

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 11.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 20, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

The Brief for the Prosecution

By C. H. DOUGLAS

In view of the urgency of the situation with which they deal, chapters from Major Douglas's forthcoming book are being printed in abridged form in THE SOCIAL CREDITER. Below is the text of Chapter II.

Francis Bacon, Earl of Verulam, may not have been the first man to apprehend our danger. But his emphasis upon the necessity of "restoring or cultivating a just and legitimate familiarity between the mind, and things" strikes a pure note of consciousness which establishes it as an authentic scripture. Confronted with some of the words around which so much of our modern politics revolve, such as "the State" or "the Nation" he would have instantly demanded to be led to him. A Queen he understood; but to be told that her condition (state, from *L. status*) could be, and should be separated from the person in occupation of it, would have appeared to him to be a gross superstition into which the barons at Runnymede were careful not to fall. To him, and to most of his contemporaries, everyone had a "condition." Their consequence was precisely measured by what they did with it. He understood the Doctrine of the Incarnation.

If Bacon had been told that the country's minerals were "nationalised" and he could have grasped some idea of the strange new word, he would probably have asked what the Queen could do with them. The statement that they *ought* to be nationalised he might have ridiculed as "being vertiginous, or in the way of perpetual rotation." But if told that the minerals were to be put at the disposal of a monopoly, he would have understood.

To put into contemporary terms the way his mind would have worked, we might say he would have asked "Do I get cheaper coal? More coal? Better coal? If I don't, is there some new, rapid, effective way by which I make my dissatisfaction felt upon those responsible? No? Then who is benefiting?"

He would have gone to the heart of the problem. He would have grasped at once that here was the Divine Right of Kings in operation, raising up this man, and putting down that. Two things would have concerned him. Where is the King? Is he doing a good job?

To leave the wise and witty Francis at this point to which he has led us, we can see that the transfer of powers and privileges from an individual to an organisation simply means the transfer of those powers and privileges to the persons controlling it. The organisation is an accommoda-

tion address. The police always suspect them. To call that organisation the State or the Nation, is quite legitimate if you are quite clear that you have put the Divine Right of Kings into commission. If you imagine that there is anywhere in the world either a democracy or any other system, which confers on Mr. John Citizen an effective control or a beneficial share in those powers which he has been persuaded or jockeyed into transferring from a tangible to an intangible executive, then you are labouring under what may quite possibly prove to be a fatal delusion.

At the time of writing these lines (January 1944) it is already evident that "monetary reform" is coming out of the wilderness into the most respectable circles. That is good. But the idea that John Citizen must automatically benefit thereby, is premature. Various well-meaning if somewhat naive organisations have stated, as though it were both axiomatic and desirable, that only "the State" has the "right" to issue purchasing power. That is the Divine Right of Kings complex once again. Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of "England" may be heard to murmur "Nationalisation? We welcome it." A much abler, if less theatrical banker, Sir Edward Holden, Chairman of the London, City & Midland Bank (Midland Bank) during the 1914-1918 war, when told that his policy was leading directly to nationalisation of banking, replied, "Well, I don't care. I should still manage it."

To put the matter quite shortly, transfer of power almost certainly means transfer of policy. We have seen the transfer of power. What is the policy? Whose is the policy?

The policy is MONOPOLY.

We shall see in the course of the following pages that its source can be identified within fairly narrow limits. It is preferable to establish its realistic implications, as well as the devices employed to bring it into actuality before concerning ourselves overmuch with personalities. They can wait.

Perhaps the most useful phrase in the lexicon of the world plotter or planner, is "common ownership." To the simple man "common ownership" means ownership divided amongst common men, of whom he counts himself. But any lawyer would tell him that common ownership means transfer of control to an administrator, who in theory, distributes the usufruct (not the thing "commonly owned," which must

on no account be touched by any one of the common owners). You, reader, are a common owner of the Post Office, which is nationalised. Go into the nearest branch, and remark that you will take your share in office pens, collect all the pens in sight, and move for the door. You will receive a lesson in common ownership.

You may now observe that as you are a common owner, either you ought to be served by the Post Office free of charge, or, alternatively, obtain your share of the usufruct in the form of a handsome dividend. The shareholders of the Bell Telephone Companies of America, which are not nationalised, do obtain such a dividend. The service is better, cheaper, and more flexible. There is an underground attack on the Bell Telephone system exactly similar to the attack on dividends in this country. If successful, which is unlikely, the American public will pay more for its telephones, receive no dividends, and get a worse service. But they will be "common owners." The distinction between joint shareholders and "common owners" should be noted.

You will be told, not merely by large "capitalists," but by their ostensible antagonists, the Labour-Socialists, that monopolies are inevitable, competition is wasteful, and "industry demands large units on the score of efficiency." You will be perhaps puzzled to find that the conflict in the economic world is not so much between cartels, monopolies and nationalised industry and property, as between all three and small businesses and privately owned property.

Let us not jump to conclusions. It is not difficult, as we shall see, to identify monopolisation, in its varying forms of cartel, "public corporation" on the model of the "B."B.C., the London Transport Board, or the Tennessee Valley Authority, or outright State ownership of the Russian type, as being a policy, not an automatic and inevitable process, as we are asked to believe. That by itself does not condemn it, although it does put it on the defensive. We are concerned to know whether the New Order is better, for the majority, than the Old. Let us begin by examining its claim to "efficiency."

In the days when London Clubs enjoyed a certain prestige, it used to be said of one of them that it was highly thought of by those who didn't belong to it. The word "efficiency" appears to have the same fascination to those numerous people who don't know its meaning, and believe it to be an adjective, rather than an abstract noun.

Efficiency, contrary to this widespread idea, is something capable of exact definition under certain circumstances, and completely meaningless in the absence of them. Generalised in a form suitable for application to political economy, it means the measure of success in exchanging something which you are prepared to sacrifice, for something which you prefer. It is clear that to have a meaning in political economy, you must have a unit common to "sacrifice" and "preference."

For example, fifty years ago, the British Railways were the finest in the world. It would be almost impossible to decide how efficient they were but if your 'preference' was rapid, frequent and comfortable travel, and your "sacrifice" was monetary, you obtained a high degree of "preference" for a small amount of "sacrifice." To say that all their conditions of employment were ideal would be absurd. Yet employment by them was highly coveted.

Nowadays, the British Railways are "rationalised," *i.e.*, approaching an absolute monopoly, and there is scarcely a graduate or professor of the London School of Economics who would not explain to you how much more efficient they are (we are considering, for the moment, pre-war conditions). The fares and rates were nearly double and the railways were agitating for more, the speeds were in the main lower than at the beginning of the century, and the service was less frequent, more congested, and was definitely deteriorating. The restaurant services were expensive and inferior, in contrast to the high standard and low charges of the old companies.

It is not difficult to see that the flat contradiction between the opinion of the man in the street, or the morning train, and that of the London School of Economics is due to a failure to agree on the object for which railways exist, and, more subtly, whether that object can be pursued without incommensurate loss. From the point of view of the traveller, the consumer, policy has been consciously and continuously directed to *lower* efficiency. From the point of view of the London School of Economics since monopoly is the objective, the efficiency has gone up in proportion to the centralisation of control and the expropriation of the shareholders. The average railway employee is now more concerned with politics than with railways.

Notice that this call for "efficiency" is pursued in the face of many contradictions and without definition of objectives.

Superficially, the contradictions appear almost naive. It is not twelve years ago since the whole world was ringing with the cry of "over-production," and sabotage and destruction of almost every description was in progress. But it should be remembered that *all the efficiencies sponsored by the London School of Economics and its Fabian-Planning associates aim at restriction of production from the point of view of the consumer*, in precisely the same manner that the grouped railways have restricted production (services) under the stress of propaganda for efficiency.

It may be convenient at this point to clarify an important factor which is often overlooked. The modern world in which we live derives its material character from technological advance in the industrial arts. It derives its social and political character, to an increasing extent from Socialist-Communist propaganda in the State schools and the Universities deriving their funds through endowments from shadowy "benefactors" whose policy is the complement of the Marxian Socialist. Nothing could be further from the truth than to imagine that such advance as has been made in civilised life has any connection with social and political progress. On the contrary the prime objective of Socialism and Cartelism is to batten on the technological advance to which it has contributed nothing, and to prevent this advance from achieving, as unrestricted it would have achieved, the emancipation of the human race from bondage. The more completely centralised in political organisation such countries as Germany and Russia have become, the more obviously technological advance has, firstly failed to benefit the general public, next, shown clear signs of itself coming under the law of diminishing returns, and finally, like a powerful drug misused, has plunged the world into convulsions of war and revolution.

Scottish County Councillors and "Vicious Tendencies"

The Perth and Kinross County Council at a meeting on May 8 referred back to its Public Health Committee a report on the Government White Paper embodying plans for a "National Health Service."

Heavy criticism of this plan came from County Councillors, and the *Perthshire Advertiser* begins its report of the proceedings by quoting Mr. D. J. Molteno's description of the proposals as "a most vicious attempt of the planners to interfere with the liberty of the subject and rush through a measure of a highly controversial nature while we are fighting for our lives."

Mr. Molteno said he wished it to be most clearly understood that while he condemned the proposed legislation he was not against an improvement or changes in the health services, which he realised needed overhauling and extension.

"What I do object to," he proceeded, "is the time chosen to bring in these extremely controversial reforms, if they can be called that, and the methods they have proposed for dealing with these reforms. It was most clearly stated by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons last October that nothing controversial that is not *bona fide* needed for the war would be dealt with by the Government. This statement should completely rule out this Bill which is unquestionably highly controversial and to which large numbers of doctors in the country are strongly opposed, while 16,000 doctors serving abroad have had no opportunity of expressing any opinion at all.

"Every section of the White Paper calls out for control and regimentation—doctors, hospitals, patients—are all to be regimented, gone will be the present relationship between doctor and patient, the State will form a third party in the contract, and I fear in spite of promises to the contrary the suggested schemes are bound to have this effect."

Many doctors considered, Mr. Molteno said, that the health services could be amply dealt with:—(1) By a revision and extension of the National Health Insurance system; (2) by a subsidy to deal with such defects as exist in the provision of medical facilities; (3) by improvement in social and environmental conditions.

"I don't say the White Paper hasn't many good points," said Mr. Molteno. "It undoubtedly has, but the broad policy which it expresses is almost indentially the same which was put into effect in Germany and which eventually proved a step towards national Socialism. So how can we follow such an example?"

Lord Mansfield seconded the motion to which Mr. Molteno was speaking. He said the main point stood really unchallengeable, that legislation of this bitterly controversial character ought not to be introduced at a time when so many people vitally affected by it, both from the point of view of patients and administrators, were not in a position to consider far less express a reasoned opinion upon it. The scheme he considered, had many vicious tendencies, some of them carefully concealed. It also showed signs of somewhat slapdash handling. A great deal more investigation on the part of public bodies was required.

Lord Provost Sir Robert Nimmo, Perth, questioned the

relevancy of Mr. Molteno's motion, pointing out that the Public Health Committee had asked the Council to accept its minute as an interim report. Mr. Molteno's motion was premature—the matter should be left in the hands of the Public Health Committee for further consideration. It was quite evident that there was inadequate knowledge regarding the effect of the proposals on Scotland. A new advisory committee had been set up and held its first meeting only a fortnight ago. Representatives of the County Councils' Association were on that Committee. There was no prospect of a Bill being drafted for many months to come because negotiations would take a long time. In considering that matter as a Local Authority they had to look at it from a Local Authority point of view. Doctors were in a different category and put their points of view otherwise. Mr. Molteno's motion was far too wide and introduced too many irrelevancies.

The county clerk, Mr. T. B. Marshall, ruled that the motion was in order.

Provost J. D. Haggart, Aberfeldy, suggested that the Public Health Committee should take the matter back and co-opt members from the various bodies concerned. He emphasised the importance of maintaining the voluntary principle.

Provost Liles, Callander, convener of the Public Health Committee, expressed himself as in agreement with Mr. Molteno's suggestion that the assistance of representatives of the various bodies affected should be sought in considering the matter.

The Council agreed to refer the question back to the Public Health Committee for further consideration, with power to consult representatives of the various services affected.

"IT MUST BE QUIETLY DONE"

Request has been made that the following, which appeared in *The Social Crediter* of February 7, 1942, should be repeated:—

"IT MUST BE QUIETLY DONE"

On March 5, 1907, the then Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, received a deputation from the Royal Anthropological Institute, The Sociological Society, the Childhood Society, The Royal College of Surgeons (England), the Royal Society (Edinburgh), The British Science Guild, and the Royal Statistical Society. It asked for a National Anthropometric Survey at a cost of £4,000 to £5,000 and was introduced by a Mr. Lehmann.

According to the verbatim report of the speeches published in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* for 1907, the Prime Minister said, among other things, "When you undertake to apply this sort of examination to adults and to the children of parents, you have to carry both the adults and the parents with you; and if you are supposed to be going too fast, or interfering too much, I can conceive that this thing would be rather set back than set forward... We must walk somewhat warily, because the least idea getting about that we are taking advantage of the children of the public schools to be made a plaything or an experiment upon, would be very fatal. Therefore it must be quietly done..."

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. 11.

Saturday, May 20, 1944.

NEGOTIATION?

In a mixed grill, one item is one man's first choice, another another's. The B.M.A. has issued its draft statement of policy on a National Health Service in the form of a Report of the Council to the "Representative" Body. Some of the main features of Dr. Hill's strategy, generally and in regard to the "representative" body, are evident from the few sentences which follow the opening sentence of the introduction to the Report. It is not necessary to analyse this, or any possible alternative, strategy here.

Many doctors who were, politically, as new-born lambs six months ago, are beginning to realise that politics, as they knew (or thought they knew) and detested it, is a mere façade for 'high' politics. Does the Report suggest that this initial degree of enlightenment has spread to the Council of the B.M.A.? This is important. Once a man knows that he is playing a game of skill, on the turn of which his own existence depends, of which he does not know even the rules, let alone the steps, there is only one course open to him, namely, *to stop*. What he does afterwards, though important, is relatively less important.

The Council of the B.M.A. is quite evidently determined to go on playing. Indeed, the strategy of the Report seems to have this as its primary objective, crying: "Kamerad, Kamerad! We will agree with all our critics! See, we will write it all down for them to read! And we will let them have a share in electing us to negotiate! Only let us draw up the statement to be approved by 'our' Representative Body in July (His Excellency The Minister can wait so long), and then we shall see how things look for you and the public when you and the public have seen how we have got on as negotiators!"

The Report ends with the words: "This is an issue of the freedom of the public rather than of the interests of the profession." And, as a concession to the B.M.A.'s critics, it is an ending pleasantly sentimental, no doubt; but as an indication that the B.M.A. knows what it is saying it is hardly convincing. Consider the statement:— "Whether or not the whole community is covered by this scheme, those who desire to obtain medical service privately should be absolutely free to do so from any doctor of their choice." This means that having paid once (or twice) out of taxation

for medical service under the scheme, the patient should be 'absolutely free' to pay for it (and get it) from any doctor of his choice. Why pay twice (or three times: once for 'controlled' doctor, once for the controlled doctor's controller, and once for the doctor the patient controls)?

If the B.M.A. is merely 'passing the buck' to the patient, it should obviously not be permitted to fill the centre of the picture as 'negotiator.' On the same principle as that which determines that white sheep eat more than black sheep, the patients could do better for themselves—there are more of them. Many of them have had a taste of 'direction to employment.'

Is the B.M.A. aware that, by another route, the Education Bill disposes of free choice of doctor? Therein is embodied the legal responsibility of a parent to cause his child to "receive efficient full-time education suitable to his age, ability and aptitude."

The educational 'negotiators' (bless them!) have finished their job: the captains and the kings have departed from the august presence of the Minister, *etc.* The House has wrangled and been licked. The Bill is within sight of being an Act. And there has already been published a White Paper on "The Principles of Government in Maintained Secondary Schools." We quote from it:—

"The abolition of tuition fees in all maintained schools will call for a re-examination of the method adopted for deciding the type of secondary education which individual pupils are to receive. It is important that the wishes of parents should continue to be taken into account, and effect given to them *in so far as is compatible with the attainments and promise of their children and with the claims of other children.* The Local Education Authorities alone will have all the data on which to reach a decision on these matters, and the ultimate responsibility for deciding which type of secondary education an individual pupil should follow *must therefore rest with them.*" (Our italics). Will the Health Minister not supply some of "all the data"? And the 'new' universities some more?

You don't 'negotiate' with an octopus. Still less do you negotiate with one of its tentacles.

The only step completely in keeping with the spirit of the Oath which still governs the conduct of a majority of living doctors would be the drafting of a comprehensive indictment of those, who, having laboured over many years to pervert and weaken it, are now seeking the overthrow of the established order of English Society. Some at least of the evidence should be in Tavistock House. If it is not, we shall be glad to assist it from its hiding place. And will the B.M.A. then use it? No. The forces which, by accident or design, it is assisting to develop have already impressed themselves upon its whole mind and constitution. T. J.

MR. AND MRS. GEOFFREY DOBBS

The wedding took place in London on Saturday last, May 13, of Dr. C. Geoffrey Dobbs and Miss Elizabeth Sedgley Edwards, Editor of *The Social Crediter* and Secretary to the Social Credit Secretariat.

PATRONAGE AND PARLIAMENT

With one or two minor excisions the following is the full text of a speech in the House of Commons on May 9, by Captain Cunningham-Reid which we record because though by no means exhaustive it directs attention to matters of fundamental importance in politics—and indicates the official reaction to their ventilation.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

Captain Cunningham-Reid (*St. Marlyebone*) speaking on the adjournment said: I am a little diffident at starting an Adjournment Debate at this late hour, because I have been particularly anxious not to abuse this certain half-hour concession that has been given to Private Members, but as my right hon. Friend, the Minister who is taking this Debate, has been good enough to stay, I shall proceed. I want to raise the question, of Parliamentary reform. Once upon a time I was an official member of a political party, but recently, by my political actions, I deliberately severed myself from any part. The natural inference to be drawn from that would be that I am against parties. On the contrary, I have no quarrel with the party system as such. My objection is that the party system has been carried too far, to the unjustifiable length of preventing the representatives of the people acting in Parliament in a way that they, and very often the majority of their constituents, think right. There was a glaring example only the other day, and there had been many examples before then. The example to which I am referring was when Members of Parliament were forced by the party managers to retract their decision concerning an increase of pay for certain women workers. It seems to me that there is a growing tendency for M.P.'s to be more members of parties and less Members of Parliament.

I am anxious to put both sides of this question. I believe that I would be stating the official Government case against more freedom of voting in Parliament if I were to say that as a Government have to go to the country if they have a series of minor defeats in quick succession, or if they have a defeat on a major issue, and that if all Government party M.P.'s voted in Parliament just as they pleased, the situation could well become intolerable from any Government's point of view, and injurious from the country's point of view. For, in the event of constant changes of administration, as might occur in such circumstances, there would be no continuity of national policy, and the same condition might prevail as did in France with such disastrous consequences. I hope that that will be considered a fair interpretation of the official case. Anyhow it sounds a plausible justification for the party Whips—that is to say, the party managers—demanding that Members of Parliament shall do what they are told, and not what they would sometimes like to do, as dictated by their consciences and the fitness of things.

The official explanation—and I have often heard it—is a cunning one, so much so that it is accepted by what one might even call undocile Members, those Members who resent being fettered. The result is that the Whips and other party functionaries often laugh up their sleeves because they know, just as many Members know, that that time-worn excuse for demoralising M.P.'s does not bear close examination. They also know that an alternative workable procedure could be arranged by a very simple Parliamentary reform. There may be several ways of dealing with this, but here is

one. I have discussed this method with one or two people who know considerably more about procedure than I do, and I am informed there is no reason why it should not work. It should be recognised that the only adverse vote upon which a Government would be expected to resign would be if they did not carry a vote of Confidence in the Government as a whole, and that in no circumstances should any such Vote of Confidence in the Government as a whole be linked up with the particular detail of Government policy that the majority by their votes did not approve of.

The following would be the course of events. When the Government was defeated in the Division Lobby on any issue, that Vote to be followed by a definite Vote of Confidence in the Government as a whole, on the understanding that, if they were defeated on that, there would either be a new Government or a General Election would be called. If not defeated, the Government would bow to the will of the House on the particular issue in question and carry on, or, if the Government were still anxious to have their way on the issue upon which they were originally defeated, they would reintroduce it, not as a Vote of Confidence, but in the ordinary way, and, if again defeated, it would then be the Government's responsibility whether they accepted such a determined wish of the majority of the House on this particular matter or whether they preferred to consult the majority outside the House. In that case, they might look very silly and lose much support, having just received a Vote of Confidence in their stewardship as a whole from the representatives of the people in Parliament.

The proposed revised procedure would mean that staunch supporters of the Government could, by their vote, defeat some particular aspect of the Government's programme without necessarily right away jeopardising the life of that Government, and their attitude would be made clear when, subsequently, they supported a Vote of Confidence in the Government as a whole...

I know full well that this question of Parliamentary reform cannot be adequately dealt with in a short Adjournment Debate... I am merely employing this occasion as what one might term a trailer, which I hope will have the effect of bringing to the House, and possibly to the Minister in charge, the desirability of time being given, possibly after Whitsun, for a full Debate on this subject. I am not asking the Minister to-day for any long reply, but I am asking him that he will be so good as to convey what I have said, and what I am going to say, to the Leader of the House...

The simple voting procedure that I have outlined would do away with that constant General Election bogey which the Whips have used for so long and so effectively to justify their despotic control. Nobody could possibly complain—and it is essential that there should be Whips—if they confined their persuasions of M.P.s. to vote in a certain direction by using persuasion which was fair. It will be agreed that an M.P. very properly has not the right or the power to

say to his electors, "Unless you vote for me, you will not get on in your career, in fact, however efficient you are, I can, and shall, see to it that you are not to be given a chance, or, alternatively, if you vote for me, I will advance your financial and social position, and possibly both." Such a practice would be most immoral but it is exactly what happens in Parliament. The people whose job it is to persuade Members of Parliament to vote in a certain direction are the same people who have the power to make them support the Government. The Government Whips have it in their power constantly to threaten the representatives of the people with a General Election and other dire penalties such as taking away from a Member at a subsequent election the support of a powerful party machine or possibly the letter of endorsement from a popular Prime Minister. But the power of the Government Whips only starts there. It is they who make recommendations for Government jobs and it is the Chief Whip, alias the Patronage Secretary, who doles out the patronage.

The boys in the back room have a bun for practically every taste. If the recipient would be content with a minor civilian decoration, they can provide it. It may be a knighthood, it may be a marquisate, it may be a governorship abroad or a lord lieutenantcy—they have got them all. They can cater for the vanity and the ambition of practically any man. Surely the time is long overdue when the Government party Whips should most certainly be completely divorced from patronage. Patronage, if we must have it, should be left entirely to the Lord Chamberlain's Office, where a special permanent commission should be established, charged solely with preferment. It would be composed of men and women of integrity, as far removed from the political arena as possible, and this commission would take over the patronage power now possessed by the Party Whips and make recommendations to the Lord Chamberlain. The various established political parties would make suggestions to the commission as would other accredited bodies, but the commission would be under no obligation to accept those recommendations, which it would only do after the most careful scrutiny. They would make recommendations for all civilian honours, including lord lieutenantships and suchlike. Where admissions to the peerage were deemed necessary, for parliamentary purposes, the commission should determine the elevations.

Anyhow, this procedure would have this effect, it would check the practice of handing out rewards to party hacks. That national honours should be handed out for party services—

Earl Winterton: On a point of Order, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. I desire to ask you how far it is in Order in this House to discuss patronage by the Crown? . . .

I submit that all the hon. and gallant Member is entitled to do is to deal with the question of recommendation, and that by the use of the words "dispensing honours" he suggests that the Crown acts solely on the advice of the Whips.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That, of course, would be quite out of Order.

Captain Cunningham-Reid: I will put it another way, for the benefit of the Noble Lord. The Whips, being relieved of, shall I say, their virtual power to recommend honours, and in most cases of having those recommendations

accepted, the ordinary Member of Parliament, having no designs on becoming a Minister, would be less inclined to submit to a tyranny that brooked little advantage to himself and even less to the nation. Many such Members would, possibly, revert to the city or the backwoods from whence they came, and the Whips would be restricted to exercising their reactionary compulsion on Members dominated mainly by the hope of office and to their proper function which, I maintain, is to arrange Government business in Parliament. As things are now, if a party M.P. persists in being politically progressive and keeps abreast of our times he will very likely run foul of his Whips' Office, in which case he will be for the "high jump," as has occurred to many distinguished Members of this House . . .

Parliament to-day is run too much by the party caucuses and not enough by the representatives of the people as, I understand, was originally constitutionally intended. The majority of key Government positions to-day are not filled by the best that the country can provide, but are filled by the best party men. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Had our country not been ruled by the privileged inefficients produced by our peculiar party system Germany would never have been allowed to rearm and it is possible that this war might not have taken place.

Mr. Ellis Smith (Stoke): Who supported rearmament? Who was a member of the Anglo-German fellowship?

Captain Cunningham-Reid: Anyhow I was not a member. The abuse of our political system has a lot to account for. For years now it would appear that Governments have taken advantage of the people's political ignorance. If only the public could learn the lessons of the past and realise what is the grim prospect for the future unless they bestir themselves and prod Parliamentarians from their Rip Van Winkle lethargy and insist that we put our House in order.

The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Ernest Brown): . . . I shall convey to my colleagues the interest that hon. Members show in Parliamentary procedure, if, indeed, that were necessary. As a matter of fact, ever since 1932 we have had continuous inquiries into Parliamentary procedure, quite rightly, because there is nothing more vital to the working of democratic institutions than to make sure that they are flexible and adapted to changing events and changing times. I should like, coming to the hon. and gallant Gentleman's general remarks, to say that he is not progressive or any friend of democracy, who does two things, first of all sets out to disparage Parliamentary institutions and, second to disparage the men who work Parliamentary institutions. He seems to think that he is the only man who has been independent. I myself at one period threw over my Whips and my party and went alone. I never complained . . .

"DISAPPEARING" MONEY

No. 1 of *The Neo-Economist* (San Antonio, Texas), is the latest exponent of the "disappearing money"-system, one of whose objectives is to solve "the problem of unemployment." We are glad to see that they dissociate themselves from the proposals of the "Social Credit-New Democracy Party," and shall be gladder still when they dissociate themselves from Social Credit.

To Free Us From Freedom

The *Daily Express* of May 10 provided a neat, but doubtless unintentional, illustration of two of the arts of government which give rise to a minimum of irritation when not perceived and are all the more exasperating when the reader spots them. They both consist essentially in labelling things with the wrong label; but resemble each other in scarcely any other respect.

There is now a much larger number of people who see through one of these propagandist devices, and, at whatever small risk there may be of depriving a noble truth-teller of his livelihood by naming it, it is the labelling of what is obviously true and important as trivial and comic, as when "Beechcomber" (note the subtle suggestion of Bohemian irresponsibility, justly visited with disrepute and indigence), is permitted to say that the seaside lodging house will probably be the only independent thing left in English life in 10 years time, and that there will always be holiday mokers [sic] who would rather organise their own holidays than have everything planned for them. Perhaps the "mokers" was an afterthought of a too-terrified sub-editor, and there are limits even to the freedom of the 'jester'.

As though to underline the contrast intended to be presumed by the reader, this natural and spontaneous observation was placed on the leader-page next to an article which asks 'why we let the Dons grab the land?'

The article is a stirring appeal for "freedom"—freedom for 500,000 young men who "may well ponder now whether they will allow these seats of learning to be their master, or whether, when they come home, they will demand that the universities confine themselves to their studies and take less interest in the ownership of the land."

As though they were not aware of grievances enough, a fresh grievance is pressed upon the notice of the readers of the *Daily Express* (a minority of whom have probably never looked upon even the outside of either of the ancient universities, and may therefore be disposed to be resentful of their 'privilege,'—and, to the under-privileged, the only thing worth while about a privilege is losing it: as the newspaper has it: "the British taxpayer regards privilege with a jaundiced eye.")

The argument is very silly. It is this, stripped of verbiage: that the wicked dons of Oxford and Cambridge can go into farming and make money in competition with the men in the armed forces *because the land they buy is exempted from taxation and death duties!* If I wanted to buy or to rent land, I should expect to buy or rent it at market price. And if I wished to do better than that, I should stand a better chance of succeeding with a vendor or lessor who could allow his heart to be softened by my appeal than with one who could not let his heart be softened because of his bill for taxes. However, during the war the universities of Oxford and Cambridge (and there are others) have been buying land, and in some cases they or the colleges composing them have bought land to a value greater than their revenue from land they already owned. But the writer of the article, Mr. Michael Stuart, thinks, or pretends to think, that somehow good would come from taxing the universities and colleges on their estate incomes and from punishing them for not dying like ordinary people every fifty years or so, by a "jubilee tax, roughly equivalent to death duties" to be paid

up every fifty years.

An interesting argument at a time when a cry for State ownership is being raised in conjunction with a campaign for "free" education for all (and maintenance) out of taxation! Mr. Stuart seems to have heard somewhere that "it is the taxpayer who ultimately foots the bill" for taxation; but he cannot, or does not want to recognise tax-exemption as the opposite of taxation. And, lest the point should occur even to himself, he drags in the farmer at this point, and suggests that if the tax-payer had not 'ultimately' to suffer a tax exemption "there would then be nothing unfair in the competition of these corporate bodies" (i.e. the corporate bodies of farming dons?)

What chiefly confers freedom on individuals is ownership of property, and, while not indestructible absolutely, the least destructible form of property is land.

It follows that what freedom the universities have is most secure in proportion as they own property, that the form of property most favourable to indestructibility of their freedom is landed property, and that the freedom is enhanced to the degree to which the "ownership" is not subject to limitation by money claims against the owners.

So the *Daily Express* article is not a plea for fair treatment of demobilised soldiers who want to go farming. It is a plea for transferring university freedom to a foundation less secure and substantial than that upon which it is now based. Even now something intervenes to prevent the free use of the Universities' freedom. But a greater limitation is designed for them—in the name of freedom! And, since Mr. Stuart can think of no victim nearer the universities than the hypothetical soldier-farmer in quest of a holding, it is he who must be made to serve as a vehicle for discontent. Besides changing the label on the bottle, you can change the bottle under the label. Mr. Stuart's article should open some eyes at Oxford, if nowhere else.

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: May 10, 1944.

HOUSING: PREFABRICATION

Mr. Hugh Lawson asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works if he will erect a small number of prefabricated steel houses in various parts of the country for immediate occupation so that the opinions of the occupants may be sampled before mass production starts.

Mr. Hicks: The prototype had to be constructed by hand, and it will therefore not be possible to arrange for the erection of a number in various parts of the country for occupation before production starts.

Mr. Hugh Lawson: Can the Parliamentary Secretary make arrangements for at least one or two more of these houses to be built, so that they may be lived in by ordinary people before the job goes into mass production?

Mr. Hicks: The Ministry of Health is now responsible for distributing the tickets to view, and this has been designed to ensure that representatives from all areas should have an opportunity of viewing the house. I am afraid that, at the present time, I am unable to entertain the suggestion that more should be built for the purpose of enabling people to live in them before it is decided to go into production.

BRITISH AID TO RUSSIA

The Prime Minister made a statement in the House of Commons on May 10 in reply to a question by Colonel Lyons whether, "in view of the information which has been published as to the supplies of material and munitions of war from the U.S.A. to Russia" he would publish detailed particulars of the assistance rendered by Great Britain and the Empire countries.

The following list was circulated in the Official Report (*Hansard*). The figure "probably excludes what was lost" (The Prime Minister); and "owing to the wide variety of their nature, specific reference has not been made to all categories of supplies":—

SUPPLIES TO U.S.S.R. DESPATCHED BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 1941, TO MARCH 31, 1944.

1. MILITARY SUPPLIES.

(a) Armaments and Military Stores.

Tanks: Since October, 1941, 5,031 tanks have been supplied, of which 1,223 were Canadian built.

Vehicles (includes lorries and ambulances): 4,020.

Machinery lorries: 216.

Bren Carriers and Starters and Chargers: 2,463 (including 1,348 from Canada).

Motor Cycles: 1,706.

Weapons:

800 P.I.A.T., with ammunition.

103 Thompson sub-machine guns.

636 2-pdr. anti-tank guns.

96 6-pdr. anti-tank guns.

3,200 Boys anti-tank rifles.

2,487 Bren guns.

581 7.92 m.m. Besa guns.

Ammunition:

85,000 rounds P.I.A.T.

19,346,000 rounds .45-in. machine gun.

2,591,000 rounds 2-pdr. anti-tank gun.

409,000 rounds 6-pdr. anti-tank gun.

1,761,000 rounds .55 in. Boys anti-tank rifle.

75,134,000 rounds .303-in. rifle.

51,211,000 rounds 7.92 mm. tank gun, Besa.

G.L. Equipment:

(a) Mark II: 302 sets.

(b) Mark III: 15 sets British; 29 sets Canadian.

Cable: 30,227 miles telephone cable.

(b) Naval Supplies:

9 Mine-sweeping trawlers.

3 Motor mine-sweepers.

102 Asdics.

3,006 Mines.

50 Vickers 130 mm. guns.

603 Anti-aircraft machine guns.

40 Submarine Batteries.

(c) *Aircraft (Fighters).*—Total despatched 6,778 aircraft, including 2,672 aircraft sent from U.S.A. These were sent on United States Lend/Lease to U.S.S.R., as part of the British commitment, in exchange for a supply of British aircraft to U.S. forces in the European theatre.

2. RAW MATERIALS, FOODSTUFFS, MACHINERY AND INDUSTRIAL PLANT.

(a) *Raw Materials.*—The greater part of these supplies have been bought from Empire sources. Over the last 2½ years we have sent:

30,000 tons of aluminium from Canada [£3,038,000].

2,000 tons of aluminium from United Kingdom [£720,000].

27,000 tons of copper from Canada [£1,431,000].

10,000 tons of copper from United Kingdom [£620,000].

\$4,672,000 worth of Industrial Diamonds, mainly from African production [£1,168,000].

80,924 tons of jute from India [£3,687,000].

81,423 tons of rubber from the Far East and Ceylon [£9,911,000].

8,550 tons of sisal from British East Africa [£194,000].

3,300 tons of graphite from Ceylon [£160,000].

28,050 tons of tin from Malaya and United Kingdom [£7,774,000].

29,610 tons of wool from Australia and New Zealand [5,521,000].

TOTAL VALUE of these and other raw materials: £39,115,000.

(b) *Foodstuffs.*—These include: Tea from Ceylon and India; Cocoa beans, palm oil and palm kernels from West Africa; ground-nuts from India; coconut oil from Ceylon; pepper and spices from India, Ceylon and British West Indies.

TOTAL VALUE of all foodstuffs supplied: £7,223,000.

(c) *Machine Tools, Industrial Plant and Machinery.*—These form the principal direct contribution from United Kingdom production to civil supplies for the U.S.S.R. Since the entry of Russia into the war, the following have been provided:

Machine Tools—£8,218,000.

Power Plant—£4,250,000.

Electrical Equipment—£3,314,000.

Miscellaneous Industrial Equipment—£1,980,000.

Various types of Machinery—£3,019,000 (e.g. Telephone equipment, food processing plant, textile machinery, port and salvage equipment).

TOTAL VALUE OF (c): £20,781,000.

GRAND TOTAL OF CIVIL STORES MADE AVAILABLE TO U.S.S.R. BY THE UNITED KINGDOM FROM ALL SOURCES: £77,185,000.

3. *MEDICAL SUPPLIES AND COMFORTS.*—The public have contributed some of the funds for these supplies. Since October, 1941, £3,047,725 has been spent through charitable organisations on surgical and medical items and clothing. In addition, His Majesty's Government have made a grant of £2,500,000 for clothing, nearly all of which has been spent.

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/-

The Problem of the Medical Profession

A Political Primer for Patients and Doctors

by B. W. M.

1/-

British Medicine and Alien Plans

by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.

(With an Appendix by B.W.M.)

1/-

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