

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 1.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

MODERN SCIENCE (XIX)

A newspaper quotes Lord McGowan:—"It would be to the good of all if from time to time university workers were hauled gently to the ground in order to observe the functioning of life at the lower levels, and for industrial workers to be hoisted equally gently so that they may be given a clearer view of the stars of the scientific firmament." Another leveller! Why not 'from time to time' gently hoist some university workers so that *they* may be given a clearer view of the 'stars' of the scientific firmament?

Opportunity for the 'clearer view' is at present as follows:—(1) the 'university worker' gets his bright idea. It is really quite immaterial what the nature of this is. It must conform to certain specifications, *e.g.*, it must concern the subject which the 'worker' has elected to profess as his; it must evoke some measure of surprise among those who 'profess' the same 'subject'; it must be 'scientific,' and what pass for Baconian rules in modern university circles must be applicable to its development. (2) Worker 1 goes to Worker 2, who is senior to him, and usually stands to him in the relationship of a kind of scientific parent. He has taught him, examined him, encouraged him, *etc., etc.* Worker 2 expresses the appropriate surprise, excitement, caution, *etc., etc.*, and explains if on more mature consideration the idea is found to have something in it money and time will have to be found to relieve Worker 1 from some part of his routine teaching (unusual this) and to provide financial means to defray costs of materials and (later) publication, although these matters may be treated as separate questions. This is usually painted as a ticklish business, as, indeed, it is. The sources from which such assistances may come are various. Departmental funds do not go far. Most of the sources are external. Several Trusts now exist, financed by such men (or organisations) as Beit, Rockefeller, Leverhulme, Carnegie, Nuffield, and a large number of smaller endowments, to allocate grants for research. Some of these periodically announce a subject and invite competition; some invite applicants suitably qualified, and approve or reject both applicant and his problem together, or accept the applicant subject to agreement about his problem. For some years, the State, in the guise of the Medical Research Council, the Committee of the Privy Council for Scientific and Industrial Research and the Agricultural Research Council, has dominated this field. These committees are run by civil servants and a rota of 'scientists.' When Professor X's turn comes, Professor X's good little boys do very well; when Professor X's turn for retirement comes along, his good little boys do less well. And Professor X has a double interest: his good little boys, and the interests (scientific?) which he has implanted in the minds of his good little boys, or which his good little boys have succeeded in implanting in his. The result (or one result) of all this is

that considerable competition is induced to succeed in choosing 'wise' subjects for investigation. The energy displayed shows itself in an increasing volume of published matter. The late Sir Joseph Larmor called it "the avalanche of voluminous research" which "drowned" him. These are some of the "clutches of research" from which he thought, if civilisation is to survive, education must be rescued.

Worker 1 has by no means always direct access to a Worker 2 who has the advantage of serving on a committee. If he has not, a little comedy is played of this description:—

"Splendid, splendid, my boy. Now then! Let me see! You must go on with this, of course! Yes, of course! We must get some money for the materials you will require. Not much? Oh! it will never do to take that view! (Anecdote) God bless my soul, let me see, what can we do? Ah! Yes! My friend X! That's the man! Do you know X?"—"Professor X? No I don't know him."—"Ah, well, never mind! I'll write to him, and then doubtless you can go and see him." In due course Worker 1 sees the 'great' X, and the later report goes something like this:—

"Well? Did you see him? What did you think of him? Yes, he is a fine old boy, isn't he? (Anecdote) Well, what did he have to say? Was he interested? Ah! Yes, I've heard something about the work he is doing. But what did he say about your work? Did you get a chance to tell him about that? Ah! yes, he would be interested, I'm quite sure. Oh, he told you that, did he? Yes I remember that. (Extension of anecdote). So? Ah, yes, I see. Well, there may be something in that. You see you are just cutting your teeth, as it were, in science. It might, as he says, be well for you to join up with these lines of enquiry which are making such headway under my dear friend X's guidance. That would give you some standing, and confidence, and then it may be easier to resume this very interesting point you have discovered. Yes, I think he may be right. What do you think yourself? Yes, naturally you will be a little disappointed. Never mind. The day will come. . ."

What day? Each of our days comes—and goes. What seems to me to be rather strange is that this deflection of the aim of the aimer from his objective is actually accomplished with the greatest ease. And why not? In many cases, there never was an aimer. All there was was an applicant for a job which carried with it certain sources of personal gratification, illusory but effective to determine the course. I have heard more often from the head of a department busy in the 'advancement of science' the remark that he is glad that "at last we've got so-and-so to start on something"—something to add to the 'avalanche'—than any complaint that the creative impulse has been thwarted. In the infinite impartiality of Science, isn't one investigation as good as another? The gradual training of the vital shoot to some

preconceived, chosen direction is not perceived by anyone.

"... for that anticipated and hasty knowledge we have at present," said Bacon*, "it is not easy for the possessor to say by what road he came at it. Yet in a greater or less degree anyone might review his knowledge, trace back the steps of his own thoughts, consent afresh, and thus transplant his knowledge into the mind of another as it grew up in his own. For it is in arts as in trees,—if a tree were to be used, no matter for the root, but if it were to be transplanted, it is a surer way to take the root than the slips. So the transplantation now practised of the sciences makes a great show, as it were, of branches, that without the roots may be fit indeed for the builder, but not for the planter. He who would promote the growth of the sciences should be less solicitous about the trunk or body of them, and bend his care to preserve the roots, and draw them out with some little earth about them."

That university workers should get a glimpse of the 'stars' of the scientific firmament would be salutary. Who are these stars? Who is behind the research councils? Like the universities themselves, which administer the expenditure of six million pounds a year of money which, if it is anybody's is the public's, they do not seem to be responsible to anybody in particular. Their errors are inherent in their constitution. At best (or worst) a piece of mechanism will only do what it is designed to do, and at the worst (or best) it just won't do at all. The stars ordain the mechanisms, and say they 'grew.' Nothing living ever grew like this. "Consider the lilies..."

(To be continued.)

TUDOR JONES.

Social Credit Secretariat

REVISED REGULATIONS FOR THE FELLOWSHIP EXAMINATION

The experimental stage having now been passed, the following Regulations have been adopted for Course B, leading to the examination for the Fellowship of the Social Credit Secretariat:—

(1) Candidates who hold the Diploma of Associate may enter for the Fellowship examination following their receipt of the official notification of their having passed the required examination, or at any time later.

(2) The Director of Lectures and Studies shall have discretion to admit, or to refuse to admit other candidates.

(3) Examiners will be appointed by the Director, whose choice is not limited to Fellows of the Social Credit Secretariat.

(4) The Examination for the Fellowship shall consist of two parts:—viz:

PART I. The presentation before an appointed date of a Thesis on a topic chosen by the candidate from a list announced annually not less than nine months before the date of Examination, or proposed by the candidate and accepted by the Director not less than nine months before

the date of Examination. A note appended defines the requirements in regard to acceptable Theses.

PART II. An examination, conducted *viva voce*, at a time and place convenient to the Director and the candidate, on the subject matter of the Thesis presented and, at the discretion of the examiners, on relevant matters of economic and political theory and practice.

This examination will be held after reception of the candidate's Thesis and within six weeks of its reception during the period of the War.

(5) A fee of 10/6 will be payable by each candidate to cover the cost of his Examination.

The acceptable standard of Theses will be one approximating to that required by British Universities from candidates for higher degrees.

Original and thorough research will be expected, and the standard of marking will be high. Citations from documents must quote originals, not compilations, *etc.*, and the objective should be the preparation of a publishable work of importance. Length is not prescribed and should be adequate for the due presentation of the candidate's work.

N.B. In all cases, copyright will be vested in the Social Credit Secretariat, and each candidate will be asked to sign an agreement to this effect. If publication is undertaken by the Social Credit Secretariat a royalty will be paid at an agreed rate. If publication elsewhere is consented to, the candidate may make his own terms with the publisher of his choice. *This rule is solely for the purpose of safeguarding the interest of the Social Credit Secretariat in impeding the attachment to itself of work which is unsound or otherwise objectionable.*

Note

EXAMINATION DATE: 1945, February 28.

LAST DATE FOR ENTRY TO THE EXAMINATION: April 30.

THESIS SUBJECTS: The following will be Acceptable Theses in accordance with the above Regulations. The list is not exclusive:—

The Financial Systems of Russia and Germany since 1918.

Cartels, with particular reference to bye-products of coal mining.

The breakdown of the Financial System, with particular reference to the maintenance of other controls and to its effect on the strategy of monetary reformers.

Monopoly. (*Candidates choosing this subject must define clearly the proposed scope of their investigation before their entry can be accepted.*)

An analysis of the strategy of the newspaper press from 1917 onwards, and of the B.B.C., with special reference to the production of situations whereby the policy of the political parties in England were determined in a manner favourable to the objectives of the German High Command.

The history of an institution supported by the proceeds of taxation, *e.g.*, The London School of Economics, or The Royal Institute for International Affairs, with reference to personal responsibility for political effects.

**Advancement of Learning*: Bk. VI, Ch. II.

CANADIANS AND THE C.C.F.

While in this country recently, Mr. NORMAN JACQUES, the Canadian M.P., sent the following letter, assessing the Canadian view of the activities of the C.C.F. in Canada, to THE TIMES, which has lately devoted a mis-leading amount of space to this party. It was not published.

Sir,

Recent dispatches from Ottawa would make it appear that the C.C.F. (Socialists) are the most important political group in Canada.

What are the facts? The C.C.F. have about a dozen members in the House of Commons, and are represented in most of the provincial legislatures, but nowhere do they form a majority. Last summer they gained a number of seats in the Ontario provincial election, which was won by the Conservatives. Less than 50 per cent. of the electorate went to the polls, and of these about 35 per cent. voted for the C.C.F., mostly in the cities. The C.C.F. failed to win a single seat among the farmers, but, following this, they won several rural ridings in different parts of Canada.

Inspired by these successes the C.C.F. held a national convention in Edmonton to plan the defeat of the Alberta Government (Social Credit).

It so happened that the leader of the "Independents" having recently died, the premier, Mr. Manning, suggested that another "Independent" be returned unopposed until after the war. At once the C.C.F. accused Mr. Manning of avoiding a contest, and nominated their candidate.

In the meantime at a C.C.F. rally at Calgary (Alberta) Mr. H. Winch, C.C.F. leader in British Columbia, "spilled the beans" by declaring—"As soon as we are in power we will institute a full programme of Socialism, and if the capitalists oppose us we shall know how to deal with them—so did Russia."

Mr. Coldwell, C.C.F. national leader, at once protested that Mr. Winch had been misquoted in this and in other statements of a similar nature. But whatever the implications there were too many witnesses at the meeting to leave any doubts as to the actual words used by Mr. Winch, nor did he deny this particular statement which prompted Mr. Drew, Ontario premier, to declare that "the C.C.F. is an anti-British, revolutionary, national socialist party."

The reaction of the general public to these statements is reflected by subsequent elections. In Alberta (Red Deer) the Social Crediters regained the seat from the Independents, the C.C.F. being swamped. In municipal elections of Toronto and Vancouver (C.C.F. strongholds) the C.C.F. failed to elect a single candidate to any office.

Mr. Drew's estimate of the C.C.F. is justified by their war record which, up to the German invasion of Russia, was little more than neutral—"No conscription," "not a man to be sent overseas," "reasonable protection for our shores," merely "economic aid which must be strictly controlled." (*Hansard*, September 1939).

(Compare this policy with that of the Social Credit Government of Alberta and group in the House of Commons—"Total war against Britain's enemies without limit, financial or otherwise."—*Hansard*, September 1939.)

Recently Mr. Gladstone Murray, late manager of the

C.B.C. (Canada's B.B.C.) publicly declared that, just before the war, he was approached by certain "left wing" leaders for permission to use the radio in favour of neutrality. Whereupon Mr. Coldwell, C.C.F. leader, felt called upon to deny the truth of Mr. Murray's statement.

To win converts to a policy by telling the people of A that those of B are all backing it is an old political dodge, but "truth will out" in the end.

It is true there is a feeling of revolt in Canada against the "old line parties," but the average Canadian is not class-conscious, and he is too independent to "fall" for Socialism once he becomes aware of its true nature.

Recent events in Canada would indicate that, thanks to Mr. Winch, the eyes of Canadians are being opened and focussed on the fundamental truth that Socialism means the death of individual freedom.

Yours etc.,

London; February 21, 1944.

NORMAN JACQUES.

CENTRALISATION OF POWER IN INDIA

On the second reading of the India (Attachment of States) Bill in the House of Commons, Mr. Godfrey-Nicholson (Farnham), who spoke late in the Debate, pointed out that the assumption in every single speech had been that the Bill was one to attach smaller States to larger States in Kathiawar and Gujarat for purposes of better administration. "That is not correct in the slightest degree. Neither Kathiawar nor Gujarat is mentioned in the Bill, although it may well be that the present intention of the present Government of India is to apply this Bill in that direction, if the Bill is passed. But I would direct the attention of hon. Members to the Bill itself. It says that any Indian States not mentioned in Divisions I to XVI of the Table of States in Part II of the First Schedule to the Act of 1935 may be attached—in other words, may be extinguished, for that is what it may amount to... it appears to me that the States not mentioned in Divisions I to XVI in Part II of the First Schedule of the Government of India Act, 1935, far from having a population of only 800,000... [have a population of] over 3,000,000... I do not know where many of these States are outside Gujarat and Kathiawar. I myself only know one at first hand—which is in Orissa. It is a small State excellently administered..."

The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Butler), who replied to the Debate in the absence of the Secretary of State for India replied to this point: "... The provision of this particular Schedule of the Government of India Act, which I remember something about, was drafted for convenience. In the language used in the Bill itself, it covers almost exactly the area which the House has before it, and that is the area of Kathiawar and Gujarat. But there are some other States, really very few, which would be affected. They are small States of exactly the same character of those which we are dealing..."

Mr. Godfrey Nicholson: "Could my right hon. Friend tell me how the difference between 800,000 and over 3,000,000 is got over?"

Mr. Butler: "... I accept the significance of my right hon. Friend's figure, but I would like to investigate further, before the Committee stage, the number of extra States likely to be affected."

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. 12. No. 1.

Saturday, March 11, 1944.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

We have received from a valued correspondent in California a copy of *The Protestant*, a monthly review. We have no means of knowing what is its circulation or influence, and under normal circumstances we should, without comment, place it amongst the numerous American products supported by the people who delight to call themselves, and to believe that they are "forward looking." To look forward is to look Left. To the Brethren of the Left-hand Path.

But the present times are not normal, and *The Protestant* will bear a little examination as a type, because it clearly has Big Money behind it.

As its name would indicate, it claims to represent non-Roman Catholic Christianity. It has on its Editorial Board a Bishop, although it is not quite clear of what or where he is Bishop. Dr. Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury (Eng.), is an Editorial Adviser.

The cover, on which its Contents are indexed, carries the names of eleven contributors: O. W. Wagner, Leslie Roberts, Kenneth Leslie, E. J. Gumbel, J. Bloch, A. Kahn, Clifton Maco, Heinz Pol, L. Fernsworth, Nicholas Halasz, G. A. Borge. Of these, seven are German or Mid-European, and of these seven, three are certainly Jews and others probably Jews. Of the remainder, the Editor, who uses the good Scottish name of Kenneth Leslie, writes almost entirely on the virtues of the Jews, and concludes, "In its effort to acquaint its readers with the attitude of historic Christianity to the Jews and Judaism, *The Protestant* undertakes the publication (which begins in this issue) of sermons and articles devoted to the Christian appraisal of the role of the Jews in the non-Jewish world. . . To each sermon or article will be appended biographical and editorial notes by Dr. Joshua Bloch, Chief of the Semitic Division of the New York Public Library."

Turning to the first sermon of the series to be published one monthly, we find it is by Henry Ward Beecher (Edited by J. Bloch) entitled *Jew and Gentile*. We read "From the Hebrews the world has received a treasure of benefit such as no other people has ever conferred on mankind. . . The people that most saturate themselves with the whole economy of the Old Testament is the people among whom popular liberty is most likely to be developed. . . the working forms of political institutions are to be found in the Old Testament rather than the New. . . It will not do [our emphasis] to say that they [the Jews] are the genius and

intelligence of administration in Europe but I may venture to say they are second to no others. . . When they were obliged to conform to a cruel reigning Christianity, in the sanctuary of their own household they were faithful to the religion of their fathers." And so on.

The next exhibit is Mr. Leslie Roberts, advertised as Editor of the *Montrealer*, of which we know nothing. Mr. Roberts writes of political parties in Canada, needless to say neither mentioning Alberta, Social Credit or the Social Crediters of Quebec Province. He describes the C.C.F. and, in his own words, "the Labour-Progressives (the leaders of which formerly led the outlawed Communist Party, but which is drawing to its banner to-day all manner of citizens who are determined to resist the Return to Yesterday)."

Mr. Lawrence Fernsworth is described as having been formerly on the staff of the *London Times*. We wonder that they let him go. He attacks Father Charles Coughlin without so much as mentioning Coughlin's attacks on the money-power.

Then we have what appears to be a review of a book by a gentleman called Pierre van Paassen. Meynheer van Paassen is described as "among the first ten in the world most responsible for bringing America into the war on Britain's (*sic*) side." So now we know that it wasn't Japan who kicked "America" (Brazil, *etc.*, please note) into the war. It was Meynheer van Paassen, and nine others. He writes of "the story of Palestine's great role in helping save the British Empire in its dark days. . ." He feels with a sense of personal involvement "Christianity's guilt in the Jewish people's woes."

Finally there is the usual string of calumny, entitled *Indian Famine Our Responsibility*, inclusive of the usual hint that "the United States of America whose forces are stationed in India and are increasing daily" should interfere. Lord Wavell, please note.

The Protestant may be, and probably is, a publication of little importance. But it is one of a quite large number of centres for the dissemination of a policy which is very far from unimportant. That policy is, "We are the Chosen People. We don't mind what you call yourselves if you are educated to recognise that, and act accordingly. We don't mind who has India, so long as we rule it. We hate European culture and in particular, English culture, and we mean to destroy it." That is the policy which is leading straight to Armageddon.

• • •

"The way to get on is to handle things, not to produce them. As long as you're handling them, buying and selling, they don't even need to exist. Never hold the baby: that's my motto in life, and it's served me champion."

— Meninsky in *The City of Gold* by FRANCIS BRETT YOUNG.

"The Messiah"

"February 1939 in Prague. 'One of our Rabbis here,' said Doktor Farisy, 'is preaching in the synagogues that Hitler is the Jewish Messiah, because he will cause all those countries in the world to be opened to the Jews, which now are closed to them.'" — DOUGLAS REED in *Lest we Forget*.

“IN THIS STYLE...”

1932 seems to have been a significant year for Canadian politics in more ways than one. In that year Social Credit became a serious threat to the U.F.A. Government in Alberta; Mr. Coldwell organised the Co-operative-Commonwealth Federation (dignified on February 10 last with a double column article in the *London Times* as the *Third Canadian Party*) and lastly, Mr. W. D. Herridge, for some years Canadian Minister in Washington, in that same year made the discovery that led to his formation of the movement of the New Democracy. And now he has written a book about it. He opens with these words:—

“Perhaps it was the great depression. At any rate, in 1932 or thereabouts, I awoke to the fact that in the battle against want and unemployment, English-speaking democracy was fighting with one hand tied behind its back.”

He had discovered that our wealth in natural resources was great enough to lift the people to a new level of security. But we were only using part of these resources because the bosses or chief beneficiaries feared that if all resources were put at the service of the people, profits would disappear. The task therefore was to devise an economic system which would give the people the total use of all the resources. Being a servant of the Government of Canada, he was tongue-tied. But in 1935 he got free of the Government, and set about vehemently to preach his doctrine. “I was not powerful, but I struck hard. The bosses of the system were powerful, and they struck back.”

“My enemies were many. But the common man remained my friend. I spoke in his name. For I was he. And am.”

The common man may have been his friend, but he did not appear to wish his friend to represent him in Parliament. Mr. Herridge was defeated.

He does not think it necessary to mention that the first Social Credit Government was elected in Alberta in 1935—on a programme based on the abolition of poverty in plenty—nor that after it was elected, he was associated with the policy of that government. But his book is addressed to the American middle classes and printed in U.S.A.*

Neither the words “Social Credit” nor “Alberta” are mentioned throughout the whole book. Yet both internal and external evidence indicate the fact that the author knows a great deal about them. The net result is as the image of a picture, seen through a glass which both inverts and distorts it.

To proceed with the story: Mr. Herridge says he preached his new doctrine, which was his conception of the Social Credit thesis, until 1939 [all through the critical years of the establishment of the Social Credit Government apparently]—until in 1939 he founded the “New Democracy” in Canada. What in fact Mr. Herridge did was to assume the leadership of the Federal Social Credit Movement under a wider title. His aim was to unite all progressives in Canada behind the front for the total use of our resources. His leadership was quite disastrous and resulted in a reduction of the Federal Social Credit representation by 30 per cent. Then, as he says, the war came,

which meant of course, that Canada *did* begin to make total use of all her resources. But the bosses mean that total use shall not survive the war. So the ordinary citizen has got to make sure that it does. This will be a peaceful revolution. The alternative is a bloody one.

Full employment, he says, means the careful, equitable and unhampered use of all that we have, up to the level fixed either by the exhaustion of the material wealth, or the satisfaction of the people’s needs, whichever is the less. We cannot use more than we have, and we should not use more than we need. The battle is against want and unemployment. There is here the usual confusion between *volume* of production, and *description* of goods produced.

We cannot, of course, know the motives that led to the writing of this incredible book. But we can assess its effects. In spite of the press misrepresentation and boycott throughout the world, it is impossible but that some knowledge of the change in Alberta must have penetrated to the United States. This book, instead of clarifying people’s thoughts, will graft the growing idea on to the old confused notion that a political party should identify itself with a particular technique.

Mr. Herridge, having presented a caricature of the problem, proceeds to hold a tea-party. Around the table sit English-speaking Democracy, English-speaking Fascism, and Communism. No attempt is made to define these systems of administration, to assign their function, or to examine differences, if any, in their philosophy. They change places as irrationally in his text as the March Hare, the Dormouse and the Mad Hatter.

“When, in the English speaking world”—says Mr. Herridge, “the state goes Fascist, the common man goes Communist. This is the complementary action, automatic and inevitable. For the common man of Democracy will not fight for Fascism against Communism. This means that Communism would destroy Fascism.” (Page seven.)

The sum total of these parlour games, on a mind which has any regard whatever for the meaning of words, is one of complete and indescribable confusion. Many other extracts remind one of the Frenchman who, taken to hear the late Arthur Roberts give a caricature of a Parisian music Hall “turn” said, “’e looks French, ’e seems to speak French, but I not understan’ a word ’e say.”

Mr. Herridge says he is addressing the people of America’s great middle class, “saved by good fortune from the disabling influences of poverty or excessive wealth.” These, he seems to indicate, are the only people who can save the world. We are probably to blame for the amused tolerance with which we have treated this idea until the American middle class feels that it must be true.

If there be any among them who search his pages for enlightenment, they will not find anything beyond the old party politics worse confounded. It is difficult indeed to review a book so abounding in fundamental error. The only answer is *Economic Democracy* in its entirety. When for instance, we read on page 140:—“If Democracy is to be saved, the men whom we elected for that purpose must come to understand that the primary purpose of the economic system should be not profits but production,” what other reply is there but, “The correct objectives of industry are two-fold; the removal of material limitations, and the satis-

*Which Kind of Revolution? by W. D. HERRIDGE; Little, Brown and Company, Boston, Mass.

faction of the creative impulse." The idea that more rather than *suitable* production, is necessary, obsesses him.

The most serious omission is of all mention of the two voting systems which until the war were still functioning to a very limited extent:—the political and the economic vote—the franchise and the people's purchasing power. There is a correct way in which both could be used to get the people what they want. Mr. Herridge must have heard over and over again in Alberta how this double voting power could be used to demand results, *i.e.*, products. The people would then get some *profit* out of the productive system. But no. Products must be unprofitable, or so he says. Are we then to go on making things that nobody wants, or can it be that Mr. Herridge does not understand the meaning of the word "profits," or is he deliberately misusing it?

He tells us that it takes both the people and their leaders to get the democratic processes working right.

"The leaders cannot proclaim a revolution. But they can propose one. The people cannot proclaim a revolution. But they can approve the proposal for one. Therefore, it is the function of our elected representatives to propose a new system of total use. It is the function of the people to accept the proposal or reject it. By joint action of this kind, Democracy can achieve a bloodless revolution." (Page 139.)

What does this mean? What possible relation to historic possibility has it? Setting aside the somewhat waggish suggestion that every one should turn a standing somersault, it must mean that it is the function of representatives to set out some technical economic scheme before the people, and that the people must then state their views as to whether the scheme is a suitable one or not. It is not possible to find any other meaning in it. But this is the rock on which the system known as "Democracy" has shipwrecked time and again, until it has almost seemed that it might founder with all hands. How often have the people been asked to approve or reject a new system—free trade—New Deal—economic sanctions—or what not, with the promise that such a scheme shall lead to better times; and how often have they been completely deceived, and found that the ship was in more distress than ever?

"But that was what the electors wanted!" is the cry. Was it? Did they want the scheme *in itself*? Do they not want something much simpler—more goods, lower prices, money to buy them, and the assurance that their own fighting forces are strong enough to protect them? It is for the experts appointed by the government to look after the details of the scheme.

Social Crediters would agree that it takes both the people and their representatives (not *leaders*) to get the democratic process working right; but it can only work right when the mechanism of the franchise and the money vote are in order.

The correct use of the franchise and the money vote are precisely what neither Fascism nor Communism, properly understood, allow to those peoples who live under their systems of administration; and since we began to fight "Fascism," so-called, we British have foolishly allowed our own voting systems to be so curtailed by coupons, restrictions, orders in council, and so forth, that at the present time

there is little to distinguish "English-speaking Democracy" from the totalitarian states.

Between the March Hare, the Dormouse and the Mad Hatter there is little to choose, except in degree of madness; and anyone who has had much to do with them will be tempted to say to Mr. Herridge what Alice said at the party:—"I think you might do something better with the time than waste it asking riddles with no answers."

But this book cannot be left without quoting a very significant passage towards the end, which will need some little explaining away on the part of the author.

"It must be agreed that if English-speaking Democracy is to remain Democracy, it must be given leadership. And it must be given American leadership.

"This does not mean that America sees more clearly than Britain (*sic*) the need for a new system of total use. The converse may be nearer the fact. It only means that America must lead, because America is more powerful than Britain in both natural wealth and human energy. America is still young. That strength, which misapplied would make America head of English-speaking Fascism, will, when rightly applied, give America the power to chart a New Democracy for the English-speaking world.

"The British Commonwealth will accept this Democracy. [?] The common man will joyfully acclaim the new order. The head of the British Commonwealth will not oppose it."

This book is addressed to the American middle class. What outcome does Mr. Herridge expect? He is a Canadian.

B. M. P.

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: February 24, 1944.

EDUCATION BILL

Considered in Committee.

CLAUSE 12.—(*Establishment and discontinuance of county and auxiliary schools.*)

Mr. Hutchinson (Ilford): I beg to move, in page 10, line 4, after "manner," to insert:

"including notice to the county district councils for the area in which the school is situate."

This Amendment and the next one standing in my name—in line 6, after "proposals," to insert "and the council of any county district affected."—have for their purpose two things. The first is to ensure that where a proposal is made to establish a new county school or to maintain as a county school a school which has not hitherto been a county school, the local authority in whose district the school will be, or is, situated should be entitled to receive notice; secondly, that the local authority should be entitled to submit any objections which they might entertain to those proposals. Of those two things the first is, perhaps, of less importance than the second, and I hope, therefore, that the Parliamentary Secretary, or my right hon. Friend, will be able to meet us with regard to the second Amendment. It is important, that where it is proposed to establish a new school, or to discontinue any school which is already established, that the council of the

local authority should be entitled to submit any objections which they might entertain to that. Dealing with an earlier Amendment, the Parliamentary Secretary referred to the fact that town planning provision would be required for the establishment of a new school. The local authority in the area where the school is to be established is normally the town planning authority. Therefore, at a later stage, it would have an opportunity of making known its objections by refraining from making the necessary provision in its town planning scheme. I suggest that that is not a satisfactory form of procedure, and it would be very much better to short-circuit the whole business by providing in this Bill that if the local authority has objection to one of these proposals it should be permitted to make its objection at the same time as other persons make their objections when the proposal is first advertised.

Perhaps I might add this further point. The Parliamentary Secretary has also referred to the fact that school siting is a question of special importance to parents, and that it is desirable that parents should have special opportunities of making their wishes known. One way in which that can be done is through the council of their local authority. It usually happens that the local council are in a strong position to know what are the wishes of the population in their district in matters like this. . .

Mr. Butler. . . I think it would be wise not to press these Amendments as they stand, but to realise that under Part III of the First Schedule—where the scheme of delegation is referred to—it should be possible to reach agreement whereby, perhaps in some cases the council, and in other cases a broader organisation involving more than one council, would be brought in and have their views considered at the right time. If we do it in that way, we are much less likely to get into a muddle than by putting these broad and sweeping Amendments into the beginning of the Bill. That, I think, is the right way to consider it. . .

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Brooke (Lewisham, West): I beg to move, in page 10, line 19, at the end to insert:

“Provided that, if it is proved to the satisfaction of the Minister that a large number of parents are anxious that their children should attend a school as to which proposals have been submitted under subsection (2) of this section and that the funds for its erection will be forthcoming the Minister shall approve the proposal with such modification as aforesaid.”

. . . The Amendment I have moved is designed to give the Minister some guidance as to the decision he should take when proposals for the erection of a new school are submitted to him under the provisions of Sub-section (2) of this Clause, that is, proposals for an auxiliary school. The Committee will remember that the Government brought forward an Amendment of their own to Clause 8 which laid it down that local authorities, in drawing up their development plan, must have regard, among other things, to the wishes of parents. This Amendment corresponds with that Government Amendment, but, on a higher plane, because the Government, having laid down that guidance for local authorities, are now, if they do not accept this Amendment, leaving the position quite open as to how a future Minister will use the power given to him in Sub-section (4). The Minister receives the proposals for a new auxiliary school, and he receives all the objections and comments. How does he act? So long as we have the present Minister in office

I think the whole Committee would agree that he will act with perfect fairness and justice. But we have, throughout this Bill, to remember that the words, “the Minister,” will not always mean my right hon. Friend. We might have a Minister peculiarly friendly to denominational schools, who would accept all proposals for new auxiliary denominational schools. On the other hand, we might have a Minister peculiarly hostile, who might refuse to accept any of the proposals that were passed to him. The Committee ought not to let this passage in the Bill go by with such complete liberty to the Minister in his future decisions. I hope, therefore, that my right hon. Friend will be ready to accept this Amendment, which would require him and his successors to have regard to the wishes of a large number of parents in an area, where it was proposed that a new auxiliary school should be built.

[*Mr. Butler* refused to accept this Amendment on account of the vagueness of the phrasing.]

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

House of Commons: February 29, 1944.

BRITISH ARMY: JEWS

Captain Ramsay asked the Secretary of State for War how many Jews had been killed at the fronts to date.

Sir J. Grigg: I regret that these figures are not available.

Captain Ramsay asked the Secretary of State for War how many of the 40,000 Jews serving with His Majesty's Forces are in the guards, artillery, cavalry, infantry, tank corps and mechanised formations; how many are in the R.A.S.C., R.A.M.C., labour battalions and base details.

Sir J. Grigg: I regret that it would not be in the public interest to give these further particulars.

FOOD AND CLOTHING CONTRACTS

Captain Ramsay asked the Secretary of State for War what firms have the contracts at present for feeding and clothing His Majesty's Forces and for supplying boots to them.

Sir J. Grigg: I regret that it would not be in the public interest to publish such a list, which would be of value to the enemy.

House of Commons: March 1, 1944.

UNITED KINGDOM COMMERCIAL CORPORATION

Viscount Hinchinbrooke asked the President of the Board of Trade what are the names of the chairman, directors and managers of the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation; how many persons are in the direct employment of the Corporation; in what countries and in what broad classes of merchandise it operates; and what is the approximate annual turnover in imports to, and exports from, the United Kingdom respectively.

Mr. Dalton: The Board of Directors of the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation are: Chairman: Viscount Swinton; Acting Chairman: Sir Francis Joseph, Bt.; Directors: Mr. A. Chester Beatty, Mr. A. D. Campbell, Mr. G. A. McEwen, Mr. J. H. Hambro*, Captain J. A. Leighton*,

Mr. E. H. Lever, Mr. C. P. Lister*, Sir Frank Nixon*, Mr. L. C. Paton*, Mr. E. J. Shearer*.

*Managing Directors.

The number of persons in the direct employment of the Corporation at home and abroad on January 1, 1944, was 1,091. The Corporation operates in the following countries: Aden, Argentina, Ceylon, Cyprus, East Africa, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Libya, North Africa (French), Palestine, Persia, Portugal, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Tangier, Turkey, U.S.A., West Africa (French). The broad classes of merchandise which it handles are those required to fulfil Government programmes. It would not be in the national interest to publish figures showing the annual value of the trade handled by the Corporation.

House of Commons: March 2, 1944.

National Health Service Officers (Recruitment)

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Ian Fraser asked the Minister of Health if, in view of the need for an increased number of doctors and other trained persons to carry out the proposed National Health Service, he will consult with the appropriate Departments with a view to promoting a plan whereby suitable young men and women, when they leave the military forces, will be given financial help to enable them to qualify for this work.

Mr. Willink: The Committee on Further Education and Training, under the Chairmanship of Lord Hankey, is considering the whole field of recruitment into the various professions after the war, especially from the Services. I have submitted evidence to that Committee showing the probable needs of the services dealt with by my Department—including the new Health Service. Financial assistance will be available to suitable applicants under new Further Education and Training scheme.

Sir Ian Fraser: Can the right hon. and learned Gentleman explain the position in some publication, that would be of help to people in the Services? It will encourage them if they knew we are thinking about their future.

Mr. Willink: I shall certainly get in touch with the Committee on those lines.

Dr. Russell Thomas: Is the Minister aware that there are far too many doctors on the medical register already?

House of Commons: March 3, 1944.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE (CONTROVERSIAL LEGISLATION)

Sir E. Graham-Little asked the Prime Minister whether, in view of the pledge he gave in Parliament four months ago that the Government would not make far-reaching controversial changes not directly needed for the war effort until after a General Election and, in view of the controversial nature of the proposals for a national health service detailed in the White Paper just issued (Cmd. 6502), he will postpone legislation to give effect to these proposals until a General Election has pronounced its verdict upon them.

The Prime Minister: The assumption that these proposals are controversial in the sense of seriously dividing the forces now united for the purpose of winning the war can best be tested by obtaining the sense of the House upon them in Debate. This will become apparent in the ordinary course of Parliamentary Business.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED INVITE THE CO-OPERATION OF READERS OF *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* IN SECURING THE WIDEST POSSIBLE DISTRIBUTION OF

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

This work, which has appeared serially in *The Social Crediter*, is now published in one cover, price 2/-. Readers of *The Social Crediter* are aware of the exceptional difficulties placed in the way of the dissemination of ideas which are not shared by those upon whom responsibility for the present and past phases of the World War rests. They are to a lesser degree alive to the awakening will to effect a just relationship between power and policy. The forces working in antagonism to peace in freedom are well-informed concerning this resuscitation, and are doubtless confident that the immense resources of power at their exclusive disposal will suffice to defeat it.

THIS GREAT ISSUE WILL BE DECIDED BY THE SUFFICIENCY OR OTHERWISE OF THE OPPOSING WILL OF INDIVIDUALS ACTING AS SUCH.

FORTIFY IT. EQUIP IT.

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