

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 30. No. 15.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1953

6d. Weekly.

Elizabeth II and The Second Elizabethans

(Continued.)

It is not my case alone, it is the freedom and liberty of the people of England. For if power without law can make laws . . . I do not know what subject he is in England that can be sure of his life or anything that he calls his own.—King Charles I.

Part I of this article concluded with a reference to the introduction of the theme of Mond-Turnerism into the theme of the coronation by H.R.H. The Duke of Windsor. We find it difficult to believe that an association at once so incongruous from a superficial point of view and so fundamentally important from a realistic point of view could have been fortuitous. Everybody knows that one of the last public acts—at all events the most important of the public acts—of H.M. King Edward VIII immediately before the abdication was an attempt to awaken a sense of national responsibility for the victims of the three-cornered struggle between the mine-workers, their so-called 'leaders' and the nominal opponents of both, the so-called 'capitalists.' There was a 'settlement,' upon the permanency of which the Duke of Windsor cast doubt. Recent restlessness, indiscipline and revolt among the 'workers,' leading to 'unofficial' strikes have led some observers to believe that the Mond-Turner pact, 'Peace in Industry,' is undermined by forces not included in it. This is an illusion, and serves to mask and hide the success, up to the present, of Mond-Turnerism from the point of view of its promoters. Their margin of safety comprises such manifestations, which have a safety-valve effect. It might even be deemed worth while to foster them for this purpose.

Is Second-Elizabethan-ism to be a Mond-Turner trademark, popularised by a salesmanship based on the historical associations of its name, or is it to be something altogether different—something which would justify the humane hopes which are the salesmen's psychological raw-material for exploitation? Is it socially possible genuinely to realise these hopes? We suggest that it would serve some purpose if the two diverging concepts of a "Second Elizabethan Age"—that fed by human hopes and that entertained by Big Business (The 'Monopoly of Money,' Private Capitalism, Judaio-Masonic Policy; it is all one)—were clearly defined and contrasted. While currents of unusual volume and strength are flowing beneath the surface of things at the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, which we should call placid in comparison with what is deeper, there is no clear statement to be found anywhere in current comment of what the torrential and turbulent undercurrents contain. Singularly, there is a spate of description of the content isolated

from distinct reference to the frame which contains it, and to which it should be referred. It is given a fortuitous, a general or an episodic reference; but not its actual reference in the tremendous crisis of our time. This fact is diagnostic of itself. Also it is unserviceable if not actually a disservice. It is frivolous, like the mild ridicule which is current of various figures boosted to transient popularity or notoriety as "Eminent Elizabethans" of 1953.

We are painfully aware that the subject we are discussing is altogether too vast for adequate treatment in a journal of the size of *The Social Crediter*, comprising as it does a sufficient if not a full appreciation of what there was that was significant in the reign of Elizabeth I which it might be desirable, if it were possible, to transport to the reign of Elizabeth II, or to develop if its germ were present; but comprising also an account of that Faith of the present, which is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen." Nevertheless, if what is narrowly designated 'the Social Credit movement' is to play any further part in the preparation of the social future, it is these matters before all others which its members must thoroughly master and understand. The Social Credit of propaganda and persuasion lived and died with a man called Manning. Born in the corruption of the ballot-box, it died in the corruption which fed it. Any service which anyone can conceivably or possibly contribute to the re-establishment of a veridical civilisation has, first of all, to divest itself of this compromising entanglement. How? Where?

The present steps towards the answer to those questions are purely expository.

The person of the Sovereign "commands love and respect"; and this fact is supposed to constitute "a completely new and indispensable function" of the Constitution. The author of the formula, Mr. Arthur Byrant, does not say "of the Constitution." With the Jungian Unconscious hard at work, the Constitution, the theme, is left characteristically to be resuracted from repression by the psycho-analyst. Having performed this necessary service, let us say that love and respect are very different acts, both personal, and neither constitutional in any sense concerning the body politic. We do not deplore their existence. On the contrary, we should like to see more opportunity in the modern social fabric for their exercise.

The State commands so little love and respect that a surrogate has to be created by massed and concentrated

Power in an endeavour ineffectually to throw a veil of humanity across its diabolical manifestations.

This is but one aspect of Mond-Turner Elizabethanism. Not only is it a "fake antique," to use Mr. Douglas Reed's telling phrase. It is a fake modernity as well. It begins and ends with artificials. As an economic power it began with artificial chemicals. At the Coal Strike it ended with artificial Peace. Its range extended itself by artifices from the inorganic to the organic, from the organic to the biological, from the biological to the social: from the physical to the metaphysical. The end is a fake humanity expiring in a social disorder which contains nothing, if possible, which is not entirely faked: the Great Apotheosis. This is the inevitable end of the Extrovert Age. Godless yet damned: ("Does Satan cast out Satan?").

Jung, a psychologist of genius, clearly recognised the excessive extroversion of the present age with its "almost exclusive acknowledgment of the visible and tangible," and as it loses its equilibrium we recognise on a social scale the sacrifice of the subject to the "so-called objective claims; to the demands, for instance, of a continually extending business, because orders lie claiming one's attention or because profitable possibilities are constantly being opened up which must instantly be seized." (Jung: *Psychological Types* p.420, English Edn. 1946.) It is fortuitous that *The Times Literary Supplement* for last week (May 29) carried a review of unusual length of two books on design, dealing extensively with the work of Walter Gropius at the *Bauhaus* at Weimar. Gropius was an enthusiast with whose ideas we are not here so particularly concerned as with the interpretations of the reviewer. "In the *Manifesto* Gropius issued," he says, "on taking over at Weimar he swept away the artificial nineteenth-century distinctions that invidiously separate the 'fine' from the 'applied' arts . . . willy-nilly, he continued, the machine has become our modern vehicle for the repetitive execution of design. Though this plain fact compels us to come to terms with it, those terms should no longer be the blind surrender of nineteenth-century *laissez-faire*. So long as production is regarded as an end in itself the individual must continue to be a slave to the machine, and the danger of a 'mechanistic anarchy' (far more real in 1953 than 30 years earlier) is bound to increase. But under sane and enlightened direction the machine's automatism can spare humanity more and more physical toil, which by ensuring a fuller life, will liberate the individual for higher activities. Yet—and, psychologically, this was the only flaw in the argument—Gropius felt convinced that if industry was to develop, even along these more rational lines, we must maintain the old dehumanising principle of the division of labour, with its soul-deadening ordinance of one man, one incidental process; one machine, one machine-minder. He did not foresee that sooner or later the inevitable concomitant of relegating factory hands to narrowly specialised jobs would be the emergence of a vast new industry, just as stereotyped in its mechanical operations as any other, to exploit the workers' leisure with equally stultifying forms of 'recreational occupation.'"

When the corrective for excessive objectivity is still greater objectivity, unconscious elements assert themselves in their most primitive forms and adaptation breaks down.

(To be continued.)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: May 18, 1953.

Old Age Pensioners (Cost of Living)

Miss Elaine Burton (Coventry, South): . . . The National Assistance Board puts the amount on which a pensioner must manage at 35s. plus rent. The Old Age Pensioners' Federation have stated recently that the average amount by which a single old age pensioner is short is 6s. 6d. per week, and 7s. 6d. per week for a married couple. The Secretary of the Federation claims that these figures are based on the actual budgets he has received from old age pensioners, and I want to ask the Government if they will look into those statements. Is the Secretary of the Federation correct when he make that claim or is he wrong? A committee of inquiry would obviously either substantiate or deny those figures. I should have thought that both sides of this House would agree that the old people, in common humanity, should have the chance of stating their case.

As the Minister is aware, the National Assistance Board is not prepared to give the breakdown of that 35s. I have tried to find out from the Board on what it was based, but I think everybody will appreciate the difficulty of the Board because, as it says, everybody spends money differently. However, we on this side of the House would say that if one has only that amount to live on, one cannot spend 35s. so very differently today on the real necessities. . . .

From the old age pensioners in different parts of the country I have a figure per week for coal of 6s. 6d., for gas, 4s. 6d. and for electricity of 7s. If we take any two of those—that is, coal and one of the other two—the lowest figure is 11s. 6d. and the other is 13s. 6d. Something else I have found out from the people who have been to see me and have written to me is that the average cost of their shoe repairs is 8s. 6d. I say shoe repairs, because the old people must have their shoes mended like the rest of us, and they have not always the money for that.

It would be easy for me to quote what I might call substuff to the Minister and I do not want to do so, but I have here four letters from different parts of the country. I do not propose to give the names because I have not asked permission, but only sentences. They are genuine letters, written by people in need, and I do not think they are written by scroungers out for what they can get.

The first letter comes from Barrow-in-Furness:

" . . . our electric light and gas had gone up—I can't afford a smoke or a glass of beer and my wife has to do without her sweets."

The next one comes from Exmouth in Devon:

" . . . we enclose our budget—We cannot put everything into detail . . . this doesn't leave anything for fruit, we never go to the cinema, and if we want anything extra as clothing or shoe repairs, either coal or bacon has to be cut out."

My next one comes from just outside Bury in Lancashire. It was in short sentences and it reads:

"Need 5s. weekly for coals. Never see egg or bacon or cheese. Quarter of a pound of sweets a week. No fruit. Fares to Bury weekly 3s., so walk. No little luxury whatever. So mind three little ones and wash and look after five people for 15s. a week. Aged 70 in July. In need of holiday badly."

My last one, which comes from just outside London, was sent

to me by an old age pensioner, telling me how she keeps her gas and coal bill as low as she does.

"Coal: burn only 6s. worth a week. Do not light fire before 3 p.m. Damp with tea leaves and potato peelings, keep in going for nearly five hours—"

I should say that this letter was sent to me in the winter—

"Gas, 6s. a week (light and cooking). Wait till nearly dark before lighting up. Go to bed at 8 p.m. by candle light. Make one box of matches last 10 days by using spills too."

Of course, we on this side of the House think that if the Government took the right action, that lady might get a few more matches in her box, or would get them a little cheaper—but that is by the way. I quote those letters only because I think they are the ordinary letters of ordinary people. If they are true—I am willing to let the Minister have them—I think they are a disgrace to any Parliament which permits such a disgrace to continue.

Also, on 23rd March, the Minister was asked if he had considered a weekly budget based on barest need prepared by the General Secretary of the Old Age Pensioners' Association. I should like to read his reply:

"The article set out a weekly budget, the total of which, excluding insurances, was approximately the same as the amount provided by the current National Assistance scales. The figures given, even if one were to accept them as typical, do not therefore support the assertion made in the article that pensioners could not afford to buy enough food."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 23rd March, 1953; Vol. 513, c. 478.]

The total of that budget was £1 17s. 3½d. Excluding the insurances mentioned by the Minister, we arrive at a total of £1 15s. 9½d.

It would be interesting, for the record, to know the contents of that budget of barest need. It was for one week, for one person, and this is what it stated:

"Coal, 5s. 3d.
Gas, electricity, etc., 5s.
Renewals for clothing, 3s. 6d.
Household requisites, 2s. 6d."

We come next to rationed food.

"½ lb. sugar, 3½d.
4 oz. margarine, 4d.
2 oz. butter, 4½d.
Cheese, 2½d.
Bacon, 1s. 2d.
1 egg, 5d.
Meat, 1s. 8d."

Unrationed food:

"3½ pints milk, 1s. 9.
Tea, 8d.
Bread, 1s. 8d.
Vegetables, 2s. 6d.
Fish, 3s.
Offals, 2s. 6d.
Jam, etc., 1s. 6d.
Flour, etc., 1s. 6d."

We all realise, without thinking, that in that there is no mention of sweets, tobacco, shoe repairs, cinemas, holidays, fruit or bus fares.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of National Insurance (Mr. R. H. Turton): . . . The hon Lady asked for a committee of inquiry into costs. I assure her that the National Assistance Board are constantly inquiring into the position. It was they who made the recommendation to the preceding Government that in September, 1951, the National Assistance scales were quite out of alignment with the cost

of living, and for that reason the rise of 4s. a week was given. It was they who came to us in the spring of last year and recommended a rise of 5s., not only because of the past rise in prices but because of the anticipated rise. For that reason we gave the increase. In fact the cost of living index has not shown an increase to the extent that was then anticipated.

The hon. Lady quoted from the budgets of old people. It must be realised that the needs of old people and their budgets vary greatly. We cannot say that one old person requires a certain amount for fuel and light. The figure must vary. The National Assistance Board try to see that the old people on these scales have an adequate amount to meet the essential needs of life. The hon. Lady quoted, I thought rather unfairly, a reply by my right hon. Friend to the open letter in the "Old Age Pensioner" showing that the cost of food and others needs was 35s. In that budget the cost of food came to 19s. 8½d. I notice in this month's "Old Age Pensioner" the editor says that the amount spent on food in the weekly budget of the old age pensioner is now not 19s. 8½d. but about 15s. 10d.

The most satisfactory way of dealing with this matter is not by an inquiry but by having confidence in the National Assistance Board. For those old people who have special needs, those who require extra food on special diets, the National Assistance Board provide additional sums, as they have discretion to do. There are at present some half a million allowances that are being supplemented for special needs and let me say straight away that what does concern me and, I am sure, the hon. Lady for Coventry, South and all hon. Members is that there are so many old people having to have recourse to National Assistance. The fact that a quarter of the retirement pensioners have to have recourse to it is a matter of great concern; and that arises from the fact that the basic scales of retirement pension at present are well below the National Assistance scale.

Mr. T. Brown: Too low.

Mr. Turton: That is a problem which we have inherited; but this Government have taken the step of raising the basic pension by 25 per cent. Of course, it is true that about six weeks before the Election there was a rise from 26s. to 30s. for some pensioners; but we have raised the basic pension from 26s. to 32s. 6d., and it has to be remembered that we are working a contributory pension scheme. I attach great importance to the contributory nature of the scheme, but we have inherited a difficult financial problem. Retirement pensions are at present costing £340 million a year, and we are told by our experts that they will cost about £700 million a year in 24 years time.

House of Commons: May 19, 1953.

Atmospheric Pollution, Stoke-on-Trent (Fluorine)

Dr. Stross asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works, as representing the Lord President of the Council, whether he has noted that the experimental evidence now available, showing prolonged intake of fluorine compounds, causes chronic kidney disease in animals, before bone changes occur; and whether he will institute an investigation

(Continued on page 7.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 30. No. 15.

Saturday, June, 6, 1953.

From Week to Week

According to the *Washington Times-Herald* for April 21, Senator Wiley of Wisconsin has declared that a reliable test of sincerity of the recent Russian peace overtures rests in whether the Soviet Union resumes diplomatic relations with Israel. Appropriately, the suggestion was made at a celebration at the Statler Hotel of 1,000 guests of the Washington Israel Bond Committee.

As an inducement to 'passing the test,' the Senator said "Israel is a powder keg with a long, long fuse—which, if lit, could start World War III."

The Social Crediter who feels the need to fortify his conviction, inherited with many other ideas from Douglas, that history is not episodic, may care to ponder the joint appearance of a Light Horse and the Mond-Turner Complex, the former in spirit and the latter as a pathological exhibit, in the interesting address of Lord Justice Denning at King's College, Newcastle-on-Tyne, (University of Durham) on May 27. The Judge was giving the Earl Grey Memorial Lecture. We have, at present, only *The Times* report, which extends beyond the limits of half a column (May 28). He said our conception of natural justice was based entirely on our habits of thought for many generations. The common law had been moulded for centuries by judges who had been brought up in the Christian faith; the precepts of religion, consciously or unconsciously, had been their guide. In primitive societies religion, morals, and law were indistinguishably mixed but those ideas became severed in the later stages of mental progress. Here, that severance had gone a long way—much too far.

The law of contract—by which men were kept to their promises—had over-reached itself. The small man was bound by conditions in standardised contracts of large concerns, which he had no choice but to accept, as if he had deliberately promised to fulfil them. The law held a man bound to the letter of his contract though unforeseen circumstances arose which made it unjust to enforce it against him. That harsh ruling was not in accordance with the view of Saint Thomas Aquinas.

The judicial interpretation of statutes had made words the masters of men instead of their servants. Saint Paul said: "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth strength," and when the Bible was first put into English the judges ruled

that statutes were to be interpreted with regard to the mischief which Parliament sought to remedy, so as to give "force and life" to the intention of the legislature.

But in the nineteenth century that broad view was supplanted by the "golden rule," as Lord Parke described it, that words were to be interpreted according to their grammatical and ordinary sense, even if that gave rise to unjust results. The judges were too often inclined to fold their hands and blame the legislature, when they ought to set to work and give the words of a statute a reasonable meaning, even if that involved a departure from their letter.

In any discussion of punishment it was important to recognise, as Christianity did, that society itself was responsible for the conditions which made men criminals. It was a commonplace that broken homes produced juvenile delinquents. When we tried to reform the criminal we were only treating the symptoms of the disease, not the cause of it. The best way to deal with it was to reform society itself; and in this regard the leaders of society had an especial responsibility.

Having now (June, 1953), speaking metaphorically but withal very respectfully, stopped and interrogated several thousands of our fellows—more than the "upper Ten"—to plead with them to disclose whether they were leaders of society, or could suggest where we might find the leaders of society, and having, in regard to the first question, received the unanimous reply that they were not, or not in any sense germane to the purposes of our enquiry, and, in regard to the second part, having received only fruitless directions to fresh interrogatees, may we say how well-served as well as grateful we should be if an authentic list of Leaders of Society were drawn up, *nem. con.* Someone has a responsibility surely; but, in these days of the Common Man, can it be he? He says 'no.'

We are among the many who have not noticed the "increased purchasing power of wages" vouched for by *The Tablet* (May 30, Page 459); but with the notion that any betterment there ever is is not primarily the work of either politicians or legislation we are in hearty agreement. Buckle the historian put it more forcibly than does *The Tablet*. He had "a confident belief that as the pressure of legislation is diminished and the human mind less hampered, the progress will continue with accelerated speed. It would be a mockery of sound reasoning to ascribe to legislators any share in the progress; or to expect that sort of benefit which consists in undoing the work of their predecessors . . . The world has been made familiar with the great truth, that one main condition of the prosperity of a people is that its rulers shall have very little power." Also: "We owe no thanks to lawgivers as a class. For, since the most valuable improvements in legislation are those which subvert preceding legislation it is clear that the balance of good cannot be on their side. It is clear that the progress of civilisation cannot be due to those who, on the most important subjects, have done so much harm that their successors are considered benefactors simply because they reverse their policy . . ."

He said great measures are extorted from the legis-

(continued on page 8.)

The Economy of Athens

by H. SWABEY

(continued).

Athens clearly illustrates the differences between welfare state and common sense economics. The police in better times "could not possess that distinct and important character among the Greeks, which it has in the states of modern Europe, as . . . judicial decisions were always preferred to the operations of police." As long as the people shared the mine revenues, as a national dividend, taxes remained moderate. But when 'welfare' measures appeared, we find the city guard tripled, taxes rising, and festivals turned into a racket to the benefit of contractors: 'free' meals and donations of corn accompanied a programme of public works and war. Boeckh remarks that, "those who profited by these measures encouraged in the people a desire to obtain the property of others, and widened the breach between the rich and the poor, which in the states of antiquity was an incessant and highly dangerous evil." This evidently did not bother Pericles.

Members of the public assembly received pay, although Boeckh (1817 A.D.) holds that, "it is a condition requisite for good government, that all who wish to partake in the ruling power should support themselves upon their own property." Senators were also paid. And the demagogue Cleon, ridiculed by Aristophanes, tripled the pay of the dicasts, who were a kind of jurymen; 5,000 of them sat on 300 days of the year. "And how great must have been the number of persons whom the state remunerated for their services . . . such as citharists, gymnasts, and others."

Athens supported the infirm and the war-orphan. "In early times Athens could boast of having no citizen in want of the necessaries of life." Societies existed and were called *Eranoi*.

No standing army was kept in peace. Pericles however introduced payment for citizens who were serving in the forces, and the navy, infantry and cavalry expanded in his time. Nicas disapproved of the Peloponnesian war, and as a result of disasters, "perhaps no country ever adopted so many strangers as Athens . . . the races of the most celebrated men and the noblest families, which had hitherto preserved an unbroken descent through internal troubles and through the vicissitudes of the Persian war, were at length sacrificed to their struggles for dominion, and became extinct." In this war, Pericles "had recourse" to the public treasures.

The war expenditure mounted. "No enterprise went so far beyond the resources of the Athenian state as the Sicilian expedition." This gave scope to war profiteers: "Commanders or demagogues, who received pay for the troops, drew it for *empty places*, as was the expression; in the same manner that in modern times generals have received pay for *men of straw*." We recall the allegation that horses have received payment in an army quite recently.

Timotheus, however, "having no silver, issued a coinage of copper tokens, which he induced the merchants to take by promising them that they might use it in paying for whatever property in land or plunder they might purchase, and he pledged himself to redeem whatever should remain over."

THE REVENUES.

Boeckh then makes the first attempt to examine the revenues of Athens. No taxes, he says, "are more repugnant to notions of liberty than taxes upon persons." So Athens banned these and only taxed property "on occasions of emergency, or under an honourable form." Slave duty was the only direct tax, apart from extraordinary war taxes, and liturgies which they considered honourable. "Taxes on houses and land only existed in states under the government of a tyrant." Public lands yielded the best revenues, and the tax farmers drew direct taxes upon aliens, and indirect taxes, besides justice fees and fines. Tributes of the confederates brought in a regular revenue which became "an accessory cause of her destruction."

The Treatise on Political Economy, attributed to Aristotle, assigns coinage to the royal (sovereign) economy: "the king must consider what description of coin is to be issued, and when it is to be made current at a higher or lower rate."

Boeckh himself notes that the ancients failed to consider "in how great a degree indirect taxes were detrimental to morality . . . On the other hand, direct taxes imposed upon the soil, upon industry or upon persons, excepting only in cases of emergency, were looked upon in Greece as despotic and arbitrary." Tertullian called a poll tax, a *token of captivity*.

Rent came in from non-private property, which included houses and theatres, and was let by auction to the highest bidder. Secular and sacred monies were lent, and Delphi and Delos carried on a flourishing business. Boeckh knew and Salmasius *De Usuris* but does not comment at this point.

The Laurium silver mines were let, being worked by slaves, and eventually Themistocles applied the income to ship building. The captured Thracian gold mines, of which Thucydides owned some, brought in more revenue.

The customs and market duties—the latter probably not levied on natives—amounted to 2%, and there may have been a 1% harbour duty. They later subjected their allies to a 5% duty on imports and exports, and raised it to 10% at Byzantium. Only tyrants levied a tithe on freehold property in Greece. Aliens paid the equivalent of a pound or two a year as protection money. Fines grew progressively severer.

Pericles made lavish use of the allies' tribute: "but while he distributed this money among the people, he built the wealth of Athens upon maritime trade . . . omitting all concern for the welfare of the landholders, whose property he gave up to devastation; and . . . laid the foundation of the unlimited democracy . . . After this, the subjection of the allies was by degrees completely established." Alcibiades doubled the rate of tribute, which was afterwards changed into a 5% transit duty. Dependent allies had to have all disputes for larger sums tried in the courts of Athens. An Athenian general commanded the forces of the "independent" allies. Tributes were sometimes called "contributions," as they are today known as *sacrifices*.

The politicians handed out land as well as money, belonging in this case to the *Cleruchise* or "colonies": "Pericles and his successors, Alcibiades, Cleon and other statesmen, employed it as a means of gaining the favour of the needy citizens."

But the greater the revenue the quicker they squandered it. "Thus was this once great nation forced to beg of Kings." The surplus of the revenue was at one time set aside as a reserve in case of war and named the Public Treasure. But it apparently caused deflation, and nothing remained by 404 B.C.

The public services, named *Liturgies*, had more of the nature of voluntary contributions, although obligatory, for the wealthier citizens took pride in performing them. They obviated "the services of many paid officers and contractors . . . and neither class received the unfair privileges which are enjoyed by the public functionaries and mercantile speculators of modern days."

EXTRAORDINARY REVENUE.

Boeckh examines the extraordinary revenue in his fourth section, and considers that the property tax "did not exist in very early times." The first was levied in 428 B.C. for the Peloponnesian War. Subsequently they "recurred in frequent succession; but for any other object than war, a property tax was scarcely ever levied at Athens." A client of the orator Lysias insisted, "If therefore you counsel well, you will take no less care of our property than of your own . . . you are all well aware that I am a better manager of my own affairs than those who administer the property of the state: if you make me poor, you will injure yourselves, and others will squander away my money, as has been so often the case before."

Large estates appeared with the growth of bureaucracy and banking. The "celebrated banker Pasion, a naturalised foreigner," is cited as an example. The war brought taxes upon moveables also, and in Aristophane's *Knights* Cleon threatens a person with having him registered among the rich, "in order that he might be ruined by property taxes." Finance evidently was interfering with the threefold constitution of Archos, Senate and Assembly.

Yet taxes were not too severe, as in the case of Dionysius the tyrant of Syracuse, "who in five years nearly reduced the citizens to indigence, by means of taxes." At Athens taxation *altogether*, not for one year but for ten, amounted to the tenth of the valuation, or the fiftieth of the property, of the rich Demosthenes during his minority. And the orator himself declared: "Shall I suppose that you will contribute a twelfth? But a tax so high as that you would not endure." In ten years, "he only paid 2 per cent, from his whole property; the same brought in, if it was tolerably managed, 100 per cent." Boeckh admits that, "a frequent repetition of these taxes . . . was a great national calamity."

In 378 B.C., a system of new classes for taxation was instituted, called *summoraiæ*. We read of forced taxation in advance ("as in modern times forced loans have been taken from the rich"), yet a decree of the people was necessary for any tax to be paid in advance, and there was a right of action to recover the advanced money. We may contrast Post War Credits. Resident aliens were rated highly, even oppressively, and the translation mentions Blackstone in whose day the English rates of taxation upon aliens were double those upon natives.

Boeckh examines the burden of the trierarch in detail and concludes that, although the son of Pasion might have

corrupted people by his lavishness, the ancients "would have had more to apprehend from the introduction of our system than we could have of theirs; especially as the means of legal redress were then far more accessible than in modern times," (*i.e.*, in Germany of 1817). He refers to Solon's exchange (*antidosis*) system, whereby a person who thought that he was unfairly asked to bear a burden could nominate another to perform the service or to exchange properties.

The Persian King on occasion subsidised the Greeks in their wars, a useful precedent, as indeed were plunder and captives. The conquered had to pay money as well. Voluntary contributions came in from citizens and especially from resident aliens, like Pasion, who desired the privileges of citizenship.

The Greek states called for loans, and gave bonds of debt, which were sometimes deposited with bankers. The Clazomenians found themselves paying 4 talents interest to their mercenary commanders on 20 talents owing to them; so they coined 20 talents of iron money and exchanged it with their wealthy citizens for silver to redeem the debt. The iron coins served as currency, until redeemed. Dionysius of Syracuse repaid a loan of silver with coins of tin, or in silver coins which he issued at twice their former value; so the ancients knew all about devaluation and revaluation. The Athenians now and then issued alloyed or copper coins, in addition to their usual small pieces. Spartans, and Byzantines, used iron coins for internal use, silver for trade, which Plato recommended. Carthaginians used leather coins.

Only tyrants plundered temples, "yet the confiscation of sacred property is of Grecian origin." The Byzantines farmed out the money-changing business to a single bank, and sold the rights of citizenship.

Xenophon, in about 356 B.C., proposed (*Essay on the Revenues*) remedies that rather favoured the aliens. Boeckh wisely remarks that they during the citizens' absence at war, "having obtained possession of all commerce, all industry, and at last of the land, would have become sole proprietors of all wealth at the expense of the Athenians . . .

Nothing contributed more to the destruction of Athens, than the gradual extinction of the descendants of the ancient Cecropidae; and a foreign race, enriched by banking and other usurious practices, destitute of all noble motives, and bent only upon monetary gain, forced themselves into the rights of citizenship, and the administration of the state." Among all Xenophon's schemes, the exhortation to peace alone is "entirely unobjectionable."

Boeckh concludes his treatise by remarking that without "that energy of individual character, that implacable hatred of oppression and the arbitrary power of rulers, which so distinguished the Greeks, we should in vain hope to escape that destruction in which the states of Greece were ultimately overwhelmed."

He ends the volume with a *Dissertation on the Silver Mines of Laurion in Attica* in which he describes their great contribution to Athenian eminence. The mines probably also provided the lead, which the state was advised to monopolise; also quicksilver ore and 'sil' used for dyeing.

The state held absolute dominion of the mines and granted perpetual leases, to avoid wasteful tenants, for which

the proprietor paid a sum once and for all as entrance money. He also paid an annual tax of one twenty-fourth, and as a tenant was exempt from taxes. But he was liable to the death penalty for such an offence as cutting the supports, which injured the public.

As before noted, "The money accruing from the mines was originally distributed among all the citizens." Every person registered in the book of the Lexiarchs was entitled to receive about 10 drachmas, until Themistocles applied the money to ship-building.

Slaves, who occasionally revolted, did the work. "The Romans condemned the offenders who had been enslaved by public ordinance to work in the mines, in the same manner that criminals of this description are now sent to the mines of Siberia." But Athens could not have done this, as the community did not carry on mining at public expense.

Mine proprietors suffered when Athens was blockaded by sea ("which frequently took place after the loss of its ascendancy"): as they still had to maintain their slaves when the price of corn rose. A measure of corn that cost a drachma in Solon's time cost 2 to 3 in the time of Socrates and Aristophanes, from 5 to 6 in Demosthenes' day, and later reached 18.

Inflation, taxes, war and alien bankers thus had much to do with the decline and fall of Athens, just as abundant currency and a national dividend contributed to her emergence.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

of the neighbourhood hazards of industrial fluorosis in Stoke-on-Trent, so as to estimate the danger to human beings.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works (Mr. Hugh Molson): I am aware that in one investigation large doses of sodium fluoride administered in the diet to rats for more than 10 months produced changes in the kidneys. This is a very different matter from exposure to minute proportions of fluorine in the atmosphere and I know of no new evidence which would suggest that further research on human fluorosis should be undertaken in Stoke-on-Trent. As my hon. Friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health indicated in her speech on the Adjournment on Thursday last, the problem of pollution of the atmosphere with fluorides will no doubt be within the terms of reference of the committee on air pollution which the Government propose to set up.

Dr. Stross: Does not the Parliamentary Secretary see that the evidence existing is that fluorine compounds are being used more and more in industry generally and that there is an increasing hazard to human beings? Would he at least say whether the experiment to which I have referred and which he has quoted is checked to see if it be accurate?

Mr. Molson: There is at present no evidence that the gravity of fluoride poisoning in the case of human beings is sufficient to warrant a detailed investigation by the Medical Research Council. As the hon. Member is aware, in the case of animals the danger of fluoride poisoning is very much greater than in the case of human beings.

National Finance

Local Authorities (Borrowing)

Mr. Holt asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the effect to date of the greater freedom given to local authorities to borrow on the open market since 31st December, 1952; how much has been borrowed on the open market; and how much through the Public Works Loan Board; and if he will now remove the restriction which imposes a maximum period for borrowing of seven years.

Mr. R. A. Butler: Since 1st January, 1953, local authorities have borrowed £13 million by stock issued in the market. I have no information about the amounts borrowed by private mortgages since that date. The Public Works Loan Board have, this year, so far advanced £185,636,296 to local authorities.

I assume that the last part of the Question refers to the requirement that borrowing by local authorities should be for a period of not less than seven years. I see no reason to alter this requirement at present.

House of Commons: May 21, 1953.

Agricultural Grants and Subsidies

Mr. Donnelly asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state in as much detail as possible for each of the years 1945-46 to 1952-53 the total cost to the Treasury of grants to landowners and farmers towards the cost of permanent improvements to agricultural holdings, such as cottages, buildings, water supplies, land drainage, etc.; purchases from farmers of farm produce at figures above market prices; sales to farmers of farm requisites, such as fertilisers, feedingstuffs, etc., at figures below market prices; acreage grants to farmers for converting grassland into tillage, and from the growth of specified crops, such as potatoes, etc., grants to farmers for the maintenance of hill sheep flocks, and for the rearing of calves; and payments to landowners and farmers for any other measures for the promotion of food production not covered by the foregoing, respectively.

Mr. R. A. Butler: Table I gives details of payments to the agricultural industry by way of grant or subsidy in each of the years 1945-46 to 1952-53. With the exception of the first three items in the table, the grants are paid only to occupiers. It is not possible, in the case of these items, to give separate figures for occupiers and landowners who are not occupiers. Table II gives figures where available, of the subsidies on home-produced foodstuffs—that is, of the losses incurred by the Ministry of Food in buying from the producer at the guaranteed price and selling on to reach the consumer at the controlled retail price. For the years covered by the Question there has been no freedom of marketing, and therefore no U.K. market prices, for the products covered in the table. Figures are not always available for the earlier years; the system of accounting in those years did not in every case distinguish between the subsidy on home and that on imported supplies.

TABLE I
(£'000)

	1945-46	1946-47	1947-48	1948-49	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52	Estimated 1952-53
Hill Farm Improvements (including cottages and farm buildings)	—	—	—	16	110	260	488	738
Water Supplies Grants ...	476	580	480	519	765	1,036	1,056	1,075
Land Drainage Grants ...	1,038	1,490	1,510	1,732	1,613	1,629	1,571	1,610
<i>Sales at Reduced Prices</i>								
Fertilisers* ...	5,953	6,982	10,355	12,250	15,250	9,210	—	—
Animal Feedingstuffs ...	13,800	18,000	31,200	70,200	33,600	3,500	24,500	30,000
<i>Grants and Subsidies</i>								
General Fertilisers ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13,000
Grassland Fertilisers ...	—	—	—	—	—	323	3,360	450
Lime ...	2,883	2,611	3,172	4,997	6,010	5,557	4,183	5,000
Ploughing Grassland ...	949	1,577	1,731	5,925	7,178	3,112	2	6,265
Crop Acreage Payments ...	23,168	17,880	17,155	18,544	15,840	11,898	18	2
Hill Sheep Subsidy ...	1,741	1,746	2,186	3,732	2,332	1,159	1,260	580
Hill Cattle Subsidy ...	1,256	1,406	1,066	1,448	1,560	1,501	1,516	1,516
Calf Rearing Subsidy ...	—	—	—	3,637	7,210	6,243	4,944	4,167
Marginal Production and Bracken Clearing Grants ...	312	334	340	353	363	564	897	1,238
Grass Conservation ...	—	—	—	67	74	54	98	10

*Subsidy for year to 30th June.

TABLE II
(£m.)

Commodity	1945-46	1946-47	1947-48	1948-49	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53 (Estimate)
Bacon ...	5.6	4.8	6.4	8.7	22.1	29.6	33.2	24.2
Bread and Flour ...	—	—	—	—	18.9	21.2	17.7	12.1
Shell Eggs ...	13.6	16.0	20.6	22.0	30.0	30.3	25.0	20.0
Meat ...	24.6	28.6	41.7	48.0	30.5	22.8	42.7	35.6
Milk (including Welfare Schemes)	42.2	63.1	66.2	77.5	96.0	106.4	90.8	83.1
Butter ...	—	—	—	—	1.3	1.4	0.2	0.5
Cheese ...	—	—	—	—	2.9	4.0	4.3	1.0
Potatoes and Carrots* (Domestic and Stock-feed) ...	8.3	18.7	10.4	11.6	11.4	4.7	4.7	7.3
Sugar (Domestic) ...	—	—	—	—	3.3	3.7	3.3	2.7
Miscellaneous ...	—	—	—	—	2.3	2.5	0.1	—
TOTAL ...	—	—	—	—	218.7	226.6	222.0	186.5

*The Ministry ceased trading in carrots from 1st March, 1950.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK (continued from page 4.)

lature: "conceded not cheerfully but with fear; and carried by statesmen who have spent their lives in opposing what they now suddenly advocate."

Nevertheless, these sentences reveal a lamentable intellectualisation of society. It is as incorrect to say that "bold and able thinkers" formulate the permanently useful expedients of society as to say that the 'representatives' of the 'common man' do so, or that the 'common man' himself does so. The common and the uncommon man are alike the soil planted with the experimental crop which displays itself

in the harvest of the Common Law. This is not an intellectual function, but an organic function.

But, to return to *The Table's* mythical enhanced purchasing power:—The man-hours per unity of production, including transportation and distribution probably decreased in the ratio of about 100 to 15 between 1913 and 1945. If prices were based on true cost, therefore, the 1946 pound would have been worth about £6 12s. 0d. instead of 8s. 4d. as it was. And what is it now?