

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 13. No. 6.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"To suggest, as has been done recently by persons in the United States who are grossly ignorant on the subject, that such an [Indian] army is a purely mercenary one, is a calumny of the vilest sort."

—Major Sarabit Singh Kalha, I.A., at the East Indian Association, October 3.

The Communist Party worked solidly with the Financiers in Australia to obtain a "Yes" vote in the recent Referendum held for the purpose of centralising political power in Canberra, and rendering the Australian Provincial Governments helpless.

J. T. Lang, once leader of the Labour Party, but now its most capable opponent, states in so many words that the Communist control Mr. Chifley, the ultra-Conservative Finance Minister (Commonwealth Treasurer), and, in an article in the (Australian) *Century* magazine, writes "The Communists have adopted the Russian view of totalitarian rule through national planning. The Government's post war planners have the same viewpoint."

Well, you have been warned. It's world wide. And it will go on until the Planners instead of the Planned, get hurt.

Petrol rationing in the United States has brought rackets into operation, similar to those in the prohibition era. Gangsters supply tickets to filling stations at 75 cents for five gallons and the customer pays 75 cents (3/-) per gallon, instead of 20 cents, and is quite happy about it. The customer then becomes marked for blackmail.

As in the case of prohibition, the gangsters are working solidly for the continuance of rationing. There is no real shortage of petrol in the United States, and none here.

The American Press appears to be going out of its way to turn feeling, e.g., in Australia, against the Americans. We have fairly strong views ourselves on the most-favoured nation situation, but we should have thought that the obvious course for the beneficiaries of the war would have been to play the situation down while raking in the chips. The only conclusion that seems to fit the facts is that the press is largely "German" controlled, and is preparing to establish the U.S.A. at the peace table as the protector of down-trodden Germany.

We have just been regarding contemplatively a map of Europe published by Field Publications, U.S.A. Each theatre of war has a twin flag on it.

At Toulon, the Stars and Stripes floats *over* the tricolore; in Italy it floats *over* the Union Jack, in Northern France it floats *over* the Union Jack (not over the tricolore).

Waal, waal, waal.

"The Nazis are in an utter frenzy. We have late news. The terror is widespread, and is mostly directed against upper and middle-class conservatives. Men, women, and even children of the best-known aristocratic families have been imprisoned on the least suspicion. . .

"The Nazis themselves are bolshevizing Germany as fast as they can. . . They say all the disasters are due to 'aristocratic swine generals'—they abuse the Officers Corps beyond belief."—*Review of World Affairs*, September 26, 1944, p.5.

Compare this with the attack in certain Jewish-controlled newspapers and books on British Officers.

Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy.

It is important to an understanding of the general situation to grasp the fact that the ideology of Communism is a mere fly-trap. Communism is a political party whose objective is power, and much like the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan, is all things to all men.

You will never be prevented from joining the Communist Party if you vote right.

Once the various movements, Stalinism, Communism, National Socialism, P.E.P.-Mond-Turnerism, "Commonwealth" C.C.F.-ism have achieved what they mean to achieve—absolute world power—you can think and believe what you like. It won't make any difference to what will happen to you.

There are more Jews, more "German" Jews, and considerably more important "German" Jews in New York, than in the whole of Germany. Half a dozen flying bombs on New York would create the greatest panic in history. Without taking risks any greater than have constantly been taken by the Germans, they could have bombed or shelled New York. Not a bomb, not a shell has been dropped from a German source on New York. How the Hitler Socialists do hate the Jews, don't they?

"It was Jewish charity that kept Adolf Hitler afloat all those years. Thanks to his conspicuous name and rather Semitic exterior, he gained admission to Jewish-endowed night shelters. His sister Paula, found a job in the Vienna Jewish Hospital."—*Parade*, June, 1940.

And now, Clarence, do you think that "Hitler" will be tried as a War Criminal?

The Watcher on the Threshold

A very old friend of mine told me recently that he feared *The Social Crediter* could never become a popular paper. He had shown a copy of it to an acquaintance who had promptly consigned it with horror to the salvage. A virtuous citizen takes up his morning mail, sees a copy of a paper unfamiliar to him, and finds on investigation that there are people who are not afraid of exposing the anatomy and pathology of the present situation. The exposure is to him indecent, and he reads no further. And it is just as well. Nothing could be less desirable than a large circle of half-baked amateur politicians who imagine themselves to be "Social Crediters." *C'est le premier pas qui coute*, and we do not intend to assist that step forward by so much as an inch.

Readers of Lytton's *Zanoni* will remember the terrible "Watcher on the Threshold," the phantom horror who had to be fought and conquered before there could be any approach to reality. What exactly Lytton had in mind by the use of this imagery I am not sure; but I shall take the liberty of believing that he was more intuitive than most novelists.

The Watcher is there all the time. To the vast majority he is completely and forever invisible. While the organ man is grinding out the tune, the children sing in Spain and the sailor sings of ropes and things in ships upon the seas. It is a delusion that the unaware are also unhappy. They are the dear good souls who just go on being good farmers, good negroes or good washerwomen—you will find them wherever there is a straightforward job of work to be done to which illiteracy is no bar. At this point some new readers may be looking around for the W.P.B. Let me hasten to explain that to me "illiterate" means "without letters," not without knowledge or capacity.

The people to be pitied are those who have seen the Watcher and have tried to forget him. Because it can't be done. No sky-high pile of salvage is sufficient to bury him, no fire hot enough to destroy. As Lytton tells, he returns when least expected, gliding among the dancers, standing beside the bride. There is only one way to deal with such a phantom. And to those who have not found it, we have nothing to say.

At this distance of time I may confess that I was once a student in the London School of Economics, for it was a very long time ago and only for a little while. At that period no other London college offered a comparable course in geography. The London School was not slow to recognise the strategical advantages of this. Readers of Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs's recent article, *Planning the Earth*, will understand the importance to the planners of cornering geographical knowledge, so far as the Universities are concerned. The founders of modern geography both in school and university were Mackinder and Fairgrieve.

The work on large-scale maps at the School was intensely interesting. It seems fairly obvious that a small-scale map is an intellectual conception that is only of value to the highly trained mind; and the placing of such diagrams before young children (and they can be no more than diagrams) is probably responsible for the fact that in the minds of many adult citizens India is no more than a pink peardrop. But apart from the large-scale-map-work the course was even

then suspect to me, and one incident I shall never forget. The lecturer, a typical woman encyclopaedist, who had been dealing with the spread of peoples across Europe, stated her view that most troubles in this planet were due to uncontrolled increases of population coupled with strong religious belief. No woman, of course, could possibly hold such a view without having first denied her own nature; but at the time this did not occur to me, nor had I ever heard the words "Every policy has a philosophy." But a young girl who had failed in her previous examination, her eyes sparkling with indignation, exclaimed "Why shouldn't they be born if they can have happy lives?" Why not, indeed. The battle continued for some minutes without either side giving way: all acid frigidity on one side and anger on the other. But it was the encyclopaedist who saw the Watcher, and betrayed it by every word she spoke.

Zanoni is Lytton's study of the various states of mind which made the French Revolution possible. It is incomplete and obscure in some ways; but its value lies in the clear realisation of the fact that the encyclopaedist heresy is inseparable from fear. Fear of life, death and love—fear of religion and freedom. The "toleration" which the Encyclopaedists have so consistently advocated is fear of a definite course of action. And there is one man whom they will never tolerate—the man who is able to synthesise the situation and is therefore beyond fear of it.

Those who rule by fear are themselves victims of a terror lest they may cease to "lead." It should not be forgotten that they reproduce themselves through the educational system. Belief in the "Fuehrer Prinzip" may be widely inculcated by quite a few determined people.

In the story, Lytton tells how those who overcome the Watcher are never again afraid. But to develop this idea further might perhaps add something to the allegory that the novelist did not intend. Read it for yourself, and if you can bear with his prose style—I find this difficult after Fielding and Swift—then I think you will agree that he knew a good many things which have been conveniently forgotten by the lecturers of the London School. Lytton was near enough to the French Revolution to see something beyond the tumult. The book ends with the death of Robespierre.

B. M. P.

Recent Publications

Programme for the Third World War

by C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 2/-

The Beveridge Plot

by C. G. D.

Price 3d.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

Parliament

COAL INDUSTRY

House of Commons: October 3, 1944.

American Report

Major Thorneycroft asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether he has received the final Report of the American Mining Section of the Combined War Resources Board upon the coal industry in this country.

Major Lloyd George: Yes, Sir.

Major Thorneycroft: Can the right hon. and gallant Gentleman make a copy of the Report available in the Library?

Major Lloyd George: I cannot say yet.

Mr. Shirwell: Is it not true that this Report contains a very serious indictment of the whole organisation of the mining industry in this country; that it exonerates the miners from all blame; and, in view of its importance in regard to the future of British industry in general, is it not desirable that hon. Members should be acquainted with the facts?

Major Lloyd George: At the moment the position is not quite what my hon. Friend suggests. A summary has been issued, by agreement on both sides, that is, between the Americans and ourselves. My hon. Friend will appreciate that we are not the only parties to this Report. Up to date the agreement has been to issue a summary, and that has been done.

Major Thorneycroft: Whatever this Report may or may not contain, is it not desirable that we should have it? What conceivable objection is there to making the whole Report and not a summary available, so that those interested in this very important matter of coal can have the benefit of seeing the views of experts?

Major Lloyd George: I am prepared to consider that. I only want to repeat that it is not a matter which is in my hands alone. This is a report which applies to both sides of the Atlantic and at the moment the agreement is that we should only publish a summary. I am prepared to look into the matter but at the moment I cannot say any more.

Mr. Shirwell: Will the right hon. and gallant Gentleman agree to publish such part of the Report as refers exclusively to the organisation of the British mining industry and we will concern ourselves with our own business and let the Americans themselves look after theirs?

Major Lloyd George: It is American business as well as ours, but I am prepared to consider the matter. I repeat that it is not a matter for us alone.

GERMANY (REPARATIONS AND INDEMNITIES)

Mr. Thorne asked the Prime Minister whether the Government have considered with the Allies the amount of indemnity that the German Government will have to pay when they have been defeated and the question of reparations; and what was the total amount of indemnity and reparations which the German Government were called upon to pay at the end of the last war.

The Prime Minister: No decisions have as yet been reached by the Allies as to the question of the payment of

reparations and indemnity by Germany. We have a considerable mass of experience on record. After the last war the German Government were called upon to pay a fixed annuity of £100,000,000 gold and a variable annuity equal to 26 per cent. of the value of German exports, together with further annuities, the payment of which was postponed. As my hon. Friend is aware, these figures were afterwards modified and reduced almost to vanishing point. Also, loans of nearly £2,000,000,000 sterling were given to the Germans by the American, and to some extent by the British public, none of which were repaid, and on balance the Germans did better out of it than the others. We must not imitate that this time.

GENERAL ELECTION (OVERSEAS FORCES)

Sir H. Williams: Was Mr. J. B. Priestley's symposium last night the first part of the Common Wealth campaign.

Mr. Shirwell: Can my right hon. Friend say whether the Government know what the issues at the next General Election are likely to be.

The Prime Minister: I should think that broadly we can see how matters are shaping themselves. As to the broadcast referred to, I was fortunate in having other engagements at the time.

House of Commons: October 5, 1944.

BRITISH NATIONALITY (ENEMY ALIENS)

Mr. H. Morrison said... naturalisation has had to be suspended except as regards applications from British born women and a few exceptional cases where an individual's immediate naturalisation is required in the national interest for special purposes connected with the war effort.

Sir J. Lucds asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if the children of refugees from Nazi oppression who have only been granted temporary hospitality in this country acquire British nationality by reason of having been born in this country.

Mr. H. Morrison: Yes, Sir. The national status of persons born in His Majesty's Dominions is not affected by the fact that their parents may only be there temporarily.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING BILL

Sir H. Williams said... the question at issue in this Clause is, whether it is, on general grounds, desirable that a Minister shall say to a local authority, "You have got to sell your land"? That is what this Sub-section means. That implies either a lease or a sale. Surely, under that head, we are entitled to consider the respective merits of the other interests, in other words, to consider whether a town council is a better landlord than a private individual. I have not the slightest doubt that I would much rather be the tenant of a private individual than of a local authority. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen sitting behind me are so beset with prejudice that they will not examine the facts. The local authority, as I have said, is under the statutory duty to exact the last farthing from anybody. They are not entitled to be considerate landlords. Their duty is to get all they can. I was going to use the analogy between the State and

(continued on page 7)

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. 13: No. 6.

Saturday, October 14, 1944.

The Big Idea

Every indication points to the Ministry of Fuel and Power as being a focal point of the P.E.P.-Mond-Turner plot. The snatching of the coal, the centralisation of petrol, paraffin, gas and electricity in a Ministry headed by the son of a Solicitor to the Zionist Movement is hardly likely to be adventitious. The whole economic and domestic life of the country is at the mercy of this organisation, which came into existence unobtrusively, yet with a fully prepared staff. It is very dangerous indeed. It must be smashed up.

It is already becoming obvious, as anyone could have foreseen, that one of the most serious anxieties of the Russian ruling junta is the effect on Russian troops of their entry into civilised countries. Every disinterested commentator has remarked on the amazing ignorance of the general population as to the conditions outside the sway of the Soviets, and it is not impossible that the marked disinclination of the Russians to invade East Prussia may be, in part, due to this influence.

The Times of September 30 indicates the line, which hardly seems likely to be very effective, that is being taken as Russian soldiers enter Roumania. Quoting an anonymous Russian war correspondent who adjured the Red Army in slightly hysterical terms, "Your eyes will be dazzled by much shoddy, sparkling, trash. Don't believe this mirage of artificial civilisation; look into the heart of the land, into the people's soul," it remarks that "great interest has been aroused in Moscow." We can imagine without difficulty, having low tastes, the remark of Sergeant Tompkins, of the Loamshire Light Infantry, on being exhorted to look into the German people's soul.

Although the danger to Socialism of educating the Russians by experience is probably more important ultimately than is generally realised, there is little difficulty in apprehending the dominant Russian objective in slowing up the war effort. It is to keep the war going indefinitely, while Russia's Fifth Column, in this country particularly, uses "war or threat of war" to establish beyond hope of release the grip of the Finance-Labour-Socialist bureaucracy with the World Sanhedrim behind it. It is, of course, this factor which makes the "Unconditional surrender" formula so dangerous. The World Plotters know quite well and quite correctly, that this crisis will only be resolved by turning national war into cultural war, and they also realise, equally correctly, that only war will marshall an effective majority into the ranks of "Labour" and enable them to hypnotise this temporary

"Labour majority" into the idea that it is a "class." The Trades Union Congress, one of the most dangerous cartels in the world, has only to look at its assets, which have increased more than £30,000,000 since 1939 to know that war is its most profitable activity.

We quite realise that Mr. Churchill is entirely impervious to advice from any quarters other than those which have enabled him to reach the pinnacle of his ambition. But if some of his immediate circle could induce him to put a little more finesse into his entirely justifiable determination to put the Germans where they belong, we think he would be in a better position to deal with the next war.

Exports and Imports

The following letter appeared in the *Scotsman* of October 4:—

Fearnan, by Aberfeldy, September 30, 1944.

The Editor, *The Scotsman*,

Sir,

I appreciate the moderation of the letter of your correspondent "Aqua Vitae," but he is evidently unable to get away from the obsession that our problem is a material, rather than, as is the case, a political one.

If the U.S.A. was a self-supporting community in 1929 (as largely, she was) she was a self-supporting community in 1933. Neither the people, the country, nor the plant underwent any material change. But in 1929, the people of the U.S.A. touched the heights of the greatest material prosperity any people ever reached. In 1933, at least a third of the country was on relief, famine and misery were widespread and the country was on the verge of revolution.

The only discernible difference between the conditions during the depression in Great Britain, the allegedly non-self-supporting country, and those obtaining in the U.S.A., the self-supporting community, was that they were far worse in the latter.

There is really no mystery, and not much informed difference of opinion, as to the cause of our continued frustration. It is that we have allowed finance to become a business in itself. I should like to observe that this situation, far from being cured by the "nationalisation" of banking, would be accentuated. The outcome of this is that the system will only work at all as an expansionist ("more exports") system, and that the expansion has to be an acceleration in geometrical progression—hence the "prosperity" in war-time. This has nothing whatever to do with Capitalism, as generally understood, and no administrative change would alter it except for the worse.

If "Aqua Vitae" wishes to get to the root of our political difficulty, he should insist on being informed as to the undisclosed terms, as affecting the control of the Bank of England, which were negotiated by Lord Reading in Washington, as a condition of the entry of the United States into the war in 1917.

I am, etc.,

C. H. DOUGLAS.

Security, Institutional and Personal

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

(Continued)

The first part of Major Douglas's address in the City Hall, Newcastle-on-Tyne in March, 1937, appeared in THE SOCIAL CREDITER last week.

Escape from Utopia

Now, once again, I can imagine quite a number of people in this audience saying that I am one of those people who has a complete set of blue-prints for the construction of a Utopia, and therefore perhaps you will allow me to explain exactly why I should not agree to that charge. I have no views whatever as to how my neighbour should spend his time, so long as his method of spending it does not infringe upon my own liberties.

To me it is a matter of no consequence whatever that many or most people are very much richer than I am. The only financial matter which is of consequence to me is that I shall be well enough off to meet my own needs, which are quite modest, as I believe are those of most people. The technical proposals which I have put forward from time to time may be considered to differ from, let us say, the well-known beliefs of Utopianism such as Fascism, Communism, State-Socialism, and so forth, in that, so far from exerting further compulsion upon individuals in order that they may conform to some machine-made conception of a perfect state, *I should like by the simplest possible methods to provide people with the means of making their own individual lives approximate to their own ideas, and not to mine.*

The more I see of Governments, the lower is my opinion of them and I am confident that what the world wants at the present time is a great deal less government, and not a great deal more.

Now I want to get a further perfectly simple idea into your minds. And that is that *Governments are your property, and you are not the property of Governments.* There is no more pernicious and blasphemous nonsense existent in the world today than the statement which has been incorporated in the constitution of the modern dictatorships, which claims that the State, by which is indicated the Government, is everything and the individual is nothing. On the contrary, *the individual is everything* and the State is a mere convenience to enable him to co-operate for his own advantage. It is this idea of the supreme State in its various forms which has made the State the tool of the international financier who has mortgaged all States to himself.

The first step towards the security of the individual is to insist upon the security of the individual. I hope that is not too difficult to understand. If you place the security of any institution before the security of the individual, you may prolong the life of that institution, but you will certainly shorten the lives of a great many individuals. Institutions are means to an end, and I do not think it is too much to say that the elevation of means into ends, of institutions above humanity, constitutes an unforgiveable sin, in the pragmatic sense that it brings upon itself the most tremendous penalties that life contains.

A great deal of our trouble in this country arises from the fact that, while we place great faith in the aristocratic

ideal (if you prefer to call it the principle of leadership I shall not object), yet we have allowed all those influences which make the aristocratic ideal reasonable and workable to be sapped and wrecked by the exaltation of money as the sole certificate of greatness, and have allowed cosmopolitan and alien financiers to obtain a monopoly of money. We have retained the ideal and allowed the material of which it is constructed to become hopelessly degraded. In consequence, we are governed in the aristocratic tradition by a hypocritical and selfish oligarchy with one idea, and one fundamental idea only: the ascendancy of money, and the essential monopoly of it.

The essence of the aristocratic tradition is detachment—the doing of things in the best way because it *is* the best way, not because you get something out of it. That requires that the leader shall be secure. No one is secure nowadays. At the root of the growing danger of Government and other embodiments of execution is the idea that human beings are all alike. So far from this being the case, I believe that as human beings develop they become increasingly different. But they have common factors, and those common factors are the only part of the human make-up which can be dealt with by a democratic system, and ought to be dealt with by a democratic system.

It was, I think, Emerson who said that “we descend to meet.” Whoever said it, it is profoundly true. We all require food, clothing, and shelter; and we *can* combine, and *ought* to combine, to get those necessities as a condition for our further acquiescence in combining for any other agreed purpose. The primary use of a Government in a sane world would be to make it certain that the greatest common measure of the will of the population, from whom it derives—or ought to derive—its authority, is enough money for decent sustenance.

The Menace of Utopianism

Now a great deal of what I have been saying can be reduced to the good old English advice to “Mind your own business.” But I should like to expand this to “Don't meddle with your neighbour's business, but assist him to mind his own.” The difference is the difference between saying to a destitute friend, “I will convey you to a Poor-Law institution where you will be given three meals a day if you do exactly as you are told,” on the one hand, and on the other hand saying, “I will settle £50 a year upon you for life, which will at any rate keep you in necessities; what *kind* of necessities you obtain you can judge for yourself.”

There is no more dangerous individual in the world at the present than the Utopianist. Mr. Montague Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, is a Utopianist. Mr. Chamberlain is a Utopianist. Lenin was a Utopianist, Hitler is a Utopianist. Just see where Utopianism has landed us. It is the Utopianist who provides the public excuse for nearly every theft of public property which has ever been committed.

Let me give you a simple instance of what I mean. We have all heard of the agitation for the nationalisation of the coal industry, and, in particular, of the raw material, coal itself. Now the actual amount which is obtained by the royalty-owner averages about threepence per ton, so that whatever the ethical aspect may be, the practical effect upon the price of coal is quite trivial. But the international bankers who hold this country in pawn consider that their mortgage

upon it would be more secure if it was backed by the coal deposits, and I can assure you that the result of nationalising coal would merely be to increase the security of the debt which we owe to certain international financial houses, and would not affect the well-being either of the miners or the consumers of coal to any perceptible degree.

Freedom the Only Policy

It is not my intention in speaking to you tonight to go to any extent into technical details, or I should like to explain to you the colossal fraud of taxation. But the device of arbitrary taxation, for which the public justification is obtained from carefully worked up "popular" opinion, is one of the most powerful weapons by which the various sections of the population are kept in antagonism with each other, and by which at the same time the power and independence of each one of them is reduced.

One of the greatest difficulties with which we, in the Social Credit Movement, have been faced has been the skilful exploitation of human frailty by our opponents, the financiers, so that the community, and even the Social Credit Movement itself, has been split and kept from effective action. Another has been to persuade the industrialist that the financier was just as much *his* enemy as he is of every other section of the community at the present time.

There is only one policy which will obtain the unquestioned acceptance of everyone for himself, and that is comprised in the word "freedom." And it is exactly that policy which, in my opinion at any rate, requires to be made universal. The oligarchy which rules us is, of course, favourable to freedom for its own members, but it is implacably opposed to freedom for the general public. Since the key to economic freedom, as the world is organised today, is the command of money, it follows that differential and arbitrary taxation is the greatest enemy of freedom which the legislative authority has at its disposal.

Taxation is a negative dividend. There is a short cut, straight and simple, from the present system of modified slavery to one of comfort, security and freedom, and that is the abolition of a negative dividend and the substitution of a positive dividend.

As many of you here are aware, the money system is an entirely arbitrary system, and the manufacture of money in the modern world costs little more than the cost of paper and ink. In saying that, I do not mean that a money system can function satisfactorily without some underlying theory which ultimately governs the amount of money which it is desirable to have at our disposal. But I have no hesitation in stating categorically that the existing taxation system is completely unnecessary, is wasteful, irritating, and predatory; and, further, that, in place of it, it would be possible to issue a dividend to every man, woman, and child in this country without depriving any individual of the privileges which they may now possess, but, on the other hand, increasing the privileges of everybody.

But such a policy *would* deprive certain individuals of unjustifiable and anti-social power over others which they now possess, and since, unfortunately, these persons have come into control of the sanctions of government, the problem is not so much a technical one as a political one.

Now I am entirely convinced by my own investigation and experiences, not merely in this country but in many

parts of the world, that while democracy in policy is absolutely essential to the functioning of the modern world, there is at the present time no such thing as a genuine democracy anywhere, and probably less in this country than anywhere else.

In this country the two main obstacles to a genuine democracy are the party system, with its offshoot, the Front Bench oligarchy, and, secondly, a mistaken idea on the part of the Member of Parliament that he is supposed to understand the methods by which results desired by the general public should be attained, and to pass laws which specify the actions of executive bodies and interfere with technical undertakings. None of these is correct.

A Member of Parliament should be a representative—not a delegate. It is his business to learn what it is his constituents want and see that they get it—not to tell them what they ought to have or to make himself responsible for its production. Policy and administration are two entirely separate things, and administration in this country is admirably carried on by a trained Civil Service. I include in the phrase "Civil Service" the staff of great productive undertakings just as much as the officials of Government Departments. They are all technicians, and on the whole they are admirable. What they lack is clear instruction in regard to policy, and it is *your* business to give them that instruction through your representative, your Member of Parliament.

Action

Now we have devised a mechanism which, if we could induce you to carry it out, would impose your policy upon your Member of Parliament quite infallibly, and if you imposed the same policy upon a majority of Members of Parliament, that policy would come into existence. First of all you have to *agree* upon that policy, and, secondly, you have to take very simple *action*.

To agree upon a policy, it is only necessary to find a common factor of human experience. There are certain people who foolishly say that it is impossible to agree upon a policy. I think that is ridiculous. It is sometimes difficult to get agreement upon a policy for the other fellow, but there is no difficulty in getting an agreement about a policy for oneself. *The first thing that we all want is at least a minimum supply of money.* We may want more, but none of us, I think, wants less. If there is such a person in this room and he will give what he does not want to me, I will see that good use is made of it.

What is *certain*, however, is that the mechanism of democracy can *never* be applied with success to *methods* of realising a policy. An understanding of this has enabled our lords and masters to split the so-called democracy of this country on every occasion on which it was desirable to the maintenance of their power.

To submit to a democracy a highly technical question such as Free Trade or Tariff Reform, with its endless implications, is as absurd as to submit to a democracy the relative advantages of driving a battleship by steam turbines or diesel engines. Any decision obtained upon such a subject by means of a popular vote can be demonstrated mathematically always to be wrong. The more complex a subject is the more certain it is that an understanding of it will be confined to a

few people who will, of course, always be outvoted by the majority who do not understand it.

But this is not true of policy. Any man who is not a congenital idiot can decide for himself whether he wants to starve to death, live in misery, or live in comfort; and I can assure you that you have only to *unite implacably upon a common policy, and to pursue it*, and the proper means for realising that policy will be found for you.

(Concluded)

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

the local authority; there is only a difference of degree. The local authority is a localised expression of the State. Is the State a good landlord? Nobody would say so who walks up Regent Street. There are two landlords in Westminster—one a Duke and one the Crown. No one has ever seen a more oppressive landlord than the landlord of Regent Street—the worst landlord in the history of this country. [An Hon. Member: "That is capitalism."] No, not capitalism; State Socialism.

Sir H. Williams said later. . . I do not think there is any doubt about what Subsection (1) says. It says that the town council can be a "spec." builder. It says that they shall not commit this crime without the sanction of my distinguished right hon. Friend or his successors, but if he knows of some fellow who definitely wants to put a building on this site, the town council must not go in for speculative building.

What are these sites that they are to buy? Let us take a short journey from here to that great devastated area round St. Paul's Cathedral on which there existed the premises of a great variety of people engaged in legitimate trade and business. I imagine that some of these people will want to rebuild. They will want, so far as may be possible—we know there may be some alteration to the line of the roads, etc.—to be where they were before. Why should the Tory City Corporation be permitted to get in for "spec" building in St. Paul's Churchyard, to put up a building which is not wanted or which is of a type not wanted by the man who had a building there? Is he not entitled to the first bite into what was his old site? I do not understand this great industrial community from Birmingham wanting to stop a man building his own industrial premises on what is, in fact, his own site. If the City Corporation should, for the moment, buy all the devastated land round St. Paul's Cathedral in order that they can make a little change in the roads, move the sewers, electric light mains, etc., which is very necessary before one can plan—[AN HON. MEMBER: "They can do the work."] It will cost a lot of money. If a man who has had premises famous for 100 years in the soft goods trade somewhere near St. Paul's Cathedral wants to rebuild his premises on a site which has been known throughout the ages, or the booksellers of Paternoster Row want to establish their premises on their ancient site, should the City Corporation of London—or the City Corporation of Birmingham, if they have a Paternoster Row—say "You must not do it"? Personally, I think if there is someone willing to develop a site, let him get on with it.

Mr. Bowles (Nuneaton): Supposing every single person who had a tenancy or house or office or building wanted to rebuild, would the hon. Member agree to that being done?

Sir H. Williams: I am suggesting that a man who was there ought to have his bite. The man who carried on a business on a particular site is entitled to some consideration over everybody else. I am talking about Sub-section (3). If the Minister knows of somebody who is willing to do the development—there are still all the restrictions to see that the development is on the right lines—surely a man should be entitled to build on the site where his old business was carried on. [HON. MEMBERS: "Why?"] The "why" is a very obvious one. The man who has built up a business, and built up a goodwill in relation to a particular area, has rights against any other member of the community.

Mr. Molson (The High Peak): Since he built up the business he has been the subject of a compulsory purchase order, and that terminates his rights. He has obtained certain cash advantages in place of his business, and, therefore, his rights come to an end.

Sir H. Williams: This is the monstrous assertion of the Nazis, the Fascists, and the Communists: that the State is entitled to destroy your rights. They have not compensated the man for the loss of his goodwill. Hitler comes with his fire bombs, and devastates an area. That area is an area in which a man carries on his business. Is there anything in sanity, in decency, in Christianity, which justifies my high-minded Friend in saying that some great authority is entitled to deny a man the right to go back to his own premises? It is the assertion of the totalitarian State, for which the young pinks stand.

Sir J. Lamb said. . . This Sub-section deals with the powers of the Postmaster-General where an order is made for a road to be closed on which there might be property belonging to the Postmaster-General consisting of telegraph poles and wires. This Department seems to have the best of it both ways. An order could be made for the Postmaster-General to remove the poles and wires from a road and he would be paid for their removal, and he might also be required to erect new telegraph poles and wires on the new road and he would be paid for that also. It looks like a case of a penny with two heads, because the Postmaster-General wins both ways. There is nothing mentioned about salvage. What is to happen to the materials? This is a matter which should be considered and the local authority should have the advantage of any salvage.

Sir H. Williams: I am going to support my hon. Friend on this Amendment. This is a real example of vested interests. This is the Crown in the shape of my right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Gainsborough (Captain Crookshank), who at the moment is missing from the Chamber, and all his successors. The Ministry of Town and Country Planning can do all sorts of things, and then the Government come along and say that this will not apply to the Crown. It really is monstrous that the Crown should be put outside the law. Now that the Crown is a trader carrying on business in the ordinary way, why should there be these exemptions? Why should it not be placed in the same position as everybody else when acting as private trader? Here is a man who sells postage stamps, gives wrong numbers on the telephone and fails to deliver our telegrams. Owing to some monstrous judgment many years ago a telephone line is in the same category as a telegraph line, and that is the reason why no working man can afford to pay for the telephone.

These monopolies want to be exempt from town and country planning. It is not good enough. I see that my right hon. and learned Friend has got all the lawyers here. They are apparently so frightened about the Amendment.

Sir J. Mellor: I wish to join issue with the hon. Member for Peckham (Mr. Silkin) when he says that it is less important to reinstate people in business than people in homes. I regard it as at least as important. When he sought to dismiss the claims of those who carry on business by saying that they can be compensated, he showed a complete misconception of the motives which actuate the great bulk of small traders. To them a business is something more than merely a source of profit; it is their livelihood and career. It is often a family business which has been handed down to them, and which they intend to pass on to their children. We ought not to dismiss the matter as though they can be adequately dealt with by way of compensation. If there is an interruption to the carrying on of their businesses and accommodation is not provided in advance of their displacement, their goodwill probably vanishes and the consequences may be disastrous to their livelihood.

Mr. Colegate (The Wrekin): I wish to support the Amendment. The hon. Member for Peckham (Mr. Silkin) has rather glossed over the difficulty which these Amendments are designed to solve. He stated that certain businesses were undesirable and surplus and that 25 shops might be reduced to six. Who is to decide that the businesses are desirable?

Mr. Silkin: The planner.

Mr. Colegate: I have had recent experience where a serious conflict of interests immediately arises. I have an area in my mind which has been beautifully planned with an excellent shopping centre. The question at once came up, Who is to have the shops? A certain well-known movement plumped for the whole lot, and they got about half of them. The hon. Member for Peckham knows that there are two large groups, one, the Co-operative Society, and the other the multiple shops, and they are a great source of anxiety and fear to small shops and businesses. They are terrified that, in planning, the small people will be pushed out by large capitalists, in the form of multiple shops on the one hand, and by large capitalists under the name of the Co-operative Wholesale Society on the other.

To leave the possibility in many areas that small businesses and shopkeepers should lose their livelihood because of the political views of the town-planning authority concerned, will create dismay among those people. . .

THE MEDICAL QUARREL

The Medical profession (and their patients), displaying that almost ineradicable tendency of the English to fight rearguard actions, seem to be still pondering whether or not they will let the British Medical Association 'negotiate' on their [B.M.A. Executive's] behalf, or repudiate an un-serviceable servant. The quarrel can be summed up in a sentence: If the doctors are going to treat the State, which badly needs it, then let the State employ them. If they are going to treat individuals, let individuals employ them. No man can serve two masters.

FRANCE

"... France is full of rumours that in a month or two 'grave events will occur' internally. This would be very serious, with a great Allied offensive mounted on the Western Front. Widespread internal troubles in France would interfere with operations, and it is reported very plausibly that trouble is being ardently fomented by a German-organised 'underground movement' composed of undetected German agents left behind for the purpose."

— *The Tablet*, October 7, 1944.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Reconstruction	6d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.).....	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	1d.
The Representative's Job.....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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