to persuade them that they want what you, or your party, want. The more persuasive you are, the more successful you will be in confusing the issue. It is a job, as we in the League have found, that can be done, and we have started doing it (See our 1943 programme based on the enclosed Members' Declaration of Policy).

It is clear, then, that the representative's job is not to be an expert on law, economics, military affairs, health, agriculture, or anything else except *representation*, which is a subject which demands all the brains and energy that any man or woman can put into it.

It should not, in our view, be the function of Parliament to pass masses of legislation resembling treatises on law or economics, but to convey clearly to the Government the results wanted by the people, and to place the responsibility for delivering those results squarely on the appropriate ministers, who will, in turn, find and hold responsible the appropriate technical staff. During war time, some elements of this have appeared, and our military commanders are subjected to this sort of pressure for results, but not, so far, our 'economic' commanders, such as the Treasury, the Bank of England, and the Ministries.

We believe that government by the will of the people, which is true Democracy, is only possible along these lines. Something of this sort must be done if we are to avoid the awful dangers of false democracy with its reliance on majority opinions—cleverly manipulated by propaganda so that they serve the will of the few—and the various forms of totalitarianism—in which the will of the dictator, not of the people, openly prevails.

We would point out that the representative, both local and national, is losing his powers, and is being rapidly reduced to the undignified status of a rubber stamp on the legislation of the permanent officials. Our aim is to bring people and representative into proper relationship so that, backed by the solid goodwill of his constituents, he can be independent of the party whip or any other outside interest so long as he continues to do his duty in representing his constituents' will. For this purpose, the electors in each constituency will need a representative body which will do work analogous to that now being attempted by the Bristol Ratepayers' Representative League in discovering and making known the will of the people. This, we believe, is the next great step forward in British Democracy and it is long overdue, for indeed it is urgent if the idea of Democracy is to be saved.

Finally, if you have read the foregoing, and regard yourself primarily as a representative of the people, we invite you to sign the enclosed declaration. If you find yourself unable to do this, since our purpose is not merely to get you to sign a form of words, but to ascertain genuinely in what light you regard the job of representative, we shall be

glad to give equal publicity to any amendment (subject to a limit of 100 words) to which you would be willing to subscribe. Your action, or refusal to act, in this matter will be communicated to our members and to the press before polling day.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) L. R. WHEATLEY, *Chairman*.
N. CORRADINE, *Secretary*.

Bristol Ratepayers' Representative League,
21, Bridge Street, Bristol, 1.

[Attached:—]

Declaration

Bristol Central By-Election

If elected as a member of Parliament I shall regard it as my first duty to discover and to represent fairly in Parliament the will of my constituents for *results*. I shall refuse to vote for any measure which involves accepting responsibility for technical matters which the majority of members of the House cannot reasonably be expected to understand fully, but I shall urge on every possible occasion that those who make technical decisions shall be held responsible for the results, and that those results shall be in accordance with the will of the electors.

Candidates' replies in alphabetical order are given below:—

Lady Apsley:

Replying to your letter of the 3rd inst., I am in sympathy with your view that the electors of Bristol Central desire results. The results at which I shall aim are clearly set out in my Election address, copy of which is enclosed herewith.

When measures are introduced by the Government, the Minister in charge of the Bill takes the responsibility for its technical implications, and there is no question that his department is responsible for ensuring that in such respects it will meet the aims set out in the Bill.

Yours faithfully,

VIOLA APSLEY. (Signed)

February 12, 1943.

Mr. F. H. Dunn:

If elected as a member of Parliament I shall regard it as my duty to represent in Parliament the particular needs of my electors in Central Bristol. Before voting for any measure I personally shall endeavour to grasp the idea of its major issues, also bearing in mind that the responsibility for its ultimate success shall be borne by the Department or Minister who sponsored it.

Yours faithfully,

FRED H. DUNN. (Signed)

February 15, 1943.

Miss Jennie Lee:

If elected as a member of Parliament I shall consider it my duty to carry out by act and vote the policy which I am now putting before the electorate. I regard it a most undemocratic practice, destructive of all good faith between elector and elected, when members of Parliament shelter behind a party machine as an excuse for bad faith. There must be direct contact between member and constituent. Membership of Parliament is a full time exacting job if both parliamentary and constituency duty are to be adequately attended to. I believe that a member of Parliament should

hold regular meetings in which to inform the electorate the business of the day in Parliament and the policy supported.

If elected I shall maintain a Committee of those responsible for my candidature, Bristol Labour, Trade Union, Co-op, Liberal and Church leaders. As to technical matters, in the new social and economic order we are approaching present parliamentary machinery is inadequate.

Yours faithfully,

February 15, 1943.

JENNIE LEE. (Signed)

Mr. John McNair:

If elected as a member of Parliament I shall regard it as my first duty to discover and to represent fairly in Parliament the will of my constituents for results. I shall refuse to vote for any measure which involves technical matters unless the majority of members of the House has had a reasonable opportunity of understanding the problems. I shall urge on every possible occasion that those who make technical decisions shall be held responsible for the results, and that those results shall be in accordance with the will of the electors.

February 14, 1943.

JOHN MCNAIR. (Signed)

The League thanks the candidates for their attention to this important matter, and does not wish to place undue stress on the particular words chosen by them in the rush of the election campaign; but, now that the election is over*, the hope may be expressed that both the electors and their representative will give this question of proper representation of the will, and not the views of the electorate the attention it deserves, and will not be satisfied without putting it to the test. The League is engaged in attempting this in local affairs but it could be applied to Parliament only by the growth of non-party Voters Policy Associations, the function of which would be to convey to the representative the results wanted by the electors. Such an association would immensely strengthen the M.P. who was doing his duty, but could organise a demand for the resignation of one who refused to represent the will of his constituents. Action along these lines would make Democracy something better than an affair of speeches and slogans.

NOTE: In accordance with the League's principle of individual responsibility, it should be stated that the above letter was written by Dr. C. G. Dobbs, formerly a member of the Executive Committee of the League, at the request of the Secretary. It was approved and signed by the Chairman and Secretary, who had been entrusted with all matters connected with publicity, and placed before the Executive Committee before submission to the Press.

*Lady Apsley was elected.—Ed.

PARLIAMENT

Continued from page 3

practice a thoroughly mischievous organisation....

The President of the Bank is an American banker, Mr. McKittrick, formerly a partner of Higginson & Co. This is not ancient history. This Bank for International Settlements exists and intrigues now, and, as my noble friend Lord Bennett will remember very well, in 1937 was against the Standstill Agreement—and this will not be beyond the knowledge of the noble and learned Viscount on the Wool-sack. Higginson & Co. made a loan, and a considerable loan, to the I.G. Farbenindustrie. For what purpose? In

order to buy arsenic for Germany from Sweden for the manufacture of the poison gas known as Adamsite. Mr. McKittrick was a prominent member of Higginson & Co. and is still the President of the Bank. He was recently over here—I believe this is common knowledge; it has been published in the Press—and taking soundings about the possibility of what was called a negotiated peace with Nazi Germany. His Swiss confrere on the Board of the Bank was very active in this country also in the same direction... This bank... is still active; it still has Japanese, Vichy French, Italian, German and British directors upon it....

House of Commons: February 25, 1943

STATE MEDICAL SERVICE

Mr. Rostron Duckworth asked the Minister of Health whether, as a start in the negotiations with the medical profession on the subject of a State medical service, he will ascertain whether the British Medical Association will supply a copy of its interim report on the subject to Members of Parliament?

Mr. E. Brown: I have ascertained from the British Medical Association that a copy of the Draft Interim Report of the Medical Planning Commission will be supplied on application to any Member of this House.

Sir Henry Morris-Jones: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether any negotiations have started between his Department and the medical profession?

Mr. Brown: I am just making arrangements.

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 Big Idea.....	2/6
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
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.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State?	
by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce:	
Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production:	
The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Social Credit Scheme for Scotland (1933).....	1d.
The Attack on Local Government	
by John Mitchell.....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
Carthorse Conditions for All (the Beveridge Report	
issue of <i>The Social Crediter</i>).....	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political	
Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long-	
Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social</i>	
<i>Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.).....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.