THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 13. No. 8. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1944. 6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

According to the usually well-informed and influential American periodical, *Fortune,* Lord McGowan, Chairman of Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd., said to Mr. Eric Johnston, President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, when he was in London: "I see no hope of collaboration between British and American business, unless the U.S.A. repeals its Sherman Anti-Trust Law. Can we in England look forward to that?"

To which the comment is made, "The answer has been given to Lord McGowan and industrialists everywhere. The U.S. is going to strengthen, not weaken, its anti-combine regulations."

• • •

In the foregoing paragraph, there is more dynamite than is required to blow up the planet. We have been, and are, severe critics of much U.S. policy, which we believe is dictated from sources implacably inimical to this country. But in this matter, the Americans have come down squarely on the side of the angels, and our only hope is to recognise the fact. The chemical cartel with its various stucco-national faces and its international intrigue is a mortal menace, not merely to Great Britain, but to mankind, and the era of cartelisation, including labour cartelisation, which grew (although it did not begin) in the inter-war years under the stimulus of Alfred Moritz Mond and his shadowy co-adjutors on both sides of the Atlantic, was the first and most important step to the identification of the British Empire with a completely alien philosophy. We have only one major accusation to make against the late Neville Chamberlain—he lent himself, from 1931 onwards, to this absolutely fatal policy.

It has been suggested from a not uninformed source to the writer of these notes that there is a diabolical policy quietly at work in international circles to move Great Britain into the position of Public Enemy No. 1, partly in order to teach us that we can't have opinions of our own on Palestine, etc. If Lord McGowan is correctly reported, he is certainly doing what he can to help.

• • •

It is a characteristic of a second-rate mind (and we appear to be living in an era of second-rateness) to invest uniformity of treatment with an attribute called justice, and then to define justice as uniformity of treatment. The desire to classify everything—and preferably to make the category as inclusive as possible, which is not dissimilar in essence—is supposed to be "scientific," "orderly," "modern," and is of the greatest assistance to salesmen of card-filling systems and business furniture. Like so many of our troubles, it probably received its primary impulse from the Freemason encyclopaedists, and was skilfully fostered in our younger days by the suggestion that we should collect stamps, birds' eggs, or butterflies (carefully to be distinguished from moths), and catalogue them.

This attribute of mediocrity and its infantile cry of "equality" has reached an all-time high since we began to operate "in war, or under threat of war." The average categorised man needs an average meal and an average house, and an average book and an average movie, and lives an average time and requires an average coffin. And partly from the fact that he has an average education, the world is an average hell, but will soon be turned into an average factory bossed by an average Trades Union, preparatory to going up in an average planetory dust-heap.

We are impelled to these reflections by contemplation of the rapture with which "the needs of industry" are now being voiced, dwarfing even the winning of the military war against the Germans. It is, of course, quite possible that much of this nightmare is merely "B".B.C., which average institution naively observed recently in effect that control of the (Hungarian) radio enabled the Germans to put over any lie, and get it believed. But if someone would point out that the average shilling buys less than the average penny fifty years ago, it might assist the average brain to wonder whether there isn't an average nigger somewhere in the average woodpile.

• • •

Yes, Clarence. How clever of you. We were thinking of insurance and the Great Principle of Social Security, coupled with the name of Sir William Beveridge, M.P., most of whose electorate did not take the trouble to vote.

• • •

As a gleam of sanity in a mad world, we welcome the pronouncement of the London Chamber of Commerce that "no community can long survive which is prepared to sacrifice all other considerations to theoretical economic efficiency."

Post-War Trade

The following letter was sent to THE SCOTSMAN *in reply to a letter signed "Aqua Vitae," the writer of which stated that he had consulted certain persons, not named, but described as below, and they had given their opinion that there was no bargain including the control of the Bank of England, made before the U.S. entered the war in* 1917.

This letter was not published, but, possibly by a coincidence on the day on which it should have appeared, a letter by D. M. Mason was published, in effect suggesting the confiscation of deposits and currency notes on the lines recently adopted in Belgium as a result of its liberation. The effect of this, if carried out in Great Britain, would be to

confiscate a large part of the wages paid to war-workers and to produce a trade crisis of the first magnitude:—

October 14, 1944.

Sir,

Post-War Trade

It would appear, in the absence of more precise information as to their identity, that "the certain persons who should be regarded as ultimate authorities on the matter" (I rather like the word "should") are not quite ultimate enough. But perhaps your correspondent "Aqua Vitae," in the face of the opinion they expressed to him, and with which he agrees, would obtain from them a commentary on the events of the post-armistice years, amongst them:

Why was the Bank of England, perhaps a somewhat ultra-conservative institution previously, completely rebuilt behind the Sir John Soane façade, as an ultra-modern fortress-bank on American lines, equipped with the latest and most elaborate American appliances?

Why was the established custom of appointing short term Governors from the City of London abandoned in favour of the appointment, indefinitely, of Mr. Montagu Norman, a member of the London Office of an American financial undertaking?

Why was, firstly, Dr. Walter Stewart, and subsequently, Dr. Oliver Sprague, both of New York and Washington, appointed to "advise" Mr. Norman for a lengthy term of years, and to be present at all important conferences?

Why was the London Discount Rate kept ½ per cent. above the New York rate, for the first lengthy period in history, during the advisory period of these gentlemen, thus driving financial business to New York?

Who advised Mr. Churchill, in the face of the opposition of important industrial and trading interests, to re-institute in 1925 a form of Gold Standard, with catastrophic results?

On what grounds was the Marquis of Reading made Viceroy of India, and, during this period, the exchange rate of the rupee raised in terms of sterling, but not of dollars, thus providing a preferential rate for American imports into India? I am aware that the Viceroy of India is not an employé of the Bank of England, but they are conscious of each other's existence.

It would be easy to extend the examination, but I feel sure that on obtaining answers to the questions, "Aqua Vitae" will be able to think of others without help.

In view of his reference to coal, however, he might perhaps also enquire why the Minister of Fuel and Power is unable to give the House of Commons certain information in regard to the British coal industry without consulting "the Americans" (*Hansard*, House of Commons, October 3).

I am, etc.,

(Signed) C. H. DOUGLAS.

"The Bretton Woods agreements are only in the protocol stage, and..." —Candidus in *The Daily Sketch*, October 18.

PARLIAMENT

DIPLOMATIC PRIVILEGES (EXTENSION BILL)

[The Second Reading of this Bill (not reported in *The Social Crediter*) occurred on September 27. The Debate was characterised by an attitude of strong suspicion that the Government were inclined to use the special circumstances of the war to advance contentious legislation. The Attorney-General then apologised to the House that he had not made it clear that "the Governments which met together to form U.N.R.R.A. did agree that they would recommend to their respective legislatures immunity" on the lines of the Bill.]

House of Commons: *October* 13, 1944.

Mr. Richard Law said... without this Bill, these international organisations which are now in operation, and others which may come into being, will be at a great disadvantage.

... It is proposed that the organisation should have four immunities—immunity from legal process, inviolability of premises and archives, immunity from rates and taxes, and immunity from import duties upon goods which are directly imported by the organisation for the purposes of the organisation...

The I.L.O.... has diplomatic immunity very much as we are proposing in this Bill, which is guaranteed to it by the peace treaties and by the Covenant of the League..

Miss Rathbone (Combined English Universities): Could the right hon. Gentleman give some idea of the approximate number of international organisations likely to be covered by this Bill? Of course, the number would not be final because it could be added to later.

Mr. Law: That is an almost impossible question to answer because no one can say what the result of the Bretton Woods Conference is going to be. We do not yet know if the International Monetary Fund will come into existence or the Investment Bank. We have had a Conference at Hot Springs relating to an organisation for Food and Agriculture and since then, there has been gestation and that organisation will almost certainly come into being, and will certainly be included under the Bill.

Miss Rathbone: They are mostly future rather than present organisations.

Mr. Law. Mostly future, but I suppose the I.L.O. would come under it, and the Governmental Committee on Refugees. The number at the moment would be very small.

• • •

Mr. Lewis (Colchester) said... As the Minister of State pointed out, it is not something that arises now during the war, but something that will be effective after the war. It is, in effect, a proposal that an undefined number of persons should be put outside the rules of law permanently. I say "permanently" in spite of the intimation that the Government propose to limit the operation of the Bill to five years, because, in the Amendment which the Government will propose, provision is made for its extension for an unlimited period afterwards. To my mind there is no doubt that the intention of the Government is that there shall be a permanent arrangement. I listened intently to the speech of the Minister of State, and I could not find

in it anything that justifies the introduction of the Bill. I could not see the necessity of which he spoke. I do not know, even now, what organisations will be affected other than U.N.R.R.A. The right hon. Gentleman has given no list of organisations at present in existence which will be affected, and he obviously cannot forecast what organisations may arise in future that will come within the ambit of the Bill.

I think we can say that a considerable number of people will come under the Bill. It may be argued that, in the past, we ourselves have insisted on extra-territoriality for our citizens in some foreign countries, and an even wider extension of the idea of special privilege, but we have only done that in cases where the Government of the country was felt to be either uncivilised or ineffective, and we have agreed to give up these claims as soon as there was a Government sufficiently competent to ensure justice for our citizens overseas. Does anybody suggest that we have a system of law in this country which is so ineffective and so unjust, that any foreigner coming here needs protection against it? . . .

The Minister not only asked us to give him the Bill—which I very much hope we shall not do—but to give him the Bill ungrudgingly. He thought it very undesirable that it should go out to the world that the British House of Commons were grudging where the privileges of these organisations were concerned. I think it would be most unfortunate if it went out to the world that the British House of Commons were grudging, when it came to defending the liberties of the British people.

• • •

Dr. Russell Thomas (Southampton): . . . The Bill as it is to be amended does a remarkable thing. Under the first Amendment it establishes a corporation endowed with diplomatic immunities and privileges under Part I of the Schedule and that I believe, has never been done before in the history of the British Parliament. It is all very well for the right hon. Gentleman to say that the corporation will voluntarily go to arbitration, but that is not stated in the Bill. It would be entirely a matter for the corporation or the Government concerned to say whether any particular case should go to arbitration. Normally, a corporation is, I think, defined by Statute, but these corporations are not defined by Statute, which is a point to be noted. Normally, I believe, a corporation is liable for torts committed by its servants acting within the scope of their authority even if the wrong was done by its servants in defiance of its express orders. A corporation is liable under our laws but this corporation is not liable at all in that regard. It is completely outside control. . .

A servant of this corporation will be completely covered under Part III of the Schedule. He may commit all sorts of illegal acts under the command of the corporation, but there will be no possibility of suing the servant himself as there would be when a subject is wronged by the Crown. It will not be liable for the acts of its servants, nor can the servant be sued for acting unlawfully. Again, in regard to contracts of the corporation there is no redress. It is interesting to turn once more to the position of the subject in relation to the Crown. Under the Petition of Right the subject can, if his goods, moneys or land have found their way into the possession of the Crown, by obtaining a fiat from the Attorney-General, ask for restitution or compensation; but if one of these trading organisations—and there will be several trading and other kinds of organisations—have got hold of lands, money or whatever it may be, the person affected has no remedy at all. By the Petition of Right he can recover money under a contract, or he can be awarded unliquidated damages for breach of a contract and so on, but in regard to his relationship with this corporation, or any corporation formed under the Act, he has no power at all.

I think I have shown that we are adopting a new idea in this legislation. . .

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE (INCREASE OF BENEFIT) BILL

Mr. Stephen said. . . I am thinking of those gallant men in Mile End, White Vale, and Denison who have always had very difficult circumstances to face. They are now being called upon, possibly, to lay down their lives in this great conflict. I am anxious to secure for them, on their return, the most adequate protection and the opportunity of a decent life. To my mind, the greatest of all the problems that we shall be faced with after the war is that of providing a decent house and a decent income for those who have made great sacrifices during this period of stress.

I propose, in the first Amendment, that the payment of 24s. a week to the individual should be raised to 30s. a week. Hon. Members may say "Why 30s?" I would have liked to take, instead of the figure of 30s., the figure *x*, and to have said that *x* should represent the wage of the worker in his industry, but the rules of Order did not make that a possibility, and I take the figure 30s. because I myself have been closely associated with the agitation of the Old Age Pensioners' Association, who claim 30s. a week as the lowest possible sum that would afford maintenance for old age pensioners. I put it to the Minister that I believe that the only satisfactory figure would be a figure which would give to the worker the wage of which he was in enjoyment during the time he spent in the factory or works. The figures proposed in these Amendments are, in a certain sense, token figures, in order to meet difficulties which one faces because of the rules of procedure. . .

House of Commons: October 17, 1944.

COAL INDUSTRY

Mechanisation (Joint Resources Board's Report)

Miss Ward asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether, in view of the publication in the U.S.A. of the Joint Resources Board's Report on the Mechanisation of British Coal Mines, he will now make the Report available to Members in the Library of the House.

Major Lloyd George: The Report of the United States Coal Mission to the Combined Production and Resources Board has not been published either here or in the United States, but a summary of the main findings of the Report was issued as an official release to the Press in both countries on August 23. On October 3 I indicated to hon. Members that further consideration would be given to the proposal to publish this Report. The Government has now decided

(*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.* 8. *Saturday, October* 28, 1944.

England, Life and Culture versus The Political Monopoly

Rumours of the impending resurrection of the so-called 'Liberal' Party have been current for some time, and are revived by the suggestion embodied in the manoeuvring which accompanied the election of Sir William Beveridge as the 'Liberal' member of parliament for Berwick last week. *The Economist* of October 14 unblushingly disclosed the pre-arrangements of the Political Monopoly in the announcement that "in a fortnight's time, the Liberals will be able to produce Sir William Beveridge as their ace of trumps." Possibly *The Economist* did not bother to look up the date of the election, which was distant only three days from the fourteenth. Possibly it meant literally that the 'ace' is intended to be played after, not on, its introduction into the House of Commons. If there were nothing besides the appearance of Lady Violet Bonham-Carter at Berwick to establish the identity, it would still be apparent that the so-called Liberal Party of to-day is the same now as when the Political Monopoly discarded it at the end of the first phase of the world war. It is a label. As a label it and the personnel who wore it were discarded. As a label it may be restored.

One of the best, if not the best, refreshers of memory concerning that curious entity is the books of Gilbert Keith Chesterton. Nor is it necessary to specify or to make exception. The only reason we know—unless the Unripeness of Time—to explain why Chesterton did not himself convince his generation of its central political error was that, fresh from its baptism of 'education,' its "eyes alive with intellectual torture," demos fell an easy prey to the suggestion that paradox was merely another way of spelling parody. He was allowed to say what he had to say, because his enemies, and ours, fully understood that they had destroyed what existed of English intelligence and were well on the road to the perversion of English instinct. He says himself (in *Autobiography*) that he was "too late"—"That increasing number of intellectuals, who are content to say that Democracy has been a failure, miss the point of the far more disastrous calamity that Plutocracy has been a success. I mean it has been the only sort of success it could be; for Plutocracy has no philosophy or morals or even meaning; it can only be a material success, that is, a base success. Plutocracy can only mean the success of plutocrats in being plutocrats. . . . With Democracy the case is exactly the reverse. We may say, with some truth, that Democracy has failed; but we shall only mean that Democracy has ceased to exist. . . . Parliaments continue to prosper; that is they continued to rot. We have lived to see the last phase. . . I am proud to have been among those who tried to save it [the 'ancient English conception of a Free Parliament,'] even if it was too late."

God knows it's late; but we do not ourselves think either that it is too late, or that the English capacity to react to experience is exhausted. If Chesterton was wrong it was in thinking that literature and truth-telling constitute a strategy. At best they constitute a distraction, an entertainment, possibly a noble entertainment; a preservative for those who have done all there is need to do, and have only to embellish recollection. They compose and confirm the mind instead of deploying the forces of the heart.

Beginning my studies. . . .
The first step I say awed me and pleas'd me so much,
I have hardly gone and hardly wished to go any further,
But stop and loiter all the time to sing it in ecstatic songs.

Poor egotistical Walt!

We do not lack things said. We lack things done.

A man ridiculed for believing it to be as sensible to plant apple trees along public highways as to plant the things they do plant nearly defeated "the Master Builder" of Cart-horse Conditions for All, and Jolly Well Leave the Apples Alone! We are told he would have done, if he had had more time and better strategy and tactics. It may seem ironical that no candidate should have stood against the Party System until the Party System is itself consolidated into the Totalitarian One-Party-System. In any case this candidate, Mr. Clark, began an electioneering leaflet with the words, "In Parliament I want to advocate what you (the voters) want." He told the electors: "All sorts of methods are being used to get me to stand down. I even got a wire from London offering me a 'sure win' seat in Yorkshire. I wanted to offer myself to you people here first, but they said 'No.' The letter that followed the telegram said "We could not hold the seat even if you won it.' Note the 'We.' Do I wish to belong to a party that has not any more faith than that? The letter ends with this: 'Do try to be sensible and realistic as well as ethical.' My answer to that was: "How can we be sensible and realistic if we are not ethical?" The campaign began with references to Mr. Clark's 26 h.p. American motor car, and ended with the taunt that he had only his 26 h.p. American car to "a fleet of cars" placed at the disposal of Sir William Beveridge. The register bears the names of 41,068 voters, of whom the *Sunday Sun* "expected" not more than 16,000 to vote. Ten thousand did vote, and "the ace of trumps" of the Political Monopoly (Liberal Label) was returned by one fifth of the electorate. The polling day was advanced two days. The "Liberal" Ace of Trumps was assisted by "Hundreds of volunteers . . . from the Socialist and Conservative parties"—(*Newcastle Journal*, October 12). His return is reported by one of his workers to have been largely due to abstentions. The Liberals would not vote because their Party candidate was a Socialist, and the Conservatives because he had been adopted by the Liberals. But "he has presented a way of running an election the people have not seen before, namely to offer himself as their servant. It may grow on them when they think about it." It will grow on them if they do think about it.

Our Cultural Disinheritance*

I.

All mammals and many other creatures undergo some course of training as soon as possible after they are born. This training is conducted by members of the previous generation, usually one or both of the parents of the individual concerned, and serves to eliminate possible modes of behaviour which might lead to consequences unfavourable to the individual, the family or the species.

Thus the habitual, as distinct from the inherited behaviour of young animals, is produced, leaving more extended experience to effect some modification.

Deprived of this training, the individual commonly suffers some disadvantage. It is not easy to say how much, because the common cause of such deprivation is separation from the mother, by death or otherwise, at a critical time in the life of the individual. Large or small in its total effect, something is handed on by each generation to the next. It is something added to the natural inheritance, and might be called the *nurtural* inheritance.

In man this nurtural inheritance is mixed up with a cultural inheritance which is quite a different thing. Broadly speaking, the influence of each generation upon the next in respect of nurture is, in animals other than man, the same. Alterations in the mode of life of the species through adaptations to changes in the environment are on the whole more likely to subtract from it than add to it, and this nurture, as it may be observed among domesticated animals, is a poor, uncertain and fitful inheritance compared with its counterpart among wild animals. In man a great increase in communicable modes of action occurred before the dawn of civilisation; but during the development of civilisation, this increase has become so vast that the body of effective knowledge accumulated at the time of the birth of each individual is now greater than can be communicated to him during his lifetime. During his lifetime a further large increase will occur in this store of effective knowledge, and the rate of such increase accelerates.

II.

The magnitude of the cultural inheritance is dimly apprehended by individuals. At best each is directly aware of only a fragment of it. This fact can readily be demonstrated by directing one's own attention to any small collection of objects in sight at any time, and asking oneself to explain how they got there, in sufficient detail as to suggest that one could secure their reappearance, by the same means *ab initio*, if they should be destroyed. Simple as it is, and few as the objects may be, provided they are products of civilised life and not merely natural objects, this experiment leads to the startling conclusion that *no one* has enough knowledge to satisfy the conditions. Indeed, the knowledge possessed collectively by all the individuals living in our time is not nearly enough to achieve the end required, since the historical development of human abilities is known only fragmentarily.

This is a *fact* as well known to Diffusionists as to Tylerians. No school in anthropology is so foolish and mistaken as to pretend to possess more than the crudest of maps, faded, torn, full of erasures, corrections, blots, holes, inevitable mistakes and falsifications. To take one of these "maps" rather than another, is not to take sides or to open some new door to endless discussion which is the chief source of ineffectuality in our time. In regard to the point I wish to illustrate, one is as good as another; the whole point is not the uncertain and bitterly contested lines of the "map," but the holes in it. What Sir Grafton Elliot Smith and his collaborators never cease from stressing—that man had inhabited the earth for ten thousand centuries before the firing of the "pistol shot" which was the signal for the sudden expansion which we know as civilisation—is not seriously contested; the details of the weapon, the velocity of propagation of the explosion, and so on: these are the matters of dispute. It does not matter for my argument whether in history each fresh impulse forward is unique, or whether the spirit, "blowing where it listeth" pants like a driven hart. The point is that most of the "puffs" are unrecorded. If we know that the artificial germination of barley secured an abundance "when and where it was required" in the Nile Valley, we know nothing of the conditions in which the discovery was made that stored grain sprouts. Neither do we now by what processes, material and psychological, the ancient Egyptians overcame what anyone with imagination must regard as a natural repugnance to draining the udders of cows to augment the infant food supply. We know only of the deification of the cow, and surmise that, having thus made his peace with her, man, now civilised, entered upon a period of development and expansion of which we know some of the results and scarcely any of the means. The results themselves are beyond the grasp of any living individual.

We do not know, in a fashion which would ensure repetition by us, without the assistance of example, of the brooding thought or the flashes of insight which led to any one of the great discoveries, nor to any one of the numberless trifles which are links in the chain that we call the development of process. G. F. Powell has shown that most of us, however humble, have unwittingly contributed more than one, and we are ignorant of the event, let alone the means. We do not know what passed in the mind of Napier that led to logarithms. We do not know how the strategem was conceived that, after many years, led to the supremacy of Newton's teaching over Descartes's. We know neither of the lives stripped of everything but resolution that were somehow fruitful, nor of them that illuminated nothing but themselves. All we know is a resultant environment of man, incredibly potent to secure human satisfaction, and incredibly active to prevent it. The potential and the resistance have grown throughout history. More and more gigantic opposites confront each other in the equation.

III.

The processes, whereby the additions are made, are understood only in principle, and principles, as Douglas has said, have no separate existence. Thus, if we accept the description of Elliot Smith, the restraining makeweight constantly opposed to the cumulative power of man to effect changes in his environment, is derived in the main from the discarded rubbish of his own experiments: discarded science (error) becomes magic, a prodigious husk imprisoning the living seed of effective knowledge. Every event in nature consciously induced by man embodies the opposite

*Reprinted from *The Fig Tree*, September, 1936.

principle. To count them would be as counting the stars of past universes.

Let us suppose that the objects before us in the experiment suggested in an earlier paragraph are merely a green baize cloth, a deal table and a cup of water. The observer may soon convince himself that even if he should be well-equipped to organise and direct the manufacture of dyes or the transport of glue, the actual production and distribution in 1936 of a green baize cloth, a deal table and a cup of water, involve processes, and many of them, of which he is ignorant and the existence of which he did not suspect. Some of these processes are industrial, recent and secret; others are intellectual, ancient and of long and obscure historical development. It is in most cases, if not in all, impossible to separate productive actions carried out in our time from past productive actions of which they are the sequelae, and any common object of modern life is seen, as soon as we enquire into its history, and into the history of the objects upon which it depends for its existence, to be as much the heir to the ages as it is a ponderable mass of matter with its own structure, form and function.

To require that the modern heritor of such objects should know much more about them than that they are there, available for the realisation of specific purposes: to be made, bought, sold and used, *is to require that he should be capable of repeating in his own experience the whole history of human development in society.* It does not matter how small is the fragment chosen for consideration, however seemingly trivial, its significance grows as we consider its ever-branching roots, until it seems to be itself the product of all civilised effort. It is.

No one is capable of repeating in his own experience the creative events which have contributed to any item of modern culture. Broadly speaking, all the items existant in any generation are inherited collectively by the individuals of the following generation. The inheritance is cumulative and vast. — TUDOR JONES.

(*To be concluded*).

"DREAM WAR OF 1946"

(*Without comment.*)

"The Free English forces had not long to wait before the enemy's secret weapon was used. The Bureaucrats' threat to control the citizen from Crèche to Crematorium was no idle boast, and the blow was struck during the hours of darkness.

"Next morning all England awoke to the sound of clanging metal and chipping of stone. An army of workmen were busy restoring the railings which had been requisitioned during the war. But the new railings were 30ft. high, *and there were no gates at any point.*

"An announcement from the Ministry of National Servitude stated that under the Railings (Compulsory Restoration) Order, 1946, after all railings had been restored civilians would require permits to leave their houses at any time laid down by the Ministry.

"People who had protested loudly when their railings were taken during the war, bellowed louder when they were put back."

— *The Sunday Dispatch,* October 22.

Trouble in the Unions?

An increasing number of politically conscious and active trade unionists are deeply concerned at the trend of trade unionism. It seems to them that the movement has lost its historic objective, and has been sidetracked into pursuit of State Socialism. The notion that the member of a trade union is interested in who owns the industry in which he works is ludicrous. Providing he gets a fair deal, the worry and responsibility of ownership does not deeply interest him. But it does interest the powerful junta which has gained control of the Unions and hopes through them to control industry and through industry the State. The greatest danger which at present threatens the future is Monopoly and whether it is private or state monopoly makes no perceptible difference to the individual. The nett result of a monopoly is to restrict the choice of alternatives open to the individual and to dominate his will. Trade unionism, which was created to protect the workers, will itself grow into a tyranny unless its members resist the present policy which is being pursued in their name by the junta. It was never the intention of the pioneers of the movement that we should change one task-master for another more powerful and less easy to combat.

The larger the union and the more diverse the trade of its members the more difficult does democratic control become. The contact between the various sections is so frail and the conflicting interests and objects of the various groups so incompatible that a common policy is almost impossible. Couple this with the vast machinery through which the voice of the members must pass before it reaches the "Holy of Holies" and the opportunities afforded to the Executive to scotch any popular sentiment before it reaches effective proportions are immense. A policy that has not the approval of the junta has little chance of success. And yet the popular voice will still burst forth unaccountably. For instance the spontaneous strike of Vickers Armstrong workers which the junta had so hard a job to suppress in the early part of this year was in reality no more than the popular reaction of members of the A.E.U. to a policy dictated by the Executive which was not in accord with the wishes of the workers themselves.

The Municipal and General Workers' Union is now having trouble with some of its members who are dockers and having failed in its efforts to cajole them back to work has retaliated by closing the branch down and proposes to open a new branch of those members who will accept the policy dictated by the union's officials. Whether this action is legal or not is open to question but that is beside the point. The fact is that here we have a body of officials who are the servants of the members not only dictating the policy to be pursued but using the extremes of coercion to enforce their will, including the confiscation of funds subscribed by the members.

"The price of freedom is eternal vigilance." That is the watchword that trade unionists must take to their hearts if they do not wish to follow the German trade unionists into a vast labour corps like that dominated by Robert Ley. For that is the dream of the junta. With more and more amalgamations and more and more power vested in the T.U.C. the dream nears its fulfilment. The methods employed are subtler than those of Adolf Hitler, but the result will be the same: no job without a trade union card, no

trade union card without obedience to dictation by the junta. A Labour Corps is a Labour Corps even if it calls itself an Essential Work Order. A Monopoly is a Monopoly even though it be known as the National Union of British Workers.

— C. TYSELL.

PARLIAMENT (*continued from page* 3)

not to do so, because much of the information contained in this Report was made available on the understanding that it would not be published. Furthermore, it would be undesirable to set a precedent of publishing confidential joint reports to the Combined Production and Resources Board.

National Coal Board

Major Proctor asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether he is aware that the National Coal Board, established by the Government to assist him in the production of coal, has not met for over six months and that the Ministry have ceased the issue of up-to-date information on production to the members of that Board; and if he will take steps to see that this body meets more frequently in future.

Major Lloyd George: Meetings of the National Coal Board and its Sub-Committees were temporarily suspended this summer in conformity with the general desire of the Government to curtail long distance travelling during the period prior to and following the invasion of the Continent. These considerations no longer apply to the same extent, and invitations have been sent to members of the Board for a further meeting to be held next month.

FORESTRY COMMISSION (LAND)

Mr. Mander asked the right hon. Baronet the Member for Rye, as representing the Forestry Commissioners, the area of land owned by the Forestry Commission in each of the years 1914, 1924, 1934, and on the latest date for which figures are available.

Sir G. Courthope: The Forestry Commission was not established until 1919. The area of land owned by the Department in each of the years mentioned was as follows:

1924	279,500
1934	891,600
1944	1,266,800

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Tax Officials

Colonel Lyons asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the approximate number of State employees, together with their annual cost, who are engaged whole-time in the collection and administration of Income Tax and Surtax.

Sir J. Anderson: It is not possible to give separate figures for staff concerned solely with the collection and administration of Income Tax and Surtax as these taxes are administered concurrently with Excess Profits Tax, the National Defence Contribution and War Damage Contribution. The number of officials engaged whole-time in the collection and administration of all these taxes was 33,600 at September 30, 1944. The estimated cost of their salaries for the year ended March 31, 1945, is £11,200,000.

Agricultural Output (Value)

Colonel Carver asked the Minister of Agriculture what is the present approximate annual value of our agricultural output.

Mr. Hudson: The value of the agricultural output of the United Kingdom in 1943-44 is estimated to be somewhat over £540,000,000. In computing this figure Exchequer payments in respect of individual commodities such as wheat and potatoes have been taken into account. The estimate is preliminary and subject to revision.

WELSH AFFAIRS

Major Beaumont: ... There is only one special point that I wish to raise in this Debate, and that is with regard to the activities of the Forestry Commision in North and Mid-Wales. There is no doubt that the Forestry Commission have done very valuable work in Wales and that they have planted many areas which were of little use for other purposes. But I am not sure that there has always been sufficient care in selecting the areas for planting. In the last 15 or 20 years, I have watched the Forestry Commission, in my part of the country, absorbing land which previously was reasonably good sheep-grazing land. They have entered the market against the ordinary buyer of land, their attractive terms have encouraged the owners of farms, especially in times of depression, to sell, and to sell to them rather than to other farmers; and while they have certainly done valuable work in planting such areas as Eisteddfa Gurig on the lower slopes of Plynlimmon and other areas of a similar nature, which could only carry a small number of sheep, they have also taken over other areas lower down the mountains and even in the valleys which, I believe, it would have been better to have left for the raising of sheep. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture is going to take part in this Debate. I know that we all congratulate him on the way in which he has helped to bring about so great an improvement in the farming lands of Wales. But I would like to suggest that, in their future plans for forestry, the Commissioners should not rush in and buy up whatever land comes into the market, simply because they need more land or becaue they wish to round off or extend their existing forests, but that there should be a much more careful survey to decide what land is best left for sheep farming and what land is most suitable for the planting of trees...

House of Commons: October 18, 1944.

MAURITIUS (JEWISH REFUGEES)

Colonel Stanley: I regret that in present circumstances it is not possible to remove these refugees from Mauritius. I am satisfied that the Government of Mauritius is doing everything possible for their comfort and welfare...

Mr. Harvey: Will the Minister bear in mind that these are all people who have escaped from murder in most terrible circumstances, and that they have special claims for consideration as soon as shipping facilities permit?

Colonel Stanley: I might point out of course, that they are in safety.

SERVICE PERSONNEL (PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATES)

Mr. Austin Hopkinson: Can the right hon. Gentleman give us any information as to various persons who are going round the Services and suggesting to future candidates that their expenses will be paid in certain conditions? Who are these persons and where does the money come from?

Mr. Attlee: I have no knowledge of that and the question should be addressed to the responsible Ministers.

EXTRA CHRISTMAS FARE

Miss Rathbone: Can we be assured that the very welcome extra supplies will not, in any way, diminish the amount of food available to be sent to the liberated countries of Europe which have suffered so much?

Colonel Llewellin: I am one of those who take the view that the people of this country, who have been on as strict rationing as anybody during these years of war, are entitled to something more.

House of Lords: October 12, 1944.

POST-WAR CIVIL AVIATION

Lord Brabazon said . . . What I complain of is that you never get a boost from the Air Ministry about our own machines. Let me give an example. There was a picture the other day in the public Press of a jet machine built here and flown here at astonishing speeds in 1941. It is now 1944. Three years were allowed to pass before we could realise it. By the side of it there was a picture of a jet machine built by Bell of America and only just flown. That is the sort of publicity you get here. There has been no mention about our jet machines that have been in action. Is there any talk about our jet machines that could fly round a Bell? It may be true but for security reasons we cannot say so. Then there comes a time when you can say something.

Let us go through some of the things that British industry has made and produced. Have we ever been told of the catapult launching of Hurricanes from merchant ships, a remarkable thing indeed, and rocket projectiles which have a fire power almost equivalent to that of a light cruiser? No, very little is said about that. Do we draw attention to the fact that there is only one machine on the Western Front, a British bomber, that can carry 12,000 pounds? There is only one machine that can carry that weight and it is a British machine. For all we are allowed to know you might think anybody could carry that weight. It is a remarkable performance that British industry has put up. Take the matter of the Mosquito alone. It takes 4,000 pounds of bombs to Berlin and it looks after itself by virtue of its speed alone. The much vaunted Flying Fortress cannot carry any more. We have some very remarkable things to our credit. Far from crying stinking fish, it is not for me to boast about English goods, but there they are if only somebody will draw attention to them. Then we have on the scientific side the remakable developments of wireless and radar. There we started the whole thing. We won our Battle of Britain on it, and since then it has been used all up and down the world. Yet most people in this country, and certainly most people in America, understand that that was an American invention. . . we hide our light under a bushel. . .

Liberal members of parliament returning to Quebec after conversations with Cabinet Ministers last month prophesy a Federal General Election on November 27, the last Monday of the month, or early in December.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.