

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 29. No. 4.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 14d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Professor Macbeath's plea for heretics before the British Association at Belfast and Mr. Bertrand Russell's immensely subtler plea for heretics (providing they are not political but only 'scientific' heretics) in his book, "The Impact of Science on Society," rightly regarded, are both encouraging signs of the sense of urgency which is at present forcing the philosophical parent of Sin into the open. The philosophical parent of Sin is Heresy. Observe that it is the modern Idol, 'Science,' which draws together the Whiggery of their two minds. Neither is a 'scientist'; but both have their eyes on those 'technological functionalists' who are becoming the 'middle' against which both ends are being played at the present time.

While asserting that the components of this 'middle' are conscious or at least semi-conscious entities, open to be 'persuaded' or bullied (Macbeath: "persuasion or force") into some epoch-saving line of action, neither can see any further than a mechanistic *zeitgeist* which their 'free' activities are to oppose, against which they are to "gird on their armour" (Macbeath).

The result is a torrent of taunts, from which, like a pickpocket through a barrage of 'stop-thief!' in a crowd, a democracy of dissenting ideological middlemen ('free,' 'scientific,' 'non-conformist'—some of the adjectives are Russell's, some Macbeath's) escapes back into the Whig fold.

How real may be the prospect of "a disaster from which it might take mankind another thousand years to recover" (Macbeath), or the "cold sweat" (Russell) in the minds of either must be a matter of speculation; but *are* there only the alternatives of persuasion and force? And, if we have no choice between the Russells and the Macbeaths, isn't it rather like force in any case? "We cannot bring about a desirable state of affairs by means which are inconsistent with the end which *we* pursue." Why are the political incompetents so absurdly sure that it is their responsibility? Why don't they take their hands off? Why not 'hands off Douglas!' for a start?

We quote *The Times Literary Supplement* for the following epitome:—"Bertrand Russell charges the mechanization of the cotton industry with responsibility for much British imperialism in India, and 'almost certainly' for the American Civil War. Marx charges mechanization of the means of production, in private ownership, with an inevitable *Verelendung* of the workers, and with an inevitably expanding imperialism. Neither, apparently, is willing to apply the scientific 'corrective' of what the mechanization (still in

private hands) has been able to achieve, for western industrial workers and for eastern peasants alike, in terms of consumption; expectation of life, health and material welfare; or of the strange vicissitudes of 'imperialism' during this century. Why must only one aspect be selected and expounded? In the case of the Communist one can easily see why. It is hard to see why in Bertrand Russell's case."

Why should it be 'hard to see' in Bertrand Russell's case? Because he "makes plain his radical opposition to Marxism"? What is the 'scientific' corrective? Social Credit? The *Manchester Guardian*, by condensation, prevents us from examining Professor Macbeath's notion of the 'chief danger' arising from a society bent upon building factories in order to distribute a shortage of purchasing power. The newspaper quotes only:

"Perhaps the chief danger to science is not so much from positive restrictions consciously imposed so that the atmosphere of a society which rewards conformity and penalises dissent may cease to produce scientists, men imbued with the spirit of free inquiry."

That disposes of the spirit-of-free-enquirers, but not of the negative restrictions, consciously or unconsciously imposed.

• • •

"... the meaning of the irrational is so ambiguous in recent psychology that the man in the street, as we all know, is inclined to draw the conclusion that, being so full of irrational factors, he cannot be expected in any circumstances to behave rationally and could hardly know that he was behaving rationally even if he did so behave. While the psychologists themselves may not be victims of this ambiguity, they could nevertheless have done a great deal more to save the man in the street from giving way to it."

(*The Times*).

What could they have done?

• • •

It was Einstein who asserted that the German Universities 'did not lift a finger' to stem the onrush of totalitarianism in Germany. When, if ever, the precise effect of the impact of the Reformation on Freedom is again understood (not the idiosyncrasy so designated by the Whigs, but the thing itself, which in its nature is an Absolute and only in its incarnation limited) the relation between the rise into prominence of a "Long Vac. Term" to take the place of a Long Vacation at Cambridge and the prevailing corruption of the Universities generally will be clear.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: July 22, 1952.

(Continued.)

House of Lords Question (Member's Complaint)

Mr. Benn: I rise to ask your guidance, Mr. Speaker, on a matter of which I have given you previous notice. It is a matter which falls within the general question of Privilege. It has more properly to do with the good relations between this House and another place.

The matter with which I am concerned arose out of the decision of the South African Government to arrest a Mr. Sachs, the General Secretary of the Garment Workers' Union, as a result of which a letter of protest against this action was compiled and dispatched from this country signed by 108 Members of this House and eight Members of another place. As a result, I imagine, of that, a Question has appeared on the Order Paper of another place in the name of Lord Barnby which, with your permission, I will read. It says:

"To ask Her Majesty's Government whether they have noted the protests of certain Socialist Members of Parliament in this country against the arrest of Mr. Sachs, the Trades Union Leader in South Africa, by the direction of the Government of the Union of South Africa, and whether they do not consider these protests a serious attempt to intervene in matters concerning the internal policy of another Commonwealth country."

I can well understand the attitude of hon. Members opposite. Yesterday a Motion in identical terms with the protest to which I have referred was put on the Order Paper by 73 hon. Members of this House.

[That this House most strongly protests against the action of the South African Government in the proceedings which it has taken and is taking against Mr. E. S. Sachs, the General Secretary of the Garment Workers' Union, and other prominent trade union leaders; and regards this as a deliberate attempt to undermine trade unionism and political freedom in South Africa.]

The position now is that tomorrow, when another place comes to consider that Question, the action of Members of this House in signing the original protest and in putting a Motion on the Order Paper in this House will be brought into question and answer, and even, according to the provisions of procedure in another place, may be the subject of debate.

I venture to submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if that were to occur it might well constitute an infringement of the rights of this House. I cite to you three points. The first is the Ninth Article of the Bill of Rights, which says: ". . . the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in proceedings in Parliament ought not to be . . . questioned in any court or place out of Parliament."

To that Erskine May adds the footnote on page 50:

"This provision not only protects freedom of speech in Parliament from outside interference, but also indicates the method by which it may be controlled . . . by each House for its own members."

This unquestionably comes within the category of proceedings of Parliament, in that Erskine May on page 61 indicates that the meaning of proceedings is extended to any formal action of this House, including the giving of notices of

Motion. I would also submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that in signing the original letter of protest it is opened to question—and I seek your guidance on this point—that the Members who signed that original protest were taking part in action so closely related to matters pending or expected to be brought before this House that they formed part of the business of this House.

I cite as the authority for that the Report of the Select Committee on the Official Secrets Acts which went into this question before the war. I should be grateful if you would indicate whether you would regard a debate in another place on this Motion tomorrow as being an infringement of the rights of Members or, at any rate, sufficient to constitute a discourteous act by one House against another.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member was good enough to give me notice that he intended to raise this point, and I have given it careful consideration. The wording of the proposed Question to be asked tomorrow in another place does not refer to actions of this House, nor does it refer, nor can it refer, to the notice of Motion which the hon. Member placed on the Table last night, because the notice of the Question appeared in the Minutes of another place at an earlier date than that.

Therefore, the action that the hon. Member complains of does not in my view come into the category of words or acts which appear to implicate one House in discourtesy to another. It is in effect, as I read it, a criticism in another place of conduct which is outside Parliament altogether. Therefore, it is not a Parliamentary proceeding so as to bring it within the rules of Privilege. As the hon. Member has correctly quoted from Erskine May, it is for each House to control its own Members so as to maintain those good relations which exist between the two Houses. It seems to me that the matter which the hon. Member has raised is a matter for the other House—a matter for the other place—and I personally would deprecate any proceedings calculated to impair the good relations which exist between us.

Mr. Benn: Would you give it as your Ruling or your opinion, Mr. Speaker, that in principle it is appropriate for a Question or a debate in one House to take place based on the actions of Members of another House? Would you not agree that that constitutes a discourtesy to one House by Members of another?

Mr. Speaker: I understand from the hon. Member himself that this manifesto or protest, or whatever it is called, was signed by Members of both Houses. Therefore, I cannot construe this Question placed on the Paper in another place as in any way an attack upon this House.

Utility Specifications (Standard)

Mrs. Mann asked the President of the Board of Trade how many departures from specifications over the Utility field have been permitted since 1951; and what practical steps he is taking to ensure a minimum standard of reliability.

Mr. H. Strauss: Various departures from the Utility cloth and clothing specifications had been permitted before the Utility cloth and clothing schemes were revoked as from 17th March, 1952. For the progress since made in establishing new textile and clothing standards I would refer the hon.

Member to the answers given by my right hon. Friend to the hon. Members for Hammersmith, South (Mr. W. T. Williams) and Dartford (Mr. Dodds) on 26th June and 3rd July respectively. Since then agreed specifications for bedding have been published by the British Standards Institution.

Under the Utility furniture scheme, which is still in force, we have allowed variations in approximately 400 individual cases this year. These variations, of course, have not allowed any lowering of quality.

Transport Commission (Annual Report)

The Minister of Transport and Civil Aviation (Mr. Alan Lennox-Boyd): . . . I would like to make plain that, as we intend to be in power for a long time, we intend to carry through Parliament a Bill which will work efficiently.

. . . I shall be glad to discuss the Bill in all its detail with the interests concerned. Those who want to retain the road haulage monopoly in public hands will never be satisfied. Those who also want permanently to shackle A and B licences within the 25-mile limit will never be satisfied. Those who want to hold road transport to a theory will never be satisfied.

All those who recognise the present situation recognise the need for radical changes, but they may differ as to the form any change should take. I shall have the time, patience and readiness to listen to what they have to say. The broad structure of the Bill represents the Government's intentions. I would never be too proud to listen to any advice which may come from those who want to see this Bill work, and who recognise that the existing situation cannot indefinitely be tolerated.

We approach this problem in this way. There is undoubtedly, as is generally recognised, an economic crisis in Great Britain. Transport can play a vital part in bringing this economic crisis under control. To play that vital part there has to be de-centralisation. The railways know it and many railwaymen welcome it. The Road Haulage Executive itself in the Report agrees that is so, and the Labour Party has frequently drawn attention to the need to regionalise national organisations.

The best way to deal with de-centralisation is through private enterprise and competition. We believe that the travelling public and the trader should choose the form of transport that they wish, and should themselves have to pay for it, not only in the ordinary cost of the transport that they use, but also the cost of any other transport services which it is in their own interest should also be preserved. This is the justification for the second use of the levy.

The first use, I think, is clearly right. It would be monstrously unjust to put on to the general taxpayer any loss of good-will in regard to the sale of these assets. The second use has this purpose: for those industries which need the railways, even though their main interest may appear to lie in road haulage, it is not unreasonable that a charge of this kind, carefully arranged and evenly spread, should also be imposed.

Next we approach this problem from this point of view: it would give me more pleasure than would anything else if I could make a small contribution towards equalising the

burdens and improving the competitive position between the railways and roads. I recognise that this is a very real difficulty. I do not believe that anybody takes the view that it can best be achieved by putting more burdens on the roads. It would be almost if not quite impossible to administer a common carrier obligation, an undue preference obligation or anything of that kind. As to taxation, the roads are already paying £350 million in taxes.

But there are ways in which we can help the railways. If there are other ways, I shall be ready to listen to them in the summer months that lie ahead. We can help them in regard to their capital requirements. I know, with Lord Hurcomb, how capital limitations are harming the railways' competitive position, and I will do all I can. The right hon. Gentleman knows how difficult that problem is. We shall hope also to improve their competitive position in other ways.

There is in the Bill, in Clause 22, what the Commission themselves have called the head-room Clause. This will enable the Commission to raise their charges, either freight or passenger, 10 per cent. to meet any sudden increase of a temporary nature, to which Lord Hurcomb has repeatedly drawn attention, and which he no doubt has in mind in the covering letter which he wrote to me with the Report. Under the Act of 1947 the transport Tribunal can impose any manner of conditions on charges schemes. We now intend to alter that and give much more room for manoeuvre to the Commission. Subject only to the obligation of publication under Clause 20 of the Bill they will have a wide measure of freedom in that field.

As to the lower charges which many of us feel they ought to be entitled to charge if they think they can get more traffic that way, they will, subject again to the qualification in Clause 20, made necessary by the huge resources of the railways, have much greater freedom in that field.

As the House knows, I am now in a position to say emphatically that the British Transport Commission would be entitled to retain for the use of the nationalised undertaking a fleet of road vehicles approximating roughly to what was held by the old railway companies in 1947. This meets the criticism of a number of hon. Members, not least one of the criticisms of my hon. Friend the Member for Abingdon (Sir R. Glyn). It will give the railways the chance of wider earning possibilities and will provide a comparison between the smaller de-nationalised units and the British Transport Commission.

Then, in regard to decentralisation of the railways themselves, I know, as I have said, that this is widely welcomed in many informed railway circles, and we look forward to the publication of their scheme. We will do all we can to make that scheme work. Hon. Members may criticise the vagueness of the scheme, but the Act of 1947 only set up a railway Executive to assist the British Transport Commission in its functions. We have gone a great deal further than that.

Many human interests are involved, and I shall never forget that that is so. They are involved both in the existing organisation and in the changes which Government legislation will bring about. I have done my best to give a certain amount of temporary security to those people who are working hard on the Commission and the Executives.

(continued on page 6.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: SEFTON Park 435.

Vol. 29. No. 4.

Saturday, September 20, 1952.

The Twilight of Caucus Government

Mr. Christopher Hollis may be justified by events in applying to the present political prospect his view that 'democracy' is one of the most short-lived forms of government. According to a newspaper report of a recent broadcast by him, he thinks the chief reason for the decay of parliamentary government is "the growing absurdity of the party system as it is now being worked." So far from the party system ensuring that every important subject was thoroughly discussed, it ensured just the opposite. This form of words reflects the theory of government by 'free discussion,' a theory which, in our opinion, rests upon insecure foundations. We believe that right government arises from the "integration of means and ends," and that, unless this conception of its social function is for ever in the forefront of the minds of legislators, 'remedies' (Mr. Hollis proposed four) are a snare and a delusion. We don't object to his remedies *per se*; we object to their being entertained as remedies for the disorder which is presumed.

In South Africa, a South African National Coalition has been formed with the following "three main objectives":—(1) To work for Christian Unity, (2) To work for the establishment of a truly Christian State, and (3) To safeguard sovereignty of the citizens. Incidentally, its promoters intend to enquire into "the practicability of a Social Credit System for South Africa." We have no two opinions as to the best way of ascertaining the practicability of Social Credit. The application of its principles would be a solvent for the 'remedies' of many a Hollis.

"The Chosen Race"

The publication of Mr. Beverley Nichols's book, *A Pilgrim's Progress*, seems to suggest that it is no longer forbidden to mention the Jews. The following extract, however, says not much more than that the mocking inscription "INRI" still stands over the cross:—

Chapter XI, p. 173 ff: "The Chosen Race":

"... 'Different from our fellows.' The anti-Semite may be inclined to score that phrase, in order to emphasize his accusation that the Jews are a separate nation in our midst, inspired by alien loyalties which must always run counter to our own. With that charge we deal in due course. But first, there are two questions to ask and answer—questions which go to the very heart of all that is implied in the phrase 'the Jewish problem.' By the time that we have answered them we may find that this 'problem' is more Gentile than Jewish.

"... Do you still await the coming of a Messiah? And if so, what do you mean by a Messiah?"

"Do you mean a person, a man, a Divine Being who will turn the world upside down? ... Or have you surrendered the idea of your Messiah? Have you ... if there is such a word ... "depersonalized" Him?"

"To answer these questions, I approached a number of learned Jewish authorities ... here is a brief, and I believe accurate, precis of their replies.

"All of my informants began by questioning the historical accounts of the crucifixion. To crucify, they stated, was an anti-Jewish method of killing. The Jewish way was by stoning to death—a comparatively merciful execution, because it was far swifter. 'It was the Romans who invented the fiendish punishment of crucifixion,' wrote the late Chief Rabbi Herz, in his commentary on the latest edition of the Jewish Prayer Book. 'If Jewish teaching and Jewish example had been heeded, the tale of torture in European history would have been far less voluminous than it is.'

"And Christ Himself?"

"It is extraordinarily difficult to answer this question, from the Jewish point of view—to enter into the Jewish mind. They grant that He is a figure of superlative beauty; they admit the constantly reiterated prophecies, in their own law—working up to a sort of divine crescendo—of the coming of the Messiah. But Jesus as the Messiah—no. Why? One Rabbi said to me—'We have to deny Him because He would contradict the Oneness of God. It would be anathema to us to think of God having personal attributes.' 'But what of the Messianic legend?' I asked. 'What of the Person who is so clearly foreshadowed?'"

"To which another, and exceptionally learned Rabbi replied: 'True. The orthodox Jew can conceive of Zionism only in terms of a personal Messiah. But he will not be a super-human being. He will not be a son of God. He will merely be the symbol of the rule of God on earth.'

"If this leaves us very much where we were, it is hardly my fault. For it seemed to me that with all their learning and all their piety, the Jews were caught in a cleft stick—a stick that had been cleft two thousand years ago. Their fathers had been taught to seek the rising of a star, and when it had risen they had denied it, because its very radiance had blinded them.

"So we come to the second question. 'Do the Jews still seek that star? Do they still expect the Messiah?'"

"Yes. They do. But I must confess from what they told me that it seemed to me a somewhat synthetic star, and a more than muddled Messiah.

"Here are some of the phrases by which they described the *expected one*.

"The figure-head of a Golden Age."

"The personification of the rule of God on earth."

"The human symbol of the final Utopia."

"It is difficult for the plain man to gain much comfort from such abstractions. They will seem to him as empty as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. More, they will seem incredibly remote. This misty messianic figure, waiting somewhere at the end of an infinite corridor of time ... , what consolation has he to offer us to-day? What guidance to give us, as the clocks tick out our little lives?"

(continued on page 8.)

Wizards' Sabbath

It used to be said of *The Times* that provincial editors awaited discreet advices concerning its 'lead' before committing themselves in their less 'responsible' columns to support or rejection of opinion on topics touching high policy, *i.e.*, High Financial policy. What other unflinching technique could there be for the (almost) instantaneous communication of nudges and whispers? The internal organisation of newspapers and news agencies is a very interesting study, to be undertaken by practising journalists themselves at their peril (and with doubtful results) and by outsiders who aspire to success in detection only if they possess 'exceptional qualifications' beyond the reach of the most optimistic advertiser. To our personal knowledge, *direct* intervention was *occasionally* necessary in 1920—the year of the publication in book form of *Economic Democracy*—and in a blatant and obvious form, *e.g.*, to a young and aspiring reviewer writing honestly about the book: "Did you write this? Then don't do it again. Good morning." Since then, time and entropy have favoured the autocratic censor of opinions unfavourable to the Continuous deployment of the Power of Finance. One no longer receives confidences of this order, and the unprofessional observer can only relate the thunders to the flash in the same way as the observer of lightning flashes—by the time-lapse.

We had occasion to comment on the time-lapses in the news associated with the publication of the result of the recent election in British Columbia. Some were explicable, and the delay in the news was attributable to unforeseen features of the working of a new system of vote-counting. There followed delay in comment, and, thereafter, the 'release' of 'stories' about Social Credit in Canada which were all variants of a 'script.' The Wizards' coven had met. It is a fact that in this country *The Times* here led the way—and, let us say, the uncouth accent of Glasgow translated.

In Canada, *The Christian Science Monitor* having for some time pursued *its* monitor, and *The Ottawa Citizen* the same, there is left, besides *Vers Demain*, one newspaper which is exceptional. It is said to have the largest circulation of all farm newspapers in the Dominion. Under the distinguished editorship of Mr. A. P. Waldron, it has long exerted a profound influence not confined to the Province of Saskatchewan, where it is published. It is non-party. We have mentioned it before in these pages: *The Western Producer*.

Its editorial article for August 21 was devoted to Social Credit. It criticises objectively as well as independently. We should not agree without qualification to the implications—or some of the implications—which underlie the assertion that the failure of the Social Credit group in the Canadian House of Commons to "get their message across to the public" was the major part of their failure, though it may have been true that to "get their message across to the public" was their "primary objective." What was 'their' message?

We are grateful for the timely adoption, in any newspaper, of the clear presentation of the view that "more important than to win elections" it is important that whether or not International Finance is collapsing and threatening the world with chaos men of faith should bear witness to their faith.

Without further comment, we print the article below. Following upon it, as Caliban on Prospero's heels, we print the outpourings of the anonymous scribe in *The Glasgow Herald* who does not think names should be treated too seriously. (It depends upon who you are and what you say!):—

(From THE WESTERN PRODUCER—August, 21.)

Social Credit

On its first try Social Credit has managed to get into office in British Columbia in whose legislature no Social Credit member ever sat before. Even though it is very much in a minority that is a remarkable achievement. And now, for the fifth consecutive time, a Social Credit government—this one very much in a majority—has been swept into power in Alberta. It is therefore timely to take a brief look at this phenomenon in an effort to discover whether it contains a portent of any significant development in Canadian public life.

There is complete confusion in the popular mind about what Social Credit is and what effect its adoption might have. Far from trying to resolve this confusion the press as a rule tries to make it more confounded. Social Credit is made the butt for cheap jibes and ridicule rather than serious appraisal and criticism. Certainly Canadian journalism can claim little credit for its performance in this connection.

Fortunately for the present purpose, however, it is unnecessary to understand Social Credit before venturing to assess what the British Columbia and Alberta election results may signify. For the Manning Government while still hanging on to the name has in annual convention of the party formally and categorically put itself on record that it will make no further move to implement Social Credit or any part of it in that province. It has endeavoured to justify this stand by arguing that the powers of a provincial legislature are so restricted that it is unable under the constitution to enact and enforce Social Credit legislation. The disallowance by Ottawa of certain measures passed during the Aberhart period is, amongst other reasons, cited as proof of this stand. So the Manning Government, as such, is Social Credit in name only and has frankly acquainted its followers and the public of that fact. It may be remembered that when this radical departure from the original Aberhart position was taken there was a minor schism within the ranks and amongst others the representative of Major Douglas, Mr. Byrne, was dismissed. The best informed observers are agreed that the move was merely a bit of sharp political practice designed to free the government from embarrassing commitments and clear the way for a prolonged lease of power which had become sweet to many of those who are profiting by and enjoying it.

The new premier of British Columbia, Mr. Bennett, was not slow in making himself clear on this point. "Social Credit is not a factor here," the leader of the Social Credit party says and adds, "Monetary reform can only be done on a national basis." Thus he aligns himself squarely with Alberta, for when the Manning Government repudiated Social Credit provincially it also raised a banner with a new device—"On to Ottawa." So the facts are plain and incontrovertible and should be known: the parties presently holding office in Alberta and British Columbia call themselves Social Credit but the name has just as much

or as little significance as has the name Radical-Socialist under which the Tory party of France marches, and which in fact is neither radical nor Socialist but Conservative.

In Edmonton on the night of the election Solon Low, leader of the Social Credit group in the House of Commons, is reported as having said:

"The voting tonight indicates without a doubt that the people of Alberta have stood firmly under the recent barrage of politics. I congratulate all the successful candidates. Alberta and British Columbia are now Social Credit provinces and there will be more. We will march forward together, with Ottawa as our goal."

As will be seen from the foregoing Mr. Low has little justification for the assumption that the victories in B.C. and Alberta, where Social Credit was not an issue, provide evidence of support for "a march forward with Ottawa as the goal." These are considerations which should be exercising the minds of the many genuine Social Crediters who are troubled by the actions of their provincial leaders.

As for the Social Credit group at Ottawa, it contains many very able and public-spirited members. Some of the shrewdest criticism of certain features of government policies emanate from that group. Nonetheless, they have failed in one primary objective. They have not been able to get their message across to the public. After over 15 years in Ottawa with the sounding board of the House of Commons at their disposal and enjoying the prestige which the letters "M.P." carry they have not succeeded in capturing the ear of the public. There is just as much confusion and uncertainty in the popular mind today about what Social Credit is and means as there was in 1935. That is the measure of their failure. In addition they have alienated the movement in Quebec, where, in spite of appearances, it is more firmly grounded than in any province in Canada.

"On to Ottawa" may be their slogan but there have been Social Crediters in Ottawa for 17 years and what have they accomplished? The same men who plead now that nothing can be done in a province are precisely the type who if by some miracle they did achieve federal power would claim that nothing could be done nationally—they would then raise another slogan "On to the United Nations." Those who don't want to act can always find an excuse for not acting.

Seldom has there been a time when conditions were more propitious for the discussion if not for the ready acceptance of Social Credit doctrine. International finance is collapsing and threatening the world with chaos. Any man who is a Social Crediter knows why and believes he knows the remedy. Now if ever is the time for them to come forward and bear witness to their faith. To do that is more important than to win elections; if it is not done no victory at the polls will do more than change the men who occupy the positions of power.

(2).

(From THE GLASGOW HERALD—August, 26.)

Social Credit in Canada

Only an older generation will remember the heyday of the Social Credit movement in Britain. The theories of MAJOR DOUGLAS had their passing vogue; but that was in the time of ORAGE and the "New Age" and the earlier phases of the inter-war depression. The economists were always united in scorn of his arguments. They still are. But the teachings of Lord KEYNES have bestowed on MAJOR

30.

DOUGLAS the reflected glory of having observed, albeit his discovery arose from fallacious premises, the occasional necessity of an unbalanced budget to sustain a desirable level of spending power. And for this he deserves a permanent place in the footnotes of a monetary treatise.

It was only in Canada that the Social Credit movement became an effective political force. The Canadian party of that name was founded by the late WILLIAM ABERHART, and his personality was not the least of the factors responsible for the astounding victory in Alberta in 1935 by which he became Provincial Premier. There were other explanations at that time for the popularity of Major DOUGLAS'S advocacy of free credits. Recovery was still no more than a word to the prairie farmers. It is more difficult to say why his ideas apparently survive there in an era when the fears of a chronic depression have given place to the perils of inflation, and when the Province of Alberta, with its flourishing agriculture and its newly found oil, has least reason of all to be experimenting with an untried specific for prosperity. Yet the recent elections confirmed the Social Credit Party in the power they have held for 16 years. And in British Columbia the party have won 19 seats and the right to form a Government at their first appearance in the politics of that Province.

Paradoxically, the most likely explanation of this success is the fact that the ideas of the founder have never been put to the test. In Alberta the party started with a programme of radical monetary reform; but the attempt to enact this programme was declared unconstitutional by the Canadian Supreme Court, a decision which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upheld as recently as 1947, by which time it was no more than an academic issue. The fact is that Social Credit won Alberta in 1935 because they offered a focus for the deep popular discontent with the existing Farmers' Party Government. The recent victory in British Columbia can be similarly interpreted as a revulsion from a Coalition Government who had been too long in office. If they display the same acumen and honesty as their colleagues in Alberta the new Government may stay long. There is no reason in these days why a name should be treated too seriously.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

Mr. A. J. Champion (Derbyshire, South-East): A bit late.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: No, if the hon. Member would read HANSARD he would see that it is quite a long time ago, relative to my appointment, that I said that holders of appointments in the Commission and the Executive which were to terminate in August or September would be retained, not necessarily in their existing offices but, of course, at their existing salary.

The members of the Railway Executive are mainly railwaymen who will be absorbed into the new railway structure if they so wish, subject to the normal retiring age. The Road Haulage Executive will come to an end when its activities have also come to an end. As regards the Docks and Harbours and the Hotels Executives, the eventual form which their activities may take must await the publication of the railway scheme. The London Transport Executive will be

retained, though not necessarily in exactly its present form or under its present name. . . .

Sir Geoffrey Hutchinson (Ilford, North): . . . Hon. Members opposite have said that the Transport Commission is a new undertaking which has yet to prove itself. That is true. It is only four years old and we are told that we ought to give it an opportunity to grow up. But we can judge the results of the system of integration which the Transport Commission are at present intent on carrying out. We can judge the results of what they propose to do by the results which have been achieved by the London Transport Executive and by their predecessor, the London Passenger Transport Board.

As I understand, the Transport Commission aim at introducing into national transport precisely those conditions which the London Passenger Transport Board was created to introduce into the London passenger transport service. The Transport Commission aims at bringing about precisely the same results by the same methods.

First, there is common ownership. All the existing separate undertakings are to be brought together and merged into a common whole. Then there is to be the equalisation of charges over a wide area. The London Transport Executive is not an organisation that has yet to prove itself; it is an established undertaking, now more than 18 years old. By its results the consequences of this form of integration can be fairly judged.

Precisely the same advantages which were claimed for the London Passenger Transport Board when it was brought into existence in 1933, and in the debates which took place in the House on the earlier Bill of 1931, are claimed today for the system which the Transport Commission are endeavouring to introduce.

I should like to read a passage from the introduction to the Commission's Report which echoes with a striking resemblance the arguments which were advanced in 1931 and 1933 when the London Transport Executive was being introduced. The Chairman of the Commissioners reports:

"In 1951 the programme of acquisition of long distance haulage undertakings, in accordance with the terms of the Transport Act, 1947, was virtually completed, and the way was prepared for many important steps in the process of integrating"—

we have that word again—

"the different forms of transport, from which large economies would eventually result."

There is something singularly reminiscent about that particular passage. We are entitled to examine the achievements of the London Transport Executive to see how far they have fulfilled the promises which were made on their behalf by their advocates in the Socialist Party 20 years ago.

What has happened? In the first six years of its existence—which, after all, were years of peace, when the undertaking was not handicapped by the legacy of difficult conditions following a war—the result of integration was that the cost of transport in London was substantially the same as it had been in the days of the separate undertakings. In so far as there was any change it was upwards and not downwards. From Table 7 of the Report one sees that the increase in London fares between 1939 and 1951 was 43 per cent., compared with a higher percentage for undertakings outside London.

The difference was attributable very largely not to the fact that the London Transport Executive had succeeded in keeping down the cost of travel; it was due to the fact that on many routes in London the fares were still exceptionally low, for certain historical reasons. On other routes they were exceptionally high. In 1951 the average increase in fares in London was less than the increase in other parts of the country, but it would be wrong to draw from that fact the inference that the London Transport Executive had succeeded in absorbing a greater proportion of their operating costs than undertakings outside London had done.

What have been the consequences of integration in the London Passenger Transport Board? Today the travelling population of London is in open and undisguised revolt against the charges of the London Passenger Transport Board. No Member who sits for a London division can doubt that. That is one of the consequences of integration. . . .

What happened in London? The first step taken was to "co-ordinate" or "integrate" all the separate undertakings which had functioned in different parts of London, before the Transport Board was formed. In those days there was a rival scheme which, I think, was sponsored by the London County Council, which had, perhaps, a better insight into such matters then than it has now. The rival scheme proposed that the separate undertakings should be retained as separate entities and that a body should be set up and given the task of co-ordinating the working of those separate undertakings.

What would have happened if that had been done? The tramway undertakings carried their passengers more cheaply than the Transport Board has ever been able to do. Croydon was one—and my own borough of Ilford was another—whose undertakings carried their passengers more cheaply than the Transport Board ever have done. They paid the same rates as the transport undertaking. One of the reasons for their being cheaper was that they had control of their own supplies of electricity. They were their own generators and their own suppliers. That is the sort of integration that transport in London has always required. It is not integration with other forms of transport alone but integration with the local authorities and the various services which those authorities used to command. In the provinces this is not so. In the great provincial cities the control which the local authorities exercised over their passenger undertakings was a powerful instrument in planning the development of their cities. But that never had been possible in London. The London Transport Executive pursues its own sweet way in one direction and the local authorities pursue their own way in another direction.

It is the destruction of those separate and independent undertakings which, in my judgment, has produced this outstanding problem of the cost of passenger transport in Central London. I was very glad to hear my right hon. Friend say that the Transport Executive is to continue, although not in the same form, or not perhaps with the same name. I do not much mind by which name it is known. I know the name which is commonly used for it, by many of its passengers, but I would not recommend my right hon. Friend to adopt that.

Let me conclude with this observation. I think my right hon. Friend will have a very difficult task in reducing the

cost of passenger transport in London. I say that for this reason. As I see it, the consequences of the policy of the Transport Executive and its predecessor has been to create in London a system of transport which is not capable of being worked cheaply. Their policy, over 20 years, has involved the extension of the tube railways, the conversion of the tube railways into suburban railways, for which they were never really designed; and the running of long-distance bus services from distant terminal points on one side of London to distant terminal points on the other side, passing through the most congested streets in the centre, which has produced a multitude of omnibuses in the Strand, Oxford Street and Regent Street during the off-rush hours with 10 or 12 or 20 passengers in a 56-seater bus.

I say that the system which has been created by this integration or co-ordination of London transport is a system which my right hon. Friend will find it extremely difficult to work cheaply. He embarks upon his task with my best wishes. Whatever I can do to assist him in this difficult job, I will do, but I warn him that it will be difficult to turn the clock back again and to get rid of the consequences of integration in London's transport.

I hope that will be a warning to hon. Members opposite not to be so unwise as to introduce into our national haulage system or our national passenger transport system precisely those conditions which have fastened an expensive and extravagant transport system on the necks of the unfortunate London population.

A Know-Nothing-Jim

"The owner of the drugstore-lunchroom bent over my shoulder to look, 'What's that you're reading?' he asked. I closed the book so that he could see the title: *McCarthyism: The Fight for America*. The ingratiating storekeeper's smile left his face. 'What's it all about?' he grunted

"Senator McCarthy," I explained, "takes up, one by one, all the charges that have been levelled at him and gives his answers. It is more like a brief than a book. He supports every statement of fact with a notation as to its source."

"The man's face grew rigid as I spoke. He could hardly contain himself. So, perversely, I remarked that I could not understand how anybody who reads this book could question the Senator's integrity—or doubt his accusation that Communists have infiltrated the State Department and have influenced our foreign policy to the detriment of this country and in favour of Soviet ambitions. 'Would you like to read it?' I asked. 'Baloney,' he growled and walked away.

"I then realised what the force behind the drive against 'McCarthyism' really is. It is a peculiarity of the human mind that belies man's pretensions to educability. It is a psychological phenomenon, all too common with *homo sapiens*, consisting of a capacity to put up with an emotional barrier to fact, understanding or reason. It has nothing to do necessarily with Joe McCarthy or with the mission he has undertaken. It satisfies a human need of substituting a hatred for any exercise of rationality.

"Recognising this psychological quirk, Lenin recommended that 'we can and must write in a language which sows among the masses hate, revulsion, scorn and the like, toward those who disagree with us.'" (*Human Events*).

"THE CHOSEN RACE" (continued from page 4).

"These are very superficial questions to the Jew, typical of a shallow Christian philosophy. For Jews—in the words of the great Spanish philosopher, Madariaga . . . 'live not in space, but in time.'

"In the meanwhile, the clocks tick on; the Jew scans the horizon; the world grows darker. Small wonder that the Jew seeks shelter in the Law, while the Christian draws nearer to the cross . . ."

The Social Credit Secretariat

Following are the forms intended to meet the convenience of subscribers:—

BANK ORDER

To:—

Name of Subscriber's Bank.....

Address or Branch of Bank.....

Please pay now to Martin's Bank Limited (East Branch) 1, Prescot Street, Liverpool, 7, for account of the Social Credit Secretariat, Liverpool, the sum of.....* and thereafter until further notice.

†£.....annually on.....date.

†£.....half-yearly on.....dates.

2d.

Subscriber's signature.....

Stamp

Address.....

..... (Date).....

*The subscriber is invited to enter here the sum, if any, in which his payments may be in arrears.

†Please cross out the line not applicable and initial alteration.

SUBSCRIPTION to the SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

I am prepared to subscribe to the Secretariat the sum ofper annum.

Payment will be made

Yearly* in.....(month)

Half-Yearly* in.....(months)

Signed

Address

*Please cross out line not applicable.

N.B.—If either of the above forms is used it should be returned, addressed:—

The Treasurer,
Social Credit Secretariat,
7, Victoria Street,
Liverpool, 2.