

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 11. No. 8.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

MODERN SCIENCE (II)

By TUDOR JONES, Sc.D., M.D., F.R.S.E.

The Scotsman on October 18 began its leading article by saying that Great Britain suffered her scientific research to undergo a marked decline in the years between the wars. The reason was not lack of 'capable and competent men of science.' We provided 'scant incentive,' perhaps because of 'a period of stagnation,' or because we were 'traditionally parsimonious towards men of science,' or for 'certain psychological or sociological reasons.' A Report had called for 'reinvigoration' of our scientific and technological institutions by the grant of substantial funds. Other newspapers, doubtless inspired by the same 'report' have taken up the theme. G. M. Young, in the *Sunday Times* of October 24 asks whether, if the function of a university is to 'gather the springs of ability into a pool' there is 'an unlimited, untapped, supply waiting to be released and set to profitable use.' What is the volume of capacity behind the 'springs'? Mr. Young doubts the sufficiency of the spring, and calls for rationing along familiar lines. He calls the customers A, E and I, 'leaving O for the Outcasts, and U for the Unfit.' A stands for the 'Administrators, who say what should be done; E the Executants, who run about and see that it is done; and I the Industrialists, who do it.' We gather that the function of universities is, in Mr. Young's opinion to produce A's. The professions, industries, branches of commerce, etc., etc. would 'indent' for them through the Government Grants Committee. I need not pause to say of this notion what Social Crediters can say much less dispassionately for themselves. If the world has gone mad that does not necessarily mean that dangerous lunatics have ceased to be dangerous. I am familiar with the notion that university men should say what should be done (except in universities). I think the answer to Mr. Young (with acknowledgements to him for his ingenious terminology) is I.O.U.

The handling of questions of social organisation in public journals is now swinging so far from any sense of realism that I am beginning not to take it seriously. Missiles flung so far and so fast as our marksmen's concern another planet, not ours, and we need not bother ourselves about them. Yet it is apparent that clothed in the language of absurdity is an intention: not an intention, perhaps, to mean something; but an intention to do something. And it is also apparent that those who cherish this intention have not the slightest understanding of the things they are dealing with. Are science and education of any importance at all? The more persuaded I become that the things which pass for these are not of much consequence, the more convinced I become that *something else* is important, and that some, possibly an extensive understanding of it is essential to the future conduct

of society, and that it (or they) will ensure, and to some extent constitute the future conduct of society. For a considerable time, science has seemed to me to be the most empty of abstractions, and so-called 'modern' science nothing more than a character in a work of pure fiction—"all the characters in this book are fictitious and," etc., etc.—I asked a not very young scientist lately if he could mention any theory of 'science' which, in his opinion, was established beyond dispute. He answered readily: "Oh, yes, many." He did not keep his word. Something of which there was never very much in quantity, yet something which was immense in quality, seems to have passed from our world; yet not altogether. When one thinks of it, one thinks of *men*, not of things, and not of functions. Here are the words of one: "Years ago I discovered that it was not possible nowadays for me to obtain a hearing in scientific journals, being drowned in the avalanche of voluminous research." Another: "We are both alike convinced that if civilisation is to survive, education must be rescued from the clutches of research." Larmor held the Lucasian Professorship (Isaac Newton's chair) at Cambridge for nearly thirty years. He died last year. The sentences were in letters from him to D'Arcy Thompson at St. Andrews. Whose are 'the clutches of research'? Here is still another quotation: this time from *The Social Creditor*, and a more pregnant paragraph has not appeared there:—

"It is clear that the Scientific Method on which the nineteenth century placed a reliance which is now seen to be a little pathetic, is itself subject to the Law of Diminishing Returns. The great discoveries which lend themselves to the operational test of validity, the steam engine, the galvanic battery, the dynamo, the Siemens-Martin and Bessemer steel processes, were the work of a mere handful of investigators. For each of these, working with crude apparatus and little or no financial backing, there are millions turned out by the Universities and technical schools of every country having at their disposal every device that ingenuity can suggest or money buy. The outcome, apart from logical development and refinement of the main basic discoveries, is a mass of abstract theories most of which are discarded a few years after they are announced as epoch-making. Probably, of all the mass of 'applied science' products with which the world has been deluged in the last thirty years, stainless steel cutlery, vacuum cleaners, and very doubtfully, wireless broadcasting, alone have much more than gadget value.

"Of course, this does not mean that the Scientific Method is not a beautiful instrument in the right hands. Far from it. It merely means that bad workmen do bad work with any tools, and in addition, spoil good tools."

These words are 'science.'

To be Continued.

Teachers and the New Order

By "DIOGENES."

The air is full of schemes, charters, plans and so forth for "new orders"—to be imposed upon us. Most, if not all those receiving wide publicity, have the disadvantage of being a little worse than the bad old order. Their inherent unsoundness appears due to the basic misconception of realities in the outlook of their sponsors.

The problems of social reconstruction are fundamentally the problems of education. In the outside world the adult citizen, his social unit of organisation (*i.e.*, the village, State, Nation, with their governmental machinery) are extended counterparts of the child, the school and the teacher; with the modification that infancy probably precludes the possibility of the democratic organisation of the school, such as is desirable and natural in the adult world.

Adult society, however, has become an artificial affair of highly developed mechanical and technical efficiency, populated largely by mechanically minded people—worshippers of mechanisms and mechanical efficiency. The sense of a social "organism" possessing its own inherent forces of growth or development is scarcely recognised. Society is regarded as a complex "mechanism to be controlled or adapted to some preconceived theory or plan of its operators." As observed by the Imperial Policy Group in the British Parliament, "too many cannot get beyond the doctrine that because some things are bad everything should go. A few are thinking constructively, and understand that although many things need changing yet much in our national life is very fine, and many of our foundations are a good deal more solid than we admit." To such people the picture consists of all black and pure white. They are the "flat earth" theorists, often of a high degree of specialised 'education,' and blissfully ignorant of the fact that the humble tiller of the soil probably has a far sounder grasp of the nature of things as a universal whole. With the confidence of superiority they set out to "plan" a world nearer to the heart's desire of the planners, who know nothing and care little about the longings, yearnings and strivings of the ordinary, individual humans, the potential victims of their ideas. They are the builders of a beautiful artificial mechanism, but destroyers of the natural beauty of a harmonious development of the social organism towards its ultimate unknown end.

The artificial mind loves artificiality. It sees nothing preposterous or incongruous in little men meeting in the Atlantic or elsewhere to devise ways and means of organising—or mechanising—humanity to fit into a system deliberately planned by self-assessed leaders, fuhrers, and intellectuals (and are we not partly responsible for the production of "intellectuals" instead of intelligent real people?). The artificial mind reads with approval daily press statements informing readers that their future purpose in the world is being worked out for them in Washington, Berlin, or Canberra by some individuals with a special touch of divinity. It even applauds the presumptions of impertinent people who would confer on us poor simpletons specific limits to our freedom in declarations of The Rights of Man, so that we may at least know what we shall be allowed to do. What divine grace! The so-called rights are, of course, really privileges, and the hand that gives is above the hand that takes. What is

given can be taken away when expedient.

Yet we have been so 'conditioned' to artificiality and the unreal that most people have apparently drifted into such mental indolence as to suppose, for some obscure reason, or for no reason at all, that given sufficient power, some benevolent external authority, some fuhrer, duce, premier or president will give us rights to freedom which can only be won and held by our own actions. We cannot and dare not be "passive recipients" but must be "active participants" in the determination and control of our own destinies.

In the main the great political and intellectual leaders are the same, or of similar kidney, to those who failed in the past to solve the simpler negative problem of removing the artificial evils which produced the strains and stresses leading to the present world anguish. Yet such schemers coolly and confidently assume the divine role of positive construction of a perfect mechanical, systematised world to be inhabited by well-tended cattle in the care of bureaucratic robots and smug "intellectuals." There is a curious mesmerism which leads to a belief in the efficacy of "bigness." It is, consequently, hardly surprising that having failed in the smaller national sphere, many planners favour internationalising our new order in the belief that a problem is simplified if extended on a sufficiently large scale.

To reverse the natural order of things, by fitting people into systems instead of allowing people to evolve systems to serve their needs, naturally requires compulsion and rigid control of individuals to the needs of the system. This aspect has been duly considered and the new orders consist largely of political, military or economic sanctions applicable to recalcitrants among the herd.

"Love thy neighbour" was given as a guiding principle for human progress but it was not backed by powers of legal enforcement. Such unreality was left to the idealist to whom the world owes so much misery. For the idealists, well supplied with good intentions—the paving stones to hell—frame their theories on what "ought to be" and ride to its attainment regardless of the obstacles of reality in what "is." Their reverence for the efficacy of laws and controls inspires actions as unreal as a decree that pumpkins will in future be grown on oak trees.

In this world of unreality teachers appear to have an advantage over most of the community. They daily observe the working of a miniature society of real human beings not yet fully 'conditioned' to fit into artificial systems. They have found that the best laid plans and ideals must recognise the personality, emotions, idiosyncracies and interests of the distinctive individual, or "go agly." They recognise the individual as the basis of society and realise that organised society can only exist rationally as it serves his needs. Teachers have had their attention repeatedly called to the truth in the Preface to the syllabus, especially in paragraphs 3-6. "The progress of growth is inherent in the child" (or adult). "The active force is within himself." It urges the idea of "organic growth" and the sense of "unity" or universality in our approach to practical problems. How different from the artificial idealism of a world as it "ought to be"!

Surely we owe a special duty to society of which we are a part, to extend the benefits of such understanding as we are privileged to possess, for the well-being of that adult society: to inculcate into the adult community the realisation

that their salvation (like education) is within alone; that the "Kingdom of God is within you;" to encourage them to exert their own active powers to accomplish a destiny in harmony with their own sense of purpose; to teach them not what to think, but how to think and act for themselves; to help them see through the maize of artificiality, and past a pagan reverence for external authority, to "put not their trust in princes (leaders and rulers) for in them there is no salvation."

To content ourselves with the rising generation is not enough. The tide of events will not wait for their maturity. If our present pupils are to be saved from lives of frustration, despair and incalculable suffering in a new struggle towards attainment of human dignity and freedom it must be by the effort of their seniors now.

(Reprinted from THE FARMER, Moonta, S.A., June 11, 1943.)

MONEY FOR COMMUNISTS

The spitfires are here, and I don't have to emphasise it too much, I suppose; but to say the least the public's morale has risen 1,000 *per cent.* at the sight of them. . . . It appears that every effort that is made to part us from the Empire only succeeds in making people more conscious of the existence of a real link and of a desire to preserve it.

In Sydney we have three English films, *In Which We Serve*, *The First of a Few*, and *Desert Victory*, which we have been preserved from viewing by those in control of distribution in this country. However, one American film obligingly stepped down to allow the showing of *In Which We Serve*. —Note that we are still in the British Empire. —The other two films, we are led to believe, will be released for the launching of the New Order in 195?.

Communists here are regarded with grave suspicion because of the large amounts of money they are spending on radio sessions and publications. It is a coincidence that this outburst of spending has commenced at a time when the Russian Legation has just taken up its residence at Canberra. Further, the Communists, after much scheming, captured the executive positions of most of the industrial unions; but to their alarm the moment they endeavoured to operate their new power in the service of Japan's Ally (U.S.S.R.) the rank and file members refused to respond. In the case of the miners, the Communists are running to Curtin to get him to intervene to discipline the unruly members who refused to respond to the friends of Joe.

The Big Idea is out, and it looks as though the edition will be exhausted in a fortnight. —R. H. C., Bexley, N.S.W. May, 1943.

REVOLT AGAINST FEDERALISM IN U.S.A.?

A State Governors' conference held in Ohio, United States of America, has demanded increased powers for the individual States in post-war affairs. The U.S. report states: "The position here resembles that in Australia, where the Federal Government is steadily encroaching on traditional State rights—and this is going to provoke violent reactions. Democrats are combining with Republicans in a revolt against Federalism."

Federal Elections in New South Wales

Some electors in New South Wales used the recent Australian general election to clarify the nature of the relationship between Constituent and Representative as a preliminary to establishing and maintaining a closer and more direct link between the two. The following is the substance of a letter sent by associations of voters to the candidates:—

"We constituents are about to appoint on the 21st of August a Representative to advocate and implement our policy at Canberra. I notice that you are an applicant for the position. In the past we have had foisted upon us, by means of the party-political machine, policies which have never arisen from us—policies which have inflicted great injury upon us. For this we constituents are alone responsible because we have been too indolent to attend to our business. The confusion which has arisen from our failure to attend to our own business has been so painful that we have determined to play our part more effectively in the future.

"In order to make a wise choice among the candidates offering to represent us, we desire to ask you the following questions:—

(1) Will you if elected, promise to give your whole-hearted allegiance to your Constituents, and derive from them, and from them only, the policies which you advocate and vote for in the House of Representatives?

(2) Will you ascertain and advocate the will of your Constituents issue by issue as they arise?

(3) Will you vote against every measure brought before the House which does not implement the clearly expressed will of your Constituents?

(4) Will you resist to your utmost all pressure brought to bear upon you which does not arise from your Constituents?

"We are asking all candidates these questions and will, as far as possible, communicate to all Constituents the answers received, with the advice that they should vote to defeat any candidate who by his answer, or failure to answer, indicates that he looks to a source outside his electorate to formulate his policy."

The party strengths in the new Australian House of Representatives are:—Labour, 49; United Australia Party, 14; Country Party, 9 (which two parties comprise the Opposition, amounting to 23); and Independents, 2. In the last Parliament the figures were:—Labour, 36; United Australia Party, 23; Country Party, 13; Independents, 2.

It is these members of parliament, irrespective of the parties to which they belong, who will be held responsible for the maintenance and development of the relationship outlined in the letter quoted above, with their Constituents.

FOR MONETARY REFORMISTS TO NOTE

"... But in its present form [price control's present form], it is designed, quite rightly, for the scarcity conditions of wartime, when the prevention of inflation may be more important than the reductions in cost that might be secured by other methods." —*The Economist*, October 23, 1943.

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. 8.

Saturday, October 30, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Whether by reason of the fact that the diocese of the Bishop of Bradford, Dr. Blunt, is the centre of a large Jewish population, and the antecedent circumstance that Dr. Blunt wrote a series of books lauding the Jews, or simply by personal ineptitude, he appears to be ambitious of a high place amongst contemporary ecclesiastics of the Anglican Church who demonstrate their dislike of Christianity, and their affinity with Anacharsis Clootz the Freemason who called himself "the personal enemy of Christ." Dr. Blunt's antics at the time of the Constitutional crisis will be remembered; and he has written a Foreword to a production entitled *Christians in the Class Struggle* published by the "Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership." This contains the following sentence:

"Is it not obvious that if we are to have Socialism—real and permanent Socialism—all the fundamental opposition must be liquidated (*i.e.* rendered politically inactive) by disfranchisement, and if necessary, by imprisonment."

If that is Christianity, we are Mohammedans.

The primary postulate, that there is a class struggle, is so basically wicked that we find it difficult to understand how men pretending to a liberal education can tolerate its use in connection with any religious tenet. So far as our memory serves us, there is not a single basic reform for the benefit of the under-privileged in this country, from Magna Charta onwards, which has not originated in individuals privileged by experience and opportunity above the average.

And there is hardly a political or economic injustice existing at this present time which cannot be traced to the influence of those people who, for the past hundred years at least, have moulded the policy of the so-called Labour and Socialist party—those people with whom Dr. Blunt is evidently so popular. If we are to accept the reality of the class struggle, then the deadliest enemies of the community as a whole, not excepting themselves, are those classes in whom a minority of Anglican prelates appears to discern a monopoly of all the virtues, in the face of all evidence and common sense. This is so thoroughly, even if sub-consciously recognised, that even the latest booby-trap, the Commonwealth Party, has to obtain the services of a Baronet

of fifteen generations, doubtless possessed of the instincts, if not the intelligence, of a genuine will to serve. It is true that, in order to guard against belated development, Sir Richard Acland has only been "elected" leader for one year. But that does not invalidate the demonstration.

It is a matter of history that the incursions of ecclesiastics into concrete policy have uniformly been disastrous, even where the individuals concerned have been of a very different calibre to those we now have with us. From Thomas a'Becket, Cardinal Wolsey, Archbishop Laud, Cardinal Richelieu, "L'Eminence Grise," John Knox, to our contemporary hierarchy, politically-minded clergy seem to be concerned to establish the truth of the saying that "The children of this world are, in their generation, wiser than the children of light." We are assuming that bishops and archbishops are the children of light, which, it will be admitted is a handsome concession.

The explanation is quite probably simple. The translation of general principles into practical machinery is a very tricky, arduous, and skilful business. Very few University Professors of Physics can design a machine, and the rash and unqualified claim, which is becoming so widespread in every sphere, that theory is a complete substitute for and is the same thing as knowledge, is always and everywhere disastrous.

At the present time, most people who talk about common ownership are either dishonest or ignorant—generally the latter. While Dr. Blunt's "Christians" are amusing themselves and misleading others, the stock and shareholding system, the only practical method of common ownership which has ever been devised which works, is being slyly manipulated to change its character to monopoly.

One of the biggest scandals of the war is the transformation of the Co-operative Societies into a gigantic weapon for driving the private trader out of business. The Co-operative idea was simple organised buying and the subsequent distribution to the consumer as a dividend of the difference between buying plus operating cost and selling price. If the Co-operative Societies were not being supported by High Finance—probably by the Bank of "England"—someone would ask how it is that the colossal sums which are being paid to acquire small businesses embarrassed by war restrictions (carefully designed for the purpose) have not been distributed to the members. Or is it that the Co-operative Societies are the biggest profiteers in history?

EQUALITY

"You will not allow the law of universal equality!"

"Law! If the whole world conspired to enforce falsehood they could not make it *law*. Level all conditions to-day, and you only smooth away all obstacles to tyranny to-morrow. A nation that aspires to *equality* is unfit for freedom. Throughout all creation, from the archangel to the worm, from Olympus to the pebble, from the radiant and completed planet to the nebula that hardens through the ages of mist and slime into the habitable world, the first law of nature is inequality."

— LORD LYTON in *Zanoni*.

The Basis of Government Policy

*A Recent Broadcast by the Hon. E. C. MANNING,
Premier of Alberta.*

Last week I dealt with the relationship which should exist between the people and their governments under a properly functioning democracy. I pointed out that the people must be the supreme authority who decide what results they want from the management of their affairs and that governments should exist for the purpose of seeing to it that they get those results.

Now, if there is no conflict of opinion on this matter there would be no fundamental political issue. We would all be in agreement on the form of social organisation under which we would co-operate to get the results we want in common. Unfortunately there is a violent conflict of views on this question. In fact, so violent is it that, as a result, the world has been plunged into War, revolution and social strife on a scale which is shaking the very foundations of civilisation.

In contrast to democracy there is a concept of society that is based upon the domination of the people by an all-powerful ruling group. Instead of the people being the supreme authority they are the servile puppets of their rulers, to be bossed, bullied, regimented and manipulated by those who control and plan their lives. This social system is being operated and advocated under a variety of labels such as dictatorship, bureaucracy, finance capitalism, national socialism, fascism, totalitarianism and so forth. However, it is not the labels which are important, but the kind of social system for which the labels stand. Yet there is a great deal of confusion on this question.

The essential difference between democracy and totalitarianism in any form lies in the relationship of the individual to the State and its institutions. Under a properly functioning democracy the State and all its institutions exist to serve the individual citizens who collectively are the supreme authority. Under Totalitarianism the State and its institutions have all the power concentrated in their hands, and the individual citizen is made a mere cog in a vast machine.

A violent clash is inevitable between these two opposite and conflicting view-points of democracy and the doctrine of the Supreme State. That is the dominating issue which is being fought out in the world to-day, and upon its outcome will depend the future of civilisation for centuries.

But it is not only in the military sphere that this conflict between these two opposing philosophies of life is raging. It permeates the national life of this and every other country. And because it is the dominating issue in the world to-day, it is important that, if we in Alberta are to tackle the essential task of establishing a properly functioning democracy in our Province, we must have an absolutely clear understanding of this question.

At the present time we have a constitutional democracy in Canada. But unfortunately, it is not functioning properly. Consequently the people have never been able to get the results they want. They have been constantly forced to submit to the over-riding control exercised by private interests—chiefly large monopolies and combines. A monopoly—whether it is financial, industrial or any other kind of

monopoly—is an instrument of dictatorship. A few men, by virtue of their monopoly control, are able to impose their will upon the people generally. That is the essence of Dictatorship in any sphere.

Now, in a properly functioning democracy there are two distinct spheres of social life in which the people themselves must be supreme if they are to obtain and retain the management of their affairs to give them the results they want.

First there is that side of social life which has to do with the making and enforcement of laws governing the relationship of individuals and the relations of the province or the nation with other provinces and nations. We term this the political sphere of social life which has to do with government.

Secondly there is that aspect of social activity that is concerned with the production and distribution of goods and services which we call the economic spheres.

In order to have a properly functioning democracy the people must be able to demand and obtain the results they want in both the political and economic spheres.

Now in what way can the people best exercise their supreme authority and effective control both of their political and economic institutions? A simple means for doing this already exists in our political and economic voting systems.

You are all familiar with the political voting system. The only reason it is not always effective as an instrument of popular control is because the people have failed to organise themselves to use their franchise as the means of expressing their collective will. Properly organised it would be a simple matter for the electorate to state in definite terms the results they want from government action and to enforce obedience to their collective will.

However, the question of the voting system in the economic sphere is of equal, if not greater importance. Actually, in our money system we have an economic voting mechanism which is used by all of us, but the greatest care has been taken to hide this fact from the people. The chief function of the money system under a democracy should be to operate as an effective economic voting mechanism.

Perhaps this view of money will be entirely new to some of you, so I will take a minute or two to explain more fully what I mean.

When you go into a store to buy some groceries you are performing several functions as a democratic citizen. In the first place you are demanding the results you want from the economic system. It may be so many cans of soup, so much flour, or a sack of beans. By your purchases you are telling Industry what to produce. Furthermore, if you ask for a particular brand of soup or of flour you are casting your economic vote in favour of a particular Firm that is giving satisfaction in providing you with the product you want. To the extent that the people as a whole have an adequate amount of money, and a wide range of choice in the goods they can buy they are able to control the volume, the quality and the type of production. That is the basis of a properly functioning economic democracy.

You see, to the extent that an individual has sufficient money in relation to the prices of goods, he has economic voting power. To the extent that he is assured of adequate economic voting power he has economic security. And to

the extent that he gets that economic voting power under conditions over which he has control he has economic freedom.

How very important then is this question of money in the organisation of a properly functioning democracy.

Now in contrast to these principles of true democracy, I wish to turn to the totalitarian—or Supreme State—concept which is being advocated here in Canada under the subtle guise of so-called socialism and communism—and which is being adopted more and more by both the old line political parties.

The basis of all so-called socialistic policies, particularly as advocated by the C.C.F. in both the provincial and federal field—is that the State should take over the operation of production, distribution and finance.

First let us examine their proposals for nationalising the banks. There is no suggestion that the money system as such will be changed. The only difference will be that a group of State officials will replace the present operators of the banks. Centralised control and centralised power will be merely transferred to those operating the State institutions.

The people still will be dependent for their incomes, their economic voting power, on wages and salaries as at present—with this difference: As Industry and Commerce will be largely operated by State officials, workers will have little choice but to accept the scale of wages dictated by the State bureaucrats. Furthermore, since there can be no appeal from the State, collective bargaining to right injustices will be rendered ineffective. With the State controlling all Industry there will be little or no competition as between one Firm and another to pay higher wages or offer better working conditions in order to attract the best workmen.

When it comes to the use of their economic voting power, the people will not have the wide range of choice provided by a large number of Firms competing for their business. The quantity, quality and type of goods will conform, not to the will of the people as consumers, but the dictates of the State Bureaucrats who will plan and order all production programmes.

In short the people will have no control over the conditions under which they will obtain their economic voting power, and their economic voting power will be rendered useless as a means of controlling the volume and quality of production.

Don't you see that this business of State ownership of the means of production is the short cut to a complete destruction of democracy and the establishment of a State dictatorship, operated under a vast bureaucracy, regimenting and dominating the lives of the people? It would constitute a huge super-monopoly with all the instruments of control, both political and economic, concentrated in a few hands.

I ask what is the fundamental difference between that and the evil thing they have in Germany under Nazi-ism?

Surely it is just common sense that we cannot do away with the evils of monopolies by creating one vast State super-monopoly to take their place.

Moreover, if we are to have effective control by the people of the entire productive system, combined with the freedom of the individual in the economic sphere, what we need is the maximum scope for private enterprise and individual initiative. The more scope there is for persons

to use their ingenuity to produce goods to please customers, the easier it will be for individuals, with their wide range of personal tastes, to get the results they want from the economic system provided they have adequate purchasing power.

Private enterprise under popular control and full scope for personal initiative are the very breath of democracy. What we are suffering from to-day is not too much private enterprise, but too much monopoly and Bureaucratic control which have all but stifled true individual initiative and private enterprise.

If the experience of State bureaucracy we are having at present does not arouse every thinking person to the menace of the socialistic doctrine of a Supreme State I don't know what will.

I have been asked if the government holds these views in regard to socialisation, why did this Province enter the fields of fire and life insurance, the sale of farm machinery parts, and so on. The answer is simple and logical. We went into those lines of business, not to create a State monopoly but to fight and break existing private monopoly and combine control.

State enterprise for the purpose of creating beneficial competition and breaking existing monopoly control must be distinguished from the socialistic doctrine of the Supreme State under which the State ultimately takes over all Industry for the purpose of eliminating competition, and establishing one Supreme State Monopoly.

I assure you that in our determination to break all forms of combines and monopoly control, we will not hesitate to use State Enterprise to create beneficial competitive conditions whenever it is in the public interest to do so.

I have endeavoured to give you some of the pertinent facts regarding the two opposite and conflicting social philosophies of democracy and Totalitarianism in its various forms. It is self-evident that there can be no compromise on this issue which involves the fundamental principles underlying all social and economic life.

In conclusion I wish to make it clear that the policies of your Provincial Government are based on an uncompromising adherence to true democracy and democratic principles. We shall oppose, expose and resist by every means in our power any and every form of totalitarianism, whether it be financial, political, or economic. We shall resist all policies directed towards centralising power in the hands of either private interests or State institutions. In this I am confident that we shall have the wholehearted and united support of all freedom-loving people.

RECONSTRUCTION

The "Glasgow Evening Times"
Articles of May 1932

By Major C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 6d. (Postage extra)

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

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: October 19, 1943.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

Cartels

Sir Herbert Williams asked the President of the Board of Trade whether, having regard to the statements contained in "Germany's Master Plan," recently published by two of the staff of the Anti-Trust Department of the United States Government, he will take steps to institute an inquiry in this country for the purpose of finding out to what extent there has been infiltration of German control into British industry?

[*Mr Liddall* asked a question on the same subject.]

Mr. Dalton: The amount of German capital invested, directly or indirectly, in British industry was very small. In these circumstances, and as commercial agreements, including cartel arrangements, with foreigners who have become enemies are now illegal, I do not consider that any useful purpose would be served by instituting the suggested inquiry. The question of cartels after the war, as the Prime Minister informed the House on July 22, is under consideration.

Sir H. Williams: May I ask whether the Minister has yet read this book, which was published as a result of official inquiries in the United States and which shows that a great many cartel agreements are so drawn up that they will automatically resume when the war is over?

Mr. Dalton: I have had a quick glance through the book, which certainly seems very interesting. Whether it is accurate is another matter, but at any rate it is very interesting. With regard to the post-war period, I have already referred my hon. Friend to the Prime Minister's statement that we are now considering what the policy should be regarding cartels after the war. For the moment, all those agreements with enemy persons are frustrated.

Sir H. Williams: Does not the Minister know that it is as a result of these cartel arrangements that we have been prevented in this country from producing certain things which otherwise we should have produced? Having regard to the fact that this book has been produced as a result of official inquiries, in the United States—it is the most heavily documented book I have yet seen—will he study it further?

Mr. Dalton: Yes, Sir.

Sir Percy Harris: Will the Minister consider appointing a committee of experts to study this very difficult but vitally important matter?

Mr. Stokes: Will the Minister specially call the attention of the Minister of Production to this matter, in view of that right hon. Gentleman's unsatisfactory attitude in regard to the production of synthetic rubber?

Mr. Levy: Is the Minister aware that a number of British industrialists are involved in these cartels, which are only temporarily suspended, and does he not think that if an inquiry was made, with discovery of documents, the result would be extremely illuminating to him, in relation to his post-war problems?

Mr. Dalton: We shall willingly consider any means of acquiring additional information to enable us to deal with post-war problems.

UNITED NATIONS BANK

Mr. Stokes asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the American proposal with regard to a United Nations Bank; and whether he has any statement to make to this House?

Sir J. Anderson: Copies of the proposal have been communicated to the representatives of the Treasury now in Washington with certain oral explanations. The text of the proposals has only just reached me, and it will be desirable that His Majesty's Government should give careful study to the proposals and explanations before a further statement can be made in the House.

Mr. Stokes: Is the Chancellor satisfied that he has not been misinformed? Is it not a fact that the draft of these proposals was in the hands of the Treasury early in April this year? In view of the discussions which are now taking place, will he make it perfectly clear to the United States Government that it is not the policy of the British people to put debtor nations in debt with the moneylenders?

Sir J. Anderson: The reply I gave was accurate, and I cannot make a statement until the proposals have been examined.

Mr. G. Straus: In view of the great importance of these proposals, might we be put in possession of an authoritative report on their details as soon as possible?

Sir J. Anderson: Yes, Sir. I should be glad to see that a copy is put in the Library.

House of Commons: October 20, 1943.

DEPARTMENTAL ORDERS

Sir Leonard Lyle asked the Prime Minister whether, following his recent exhortation to Government Departments to cut down the length of the orders and regulations issued and to frame them in much simpler language, he has received any report as to the results achieved?

Mr. Attlee: As stated by my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary on May 26, general guidance has been given to Departments on the drafting of this subordinate legislation, and in particular on the importance of securing that so far as practicable it is intelligible on the face of it without unnecessary reference to other enactments. I believe that these instructions are being generally observed.

Sir L. Lyle: Is my right hon. Friend aware that the Ministry of Home Security recently issued a Fire Order of approximately 70 pages, with a supplementary Memorandum of something like 700 pages, and that it took a certain town clerk on the south coast, with his assistant and the borough auditors, from 2 until 6 o'clock to find out what it all meant; and is it not a fact that 10,000 Orders have been issued to local authorities since the beginning of the war?

Mr. Attlee: I am not aware, of course, about the matter of the town clerk, but my hon. Friend is trying to get two things done. He wants things made absolutely intelligible to the most uninstructed person, and he asks for the greatest amount of brevity, and these two things are not always compatible.

Mr. Levy: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these Orders are not only issued in official jargon that nobody

can understand but that, when explanations are asked for from the Departments, they reply in the same official jargon which nobody can understand? Why issue Orders at all if people cannot understand the jargon used?

Mr. Attlee: My hon. Friend is giving to the lack of understanding too great a universality.

Commander Locker-Lampson: Why not use basic American?

PAPER (ALLOCATION)

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay asked the Minister of Production how many tons of paper are allocated per annum, respectively, to newspapers, the Stationery Office, the War Office and to books?

The Minister of Production (Mr. Lyttelton): The approximate figures are 250,000 tons for newspapers, 20,000 tons for books and about 100,000 tons for the Stationery Office. The War Office uses about 25,000 tons a year, taken from the Stationery Office allocation.

Mr. Lindsay: Without wishing to get the matter out of perspective, would the right hon. Gentleman reconsider this question? I believe that another 1,000 tons would produce 5,000,000 books of average size and that the War Office is using 5,000 tons more than the whole of the book trade.

Mr. Lyttelton: I do my best to try to keep the quotas more or less equitable.

House of Commons: October 21, 1943.

NATIONAL WAR EFFORT

Young Women (Imprisonment)

Mr. Rhys Davies asked the Minister of Labour whether he has considered the representations from the Council of the Magistrates' Association, stating that they are alarmed at the number of young women sent to prison for failing to comply with his directions and urging that such women should be psychologically examined before they are prosecuted; and what reply he has sent in response to those representations?

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Ernest Bevin): The present arrangements provide for such an examination to be undertaken where this seems desirable, and I am exploring the possibility of improving the present methods of identifying appropriate cases for special examination. A reply to this effect has been sent to the Magistrates' Association.

Mr. Davies: Does the Minister not think it time he reviewed the whole policy of his Department of prosecuting work-people for offences that were never punishable before the war commenced? Surely it does not achieve anything worth while for the State by prosecuting these people.

Mr. McGovern: Is the Minister aware that there was a case in Bristol last week where a young girl of 18 was sent to prison for six months? Is not treatment of that kind shocking?

Mr. Bevin: I never heard of the case.

Prosecutions

Mr. Rhys Davies asked the Minister of Labour how many persons are employed by his Department preparing cases and prosecuting persons for offences that were not punishable before the outbreak of war; and what is the annual cost involved in such prosecutions?

Mr. Bevin: During the 12 months ending August 31

1943, an average number of 15 persons was employed in the Solicitor's Department of the Ministry in preparing for prosecution cases of the type mentioned in the Question. The conduct of the prosecutions was entrusted to solicitors or counsel who were paid by fee. The total annual cost was approximately £40,000, of which about £34,000 represented fees. In addition, officers in other Departments of the Ministry, both at headquarters and in out-stations, were concerned in the preparation of these cases, but it would not be possible without excessive cost to ascertain the particulars relating to these persons asked for in the Question.

SITUATIONS VACANT

WANTED: Well-educated person to act as Secretary to the Higher Educational Policy Association. Apply in first instance to X., C/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool 15.

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 "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
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.
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.	
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell.....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
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.