

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 18. No. 2.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 15, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

A stage is approaching in the affairs of this country at which comment becomes increasingly difficult by reason of conflicting priorities. If we are to take the Administration at its own valuation, no competent ability has previously been applied to the affairs of these islands or the vast Empire which grew up round them. But we are now in the hands of experts; and they are showing us what brains and a training in Trades Unionism and the political Testament of Sir Ernest Cassel synthesised with Karl Marx and distilled by the London School of Economics can do. We are now Planning in a Big Way.

The first step was to insist on Greater Production and More Hard Work for Everyone. Without stopping too long to consider the million bureaucrats appointed to hinder the decreasing number of actual producers, we made such strenuous efforts to produce electrical gadgets that the country has been practically shut down (we will consider alternative explanations later) because the misguided public insisted on using them. So no more are to be sold except for export.

But it is fairly obvious that we are not going to export them to the United States or Canada which make unlimited electrical gadgets better and cheaper than we do. So we are sending them somewhere else. (Whiree, rah, rah). Bearing in mind that electrical gadgets require much imported raw material which has to be paid for, and that production itself takes power, let us contemplate the full beauty of Planned Achievement. *Forty two per cent (£590,000,000) of our imports are coming from the dollar area, and only fourteen per cent of our exports (£132,000,000) will be set against them.* This leaves a bill for about £460,000,000 per annum to be paid to the dollar area which is quite considerably composed of the raw material we have thrown into "soft" currency credits in countries from which, apparently, we do not wish to import. If we were not in the hands of Experts, we should suggest that the major portion of these credits will be, or is irretrievably lost. So that the apparent result of our last year's work is to do 100% of it for 14% pay, the pay being largely the raw material with which to do 150% work next year for 10% pay. On the basis of this brilliant performance, everyone's pay is to be raised, to avoid inflation.

Bearing in mind the foregoing evidence of our Brilliant Political and Economic Revival, Clarence, perhaps we may enquire of you, whether the current crisis is due to:

- (1) Lack of coal.
- (2) Lack of electrical plant.
- (3) Whether if we had suddenly acquired more electrical plant, the miners would have mined more coal to work it, or if we hadn't, more coal would

have made it break down oftener?

- (4) Why, with half the consumption of electrical energy in 1920, a trivial amount in 1900, we were far better off?
- (5) Why the miners are to have special privileges when the trouble is lack of electrical plant (or isn't it)?

Turning for a moment from economics to politics, we pause to consider the fact that we are having war waged on us in Palestine. At the same time nearly every key position in this country is either held or controlled by the co-racialists of the people who are murdering our soldiers, thus preventing them from fighting back, these positions having been won mainly by fraudulent book-keeping. From a land which is not theirs, and has been occupied by Arabs for far longer than it ever was by its fresh claimants, the British are to be driven into the sea. From islands which we thought were ours, we are not to debar, still less to expel those co-racialists who are attacking us the world over, and, arranging to transfer our assets elsewhere. Truly the British are a strange race.

The increasing divergence from that attitude which Francis Bacon so brilliantly envisaged—"a just and legitimate familiarity between the mind and things"—is nowhere more strikingly exemplified than in the Socialist-cum-Chatham House-Arnold Toynbee chatter on the subject of National Sovereignty. As a commentary on it, let us consider Turkey, which has a total population of about nineteen millions. She is maintaining and equipping a standing army of over 600,000, the size of Germany's army before the 1914 War. Their pay is tenpence per month, yet more than half Turkey's Budget goes for military uses. That is because the Turks will endure anything rather than lose their national sovereignty.

The *Sunday Times* is easily the most sober and responsible of the newspapers sold on that day—we often wonder why it does not advertise that it is not published on week-days—and it is therefore the more astonishing that it should emit such nonsense as that embodied in the first paragraphs of its leader of March 2, which it entitles "Crisis in Leadership." Properly discounting the facile explanations of the present situation given by Mr. Shinwell and others like him, it remarks "The cause lies much deeper . . . It lies in a chronic tendency for consumption to outrun production, for purchasing power to exceed the goods available to buy."

We acquit the author of that statement of conscious misrepresentation. What he means, but does not convey intelligibly, is that the whole industrial effort of this country is being perverted, so that it does not adequately supply the consumers market; while the large essentially fictitious wages account for non-consumer goods swelled by nearly

a million useless hinderers, the bureaucracy, all drawing salaries, is loosed against it. The leader is simply appalling. If it came from the gutter press, it would not matter. From a journal of the pretensions of the *Sunday Times*, it does. The remedy for the situation is exactly the opposite of that which it goes on to advocate. It is a shift of emphasis from—not a cessation of—capital and export production and an increase of consumer goods for sale at constantly falling prices. That will restore the exchange value of the pound; and nothing else will.

The rapturous folly of the general mentality on these matters is well illustrated by the enthusiasm of Mr. Thomas Johnston, who talks much of getting dollars from American tourists.

Does Mr. Johnston seriously think that Americans would tolerate present living conditions in this country, or is his suggestion, that, like Moscow, there should be luxury for the Kommissars and their visitors, and penury for everyone else?

An American actress visiting one of our richest Northern cities recently commented in crisp phrases on the discomfort, bad food, bad cooking and general squalor. She was informed that of course, this was all due to the war. Her reply seems to us to be adequate. "Yeah, that was two years ago. You won it. So what?"

There is a curious and widespread feature in even the minority of sincere and disinterested comment on the financial system which accounts for much of the disruptive effect of monetary reform. We refer to the great difficulty which seems to be experienced in recognising the inescapable inferences from the most obvious facts. An instance of this is contained in an article from the pen of Mr. J. L. Benvenisti, published in the *Dublin Standard* of February 28. The article is headed "Not enough to go round."

The argument may be summarised by short quotations from it. "The trouble is not so much diminished production as increased consumption due to the fact that Britain [*sic*] is now for the first time in two generations experiencing the phenomenon of full employment in times of peace." "The root difficulty was an inability to command the food and raw materials which were necessary to maintain the standard of life which social reformers quite legitimately thought to be the citizens' due" . . . "That people should have thought they could be conjured out of existence by some kind of monetary magic is a sad reflection" *etc, etc.*

Mr. Benvenisti is, we believe, an "office" economist, i.e. he does not make or grow anything, so the first question we should put to him may not be of the type to which he is accustomed. The present consumption of electrical energy per head is nearly twice what it was 25 years ago. A unit of electrical energy represents broadly the work of ten men for an hour. There was a great deal of "unemployment" twenty-five years ago. *What are we getting for this immense increase in work, if it is not the food and materials we want? And why do it, if it is useless? And if what we wanted was food, why were five million acres of good arable land forced out of cultivation by taxation and financial chicanery during the armistice years? And why did not we develop our Empire relations*

so as to absorb all the food and raw materials they wanted to send us?

Mr. Benvenisti is not merely wrong but he is dangerously wrong, because he is obviously unable to see that the root cause of our difficulties is political and that the financial system, defects in which he admits, was not defective from the point of view of those who wished to make it a political not an accounting device. It was marvellously effective. Sir Stafford Cripps has closed any possibility of discussion by admitting that only 14% of the export drive is, in effect, any use to us.

We are misusing our energies and never so much as now; and Mr. Benvenisti is, no doubt, unwittingly assisting those who are determined we shall continue to do so.

We cannot be accused, in these pages or elsewhere, of having failed to indicate where, in our opinion, our policy is incubated. Having done our best in this matter, we are nevertheless coming to the opinion that the better elements in this country are rather "lying down to it." God wot, they have excuses; but being faced with the alternatives of being shot or boiled in oil, there seems to be something to be said for spitting in the eye of the executioners. To be quite concrete, this country is rapidly heading for a condition of combined squalor and decaying monuments of past grandeur at home, and, at best, contemptuous pity, abroad; and that progress is not going to be arrested by the present fraudulent democracy acting through a Communist-perverted Single Chamber. Many of our present ills can be traced back to that agent of the alien, Cromwell, but no-one ought to deny him realism; and his manner of dealing with the intensely unpopular Long Parliament, by ordering his soldiers to 'take away that bauble' the mace, and clearing and locking the doors of the House of Commons, may yet, in essence, if not in form, be forced upon the remnant of native 'Britain.'

"Yet to all empires comes a day of which it can be said 'At this point the sceptre had passed to other hands.' That day came last week to Britain [*sic*]. For years both the wise and the merely smart had been pointing to the signs of Britain's [*sic*] decline. But it took the coal crisis to bring home to the world that decline had reached the Empire's heart."

"Time," U.S.A., February, 24.

Notice the grief.

We have much pleasure in giving the widest publicity in our power, for the benefit of our overseas readers, to the broadcasting by the "British" Broadcasting Corporation in its Home Service Bulletin of March 6, 8 a.m., of its apology, under pressure from Mr. Odlum, for the publication of a libel reflecting on him as a farmer. The Judgment of Mr. Justice Atkinson in *Odlum v. Stratton* was given at length in our columns and we consider that a great debt of gratitude is due to Mr. Odlum for his demonstration that our new autonomous MONOPOLIES can still be reminded that their licence has limits.

Out of Sight

A writer in the *Catholic Herald* says that about 10,000 members of the Communist Party of Great Britain have "apparently vanished into thin air since last year."

An Introduction to Social Credit*

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

Part 1.—PHYSICS.

(3)

So far we have considered the subject of "plenty" from its origin in the individual—we have considered what is available to the individual as such, allowing him the cultural inheritance but otherwise using only his own animal energy and the tools he has made or inherited. Tools and knowledge place him at a great advantage over the primitive condition, and this advantage is enormously, incalculably, extended and enriched by three further factors.

The first is the association of individuals to achieve a common objective. The first obvious result of association is that a given job may be accomplished more quickly and more easily; and this is the least important result. For association makes possible results impossible for the individual as such. Not only may two men lift a heavy object more easily than one—two men may lift a weight that neither alone could lift. Within reasonable limits, new results become possible with every addition to the number. Thus there is a benefit in association far beyond the benefit of simple addition of numbers. What emerges over and above the simple addition is called the *unearned increment of association*.

It is difficult to think of much that modern man does which does not rest somewhere on this increment, the various forms of which are of great complexity. The "division of labour" and consequent mass-production on which we all increasingly depend is a simple extension of the idea of primary association, more complex are the relations between various associations. The telephone, itself the result of complex associations, depends on there being at least two users, and the addition of each new user increases the potential usefulness of the system to all the existing users. But the existence of the telephone system as a whole enhances the efficiency of all industry, and some processes are dependent on the telephone, or some equivalent system, of instantaneous communication. Thus the "association of associations" produces a further increment. It is, of course, impossible to follow and analyse the ultimate complexity of association; but the principle can be grasped so that its immense multiplying power may be appreciated. It must be remembered that this multiplication operates on the individual achievements we considered first.

The second factor is the introduction of solar energy in place of animal energy as the basis of work done. Solar energy means energy derived in one way or another from the energy of the sun; it therefore includes energy stored in the form of wood, coal, and oil, and water-power derived from the changes in the distribution of water due to the sun's heat.

It must be emphasised that it is *energy*, and not machines as such, which is under consideration here. Machines are simply a form of tools, and the relation of these to output, in principle, has already been considered. From a theoretical point of view, it is a matter of indifference what is the source of energy which powers the tools; what is important is the total available energy, and the efficiency with which it is utilised. On this basis, human *labour* is only a proportion

of the total energy, and although exact figures are not available, it is certain that human labour contributes less than a fiftieth of the total; and since solar energy is harnessed more rapidly than the human population increases, the human contribution of energy is a decreasing fraction.

In fact, from the point of view of energy, human labour is negligible, and could for the most part, be dispensed with entirely; its importance lies in quite another direction. It has, become as Major Douglas describes it, a *catalyst*. This is an illuminating analogy. The term "catalyst" is used in chemistry to denote a substance the presence of which either enables a chemical reaction to take place, or to take place very much more rapidly, but which does not itself enter into the reactions; thus the catalyst is not consumed in the reaction, though it may be dissipated to some extent. Manufacturing chemistry is to a large extent dependent on the use of catalysts. In the same way modern industry is dependent on human labour; production is effected predominantly by solar energy and tools, but it requires the presence of human "labour" to "catalyse" the processes. The quantity of production is proportional to the total energy, not to the number of men employed—for example, a machine tended by one man may go faster or slower, according to the power supplied to it, without making much difference to the man supervising it.

The amount of solar energy already harnessed is immense—many times the man-power of the entire world—and the efficiency of its utilisation, from a mechanical point of view, is constantly increasing. For this reason, the energy which might be derived from nuclear fission (so-called atomic energy) or from genuine atomic energy, is largely of academic interest. Every individual at present has at his *potential* disposal the solar energy equivalent of fifty or more man-power.

The third factor is the introduction of automaticity into the operations of machines. There is a vast difference between say a power-driven grinding-wheel against which a man may sharpen a blade, and a machine which automatically, even in such a simple machine, goes much further. A machine which is fed from strip steel and cuts, shapes, grinds, sharpens, and finishes a tool, and mounts it into a handle, or wraps and packs it (as with razor blades, for example), is a simple machine as machines go these days. Extraordinarily complicated procedures are carried out entirely automatically, and with extreme precision. This development is equivalent in its effect to the use of solar energy; it presents a *multiplying* factor.

The development of what is popularly called "electronics" marks almost a further multiplying factor. Electronics centres largely around the use of the photo-electric cell and related appliances. The peculiar importance of the development is that it gives machinery "eyes"—but eyes that for certain purposes transcend the limitations of the human eye as does the microscope. Thus this "eye" can analyse fast-moving stuffs that to the human eye would be only a blur.

Related to the "eye", and another development of electronics, is machinery which can perform with incredible speed certain functions of human thinking. It can perform mathematical "calculations" of extreme complexity and great length. We are certainly only on the threshold of these

*Now appearing in *The Australian Social Crediter*. The commencement of Dr. Monahan's essay, publication of which has been interrupted, appeared in *The Social Crediter* on January 25.

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. 18. No. 2.

Saturday, March, 15, 1947.

The Myth of the Trades Union

By reason of its chameleon-like disguises, MONOPOLY often escapes notice under the label of some particular embodiment of it. When Social Crediters drew attention to the dominance of Finance in the years of the Armistice, they were merely (and the better-informed of them realised the fact) dealing with something which, *at that time*, occupied an almost unique position astride the world of production and distribution—a position derived from its peculiar claim to synthesise *value*, or wealth. Major Douglas has frequently deplored the undue emphasis on the later chapters of *Economic Democracy*. The pathetic inability of many otherwise intelligent people to penetrate below the appearance to the MONOPOLY, which was the thing-in-itself, has been demonstrated by the almost universal clamour, until it was too late, for the “nationalisation,” *i.e.*, complete centralisation and MONOPOLY, under an uncontrolled and uncontrollable anonymity, of Banking and Currency.

But the phenomenon is far from standing alone. For generations and almost without protest the Myth of the Trades Union, *i.e.*, the MONOPOLY of Public Service, has gone forth.

The Myth takes the form that Trades Unionism is inherently good; a marvellous gift to suffering humanity; that British Trades Unionism in particular is the primary cause of the “emancipation” of “the worker;” and that to attack Trades Unionism is just a Tory demonstration of obsolete reaction. Trades Unionism is MONOPOLY and inherently bad and anti-social.

The first point to notice is that Trades Unionism, like every other monopolistic economic practice, is directed against the consumer, consumption being the only aspect of the human individual which is recognisably universal. With that Satanic ingenuity which suggests its origin, Trades Union propaganda never admitted this; its adversary was always the “rapacious” employer, the man who had the brains, the enterprise and the courage to come out of the rut, to try something new, and, to take the responsibility for it. But, in his turn, the employer was instructed, probably from the same source, that the attack of the Labour MONOPOLY could be passed on to the Individual, the consumer, by monopolistic price rings, Trade Associations, Trusts and similar devices. Clearly, the logical next step was the Mond-Turner Conference to unify Labour and Management into a Production MONOPOLY which would eventually deal only with the Individual through a Distribution MONOPOLY, of which the Co-Operative Societies would be the shop-front but would either give place to, or be wholly controlled by, the not-very-shadowy PLANNERS, the MONOPOLY of POWER, P.E.P.

Just at the moment, we are witnessing the amazing spectacle of the British Empire being wrecked in a mere matter of months by the agency of the Union of Mineworkers which clearly dominates the administration with their Minister, Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, acting as the pipeline for the explosive. There are, we believe, less than 800,000 members, headed by the Communist Mr. Arthur Horner, whose spiritual home is in Moscow, although he prefers to live here. They boast that they control forty Members of Parliament. Of those 800,000 probably much less than half-a-million actually work at the coal face; yet this small body of men, mostly the best of fellows, and abysmally ignorant of the true meaning of what they are doing beyond getting fantastic wages and special privileges, are allowing themselves to be made the sanctions for the radical disruption of a world-wide Empire which stands in the way of the World MONOPOLY to which they, as well as the dupes of the other Trades Unions and the Co-Operatives (!) will be delivered, bound hand and foot, slaves of an invisible Sanhedrin.

There is a weak place in this pretty scheme, and Mr. Shinwell and his Masters know it. It is only the rapidly declining intelligence of the population which prevents the fantastic absurdity of “full employment” from dissolving in a blast of derisive, but angry, contempt. It is really amazing that people will accept a falling standard of living, combined with universal slavery, while at the same time they have thirty mechanical slaves per head and modern production technique at their disposal. If that is the best we can do, then let us scrap all our advance in the industrial arts as pure delusion, and go back to the Middle Ages before we are detonated into the Dark Abyss.

“Dress Rehearsal for Suppression”

Mr. Douglas Reed answers four questions put to him by the *Catholic Herald* in its issue for March 7. An exception to a horde of near-honest commentators on the “ban,” Mr. Reed has recognised the point at issue regarding the relatively unknown trade association which “negotiated” with officials of the Fuel Ministry. He discloses that it was this association which recommended that the increase of paper granted to newspapers last autumn should be withheld from newly-formed independent journals. He says further:

“I regard dictatorship as the devil of Christian teaching, and politicians who inflict it as the devil’s imps.

“I think it my duty to fight him and them in every way open to me: by writing, speaking, combating and defying illegal measures; recalling politicians to their duty when they dally with the demon, exposing them and untruth everywhere I see it by the constitutional means still left to me.

“I think the great source of danger to the Christian and liberty-loving citizen is that there seems to be no political party with the courage to speak and fight against the devil’s party; in other words, that there is at this moment no Christian party; and I feel that people who really want to save themselves and their country should busy themselves calling the politicians of the so-called Opposition Party to account.”

The Economist (March 8) reports some interesting (shadow) boxing about an alleged refusal of an import licence for copies to be printed in America by the Whaley-Eaton Service of Washington.

First Things First

(The substance of an address by Mr. Hewlett Edwards to the Bromley Group of the Housewives' League, February 28, 1947.)

The first thing to make clear is that in my opinion the dangers which beset the provision of food are only a part of the danger which confronts us. I do not think that anything effective can be done on the surface. If the landslide is to be stopped it can be done only by work at a deeper level, not merely by altering the position of the stones and debris which threaten to overwhelm us.

To begin, however, with food; the objective is, of course, the meal on the table. The farmer grows it, and the housewife prepares it. All else is secondary. The stability of society depends on the preservation of those two factors. The farmer and the housewife: the land and the home. You will not be overmuch concerned about the farmer unless your supplies fall off. They have fallen off. Therefore you may well ask yourself the question: "What has happened to the source of my supplies?"

It is not difficult for the housewife to have a pretty good understanding of the farmer and his work. For both he and she specialise in the service of the growth and care of living things. You know about children; how each is different from the other, what small alterations of this or that will help or hinder straight growth, how you and they grow together—on different planes—in understanding.

It is very much the same with the farmer. He knows such things about plants and animals. The soil, and how it varies from field to field; of what it will grow and what it will not; of weeds and their curious habits; of animals, their pedigrees and personal peculiarities; of sowing, reaping, hedging, thatching and all the work that goes on around a farm. The real farmer has an immense store of such observation and practice. It is this which links him to the land.

This link is being broken, in favour of quite another idea. For there are two irreconcilable ideas in conflict:—

"The first of these is that the world we live in is an organism, and that men and animals have intricate relationships with the earth, not amorphous but specific and infinitely varied, which can only be disregarded at the peril of both men and that earth they live on. The second and antithetic idea is that the world is merely raw material for a factory, and that the nearer agriculture approximates to Mr. Ford's conveyor-belt principles, the better we shall be."

There is only one sound guide in the choice between these alternatives; and that is an unwavering determination to secure the quantity and quality of food required for the family table. Which way shall we get that? From compulsory cultivation according to rule and regulation enforced by penalty? Or from free cultivation by those who have an intimate understanding of the soil?

There is not much doubt about that: in fact there is proof. The soil itself has all the characteristics of a living medium. And wherever it has been treated as raw material for factory use; wherever mechanisation, artificial manures, standardised methods, and so forth have become the accustomed rule—the result has been to kill the soil. Within the last fifty years, vast areas of what was once fertile land have, by such treatment, been reduced to sterile desert.

England is now in process of adopting these methods. Many of our farmers are still of that tradition which has produced the best farming in the world. Their intimate understanding is to be scrapped, and they must become factory managers—or get out of farming. The link between the farmer and his land—between us and our food—is being broken.

A system of land ownership which leaves the farmer free to work the land according to his tradition is the very bed rock of civilisation. Our land system was not destroyed by either landlords or tenants. Nor was that sabotage an English conception. At bottom it was forced upon us by international plotters, aided by "British" (I will not call them English) planners. The power used was that of finance, brought to bear upon the land, through the Treasury, by taxation. Income tax plus other current taxation is beyond what the land can sustain. Death Duties are a deliberate weapon to break up ownership, for they cannot be paid out of what the land produces. This attack has broken the continuity which is vital.

This process is to be completed by the Bill now before Parliament. The principle of this is clearly stated:

In return for a guaranteed price level, all owners and occupiers of rural land must accept an obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of good husbandry and estate management, and submit to the necessary measure of direction and guidance, subject to provisions for appeal to an impartial tribunal.

You may not think that sounds so unreasonable. Well, the composition of the Committees which will control the farmer is laid down; and I suggest that you consider how such an arrangement would work in your own affairs. It is as if you were offered what someone else thought was a satisfactory housekeeping income for you, in return for which you would have to "submit to what someone else considered the necessary measure of direction and guidance" to preserve what someone else considered a "reasonable standard" of good housekeeping. This *someone else* would be a Committee consisting of five young women from the Ministry of Housekeeping: three from the County Womens' Institute: two from the House Agents' Association: and two from the Charwomens' Union. This committee would have, and use, drastic powers to enforce their directions.

You may think this an exaggeration, but it is not: on the contrary, it may still happen to you. It sounds impossible that anyone should accept such a bargain, but I daresay you have known women so harassed and ridden by monetary worries that they might think "I would sell my soul for regular housekeeping money that I knew would always be there." That is exactly the position of most farmers.

Very well. The farmer's soul is his own concern. But the food which the land produces is our concern: and as the farmer loses his tradition, so the land will lose its fertility. And what will become of us? One of the specific objectives of the French Revolution was the reduction, by some millions, of the population. In the Russian Revolution the population was reduced—by 30 millions. Now we hear persistent rumours that the proper population for this country is twenty—not forty-six—millions.

However that may be, there is one exceedingly useful fact which is revealed by the passing of the Bill. It is

approved by all Parties. No one made any attempt to dispute the principle stated above. No one. So we know where we stand with the Parties.

So much for farming and Food, which, as I have said, is only a part of the landslide which is overtaking us. For the fact is that by the same process of order and penalty—concerning our food, clothing, houses, health, children, work, insurance, and so through every department of life—we are being reduced to graded material for the new conveyor-belt society. Whereas within ourselves we know human beings are personal, each is unique and cannot so be standardised: we know the growth of the human spirit—for we do not live only by eating—to be our true objective. It needs no argument to show that Rule and Regulation will not serve that end.

How has this come about? Well, these things are imposed upon us by Law: by Regulations which have the force of law: and by "Instructions" which are presumed to carry the weight of Regulations.

These Laws and Regulations are enforced by penalties. And these are put into effect by the Police who, if or when it comes to it, have all the armed forces of the realm behind them. It is those who control Parliament who control these forces. So much is fact. Theory adds that it is "The People" who control Parliament.

So we have this extraordinary fiction in which 'the people'—and that means you and me—are envisaged as imposing upon themselves conditions which we loathe; threatening ourselves with degrading penalties; sending each other to prison for such trivialities... and so on. How do ordinary English people come to act like this? Or don't they?

I should say they don't; but that the political system has been and is manipulated so that someone else can do these things. This manipulation permeates the system, but there are three major centres around which all revolves. The first is the Law. The second is the assumption of limitless sovereignty by Parliament: and the third is the electoral system.

Just as English Farming was proverbial, so is, or was, English Common Law respected and envied the world over. It was not based upon abstract ideas but upon practice. That is to say, that individuals worked out, in their lives and by long experience, what was proper and what was not proper to be done. Only after long established usage was this given the effect of law. This formal confirmation of the closely knit growth of experience—this natural law—is the human counterpart of physical 'laws.' It forms a framework, which might be called "the rules of the game" within which the individual is (or rather was) free to pursue his personal ends and desires. Its essence is the preservation of freedom.

"English Common Law embodies certain Rights and Liberties, established by the natives of these islands by long custom; Rights not subject either to the whim of Parliament or to the conspiracy of politicians. The King was the supreme Defender of these Personal Rights."

Most of the legislation which now proceeds from Parliament is in flagrant breach of these rights and liberties. It is not based upon experience, but upon an abstract idea... the idea that man's place in society is subservient to the State, and that his personal inclinations are of small importance and

must be controlled. For this a man must be told what to do and made to do it: hence the multiplicity of orders and penalties to enforce them. No doubt those who devise such law believe in it: for it is they who *are* 'the State,' and it is their ideas which are to be so served. Common Law states the Rules, and stands aside. This *other* and newer sort of law tells you *how* you must play the game—and it's their game you *must* play.

This position has been made possible by the embodiment of an idea—a false idea—the doctrine of the limitless sovereignty of Parliament. This is a Whig conception which, pushed far in the eighteenth century was partially expelled during the nineteenth; but was revived, notably by Lloyd George, early in this century. Since then it has gained ground with every succeeding Administration. There still remains a link—once of great potency—between the King and his Subjects... the Petition of Rights. There is a Bill now before the House for its abolition.

It is possible that you may find this wholesale disregard and destruction of your rights hard to credit. So I will propose a test. It is possible that you do not wish to pay 4/9 a week for the rest of your life in exchange for the sole certain benefit of £10 (or is it £20?) for your burial. If so, it *was* within your Rights (as a free member of a free society) to decline to take part in this National Insurance scheme. Do so now. The result will be a summons, and an injunction to pay. If you don't, £10—and if you still resist £10 a *day* until you give in.

It is not necessary to describe the electoral system by which Parliament maintains this supremacy of power. I suppose that in theory Parliament is the product of the fully informed and balanced appraisal by each voter of the issues presented. Do you think it is?

We all know that it cannot be, while such a vast complication of issues is presented in so deceptive a manner. Elections are 'run' on the most attractive 'slogans' the Party Managers can think of. Anything but the truth. What Party would 'go to the country' with a 'programme' setting forth that it is proposed to subordinate the individual to the State—that any Rights against this which the elector may think he has will be overruled or abolished—that a series of measures will be passed which, in all essential matters, will authorise that he be ordered what he must do, where before he had freedom of choice—that these measures will cost him—so much—per annum, for the rest of his life, in taxation—that if he tries to resist he will be heavily fined, or imprisoned, or both?

You may think that excessive. It is literally true of at least three recent measures—National Insurance, Education, and Agriculture. True, not merely of Socialists, but of *all* Parties in Parliament, for in principle, all Parties were agreed.

The keynote of the present political system is irresponsibility. The Government becomes irresponsible because there is no line set beyond which they must not trespass—no inviolable Constitution. The Parties are irresponsible because they can get away with it. The voters, too are irresponsible; partly because most of them have not the vaguest idea of what it is all about. And that understandable irresponsibility is encouraged by secrecy, the secrecy of the ballot. This is very far from the sound English tradition of the forthright and open expression of opinion.

Therefore, I think that the solution of this enigma is for each part of the political system to be made answerable for its actions. The Government for the preservation of specific inviolable Rights. The Parties so tied to their programme that they cannot escape responsibility for the results they produce. And the voter?

Well, no one can really be responsible for what he does not understand. So it becomes a matter of putting the issues involved before the elector in a way he can understand. From what I have said you may think I have little respect for his intelligence. But it is not intelligence which is required of him. It is common sense—and of that he has plenty—if matters are so presented that his common sense can grasp them. Try summing up a proposition to him in this way: "This is the proposal. These are its consequences, *to you*. This is its cost, *to you*. Is that what you want? Are you willing to back it with—so much—of your money? If the proposition is a success, you gain. If not, you must be prepared to lose more than those who have not voted for it. For if you vote for it, it is *your* proposition."

In your Statement of Policy you have a striking clause: "To provide the British Housewife with an effective voice—" Yes. But the Voice which is effective *now* is that which demands ever more and more control of ordinary people—to push them on into this new conveyor-belt society. You can never counter that drive by the discussion of its details, that is, details of rationing and controls.

You would not wish me to advise you with anything less than full conviction. It is first necessary to appreciate the worst, and it is bad.

The Parties are against you: all are determined on the mechanisation of humanity.

Your individual Member of Parliament—even though he may wish—is powerless to help you.

Petitions to the King are ruled out: and to Parliament, quite useless. Those byeways are closed.

But there is still the highroad. The avowed purpose of the Electoral system is to make your Voice effective. But it turns in your hand, like a broken tin opener. Therefore, the first objective is to make it effective.

In my opinion that is the only manner in which you may make substantial headway towards the fulfilment of your policy. And on those lines there are many who will be with you.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: February 27, 1947.

Supply: Committee—Foreign Affairs

(continued)

Mr. Hollis proceeded:—

The other parties are neither Conservative nor Socialist. Their differences from Socialists are not differences of immediate economic policies at all. In the politics of France there has not been very much difference between the M.R.P and the Socialists or Communists as to what industry should be immediately nationalised and what industry should not. Rightly or wrongly these parties are willing to tolerate a great deal of nationalisation. The issue is a different one. It is that these new parties demand that social and economic

problems should be solved within a framework where absolute values of liberty and justice are recognised as paramount, and refuse to admit that words such as "liberty" and "justice" should be treated as mere economic counters. For better or worse, that is the issue of the new age as opposed to the past age. That is the issue of the new age on which parties are today shaping themselves—a division not on economic lines but on spiritual lines. That is the fact we have to face.

Therefore Europe has for the moment, broadly speaking, divided itself into two, with the iron curtain between—the countries which live under the old plan of an economic world and the countries which are striving towards the new plan of the spiritual world. An uneasy peace rests between them...

The great issue is whether there is any hope of doing anything better than merely patching up those differences with an uneasy compromise. In the long run, the situation is a great deal more hopeful for two reasons. The first reason is that the great Marxian society is not working out to Marxian conclusions at all. It is not at all working out towards the classless society but, for better or worse, to something much more of the nature of a managerial society. The capitalist societies of the West are also moving in the same direction, to a managerial plan. In the general lesson of history that there comes from time to time a conflict between two apparently irreconcilable forces. That has happened before in Europe. The general lesson of history is that when that occurs something happens as happened in the 15th and 16th centuries when there were the great wars of religion. To begin with the Catholics said that life was not tolerable unless the Protestants were entirely exterminated, and the Protestants that life was intolerable unless the Catholics were exterminated. After a period of conflict and stress there emerged not a victory of one of those creeds over the other, but the victory of a *tertius gaudens*—a third point of view—in that case the people who demanded religious toleration and believed in a new sort of society which would not admit of those exclusive religious claims. That is the way history will work now. There will emerge a new society that will be neither Socialist nor Capitalist but of a third pattern. Therefore it is for that reason very important that the Foreign Secretary, to whom we wish well, and any other statesmen of responsibility who can, should give the world this important breathing space.

The second reason why I am optimistic is that no one who knows anything of the Russian nature and of Russian literature can believe that this denial of the spiritual nature of man is a permanent state in which the Russians will be content to rest. No society can for long be built upon a complete denial of science and whatever we think of Marxian economics, Marxian metaphysics, the entirely out of date materialism of our great grandfathers is in flat contradiction of all modern science, and it is quite certain that any society which will survive has itself to revise those metaphysics. Indeed, this challenge to the totalitarian system came most vividly, by a curious paradox, in the nineteenth century from the greatest of Russian thinkers himself, from Dostoevsky. Not for one moment do I think that Russia will ever go back to political or economic arrangements that existed before 1917. We shall never get the Russia of the Romanoffs back again, but we shall get the Russia of Dostoevsky back again; we shall find a new Russia which will insist upon answering the new questions and the new problem, but answering the new problem with the old and with the eternal answers.

Therefore, the question for the moment is, what message we can send to the Foreign Secretary on his journey to Moscow? ... we might, at any rate in generalisation, say this: that however we may be uncertain about details, it is an essential of foreign policy that, in the old mediæval phrase, "words should be cousin to the deed;" that is to say, a very large proportion of the troubles of the world have come from this evil habit of patch paper formulæ, of people inventing formulæ in order to pretend to cover differences which are really not covered at all.

Take the situation of Potsdam. There was nothing particularly wrong in the idea of treating Germany as an economic unit. It was a good plan in itself, if it could have been done; but there was something a great deal wrong in merely saying that we would do that, when, in fact, it would be impossible to do so. So we have the political problem of Germany. I appreciated what the right hon. Gentleman said about the undesirability of irrevocably dividing either Germany or Europe into two parts. We do not want any divisions that can be avoided, and if the right hon. Gentleman can find at Moscow an entirely new spirit, and can bring back a genuine settlement and agreement on the German problem that is wholeheartedly subscribed to by all the great Powers of the world, we shall congratulate him and we shall support him loyally. But we hope he will not bring back a mere formula that pretends to be what it is not.

We do not advocate the division of Germany between East and West, but I think it would be much better to have a frank division of Germany between East and West than a pretence that Germany was not divided when, in point of fact she was. I do not think it is a good thing, but I do not think it would necessarily be an irremediable evil if Germany should be divided between East and West, because ... this Prussian Germany is a very modern thing, the creation of a long lifetime, an unnatural thing. One way and another, if Europe is to have security, we want to bring it to an end. The best way to bring it to an end would, I agree, be to create a free federal German unity, but another less good, but not impossible, way to bring it to an end would be by a division of Germany between East and West which would at least have this advantage, that it would mean that the unnatural parts of Germany, the Prussian parts, were separated from the rest.

The right hon. Gentleman, in a once familiar phrase, laid down as the principle of his foreign policy—and it is not a bad principle of foreign policy—that he hoped to see the day when he could go down to Victoria and get a ticket for wherever in the world he wanted to go. Among all the high falutin' things said about foreign policy, there are many things that have been said which were a great deal less profound than that. That is no bad test of foreign policy, and I think it is no bad test that we should have a special friendship with those countries which are at any rate making some attempt to allow the right hon. Gentleman to take his tickets at Victoria; and if we find countries that are not making that attempt, then we have frankly to recognise that here is a different kind of society.

That is all that I appeal to him to do, to make the word the cousin to the deed. Let us have friendship between all nations if we can get it; let us have unity between all nations if we can get it but do not let us say we have

friendship and unity when there is neither friendship nor unity, for that is the worst obstacle to true friendship and true unity that can be found.

Introduction to Social Credit (continued from page 3.)

developments, which will transform industry, as the introduction of solar energy transformed "manu"-facture.

So immense, so far removed from mere animal existence, are the processes and developments we have been considering, that it is all too easy to misapprehend them; and the very division of labour confuses the total picture and conceals the totality. To gain some perspective and clarity, it is legitimate to adopt a special point of view.

So we may consider Mankind and its history as if it were one man who has lived part of his span of life. In the beginning, that man is a helpless infant, whose almost sole external activity is suckling at his mother's breast. Later, he is a child, taking more concentrated foods, and possessing a surplus of energy which he spends in play; but that play teaches him the techniques embodied in his cultural environment, and he learns more and more how to do things for himself. By degrees his play becomes more purposive; it is consciously directed to the acquisition of knowledge and skill.

At some point the child begins the accumulation of possessions. To begin with, they are toys, but soon they become tools in the more general sense. By virtue of the knowledge gained and the tools accumulated, the child become adult is able constantly to add to his possessions; and some of these outlast his lifetime and pass to his successors.

This man displays two essential types of activity: there are those that merely subserve his simple existence, and those which are a sort of efflorescence. The former are those which relate to the production of the materials for his necessary consumption of food, clothes and shelter, and the latter those which relate to his production of permanent assets in the most general sense. The former activity is the production of consumer's goods, and these, of course, may go far beyond the bare necessities; the latter is the production of capital goods.

(To be continued).

The Chesham Trades Council

A letter to the *Sunday Times* states that in the *Bucks Examiner* there has appeared a notice on the fuel crisis published by the Chesham and Amersham Trades Council and signed by their secretary. It appeals to the public to report to the secretary of that council cases of infringement of the Minister's fuel restrictions.

"This," says the writer, "seems to me to be one of the most serious cases of the amateur gestapo in England."

GLASGOW (SOUTHERN) D.S.C. SOCIETY.
Current Affairs Section.

A PUBLIC MEETING
will be held in R.I. Rooms, 200 Buchanan Street,
on TUESDAY, MARCH 18, at 8 p.m.

Subject:—THE SECOND WORLD PEACE.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.