

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 22. No. 8.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The really ominous feature of Sir Stafford Cripps's Budget is its organised reception outside these islands. Wall Street and Washington are unanimous in praise of it; leading articles in the "Leading", *i.e.*, controlled, Press of the Dominions emit variations on the theme of the fortitude of the "British" and the rectitude of Cripps. We have endured many Budgets; but we never remember any Budget, not even those of Lloyd George, which were the precursors of the present situation, so enthusiastically received by our enemies, so complimented by the more suspect of the alleged Parliamentary Opposition, and, to the extent that it is comprehended, so vigorously disliked by the country at large.

It is banal to write that we are being taxed by enemies in the interest of enemies; but it is, we hope, alarming to indicate the world-wide organisation with which we are faced. We have never been under the illusion that wisdom was born with those who are responsible for the appearance of this review, or even with those who read it; but we are genuinely perplexed at the lack of evidence that there is any effective appreciation of the gravity of the situation. From the South African War, at least, the people and resources of this country have not merely been used to pull chestnuts out of the fire for their enemies, they have been skilfully manoeuvred into doing it in such a manner that they were the chief losers, and were more firmly committed to repeat the folly until our final disappearance from the world stage as a nation. We fought the Kaiser so that American-German-Jews could procure the murder of the Czar and sequester British property in Russia; we fought Hitler so that American-German-Jews could sequester British investments in U.S.A., steal private property in "Britain" and steal Palestine from the Arabs, with the liquidation of the British Empire as a side show after we had once again fought (and lost our best blood) to defend it; we have, almost alone, suffered four years' "austerity" so that the product of "full employment" may build up our enemies for the next war, which we shall fight for the benefit of American-German-Jews who have no further use for "Russia" except as a slave reserve. Will nothing teach us? And is High Treason to be allowed to pay large dividends indefinitely?

• • •

"The three great ends which a statesman ought to propose to himself in the government of a nation are: (1) Security to possessors; (2) Facility to acquirers; (3) Hope to all."
—Samuel Taylor Coleridge. June 25, 1831.

• • •

The insanity of the ballot-box majority system is so obvious once the hypnotism which supports it is penetrated, that the fantastic situation produced by the sweeping Conservative gains in the L.C.C. elections in which Socialists and

Conservatives hold 64 seats each, is perhaps barely worthy of special attention.

As against 128 elected Members, presumably holding opinions which can be labelled "Socialist" or "Conservative," one Member, labelled "Liberal," has been elected for a predominantly Jewish constituency. On every occasion in which either Socialists or Conservatives wish to utilise their majority voting-power the one "Liberal" of Polish-Jewish descent, can ensure their defeat. It is quite true that, by himself, he cannot carry any measure whatever; but by making "deals" with either side, he can quite probably carry a good many.

We have small doubt that the "Liberal" revival, such as it is, in Parliamentary politics is based on a hope to duplicate this situation. So far as can be estimated, the chances of a "Liberal" Parliamentary victory are negligible; but the greater the swing to the "Conservatives" short of an absolute and considerable majority, the greater the power of a minority party. And the less the difference between the large parties the smaller the minority which can control them.

There is in fact no aspect of the present electoral system which would not be in place in *Alice in Wonderland*; and the destinies of half the world are committed to it, without, so far as we can judge, any considerable body of opinion dissenting.

• • •

The so-called Labour Party has always followed the lead given to it by the Christian Socialists such as Kingsley and Maurice—that the "worker" was the victim of intolerable injustice and that the more fortunately circumstanced in life were where they were as a result of robbing the poor. In the early stages, manual labour was the only passport to honesty, but as this became patently unworkable as practical politics, "the worker by hand and brain" was substituted.

The point we are making is that some kind of a moral code was invoked, involving such words as "justice", "robbery."

It is probable that no Administration in these islands, with the possible exception of that of Cromwell, has ever been so fundamentally immoral and unjust as that of this, the first declared Socialist Government. Its ideology, to use the current term is that of the *Protocols of Zion* "by the law of Nature, right lies in force . . . we must know how to apply . . . an idea whenever it appears necessary to attract the masses of the people to one's party for the purpose of crushing another who is in authority."

To realise the complete demoralisation of politics, it is only necessary to consider one argument frequently heard in regard to taxation—that the "rich" cannot be taxed further, so the "worker" must now work, instead of (as he thinks) living on the ill-gotten gains of the wealthy. The very idea of social morality has disappeared, and no one seems to notice it. But they will.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 31, 1949.

National Parks and Access to the Countryside Bill

(The Debate continued: Mr. Silkin is speaking.)

General powers are conferred in the Bill upon the local planning authorities to take any action to secure the purposes for which the parks are created. A great many of the purposes for which these parks are being established can be carried out under existing legislation, under the Town and Country Planning Act, 1947, and other enactments. Where it is possible for that to be done, it is proposed that it should be done under existing enactments, but specific powers are conferred to enable the local planning authorities to provide accommodation, camping sites, parking places, refreshments—including licensed premises—improved access for the planting of trees, the removal of disfigurements, such as shacks, and other unsightly objects, and the restoration of derelict land in the national park area. It is intended that in the provision of these facilities which I have mentioned—accommodation, camping and refreshments—the fullest use should be made of voluntary associations such as the Youth Hostels Association, the Workers' Travel Association, and others, by means of a subsidy, where necessary, from the local planning authority. But the local planning authority can provide these services where they are satisfied that no other body is able or willing to do so.

Powers are conferred on the planning authorities to improve waterways; I have particularly in mind the Broads, which represent a serious problem. The most serious threat to the Broads as a holiday area is the encroachment of sea vegetation on the open water. . . .

. . . Under the Bill there is power to provide a warden service. I would like to make it quite clear that the wardens will not in any sense be a police force. Their main job will be to explain to visitors what they can and what they cannot do in the parks and to report damage to fences, trees and so on. . . .

There is power to restrict traffic of any particular description in a national park area and areas of extensive beauty or roads forming a long-distance route, subject to the approval of the Minister of Transport. These powers will be reinforced in three ways. First, there is the system of Exchequer grant, which will normally be up to 75 per cent. of the cost, but in special instances, which are referred to in Clause 79, they will be as much as 100 per cent. I have explained already that the National Parks Commission will be responsible for recommending grants. . . .

My second proposal for reinforcing the powers of the local planning authorities is by acquisition of land. Wide powers are conferred on the local planning authorities to acquire any land required for the exercise of their functions, either by agreement or, in cases where land is required for a specific purpose, compulsorily. This includes the acquisition of land for giving public access to open country. The Minister will have corresponding powers to acquire open country in national parks by agreement or compulsion. He will also be able to buy, by agreement, other land in national parks which needs to be preserved.

The kind of case I have in mind is where a large, and possibly expensive, estate comes into the market which it is desirable, for amenity and other reasons, to preserve substantially in its existing condition but which, unless it were

acquired, might be split up and its existing character destroyed. In such a case, as well as in other cases where agricultural land is acquired and it is proposed to retain it as agricultural land, the usual practice will be to transfer it to the Agricultural Land Commission for management. My Department do not propose to hold or manage land if we can avoid it. Once the Minister has acquired land not suitable for management by the Agricultural Land Commission, he will normally dispose of it for management to somebody able and willing to manage it, possibly to a body like the National Trust.

. . . The third means of securing the carrying out of powers by the local planning authorities is by the exercise of powers of direction. The Minister may require an authority to exercise any power in a national parks area, or an area of extensive beauty, and the Commission have the duty of drawing the attention of the Minister to any failure on the part of the local planning authorities. This power is enforceable by *mandatus* in the courts. It is possible under Clause 84 to authorise another local authority to act in place of the local planning authority. This is an additional default measure. There is provision for other local authorities to assist financially, or to act in a particular case, by agreement, in the place of the local planning authority. For instance, a city could provide accommodation, or other facilities, for rambles in a nearby park.

The next part of the Bill is that dealing with nature conservation. As some hon. Members know, a Nature Conservancy was recently set up by Royal Charter— . . . The objects of the Conservancy are stated in the Charter to be to provide scientific advice on the conservation and control of the natural flora and fauna of Great Britain; to establish, maintain and manage nature reserves in Great Britain, including the maintenance of physical features of scientific interest; and to organise and develop the research and scientific services related thereto. Three hon. Members of this House have, among others, been appointed as the first members of the Nature Conservancy, the hon. Members for Twickenham (Mr. Keeling), Forest of Dean (Mr. Philips Price) and Motherwell (Mr. Alex Anderson) and the hon. Members for Motherwell and for Orkney and Shetland (Sir B. Neven-Spence) on the Scottish Committee.

The beauty of the scenery in the national parks and areas of beauty depends, to a large extent, upon the trees and other plants that grow there. To maintain and enhance the beauty of this natural flora calls for scientific knowledge and advice. . . .

. . . The Conservancy will, no doubt, follow the report of the Wild Life Conservation Special Committee, which recommends the setting up in England and Wales of about 70 nature reserves, having a total area of about 70,000 acres. It is expected that the total acreage needed in Scotland will be of the same order. The Bill empowers the Conservancy in England and Wales as well as in Scotland—and this is the only part of the Bill in which Scotland is concerned—to agree with owners of land for securing that the land is managed as a nature reserve, to pay compensation for the effect of any restriction on the land imposed by the agreement, and, in certain circumstances, to acquire land compulsorily. Local authorities are also empowered to set up local nature reserves. . . .

Part IV of the Bill deals with public rights of way. Broadly speaking, it carries out the recommendations of the Special Committee on Footpaths and Access to the Countryside and also of the Scott Report. Its main purpose is to

provide a simple procedure for the settlement and establishment of existing rights of way. It requires the county councils to make a survey of existing rights of way within three years. It requires that, wherever possible, the district councils and parish councils should be used in making this survey. . . .

. . . There will be a right on the part of members of the general public to object to the omission from the list of any particular right of way which they claim existed and there will be an appeal to the Minister. . . . There is provision for publication of the final definitive map and the periodical bringing of this map up-to-date thereafter. There is also a very useful provision for ensuring that in future there is a presumption of dedication of right of way after 20 years user in all cases. . . .

The Bill gives the responsibility for creating new rights of way to the district councils. It is believed that they are more closely associated with the needs in that direction than are the county councils; but there is power for the Minister to transfer this function to the county councils if he so desires. An hon. Member asked about compensation. There is compensation provided to owners of land for depreciation in the value of their land arising from the creation of a footpath. The Bill itself makes no specific provision for the closure and possible diversion of footpaths. It may well be, however, that, in the interests of the farmer and the rambling public, an alternative footpath might be more convenient. I propose to discuss with representatives of the ramblers' and farmers' interests the possibility of making some arrangement in this Bill to facilitate the diversion and closure of existing footpaths.

The Bill provides, for the first time, for a liability for the maintenance of footpaths. This will now rest fairly and squarely on highway authorities. By maintenance I include not merely that a footpath should be kept in a usable condition, but that it should be free from obstruction preventing its use. The Bill also provides for the establishment of long distance paths. This has been one of the grievances of the Ramblers' Association and other associations. The Commission are entrusted with the duty of proposing long-distance paths. The Minister's duty will be to consider and approve if desirable, and it will be for the local authorities to carry out the physical work of creating long-distance footpaths, for which the Exchequer will make a 100 per cent. contribution. . . . I have not been able to accept the rather sweeping recommendations of the special committee under which the right of public access is afforded automatically on all uncultivated land, mountain, moor, heath, down, cliff or foreshore, whether privately owned or not, and apparently unconditionally. I have come to the conclusion that where public access is in fact provided today—and I must in fairness say that applies to large areas all over the country—there is no reason why the machinery of the Bill should be applied. It is left to the local planning authorities in any particular case to decide whether or not it is necessary to apply the provisions of this part of the Bill. The Minister may intervene, however, where, in his opinion, a local planning authority is not taking steps to secure public access in a proper case and the Minister can, as I have explained, acquire access land himself in suitable cases. . . . The main provision in Part V is that the planning authorities can by agreement, by order or by acquisition, give access to open country as I have defined it. One of the effects of the agreement will be that ramblers

will not be trespassers as long as they confine themselves to the land which is subject to the agreement order, and so long as they comply with the not very onerous rules of conduct set out in the Second Schedule to the Bill.

If this Measure is to succeed these rules of conduct will have to be rigorously obeyed. The public are being put on their honour not to do anything which would create wilful damage to the farming interests. For the first time in the history of this country there will be a legal right on the part of the public to wander over other peoples' land. Some of it may be grazing land and other parts may be available for other purposes, although it is not proposed that this right should extend to purely agricultural land. . . .

. . . There is compensation provided under the Bill to owners of land for depreciation in the value of their land arising from the granting of public access. . . .

These provisions are not limited to national park areas or areas of special beauty. I think it is right that if an owner of land suffers loss, and can prove that he has suffered loss, as a result of allowing the public to roam over his land, he should be entitled to compensation. It is for that reason that the provisions have been made. They extend to the whole country, but the Exchequer grants up to 75 per cent. for the cost of acquisition and for compensation apply only to national park areas and to special areas. . . .

. . . I want to make it quite clear that I can give no guarantee whatever that it might not be essential to permit a certain amount of what some hon. Members will regard as undesirable development in the national park areas. It may be necessary in the future as it has been in the past to permit some part of the national park areas to be used for purposes of national defence. It may be necessary to utilise the mineral wealth which lies in those areas for the purpose of ensuring the economic life of our people. I do not think anybody would seriously suggest that we should ignore the existence of this mineral wealth and fail to utilise it, subject to a number of conditions. The first condition is that it must be demonstrated quite clearly that the exploitation of those minerals is absolutely necessary in the public interest. It must be clear beyond all doubt that there is no possible alternative source of supply, and if those two conditions are satisfied then the permission must be subject to the condition that restoration takes place at the earliest possible opportunity. . . .

Sir Arthur Salter (Oxford University): With the professed purposes of this Bill I am sure hon. Members in all parts of the House will be in cordial agreement. Nevertheless, in regard to the first and, I think, the most important purpose, specified in Part II of the Bill, the preservation and enhancement of natural beauty, I fear that those best acquainted with the problem are seriously disappointed with the Bill as it is presented. . . . I gravely fear that when our successors look back after, say, 10 years, and ask what has happened, it is more likely that they will say that, on balance, beauty has been destroyed or diminished, rather than that it has been preserved and enhanced.

I should like to state certain reasons why I think that is so. In the first place, I think that both the Town and Country Planning Act and this Bill are based on the assumption that the principal threats to the beauty of the country come from ill-regulated or insufficiently controlled private activities of individuals or companies, and that, therefore, the answer is to secure that there are adequate powers for public

(Continued on page 6.)

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. 22. No. 8.

Saturday, April 23, 1949.

Third Programme

The notion quoted elsewhere in this issue from a book by Dr. du Nouÿ, who has made a reputation for himself as a medical scientist, that compulsory education, the banisher of "educational destitution," has produced many people who think they know what to do with their brains but don't is not new to our readers. The "B."B.C. Third Programme is evidently designed to exploit such latent powers as may be at a loose end in this field. It is not unduly—or indeed at all—cynical to observe that this kind of intelligence can come to any conclusion but the right one. The notion of a Right conclusion is absolutist; and no one can possibly reach something which doesn't exist; and absolutes, so it is postulated, don't exist. It used to be a matter for jest among the ignorant that scholastics once employed themselves in debating the number of angels who might dance on the point of a needle. We are, of course, in a minority; but it seems to us more important that at least one angel (how many more we frankly don't mind) can stand (or dance) on a point, than that the multitude should be able to make rings around it, and never come to it at all.

These reflections have been evoked by listening to the third of a series of six lectures on Christianity and History by the Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, Mr. Herbert Butterfield. The lecturer is provided with an invited audience, which is to be increased in size (*upper* Third?); so we may infer that demos is this time being given 'the goods'. The phrase is not so inadequate as it might seem, since Professor Butterfield is evidently a Moralist as well as an Historian, and believes in the continuous operation of Judgment. We shall await the publication of his lectures to study them more closely; but, in the meantime, we would point to a question which seems to us not theological, not philosophical, not even psychological, but merely a question of common sense, but not even common sense as a sort of inferior sense but rather as a sense which being common has to do with all things whatsoever. If systems—the Greek City State, the Roman Republic, the Roman Empire, the Christian State of the Middle Ages, the Liberal State of England in recent times—simply don't matter, and the goal of life can be as easily reached by the aspiring individual under one system as under another, why tolerate them any longer? Why not do away with the system under which Professor Butterfield, for example, is in no better position in regard to his salvation as an official of the University of Cambridge than he would have been as the night watchman at the Keighley Trade and Grammar School which initiated him into the mysteries of the world of learning? Is the system which encourages the notion that no

distinction can justly be drawn between stones and bread a moral system, or indeed a system at all?

The New Ruling Class

Edna Lonigan contributes to *Human Events* (Washington, D.C.) for March 30 an article on the new ruling class in which she says "The political problem of our day is the emergence, beneath all the Left Wing governments, of rule by the 'palace guard.' This small elite within the bureaucracy knows all the Machiavellian arts of power, and skilfully uses the pretext of mass welfare to establish itself in absolute control. We were right, in November, in regarding President Truman as a cracker barrel politician, out of the old West. We were also right, in January, in thinking that the Administration had abandoned our Constitution. What we missed was the connecting link; the fact that the 'palace guard' controls Truman, as it controlled Roosevelt, and that its only policy is maintenance of its own power. Harry Hopkins and other shining lights of the Roosevelt elite are gone, but they were not important as individuals. The elite is a new class, trained in handling the high voltage wires of absolute power. When one topples, another is ready to take his place. The forces that support this group must be defeated, if we wish to return to Constitutional government. . . . The goal of the new elite is the same in every country. They devise one programme of 'welfare' after another, but, however their 'planned economies' may seem to differ, they all centralise power. . . .

"The governing elite must be conspiratorial, because it is doing the exact opposite of what the Leader says. Every governmental utterance must be designed to delude. The elite must be secretive, because it must constantly change its tactics to keep the people deceived, and to confuse its adversaries. The elite must be dynamic, to seize quickly all the new means of power, before people realise what is happening. When it assumes power, the leadership party's programme is pacific and takes the form of the domestic Welfare State. But first in Germany, then in Russia and Japan, now here in America, we see the effort to build the World Welfare State, scattering its largesse and spreading its tentacles over the world. Of course this brings opposition, and then the Welfare State becomes the Garrison State, in which the people are induced to surrender what remains of their wealth to the elite, for protection against 'The Enemy.'"

The Power of the Majority

—But, my dear good Crito, why should we care so much for what people think? The best people, the people we ought to think of first, they will know that things have happened as they have [*i.e.* that Socrates was put to death].

—But you must surely see, Socrates, that it is absolutely necessary to take some account of the opinion of the majority. What has happened now is a proof in itself that they have it in their power to do, I may say, the greatest possible harm, if they take a prejudice against a man.

—I only wish, Crito, they had the power of doing the greatest harm, and then they might have the power of doing the greatest good; that would be very well; but, as it is, they have neither the one power nor the other; they cannot make a man wise or witless,—they have no power but what chance has given them.—Plato's *Crito*.

Constitutionalism

(Some notes on the address delivered by Major Douglas to the Constitutional Research Association in 1947).

What Douglas means by a realistic constitution is quite clear, I think. It is a body of what one might call "understanding," of common agreement, arrived at over a period of time and growth, and therefore what we call organic. It is, in effect, the individual's contract with his association or group, not only his charter of individual rights and privileges, but also defining his own obligations, negatively, so to speak, in that he is pledged by the mere fact of their common association, to preserve them in respect of his neighbour.

There is no written Constitution, so far at any rate as Great Britain is concerned, in the sense that the United States, or one's own tennis club has one; but that does not mean that there are any gaps or omissions. The whole thing is implicit—explicit, too, for that matter—in English Common Law, the obligation to *uphold the administration* of which, and sanction both the pruning away of any atrophied parts and the consolidation of any further extensions in growth, *may be said to cover the chief part of the function of government.*

In essence the whole thing is as simple as that; which, if there is real virtue in what Douglas means by the idea of Constitutionalism, shows how disastrously far we have strayed from the path!

That is the purely political, or legal side of the matter; the obligation of a Government, voluntarily empowered by the community through the sanction of the military, naval, and civil Forces, to see the Common Law upheld, as between individuals and individual groups, with as near to complete justice as is humanly practicable. That is ideal or theoretical Constitutionalism. But beyond and outside that—the basis upon which the whole structure of the Constitution rests: its substance, in fact—is the higher or Natural Law, and only as, and when, Government is maintained in conformity with that Higher Law, can a constitution be realistic (living, real); or the system under which that particular association exists be called Realistic Constitutionalism.

Douglas states it quite clearly near the bottom of page three of his published essay: "... the rules of the Universe transcend human thinking, and cannot, in the ordinary sense of the words be altered and therefore must be ascertained and obeyed." The denial of that postulate Douglas calls Absolute Idealism. And he suggests that it is hardly realised the extent to which that un-real idea—what one might term a mental enormity—has come to "tincture thinking on this subject."

To conclude this aspect of Douglas's thesis in his own words: "... the conception of writing a new Constitution for this country is inherently misleading, if anyone entertains it; we *grew* a Constitution, and our business is to free it from the weeds that are choking it, and to restore its power and effectiveness." (p. 6).

In Douglas's opinion, the immediate political need of this country is "the restoration of the supremacy of Common Law, the removal of encroachments on it, and the establishment of the principle that legislation by the House of Commons impinging upon it is *ultra vires* . . ." The so-called Democratic idea of Parliamentary Absolutism is heresy; for as Douglas says "... the locus of sovereignty over Common Law is not in the electorate," which is merely

a cross-section of the community in Time, whose elected Parliament or Assembly of Public Debate, is appointed by it merely as a watch-dog or caretaker of the nation's Cultural Inheritance, which the Common Law embodies, and which, in contra-distinction to the electorate, is a *perpendicular* intersection of Time. It stands to reason that the House of Commons itself, along with the individual citizen, must be subject to the Common Law; the temporal authority and debating ground regarding current affairs, must be subject to the continuous Common Standard or measure. What it amounts to is that there cannot be one standard for individuals and another for governments; that is, not without despotism, the condition to guard against which Parliaments were devised.

What we are threatened with is Laski's interpretation of the British Constitution, embodied in the idea of the Supremacy of Parliament, the full fruits of which un-British concept we can see and judge of in contemporary Russia. But the British Constitution is—or was before Professor Laski, and those of his politico-racial faith "got cracking" on it—an organism; whereas the Russian System is an organisation, and, as Douglas says (p. 7) "All organisation is what used to be called magic, and a good deal of it Black Magic . . ." In essence all organisation is the manipulation or arrangement of numbers; the mobilization of the magical force of numbers to more or less immediate and executive ends. And it begins to assume the form known as Black Magic when those ends tend to become long term and political, instead of executive merely. This change has actually taken place when more or less the whole social organisation of a nation assumes the form of a Supreme Parliament, without checks or hindrances of any kind but its own will, as in Russia. And we can begin to realize the potentially magical blackness of the prospect ahead of the United Kingdom under its present monopolistic control.

Whatever realism there may have been in the Athenian concept of Democracy—and having regard to our knowledge of the Greeks, there seems likely to have been a good deal,—the contemporary interpretation of it as an omnipotent numerical majority without checks or counterweights or safeguards of any sort, is the most dangerous and destructive idea that any society could embrace. As Douglas says, "It ought to be clear to any unprejudiced individual, that a majority is *always* wrong in its *reasons* for a given situation, and cannot, therefore, possibly be right in its remedies, although a native-born homogeneous majority is often instinctively right in its judgment of the *nature* of a situation." (p. 10).

I take Douglas, with his emphasis on "always," to mean here that a majority, being subject to mass-suggestion, is invariably furnished with the wrong interpretation of any mistake in policy by those whose mistake it was. And, alternatively, misled as to the real source of anything advantageous, by those who wish to exploit it for their own ends. The wrongness of popular remedies follows automatically. And when he says that instinctive, public judgment of the *nature* of an immediate situation is *often* right, he means that in spite of all propaganda to the contrary, and all false assurances, the public knows when a given situation is intrinsically bad and dangerous,—hence the necessity to attribute the blame in the wrong quarter, resulting in further confusion!

"But whether," Douglas says (p. 9) "by the strengthening and elevation of the Common Law, and its repository

in the care of an effective Second, non-elective Chamber or by some other method, clearly defined limits must be placed on the power of a House of Commons elected on a majority basis." That is one point surely, with which no individual having any pretensions to statesmanship, or philosophy of outlook whatsoever, could possibly disagree, even if he tried to evade it? I would go further, and say it is a fundamental political proposition with which no one with pretensions to being a Christian could disagree. And could it not therefore be sufficient basis for a new political alignment; whether party or non-party? A starting point for Young Conservatives, a New Toryism? That by the way. The acknowledgement of a power superior to the single elective House under the prevailing concept of a democratic majority is one essential in Douglas's view—as a strategic objective, first priority.

The type of legislative machine, then, to be avoided—putting the matter negatively—is single-chamber government. There *must* be a counter-poise to the tyranny of monopolistic sovereignty—to mon-archy—whether of the Royalist, Jamesian type, or of the Cromwellian. And Douglas observes (p. 7) "In some form or other, the sovereignty of the British Isles for the last two thousand years has been trinitarian. Whether we look on this trinitarianism under the names of King, Lords, and Commons, or as Policy, Sanctions and Administration, the Trinity-in-Unity has existed, and our national success has been greatest when the balance (never perfect) has been approached." And later (p. 9) "... to be successful, constitutionalism must be organic; it must have a relation to the nature of the Universe. That is my understanding of 'Thy Kingdom come on Earth, as it is in Heaven.' When England had a genuine Trinitarian constitution, with three interacting interrelated loci of sovereignty, the King, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons, those ideas were instinctive, and those were the days of Merrie England."

That concept, of the basis of society as Trinitarian; of it as a tripodal structure, where did a simple society—so much less sophisticated, and educated, and globally minded and even humanitarian than we—get this profoundly correct and statesmanlike, and realistic idea? For it is realistic, the understanding that to be stable, a political structure, like a stool, must have the equivalent of at least three feet; that neither one, nor two even, are self-supporting. The answer is that they got it from the Medieval Church, which in its turn got it from Christian doctrine.

This concept—to return to Douglas's preliminary statement—he relates to a point of view which he calls "objective reality." This is the view that holds this universe to be moved by Laws—a government—transcending human thinking, "... which cannot, in the ordinary sense of the words, be altered, and therefore must be ascertained." It is the recognition of a force, a potency, *something*, outside and superior to, mere human will. And if you look round the world today you can see that Truth, or Fact, actively denied by governments and individuals everywhere. Consciously and openly by those who are called Marxists, of whom the Soviet Union may be taken as the representative Government, and, say, Professor Laski as an individual; who aver that Christianity has failed; meaning by that that there is no point of common agreement, no compelling, objective Law or Mind, but only a welter of wilful personalities, competing for control of the available military sanctions and secrets.

And along with them—and this constitutes perhaps the core of our problem—is the whole host of un-declared

"fellow-travellers," not actively, or even vocally Marxist, but in a passive sense anti-Christian—"He that is not with me, is against me." All these, until some turn occurs in the mental tide; some change in the climate of opinion, tending to grow less and less Christian, more individually wilful, and less able to co-operate every day.

To sum up, then—according to Douglas, the elementary requirements of the situation are, first, a *Determination*: a more or less general political avowal of adherence to the Common Law of the land, as equally binding on all parties *i.e.* as between individual and individual, and individual and State, and superior to all and every kind of material power, of which the numerical majority, whether of votes or legions is the chief symbol.

Second, an *Understanding*, also more or less general, that to raise and maintain that idea (ideal) above, and superior to, the ordinary traffic and compromise of the purely physical universe, requires a tripodal, or trinitarian structure of social engineering; a joint inclination, or convergence (conference) of representatives of the three feet, or understandings, to the common determination.

Third, a more or less general *Acceptance of Responsibility* for a policy that may appear like one of retreat; a going-back, a re-constitution in fact. The return of the prodigal—"Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called Thy son."

Douglas gives four clear hints as to *action*: (a) a reference to the open ballot—"the individual voter must be made individually responsible, not collectively taxable."

(b) Regarding any change in the Common Law, that it "... should be made at least as arduous as an Amendment to the United States Constitution."

(c) "... Constitutionalism and economics, are, or ought to be, only related in the same way that the coal under the boiler is related to the policy of the factory which is driven by the coal. When the coal becomes a dominant issue, instead of a mere incident to the policy ... there is something wrong besides lack of coal."

(d) A reference on p. 10 to the *money vote*. "The economic, as distinct from the political, system had a marvellous voting system, continuous and flexible, until the same influences as have perverted the Constitution were brought to bear on it."

Wanted as a preliminary: a group of individuals in Parliament, of any and every political complexion, dedicated to making their Assembly subject to a standard or code *in common* with the individual citizen. The rest follows.

NORMAN WEBB.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

authorities to control them. That was true in the 19th century. I believe it is an obsolete assumption now. I believe that it is now true that it is the opposite of the truth. I believe that the main threats to the preservation of the natural beauty of this country now come from public authorities, local or central.

If we are thinking of the kind of activity that is likely to destroy a national park, I had only to cite the opposition to the removal of the factory on Lake Windermere by the county council; or the question of the Ennerdale Reservoir; or the cement works in the Hope Valley; or the invasion of Dartmoor. And coming from the local authorities to the

national Government, the kind of thing that is likely to destroy beauty and to destroy these national parks will be, for example, the desire of the Board of Trade to develop parts of Cumberland, that is the Lake District, as Development Areas; the desire of the Ministry of Transport to drive a great special road, endangering the Backs of Cambridge, or possibly running through one of the national parks contemplated here; or the nationalised electricity authority's planning of large new electrical establishments, let us say, in North Wales; or the Gas Board of the recently nationalised gas industry proposing new horrors blocking the view on the main approaches to a city like Oxford. Again the threat may come, and on a bigger scale, from the War Office, desiring to add to the Plain of Salisbury other parts of Wiltshire for training purposes. Or it may, of course, come from the Air Ministry.

It is, in my view, threats of that kind from local or national authorities that are the threats of the present time, the main obstacles in the way of the preservation of the natural beauty of this country. I am not saying that any of these purposes are improper. I am not saying that any of them is unnecessary. Quite obviously, however, in regard to any one of them the question will arise whether a particular location is the right one; whether in a particular instance the balance is rightly struck between the immediate economy and convenience of a particular site to a Department and the destruction of beauty; and whether a slight loss of economy or convenience should not be sustained to avoid an intolerable damage to natural beauty.

I shall come back in a moment to the way in which the machinery of Government in this country works. We have what are, in fact, great Departments of the Government, not only the Departments in the strict sense, like the War Office, but nationalised concerns as the interested parties in such questions. So much, I think, we have as a background when we try to assess the prospect that the objects of this Bill will be achieved. . . .

I therefore think that the phrase "national park" is a misnomer in regard to both its terms. A very celebrated ecclesiastic once said that Christian Science was so-called because he was informed that it was not scientific and he knew that it was not Christian. A somewhat similar observation is I think appropriate to the Minister's term "national park" in the Bill which he has presented to us. It is true, of course, that while I think the centre of gravity of the powers is with the local planning authority, the national Government have sufficient powers and can do a great deal. But on the whole what the Government as a whole will mainly do is, I believe, destroy the beauty of the country and not preserve it. This not out of ill-will but because so many of the schemes that threaten national beauty come from specialised Government Departments which have a particular interest which naturally predominates against the more general interest of preserving national beauty. Against the specialised and eager interest of a strong Department, I think that the Minister will usually be incapable of securing the same kind of impartial judgment, the balancing of advantages and disadvantages, as he would be able to secure if the interest in question was a private interest and not a Department of the Government.

I think that there is an illusion in the public mind that when a great department of public life is taken over by the State, which is supposed to be the guardian of the public

interest, the general interest of the public will be safer than when that part of the national life was still in the hands of private interests. I believe that that is not only not true but that it is the precise opposite of the truth. Let me take, as an example, the instance to which I have just referred—the proposal that there should be further developments by the gas authorities near the approaches to Oxford. There we have the City opposition, the University opposition and the Oxford Preservation Society opposition. I am sure that we have too the inner sympathy of the Minister with the people who are objecting to this proposal. I am quite sure that if gas had not been nationalised and there was no national gas authority, supported as it naturally is by the Minister of Fuel and Power, the opponents to that proposal would prevail; at least I am quite sure that they would have a much greater chance of prevailing than they will now that gas has become nationalised.

That is how the thing works under a Government machine. Many of us in this House have had experience of how Government Departments work with each other, and how the Cabinet works. A particular Department and a Minister with all his expert advisers will have worked up their case; they say quite truly that there is a convenience in a particular horror being sited in a place of beauty rather than elsewhere; they can save money and it is more convenient; the experts have worked out all their figures to the last decimal. Against specialised knowledge, I suggest that the Minister will usually not find that he is strong enough to resist successfully. The dice are loaded against him all the time. They are much more strongly loaded against him than if he were controlling a private interest. So I suggest it will be when he comes to the Cabinet. The Minister concerned with a particular scheme will push his scheme so far as he can; and the Minister responsible only for the more general duty of preserving beauty will almost always lose.

That is now the new, and the greatest, danger. There is at least a possible partial remedy. I do not now suggest that the Government should go back on the whole of their nationalisation programme. What I do urge is that the Government should consider the proposal made by the Hobhouse Committee in, I think, paragraph 116, that there should be a permanent Cabinet Committee watching problems of this kind. When a particular Departmental Minister comes with his scheme for gas or electricity or a special road or whatever it may be, he would then find himself confronted not with one Minister, and a less specialised and powerful Minister, but with a permanent Committee of Ministers who will develop the proper traditions with regard to these problems. I venture to press that suggestion on Ministers and upon the Government generally. . . .

“Tricks’ of Civilisation”

“The education of children, which is so fundamental from the point of view of the moral development of a people, has always been influenced by political and social convulsions. It is possible that in certain periods of the past, education was superior to what it is today. It was evidently less general, but the problem is not so much one of quantity as of quality. A bad education, or an education based on false principles and widely extended, leads to disastrous results. The theory of universal culture is excellent, but premature as long as people do not agree on the quality and nature of

the instruction and on the preparation of the ground. To give children an intellectual tincture, a smattering of 'instruction', without previously constructing on firm moral foundations the base which must support it, is to build on sand; and the higher the monument the more complete will be its collapse.

"This manner of procedure is, alas, much too frequent, and probably rests on the deplorable confusion between education and instruction. Education consists in preparing the moral character of a child, in teaching him the few fundamental and invariable principles accepted in all countries of the world. It consists in giving him, from tenderest childhood, the notion of human dignity. On the other hand, instruction consists in making him absorb the accumulated knowledge of man in every realm. Education directs his actions, inspires his behaviour in all his contacts with mankind, and helps him to master himself. Instruction gives him the elements of his intellectual activity and informs him of the actual state of his civilisation. Education gives him the unalterable foundations of his life; instruction enables him to adapt himself to the variations of his environment and to link these variations to past and future events. Only in the past is environment immutable; it is essentially variable in the present. . . .

"Intelligence, or rather the faculty of reasoning, has been cultivated by compulsory education. A certain number of individuals, gifted with brains which were apt to develop, were thus revealed. These minds learned the 'tricks' which characterise civilisations, and two principle groups of unequal number and quality were formed. The first, and largest, is composed of those who have absorbed their primary or secondary instruction without digesting it. They constitute a kind of standardised mass which lives under the illusion that it knows how to use its brains and derives therefrom a pride which is sometimes dangerous. The second is represented by those who have digested and assimilated their instruction, have gone beyond it and combined it with their intuition, with their own genius and are thus qualified to make human knowledge progress. The existence of these two groups is practically ignored from a moral and religious point of view. . . ."—From *Human Destiny*: Lecomte du Noüy.

The English at School

The National Book League is holding an exhibition at 7, Albemarle Street of class room relics, "The English at School," which include reports written about them when G. K. Chesterton and Lord Montgomery were senior pupils at St. Paul's. Of Chesterton when he was 18, it is reported that he was "Not on the same plane with the rest. Com

STATES ACTUAL, REAL & POTENTIAL

by

TUDOR JONES, Sc.D., M.D., F.R.S.E.

(The substance of an Address to the Speke Discussion Group on 7th December, 1948).

PRICE 6d.

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

position mostly futile. But will translate well, and appreciates what he reads. Not a quick brain, but possessed by a slowly moving, tortuous imagination. Conduct always admirable." The report goes on to say that in composition he was "nowhere." His French was "careless" and his mathematics "very poor."

With the Chesterton report there is another dated May, 1905, about B. L. Montgomery, now Field Marshal Lord Montgomery. It reads: "He is rather backward for his age, but has made considerable progress. To have a serious chance for Sandhurst he must give more time to work." His divinity and English are described as "fair on the whole, essays rather weak." His mathematics are described as "backward but improving," his drawing as "fair, does all he can," and his science as "backward but tries and improves." His French "has improved but it is still inaccurate. Too easily satisfied with his work."

Conservative Collaborators

" . . . Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, fresh from Nurneburg, attacked the Socialist ministers with a violence which surprised me: 'I have seen my country sacrificed to Socialism and crucified on a cross of dogma.' The charge would have come better from an opposition which had given fewer hostages to socialist tendencies than had the Conservatives when they were in office. The truth is that they have regarded the journey towards collectivism as a fatality and that they only difference between them and the Socialists has been in the speed of travel. The National Government's propaganda, both at home, abroad, and in the forces, was a breeding-ground of socialists. The ship of the Labour ministers, for all their ideas, rides the collectivist stream almost at the same pace as the ship of Conservatives rode it in their time, for all their ideas. For the transformation of the English scene in the direction of State control included amongst its artisans Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Churchill.

"The reason for what amounted to the outlines of a revolt, however deferential and courteous in form, among the Conservative militants, [at the Blackpool Conservative Party Conference, 1946] was just the fact that they had been drawn by their chiefs into defending and justifying political acts of every kind which were so tainted with empiricism as to give them an inner feeling of vertigo. As one of them put to me: 'I ask for nothing better than to fight for the liberties of the individual against the encroachments of the State. But my duty has in fact lain in pleading the virtues of organisation to a point at which I could hardly tell the difference between myself and a socialist. And only nine little months from the time when I was denouncing Russia as an aggressive power, I have had to salute her as our great ally. Our leaders have talked like socialists throughout the war. Can you, after that, feel much surprise at the socialists winning votes when they have had us collaborating in their own propaganda?'"—*Problems of Socialist England*, pp. 21, 22. by Bertrand de Jouvenel. London: Batchworth Press.

A selection of K.R.P. Publications is obtainable from:—

MR. KEITH G. CATMUR, 2, STEPNEY GREEN,
'Phone: STE 3025. LONDON, E.1.