

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 30. No. 25.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 15, 1953.

6d. Weekly.

Churchill as the 'Honest Broker'

(continued)

Churchill at this time (1930) saw clearly the reasons for doubting that institutions based on adult suffrage could arrive at correct decisions "upon the intricate propositions of modern business and finance. Of course," he said, "if the House of Commons shut itself up for three or four weeks to debate upon a long and profoundly considered series of resolutions on the present new and serious economic position of this island, and of the Empire of which it is the heart, it might well be that when the doors were opened some one would emerge with a bold plan and a resolute majority. But the attempt to find the best way out of our economic difficulties by party politicians urgently looking for popular election cries, or the means to work up prejudice against those cries, [our emphasis] is hardly likely to lead to a successful result." He admitted the need to find "in a reasonably short time" a national policy to reinvigorate our economic life and achieve a more rapid progress in the material well-being of the whole people. It might well be that the measures which in the course of several years would vastly improve our economic position actually and relatively, and open broadly to us the high roads of the future, would be extremely unpopular, and that no single party, even if they possessed the secret, would be able to carry their policy through in the face of opposition by the others. In fact it would probably be safe to say that nothing that is popular and likely to gather a large number of votes will do what is wanted and win the prize which all desire."

It is, of course, possible that Churchill had nothing more in mind than the "austerities" incidental to "sound" finance; but hear him:

"Let us now look at some of the economic issues about which our partisans contend so loudly and about which great numbers of intelligent people are in honest doubt.

"The classical doctrines of economics have for nearly a century found their citadels in the Treasury and the Bank of England. In their pristine vigour these doctrines comprise among others the following tenets: Free imports, irrespective of what other countries may do and heedless of the consequences to any particular native industry or interest. Ruthless direct taxation for the repayment of debt without regard to the effects of such taxation upon individuals or their enterprise or initiative. Rigorous economy in all forms of expenditure whether social or military. Stern assertion of the rights of the creditor, national or private, and full and effectual discharge of all liabilities. Profound distrust of State-stimulated industry in all its forms, or of

State borrowing for the purpose of creating employment. Absolute reliance upon private enterprise, unfettered and unfavoured by the State. These principles, and others akin to them, are all part of one general economic conception, amplified and expounded in all the Victorian text-books and endorsed by most modern histories extant and current.

"Whatever we may think about these doctrines—and I am not to-day pronouncing upon them—we can clearly see that they do not correspond to what is going on now. No doubt each political party picks out unconsciously from these tables of economic law the tenets which they think will be most agreeable to the crowd that votes for them, or which they hope will vote for them. They ignore or transgress the others. They then proceed to plume themselves upon their orthodoxy. But the growth of public opinion, and still more of voting opinion, violently and instinctively rejects many features in this massive creed. No one, for instance, will agree that wages should be settled only by the higgling of the market. No one would agree that modern world dislocation of industry through new processes, or the development of new regions, or the improvement of international communications, or through gigantic speculations, should simply be met by preaching thrift and zeal to the displaced worker. Few would agree that private enterprise is the sole agency by which fruitful economic undertakings can be launched or conducted. An adverse conviction on all these points is general, and practice has long outstripped conviction. The climate of opinion in which we live to-day assigns the highest importance to minimum standards of life and labour. It is generally conceded that the humble local toiler must be protected or insured against exceptional external disturbance. It is admitted increasingly every day that the State should interfere in industry—some say by tariffs, some by credits, some say by direct control, and all by workshop regulations; and far-reaching structures of law are already in existence under several of these heads. Enormous expenditures have grown up for social and compassionate purposes. Direct taxation has risen to heights never dreamed of by the old economists and statesmen, and at these heights has set up many far-reaching reactions of an infrugal and even vicious character. We are in presence of new forces not existing when the text-books were written. There are the violent changes in world prices and in the localities where the leadership of particular industries is situated all unmitigated by any steady uptide of British population and consuming power. There is the power of vast accumulations of capital to foresee and to forestall beneficial expenditure in new regions or upon new processes.

(continued on page 5.)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: July 7, 1953.

Foreign Competition (Export Subsidies)

Mr. Russell asked the President of the Board of Trade to what extent he has information that United Kingdom exports, especially to South America, are being handicapped by subsidised exports from foreign countries.

Mr. Mackeson: Certain foreign Governments have special incentives for their exporters which, in our view, act as export subsidies. These schemes are one of several factors contributing to the increased competition which our exporters are meeting in South America as in other markets, but their effect cannot be measured in isolation.

Mr. Russell: Can my hon. Friend say what steps he is taking to bring this up to the Committee which is responsible for running G.A.T.T.?

Mr. Mackeson: Yes, Sir. We are talking to individual Governments, raising the matter with the appropriate international institutions and, in particular, with the International Monetary Fund and with O.E.E.C.

Mr. Bottomley: Is the House to be informed of any success following the visit of the Joint Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs? The Secretary for Overseas Trade will remember that I said that it was the job of the Joint Under-Secretary to report to us as well, if he had any information of any kind.

Mr. Mackeson: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will put down that question to the Foreign Secretary.

Mr. K. Thompson: Is the Minister aware that one of the most important subsidies for exports to other countries is extended credit, and that efforts on the part of British exporters to offer extended credit have been hampered to some extent by the increase in the rates charge by the E.C.G.D. covering these exports, and will he look into it?

Mr. Mackeson: I will gladly look into it, but I should like to see that supplementary question in writing.

£ Sterling (Purchasing Power)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the purchasing power of the £ at the latest available date taking June, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952 as 20s., respectively.

Mr. R. A. Butler: On the basis of the figure for May, 1953, in the Ministry of Labour Interim Index of Retail Prices, which is the only official price index available monthly, the answers are respectively 15s. 7d., 15s. 10d., 16s. 2d., 17s. 9d. and 19s. 7d.

Sir W. Smithers: Will the Chancellor warn the country and himself before it is too late that increases in taxes, rates and wages can result only in a vicious spiral and a further depreciation of the paper £, and that in a country which cannot be self-supporting they must increase our cost of production and impede or destroy our ability to export at world competitive prices, which we must do or starve.

Mr. Butler: I accept the personal warning from my hon. Friend. With regard to the national impact, I hope attention will be paid to my hon. Friend's words.

Mr. Bottomley: Would the right hon. Gentleman agree that a £ worth 20s. in October, 1951, is today worth only 18s. 7d.?

Mr. Butler: I do not think things are quite as simple as that. If the right hon. Gentleman will study this Question and then put down a further Question to me, we may get it straight.

NATIONAL FINANCE

Canada (Payments to United Kingdom)

Mr. Erroll asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the separate totals of Treasury receipts of Canadian dollars arising out of export sales and Canadian investment income for each annual accounting period since the end of the war.

Mr. R. A. Butler: It is not the practice to publish details of United Kingdom estimates of the balance of payments with single countries. The yearly figures published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as to Canadian payments to the United Kingdom on account of imports and interest and dividends are, however, as follows:

CANADIAN* PAYMENTS TO THE U.K.

(Can. \$ millions)

	Imports f.o.b.	Interest and dividends
1946	138	54
1947	182	53
1948	287	50
1949	300	55
1950	399	55
1951	417	57
1952	350	56

* Including Newfoundland from 1949.

House of Commons: July 8, 1953.

Colonial Judges (Termination of Appointments)

Mr. Marlowe asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies what safeguards exist to prevent the removal from office of a colonial judge who is fit, competent and of good behaviour, at the will of the executive before he reaches his retiring age; and in what circumstances, before the pleasure of the Crown is exercised to terminate any such appointment, an address is required either from the Imperial Parliament or from the colonial legislative assembly concerned.

Mr. Lyttelton: The removal of a colonial judge, while fit and under retiring age, from an office which still existed would be regarded as dismissal and therefore require reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I do not know of any circumstances in which an address from Parliament or a Colonial Legislature is required before the appointment of a colonial judge can be terminated.

Mr. Marlowe: Is my right hon. Friend aware that High Court judges in this country can only be dismissed or removed by legislation of both House of Parliament and that a recent High Court ruling has shown that a colonial judge can be removed at the will of the Executive at any time without any reason given? Does not that make nonsense of the statement which my right hon. Friend made last week that a colonial judge enjoyed the same security, and is he not quite wrong when he endorses the statement of his predecessor that there is no difference between the two? Does he not agree that this is a matter for investigation?

Mr. Lyttelton: I think that my hon. and learned Friend is quite right in taking a particular interest in this Question. He has, in the course of his supplementary question, attributed a number of statements to me which I did not make. In the case of a dismissal, as I have said, it would require the assent of the Secretary of State and reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I am satisfied that *de facto* colonial judges enjoy the same immunity from dismissal from the Executive as High Court judges in this country. If that position can be improved upon by any practical methods, I will examine them.

Mr. Marlowe: My right hon. Friend is misinformed again, because in the particular case in which High Court proceedings were taken there was no reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council at all. His Department keep maintaining that people cannot be removed without close investigation by the Judicial Committee and that they enjoy the same security as in this country, but this particular judge was removed without any such inquiry and without any cause of complaint made against him.

Mr. Lyttelton: My hon. and learned Friend keeps on referring to the dismissal of this judge. He was not dismissed.

Mr. Gordon Walker: If the right hon. Gentleman says that these colonial judges enjoy the same practical security as judges here, would it not be wise to give them the same legal security, as well?

Mr. Lyttelton: That is a question that I am quite willing to examine. It is not quite so simple as it sounds, because it would probably have to depend on local legislation and local legislation can be set aside by other local legislation. I am willing to re-examine the matter, but my present opinion, which is liable to change, is in fact—[*Interruption.*] Anybody's opinion can be changed on examination of the facts. It is only the obstinacy of some hon. Members opposite which leads them to take a wrong view.

U.N. Refugee Organisations (U.K. Contributions)

Sir R. Acland asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will publish a table showing what payments this country has made to the United Nations Relief Works Agency for Palestine, the United Nations Relief of Palestine Refugees, the International Refugee Organisation and the United Nations Commission for Refugees, showing in which years the payments were made; and what further payments are either promised or intended in future years to these or to other similar organisations,

Mr. Nutting: Below is a table showing payments made by Her Majesty's Government to the organisations listed by the hon. Member.

The United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees and the International Refugee Organisation have ceased to exist and the question of further payments does not, therefore, arise. Her Majesty's Government's contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for the year July, 1953, to June, 1954, is now under consideration.

The administrative expenses of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees form part of the general United Nations budget and are borne by the United Kingdom on the basis of our normal percentage assessment of the budget as a whole. No further United Kingdom contribution has been promised to the United Nations Refugee Emergency Fund; and any such contribution would require consideration in the light of future circumstances.

UNITED KINGDOM CONTRIBUTIONS TO POST-WAR REFUGEE ORGANISATIONS.

Year	European refugees	Arab refugees
	£ <i>International Refugee Organisation</i>	£ <i>United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees</i>
1947-48 ...	5,618,557	
1948-49 ...	5,665,625	1,000,000
1949-50 ...	5,637,057	100,000
		<i>United Nations Relief and Works Agency</i>
1950-51 ...	3,927,846	2,000,000
1951-52 ...	866,248	2,500,000
	<i>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees†</i>	
1952-53 ...	100,000	4,000,000
1953-54 ...		4,000,000*
Total ...	£21,815,333	£13,600,000

*Included in the Estimates but not yet paid to U.N.R.W.A.

—	Year	Total budget	U.K. percentage assessment
Office of United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	1951	U.S. \$ 218,353	11.37
	1952	639,100	10.56
	1953	650,000	10.30

£ Sterling (Purchasing Power)

Mr. Swingler asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what, at the latest date, was the purchasing power of the
(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. 25.

Saturday, August 15, 1953.

From Week to Week

It has not escaped the notice of several acute observers who are readers of *The Social Crediter* that the issue before us is becoming rapidly clarified. They, at all events, recognise why 'a change of heart at the centre' (i.e., within the Secretariat, not within the Bank of England) cannot possibly occur, and would involve the final and disastrous collapse of the Social Credit movement if this were otherwise. It is not entirely flippant to suggest that 'the Centre' hasn't got a heart to change; all it pretends to is a mind reasonably certain of its own content. That it should aim to possess this was one of Douglas's most recent and most emphatic and considered requirements. He enjoined that we should be clear in circumstances where apparently most others (the opposition itself possibly not excepted) were confused.

Those who are most closely in touch with 'the Centre' collectively cover a wide field. One or two have the 'stance' of the eye's view of a fairly high bird; but, be that as it may, collectively what is viewed is a considerable expanse of human experience and current report. Not much, we believe, is missed. Others, with greater facilities, miss a great deal because intensity is their aim rather than range: they have partiality. To this cause, which is in line with the technologically specialised tendencies of the present age, and, indeed, its besetting sin, we ascribe, in part at least, the psychological resistance which is so discouraging a feature of the terrain over which Social Crediters have to travel. But this resistance must sensibly diminish with advancing clarification of the nature of the fundamental division in human society.

Were our facilities increased, there would be more expedition about our reports; but we should bear in mind that tall oaks grow only slowly from little acorns, direction is more important than speed, and a 'stop-press'-news mentality lacks other things besides serenity. Doubtless we should have noticed years ago the political implications of, for example, Professor C. G. Jung's interest in "the misappropriation of power." While the same writer's concern with "how and why the devil got into the consulting room of the psychiatrist," a concern explicit as long ago as 1951 (if that is long ago), is not far removed from the concern we should feel if he got in among us. Nevertheless, this concern is not any more an affair of the heart merely because the physical exertion of the chase makes our heart beat faster.

And what we are saying, in any case, seems to promise a near future in which, even if the excitement increases, the call for exertion may be less.

"May be . . ." We recognise that, such is the deference paid by the modern 'upholder' of 'sound' doctrine to the prejudices of his employer, much which attracts our approving attention has to be 'slipped in' under cover of less admirable paragraphs, and that the covering, hiding, volume is immense. But this does not apply to Jung and his collaborators. Nor does this apply to the English lawyers whose attention converges increasingly upon fundamentals. (We may, for emphasis here recount the experience of a student of Law at one of the 'older' universities who

(continued on page 8.)

"The Australian Social Crediter"

However greatly it may surprise our Australian friends to hear it, we deem what is called the Social Credit 'Movement'—the movement which does not seem to move (and perhaps is all the more important for that reason) to be better situated than anywhere else in the world at the present moment in *Australia*. It has even been under consideration to transfer the headquarters (the 'centre') of the Social Credit Secretariat to Australia, for a time, a step which would greatly affront what may be termed "English Nationalism," and thus incidentally Social Crediters all over the world. There are sound Social Crediters in Canada, in New Zealand and in many other places; but they are not so *visibly* holding their own against immense pressure anywhere as in Australia. ("New France"—the chosen designation for the territory dominated by *Vers Demain*—is a special case, and is here exempted from consideration).

Without hesitation we ascribe the fortunate position which we deem to exist in Australia primarily to the activities and initiative of three men, Dr. Bryan Monahan, the late Mr. W. Hand and Mr. H. A. Scoular, respectively the adviser, the founder and the editor of *The Australian Social Crediter*.

This noble effort ceased publication on July 25, and in its issue for that date announced that subscribers who were in credit for further issues might choose to transfer this to (1) *The Social Crediter*, or (2) *The New Times* (Melbourne), or (3) credit for books published by Tidal Publications (Sydney). We do not demur: this is the subscriber's business. *The New Times* is admirably conducted on lines which many Social Crediters in England would like to impose, by hook or by crook, upon *The Social Crediter* itself. But we adhere to the conviction that it does this at the high level which gains our admiration *because of* the continued existence of *The Australian Social Crediter* since December 1, 1945. In this connection, the existence of *The Social Crediter* since 1938 just doesn't matter. "One day," says a farewell editorial, "because it may be possible, or necessary, we may resume publication." We have underlined the words which make this assertion truly distinguished, and, in doing so, perhaps we may venture to hope that the coming Australian Spring will justify and reinforce the confidence of Mr. Scoular and reverse what must be in his mind a sense of disappointment. He has done what is right. In passing, we notice that Mr. Scoular's major problem was not money but personnel: there is a limit to heroic private enterprise.

CHURCHILL AS THE 'HONEST BROKER'—

(continued from page 1.)

There are the remarkable economies with their consequent competitive dominance which flow from scientific mass production. There is the vast network of cartels and trading agreements which has grown up irrespective of frontiers, national sentiments, and fiscal laws. All these are new factors. These examples could be multiplied, but enough will suffice. It is certain that the economic problem with which we are now confronted is not adequately solved, indeed is not solved at all, by the teachings of the text-books however grand may be their logic, however illustrious may be their authors.

"But a harder task lies before us than the mere breaking up of old-established conclusions. It may well be indeed that these conclusions are sound, that they are the true foundations of the palace in which we seek some day to dwell. Our task is not to break up these foundations and use the fragments as missiles in party warfare. Our task is to build another storey upon them equally well-proportioned, symmetrical and unified. This then and nothing else is the dangerous puzzle with which you now confront your ancient and admirable Parliamentary institutions and the harassed managers or leaders of your political parties. If the doctrines of the old economists no longer serve for the purposes of our society, they must be replaced by a new body of doctrine equally well-related in itself, and equally well-fitting into a general theme. There is no reason that the new system should be at variance with the old. There are many reasons why it should be a consistent, but a more complex, secondary application.

"I will take a sharp illustration. On the one hand we are told that imports injure our prosperity, and that we should insulate ourselves against them and substantially abate their volume. Something like this, you will remember, was done for us in the war by the German submarines. On the other hand there is the view that it is what comes into the island rather than what goes out of it that we enjoy: and that to refuse imports is to refuse the payment for your exports and consequently to impede your exports, or else it is to refuse to receive the interest upon your immense foreign investments. Therefore, it is argued, the more imports the merrier. But why should we accept this bleak dichotomy? Could we not by a selective process so handle the matter that while the volume of imports actually increased or remained constant, its character would be changed, and the commodities which compose it and the sources from which they come would be quite differently proportioned. What is required is not a simple Aye or No, but a discriminating process based upon systematized principles. These principles, no doubt, exist; but they are hardly likely to be discovered for regulating either imports or exports, by candidates for Parliament promising to protect their local industries; or by any favours which Ministers may bestow upon the mining constituencies whose support they enjoy.

"It is evidently a matter requiring high, cold, technical, and dispassionate or disinterested decision. It is a matter requiring stiff rules to which local and individual interests can be made to conform.

"I cannot believe that the true principles will be dis-

covered by our excellent Parliamentary and electoral institutions—not even if they are guided by our faithful and energetic Press. We might have a General Election in which eight million voters were taught to sing in chorus, 'Make the foreigner pay,' and eight million more to chant in unison, 'Give the rich man's money to the poor, and so increase the consuming power'; and five other million to intone, 'Your food will cost you more.' We might have all this; we probably shall! But even so we may be none the wiser or the better off.

"Beyond our immediate difficulty lies the root problem of modern world economics; namely, the strange discordance between the consuming and producing power."

We emphasise the opinion. Churchill went on: "Is it not astonishing that with all our knowledge and science, with the swift and easy means of communication and correspondence which exist all over the world, that the most powerful and highly organised communities should remain the sport and prey of these perverse tides and currents? Who would have thought that it should be easier to produce by toil and skill all the most necessary or desirable commodities than it is to find consumers for them? Who would have thought that cheap and abundant supplies of all the basic commodities should find the science and civilisation of the world unable to utilise them? Have all our triumphs of research and organisation bequeathed us only a new punishment—the Curse of Plenty? Are we really to believe that no better adjustment can be made between supply and demand? Yet the fact remains that every attempt has so far failed. Many various attempts have been made, from the extremes of Communism in Russia to the extremes of Capitalism in the United States. They include every form of fiscal policy and currency policy. But all have failed, and we have advanced little further in this quest than in barbaric times. Surely it is this mysterious crack and fissure at the basis of all our arrangements and apparatus upon which the keenest minds throughout the world should be concentrated."

Again we emphasise the opinion, adding that to our knowledge Churchill had at this time been made well acquainted, while 'resting' in a pleasanter climate than our own, with all that Douglas had to say on this vital point. He recognised that "Lasting fame and great advantage would attend the nation which first secured the prize. But here again it is doubtful whether Democracy or Parliamentary government, or even a General Election, will make a decisively helpful contribution.

"Are we, or are we not, capable of a higher and more complex economic, fiscal, and financial policy? Are we not capable of evolving a united body of doctrine adapted to our actual conditions and requirements? Could not such a system of policy be presented and accepted upon a national and not a party basis? Could it not when devised be taken out of the political brawling and given a fair trial by overwhelming national consent? Here then is the crux for Parliament. Many dangers threaten representative institutions once they have confided themselves to adult suffrage. There are dangers from the right and dangers from the left. We see examples of both in Europe to-day. But the British Parliamentary system will not be overthrown by political agitation: for that is what it specially comprehends.

It will pass only when it has shown itself incapable of dealing with some fundamental and imperative economic need; and such a challenge is now open.

"It must be observed that economic problems, unlike political issues, cannot be solved by any expression, however vehement, of the national will, but only by taking the right action. You cannot cure cancer by a majority. What is wanted is a remedy. Every one knows what the people wish. They wish for more prosperity. How to get it? *That is the grim question, and neither the electors nor their representatives are competent to answer it. Governments and the various parties moving in the political sphere are not free to proclaim the proper remedies in their completeness, even if they knew them.* [The emphasis is ours.] All kinds of popular cries can be presented for an election, and each may contain some measure of the truth. None in itself will provide us with the key. For this reason opinion has been turning towards the treatment of the subject on national and non-party lines. The leaders of parties, we are told, should meet together and arrive at a common policy. *But these leaders, having their being in the political sphere, would not be able at such a conference to do much more than to restate in civil terms the well-known differences and antagonisms which they represent.* [We underline his words.]

"It would seem, therefore," he went on "that if new light is to be thrown upon this grave and clamant problem, it must in the first instance receive examination from a non-political body, free altogether from party exigencies, and composed of persons possessing special qualifications in economic matters. Parliament would, therefore, be well advised to create such a body subordinate to itself, and assist its deliberations to the utmost. The spectacle of an Economic sub-Parliament debating day after day with fearless detachment from public opinion all the most disputed questions of Finance and Trade, and reaching conclusions by voting, would be an innovation easily to be embraced by our flexible constitutional system. I see no reason why the political Parliament should not choose in proportion to its party groupings a subordinate Economic Parliament of say one-fifth of its numbers, and composed of persons of high technical and business qualifications."

Here Churchill descended from the relatively high level of discernment which had marked his address up to this point. Perhaps he had his tongue in his cheek. In any case he did not hesitate to gild his lily such as it was:—The idea he said, "has received much countenance in Germany. I see no reason why such an assembly should not debate in the open light of day and without caring a halfpenny who won the General Election, or who had the best slogan for curing Unemployment, all the grave economic issues by which we are now confronted and afflicted. I see no reason why the Economic Parliament should not for the time being command a greater interest than the political Parliament; nor why the political Parliament should not assist it with its training and experience in methods of debate and procedure. What is required is a new *personnel* adapted to the task which has to be done, and pursuing that task day after day without the distractions of other affairs and without fear, favour, or affection. The conclusions of such a body, al-

though themselves devoid of legal force, might well, if they commanded a consensus of opinion, supply us with a comprehensive and unified view of high expert authority, which could then be remitted in its integrity to the political sphere."

It is curious that high intelligence can so easily succumb to a phrase: "Consensus of opinion"—a "common" consensus or a consensus of the selected? To whom is the "sense" to appear?—To the dismissed electorate or to the chosen who "care not a halfpenny"?

"Let me" said Churchill "recapitulate the argument I have submitted to you upon this aspect of political science. The economic problem for Great Britain and her Empire is urgent, vital, and dominant. There exists at the present time no constitutional machinery for dealing with it on its merits, with competent examination and without political bias and antagonisms. The House of Commons, to which the anxious nation looks to provide a solution [its instinct led it to believe there *was* a solution], is unsuited both by its character and the conditions which govern its life to fulfil such a task. Nevertheless, the task has to be done. Britain is unconquerable and will not fail to find a way through her difficulties. Parliament is therefore upon its trial, and if it continues to show itself incapable of offering sincere and effective guidance at this juncture, our Parliamentary institutions, so admirable in the political sphere, may well fall under a far-reaching condemnation. [And haven't they?] If Parliament, and the Ministries dependent upon Parliament, cannot proclaim a new policy, the question arises whether they should not, while time remains, create a new instrument specially adapted for the purpose, and delegate to that instrument all the necessary powers and facilities." Adapted for the purpose, yes; we would only remark how vaguely the purpose has been defined.

"I hope you will feel I have been justified in troubling you to-day with these anxious matters," the lecturer went on. "These eventful years through which we are passing are not less serious for us than the years of the Great War. They belong to the same period. The grand and victorious summits which the British Empire won in that war are being lost in the years which followed the peace. We see our race doubtful of its mission and no longer confident about its principles, infirm of purpose, drifting to and fro with the tides and currents of a deeply disturbed ocean. The compass has been damaged. The charts are out of date. The crew have to take it in turns to be Captain; and every captain before every movement of the helm has to take a ballot not only of the crew but of an ever-increasing number of passengers. Yet within this vessel there abides all the might and fame of the British race and all the treasures of all the peoples in one-fifth of the habitable globe. Let this University bear her part in raising our economic thought to the height of the situation with which we are confronted and thereafter in enforcing action, without which such thought is vain."

So there!

Order the book you need from:—

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., LIVERPOOL.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

£ as compared with 1887 or the nearest year to 1887 for which figures are available.

Mr. Maudling: Comparison with periods before the First World War is difficult because of the absence of official statistics. Bearing in mind this reservation, it is estimated that the purchasing power of the £ in May, 1953, was roughly one-quarter of what it was in 1887. The basis of the calculation is as follows:

Between 1887 and 1914 unofficial but published estimates of price changes are used.

Between 1914 and 1938 the Ministry of Labour cost of living index is used.

Between 1938 and 1952 the price index for all consumer goods and services calculated annually for national income purposes is used.

Since 1952 the index is provisionally brought up to date by using the Ministry of Labour interim index of retail prices.

Electricity (Windmill Generation Experiments)

Mr. Neal asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what progress he can report concerning the experiments in the generation of electricity by windmill.

Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd: Experimental work is in hand on two 100 kilowatt windmills, one erected by the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board in Orkney and one just completed for the British Electricity Authority and now being tested by the Manufacturers before erection in Wales. My Department is collaborating with these organisations and with the Electrical Research Association on basic work, and has recently bought for test a smaller windmill working, like the British Electricity Authority 100 kilowatt machine, on the Andreau principle.

House of Commons: July 9, 1953.

Adventurers Fen, Burwell

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Agriculture why he proposes to hand back to the National Trust land in Adventurers Fen, in Burwell and Swaffham, in view of their expressed intention to flood it; how much public money has been spent by the agricultural executive committee; and if he will make a statement on the particulars which have been sent to him.

Sir T. Dugdale: Adventurers Fen was derequisitioned last year, in accordance with the recommendations in Section VII of the report of the Agricultural Land Commission. This land formed part of a larger area of requisitioned land at Swaffham Prior and Burwell Fens and it is not possible to allocate expenditure by the County Agricultural Executive Committee between different parts of the total area. I am satisfied, however, that the crops obtained during the period of requisition justified the cost.

Sir W. Smithers: How does the Minister justify, under Section 84, (1, a and b) of the Agriculture Act, 1947, making derelict good agricultural land by flooding?

Sir T. Dugdale: I think the hon. Member has a Question on that Section later on, but as far as this land is concerned it is curious that he should object to my returning to the National Trust land which was their property previously.

Mr. G. Brown: But would it not be better to use the provisions of the Act to acquire this land and keep it in food production.

Mr. Bullard: Can my right hon. Friend say how much land is involved in this proposal to re-flood land? While we want to keep as much land in the Fens as possible in cultivation, will he also bear in mind the naturalist side of this problem, because the research work done at Wicken and Burwell is enormously important?

Nationalisation (Government Policy)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Agriculture if he is aware that his use of the Agricultural Marketing Acts and other Acts is leading the way to the nationalisation of the farming industry; and if he will make a statement on his future policy in this regard.

Sir T. Dugdale: No, Sir. On the contrary, the Government are moving steadily towards a freer agricultural economy, as is shown by the decontrol of eggs and the forthcoming decontrol of cereals and feedingstuffs.

Sir W. Smithers: Whatever the Minister says, does he not realise that in fact he is operating the Socialist policy of land nationalisation, that farmers are being dispossessed without the right of appeal to an ordinary traditional court of English law on points of fact and merit, and would he, as a Conservative Minister, stop doing these things?

Sir T. Dugdale: That has nothing whatever to do with the Marketing Acts. It may be of interest to my hon. Friend to know that any Marketing scheme, before it becomes the law of the land, must first come to this House and then be agreed to by a large majority of the producers themselves.

Mr. G. Brown: Will the right hon. Gentleman accept that anxiety by the farmers about setting the industry free is the biggest conclusive proof that he is not operating Socialist policy?

Mock Auctions

Mr. Dodds asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will inquire into the methods being practised by an increasing number of mock auction businesses, with a view to considering legislation to protect the public and traders against this form of trading.

Sir H. Lucas-Tooth: My right hon. and learned Friend has recently agreed to a request from the National Chamber of Trade to send a deputation to the Home Office to discuss this matter.

Mr. Dodds: Is the hon. Gentleman's right hon. and learned Friend aware that there is a tremendous increase in this type of business and, despite the clever technique involved, it is in the main nothing less than bare-faced robbery?

Sir H. Lucas-Tooth: As the hon. Member has given

notice that he intends to raise the matter on the Adjournment tomorrow, I think it might be more appropriate to discuss it then.

AGRICULTURE

Common Land

Mr. G. Williams asked the Minister of Agriculture if he has considered using common land, in suitable circumstances, for agricultural purposes.

Sir T. Dugdale: As the law stands at present the agricultural use of common land is severely restricted. Certain commons, requisitioned under emergency powers, will be retained under cultivation for as long as those powers continue. Apart from this there is little initiative which the law allows me to take. It is, however, open to persons with an interest in a common to co-operate over the improvement of the grazing, and I hope that this will be done in many places.

Average Milk Yield

Dr. Stross asked the Minister of Agriculture the estimated average milk yield from cows in gallons per year for 1952-53 and the yield pre-war; and what future improvement he expects.

Sir T. Dugdale: The estimated average annual milk yield per cow in the United Kingdom in 1952-53 is 609 gallons. The comparable pre-war figure was 542 gallons. Over the past two or three years the average annual increase has been between 1 and 2 per cent., and I should expect this average rate of improvement at least to be maintained in the future.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK— (continued from page 4.)

told his tutor that since all true Law depended upon the co-existence of effective sanctions there could be no such thing as 'International' Law—"Good God, young man! You may be quite right; doubtless you *are* quite right; but you mustn't let anyone hear you say that nowadays!" Note that the tutor here said two things, both important, and how important the student well understood.)

Of the under-cover passages, we present the following, which embodies the vital information which it has been the objective of this journal to propagate for some years past:—

"The final chapter is one of criticism. The politics of modern Gnosticism are recognised as the dominant strand in modern politics, but not the whole; and at the same time they are recognised as inherently self-defeating. The mechanism of the self-defeat is simple but conclusive. The Gnostic (whether he is 'Puritan,' liberal, progressive or communist) interprets society and its order as an eschaton [1]; he does not want society to exist unless its order represents the specific type of 'soteriological [2] truth' in which he believes. His aim is to secure the monopoly of existential representation in his society, but only as a means to imposing a particular kind of transcendental representation which nevertheless is unavoidably destructive of the existential order. The 'truth' he embraces is a dream that bears no relation to the *conditio humana*, and in the

end it can be maintained only by the forcible suppression of whatever opposes it. The criticism is neat, but at some points it is uneconomical in its reliance upon unnecessarily extensive assumptions. Perhaps the most serious defect of the whole account is the under-estimate of the strength and vitality throughout modern European history of what may be called neo-Augustinian politics as both the partner and opponent of Gnostic politics."

(Editorial Note: (1) "eschaton": ? *eschatos* (Gr.), last, final. (2) "soteriological," saviour-speaking. The paragraph is from that popular sheet, *The Times Literary Supplement*.)

So at last it is admitted that the politics of Gnosticism are recognised as the dominant strand. If, as we said, we had a heart, with this encouragement to the contrary we certainly should not change it.

THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

by C. H. Douglas.

This book is the last of the contributions to the understanding of world politics written during the war of 1939-1945 by the author of SOCIAL CREDIT. The series began with THIS 'AMERICAN' BUSINESS (August, 1940) and continued and expanded with THE BIG IDEA (1942), THE 'LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN) PEOPLE' RACKET (1943), and, PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR (1943).

There is no comparable commentary on the causes of the war and the ultimate seat of responsibility for the threat to civilisation and even the continuance of human life, which outlasts the coming of "Peace," by any writer in any country.

It embodies an analysis of the policy now known as *Mond-Turnerism*.

8/6 net.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD., LIVERPOOL, 2.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton.