

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 24. No. 15.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

We record with sorrow the passing of His Excellency Field-Marshal Earl Wavell, Colonel of the Black Watch, Viceroy of India.

Although originally an officer of a distinguished Highland Regiment, and claiming some Scottish blood, Lord Wavell was an authentic Englishman of the type we associate with our days of greatness.

Ave atque vale.

• • •

"The enemy is further kind enough not to wound your feelings; you are comforted with the doctrine of inevitability of the demise of individuality as part of the process of industrialisation. Centralisation and a corresponding reduction of individuality are declared to be inescapable, no matter if lamentable or otherwise. The enemy has definite convictions; while would-be individualists dare not have convictions, for fear of offending somebody."—Lewis G. Anderson in *Human Events*.

We are pleased that someone besides ourselves has noticed it.

• • •

There appears to be a tendency, (which we have done our best to discredit) to suggest that the Social Credit Secretariat should mould its activities on those of the American statesman who concluded his electioneering address with the words, "Them's my principles, gents, and if you don't like 'em, I'll change 'em." So far from complaining of this attitude, in moderation, we recognise that it represents a degree of confidence for which we are grateful.

But in fact, the idea that there is some magic word which if discovered and pronounced would transform the situation, can be very dangerous. At some risk of being platitudinous, may we repeat what in effect we have been proclaiming for thirty years—that policy, function, and power are all different, and that the fundamental "sin" of our present era is that we allow policy and power to be dependent on function. To put it in the simplest manner, to our orthodox philosophy, there's nothing like leather.

It is from this fundamental fallacy that we derive such fatuous ideas as the "right" of "Labour" to do this, that, and the other, e.g., "Full Employment." "Labour" has no rights whatever except the right of the *individual* labourer not to function—to contract out.

If this situation is clearly grasped, and it is surely not too difficult of apprehension, it should be obvious that the best of policies (and it must be remembered that we can only impinge upon ideas which go to form policy) is quite powerless without function and power. We commenced our crusade by emphasising that finance controls policy, and

(because we have a fraudulent financial system) our policy is fraudulent.

Finance is part of our Constitutional system (more so than ever since the "nationalisation" of our Central Bank) and to rectify Finance, we have to rectify our Constitution. We have made consistent suggestions, alone amongst contemporary movements to embody these policies. They have not so far been pushed very hard (that is neither our business, nor within our competence), but we have no bright ideas to offer which will make the walls of Jericho fall down even without trumpets.

"Them's our sentiments, gentlemen, and if you don't like them, we're sorry."

• • •

Observation of the events of the past few years has confirmed our opinion that the only legitimate power (and properly exercised, it is immense) of a democracy as such, is negative—it is almost comprised in the power to contract-out. We say almost, because such criticism of the present Government mentality as that of the Dean of Chichester, Dr. Duncan-Jones, is of immense value, although negative in form. "Positive" politics cannot possibly be democratic—the idea of obtaining a majority for a specific policy which is comprehensive and sound, is on the face of it, ridiculous. But an educated minority can reject a fallacious policy and, in so doing, automatically provide a demonstration which will ultimately be effective in forcing the substitution of something better.

It is with great satisfaction that we notice the growing body of negative criticism of totalitarian Governments, Viscount Cecil's Motion on the Power of the Cabinet being symptomatic. That way, and, we think, only that way will the poisonous growths which have stifled us for much too long, be eradicated. There is an organic connection between "inevitable and automatic progress" and "positive," Planned Legislation. The difference between the statesmen of England's great days, and the Aneurin Bevans and Shinwells is that the former knew their limitations; the latter cannot conceive that they could have any.

The Lost Empire

"As I travelled the vast imperial hinterlands, I was astonished to discover how much of the world's hard work, the dirty work, was done by a handful of British. It used to depress me on my return to Great Britain to find that this magnificent effort was by all too many taken for granted. The British Empire as it stands today is a radically different community from the one whose outer marches I tramped only a quarter of a century ago. The thought occurs to me that I was the last British King to have seen it all intact."
—H.R.H. The Duke of Windsor.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: May 19, 1950.

Petrol Rationing

The Minister of Fuel and Power (Mr. Philip Noel-Baker): . . . The motion is the House of Commons version of what the right hon. Member for King's Norton said in the General Election three months ago. Speaking at Doncaster, he said that if the Conservatives were returned they would make a substantial increase in the petrol ration. The right hon. Gentleman did not know the dollar position. He said that the Conservatives would have increased this ration considerably had they been returned to power in 1945. Those statements, and the speeches made on the other side, have taken no account of the fact that the petrol used in Britain has gone on increasing steadily since the end of the war. In 1945, it was 3,300,000; in 1948, it was 4,264,000, and in 1950, 5,090,000 tons.

The speeches have taken no account of the fact that cars and motor bicycles are more in number on the roads of our country than they were before the war. Leaving out agricultural tractors and the immense increase in lorries from 450,000 commercial lorries before the war to nearly 800,000 now—

Mr. Lloyd: Would the right hon. Gentleman excuse me? On the question of fact as to the number of motor cars licenced, the figures I have here and which I believe are official—they are from P.E.P.—show that in 1939, 2,034,000 cars were licensed whereas, in 1949, the figure was 2,035,000, an increase of 1,000.

Mr. Noel-Baker: My figure includes motor bicycles. [HON. MEMBERS: "Ah!"] In any case, the figures with which I am furnished from official sources are, for August, 1938, 2,450,000; August, 1949, 2,724,000. I prefer official sources even to P.E.P.

Complaints have been made to-day about the price of petrol. Everybody knows the results of comparisons of the prices here with those on the Continent, of which hon. Members opposite have spoken in such ardent tones. In Italy, for example, the cost of petrol is 5s. 8d. a gallon; in West Germany, 4s. 7d.; in France, 4s. 4d., and so on. We consume, of course, seven times as much petrol per head of the population as Italy, and a great deal more than most other countries. The truth is that on the Continent petrol plays a far smaller part in the life of the nation. The dependence of those countries on overseas supplies of food and raw materials is far less, and their balance of payments problems far easier, than ours; and the prices which I have quoted show that in a great measure petrol is rationed by the price.

The Motion and the speeches which have been made by hon. Members opposite imply that the Government have not done all that they could to meet the needs and wishes of the people. Above all, however, those speeches and the Motion really do not take proper account of the basic economic fact by which the Government have been moved. The dollar shortage—I am sorry to weary the House with this again—is essential to the whole thing. The petrol problem is part of the dollar problem. The two things just cannot be torn apart. The petrol bill has been a major factor in our dollar and gold deficit.

. . . Of course the dollar gap is grave. Let me repeat

to the House the basic figures which are given in the Economic Survey for this year: 1947, 4,100 million dollars; 1948, 1,700 million dollars; 1949, 1,500 million dollars. That is tremendous progress, but we have not yet closed the gap. Who can say with full assurance on the other side of the House that in all the circumstances, whatever happens in other countries, we shall close the gap by the time that Marshall Aid has ended in 1952? How can we close it? By expanding exports to the dollar markets; by restricting dollar imports; by the restriction of consumption here of dollar products; by switching the purchasing of essential imports from dollar to non-dollar sources. The House knows all we have done about food and raw materials.

Let the House note this: 625 million dollars, unless something new happens, will be spent this year on oil.

Mr. Lloyd: That is the net figure, not the gross figure?

Mr. Noel-Baker: That is the net figure, calculated at the beginning of this year. Confronted with that situation we have done with oil what we have done with food and other essentials. We have controlled consumption, not of essential oil required to make industry efficient, not of oil required for full employment and the greater productivity of labour, but of oil, of petrol, which while we have wanted it, while we should have been very glad to have had it, was not absolutely essential to our national life. If we had adopted the right hon. Gentleman's plan and had given more petrol we should have been 170 million dollars further from our goal. Petrol rationing has been a part—a regrettable and regretted part—of our national plan.

Hon. Members opposite have asked to-day, Why use dollar oil? Why not use sterling oil—the oil which British companies produce? It is quite clear that the House understands that British oil has a large element of dollar cost. The reason is well known in this House. I hope it is becoming plain to the motoring public. Providence has not ordained that oil should be found in any considerable amount inside the Commonwealth. The British companies, with those of the United States, lead the world in oil production. Our companies' production is between a third and a quarter of that of those of the United States; but the United States consume most of their oil at home, and they use as the right hon. Gentleman said, about two-thirds of the world's supplies. Between them the British and the American companies hold the pre-dominant position in the international trade. They are about 50-50—almost equal.

The British oil is drawn not from the Commonwealth but from countries outside, and everywhere where it is produced the companies have to pay some dollars in the conduct of their work. Of course, it varies from place to place. The House knows quite well what it is. In Venezuela, for example, they have to pay the staffs and workers in a currency which is equivalent to dollars; they have to pay royalties in dollars; they have to pay taxes to the Government, and the rest; and we have had to construct a refinery there because it was one of the conditions of the contract. In other places the dollar content is less. In the Middle Eastern countries it is much less, but there is always a dollar element: tankers, oil equipment, sometimes a gold clause in the royalty agreement, and other things. Even in Kuwait there is a dollar cost . . . the average dollar content of oil produced by British companies under British

control, as I said on Monday last at questions, is about 30 per cent.

In some countries, of course, it is higher than it is in others, but it is really mis-leading to look at the dollar costs in one country and to imply that we in this country could buy oil from that country without considering the world wide work of the companies as a whole. It is the average of a company's costs throughout the world that concerns us. These companies have to serve the whole sterling area. They earn a lot of foreign exchange in countries outside. If they sell low dollar cost petrol to the United Kingdom they have got to sell high dollar cost petrol to other people. If they sell it inside the sterling area then the result is just the same, because we have the sterling area pool of dollars. If they sell it outside then the earnings of foreign exchange are correspondingly reduced.

We cannot say to the British companies—and this is the fundamental error into which hon. Members opposite have fallen—“Divide your trade into small compartments. Never mind about the true costs of supplying different markets. Never mind about the transport costs. Send this particular lot of petrol to this destination—low-dollar cost petrol to the United Kingdom. Never mind how that effects your general trade or costs elsewhere.” Of course we cannot order the companies to distribute their exports from foreign countries in that way. It would be grossly unfair.

Miss Irene Ward (Tynemouth): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if that not what we do with regard to our coal in this country? We export it at a vastly increased price over the production cost here.

Mr. Noel-Baker: With great respect, that is a different point and I am quite prepared to argue it with the hon. Lady on another occasion.

As I was saying, it would be grossly unfair to the companies. It would be worse than useless to the sterling area. On balance we should lose. It would be useless to the United Kingdom itself. On top of the dollar cost of sterling petrol, we expect this year to spend 350 million dollars on American oil for the sterling area. The dollar content of that American oil is at present 90 per cent. That dollar expenditure cannot be reduced unless we have a surplus of sterling oil over everything we need for all our British companies' markets. Until we have that surplus, if we consume more oil here, we must buy dollar oil. More consumption means more dollars and up to the beginning of this year that has always been true.

Faced with those basic facts what have His Majesty's Administration tried to do? They have sought to reduce the dollar element in sterling petrol; to reduce the dollar cost of dollar petrol; to increase the supplies of sterling oil; to increase the production of crude oil by British companies; to increase the refining capacity in this country. . . We have embarked on a refinery programme here in the United Kingdom which will increase the economic strength of the nation; and that is desirable on strategic and international grounds. It will reduce the foreign exchange cost of the oil products we use, and the dollar cost of the dollar oil we use; because when the American companies refine their American oil in this country they have of course a large sterling element, as we have a dollar element elsewhere.

Earl Winterton (Horsham): What about Canada?

Mr. Noel-Baker: There is not any Canadian oil coming in that I am aware of. Before the war, the companies were building refineries, but they built them overseas. Almost none were built here. After the war, the companies decided that they would like to build refineries here. Again, we gave them warm encouragement. We thought that there would be many gains. . . .

. . . In 1939, before the war, the total volume of crude oil refined in this country was 2,360,000 tons; in 1948, it was 4,500,000 tons; in 1949, it was 6,333,000 tons; in 1950, we hope that it will be nearly 9 million tons; in 1951, 12,500,000 and in 1952, 18,000,000. That great advance has not only reduced the dollar cost of petrol, but has also increased the total amount of sterling oil products available to us and to the world. We are reaching the point at which we have more sterling oil products than we need at the moment for the markets which the British oil companies serve. In view of our general dollar situation, we thought that we must try to make dollar savings with this surplus, or to do in the sterling area what we have done with food and other things, and switch purchases of oil from dollar to sterling sources.

That is a very delicate matter. When we have the British and American companies sharing in almost equal parts the international trade of the world, can we really do what some hon. Members seemed to suggest and just push the Americans out of all the markets like that? Of course, not. We should start a major oil war, and throw an apple of discord between ourselves and the American State Department which would have immense and terrible repercussions. . . .

We do not proceed in that way, but we did propose a plan for substitution—to use our surplus to save dollars and make our dollar position really safe. We wanted to reduce still further the 625 million dollars bill for oil which the sterling area would otherwise have to pay this year. In that substitution plan, we had one object alone. We did not want to discriminate against American companies or deprive them of legitimate trade, or make any country dependent on British oil alone. We are not in favour of monopoly, in the Commonwealth or elsewhere. Our only concern is to help to close the dollar gap.

At Washington last year, it was recognised that the achievement of that object was a common interest not only of ourselves, the sterling area, the United States and Canada, but of the world at large. In our talks in Washington, we have for months past been doing what the right hon. Gentleman opposite suggested today. We have made it plain that we should be glad to take more American oil if we could together find some way by which they could purchase more goods from us and thereby enable us to pay with dollars for the extra oil we took. That is the central idea of our incentive plan. It starts from the premise that the American oil producers and British oil concerns have a common interest which will help both our countries to promote the solution of the dollar difficulty. . . I cannot tell the House all about the negotiations, but I will say a word or two about them.

Our proposals were these. We would limit the extent

(Continued on page 7.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

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

Vol. 24. No. 15.

Saturday, June 10, 1950.

Patience

It is perhaps easier at the present moment, *Muscosi fontes et somno mollior herba* (*), than in sterner seasons to entertain the counsel of patience. Sleepers are indisposed to argue. So we seize the moment to suggest patience to the correspondent who finds "disconcerting and disheartening" the silence concerning Major Douglas's ideas which reigns in circles where the discussion of Christian concepts is reputedly not only "liberal" but "enlightened." Without otherwise associating them, we do not forget that "light" has its votaries in both Rosicrucianism and Luciferism. It is asserted that the best thought remains "incomplete and misleading" without the leaven of Social Credit, and that "the maintenance of this iron curtain in such cases remains a mystery."

For the moment the colours which close and open the road to the future seem to be the reverse of the robot lights, and Red beckons while Green delays. Mankind is bound to a convention from which he must escape unless it is to strangle him. The mark around his neck becomes more noticeable; and so again: *muscosi fontes*.... Time is neither fleet of foot nor lagged. The parent, Leonardo called him, of a single daughter—Truth.

Major C. H. Douglas's

"The Monopoly of Credit"

K.R.P. Publications Limited will republish this important work by Major Douglas which has been out of print since existing stocks were exhausted during the past war.

The work is that advised for study by those who desire to master the technical aspects of Social Credit, and is, for this reason, one which it is desired to keep in constant supply. War-time restrictions, altered rather than diminished by post-war conditions have hitherto prevented the fulfilment of this desire.

The volume of 192 pages, fully bound in cloth, crown octavo, will now, however, be available in six to eight months of this notice if the demand can be estimated with sufficient accuracy. In present circumstances, to under-print would be as undesirable as to over-print.

The publishers, therefore, invite orders from readers of this journal (there are many standing orders) immediately.

The price will be 12/- net, payable on delivery.

To secure your copy, please order now, from K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2.

(*). Mossy springs and grass softer than sleep.

"Planning the Earth" by C. G. Dobbs

This work, which appeared serially in *The Social Crediter*, will be made available, 96 pages thread sewn at 7/- a copy, net, if there is sufficient demand.

Readers are invited to indicate their requirements immediately to K.R.P. Publications, 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2.

"Air Space"

The following letter was broadcast on "Air Space", B.B.C., at 6-30 p.m. on May 26:—

Dear Sir,

The question is often asked—what is wrong with Democracy? One thing which is very seriously wrong with it is that it is anonymous and irresponsible. A lot of careerists climb to power by promises made to people who record their vote in secret, and thereafter in the name of "the people" proceed to divest the individuals who make up that collectivity of both liberty and property. Incidentally these two are inseparable; they are Siamese twins and separation means the death of both. Property which is nationalised is simply transferred from its owners to the ruling or official class; the people do not own it; they don't own anything but are merely employees and employees who cannot change their employers.

People must accept responsibility for the consequence of their votes if democracy is to work. That is to say there should be an open, recorded and published vote. Each Party should publish its proposals together with their estimated cost to the taxpayers and the special interests affected.

The major part of any increased taxation should be borne by those having voted for the successful party (say seventy-five per cent) and only twenty-five per cent by those who did not vote for them. Conversely, any reduction in taxation attributable to legislation by the successful party should be shared as to seventy-five per cent by those having voted for them and twenty-five per cent by those who did not vote for them.

This would probably result in many being afraid to vote at all; but that would be to the good, as those only should exercise the vote who know what they are doing and are prepared to accept responsibility for it. What we have at present is power without responsibility which can only lead to disaster.

Yours faithfully, D. BEAMISH.

The headquarters of "Air Space" are at the B.B.C., Bristol.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.

An Enigmatic Adjunct

by

HEWLETT EDWARDS.

Current comment not infrequently suggests that the invention of the atomic bomb marks the beginning of the end of society, or variously of humanity or of the physical structure of the earth. Francis Bacon and his contemporaries could have had no conception of such an end, yet it was they who, in the instrument of scientific precision known as the inductive system, provided the means.

The most perfect instrument may be misused, and gross subordination to political aims is evident. Beyond this, by intensive organisation research has been canalised, sectionalised and industrialised to such effect, that many engaged upon it have little knowledge of its objective; others, while disagreeing, still work towards it. Such scientists can claim no high principles about their work; they are employees, working for ends dictated by an employer. This research has little relationship to "the instinct for perfect knowledge"¹; indeed a science which with airy nonchalance can produce such items as "depersonalisation" by drugs—the "extinction" technique of germicidal warfare—artificial insemination—and the 'A' and 'H' bombs, would appear at best an enigmatic adjunct to society. For the common factor in such of science's services to mankind is the development of power; inevitably to be used over the minds, bodies and estates of individuals in the implementation of Machiavellian doctrine repugnant to our traditions. These results are so far removed from the benefits and conveniences which we are accustomed to receive as must elicit challenge.

Does this perversion in the use of the inductive instrument wholly account for 'advances' in such unwelcome directions? The field is wide. General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, speaking recently of the Hydrogen bomb remarked, "You can't stop progress, you cannot say that electricity, which has increased the horrors of war, should not have been invented". But before such universal threat, 'progress' itself will not remain exempt. As General Bradley suggests, science has a long and often respectable history, which nevertheless has resulted in the present position. It is true that, since the rise of modern science some have held that there is in the nature of things that which is inimical to man's existence, and which in the end must destroy him. And there is a sense in which scientists . . . the physical principles which they uncover . . . and the world of men into which these discoveries are launched, comprise one thing; one interaction, which now nears disaster. But scientists claim to discover truth; are we then to find that the truth is merely a short cut to inevitable death and extinction? Is scientific truth of such quality and wholeness as to enforce resignation to this conclusion? Or is there essential error—some deficiency or

¹Eddington. *The Philosophy of Physical Science.*

For correct information concerning the Constitution of
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for
the Statement published in July, 1949, (postage 1d.)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

bias—in the approach made to it? That approach is the inductive system.

Induction is primarily an organisation of ideas, which originated from and is operated by individual human beings, in whom, as Eddington laid it down, "the purely objective sources in observational knowledge are Life, Consciousness and Spirit."² Whether regarded as a privilege or as a limitation, this threefold nature is 'given' and it cannot be rejected. Each phase is readily distinguishable but they are not separable; only together can they form the whole—the individual. Induction, though pre-eminently an intellectual process, exhibits this triple theme in its three major operations. Observation is drawn from the senses looking outward; hypothesis springs from imagination within; while reason plays the major part in proof—what is observed and what is proved being fructified to growth by imagination. Pursued with vigour and within its own proper boundaries, inductive science is self-cleansing with regard to its own plane of truth. Upon this basis has been erected the vast structure of physical science, each member tested and counter-tested by innumerable proofs and counter-proofs. There are considerable spheres where-in the system is debased, as where, upon inadequate observation, vast speculation is presented as having validity. Discounting such the main structure remains, within its own frame of reference, inviolable. That is to say, subjected to its own formula of tests, it passes them, and considered within the limits of its own objectives, it works—superabundant evidence of which exists in the backgrounds of everyday life. But a frame of reference implies limitations, and this system has them. A formula of proof does not necessarily cover everything to be proved; and objectives are still objectives though not amenable to this form of induction.

The validity of 'truth' uncovered by physical science rests upon proofs which consist of identification, measurement and number; nothing which is not subject to what Eddington calls 'pointer readings' may properly be taken into account. Dazzled by success many exponents have claimed that truth does not exist unless it can be measured; hence the attempts to reduce life, consciousness and spirit to terms of mathematics; whereas there is no reason to suppose that mathematics exists outside the mind of the mathematician. The position is much simpler. A hungry man conceives the hypothesis that a certain root is edible. He eats, and judging by the results ascertains whether or not it satisfies the requirements of his body. Einstein designs a formula into which he thinks the whole physical universe will fit; and subjected to proof this formula will or will not be found to fulfil the requirements of the intellect. Whether it does or not, the universe will not depend upon Einstein's mathematical expression of what he knows about it. "All 'laws of nature' are subjective"³. The intellect builds up from step to step, and whatever height attained stands as it were, upon the apex of a pyramid of subjective abstract theory; and what it contemplates is the coherence of this structure within its own limitations.

²Op: cit:

³Op: cit: Eddington concludes that "the realisation that physical knowledge is only concerned with structure points the way by which the conception of man in a moral and spiritual order can be dovetailed into the conception of man as the plaything of the forces of the material world."

In the search for Truth each facet of threefold personality has something to do and something to say. The Senses have their own language which must be translated into words and so become intellectual concepts. On the other hand words are the natural medium of the intellect, whose function is to reduce all with which it deals to a form which can be dealt with by reason and logic. That which takes place in the mind does not consist solely of sense impressions plus reasoning; the Spirit has the primary message yet its movement is not easily put into words; for intellectual concepts cannot properly convey it. The fundamental condition to be met is that "the objective element in our observational knowledge" cannot be communicated directly to others. The intellect has established indirect communication in the elaboration of a technique in the use of words; and this technique dominates the words which, in themselves, are attuned or biased towards it and away from the spirit. Parable and poetry evade or endeavour to evade this domination, as does the broadcaster who attempts to describe in some important match the transformation of spirit occasioned by a hit 'over the pavilion'. His words are poor lame things, he is purposely disjointed, repetitive and exclamatory; and the wordless shout in the background conveys more than they do. The medium in which the spirit is expressed is not precisely words, nor yet exactly action; it is in *being*. . . . Induction carries all the bias words carry; towards the phase of reason and away from that which inspires reason.

In whatever direction investigation may reach it must always begin with an axiom accepted without proof, which in this case is the *equality* of whatever units are to be identified, numbered and measured. Though within certain limits this assumption 'works' it has been shown to have no correspondence in reality. For investigation into the ultimate constitution of matter has disclosed a limit beyond which it is not possible simultaneously to ascertain the mass velocity and position of particles. 'Equality' is found to be irrelevant, for in this analysis matter becomes non-material; the general effect of the relativity formulæ being to represent the universe as immaterial unity. This indirect conclusion is drawn (by reason and mathematics) from the sources of observational knowledge—Life, Consciousness and Spirit—in which the same conclusion is directly experienced. Equality cannot exist therein, for each of the incessant succession of 'states' presented by the inner being is unique . . . chaos brought into unity only by that elusive entity—which nevertheless *does* it—the spirit. No one can simultaneously identify, measure and number his non-material 'states' as they not merely pass, but at once pass and *are* him.

Whether the macrocosm is examined in all the strict logic of mathematics or the microcosm by direct observation, a substratum is found which is subject to neither mathematics nor measurement. Such conventions are useful and convenient and up to a point they 'work'; beyond it they are meaningless for they fail to connect material with spiritual truth. At that point the conventions of 'equality' must be abandoned and attention directed towards the uniqueness of all phenomena, which is no convention but is reality. Thus each organism is seen to contain its own scale of measurement which connects inner with outer truth. For in ceaseless interaction with its environment, each finds life (each 'works') within the limits of a certain

tolerance; between deficiency in, and excess of what is required from the world outside itself, there is an *internal* adjustment towards 'enough'.

R.S.P.C.A. and "Kosher" Killings

The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, of which Sir Robert Gower is Chairman, has refused the "demand" made by the Council of Christians and Jews for the withdrawal of a leaflet issued by the Society dealing with killing practices in Jewish slaughterhouses. The leaflet has been in circulation since October, 1948 and is still being circulated. It describes "barbarous practises" attending the "kosher" killings of beasts, calves and sheep.

Interviewed by a Sunday newspaper (the *Sunday Dispatch*) last week, Sir Robert Gower said: "It is urged that certain things in the leaflet are wrong. We have replied that we are not going to withdraw it, and that we will be pleased to meet our critics and substantiate the leaflet."

It is the contention of the R.S.P.C.A. that every animal should be mechanically stunned before being either "cast" or having its throat cut.

It contends that this should be made a legal objection in the case of both Jewish and Moslem killings, as it has in other slaughterings since 1933. Since January 1 hand "casting" of beasts has been unlawful and has been replaced by the provision in slaughterhouses of mechanical casting pens.

"Because of this it has been suggested that the leaflet is out of date now," Mr. Arthur W. Moss, chief secretary of the R.S.P.C.A., told the newspaper representative. "We do not agree," he said, "The elimination of suffering depends on what type of casting pen is used and where it is sited. There was one case recently where a beast dealt with in a casting pen had its legs cut right into.

"A demand has been made for the withdrawal of the leaflet on the ground that it does not give a true picture of the present state of affairs. The society's reply to that is that the leaflet is still true. The Council of Christians and Jews has suggested a meeting to discuss the matter. We are quite prepared to discuss it, but not to withdraw the pamphlet."

"Argus and Australasian, Ltd."

The *Daily Mirror* for June 1, in a report of the 30th Annual General Meeting of The Daily Mirror Newspapers Limited, held on the previous day, contained the following from the remarks of the Chairman, Mr. H. Guy Bartholomew:—

"The additions to our investments include slightly under 50 per cent. of the ordinary share capital of a company entitled the Argus & Australasian Limited. It operates in Melbourne in the State of Victoria and publishes, amongst other papers, the well-known daily newspaper the *Argus*. The *Argus* Company is at present installing in Melbourne some of the most modern printing machinery, and when fully equipped should be in an advantageous position to benefit from the developments that are so certain to take place in the area in which it operates."

It was stated that during the year, Mr. Terence Donovan, K.C., M.P., was invited to a seat on the Board.

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3).

of substitution of sterling for dollar oil which we would carry out during the period of Marshall Aid and in addition, we would take more American oil by reference to any extra purchases which they make from us. We have been negotiating both with the American Government and with the American Oil Companies, for a long time, and we have had a lot of offers from the American companies.

In August last, the Jersey Company, which is of very high standing as the right hon. Gentleman knows, asked if they could sell oil for sterling to countries like Argentina, Denmark and Holland, which could not afford to pay dollars for American oil. They undertook to spend as much as possible of that sterling in this country or in the sterling area, but they asked for the remainder to be converted into dollars, and they talked about converting up to 50 per cent. We were very sorry about this, but we thought that 50 per cent. was too high. Early this year, after the substitution plan had started, they came forward with a second proposal, much the same as the first, but including the United Kingdom in the area for which they would sell for sterling. They made definite the figure of up to 50 per cent. for conversion into dollars of sales made for sterling both inside and outside the sterling area. Again, we very much appreciated the spirit in which that proposal was made. We looked at it very sympathetically, but we were satisfied that it would cost too many dollars and could not be accepted.

Caltex, the other big company which serves us here, made another plan a little while ago under which they undertook to reduce the content of their oil very substantially if they could be allowed to sell it for sterling freely. We are still discussing that plan with them, and have asked them to produce figures showing how they propose to reduce the dollar cost of their oil.

We have had another offer. We are discussing it now, but I am afraid I cannot tell the House any more about it today. . . .

Mr. Erroll (Altrincham and Sale): It was unfortunate that he [the Minister of Fuel and Power] should suggest that there were more motor cars licensed today than before the war. The implication was that a very considerable increase had taken place whereas, in fact, it has not. It thereby throws into doubt the accuracy of all his other figures, which we, on this side of the House, are not in a position to check.

He also went on to deal with the price of petrol in European countries, leaving out of account altogether the fact that in many European countries there is no licence duty and the whole amount of road revenue is obtained by taxing petrol. It is extremely unfair, therefore, to compare petrol prices on the Continent of Europe with those prevailing in this country. If a true comparison is to be obtained, then to the cost of buying the basic ration of petrol in this country should be added the total cost of licensing a car for the month or year concerned.

The Minister went to great pains to explain the size of our dollar gap. We, on this side of the House, are just as aware of the problem as he is. Indeed, we realise the immense dollar cost of petroleum products. We are glad that the tremendous programme of post-war refinery con-

struction should be succeeding so well because it will be a great monument to private enterprise in this country. It was conceived by private firms and is being carried out under private enterprise.

. . . During this Debate the emphasis seems to have been on the dollar content in petrol, but there is just as much dollar content in fuel oil, diesel oil, gas oil, tractor vaporising oil and lubricating oil. What is significant is that, if the dollar content of oil products is so important, there is in fact only one sector which is closely rationed and supervised. To all intents and purposes one can get all the fuel oil, all the diesel oil, all the gas oil, all the tractor vaporising oil, and, indeed, all the red petrol one wants, but the whole apparatus of rationing is concentrated on only one sector of the field, namely, white spirit for motor cars.

I know the seconder of our Motion referred to the difficulties that one of his constituents was experiencing in obtaining supplies of red petrol for his lorries. But he was only a private operator. There is no difficulty for the nationalised road haulage organisation in getting all the petrol they want. The proposer of the Motion asked the Minister to explain what sort of rationing of red petrol there was for the nationalised industry. He had no reply. We know that the rationing of red petrol is applied purely for political purposes and not because of its dollar content.

Furthermore, there is no question of applying rationing to gas oil. We never hear about the dollar content of coal gas. It is quite considerable, because, owing to the poor quality of gas and coking coal supplied to gasworks, there is a large element of dollar-content gas oil employed all over the country to enrich the output of coal gas. That is not rationed. No steps are taken to keep an eye on that consumption. Yet if we are in fact to reduce the dollars spent on oil products, it is just as important to keep an eye on all oil products and not concentrate our whole attention upon the petrol used for private motoring which is indeed only one-tenth of the total consumption.

The fact is that only one-tenth of the total consumption is subject to any practical restriction whatsoever. If the Government were really honest they would supervise the Consumption carefully and scrupulously throughout the whole range applying their attention particularly to diesel fuel, red petrol and tractor vaporising oil. But rationing is not done for that purpose at all. In the continuance of petrol rationing we see only another vendetta against the private motorist. It is a hangover from the last Parliament when we saw so much class discrimination of the basest sort. So called pleasure motoring is to stand condemned. Yet two cars out of every three on the roads today get supplementary rations, showing that they are not engaged upon pleasure motoring at all but on purposes which are regarded as essential by the rationing authority itself. . . . In all this matter we are in great danger of breaking our economic neck by falling out of the groundfloor window. The gap as far as petrol is concerned is only of the order of 600,000 tons, as the proposer of the Motion so ably described.

Mr. Noel-Baker: The other day the right hon. Gentleman said it was one and a half million tons. In fact, we estimate that abolishing the rationing of private petrol would cost about one million tons a year.

Mr. Lloyd: In the sterling area?

Mr. Noel-Baker: It is 200,000 tons in the sterling area

and one million here; 1.2 million, to be precise.

Mr. Erroll: Petrol rationing has been abolished in many parts of the sterling area. I am concerned mainly with the effect of abolishing it in the United Kingdom. I will gladly accept the Minister's figure of one million tons instead of 600,000 tons. It still shows how relatively small the gap is. In order to damp down consumption by as little as a million tons a year we are to have the whole apparatus of rationing—and how expensive it is to our national economy!

As regards the staff of the Ministry of Fuel and Power alone, to the 1,700 in that Department must be added the 480 in the Ministry of Transport, plus the expenditure on office accommodation and other office overheads—a total sum expended of over £1 million a year, equivalent to $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a gallon on the price of petrol. Then on the companies' side, the companies administering rationing estimate the extra administrative costs to be equivalent to 10 per cent. on their costs of distribution. Earlier speakers have referred to the immense burden of clerical work which falls upon the small garages, particularly when they can only order their supplies in minimum quantities because their floats are kept down to small quantities of 200 gallons. . . Are we really watching our deliveries of sterling oil to non-sterling countries? I know it is necessary, because of the importance of the world position which we hold, to supply oil to many countries in the world and I understand that last year 50 million tons of sterling oil were supplied to non-sterling countries and that of that total about 25 million tons went to soft currency countries.

While I agree that it is necessary to send oil to those countries, does not the Minister think it might be possible to do a little pruning? If the Minister were to reduce those supplies by as little as 4 per cent. it would be possible to close the million-ton petrol gap which we discussed earlier. There are certain non-dollar and non-sterling supplies which become available from time to time. There was that remarkable offer to the Australians by Italy when Australia, a member of the sterling area, could have accepted 100,000 tons of non-dollar petrol. Why was that offer turned down? Why did not we make a greater effort to secure that important contribution towards closing the petrol gap?

There is the great refinery at Haifa which, month after month, continues to get into a deeper state of neglect. . .

. . . I hope that we have heard the last of the politics about refinery location. There were perfectly good reasons why before the war refineries should be built abroad, and very good reasons now why they should be built at home. If we before the war had seen that refineries were built in this country, the Conservative Party would now be attacked for having neglected the Colonial Empire—Burma, for example. Having developed those territories, we are now told that it was wrong for us to have done so. I resent this playing of party politics. Refinery location is a highly technical business, just as is the location of steel plants. I maintain that the rationing apparatus is extravagant and largely unnecessary in today's conditions, particularly as the restrictions apply to only one-tenth of the consumption in this country. Moreover, additional non-dollar supplies could be made available, more than sufficient to supply our reasonable needs, had the Government only the will and determination to do so.

Mr. Wolfson's £100,000 Gift

The *Daily Telegraph* for June 1 said:—"Mr. Isaac Wolfson, chairman of the British firm Great Universal Stores, who was a witness at the Lynskey Tribunal, has given £100,000 to the Weizmann Institute of Science in Rehovoth, Israel. Mr. Wolfson, who has been visiting the United States, is sailing for England in the Queen Elizabeth to-night. [June 1.]"

Reissued in Canada:

DICTATORSHIP BY TAXATION

By MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS.

(The text of the Belfast Address of November 24, 1936).

PRICE: THREEPENCE.

From:

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., Liverpool or Electoral Campaign Headquarters, 207/413, Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(<i>reprinting</i>)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements	
by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage	7/-
The International Jew by Eric D. Butler	2/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W.....	1/-
Social Credit and Catholicism	
by Georges-Henri Levesque, O.P.	1/-
Southampton Chamber of Commerce:	
Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
This Freedom	9d.

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

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