

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 28. No. 8.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

Decline of Rome: Division

By H. Swabey.

Diocletian, whose father had been a slave, was evidently a master politician, for he was one of the very few emperors of Rome in three hundred years not to meet a violent and speedy death. But he reigned for twenty years (284-304), restoring peace to the empire, and then retired. But he introduced a new system, not only associating an Augustus and two subordinate Caesars with himself, but practically abolishing the Senate. He was seldom in Rome—and celebrated the last of all triumphs that Rome witnessed—and this absence was the senate's "most fatal wound" (Gibbon), and the title *Dominus*, Lord, or Master, was assumed in place of those formerly conferred by the Senate. We may compare the position of the House of Lords. "In the exercise of the legislative as well as the executive power, the sovereign advised with his ministers, instead of consulting the great council of the nation."

Barbarians were now settled within the frontiers, and "multitudes of secret enemies . . . were introduced into the heart of the empire." Not many years later, barbarian troops were used *under their own* commanders. Gibbon compares the new arrangements to the court of Persia, and says that Ostentation and Division were its leading principles. By the phrase, "He multiplied the wheels of the machine of government," we may understand a large increase in the bureaucracy, and are not surprised that "the burden of the public impositions, and particularly the land tax and capitation" became a standing and intolerable grievance. The decline of the arts was startlingly in evidence when Diocletian set about building himself a new palace. Gibbon deals with the persecution or "reformation" of these days.

At one time there were no less than six petty emperors with their retinue, and it is no wonder that, in this next period, the Romans revolted when "an Illyrian peasant . . . presumed to number Rome among the tributary cities of his empire." We find a considerable part of Autun left uncultivated, and many provincials living as exiles or outlaws, because a tax was "so extremely oppressive." But Rome's revolt left it in the hands of a new master, who first invented "the method of exacting a *free gift* from the senators." When Constantine took over, he "converted the free gift into a perpetual tax," and abolished the praetorian guards (313). One of his laws was directed against infanticide, which resulted from distress "principally occasioned by the intolerable burden of taxes," and he directed that relief should be given to parents who could not afford to educate their children. Taxes were continually going up. Constantine, when he had cut his way to the throne, addressed himself to the foundation of Constantinople and the establishment of Christianity.

There is little in the notorious fifteenth and sixteenth chapters to offend anyone who could read Trollope without a blush. In XV., Gibbon deals with the progress of Christianity; in XVI., with the persecutions. Gibbon points out that while "the Gnostics blended with the faith of Christ many sublime but obscure tenets," the early fathers spread the veil of allegory "over every tender part of the Mosaic dispensation." He complains that "rigid sentiments . . . appear to have infused a spirit of bitterness into a system of love and harmony," but appears to criticise the extreme reluctance of early Christians to shed blood. He summarizes: "It was by the aid of these causes, exclusive zeal, the immediate expectation of another world, the claim of miracles, the practice of rigid virtue, and the constitution of the primitive church, that Christianity spread itself with so much success in the Roman empire." He says that other deities might have occupied the deserted temples of Jupiter and Apollo, "if, in the decisive moment, the wisdom of Providence had not interposed a genuine revelation, fitted to inspire the most rational esteem and conviction." Yet the new faith received from the Jews of Palestine "so cold a reception" that no Hebrew gospel was needed.

Gibbon mentions the cruelty of the Jews, (he was not an admirer of Maimonides), their refusal to pay taxes, the revolt under Barchochebas (Son of a Star), 132-5, the re-naming of Jerusalem as Aelia Capitolina, and the restoration of their privileges soon afterwards. He concludes that "the Jews were a *nation*; the Christians were a *sect*," and says that the Roman disliked associations. When Rome was burned, under Nero, the former "were a much fitter object for the suspicions of the emperor and of the people . . . But the Jews possessed very powerful advocates in the palace, and even in the heart, of the tyrant . . ." Gibbon considers that the tumults which later occasioned the death of Christians were "usually fomented by the malice of the Jews," but in his editors' opinion those interested in the old religious were responsible. There were some eighteen years peace under Diocletian, and the origin of the persecution is most obscure, but it was evidently urged by his colleague, and property was confiscated in this "reformation" in addition to persons being violated. Diocletian himself soon abdicated. Gibbon calls attention to "a melancholy truth . . . that the Christians . . . have inflicted far greater severities on each other, than they had experienced from the zeal of infidels."

Gibbon wrote without the insights of the later historians, Mommsen and Del Mar, and gives no reason why the seat of government was moved to Constantinople. But he recounts that the decline of the arts was revealed when the new capital was adorned, and says it was due to "civil and religious slavery." Constantine organised a senate there, and improved on Diocletian's system, setting four *praetorians* in charge of four divisions of the empire to supervise the

respective justices and finances. The empire was further divided into thirteen dioceses, of which Britain was one. A measure of decentralisation was forced on the ruler, whose policy was to "divide the substance and multiply the titles of power." He divided the military from the civil administration, but "the promotion of lawyers was pregnant with mischief and disgrace," the frontiers were insecure, and informers reached the number of ten thousand. Moreover, the emperor's orations were composed by a quaestor, and these "acquired the force, and at length, the form of absolute edicts." The treasurer-general was called *count of the sacred largesses*, "with the intention perhaps of inculcating that every payment flowed from the voluntary bounty of the monarch."

Britain meanwhile had lost her mint.

The increase in taxes and in the difficulty of paying them turned Campania into an uncultivated wilderness and "the agriculture of the Roman provinces was insensibly ruined." Among taxes were *indictions*, or tribute that was prescribed, and even super-indictions; a tax on landed property; a capitation tax; a lustral (four year) contribution; and "coronary gold." It is not surprising that the character of an absolute monarch should deteriorate, or that his son (Constantius) should be degenerate. Gibbon likens Constantine, who died in 337, to Henry VIII. The edict of Milan legalised Christianity in 313.

However, another kind of force was emerging. Principles were extinguished "in a declining and despotic empire . . . A prudent magistrate might observe with pleasure the progress of a religion, which diffused among the people a pure, benevolent and universal system of ethics." Constantine left his guards outside the Council of Nicea (325) and his respect was similar to that "with which the senate had been treated by the Roman princes who adopted the policy of Augustus." Gibbon describes Athanasius generously, mentions his "personal authority," his resolute opposition to Constantine and his successor Constantius (337-61) when they appeared to be Arians, and says that the latter's delay in liquidating Athanasius "discovered to the world that the privileges of the church had already revived a sense of order and freedom in the Roman government." Corruption ("the most infallible symptom of constitutional liberty") was used against him in the end, he was supplanted by George of Cappadocia and had a price put on his head. Constantius "experienced the strength of those principles, which, in the cause of religion, could resist the most violent exertions of the civil power." Authority was emerging, but it was precarious, despite the accuracy required. ("The substance of an orthodox, or an heretical creed, may be expressed by the difference of a disjunctive, or a copulative particle.")

Christianity was threatened from within by division and fanaticism, ("The abuse of Christianity introduced into the Roman government new causes of tyranny and sedition"), and a puritanical sect anticipated Cromwell's hosts, calling their club an *Israelite*, and using *Praise be to God* as their war cry. These and further extremes Gibbon called "the last abuse of that inflexible spirit, which was originally derived from the character and principles of the Jewish nation." It is significant that sectaries fly to the Old Testament: the Adventists, for example, have reverted to Saturday worship.

The early puritans proclaimed equality and used torture.

Julian (Emperor 361-3, 'the Apostate') was an external enemy, and he tried to employ the Jews as auxiliaries, for he wrote a public letter to all the Jews and tried to rebuild their temple, calling a great assembly of them. (On *this* problem Gibbon, like Blackstone, maintained the traditional attitude: he quotes the Misnah's threat of death against those who renounced Judaism, and mentions a law of Constantine to protect Christian converts.) But the restoration of the temple, "secretly connected with the ruin of the Christian church," was prevented by a fire. Ambrose later described it in a letter "which must provoke the severe animadversion of the Jews."

The pagan emperor destroyed himself in a war against Persia, the real reasons of which are barely touched. A hint may be gathered from Julian's exhortation to supply the Roman treasury, and from his emulation of Alexander. For Alexander recovered much of the gold, which tended to drift to the East. In his description of this adventure, Gibbon notes that the foreign trade of Assyria "appears . . . to have been conducted by the hands of strangers." Famine was aggravated by monopoly at Antioch, whereby "all the profits of the intermediate agents are accumulated on the head of the defenceless consumer." Julian resorted to "a very dangerous and doubtful step, of fixing, by legal authority, the value of corn." Gibbon's cool judgment tells us more, on this occasion, of the eighteenth century than of the Roman world.

The next year (364) the Empire was finally divided into Eastern and Western sections, with an older and younger brother as Emperors. This in itself need not have been fatal to the Empire, if the two halves had stood back to back against external enemies. Anthony Trollope considered it probable and desirable that the Northern and Southern States of U.S.A. should become independent countries. But he lived before the U.N.O. age.

?

"Sir,—In your leading article on the county council elections you referred to the possibility of "a permanent shift in political power" as the result of the granting of universal suffrage. I am wondering whether there is not also involved a still wider issue? Is it wholly fortuitous that, parallel with the gradual extension of the franchise, there has been a gradual extension of the control of the individual by the State? I remember reading some years ago a prediction by a German philosopher that universal suffrage would mean the death of democracy. Does the parallel development I have mentioned provide any indication that that prediction is likely to prove true?" (Mr. Rowland Evans of 44, Hurlingham Court, S.W.6., in *The Times* of April 10.)

On Planning The Earth

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

6/- (Postage extra).

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 26, 1952.

MINISTRY OF FOOD

Wheat

Mr. Archer Baldwin asked the Minister of Food what is the tonnage of wheat necessary to provide flour for the present annual bread consumption; and how much of this wheat is home-produced.

The Minister of Food (Major Lloyd George): The present consumption of flour in all its forms requires at the current extraction rate the equivalent of six million tons of wheat yearly. About 62 per cent. of flour consumption is for making bread and the remainder for biscuits, flour confectionery and other farinaceous foods. Approximately 24 per cent. of the total wheat requirement is home grown.

Mr. Baldwin: Does my right hon. and gallant Friend not think that his attention should be confined to the purchasing of bread grain and that he should hand over the purchasing of coarse grain to the trade and thus save the enormous losses in bulk buying and bad storage which go on at the present time?

Mr. Baldwin asked the Minister of Food to what extent the present importation of wheat and flour is sufficient for the annual bread consumption; and whether he will now permit home-growers to consume their own wheat for the production of bacon, poultry and eggs.

Major Lloyd George: About 76 per cent. of our present total requirements for bread and all other forms of flour usage is met by imported wheat and flour, and the balance by home-grown. It is not possible in present circumstances to permit farmers to retain larger quantities of home-grown wheat for feeding livestock.

Mr. Baldwin: In view of the penalty which is imposed on wheat growers, who have now to provide a certain amount of wheat for the coarse grain ration, does my right hon. and gallant Friend not think it is time that rationing was done away with and that there should be a free trade in grain?

Major Lloyd George: There is at present an obligation to hand over a certain percentage of feeding-stuffs; but if what my hon. Friend suggested came about it would simply mean that we should have to purchase more wheat, involving a very high dollar expenditure.

Mr. Harold Davies: Might I ask the right hon. and gallant Gentleman if he realises that a much more intelligent way of freeing trade would be to encourage as far as possible the further importation of coarse grain from Eastern Europe, whereby Western Europe could be helped? Will he suggest that the Government might consider send-

ing a delegate to the Moscow economic conference on this issue?

Major Lloyd George: We are getting a large proportion of coarse grain from Eastern Europe now.

Textile Industry

The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Peter Thorneycroft): . . . Many hon. Members are well versed in the background to these problems and the turbulent history of these industries. They have brought much in the way of riches to this country and also, very often, much in the way of poverty. They still retain a great deal of the fierce individualism which inspired them in their early days. Twice, at any rate, the cotton industry has been the stage of a great struggle in world trade. Once was in the 1770's when Hargreaves, Arkwright and Crompton invented the spinning jenny, the power spinning frame and the mule and enabled this country to sweep into and dominate the markets of the world, until, in 1913, our cotton exports reached the great total of no fewer than 7,000 million yards.

The second stage of that struggle, with the cheap labour of Japan and the rise of domestic industries in other countries, to which the hon. Gentleman referred, reversed in two or three decades the advantage which we had won and held for 150 years. I only want to say about that that the history of those events is not simply recorded in the dry statistics of the Trade and Navigation Accounts, but is written deeply in the hearts and homes of many families in Lancashire, and it is right that we should bear that in our minds when we deal with this problem today.

I now turn to the situation as it has developed. During the last war these industries were concentrated so that the maximum use could be made of the labour and the limited materials which were available. Many whose normal occupation was the manufacture of textiles turned to the sterner tasks which the national need at that time demanded. When peace came, the textile industries flung themselves with enthusiasm into the job of rebuilding the economy. Hon. Members on all sides will remember the efforts which were made to collect again the labour force of the textile industry and to attract women and girls back into the mills.

There was an immense opening. The world was hungry for goods which it had been denied for many years, and it was a world from which Japanese and European competition was still virtually absent. It is worth recalling that the men who faced those difficulties and seized those opportunities are the men who are facing the problems in the textile areas today which the hon. Gentleman so fairly described. We owe them a lot.

Mr. Ellis Smith (Stoke-on-Trent, South): And the women.

Mr. Thorneycroft: And the women. We owe them a lot.

The picture of a post-war boom which I have been describing has now changed. There is today a world-wide recession in the textile and clothing industries, and the United Kingdom is sharing in that recession. It is to be emphasised, as the hon. Gentleman very fairly emphasised it, that this

(continued on page 6.)

Grand Orient

FREEMASONRY UNMASKED

by MGR. GEORGE E. DILLON, D.D.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

5/-

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. 28. No. 8.

Saturday, April 19, 1952.

From Week to Week

Edna Lonigan's opinion expressed in an article, "Out of Egypt," in *Human Events* for April 2, that "something has gone wrong with the purveyors" of the illusion created (in the United States only?) by the Lisbon Conference—Acheson as a conquering hero bringing home "regiments of words" to hold back the Russians *may* be correct. But, has anything gone wrong with the Plan? We do not know the answer. It is true that 1952 is reminiscent of 1929, and that, in some ways, the United States stands where she stood after the first phase of the world war—confronting "the delusion of super-production" and hypnotised by it. By all the rules, she should fall into the mess into which she pushed a Civilisation immeasurably greater than her own—she hasn't any; but reflects a little which is not her own from patches where the silver of the mirror has not corroded. Let it be understood that the mess is part of the Plan. We do not look to America for the appropriate resistance. We look anywhere *but* to America. Help cometh not from Below. Whether there is anything real in "America" which belongs to "Above" remains to be seen. Talk, 'discussion,' the what-have-you of an anti-hierarchal (*hieros*, sacred) 'democracy' may belong to the reality of "Below." Speeches! But let Miss Lonigan speak for herself:—"The speeches reminded us of something familiar. It was the last final spurt of the stock market boom in 1929. In the spring of 1929 it was evident to trained observers that the boom was over, the crash must come. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York issued a severe warning that credit was over-extended and that stock prices were too high. The market hesitated. Charles Mitchell of the National City Bank put out a boastful statement that prices were not inflated, they were going much higher. The market responded, prices rose higher and higher in a frenzied spiral. The last warnings were wasted.

"For six months the spiral continued upward. Then in early fall an insignificant firm failed in London. No one knows why the failure of Hatry and Company precipitated the crash, but within a few weeks the stock market had fallen from its feverish heights to the icy depth in which not even one bid was offered for U.S. Steel.

"It is plain the Fair Deal and its foreign spending programme are in the last fever of expansion; like that of the stock market after it defied the open warnings of the banking system, and carried along a deluded people for six months more, with consequent losses of billions.

"Those who watched the crack-up of the stock-market mania, and recognize the close resemblance between Charles

Mitchell's promises and those of the Fair Deal, are wondering what trivial incident will prove to be the Hatry failure, the almost unnoticed prick which will deflate this bubble."

The warnings?

Miss Lonigan goes on to say that mass production and the Taylor system had "introduced a new automatism to take the place of declining individual enterprise. After October 1929, we had to encourage about four separate unnecessary depressions to achieve catastrophe, and even then we were not licked. We were back on the highway to genuine recovery by July, 1932."

Recovery of what? Debts? Back onto the highway of The Plan? Genuine? —Well, as you like!

Finally, Miss Lonigan says if we can "shake our minds and hearts free of the clinging cobwebs of the Fair Deal . . . we can begin today to start our march forward, *like the Children of Israel marching to the Promised Land.*" A "genuine recovery"?

Be Well-informed

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*,

Dear Sir,—*The Social Crediter*, pursuing a consistent policy for the past thirteen years, is beginning to have its effect on the welter of misinformed opinion on which, beacon-like, it shines.

While the negative side, that of exposure of the agents of Judæo-Masonic philosophy, is necessary, readers should not be diverted by the fascination for detective stories from the constructive aspect of Social Credit. We stand for credit; not debt; for the restoration to the individual of his credit; for the distribution without discrimination of power (purchasing-power) as the alternative to the concentration of power; an increase of freedom within the laws of God.

The time is ripe for supporters of Major Douglas to renew their efforts to increase the circulation of their journal. A glance at some of the important topics discussed therein will convince anyone that a very wide field is covered. But, more important, a sense of direction is imparted and a corrective supplied to the avalanche of print descending on an unsuspecting public. *The Social Crediter* provides an answer to the Masonic whisperers who, without intermission, circulate the lie that we are a worn-out, effete, C3 people, due at any moment to be eclipsed by giants who derive their mythical superiority from Chinese bayonets made in Birmingham, or the consumption of iced sarsaparilla eked out by a splash of Scotch.

A review of your pages will corroborate the conviction, that we, with other Europeans and those dominions which share our traditions, are still "quality." Let us get our friends to read *The Social Crediter*, so that they, with us, may, in the words of the Etonian quoted by Major Douglas, "KNOW OUR PLACE AND KEEP IT."

Yours etc.,

Ross-on-Wye, April 10.

PASCO LANGMAID.

In introducing *The Social Crediter* to prospective new readers, it is suggested that numbers containing articles and

(continued on page 8).

Education v. The Educationalist State

by DRYDEN GILLING SMITH.

(Continued).

It is unfortunate that our national society, the state, should be made to operate on the material level of 'Public Utility' supplier at a time when the majority of men have become obsessed with the notion of the state as a super-human being with an independent existence. They have been unable, when acting in this capacity, to think of the state as merely one form of human association which would often be advantageously replaced by another form of human association. That is why they have been unable to see the importance of the above measure to ensure greater control by the individual of the state's use of his money, and why it has received so little attention. As Mr. Wyndham Lewis pointed out in his *Rude Assignment* (1951) "For many eminent thinkers the State is of course everything—in Hegel's system it is a metaphysical absolute, conditioning the individual. Plato was by far the most illustrious exponent of this barbarous doctrine. Such a type of thinking is that of men in love with power—Hegel, the slave of the idea of the Prussian State, Plato an unusually embittered member of the Athenian aristocracy."

The state's increased control of educational institutions has been made possible not only by the pretexts for interference given by the problem of child-labour, and by the unlimited financial resources consequent upon the removal of all constitutional restraints, but also as a result of many years during which the country had to endure war conditions. The psychological importance of the national state is naturally at its greatest when the country is at war, when it is exercising one of the main functions for which it exists as an institution—protecting the rights and ensuring the survival of the people and institutions of which it is composed. The fact that the wars concerned may not have been entirely waged for this reason may be either the result of statesmen insufficiently grounded in the 'classical traditions' to which I have earlier referred and/or the result of a deliberate policy to create war conditions so as to increase the power of the state. We have for evidence the well known statement of the Political and Economic Planning broadsheet in 1938 that only "in war or under threat of war could the British people be persuaded to embark on large-scale planning." Mr. Jacks in *Total Education* quotes with approval Karl Mannheim's statement about the value of war for getting agreement about social reform—"Otherwise the only alternative is dictatorial planning." The question he raises is not the rightness or wrongness of his 'social reform' but whether the people can be conditioned into swallowing the poison quietly pretending to themselves that it is syrup or whether they are to have it forced down their throats knowing it by its full name of "dictatorial planning." He continues "In this context there is much truth in the statement of the psychologist William James that the problem of modern society is to find a moral substitute for war. That means to find a unifying purpose which acts as strongly as war in stimulating a spirit of altruism and self-sacrifice on a large scale, but without an actual enemy." Apart from natural suspicion of anyone who has to find an ostensible end or purpose in order to employ his means we are also justified in suspecting that men of Karl Mannheim's mentality

(and no doubt race) will do their best to promote war conditions until they can effectively operate an equally powerful mechanism of psychological and physical control. That the 1944 Education Act was an important part of such a mechanism is indicated by Mr. Jacks' further comment that to fight this social reform campaign "to victory, total mobilization will be necessary and the integrating conditions of total war must be reproduced."

The way that the abnormal notion of the state, during the artificial conditions of war, has been harnessed to permanent civil legislation is notorious. H. C. Barnard in his *History of British Education* tells us that "It is not without significance that the Education Acts of 1870, 1902, 1918 and 1944 were passed in time of war . . . there are not wanting those who are interested in education primarily as a means of promoting military efficiency." The part played by a 'comprehensive' education system in the omniscient state did not pass unperceived by those Englishmen who observed with admiration the successful Hegelian model state of Prussia. Professor Barnard says earlier in his book that "The noteworthy advance which Prussia, for example, had made since the beginning of the century, and her recent successes in war against France, were attributed as much to her educational system as to her military organisation." Since the Hegelian conception of the state needs the unnatural conditions of war to give it the appearance of reality, and since all other countries tend to assume this artificial appearance under war conditions which, in addition, disrupt and unbalance the philosophical thinking of even the most stable individuals (as reference to most books on social problems written during the recent war years will illustrate), no civil legislation of a permanent character ought to take place during such periods.

Before dealing with the anchorage which the Hegelian idea of the state was able to sink more deeply into England with the 1944 Education Act, we must consider the fourth idea-clot I have mentioned—'learning for its own sake' as the justification for learning not of immediate practical use as opposed to the 'comprehension of universals.' If the opposition to a state-controlled monopolistic system of education allows itself to accept this maxim as the aim of an alternative policy it has allowed the ground to be cut from under its feet. The logical and water-tight case which is presented by the argument that those versed in traditional and classical knowledge, in the crystallised experience of countless generations, must supervise and limit the actions of temporal powers and not be part of a system subject to every wish of those temporal powers, is completely lost when the aim of the accumulation of knowledge is merely the accumulation of knowledge. If your aim is the indiscriminate accumulation of knowledge you may disagree with the aims expressed by the supporters of the omniscient state but you will find little to fight against in their system of education since any system is as good as any other system looked at from the viewpoint of the indiscriminate searcher for knowledge. The London School of Economics will give him all the facts and figures he could wish for.

It is interesting to note that the places where 'learning for its own sake' was most obviously the operative principle, the German Universities, that were the laughing stock of the world before 1914 as far as their

accumulation of irrelevant knowledge was concerned, were those which worked inside the Hegelian Prussian State. Ezra Pound complained bitterly that American Universities were growing up on the German model. He attacked what he called the German-American conception of learning, which he saw spreading to many other countries, in an article for *The New Age* (1917). He said that the action of that German-American system in incorporating 'learning for learning's sake' had been perfectly simple. "Every man of intelligence had that intelligence nicely switched on to some particular problem, some minute particular problem unconnected with life, *unconnected with main principles . . .*" The system says in effect that "Metaphorically you are to build up a damned and useless pyramid that will be no use to you or anyone else, but will serve as a 'monument'; to this end you are to sacrifice your mind and vitality. . . . The student has become accustomed first to receiving his main ideas without question; then to being indifferent to them . . . in most cases his experiments have been blind experiments . . . in accord with a main idea dictated by somebody else . . . in this state he has accepted the idea that he is an ant, not a human being. He has become impotent and quite pliable . . . his mind is prepared for all sorts of acts to be undertaken for exterior reasons 'of state' *etc.*, without regard to their merit."

That such occupation is not the natural one for men who are not hard-pressed by the process of providing for their immediate livelihood is admitted indirectly by Veblen in his "Theory of the Leisure Class." "Knowledge for its own sake, the exercise of the faculty of comprehension without ulterior purpose, should, it might be expected, be sought by men whom no urgent material interest diverts from the quest." He identifies the most obvious field of knowledge for its own sake as that of "the sciences properly so called" and points out that the intellectual interests of the leisure class tend to seek expression "on the side of classical and formal erudition, rather than on the side of the sciences . . . The most frequent excursion into other than classical fields of knowledge on the parts of members of the leisure class are made into the discipline of law and the political, and more especially the administrative sciences." Though he may not approve of it he admits that the natural tendency of men released from immediate material pre-occupations is to try and learn something of universal principles (the laws of the universe) and to see how they apply to their own surroundings.

For this considerable knowledge may be required; but it is selected and ancillary to the main purpose. Where Mr. Jacks in the work quoted says that "Education can never be practised merely as a means to an end: it must be practised as an end in itself, and then it will be found to be both end and means," Remy de Gourmant gives us the wiser counsel (*Le Chemin de Velours*, 1900—authorised English translation by William Bradley): "Education is a means, and not an end . . . Considered as the precise instrument of future work, education may have a very great, even absolute importance. It may be the necessary condition of certain intellectual achievements. It will be the staff of the intelligence; but offered to the second-rate brain, directed simply and solely to the enlargement of the memory, it has no power to regenerate sick cells. It will rather serve to crush them. It will make them dull. It will

divert from the natural needs of life the activities merely meant for daily exercise . . . it has an influence only upon an intelligence in action or capable of action. It does not determine, it inclines. Above all, it does not create intelligence."

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

is a world-wide problem. Japan is hit. America is hit. Japan has cut back her production. There is unemployment in the textile industries in America. As the "Manchester Guardian" put it this morning:

"There is no easy Socialist solution; there is no easy capitalist one."

That is the simple truth of the situation which confronts us. . . .

Mr. W. A. Burke (Burnley): I am glad of the opportunity to draw attention to the present serious situation in the Lancashire cotton towns. While I am aware that this debate is concerned with textiles generally, I can only speak, of course, of the cotton industry. I can speak most definitely for that part of Lancashire which we know as the weaving area—North-East Lancashire, the part that stretches from Blackburn right across to Nelson and Colne—the Burnley area, and by the Burnley area I mean the Burnley Exchange area which covers Nelson and Colne and a number of smaller places.

In that area are towns which are literally cotton towns. They have, as the President of the Board of Trade said, only one industry, places like Great Harwood, where 80 per cent. of the insured population work in the few cotton mills which are in that town. The rest of the insured population is made up of postmen, policemen, school teachers and people like that. When the cotton industry is hit in those towns it means that the whole town practically dies. That situation is prevalent in a very large part of North-East Lancashire, which is the Burnley area. I know from conversations which I have had previously with the President of the Board of Trade that there is no great need to press upon him, or upon the Government, the seriousness of the situation, but I should like to tell him of the alarm and despondency which is felt in that area by the sudden turn of events that seems to have overwhelmed the population.

The right hon. Gentleman spoke about 5 per cent. of unemployment. I am afraid he is seriously under-estimating the situation. There is a great deal more than 5 per cent. unemployment in Burnley, at all events. . . .

Mr. John Edwards (Brighouse and Spensborough): . . . The D scheme is open to all kinds of objections. Here is one from a constituent of mine who makes women's underwear. He says quite simply in his letter:

"The D plan makes it quite impossible to put out a simple range of women's underwear in a good wearing cloth without paying Purchase Tax."

He is talking about rayon, and that is just another point to add to those which other hon. Members have brought forward. The least that can be done with the D scheme is radically to revise it and, in particular, to place D at a very much higher level. I emphasise that that is the minimum.

The optimum would be to take Purchase Tax off textile goods at the present time. I am a former Treasury Minister,

and I hope I have a proper understanding of what revenue means. It might mean a loss of as much as £60 or £70 million, but even that would be a small price to pay if we could remove the blockage and get goods moving along the pipeline.

Mr. Beswick: May I mention some figures which are relevant? My hon. Friend suggests that £60 or £70 million might be involved. In 1949 the total amount collected in Purchase Tax on textiles and also shoes, plastics and other sundries was £90 million. My information from the Wholesale Textile Association is that over the last six months the collections have been running at the rate of one-sixth of the 1950 figure. Therefore, the amount involved is nothing like that which my hon. Friend is suggesting. That bears out the case which he is making.

Mr. Edwards: I gave a round figure. According to figures given to me by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury for Purchase Tax, excluding haberdashery, the out-turn in 1951-52 was £68 million.

The substantial point which I make is this. I cannot think of any instrument which lies more readily to the hand of the Government at the moment than Purchase Tax, I know the revenue considerations, and I know that Sir Stafford Cripps always held the view that one could turn Purchase Tax on or off in general, depending on the inflationary or deflationary situation at the time.

He also held the view, as he often told me, that it was important to use Purchase Tax not just as a general instrument but as a particular instrument, and it may be recollected that in the last Budget of the late Administration we increased Purchase Tax on a number of things, against the wishes of hon. Gentlemen opposite. We did so not to get revenue but to stop production in large quantities of things like refrigerators.

It seems to me that, if it is right to do it that way, it is right to do it in reverse, and although I am in no position to judge the revenue aspects of this, I beg Her Majesty's Government to consider whether this instrument can be used, if not in whole at least in part, to help to keep the goods moving in the pipeline and to begin to shift the deadweight load which is pressing down upon the industry in Lancashire and Yorkshire. . .

AGRICULTURE

Productive Land (Use)

Mr. Nabarro asked the Minister of Agriculture how many acres of farmlands have been lost to building construction, opencast, iron-ore, coal and other mineral working and to sundry other causes during 12 months ended on the latest convenient date; and what steps he is taking to curtail this process of eroding the acreage of productive farmlands in the United Kingdom.

Sir T. Dugdale: The total area of crops and grass and rough grazings in sole occupation in England and Wales in the June, 1951, agricultural returns was 9,500 acres less than the area a year earlier. No precise information is available of the acreage of farmland used for each form of development.

My Department is consulted on all proposals to use agri-

cultural land for other purposes. This procedure ensures so far as practicable that no good farm land is lost to food production where it can reasonably be avoided.

House of Commons: April 1, 1952.

North Wales Hydro-Electric Power Bill

(By Order)

Mr. Raymond Gower (Barry): I rise to support what I hope will be the passage of this Bill through its Second Reading stage. It is a Private Bill promoted by the British Electricity Authority. On such an occasion one must declare one's interest. I have no interest in either the nationalised form of electricity or the supplying free enterprise industries connected therewith. I have only the interest of a native of the Principality and a natural desire, therefore, for the passage of all legislation which, on balance, I consider likely to be beneficial to North Wales in particular, to the Principality as a whole, and, indeed, to the whole of the British Isles.

This Measure may be described as a non-political, or perhaps more appropriately a non-party Measure. Though promoted by the British Electricity Authority it required the consent of the Minister of Fuel and Power under Section 10 of the 1947 Act. That consent was given by the Minister of Fuel and Power in the last Labour Government, and I am instructed that after very careful consideration that sanction was ratified by the present Minister of Fuel and Power.

The projects mentioned in this Bill were contemplated, before the industry was actually nationalised, by the North Wales Power Company, who might be described as the predecessors in title of the British Electricity Authority. The British Electricity Authority continued the investigations into the various schemes and the necessary surveys. Therefore, all those schemes are now included in the Bill.

As hon. Members are aware, the proposals are to extend the catchment areas of the existing stations at Dolgarrog and Maentwrog and to construct a new hydro-electric system near Ffestiniog and also three related generating stations, with full powers to erect and maintain all necessary aqueducts, reservoirs and similar works as described in Clause 4 of the draft Bill.

Five other schemes were originally contemplated, but those are not included in this Bill. It is true to say that some local authorities have pressed for the implementation of some of the other schemes, in particular the Rheidol scheme, and I shall say something later about the connection between those schemes and the schemes at present under consideration.

I am instructed that the present proposals involve approximately an average annual output of electricity of 84,500,000 units. I am advised that the new generating capacity is likely to be in the region of 45,500 kilowatts. The average cost per kilowatt installed is estimated as likely to be £94 5s., and I am further advised that the complete cost per unit sent out will be about 6d.

The probable saving in coal is likely to be in the region of 55,000 tons per annum, and the amount of steel required has been estimated at about 2,500 tons. I should like to point out that that is less than the amount of steel which

would be required for steam works of similar generating capacity. On the other hand, it is fair to say that a large amount of cement will be involved—in the neighbourhood of 37,000 tons, which would be considerably more than would be required for steam stations of similar generating capacity.

I should like to put forward for the consideration of the House certain other aspects which I see to be favourable to the Second Reading of this Bill. Once the original capital has been expended there should be no subsequent requirement of heavy capital expenditure on raw materials connected with it. The operation of the schemes is likely to be extremely economical in manpower. I am advised that the capital required for all the schemes originally contemplated by the Power Company prior to nationalisation would be something in the neighbourhood of £30 million, but the schemes in the present draft Bill would cost approximately only £4½ million of the total of £30 million.

Though these costs may be comparatively high we must offset against them the fact that the operating costs would be considerably less than the operating costs of alternative schemes, and in particular of steam generation. Also the life of the plant to be erected must be longer than the life of any steam generation plants. I am advised that the probable life of this kind of hydro-electric project would be in the neighbourhood of 80 years or more whilst the usual amortisation period for steam generating plant is about 25 years. The amount of steel required is less than would be required for steam plant of similar generating capacity . . .

Mr. Gerald Nabarro (Kidderminster): I find myself almost completely in opposition to the views expressed by my hon. Friend the Member for Barry (Mr. Gower). My opposition is not concerned only with scenic and amenity considerations, which I believe rightly to be the prerogative and responsibility of the Welsh Members. I am concerned with financial and economic considerations, for I believe that the measures that are proposed in this Bill are extravagant and do not use our financial and economic resources to the best advantage, particularly in terms of coal conservation.

There is a generally misunderstood misconception of how our fuel and power economy should be balanced, by those who say that because hydro-electricity is produced from water and does not use any coal in the process, it must therefore be good. Those people generally conveniently omit to consider the enormous capital costs involved in hydro-electricity installations.

Let me say, at the outset, that I do not agree with my hon. Friend that this Bill should be treated in isolation from ensuing Measures. It is the intention of the British Electricity Authority to create in North Wales no fewer than eight major hydro-electricity establishments. They are the extension of the Maentwrog scheme, the extension to the Dolgarrog scheme, a new scheme at Ffestiniog; then, if those three schemes are approved, the British Electricity Authority will proceed with a new major scheme at Rheidol, followed by new schemes at Mawddach and Conway, and, finally, the schemes on Snowdon itself and at Nant Ffrancon.

It will be observed that the British Electricity Authority are proceeding on the basis of introducing the least offensive schemes at first. Lord Citrine is flying a gaily coloured kite. He hopes to seduce the House of Commons into be-

lieving that this Measure is innocuous and that, therefore, succeeding Measures will meet with less opposition. I believe that all eight schemes should be considered in unison and as part of the same general proposal. The cost of it, as my hon. Friend mentioned, is £30 million if the Nant Ffrancon and Snowdon schemes are excluded. If they are included, the cost will be £40 million. For that £40 million there will be 300,000 kilowatts of power available on installation, or 300 megawatts. Those are the basic desiderata of the scheme.

What is perhaps important at the outset is that I should make my position quite clear in regard to rural electricity in Wales. I do not wish to be attacked later by nationalistic Welsh newspapers accusing an English hon. Member of seeking to deny rural Wales its legitimate needs for electricity supply. On the contrary, rural Wales and the North Wales littoral has every bit as much right to electricity supplies for its farmsteads and small holdings as any other part of the rural areas of the United Kingdom.

What we should consider, surely, is how these rural electricity supplies may be provided most economically and most speedily. I believe that we cannot provide them economically in these hydro-electric Bills, and that, most certainly, we cannot provide them speedily, because the whole scheme of hydro-electric development in North Wales will be spread over 15 years, whereas, as I hope to show, the rural districts of the North Wales littoral can be provided with electricity within a period of two or three years from now, by using the existing installations and power stations augmented by current development and construction.

(To be continued.)

(Continued from page 4.)

paragraphs of special appeal might be used. Some recent instances are listed below. Copies are available at sixpence each, post paid to any address, from K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2:—

- Jan. 5—Treachery in the Middle East.
- " 12—International Finance: Finland, Paraguay and Italy.
- " 19 and 26—The Pope's address on Science and Theology.
- Feb. 2—Usurpation of function by Insurance Companies (C. H. Douglas).
- " 9—Lord Lovat on "Sheep and Cattle Production."
- " 16—The Constitution: Mutilation by *The Times* of Mr. Winston Churchill's broadcast.
- " 23—"Board Hunting" (Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs).
- Mar. 1—Canada a Kingdom? (Mrs. Davidson's letter to a Toronto newspaper).
- " 8—Mr. Sam Bronfman's protégé and N.A.T.O. (Quoted from Mr. A. K. Chesterton.)
- " 15—House of Commons debate on the Companies Bill.
- " 22—Decline of Rome (H. Swabey).
- " 29—Lord Wavell on Education.
- Apr. 5 and 12—Education *versus* The Educationalist State. (Dryden Gilling Smith.)