

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 5.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The brilliant review and commentary by Mr. Norman Webb on *Soviet Legal Theory*, which has recently appeared in our columns, is in our opinion a document of major political importance. The policy of Russia is, to many people, outside the pale of reason. The same phenomenon was encountered by all the earlier exponents and protagonists of Social Credit financial theory, and was so remarkable that an enquiry into it was made by a medical psychologist of European reputation. His conclusion was that the subject penetrated below the reasoning brain to the subconscious, and caused an emotional conflict which inhibited the ordinary processes of thought.

Mr. Webb's processes have not been inhibited; and to us he brings out with perfect clarity a major issue—that the Left Wing in politics is under central direction, probably from New York, pursuing a coherent policy based on the soundest principles of military strategy—notably, Foch's principle of the Limited Objective.

No Socialist system has ever worked except by the exploitation of private initiative, and this is so universally true that we may say that Socialism is a scheme to capture it, just as the Post Office is primarily an organisation to exploit the village shop.

Socialism, Cartels, and the World Wars are parts of one whole, and to anyone who will approach the subject with an open mind, the stages by which world conquest is to be achieved are plainly marked. Merely taking the present century, the Wall Street attack on British shipping by the formation of the *International Mercantile Marine* opened the main battle and was a direct consequence of the South African (gold) War. This was repelled by the refusal to permit the sale of the Cunard Company. Money and political influence took a swift revenge in the Liberal ("Chinese Slavery") landslide of 1906, which provided Mr. Lloyd George with his opportunity to attack the land, and Mr. Asquith the excuse for the Parliament Act. The Four Years' War had as one of its main objectives the Russian Revolution, as well as the next stage in the elimination of "Britain" as a World Power.

The Armistice was a pause to consolidate the gains of the preceding period, and to re-equip "Germany" as an *agent provocateur*, so that Wall (and Pine) Street might repeat the manoeuvre. The Six Years' War has ended in the attack on British power and influence everywhere, with Wall (and Pine) Street using British troops, controlling British food, and regulating British currency and credit. And the *agent provocateur* is now "Russia," which obligingly demonstrates the source of its instructions by a continuous stream of abuse directed at "Britain" which bore the major

cost and risk of providing the materials and strategy which stemmed the German invasion. At the same time, Mr. Herbert Lehmann, of the Palestine Corporation, controls relief and emphasises the unquestioned dominance of "America" in world affairs. "Britain" is handed over internally to a gang of carefully trained wreckers, and we are all treated to a shadow-boxing exhibition with the atomic bomb just to show us who is the heavy-weight champion. It is impossible to deny that Satan is a capable organiser.

Mr. Herbert Morrison, speaking at Dewsbury, said that "even the parasitic aristocracy could join the Labour Party if they would agree to work for the elimination of the idle rich." Well, Lord Rothschild has joined, hasn't he?

The word "idle" is largely a mental mirror, but Mr. Morrison is not idle, although no one will make the mistake of calling him an aristocrat. This country needs, and will get, a thorough de-lousing; but it would not be wise of Mr. Morrison to assume that he will be in charge of the operation.

Of the persons so far arrested in Canada for selling or furnishing secret information to a foreign power, F. "Rose," M.P., Shugar, Gersen and Dr. Israel Halperin are Jews, Magenall is alleged to be partly Jewish, and Eoyer married a Jewess. Mrs. Woikin is a Russian Doukhobor from Saskatchewan, the C.C.F. (Socialist) stronghold, and three others are said to be "British." Such information as we possess suggests that they are British Communists.

The fundamental principle of Communism is insurance; and the fundamental principle of insurance is that it costs more than it comes to. Lord Rothschild has joined the Insurance Party.

We cannot vouch for the truth of the rumour that Mr. Herbert Morrison is being urged to bring before his fellow sufferers in the Cabinet a 'peace'-time version of "Careless Talk Costs Lives," to be called "How Careless Clarence lost his nice kind Labour Government," but, if the volume of careless talk about furniture from 'Government' stocks being burned, parachutes picked over for strings to supply raw material for paper making, boots and 'Mae Wests' unpicked also to find bits of the stuff the Inland Revenue distributes (and the only thing it distributes besides sin and misery), factories in 'full destruction' supplied by factories in full 'production' to supply them; leather, silk, cloth, rubber, electrical equipment and other valuable commodities treated as 'waste,' etc., etc., grows at the rate suggested by what one hears on a single railway journey, 'The Enemy'—i.e., you, Clarence,—may soon be in full cry. Or won't you?

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 19, 1946.

AMERICAN FILMS (PAYMENT TO U.S.)

Sir Waldron Smithers asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer how much has been remitted to the U.S.A. since September 1, 1939, under the agreement between the film companies and the Bank of England.

Mr. Dalton: There is no agreement between the film companies and the Bank of England. But £82,600,000 was remitted to the United States in payment for American films between September 3, 1939, and January 31, 1946.

Sir W. Smithers: Does that figure include the profits on the showing of films in addition to payment for them? In view of the desperate export situation will the Chancellor not stop the importation of American films altogether?

Mr. Dalton: No, Sir: I do not see why the hon. Gentleman should interfere with the pleasure of the people. The people like American films.

Mr. Boothby: Does not the Chancellor agree that there are limits to which the pleasures of the people may be indulged in this particular respect when the country is on the rations that it is to-day?

BRITISH INFORMATION SERVICES (NOTES)

Mr. Pickthorn asked the Assistant Postmaster-General, as representing the Ministry of Information, who are the persons in the United States concerned with British affairs, though they are not British officials, to whom B.I.S. Notes are issued; why Volume I, No. I, described a declaration by the Foreign Secretary as expressing his personal rather than the Cabinet's view; and why it gave the impression that there is practically parliamentary unanimity in favour of merging the duty of deciding matters which affect the life and death of the people in the greater power of a directly-elected assembly.

Mr. Burke: B.I.S. Notes are distributed primarily for the background use of British officials in the United States, but are also circulated among United States Government officials, editors, writers and broadcasters who have expressed an interest in British affairs.

The issue in question drew attention to my right hon. Friend's suggestion, in the Foreign Affairs Debate on November 23, of a directly-elected world assembly, which hon. Members will no doubt recall he himself stated was a personal not a Cabinet view. I do not think that the statements in this Note bear out the contention in the last part of the Question.

Mr. Pickthorn: Can we be told what machinery there is for vetting these notes? Are they submitted to the British Embassy, or who vets them before they are published in the United States?

Mr. Burke: They are sent out from this country, and, I understand, the information is put together in the United States.

Mr. Pickthorn: Are we to understand that these notes are composed in this country, and sent direct from this country to that? If so, what Minister in this country is responsible for their composition?

Mr. Burke: No, Sir; I understand that they are com-

posed in the United States of America.

Mr. Pickthorn: May I return to my original supplementary question? What machinery is there for vetting them in the United States before they are published?

Mr. Burke: I do not know about the machinery for that.

REGISTERED TRADE UNIONS (POLITICAL FUNDS)

Lieut.-Colonel Bromley-Davenport asked the Minister of Labour the number of members of registered trade unions; and the number of those members paying the political levy for each of the years 1926, 1927, 1939, 1944 and 1945.

Mr. Isaacs: Figures are not yet available for the year 1945, and the information desired is only partially available for the year 1926.

The following is the information available:

Year	All Registered Unions	Membership Registered Unions with Political Funds	Contributing To Political Funds
1926	4,147,653	*	*
1927	3,903,048	2,947,400†	2,224,000†
1939	5,018,968	4,018,479	2,012,446
1944	6,738,738	5,579,057	2,397,111

*Not available.

†A relatively small number of members of Employers' Associations are included, separate figures not being available.

March 20, 1946.

CAMBERWELL, BRISTOL AND NOTTINGHAM ELECTIONS (VALIDATION) BILL

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby): ... During the war, we legalised for the time being, the holding of seats in the House by men who occupied ambassadorial and other Government posts abroad. Some of those posts have now been terminated and it may be that they will all terminate. But there is growing up in the House a dependence on the Government which I regard as dangerous to the independence of the House itself.

The question of financial consideration links up with another, namely, the growth of party control. The Cabinet system has led to the assumption that all Members of the Cabinet must vote in the same way in the House. Subsequently, that came to apply to all Members in the Ministries, whether holding major or minor offices. We are now reaching a stage where the doctrine is being bruited abroad that a Parliamentary Private Secretary ought not to vote in a sense contrary to the Minister whom he serves. You have only to add up all the Ministers, all the Under-Ministers and their private secretaries, and there is practically only me left.

Earl Winterton (Horsham): ... I should like strongly to support what was said by the hon. Member-for Rugby (Mr. W. J. Brown). I have some hesitation in saying this, because it may seem effusive, but not for the first time has the hon. Member shown himself to be a staunch supporter of the Constitutional principles upon which this House is based. As a party politician myself, and as one who belongs to an organised party, I say that it is absolutely right to call attention to the dangers of hidden corruption in our present system, which may not necessarily be entered into by Members with their eyes open or be due to evil intensions.

I would call attention to the very strong criticism made in the Report of the Select Committee on Offices or Places of Profit under the Crown. In 1941, they wished to limit not only the number of Ministers in this House but the number of Parliamentary Private Secretaries. During the last 10 years, let alone during the last 40 years, the idea has been growing up that the Government should have a number of janissaries, bound to them by every tie of honour and expectancy, who will vote for them in any circumstances. This would be a serious thing in the old days. It is not only my view, it is also the view of the Select Committee, composed of Members from all sides of this House, and the hon. Member for Rugby did well in drawing attention to it.

I do not know whether the Press and the public will pay any particular attention to this Debate. Any working journalist knows all about the extreme pressure on space at the present time, and it may be that no attention will be called to this matter, but I can assure the public that it is a matter which indirectly affects them very considerably, and is not merely a domestic question for the House of Commons. This Bill raises that very delicate Constitutional point, to which the Attorney-General did not refer, in addition to its domestic aspect. I hope that I may state the Constitutional point correctly; it would be better for me to put it in the form of a question. Is it not the case that a subject of the Crown who breaks the law and thereby incurs penalties, whether he be a Member of Parliament or not, cannot plead inadvertence? Has it not, again and again, been held that there is no justification for ignorance of the Law, even if the Law is of an anomalous nature? Have not judges said that they are very sorry for the offender, but that he must pay damages—the inadvertence may affect to some extent the extent of the damages awarded? For the second time, in this Parliament, we are being asked to treat Members of Parliament as if they were *sui generis*, as if Members of Parliament can commit offences without the penalties which would attach to persons outside. It is not a small matter that, for the second time, we should be called upon to grant a Bill of indemnity. But the matter goes further than that. . . .

March 21, 1946.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Benn Levy: Relating to the business arrangements for last Wednesday night, may I ask my right hon. Friend in view of the fact that there was a clear mutual understanding, arrived at through the usual channels, that the Debate on the Scottish Housing Bill should terminate at 10.15, and that the hon. and gallant Member for East Renfrew (Major Guy Lloyd) saw fit to break that gentleman's agreement—[HON. MEMBERS: "Oh."]—what will be the attitude in the future of the Leader of the House towards this time-honoured system of private arrangements, if certain hon. Members opposite consider that these gentlemen's agreements are something from which they are exempt?

Mr. Stokes: On a point of Order. In defence of the rights of back benchers—[HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear."]—may I ask are you, Sir, going to tolerate the suggestion that these private arrangements should supersede the rights of back benchers?

Mr. Speaker: I agree that they are in no way official.

(Continued on page 6)

The Jewish Question

"The nation is, and will remain for a long time to come, an essential constituent of human society. It is not possible to arrive at internationalism by disregarding the nation. . . . If the Jews wish to become members of the international Society of Nations, they themselves must become a nation again. . . . The Jewish question cannot be solved by the defeat of German Nazism. The Jews, who control the emigrant Governments in London and dream bloody plans of revenge, will be on false ground. . . . Dr. Benes, with the help of the British or Soviet armies, can return with his Jews to Bohemia. He can have as many Czechs condemned as he likes, he can return to the Jews all their former property. However, a much deeper and more hateful form of anti-Semitism will arise among the Czech nation, which until this war did not have anti-Semitic feelings, than there is to-day among the Germans. Every Czech will ask himself the question, What right have these Jews, who during the war have lived in safety and plenty abroad, to come home as conquerors?"

"Similarly, the Polish people will ask themselves the same question, and so will people throughout the whole of Europe. These Jews, who to-day in the background of the emigrant Governments dream plans of glorious homecoming, are in reality only preparing the ground for a deeper anti-Semitic hatred than Hitler could ever organise. Only the Zionists are the prudent leaders of the Jews and the only possible partners in the new organisation of nations. Also, Jews up to now are paying very little attention to their voices. They are behaving towards them just as they behaved towards their prophets before Jews were scattered throughout the whole world. Only to-day the question which is before them is not one of dispersion, it is simply this: either a Jewish State and the end of anti-Semitism or anti-Semitism until the end of the last Jew."

— V. Lezak-Borin, *To-morrow's Dawn*.

THE BRIEF for the PROSECUTION by C. H. DOUGLAS

8/6 net.

"... Major Douglas possesses one of the most penetrating intellects of our time; he has a profound knowledge of the 'set-up' behind governments—and he is fearless—a combination of gifts most rare in a time-serving world."

"Major Douglas at his best."

— Truth.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, Victoria Street, LIVERPOOL, 2.

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: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 16. No. 5. Saturday, April 6, 1946.

We Descend to Meet

"We are armed all over with subtle antagonisms, which as soon as we meet, begin to play, and translate all poetry into stale prose. Almost all people descend to meet. All association must be a compromise, and, what is worst, the very flower and aroma of the flower of each of the beautiful natures disappears as they approach each other. What a perpetual disappointment is actual society, even of the virtuous and gifted."

Emerson's insight reaches the heart of the problem of society. We can now speak only metaphorically, in whispers not overheard, of virtues and gifts. The 'psychologists,' those heavy-weight disembodied spirits, or cloudy sublimates of mechanistic physiology, have abolished all the virtues, everyone of them, together with virtue itself; and, of course, no one can be gifted, since to be gifted implies a giver. There are no givers: there is no Giver. Men are just sluices for taxes *en route* to The-Great-Taker-of-All. So the virtuous and the gifted do not any longer exist. Poetry does not exist. It has been brought down *from* its level. It has descended. It has met Miss Wilkinson. Which reminds us that even prose can no longer be considered to be altogether prosy. There is something duller, to which further descent is possible, *e.g.*, the speeches prepared for Miss Wilkinson. People are really all alike, and soon, Miss Wilkinson hopes, all the school children will be exactly like her, growing up into—Ah! no, not that. But, anyhow, we shall be really all like Miss Wilkinson. And the gorgeous spread of official luncheons will be ours too, but *equitably* distributed, on smaller plates, and one plate each, or not more than two or three sharing (*equitably*) the same plate. This giving business must stop.

The world will find the answer to this, if at all, in tribulation. But we do know what the answer is, and that it lies in an extension of Emerson's intuition, and in a tidying of its incidence, to rest upon the commoner matters of human relationship as well as upon the sublimities. In their functions, people are *not* individual; people are persons, individuals, *except* in their functions. The unearned increment of association is a *functional* not a *political* concept. Politics has to do with the utilisation of the increment. It has *not* got to do with the subordination of the individual. The supreme value is the individual. Combination is good and useful only so long as the individual is not sacrificed to it.

British-American Military Alliance

The following letter was sent to but not, so far as we know, published in the *Scotsman*:—

In suggesting a formal military alliance in peace-time

between this country and the U.S.A. Mr. Churchill proves to us once again the force of heredity—he is an Anglo-American by birth—and the strength of ideas assimilated in youth.

The peculiar American admiration for Bigness and the belief in the 'safety' inherent in ever vaster agglomerations of power, are of course signs of immaturity of thought. He would be a bold man, however, who would venture to suggest that there is anything immature about the intellect of Mr. Churchill and we must leave future historians to explain how it comes about that so many of the highly experienced worldly-wise politicians of the old world have for more than half a century been dominated by the chain-store conception that the only way to solve a problem is to enlarge its confines.

The matter is put quite bluntly nowadays. Nations wage wars so you must abolish nations if you want to abolish wars. You must create a world-government, backed by the sanctions of a world-police force. There is an ominous hint in Mr. Churchill's speech that his alliance may eventuate in common citizenship, with, presumably, a common Anglo-American police force to ensure that we may all enjoy the blessed state of peace and tranquility said to reign in the cities of Chicago and New York.

If, by a mishap, this 'prophecy' remains unfulfilled we can still look forward to the creation of those overwhelming sanctions which Mr. Churchill, in common with prominent Continental politicians, has deemed should be placed at the disposal of the world organisation till recently known as the League of Nations but currently answering to the three letters U.N.O. So we might get the world police force (state?) by another route.

The solution to our (and the world's) difficulties lies in a different direction. The only viable and effective League of Nations the world has known is the British Empire. Let us recall Mr. Churchill's wartime statement that "he had not become His Majesty's first Minister to assist at the liquidation of the British Empire" as well as his equally invigorating exhortation "to hold what we have."

What we have is not a trifle, even if we take that modern criterion of greatness, size. The British Empire is three or four times larger than the U.S.A. generally advertised as "the greatest country in the world" (*vide* the world press anywhere). The population of the U.S.A. is only a quarter that of the British Empire.

But the real point is: what have we done with "what we have?" The statistics with regard to the respective contributions of the Big Three Powers show that the war-effort of the British Empire was far greater than America's and Russia's; that in 1943 and 1944 every British Dominion as well as the mother country, contributed a larger share of their national incomes towards winning the war than either the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R., and that over the whole period the output per man was greater than in the U.S.A. with Russia far behind. Add to this that no decisive weapon used in the war originated outside the British Empire and that the Empire possesses every raw material needed by modern industry, and you have the background against which any further rapprochement between our two countries, with their two distinct cultures and ideals, should be viewed.

I am, etc.,

W. L. RICHARDSON

Lawers, March 13, 1946.

An Objective Analysis of Bureaucracy*

(Continued)

The conspicuous merit and achievement of Professor von Mises's book already noted* was its objective analysis of Bureaucracy; its function and its nature and, as the outcome of both, its method—a thing neither good nor bad in itself; an inevitable concomitant of all Government. It is useless waste of time to inveigh against things for being what they are. Reserve your censure for those things that abuse and overstep their natural function. Bureaucratic methods are of their nature dilatory unimaginative and legalistic; but that is their nature, and the reason it is so is given in this book with extreme clarity.

What arises, however, from this analysis, and is of even more value, is the knowledge that the loss of efficiency noted above is common to all undertakings lacking "the profit motive," not only because the essential stimulus is absent, but because the basis both for correct planning and for quick and responsible calculation and administration disappears with the substitution of service (civil service) for Profit (personal interest). It is upon this point—the practicability or otherwise of Bureaucracy as a productive technique—that Professor von Mises discredits Socialism so convincingly, and further, accuses Socialists of duplicity and evading the issue. "The recognition of this truth," he says, "has for many years been prevented by the taboos" (occult threats) "of Marxism. One of Marxism's main contributions to the success of pro-Socialist propaganda was to outlaw the study of the economic problems of the Socialist Commonwealth." It was argued that in obedience to the laws of Historic Determinism, *i.e.*, Marx and Engels's Hegelian methods of reasoning, Socialism was unavoidable, and therefore it would be waste of time asking how it would work. "One of the most remarkable facts of the intellectual history of 19th and early 20th centuries" we read, "is that this Marxian *Verboten* is strictly obeyed. The few economists who dared to defy it were disregarded and soon fell into oblivion. Only about twenty-five years ago the spell was broken. . . ."

One breaks off here to speculate on several matters. The italics above, which are not the author's, indicate the direction of one's thoughts. Twenty-five years ago—von Mises's book is dated 1945—saw the publication of the book, *Economic Democracy*. What other spell-breaking publication saw the light then? One has never heard of any other. The author in a note on this page gives the names of three books, one by himself and two by Dr. Hayek, but their dates are 1935 and 1936, fourteen years later. And yet, while his conclusion in this book is not so deeply pessimistic as the last chapters of *The Road to Serfdom*, it contains not the slightest hint of a recognition that the practical unworkability of the Socialist Planned Economy, due to the nature of the Bureaucratic method, is in almost every way matched by the unworkability of a so-called Free Economy under the present system of debt-accumulation.

After all, the universally-detested system of State interference has only gained popular support as a means of resolving the hopeless impasse in which Free Enterprise finds itself. Yet the taboo against questioning the presumptions of Socialism, which Professor von Mises has so greatly helped

to break by this book of his, still apparently surrounds the working of orthodox national accountancy. Russia's past revolutionary experience may be having a profound effect in "high places," as to the economic effects of unqualified Government control, but the "Iron Curtain" is still down upon the Social Credit analysis of orthodox finance, and unfortunately both the Austrian doctors are on the wrong side of it. For them the assumption as to the self-liquidating character of our present Money System is still unchallengeable; for them in spite of the evidence to the contrary in every quarter of the globe, given by mounting public indebtedness, the operative word is still *Verboten*.

It was this same hypnotised blindness that clouded Dr. Hayek's otherwise magnificent essay, and closed it upon a note of unrelieved pessimism. And it is the same myopia we find at work here operating to take the heart out of this equally useful work. The weakness becomes evident, as such weaknesses always do, when Professor von Mises comes to ask himself in his last chapter—Is there a Remedy? It is always at this point that the thinking individual who has not cleared his thought of dialectics;—as it were, becomes "pure in heart" in the Gospel sense,—betrays his partisanship. The Professor is under no illusion that ideological Bureaucracy, *i.e.*, Socialism, will work; but unfortunately he is still under the occult influence that keeps him believing that ideological industry, that is, Capitalism, will. The truth is, however, that under the unrealistic conditions introduced by a faulty system of financial measurement, regulation (government) of any and every kind, Bureaucratic or Enterprising, to coin a term, becomes distorted and bloated and stinking. Big Ministries, the abuse of Bureaucracy, or Big Business, the abuse of Industry, are complimentary, and equally tyrannical and restrictive. And in as far as we put up Capitalism, which is Production as it is forced to operate under the present unrealistic Money System, in opposition to Socialism, which is Government under the same unrealistic compulsion, we are merely reacting dialectically, and confusing and helping to embroil different aspects of the same thing. Capitalism is no cure for Socialism, any more than Socialism is a cure for Capitalism; "the blind cannot lead the blind."

The party-political truth is that it is as unsafe and as unrealistic to hold a brief for Right Wing idealistic Capitalism as for Left Wing idealistic Socialism. The only safe course is the straight line between them. This last Professor von Mises fails to see, and as a result the balance and conviction of this excellent study is marred, and its scientific value, which as it is is considerable, greatly lessened. His mind on the subject is only partially cleared of cant, and consequently we find such misleading and partial statements as this: "Under free capitalism unemployment is a comparatively unimportant temporary phenomenon." Or this: "Capitalism is progressive, Socialism is not." Could an intelligent Marxian ask for a better sitting shot? So it is not surprising to find the author, in answer to his own question as to the remedy for rampant Bureaucracy, suggesting unconvincingly: "There is but one way towards an increase in real wages and rates for all those eager to earn wages, progressive accumulation of new capital and the improvement of technical methods of production which the new capital brings."

**Bureaucracy* by Ludwig von Mises. Wm. Hodge & Co., Ltd., 8/6.

That is simply a description of the process that has

been going on under the present financial system since the Industrial Revolution began—since civilisation began, really. Can it be called an exaggeration to use the word “mesmerism” to describe the state of mind that puts that forward at the conclusion of this most intelligent essay, as a practical means of escape out of the mess into which the process itself has led? Just the popular parrot-call—popular alike with “collectivist” Labourites and “individualist” Tories—to “capital construction” and/or exporting, in order to distribute the consumption goods (real wages) which the orthodox Monetary System is unable, or unwilling to distribute. How long ago was it that Douglas described that some System as one that compelled us to build a cruiser in order to have a loaf of bread to eat.

It is the persistence of this Right Wing, partisan weakness, that supplies the Left with its dialectically so effective ammunition, and enables them to broadcast among the public a plausible apprehension of the return to a Free Economy. It is no answer to the inexpressible evils of collective utopianism, to promote an individualistic Utopia and hope for the best; and it is because our own Conservatives and their transatlantic cousins, the exponents of the “American Way,” hypnotically ignore these undeniable abuses; a denial leading directly to the unemployment and uncertainty which are the stock-in-trade of all Left Wing propaganda that so little headway is made.

We predict a success for this book among intellectual Conservatives of the same kind as Dr. Hayek's *Road to Serfdom* has gained, and for the same reasons: that, whether the authors wished to or not, they have both provided a really effective and scientific condemnation of Big Government—Totalitarianism—without giving away, or demonstrating any express objection, philosophic or technical, to Big Business, which is Totalitarianism under another name, and just as sweet-smelling.

Can those two sensitive and acute minds of “the Austrian Economic School,” not be induced to carry their personal war against occultism—the Marxian *Verboten*—a step further, so as to embrace both aspects of the dialectical disease from which modern society suffers. They might jeopardise their success with the political Right, but we would remind them that there *is* a Middle Course, neither Right nor Left for which Anglo-Saxon culture has a natural bias, failure to discover and follow which, if it is very much longer delayed, will mean the end of this present civilisation.

“Whether we like it or not” says Professor von Mises, in his last chapter, advocating the economic education of the man-in-the-street, “it is a fact that the main issues of present day politics are purely economic and cannot be understood without a grasp of economic theory.” But which, or what economic theory? Both the political Left and the political Right hold the same; both are for Full Employment, *i.e.*, industrial expansion, “accumulation of new capital,” as Professor von Mises puts it, not for the sake of output, but for the sake of work, jobs; both are for a policy of Exports for exactly the same purpose; and both, if only they would stop to examine the situation, must admit that it is the attempt to rely on those same utterly artificial and unrealistic expedients that has already precipitated two world-wars, and must surely bring a third?

Whether Professor von Mises refers to the publication of the book *Economic Democracy* or not, when he speaks of the breaking of the spell prohibiting the study of the practicability of Socialism twenty-five years ago, one is not in a position to say. It is a fact that, as he says, “The impossibility of economic calculation under Socialism was demonstrated in an irrefutable way” at that time. But it is unfortunately also true that the Marxian taboo still persists over a vital part of the economic field, as is proved by the author's own blindness to Douglas's demonstration.

—NORMAN WEBB.

Police Description

“*Special features:* Second and third toes of the left foot attached. Semi-impotent left arm. *Appearance:* Ordinary. *Hair:* Dark-brown. *Moustaches:* Brown. *Nose:* Straight and long. *Forehead:* Straight but low. *Face:* Long, swarthy and pock-marked.”

“The police of 1902 described this man (then twenty-three years old) as ‘an intellectual’ and as ‘a professional revolutionary.’

“It was a man of many names, including ‘David,’ ‘Wyeradze,’ ‘Ivanovich,’ ‘Koba,’ and his nick-name of ‘Sosso.’ His birth-name was “Joseph Visarionovich Djughashvili”—yes, you have guessed.

“He was—. But to-day he is Marshal Stalin.”

— Truth.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

Mr. Gallacher: Was it an Englishman or a Scot that made the agreement?

Mr. Morrison: It is perfectly true an arrangement was reached. Although it was private in the first place, it was announced and confirmed by me, with the assent of the Acting Leader of the Opposition. These are not corrupt bargains between the two Front Benches; they are matters for the convenience of the House and its workings—

Mr. Stokes: No.

ARTS COUNCIL

Viscount Hinchinbrooke asked the Minister of Education who are the members of the Arts Council; what salaries are paid; and what is the period of appointment.

Miss Wilkinson: The members of the Arts Council are:

The Lord Keynes, C.B. (Chairman), Sir Lewis Casson, Sir Kenneth Clark, K.C.B., Lord Esher, Dr. B. Ifor Evans, Mrs. Barbara Ayrton Gould, M.P., Lord Harlech, G.C.M.G., Mrs. Thelma Cazalet Keir, Mr. John Maud, C.B.E., Dr. O. H. Mavor, Mr. W. E. Williams, C.B.E., Dr. R. Vaughan Williams, O.M.

No salaries are paid, and there is at present no period of appointment for councillors.

Viscount Hinchinbrooke asked the Minister of Education to what extent she accepts responsibility for the policy of the Arts Council.

Miss Wilkinson: I am responsible for seeing that the

funds provided by Parliament are used for the purposes for which they have been granted and that the money is properly accounted for. On April 1 next, this responsibility passes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer who has, nevertheless, said that he will consult the Secretary of State for Scotland and myself over appointments to the Council and over major questions of policy. The detailed application of the funds for the purposes for which they have been granted is a matter within the discretion of the Council itself.

Viscount Hinchinbrooke asked the Minister of Education what is the annual expenditure of the Arts Council; and to what extent contributions are made to its expenses from central Government funds.

Miss Wilkinson: The Council's budget for the current year, 1945-46, amounts to £244,085. The Exchequer has contributed £235,000 by way of a grant in aid on the Vote of the Ministry of Education. Provision has been taken in the Civil Estimates for the year 1946-47 for a grant in aid of £320,000 (Civil Estimates, 1946, Class IV, Vote 10).

March 22, 1946.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (QUESTIONS)

Sir John Mellor (Sutton Coldfield): ... I should like to make one particular point. The real sanction which lies behind our getting satisfactory answers to Questions is the power of back bench Members to raise a question at other times if they do not get satisfaction at Question time. At the present time, virtually the only opportunity they have is upon the Adjournment, and all Ministers and their advisers know perfectly well that the chance of a back bench Member being able to get the Adjournment before the Question has become completely stale is probably something like 20, 30, or 40 to one against. . .

It is well known to Ministers that the chance of back-bench Members raising a question on the Adjournment before it has become stale is relatively small, and that at the best it is speculative. I believe that this must have some influence upon the way in which the Ministers prepare their answers where the matters are rather ticklish to deal with, and I maintain that if that is the real sanction lying behind the right of private Members to obtain answers to Questions at Question time, they ought to consider for a moment whether it is a sufficiently strong one. In my submission it is not, and I therefore suggest that the House ought to require something in exchange from the Government for giving up their right to give one clear day's notice only for Questions. We ought to ask the Government to give at least one day to private Members per month, for Motions for which we should ballot in the old-fashioned way. I do not think that is an unreasonable request. It would add to our powers of raising questions on which we have not obtained satisfaction at Question time. . . .

March 25, 1946.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES (RECONSTRUCTION)

Mr. R. S. Hudson asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he is now in a position to make a further statement on the reconstitution of the county W.A.E.Cs.

Mr. T. Williams: As the reply is rather long I will,

with permission, read it at the end of Questions.

Later—

Mr. Williams: Yes, Sir. After discussions with representatives of the industry, I am proposing to reconstitute the War Agricultural Executive Committee in each county in England and Wales on the following basis: Three members appointed from a list to be submitted by the National Farmers' Union; two members appointed from a list submitted jointly by the National Union of Agricultural Workers and the Transport and General Workers' Union; two members appointed from a list submitted by the Central Landowners' Association; together with the chairman and not more than four other members to be appointed independently by me. In addition the representative of the Women's Land Army will continue to be a member. The purpose of my direct appointments will be to add to the members selected from the lists submitted by the various organisations a number of persons with general or special qualifications, knowledge and experience, such as would be of value in improving the efficiency of the Committees. I shall for example have in mind the claims of persons with appropriate scientific, technical or professional qualifications; persons with experience of commercial horticulture and other special types of food production that are of importance in a particular area; persons qualified to represent the point of view of working owners or owner occupiers of small farms in those counties where such farms are of special importance; agricultural workers where there are suitable men available who have not been appointed from the Unions' lists; and persons of any class who have served with distinction on the wartime Executive Committees and whose continued service is desirable. This reconstitution, which I hope will take place in June, will be for the interim period until legislation providing for the permanent Committees is on the Statute Book, and will be without prejudice to the basis of constitution of the permanent bodies.

Wing-Commander Mullington: Will the Minister reconsider the reconstitution of these committees, because with three farmers and two landowners to every two workers' representatives, the workers cannot be expected to carry out the policy of increased production per manhour?

Mr. Williams: I am sure that the hon. and gallant Member will not forget that the new county executive committees will have power to dispossess any farmer who fails to rise to a standard of good husbandry—not only to dispossess him of his farm, but of his household too. The same remark applies to landowners who fail in estate management. The same thing does not quite apply to agricultural workers.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BILL— BUILDING MATERIALS

Dr. Barnett Stross (Hanley): ... The Minister mentioned a very important material when discussing plaster boards. Whatever may be the future of house building, it is certain that plaster board has become a very important and popular constituent in house erection, not only for walls but for ceilings as well. I think the Minister gave a figure of 700,000 square yards a week as the present output. In terms of weight I think it is reasonable to say that the probable output per year is about 180,000 tons and the firms that manufacture this important element in house construc-

ion have offered to increase their production gradually until they ultimately reach an optimum of 500,000 tons per annum.

In order to effect manufacture on this scale, they will require something like 1,250,000 tons of gypsum/anhydrate per year. This material has not always been found in this country in the past, and a portion of it used to be imported. It is available from Soviet sources in Riga, and can be obtained from France at a very reasonable price. It was also imported from Canada, although now there is a problem with reference to currency and the dollar exchange. Only two firms, as far as I know, are interested in the production of plaster board, and this makes as close a monopoly as any other that exists, or ever has existed in the country. The two firms are I.C.I. and B.P.B.—The British Plaster Board Company—and they became interested in this production in the 1930s, first importing it and later creating their own manufacturing plant here. I.C.I. are in a privileged position, because they rely on their own resources of gypsum/anhydrate, but British Plaster Board have allocated and laid out three of their largest plants for imported gypsum material from Canada. This is bound to cause difficulty in increasing our production if we ask for, and we must ask for, increased production as quickly as possible.

This association of two firms or companies succeeded in monopolising itself by taking over some 15 competing firms before the war, and three more firms during 1944. I doubt whether five *per cent.* or 10 *per cent.* of the material is available from any other source to-day...

Obviously only one of two things can be done. The Ministry must take over the firm because it is a dangerous monopoly, or else they must encourage production by outside firms even if they create them, so that we may know where we stand.

House of Lords: March 20, 1946.

OFFICERS' PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Lord Balfour of Inchrye: ... I can remember that in the war, when great operations were proceeding in North Africa and in France, the Lord President of the Council spent three mornings adjudicating between the Service Departments and the Treasury as to what were the allowances to be paid to those in charge of our Service missions in Washington. I think it was a terrible indictment of what I would call the worst form of Treasury attitude, that we should have to have four Ministers of Cabinet rank, or their deputies, including the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Lord President of the Council, arguing for three mornings as to what allowances should be paid to Generals, Air Marshals and Admirals, while the greatest war the world has ever seen was in progress.

I think we might take a leaf out of Russia's book in this matter. I understand a Russian General's pay is approximately on a level with that of our Generals. I understand also that Russian Generals retire on full pay. Recently, when this matter was being discussed with a British General and a Russian General, it was found that, broadly speaking, the rates of pay of General Officers in the two countries was the same. But then our General said: "Of course, there is the tax to be taken into account." The Russian General said: "Tax! Who on earth should make soldiers pay tax? The whole thing is immoral." I do not say we should go so far

as that, but I do ask that we should treat our Generals, Air-M Marshals and Admirals on a scale which will allow them to keep up the positions we ask them to fill. ...

Lord Mountevans: ... I liked the reference of the noble Marquess, Lord Reading, to the "trick cyclist." I agree with him that too much value is attributed to what the psychiatrist says, and I think if one searched back into the antecedents of psychiatrists one would find that most of them were not very English. ...

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
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.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....(reprinting)	

ALSO

Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
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/-
Aberghart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...8d.	
Why You Are Short of Coal by Aims of Industry.....6d.	
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick.....6d.	
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....4d.	
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson...6d.	
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....3d.	
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
A Comprehensive Medical Service (Reprinted from <i>The Tablet</i>).....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.