

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 11. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

MODERN SCIENCE (XVI)

To cite again the Master of Balliol and his friends, the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford holds his office usually for three years and then "passes it on to the next Head of a College, in order of seniority as Head, who is able and willing to hold it." At Cambridge he is nominally elected from two names put forward by the Council of the Senate, and for two years. In both universities, he is "the Prime Minister, without a Cabinet and without a constituency." At Oxford, both the Vice-Chancellorship and his Headship are "a full-time job" and the routine work of at least one of the two offices "must be, as far as possible, delegated." "He possesses supreme power of interpretation of statutes and decrees, and an unlimited right of veto in respect of them, which he employs extremely rarely. . . ." "In particular, he is chairman of the Curators of the Chest, who control the university finances, and of the General Board of Faculties, which heads the organisation of university teaching. The possibilities of influence by a determined Vice-Chancellor thus opened up must be obvious. . . . There are many who believe that were the Vice-Chancellor, even with his present constitutional powers, able to contemplate a longer term of office, he could substitute a coherent policy for drift in the broad development of the university."

The Vice-Chancellors of the 'Modern' universities in England and of the Scottish universities are permanent salaried officials chosen by the Crown or by the university Court.

I have introduced these details from a responsible source, the names of which will be given, because of its insistence upon two points, the absence of a "coherent policy" and the opinion that both 'Prime-Ministering' a university and Headship of a College are full-time jobs. The group responsible for "The Government of Oxford" was constituted by themselves in 1929 to effect a "continuous appraisal of the governmental institutions of Oxford" in the belief that such a method was "much preferable to the spasmodic investigation by Royal Commissions. . . ." The members of the group were: Mr. A. D. Lindsay, Mr. A. B. Emden, Mr. W. D. Ross, Miss L. Grier, Miss S. M. Fry, Professor J. L. Brierly, Mr. K. N. Bell, Mr. R. H. Brand, Mr. Lionel Curtis, Dr. H. E. Craster, Dr. C. R. Harris, Sir H. Hartley, Mr. W. L. Hitchens, The Marquess of Lothian, Professor R. A. Peters, Professor F. M. Powicke, Mr. A. H. Smith, Mr. B. H. Sumner, and Mr. H. V. Hodson and Mr. D. H. F. Rickett, Honorary Secretaries.

Dr. Lindsay was Vice-Chancellor of Oxford from 1935 to 1938, and although it is not wildly improbable that what one hears of the present demoralised condition of Oxford is the inevitable result of planners and planning somewhere, there is no apparent reason for placing the responsibility at his door. Of Mr. Ross, more later. Mr. R. H. Brand is

managing director of Lazard Brothers and Co. Mr. Lionel Curtis was for some time Town Clerk of Johannesburg, and later a Member of the Transvaal Legislative Council, then Beit Lecturer in Colonial History at Oxford. Dr. Charles Reginald Schiller Harris was Director-General of the Buenos Aires Great Southern and Western Railways from 1935 to 1939. Sir H. Hartley has been Vice-President of the L.M.S. since 1930 and Chairman of the Fuel Research Board since 1932. He has published scientific papers on chemical subjects. The late Marquess of Lothian died in 1940, after a career intimately bound up with the present and future histories of the British Empire and its culture. Professor Peters is a biochemist. Mr. Sumner was a member of the British Delegation to the Peace Conference and was on the I.L.O. at Geneva. Mr. Hodson was Editor of the *Round Table* from 1934 to 1939, and was Reforms Commissioner to the Government of India in 1941-42. "As far as the teachers and officers of Oxford and Cambridge are concerned, the system of government is a direct democracy. In London and the other universities it is a combination of an oligarchy and a representative democracy."

It would seem to be "fortuitous" (to use the word of "The Government of Oxford") that Vice-Chancellors with a long list of governmental associations took office in 1941 at both Oxford and Cambridge. At Oxford it was Sir W. D. Ross, Provost of Oriel since 1929. Like the late Sir Henry Jones, Sir W. D. Ross is a Moral Philosopher. His First Class Lit. Hum. was in 1900, and two years later he became a Fellow of Oriel, of which John Henry Newman was once a Fellow and Tutor. The first entry in *Who's Who* concerning matters far from Oriel Lane is for 1915-16, when Ross was Secretary of the N.E. Coast Armaments Committee. The following year he served in the Department of Inspection of Munitions and in 1918-19 he was Deputy Assistant Secretary to the Ministry of Munitions. Four years later he became Professor of Moral Philosophy, to be interrupted in 1932 by appointment as Chairman of the Tobacco, Baking, Furniture Manufacturing, Ready-made Tailoring, Shirt-making and Dressmaking Trade Boards. In 1936 he was made Chairman of the Departmental Committee on the Woollen Textile Trade in Yorkshire; in 1937 of that on the Health of Cotton Card Room Workers and on the Fair Wages Clause, being at the same time a member of the Departmental Committee on Holidays with Pay. He was a member of the Appellate Tribunal for Conscientious Objectors, 1940-41, and in 1942 became Chairman of the Civil Service Arbitration Tribunal.

The 'philosopher,' unable—unwilling?—to envisage an order which will work, goes out to help turn the wheels, as though an engineer unable to instruct an apprentice in the principles of locomotive engines stood by with a whip to teach the boy to push!

(To be continued.)

TUDOR JONES.

Socialism and State Control

ARE THEY INTERCHANGEABLE?

The following letter appeared in THE SCOTSMAN of February 3:—

Sir,

The deadening legalism which is fast navigating the ship of State back to the position in which this country found itself during the twelfth century when almost all legal authority had come to be vested in a supreme trust—the “King”—has been made possible largely because vast numbers of mainly quite well-intentioned people have believed, with your correspondent, Mr. George Fraser, that “every true democrat stands somewhere on the road to Socialism.”

Socialism is, as Dr. Frederick Porter correctly points out, in the process of being introduced in this country, as it has been introduced in Guild Socialist Italy, in National Socialist Germany, and in Soviet Socialist Russia, in all of which countries the fundamental doctrine of Socialism, i.e., the “nationalisation of the means of production,” has been fully translated into the realm of action: no aspect of economic life but is strictly controlled by the “State.” Similarly, one aspect after another of British economic life has been made subject to the mortmain of State control since socialist Ministers joined the National Government, and, judging from their “State-controlling” propaganda speeches all over the country—which is supposed to enjoy a party truce—they are going to hold what they have, and get more if they can. In view of this, can Mr. Westwater, writing in support of Mr. Fraser, blame those of us who regard “Socialism” and “State Control” as interchangeable terms? In view of the highly significant fact that Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin began their political careers as Socialist defenders of the rights of labour and ended by dictating to all their compatriots what terms they should labour under; in view, further, of that equally significant fact that every Socialist dictator we know of has immediately (a) abrogated the right of labour to strike, and (b) directed such vast numbers of their own labour into armament production and allied industries that, sooner or later, an invasion of foreign territory became a “diplomatic” necessity; can Mr. Fraser blame us for thinking that the Socialist highroad leads in the diametrically opposite direction to “Democracy” defined as “rule by the will of the majority of the people”?

It is, of course, quite outside the scope of this letter to trace the history of international Socialism, but I might perhaps be allowed to draw to the attention of any remaining believers in the myth of “public ownership”—the words themselves are incompatible, there is either ownership or there isn't, as the Italians, Germans, and Russians have found to their cost—that the fatherland of political socialism was Germany, that Marx was a German, that Bismark considered the well-organised and obedient German Socialists as his comrades in arms (“We march separately, but we fight together”), and that, in fine, political Socialism, by being “pacifist” in the democratically-minded countries and “militarist” amongst totalitarianly inclined populations, has, step by step, through war and peace, proved an invaluable ally of Pan-Germanism.

There is only one possible explanation of the truly amazing phenomenon that Socialism, which has never created

a single industry, and which causes immediate decrease of output of any industry “it” takes over, is still a live political issue to-day: Socialism is perhaps the most effective means by which the most powerful single group of individuals in the world—the monopolists of credit—implement the policy of their philosophy. If we to-day are threatened with a situation comparable with that which all but caused a nation-wide revolt in the twelfth century, if our economic life is once again on the point of being centralised, or entombed, in the pyramid of a supreme State-trust—this time to be labelled the “people” or “nation”—then it is directly traceable to the collusion between the “leaders” of the State-worshipping Socialist masses and the gentlemen who give world-wide, albeit discreet, support to their belief, for the sole and sufficient reason that they are the “State”: *L'état, c'est nous.*

I am, etc.

W. L. RICHARDSON.

Killin, Perthshire; February 1, 1944.

The Nature of War

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

The following is the text of a broadcast address, as amended by the Australian censor, given in Tasmania on November 7, 1943. The nature of the censorship was to confirm the warning we have given against such phrases as “public control of credit” “the restoration of the monetary issue to the people etc. In other words, it is MONOPOLY we are fighting—not personal monopoly in favour of impersonal monopoly.

Much publicity has been given this week to the great success of the Moscow Conference; what the nature of this success is we do not yet know. The delegates to the Conference were representatives of Great Britain, Russia and U.S.A.

Any Conference where people of various countries are brought together for mutual understanding is of great value and importance, and in war time, when decisions affecting the life and death of millions of people are taken by Governments, then any understanding which can save precious lives is important. And for this reason the Moscow Conference is important.

But I think that it is very essential to break down any idea that one or two leaders conferring together can confer on the people of the world lasting peace and goodwill. First of all, I do not believe that any people of any nation want war. Secondly, I do not believe that organised war as we know it today has got anything to do with human nature, or with the pugnacity of even a minority of men. And thirdly there is evidence available to show that a few men who exercised great power and influence in international affairs worked hard and consistently to bring about war.

Before discussing War, and the punishment of Men guilty for this war, and the avoidance of a third World War, it is essential to realise exactly what war is and what it does.

Only in war, or under the threat of war, will people consent to hand over their affairs to Centralised Authority to run; only in war can the people be persuaded to submit to

something in the nature of a dictatorship, with the consequent reduction of personal liberties.

In other words, war is the one means whereby in the course of a few short years, all the rights of Man can be swept aside in the most ruthless manner without that opposition which would come in times of peace.

War, therefore, is a very obvious means to an End. That end is World Dictatorship.

When we search for the War Criminals it is not enough to punish those directly in the public eye—men like Mussolini and Hitler; we have to get at the men who decided to have a war and used and financed Hitler and Mussolini as useful tools of, or means to, their ends.

In England a vast propaganda was used to prevent the British Government from arming the country to protect itself against an obvious and terrible menace. This propaganda was run by the League of Nations and by the Leftist Press and other foreign agencies; most of the people were ignorant of the purpose to which they were being used. Individually they helped to make this war possible, but they were not the real criminals.

Lord Vansittart, who was permanent chief of the British Foreign Office for many years, has written more scathing attacks on the German people, than probably any man living; he knew what was happening. But it was obvious there was some outside influence which was more powerful than the British Foreign Office—some outside influence which could over-ride the British Foreign Office.

Since 1920, Montagu Norman has been Governor of the Bank of England; he has brought nothing but financial disaster and frustration to the British people. There is no body of opinion in England which approved of the methods used by Montagu Norman. On the contrary, very strong protests came from every influential quarter about the strange methods of this strange man who helped, more than anybody else, to reduce a great country to financial chaos.

In 1916 Rufus Isaacs negotiated some kind of deal with the United States Government—but we do not know the details. We know that the so-called Bank of England was a counter in this deal because it was completely re-organised under American supervision. We know that Rufus Isaacs was made Viceroy of India against all tradition, and that a raging propaganda against British control of India was, and still is, proceeding in the International Press.

I don't know what happened to the various industries in England but I do know that after the last war practically the entire Electrical Industry of Great Britain was taken over by certain foreign interests. Since these industries were the most profitable industries those who took them over must have been able to exert very great pressure.

Hitler, according to many press reports, has carried out extensive persecution of the Jews; but there is much evidence to show that some of the most powerful and influential men behind Hitler are Jews, and a Jew lecturing at the Town Hall, Hobart, recently, said that the Big Jews are the greatest enemy the Jews have—and he gave their names.

There is no doubt that the vast Jewish financial organisation of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., of New York, the most powerful organisation in the world, exercises certain control over American and British finance.

During the last war, the British Ambassador in America

warned his Government about this organisation, but unfortunately, he died shortly afterwards.

The agents who were sent to America to start the Russian Revolution in 1917 were backed by powers greater than the British Navy or the German armies, because these agents were given special permits to pass through both—across the Atlantic through the British Fleet, and across Germany in sealed trains, and then through the Czarist armies.

The little international gang who control finance, and therefore control the world, found it convenient to shelter behind the British Navy, and for many years they made their home in London. Whether they then decided that the British Empire had no more spoils to offer them, or that they had decided to liquidate the British Empire, I don't know. However, their home is not now in London.

If the American people allow this gang to use their name and carry out their desperate games under the shelter of their flag then they must be prepared to suffer the same humiliation that England has suffered.

The British people have given their loyalty and their allegiance to Churchill, and they have been lucky to have a man of his calibre and integrity at such a time. But many people have remarked about the men under him, and there can be little doubt that many of Churchill's lieutenants are not picked by Churchill. In other words, Churchill is being surrounded by men whom he himself did not pick.

Since Germany lost command of the Air the centre of the war has shifted from military strategy to political strategy. The scene is being set for the new structure of peace; key men are being selected and placed in strategic positions round the world.

The people of the world have had no say in the selection of these key men; I am quite certain in most cases the Governments of the world have had no say in the selection of these key men.

The political structure of the world may be settled in the next few years in a shape which may last for centuries. The plan that has been devised for us is one of centralised world control. The plan consists of four parts:

1. A Central World Bank, controlling a gold currency and controlling the central banks of each country.
2. An international Air Force which will be able to control any country which refuses to give obedience to the edicts of the international controlling authority.
3. The subjection of the Christian Religion to one in which the "State" is supreme over all individuals, and in which no one has any rights except through the State; this idea is already supported by a large number of people.
4. By the introduction of Bureaucratic Socialism no one will be held responsible for anything; a complete alibi could be supplied for every crime.

There are four things which can destroy this scheme; they are:

1. Personal initiative—that is, faith in oneself.
2. The power of an idea, which can spread like a bush fire.
3. The spiritual nature of Man which refuses to be satisfied by material things and animal comforts.
4. Exposure of the real enemy.

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. 11. No. 23. Saturday, February 12, 1944.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"Authorisations and licences have been granted by Germans to Swiss industries for the sale to the British of machine tools without which certain parts for planes could not have been manufactured in England. . . These sales were made with the express condition that payment should be made in *refined copper*." (Italics in original)

— *Switzerland: Foster-mother of Cartels in Harper's Magazine* September, 1943, p. 310.

Whatever reservations one may have about a certain stormy petrel of politics, he's completely stolen Roosevelt and Mackenzie King's thunder, and they're hopping mad about it.

It is increasingly evident that the present situation demands more of the Elizabethan spirit. Politeness, if employed, requires an unmistakable sting in its tail.

The Russians are said to be re-naming towns captured from the Germans with the old Imperial Czarist titles. Gatchina is to revert to the pre-revolution Tsarkoe-Seloe.

The rumour that the Communist Party of Great Britain is organising a celebration in honour of King Charles the Martyr seems to be premature, however.

It appears to be possible to make any statement on the transcendent merits of the Russian social and economic system, which is State Monopoly, Socialism, or State Capitalism, whichever label you prefer, with the assurance that the response will be that of the children when the rocket goes up. A news-letter quotes General Schestakov as saying that "by the socialisation of agriculture, the Soviet Union will soon be self-sufficient in food."

Prior to the Bolshevik Revolution, Russia was not only self-sufficing in food on a general standard of living higher than that obtaining in 1939, but was the largest exporter of food, and particularly wheat, in Europe.

So far as it is possible to obtain information on Russian affairs, Socialism has done one thing, and one thing only, and to do that has required immense outside help. It has equipped a magnificent army, the human material of which has always been of the highest class for fighting purposes. As Socialism always pretends to detest war, this achievement seems to require explanation.

We have little doubt that the recent speech of Lord Halifax at Toronto is a not very carefully veiled "check to King"—Mackenzie variety. To what extent it is realised

in Ottawa we do not know, but the continuous and excessive toleration which has been accorded to the pro-Washington attitude of the pseudo-Liberal Government has been almost entirely due to the large financial interests of the City of London. That attitude has been as detrimental to Canadian interests as it has been hampering to genuine inter-Empire collaboration.

But as the United States has been careful to acquire at knock-out prices in payment for pre-Pearl Harbour supplies practically the whole of "British" held Canadian and U. S. securities, that sanction no longer exists, and it is highly probable that a fairly clear call, "In which camp, Bezonian?" is in process of enunciation.

Citizens of the United States divide their time between ridiculing the British Diplomatic Service and complaining bitterly of its success. However that may be, it is neither so foolish nor so incompetent as to stand by without suitable advice in the event of too hasty an assumption that the only role of Great Britain is that of whipping boy.

It does not appear to be sufficiently recognised in Canada, and particularly in Quebec, that the Imperial relationship has been the only possible bar to absorption in the United States and that most of the advantages of it have been on the side of Canadians. We have, for instance, every sympathy with the *cultural* idea contained in the use of the name "*Nouvelle France*" popular in portions of the Province of Quebec. But as a political conception, it is just plain nonsense. If some of the Quebecois who do not realise this would take the trouble to investigate the very real apprehension of the Latin American countries, and their determination not to be dominated by Washington, they would also realise that the British association, freed from financial exploitation, offers greater promise than any other conceivable arrangement.

You have to hand it to the "B".B.C.

After listening to the announcement of the splitting of Russia into sixteen autonomous republics each with its own army and treaty-making powers, sandwiched in between the usual "recapture of forty inhabited places," all in the voice of the curate making the usual request for helpers at the Mothers' Meeting, we should not be surprised at hearing news of the Second Advent in the middle of the football results.

Monetary reformers will be more pleased with Mr. Boothby's speech in a recent debate on U.N.R.R.A. than we are.

"As long as human needs remain unsatisfied, the solution of the economic problem should be sought by expanding demand rather than by contracting supply; by clothing these human needs with effective demand in the form of adequate purchasing power," he said, in a plea that monetary orthodoxy should be subordinated to the achievement of the end in view. But what is the end in view? He described his notion of it later: —

"What is the ultimate goal of U.N.R.R.A., and of the United Nations? Freedom from want, and full employment, in a free society. . . Functional organisation, and the development of balanced regional economic units must be our first international objective; and the necessary foundation of any wider world economic order."

They Loved Life

By the Rev. PERCY JACKSON

Among the things I have kept for the sweetening of my soul are hundreds of notices, chiefly from *The Times*, most of them obituary notices, touching the people of our day. The quotations to follow are characteristic of scores and scores of such.

L. H. C. K. writes of LT. E. P. S. RUSSELL, R.N.V.R.: "We were together at Eton. . . . No man could have asked for a better or truer friend. He was an enthusiastic talker and a patient listener, and he had a rich fund of humour which I never heard him use unkindly.

"He was one of the very few people of whom it can be truly said 'He lived every minute of his life.' Somehow his vital personality stimulated one so that a moment with him was one to be enjoyed and remembered. . . . The courageous manner in which he died was entirely in keeping with his fine character. A poor swimmer, he dived overboard to go to the assistance of a shipmate in distress. But the heavy seas were too much for him, and in his gallant attempt to save another man's life he perished."

Of MAJOR C. M. BALDWIN writes J. W. A. S.: "His very presence was always an inspiration and a tonic. He was quite imperturbable. No matter what kind of crisis might involve him or those with him, his never-failing cheerfulness and optimism, combined with a courageous commonsense seemed to enable him to carry it off. . . . The crisis might never have existed. He was a splendid companion and enjoyed whatever life had to offer to the full. He joined in everything, though England and things English—riding to hounds, boxing, shooting, Rugby football—made a special appeal.

"His charm of manner was infectious, affecting young and old alike wherever or whenever they had the good fortune to meet him. . . . We have lost a grand fellow."

Of LT. C. G. M. THORNYCROFT another writes: "He was one who never gained, or sought, distinction, but whose life made many others happier, and also better. Wherever he was, in his home, at school at Shrewsbury, or at Loughborough College, no one came across him without feeling the infection of his happiness, his sincerity, his warm-heartedness, his gaiety and his sheer goodness. He combined an adventurous spirit and a zest for life with a simplicity of outlook but a depth of feeling. . . . He was as strong-minded as he was good-natured. He had a gift for friendship. . . ."

L. bears this testimony of MAJOR THE HON. A. P. S. CHICHESTER: "Among his many gifts and qualities were his unfailing courtesy to young and old alike, and his ardour and sincerity of purpose in anything he set his mind to. . . . His gaiety and love of life combined with the serious side of his character made him the most lovable and endearing companion. Though his interests were wide and varied, he enjoyed all the higher side of life to the full. . . . He was in all respects the perfect son and brother."

Of CAPTAIN M. S. CURTIS a correspondent writes: "No man more lovable or more universally beloved has the war taken from us than Maurice Curtis. To many his memory will abide as a pledge of the meaning of true Christian manhood. His vivid charm and keen sense of humour made

his self-discipline and devotion to duty seem natural achievements. His rich and many sided enjoyment of the world, issuing in unsparing service, would have delighted his great headmaster, Dr. Saunderson, of Oundle."

R. L. V. P. writes of LT. VISCOUNT MAITLAND: "Ivor Maitland was at all times one of the most delightful characters it is possible to meet. His charm and spontaneous gaiety were an inspiration to everyone who knew him. He was always cheerful, overflowing with joie de vivre and good humour. A more loyal friend could never be found. A keen sportsman, he was educated at Stowe. . . . Those who knew him and loved him will always carry with them through life the memory of a sweet, generous, gay and very lovable person."

Of LT.-COL. SIR RANULPH FIENNES writes H.R.M.; "Lugs' was a man of exceptional personal charm and great breadth of vision. . . . His enthusiasm and sense of humour were infectious. . . . He was incapable of being jealous or unkind. He was a splendid leader who took a tremendous interest in those less fortunate than himself. He had travelled and read extensively and the post-war period will be much poorer owing to his death. . . . His frankness and his clear brain will be missed by many."

Of SQUADRON LEADER L. H. DAY: "To his friends, his important place in their lives was won, not only by his courage and inspiring leadership, but even more, by his real 'goodness' and shining honesty. . . . He had no time for shams and bluff. His happiest epitaph would be, in the words of one who had been his gunner, 'A grand skipper and a very great gentleman.'"

Of LT. F. C. BOULT it is written: "Oxford, like Harrow, owes him a great debt. . . . But his friends will think first of his lovable and gracious personality. He had those qualities which we do not usually associate with war—shyness and a love of music, and of little children and all things beautiful; but he faced the ugly duties of the time with courage."

Of FLYING OFFICER P. J. C. BATEMAN-CHAMPAIN: "A natural style appeared in nearly everything he did which gave him the same sort of distinction as a person that he always had as an athlete. . . . But it was his complete innocence of conceit or self-pity, his knack of unobtrusive leadership, his instinctive dislike of evil, the effectiveness of his compassion for the unprivileged, the intimacy of his friendship with his father and mother; it was these that were the really characteristic example of his naturally distinguished style. . . . We rejoice in the continuing enrichment of many sorts and conditions of men that has come from the integrity of his loving and life-saving 27 years of life."

J. L. C. S. affirms of SURGEON LT.-COMM. DR. M. CAY, R.N.: "Apart from his professional skill, he possessed all those attributes which form the make-up of an officer and a gentleman of high degree. His was indeed a gentle character, with a natural kindness and tolerance which endeared him to all who met him. He gained few material rewards for all he did, but he would not have sought them. I am sure he never realised the influence he had on the future lives and conduct of the many young doctors he trained. . . . When I last saw him he was smiling and waving his hand, and that is how he would wish us to remember him."

Of LT. DAVID C. LLOYD, Royal Marine Commando, this is declared by Lt. G. L. Taylor, R.N.V.R.: "Few

people meeting the gay Commando would have guessed what hard work he had in childhood to overcome the handicap of ill-health. He lost his life in the landing at Salerno. He was a perfect companion; his infectious laughter, his sense of the absurd which could shed light on the dullest party, perhaps by some grotesque turn of mimicry—in a word, *the happiness which he radiated* wherever he went, will not easily be forgotten. Quite unselfconscious and unspoilt by popularity, he was by nature generous, but above all warm in his affections. The remembrance of his *gaiety* must comfort us. . . .”

And lastly of LT.-COL. LOW WYFOLD writes A. R.: “[I was given] special opportunities of appreciating the excellence of his brain, his courage, and his skill. He was a highly esteemed figure in his county of Oxfordshire—a leader of many enterprises. His family life, in his delightful home, was a model of happiness and all else, and fulfilled in the highest degree the best traditions of ‘Merrie England.’ To his children he was as the most delightful of ‘brothers.’ . . . He was a loyal friend, and went to endless trouble to help others in their difficulties. His advice was indeed worth having, as he had a first-class brain and the kindest of hearts. He will be missed indescribably in the locality in which he lived.”

The point of this present note is to put the question, Is this type of gay, effortless grace and goodness, humility and nobility any longer to be permitted to grow in England? *The kind of character revealed in these extracts requires space and freedom for its growth, and some amplitude of resource.*

There are those rejoicing in the prospect of bespoiling the estates, taxing out of existence the old country esquire, by death duties and other rigours making well nigh impossible the continuance of life tuned in to this level of delightfulness. One may have knowledge of humbugs in County Society, so there are everywhere. But there are those who interpret the trusteeship of their estates in the most thorough-going fashion, and whose coveted reward is the happiness, not only of their relatives and House associates, but of their employees also and all who depend on them, and whose pride is in the sweet wholesomeness of their lands.

The levellers will have no room for this kind. The centralisers may offer him a salary, but he will take his orders from an office in London. The taxers will see that he is kept poor. With the element of gaiety removed from goodness, life will become dour, grim; and with Government by “regulations” the element of enterprise and adventurousness dies of inanition.

In certain circles the Beveridge Report is being hailed

THE BEVERIDGE PLOT

An exposure of the network of oppressive restrictions which comprise the Beveridge Plan for ‘Social Security.’

Price: 3d. (postage extra)

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

as a contribution towards ameliorating the severest distress of our social disorder. A great deal of sentiment is being exploited, and those who have been uneasy for the wretchedness of the men on the dole are apt to accept, with little exercise of the critical faculty, the proposals as a salve for their consciences.

This little note is not intended as an examination of the proposals, which arouse the gravest misgiving, on various grounds. The question is pertinent however, if it be judged intolerable to permit the old frustration and despair to settle once more upon our people, why is it not deemed possible to level up instead of to level down; that is, to make possible the blithe survival of the best pertaining to our English traditions and to offer hope to the whole of the Commonwealth *at the same time*? Can we build a society which fosters and conserves the finest qualities of English life and, *at the same time*, extends a generous gesture to all to partake more liberally of the Feast of Life? We know the resources are adequate for the job.

THE NEW ‘BRITISH’

Mr. A. P. Michaelis, vice-president of the Association of Jewish Refugees in Great Britain, said recently that the hope of the majority of refugees in this country was to stay in Britain rather than to return to Germany or Austria, and there were increasingly hopeful indications that this would be allowed.

Mr. Michaelis gave figures of the number of Jewish refugees in this country. There were, he said, about 10,000 from Czechoslovakia, about 5,000 from Poland, and about 50,000 from Germany and Austria. Of these numbers, 15 per cent. were between the ages of one and 15, 40 per cent. between 16 and 50, and the remainder over 50. Six thousand refugees were serving in the Forces.

P.E.P., in a recent broadsheet, estimates that 40,000 refugees, mostly German and Austrian Jews, will wish to stay in this country, and argues that they should be welcomed, (1) because of their contributions to “our national [*sic*], life in industry,” the universities, the arts and sciences (the Prime Minister, in 1940: “Since the Germans drove the Jews out and lowered their technical standards, our science is definitely ahead of theirs”); (2) because “if Britain enjoys [*sic*] full employment after the war” she will need all the labour she can find; and anyway, refugees actually create employment; and (3) to compensate the declining birthrate in Britain.

P.E.P. adds a warning: “Under normal conditions immigrants can only be expected to identify themselves with the country of their choice if they have a fair chance of sharing both the rights and the obligations of the British people.”

In a note on this broadsheet the *Economist* corroborates its findings, concluding: “Full assistance should be given to them (the refugees) to share in the rights and obligations of British subjects.”

So much for the idea that we are fighting to free Europe for Europeans to live in!

Points from Parliament

House of Lords: February 2, 1944.

THE SOIL AND HEALTH

Lord Teviot had the following Notice on the Paper: To call attention to the Royal Commission which it has been decided to set up to investigate the birthrate and trends of population, and to ask whether the terms of reference cover the subject raised in the debate in this House on 26th October, 1943—namely, the Condition of the Soil in relation to the health of man, animal and plant—and to move for Papers.

The Earl of Portsmouth (moving the Motion on behalf of Lord Teviot who was absent through illness): . . . Positive health, in my opinion and I believe in that of most of those who have thought deeply upon this question, must begin in the womb and indeed in the womb before conception starts, with the health and vitality of the mother. In that connexion the doctors working in the Peckham Health Centre discovered that feeding the families in the Centre with the ordinary so-called balanced food diet bought from a shop was not enough. The vitamins and so forth in the ordinary analysis of such vegetables as spinach and in such food as milk were not there; the vitality was not there; and they were forced to turn then to their own farm. They were forced to grow the food themselves, so as to get the beginnings of positive health in the unborn child, and the methods they were forced to use were methods upon which Lord Teviot and others spoke in the debate on October 26 last.* They were forced to use not new methods but the ancient method of returning waste to the soil and creating humus.

I think the importance of their work is to be found not only in the wide field covered but in the results of their original examinations. The number of individuals examined from these families ran into nearly four thousand. Of those a very large proportion had actual disease, but even more, the majority, were suffering from some disorder of which they were largely ignorant because it had not immediately affected them. As your Lordships know, it is quite possible to have cancer and to be ignorant of the fact. The majority of these people had some disorder which would affect them in later life but of which they were in ignorance because they had been able to compensate themselves in other ways. It was found that 10 per cent. had either disease or disorder. The most striking and I think the most sinister finding, however, was that among the nearly two thousand women examined only 4 per cent. were found to be without disorder. It seems that while many things may have contributed to this disastrous state in a comparatively well-off section of the population, even from their own findings the doctors were forced to get food which they thought would create the beginnings of positive health. There must be a very serious connexion between the food we eat and the health which it produces. It seems to me that we are too much concerned to-day to try to build the shell, the structure of the Social Services, too much concerned with pathological remedies and palliatives, and that we do not pay sufficient attention to the living organism which must grow within the shell, or in spite of it. I feel that we are confined far too much to-day in our farming; and in our medical life within the scaffolding of pathology. . .

. . . before the war on a visit to one of our research stations in England. . . you could have gone into the laboratory and have had explained to you a new form of spray for poisoning aphides on apples. The history of the need for that new spray was that round about 1900, when apples were being sprayed with arsenic to keep them free from various attacks, several people died of arsenic poisoning through eating apples, so that a law was introduced prescribing the maximum amount of arsenic that could be sprayed on apples. But about 1935, 200 times the legal amount of arsenic was being sprayed on apples which had to be washed afterwards with some naphthalene solution. The various parasites which the arsenic was supposed to kill had developed a resistance to arsenic, and although the strength was increased 200 times the parasites were still there. Therefore it became necessary to develop a new form of poison. But on those farms in Holland no sprays of any sort, apart from certain vegetable sprays, were ever used. . .

. . . is it too much to ask that this Royal Commission should undertake to consider whether there may not be something which is vital to life in the forms of agriculture which were debated on the 26th October? I do not believe it would be very expensive. It might take a long time but that would not matter. But we are in desperate danger now. If what we say is right, if there is anything in this theory, recovery will take a long time. Even if there is nothing in it we shall have gained knowledge, and still be able to go ahead with clear consciences. If there is something in it, the quicker a start is made, and the more thoroughly the investigation is carried out, the greater will be the benefit not only to this country but to the whole human race. And the cost of obtaining this knowledge would be just the merest fraction of the cost of obtaining another 100 miles an hour speed in the air.

One thing that we do know is that we have lost that full abundance of overflowing health which once we possessed. Picture the swallow curving in flight above the river in summer, or the teal dropping down at dusk. Consider the vigour and the beauty of their flight. Imagine a tigress with her cubs coming down in the evening to drink at a pool on the edge of a jungle; note the ripple of her sleek coat and the beauty of her colouring which, in its way, equals that of the wild peacock which she disturbs. And then think of the multitudes of human beings, 90 per cent. of them suffering from disorders, swaying wearily homewards in the Tube at night. In the rather self-conscious evening of our civilisation cannot we use by every means in our power the knowledge which we have got in order to discover something which can give back to mankind the feeling of the morning of the world? My Lords, I beg to move.

Lord Geddes: . . . There is no doubt whatever that you can produce from the fields a great quantity of food by the use of chemical fertilisers. . . that is what I think has blinded a great many people to the real problem. The food that we eat. . . [is] divided sharply into two parts, possibly more but certainly sharply into two parts—the part which is required as a fuel to provide the energy for movement, for all those activities in which we as men and women can indulge, and the part which is required to repair and replace and recreate our actual bodies themselves. Now it seems pretty clear that so far as the fuels are concerned they are not necessarily of such fine and precise composition in order

*See *The Social Crediter*, November 6, 1943.

to be useful to us as are those portions of our food which go to the building or rebuilding of our own bodies and tissues.

There is a very long history behind this controversy. It goes back for nearly a century and it has been made a very difficult controversy to follow by the dominance for so many years of the German school in connexion with biology. The German school—Virchow, Schwann, Liebig—laid the emphasis upon the cell out of which in their millions our bodies are created and they regarded food for the cell as all that was required. Apart from that, and really obliterated and eclipsed by the German school, very likely as a result of the Franco-Prussian War and the prestige the Germans got through that war there was a French school of which Professor Béchamp was the leader working at Montpellier in the fifties of last century. This school had a quite different idea about the structure of the body and the vitality and vigour of the body, and I think it was a great pity that as a result of the Franco-Prussian War and various things that followed it in the 'seventies a great deal of the work of Professor Béchamp was entirely ignored and overlooked...

[Lord Geddes went on to detail the nature of the research which he thought should be undertaken on the basis of Professor Béchamp's work.]

Lord Snell: ...I can repeat what the noble Duke said on the last occasion, and say that the arguments advanced to-day will be noted by the Departments concerned...

With regard to the Royal Commission, in drawing up the terms of reference, the Government were careful to make them so comprehensive as to exclude nothing which might have a bearing on the present trends of population. Perhaps your Lordships will permit me to remind you of those terms of reference:

"To examine the facts relating to the present population trends in Great Britain; to investigate the causes of those trends and to consider their probable consequences; to consider what measure, if any, should be taken in the national interest to influence the future trends of population; and to make recommendations."

Your Lordships will note that the Commission is asked to investigate the causes of the present trends of population, and it may be that certain methods of soil cultivation are amongst those causes. If the Royal Commission so decides, it can under its terms of reference examine that question; but the Commission must be absolutely free to decide upon the scope of its inquiries, and it must itself determine the evidence which it shall receive...

The Earl of Portsmouth: My Lords, the noble Lord, Lord Snell, who has just replied for the Government, has not ruled out the possibility of research, but on the side suggested by my noble friends Lord Hankey and Lord Bledisloe he has not given us much encouragement. I have forgotten which Government phrase it is—whether "active consideration" or "urgent consideration"—which means that something may happen, but I do hope that consideration of the priority kind will be given to this matter by the Departments concerned... I do hope that this consideration will be active, not only from the noble and learned Viscount's point of view as Chairman of the Royal Commission, but from that of the scientific and research departments of the Government itself. I beg leave to withdraw.

Motion for Papers, by leave, withdrawn.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is now in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Reconstruction.....	6d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
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.
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...8d.	
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.).....	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	1d.
The Representative's Job.....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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