

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 5. No. 16.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1940.

6d. Weekly.

THE WHOLE CASE FOR FEDERAL UNION

By N. F. W.

Two books side by side often make enlightening comparison. A good example of this occurs in W. B. Curry's *The Case for Federal Union* alongside *The Dead Hand of Bureaucracy* by Dennis Sullivan.

On the cover of Mr. Curry's book Wickham Steed is quoted to the effect that it represents one of the soundest pieces of constructive reasoning he has ever read. But a man of Mr. Steed's ability, were his mind not already made up in the matter, must surely see that the whole volume is a piece of special pleading, with as little relation to philosophic fact as a defence by a brilliant counsel in the Law Courts. In short, as its title implies, it is a "case;" and its presentation, notwithstanding a reasoned and judicious tone, has an insistence that subtly suggests the witness-box in its unconscious effort to grasp and impound our judgement.

Re-reading Mr. Curry, what strikes one most is the under-current of fear, of sheer cold panic in his writing. He gives the impression of being in the grip of two all-pervading obsessions: war and the United States of America. These two factors seem to loom larger than Life itself to him, as is the way with obsessions. It is no travesty of the intention of his book to say that it is entirely based on the assumption that national sovereignty is the cause of war, and that federation in the manner of the United States is not only its cure, but the cure of all our social ills as well.

This is not, of course, a scientific proposition, and therefore not a sound method of arriving at a correct solution of our problem. Nevertheless, if evidence were forthcoming of a sound "result" under federation in the particular area, there is no doubt a sound case could be made, even from so unpromising a start; the method of science allows of

the greater being deduced correctly from the lesser, within certain limits.

But Mr. Curry is content with his assumption, and brings forward no evidence in its support. "It is clear," he says, "that where Federal Union has actually been attempted, as in the United States of America, in Switzerland, in Canada, in Australia, in the Union of South Africa, it has actually worked."

But is it clear? To those of us who may not think so, Mr. Curry supplies no help. And since he does not define what he means by "working," as used here, we are forced back on what we can discover of the actual conditions of America to furnish this, and here Mr. Dennis Sullivan should be of assistance.

"We must ask ourselves," Mr. Curry says elsewhere in his book, "what are the fundamental political conditions out of which the likelihood and possibility of wars arise. Under what condition would it have been impossible for Hitler to emerge from the position of an obscure neurotic and become the menace of the whole world?"

In Mr. Curry's estimation those conditions are supplied by the United States. So that the whole validity of his contentions, and of his book, and indeed of *the whole case for Federal Union*, which is no small matter, rests upon the demonstration supplied by the United States that it is organically more sound and structurally different *in kind* not only from our own modest monarchy, but from those European states that exemplify in extreme degree the conditions of inflamed national sovereignty, which Federal Unionists claim, is the prime cause of war.

Let Mr. Sullivan speak then, keeping in mind that he is evidence for the Federal Case; and that incidentally he is defining for us what Mr. Curry means

by the intransitive verb "to work." His authority, as far as we are concerned, being neither more nor less than Mr. Curry's.

Mr. Sullivan's theme is American Bureaucracy, described by him as "representative government suffering a nervous breakdown." An apt comment on one's own impression of panic in Mr. Curry's book. What follows is taken for convenience from a précis in the *Readers Digest*, so as to give a picture in the smallest possible space. It will be seen straight away that Mr. Sullivan in Washington takes a rather different view of the matter to that of Mr. Curry in Devon:

"To check the crippling influence of runaway bureaucracy is our foremost problem; and upon its solution depends the survival of the American way of life. The sheer bulk and range of government to-day, top-heavy, loose-jointed and running amuck with arbitrary powers, has become a suffocating restraint upon our whole economy.

"In the last 140 years our national population has multiplied by 25. But the machinery of federal government, as measured by administrative personnel, has multiplied by the astounding figure of 17,950—more than 700 times faster than the population. It is a maze of ten Departments, 134 subsidiary Bureaus, Divisions, Authorities, and Agencies, and 68 independent establishments, employing, altogether over a million persons. . . ."

"The significant fact about these bureaus and commissions is that they are responsible directly to no elective authority. For all practical purposes the commissioners are removed from personal political accountability. Congress defines roughly the area to be administered, leaving to the President or his subordinates the promulgation of 'such rules,

regulations and procedures as may from time to time appear necessary.' All our recent bureaus were established under the pressure of 'emergency.' There was no time, Congress was told, to define precisely the scope and direction of the proposed new administrative authorities. Congress therefore delegated broad powers under 'blank check' laws. In reckless haste scores of bureaus were set up, and endowed with vast, loosely defined powers to regulate this and that field of economic life.

"The result has been a stream of executive orders and decrees, so limitless and confusing that no one can hope to keep up with them. Take the case of Bill Miller, a typical village grocer in Cheltenham, Maryland. One summer's day in 1939, an agent of the Bureau of Internal Revenue entered his store. Miller, it developed, had sold 100 pounds or more of sugar to some of his customers without reporting the buyers' names and auto-license numbers to the Collector of Internal Revenue. Though he had never heard of such a law, Miller found himself accused of 20 violations of the decree, with 21 government witnesses to testify against him.

"Testimony at the trial adduced that after the Treasury agent's visit Miller had telephoned his friend, Congressman Usher Burdick, of North Dakota who informed him no such law was on the statute books. In testifying for the defence Burdick explained: 'The Legislative Reference Service at the Library of Congress confirmed my opinion, erroneously it would seem, that it was no violation of the Law to sell 100 pounds of sugar without reporting it to the government agents. The regulations laid down by the Treasury change so often,' he added, 'you can't keep up with them'—a sentiment echoed by Congressman Sasser, of Maryland, who defended Miller. Erroneous legal guidance, however, even when offered by a member of the House of Representatives, is no defence, and the jury sentenced Grocer Miller to 60 days.

"The case illustrates with poignant force the state of federal *corpus juris* to-day. With some 150 administrative units of government grinding out rules and regulations, and deriving their powers from 964 statutory provisions and 71 presidential executive orders, the mere volume of new federal code is utterly beyond human grasp. When it is realised that often one statute may be the fountain of several hundred administrative orders over a period of years, the

ultimate range of departmental law is glimpsed."

"... If we are to safeguard our constitutional processes, we must somehow limit such capricious law. The perpetual fountains of regulatory orders must be restrained by the fundamental protection which constitution gives all citizens. Without this safeguard, administrative authority will constantly be exposed to the predatory influences of corruption and incompetence.

"American bureaucracy has developed its own techniques of tyranny. Crossed, it can move against a citizen like an angry monarch... Coercion and intimidation by government now exist on a scale previously unknown and undreamed of in America. The federal government has some 13,000 intelligence agents checking citizens' conduct. They may commandeer books and private records; they have tapped telephone wires and intercepted the mails. In 1939 the Senate Committee on the Judiciary said: 'Unless this country is to become a totalitarian government, these agencies must be required to observe the terms of the statutes and to exercise good faith in their administration,' and the American Bar Association recently urged Congress to provide judicial protection against the edicts of our 'anonymous and sheltered officialdom.'

"There is no likelihood of protection from the locust horde of reports the bureaucrats demand. Last year citizens returned to federal bureaus 135,500,000 reports, questionnaires, accounting forms, tax schedules and inspection sheets—in which there was a substantial amount of unnecessary duplication. Twenty-one agencies now require reports from farmers, 11 from railroads, 8 from communication companies, 19 from food processors, 12 from textile mills, 17 from banks, 12 from the construction industry, and 26 from retail stores."

"... During the last decade organised resistance to federal expansion has been gaining power. Through the Council of State Governments, 37 commonwealths are seeking constantly to check the advance of federal bureaucracy, by co-operative action on regional problems, and by uniform state laws on matters of bona-fide national concern. The Annual Conference of Governors likewise has devoted increasing attention to the problem.

"But only the people, through Congress, now can pull bureaucracy's claws. We know that boards and com-

missions tend constantly to extend their influence, to usurp new powers not contemplated in the delegation statute, to make steadily increasing demands upon the Treasury, and to strangle gradually the normal processes of free competitive enterprise. We know that bureaucracy grows away from the people and loses touch with the public welfare, that it feeds upon its illusions and develops techniques of self-preservation."

"... America wants to be American again—robust, venturesome, confident—but bureaucracy rides our necks like the old man of the sea."

Thus Mr. Sullivan. We can sympathise with that last poignant cry, "America wants to be American again." We would like to help her, for our own sakes as well as hers; but unfortunately we have a full time job on hand.

Sympathy apart, we have here a picture of the country that Mr. Curry puts forward as a model for Europe to follow. His thesis is that America is the well man, as distinct from a Europe sick with sovereignty. All we need to do to be well is to wash—is it seven times?—in the same waters in which America has washed. But Mr. Curry's cure is already familiar to us. To our simple minds it appears as the disease.

WAR AIMS ANALYSED

BEACHCOMBER of "The Daily Express" writes:

"Having read with close attention a great deal of the stuff written by the people who are clamouring for some sort of manifesto about the world we are to have after the war, I gather that whole question of war aims is a very simple one. The main point, on which all the writers seem to be agreed, is that when once you have made it impossible for any gentleman to take part in the governing of the country, all will be well.

"It seems to boil down to a question of ties. The ties of Eton, Harrow, Rugby, Winchester and so forth stamp the wearers as vile and unintelligent 'reactionaries.' Grammar-school ties are all right, of course, and even one or two of the lesser-known public-schools might scrape by.

"It is a superb constructive programme, and omits only one thing: the part to be played by the women novelists."

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

WAR AIM?

"We fight in the most anguished of centuries, not because we are pure, but because we want to be pure."

— DOROTHY THOMPSON.

TERRITORY FOR WAR DEBT

The American Institute of Public Opinion reports that the idea of obtaining some British territories in the Western Hemisphere in exchange for settlement of the last war debt, appeals strongly to the American people.

In a recent poll the question was asked, "If England offers to pay its World War debts by giving us islands or land near the Panama Canal, would you approve our accepting this offer?" To this 88 per cent. replied "Yes." A year ago 60 per cent. replied "Yes" to a similar question.

Commenting on proposals of this kind in a letter to the *New York Times*, Mr. James Warburg, the well-known banker, said: "If we believe in Democracy we cannot barter human beings from one sovereignty to another without their consent. The inhabitants of British possessions may not want to be transferred."

AN AMERICAN ON ORAN

"Because of what General Giraud had told him, General Nogues refused to see the British emissaries [Lord Gort and Mr. Duff Cooper], or to let them talk to any of the political leaders aboard the *Massilia*. They were kept under surveillance from the moment of their arrival at Casablanca. The next day they flew back to London. Their mission had failed.

"It was a tragic failure, because their mission was more important than any Frenchman knew. They had come to enquire into the authenticity of a German code message which had been picked up by the British Intelligence service. This message stated the alleged terms of an agreement whereby French warships at Oran were to be handed over to the Germans.

"This message, as the British learned later was a trick designed to

mislead them. If General Nogues had consented to receive Lord Gort and Duff Cooper, the trick would have been exposed in time. But their rebuff at Casablanca convinced them that the message was genuine.

"Because of this misunderstanding, the British fleet steamed into Oran, in French Algeria, on July 3 and delivered a six-hour ultimatum to the French warships lying at anchor there. French admirals declined to accept the terms of the ultimatum because they violated instructions from Marshal Petain's Government. So the British fleet opened fire, sinking some French ships and damaging others, killing several hundred French officers and sailors.

"The engagement revealed that the French ships were totally unprepared to defend themselves, and could not have planned to leave Oran. French naval officers later explained that they had been instructed to lay up their ships, and had already begun to break down guns and engines.

"There seems to be no doubt that sentiment in the French fleet at the time was overwhelmingly pro-British. Orders to turn over the ships to Germans or Italians would have resulted in mutiny. If the British had delayed action for a week or two, which they might safely have done, they would have discovered the true state of affairs.

"The sinking of the French fleet at Oran has generally been hailed as a British triumph. But the Germans may equally claim that it was another victory for them. For, along with the French fleet, there sank also the hopes of many Frenchmen for further resistance to Germany. The British action cleared away the last remaining doubts of General Nogues, who promptly rearrested Mandel and ordered the *Massilia* to leave Casablanca at once for Marseilles, with all the outlawed French political leaders on board, except one. That one was Daladier."

— *Demaree Bess* in "The Saturday Evening Post," November 9, 1940.

ECONOMIC POLICY AGAIN

"... In the case of the railways,

the public is not to gain from any reduction in the burden of overhead costs. . . The public is soaked coming and going; it loses on the swings and gets mulcted on the roundabouts. Is it any wonder that Labour, regarding the behaviour of industry, replies with a hollow laugh to all well-meant, earnest attempts to persuade it not to advance its claims in proportion to every rise in the standard of living?

"The same apparent contentment with a policy of drift is apparent in the management of the national finances. In the current quarter expenditure has been running at the level of over £4,400 millions a year. Revenue is estimated at £1,360 millions, and the National Savings campaign, after a year of Sir Robert Kindersley's untiring efforts, has produced £475 millions. This is admittedly not the total of savings accruing to the Government, but it is apparent that the 'gap' in the Budget is of the order of £2,000 millions a year. But nothing is being done to prepare the public either for a policy of narrowing the gap or for the consequences of leaving it unclosed, and even the warning voices of a year ago are now reassuring. Is this policy? Or is it improvidence?

"... Lord Beaverbrook did wonders in the summer in accelerating the production of fighters; for that he deserved and has received the thanks of the nation. But it is the defects rather than the merits of his methods that are now the more apparent. Lord Beaverbrook's tactic is that of inspired brigandage; he plays his own hand; he wages war on other departments as well as on the Nazis; he lends himself to no co-operation, let alone to any co-ordination. Complaints are being heard from America of the confusion caused by his insistence on having his own Purchasing Mission, and at home every industrial firm can tell tales of the victories he has scored over the programmes of other departments. The damage done is increased by the difficulty of disputing with a Minister who not only sits in a War Cabinet from which many of his competitors are excluded, but also stands in a position of intimacy with the Prime Minister."

— "The Economist," Nov. 30, 1940.

THE DENIAL OF EQUITY (II)

By B. M. PALMER.

It would, indeed, entail the statement of the whole of *Economic Democracy* entirely to refute the errors set forth by the *Times* in its leading article, *The Two Scourges*, but perhaps a little more space may be allowed me to underline the significance of its appearance just at this time, when the great mass of the people are longing to break through into the life more abundant which they know lies just beyond the war—if they take the right path.

The Times is an evil sign-post. It points back, back to the 19th century.

Read this:—

“So long as it remains true that war or preparation for war is the only effective remedy for unemployment, wars will continue however cunning the machinery devised to prevent them. Any new international order will be still born so long as this cancer is not eradicated from the social system.”

Yes, it is true that war is the only “cure” for unemployment, so called. Death is a cure for Life.

Unemployment is not a disease. It is a sign of health and progress.

The new international order, as pictured by those who hate national sovereignty, is the cancer because it must, by reason of the centralisation it entails, be anti-democratic.

The Times's case is a complete inversion of the Social Credit. God has become the Devil, and that is what we have to deal with.

No doubt some of those who had the patience to read last week's article may say:

“I accept the four propositions on which an equitable economic system must rest, as set forth in *Economic Democracy*. But I want the answer to *The Times's* contention that what favours British agriculture may ruin the Danish farmer, and that ‘trade’ and ‘progress’ cannot continue without sacrifice of profits and luxuries, rights and privileges on our part.”

As presented by *The Times* leader writers the alternative is to be shot or boiled in oil. It is more than likely they know this to be a false alternative. Their readers do not, however, and if these old, false arguments are to be re-

vived now as propaganda for the New World Order they will have to be refuted.

In a real sense the wealth of a country consists in goods and services *in esse*, and its capital is the capacity to reproduce them as they are used up and destroyed. All exports are therefore a loss of real wealth because we part with things we might use for our own benefit. The only sane system of export would be exchange of a surplus for things which we could not produce ourselves, by means of which we might add variety and interest to our food, clothes and home life.

We can imagine the Danes, by use of up-to-date methods, producing a large quantity of butter, eggs, cream and bacon, far more than they can eat themselves (not *buy*, that is another question). Why should not this be exchanged against an agreed quota of coal, strawberries or motorcars, to the satisfaction of both nations? Douglas has set forth the method whereby the national income can be equated with the national wealth and the National dividend provide each man and woman with his due share of food, clothes and shelter.

But if you make a financial law that no one shall have money unless he renders personal service to industry your British farmer is at once penalised; for every ounce of butter imported from Denmark will mean that the Englishman will lose a fraction of his income.

Moreover if by means of the international banking system you allow financial institutions in this country to invest in Danish farming your troubles will be intensified, for the only way the Danes can pay the interest is by selling more and more goods here, goods perhaps which they would rather keep in their own country for their own use.

It has often happened that the Danes have exported butter and eaten margarine.

Observe the nonsensical contradiction. For a nation to collect debts in the form of goods means a saving of work, and thus a loss of income to individuals, so that anything which saves work is regarded as injurious. People do not want to receive the reality of wealth, but merely the title of wealth. They do

not know what wealth is.

The money magnates whose policy *The Times* is voicing are determined that no money shall be distributed except as wages, and that the foreign investment system shall continue. This can only be done by injuring everybody, English and foreigners alike. But call the injury “sacrifice,” and hypnotise the people into believing that these man-made financial laws are God's laws and cannot be altered; if you can succeed in doing this perhaps you may hoodwink the people to submit to a rationing or distribution of the injury, so that the English farmer will agree to lose some of his profit, and the Danish farmer consent to work a little harder for less wages, and both lose some, if not all of their sovereignty to an international authority run behind the scenes by the very same financiers who benefit by the international investment system.

This is what is meant by the “sacrifice of profits and luxuries, rights and privileges.”

This article must necessarily be inadequate. It is only an indication of the sort of reply which every social creditor must be ready to give when confronted by this new form of propaganda obviously about to be launched as a side line to the New International Order.

December 16, 1940.

Mr. HILL ON THE BUDGET

“Is not the time coming near when current methods of war finance will become inadequate?” asked Mr. Wilfrid Hill, addressing Leamington Rotary Club, recently.

“Is it wise,” he went on, “to leave a budget deficit of the present magnitude? Is it not damaging to the nation's credit and a forerunner of serious inflation?”

“I still maintain that creation of interest-free ‘money’ by an overdraft on the security of the national assets would be the cheapest, simplest and most equitable way of solving the budget problem. Again, would not an increase in interest-free national debt be less inflationary in effect than a national debt plus interest and rising by millions of pounds a year?”

“Obituary”...

Newspaper readers are familiar with the customary lines of those notices which begin by announcing the death of some notable and proceed to give an account of his origin, his preparation for life as he lived it and the outstanding consequence for himself but not for others of his manner of living it. Such notices may be said to serve two purposes: they provide a compendious list of the aspirations which the ambitious may profitably consider and they confirm its details among the unambitious who are destined to make it profitable. The casual reader might think that in these days of standardisation a standard obituary notice, to be altered at the last moment ‘before we go to press’ and only as to its minor points might be instituted, and, to a large extent this has indeed been done without protest from the newspaper reader. But ‘at the time of going to press’ notices are still kept in separate envelopes in all the Great Offices, one under “B” for Butter, Henry J. (Sir) and another under “S” for Sugar (Lord: see Molasses, George.)—and so on. Such collections occupy acres flippantly referred to ‘downstairs’ as ‘The Cemetery’ or ‘The Grave-yard.’ Very occasionally such a notice sees the light in consequence of mere rumour of the death of the Great Person, as happened in the case of the late Mr. Mark Twain, who, on hearing the report said it was ‘exaggerated.’ So too the following is exaggerated. From which ‘Cemetery’ it was abstracted is no matter: one Great National Daily is just like any other Great National Daily:—

OBITUARY: H.S.M. The Devil

“We record with deep regret the death last night of His Satanic Majesty, The Devil, who passed away peacefully, surrounded by his Sons and Daughters. Many descendants thronged the ante-rooms of the Death Chamber, brought thither by the widespread report of the seriousness of the illness of the deceased Gentleman. He was very old.

“Archibald Boniface Cain Dominic Eleazer Faustus Gideon Hannibal Ignatius Josephus Kenelm (to give His late Majesty at most half his many names), surnamed Belial, first attracted attention as an artificer of unusual dexterity. He was the first of his kind to recognise the uneconomical and wasteful nature of the

abundant profound prejudice, which was at one time universal, in favour of fabricating the good things of this world from materials chosen specially for their quality or inherent goodness, and soon showed that the highest good could be produced from evil far better than from good materials. The great advance which the world has witnessed along this line is phenomenal. While a few centuries ago more than half of the world’s good was used up in the staple manufactures of that time, the last decade or so has seen so spectacular an increase in the utilisation of evil for the purpose that, thanks to Belial, the conquest of the last decimal point may confidently be said to be well within the grasp of living generations. The advance already secured was not without opposition, and, while the bitterest phases of antagonism to the fruitful genius of His late Majesty are now merely a sad memory, many a battle was fought before the race of men were brought, through the hard school of personal sacrifice and suffering to recognise the supreme advantages which lie in the use of evil for practically all constructive purposes. The easy dogmatism that ‘Good cannot ensue from Evil’ crystallised itself quite early in the history of civilisation into a proverbialism which, at many critical points, wellnigh defeated the infinite capacity for taking pains which distinguished the young Belial, a power which only ripened as he grew older, and enabled him to overcome every obstacle. His ‘Peace’ is unquestionably his masterpiece in such fabrication.

“What The Devil was like in earlier centuries there is little but the odd caricatures of a lingering superstitious antagonism to suggest. The horned front, the crimson-tinted wings set off with incongruous avian talons, the almost reptilian scales, the piscatory eye are libels which many generations have happily been able to banish. The innumerable personal contacts of more tolerant times, BETTER times, hand on to posterity a TRUER picture. Millions knew him as a perfect gentleman.

“From others of his kind there was really little to distinguish him in appearance save the familiar scar which he bore upon his nose. It was the outcome of an unfortunate encounter with Dunstan, who became Archbishop of Canterbury and was canonised. Belial

met him frequently, a young man working at his forge. With fantastic imagery characteristic of those ignorant times, legend endows The Devil with a taste for appearing in disguise, even, sometimes, in the form of a bear, a serpent or other noxious animal. But one night Satan came in human form, as a woman, and looking in at the window began to tempt the young workman with improper conversation. His beneficent object, which was evidently to place some opportunity for self-control and sacrifice in the path of his young friend was entirely unperceived, and the young saint, waiting only long enough for his pincers to kindle to a white heat, applied them to his visitor’s nose. It was the scar thus produced that The Devil was wont to cover with his finger, a familiar gesture, when admonishing some youthful indiscretion.

“How large a number of its most cherished inventions the world owes to the deceased is known to astonishingly few, the Lie, the Trick and the Deceit, from which our irresistible System of Sound Finance derives its very foundations, as well as the Suppression, the Censorship, the Election and the Debate by which statesmen are upheld, and the body politic sustained: are but the Ubiquitous evidences of an inventive ingenuity unequalled in the mere Arts. That due recognition of the source of origin of these Good Things (each manufactured, be it noticed, from Evil) is not commonly accorded is partly due to the majestic fertility of The Devil in his second great string, the Art of Organisation. It has well been said that any Great Man can invent a blessing for mankind; but IT TAKES THE DEVIL TO ORGANISE IT. Organisation was the supreme ability of His late Majesty. He organised the Nations, the Religions, the Arts, the Conferences, and the Societies, not merely some of them but every one. No Great Historical event was complete without his masterly but invisible finger. His death will be a loss such as has not been sustained before; but happily his work was done, and willy-nilly the world will pursue the path He made inevitable towards ULTIMATE victory.” *De mortuis nil nisi bonum.*

A. G.

“An appreciation of The Devil will be broadcast by the B.B.C. after the six-o’clock news to-day.”

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.

Editorial Office:

4, ACREFIELD ROAD,
WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL.
Telephone: Gateacre 1561.

Vol. 5. No. 16.

Business Office:

12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.
Telephone: Bank 5260.

Saturday, December 28, 1940.

The Approaching Crisis in the Medical Profession

At the present time there is probably no profession more concerned with its status than the Medical Profession. Consultants at hospitals are completely bemused by the conditions they see around them; famous voluntary hospitals with empty coffers and astronomical waiting lists, the sufferings of sick people. They do not agree with state medicine, since they see the great superiority in the quality of the work at the voluntary hospitals; but they see no alternative. Now is the time for the action of a few men who know what to do.

On the other hand the status of the General Practitioner is rapidly degenerating from general medical expert to untrained clerk. It is therefore very refreshing to read Dr. Douglas Boyd's booklet.* This, addressed in the main to the general practitioner, has an interesting approach. It is pointed out that whereas about one third of England's population are undernourished (according to Sir John Boyd Orr's report on the Incomes and Diet) their incomes are further reduced by a compulsory payment to the National Health Insurance. This naturally increases the disease incidence even further and besides paying the Doctor it also pays the wages of an army of administrators. They are thus overcharged for the medical services they so badly need.

But what are these medical services? As Dr. Boyd very truly shows, the wretched doctor is harrassed from the beginning of his career to the end. In the first place, because of the capitalisation of medical practices and the

development of contract practice there are few localities where he may expect a reasonable living if he just "puts up his plate." He is required to purchase a practice. This is usually financed by an insurance company which requires, besides interest and repayment of capital, that the practitioner shall insure against sickness and death. Thus throughout most of his career he is working for the insurance company. Over and above this, since taxation is approximately 10/- in the pound (direct and indirect), half his time is spent working for the government. He possesses little to show for his work. And what of this work? At hospital as a student he is taught the diagnosis, prognosis and treatment of disease and he is exceptional if this does not become an absorbing interest. After final M.B., B.S. and perhaps (if he is very lucky) a few hospital resident appointments he is precipitated into Practice—usually panel practice. Does he practise the medicine he was taught? Does the system encourage him to give of his best to his patients? In fact, the majority of his time is taken up by the signing of certificates and the writing of prescriptions, the majority of which he knows quite well are merely to placate his patient. On one occasion I did surgery for a doctor when he could not attend. The surgery lasted 2½ hours and I made a careful note of how I occupied my time: 63.4 per cent was occupied in writing certificates and filling in forms. Such is the encouraging atmosphere.

Here are the facts. What is the solution? Dr. Boyd very forcefully points out the fact that lack of money is the problem; lack on the part of the patients and lack on the part of the doctor, and this keeps his nose on the clerical grind-

stone. Banks create credit costlessly and falsely issue it as a "loan" from themselves. The greater part of taxation is to pay the interest and redemption charges on this so called debt, so unnecessarily and fatally strangling our economic and social lives like a cancer. It is pointed out that the medical is the first profession to receive the doubtful honour of regimentation by these financial manipulators (regimentation being necessary to perpetuate their system), the National Health Insurance being based on the earlier German model. Characteristically the financial powers have set up large vested interests in the form of civil(?) servants (?) who will fight to perpetuate the system. The complicated procedures and the multiplicity of forms, certificates and committees still further obscure these already closely hidden facts.

How shall we break this vicious circle of gilt-edged paper? Dr. Boyd points to the doctor and says that the very system which has made his life a relative misery has put him in a key position to place the facts before his patients and to influence them to bring political pressure to bear on the problem. It is unfortunate however, as he probably realises only too well, that the doctor is allowed so little time for thought and relaxation and is so continually in a position of assumed intellectual superiority that it requires a very definite knock on the head before he will stop to wonder what is going on around him. If this booklet is the mallet whereby the blow is delivered which will result in the formation of a satisfactory revolt against the present intolerable bureaucratic control of the medical services Dr. Boyd will have done the greatest service by his individual effort. None could do more.

G. B. S.

SWASTIKA BECOMES WINSTON

Swastika, Ontario, is to be designated Winston on provincial highway maps, Mr. McQuesten, the Highways Minister has decided. This has provoked protests from among the 1500 residents of the railway junction town near Kirkland Lake.

The residents declared that they appreciated the honour of being named after Mr. Churchill, but the town had been Swastika for more than three decades, long before the Nazis.

Since the town is not incorporated, residents have no official say in the matter.

*Barrier to Health, By Douglas Boyd. The Abbey Press, Bangor, County Down, Price 6d. Obtainable from the publishers and from Erskine Mayne, Donegal Square West, Belfast, County Down.

The Use of Some Abstract Terms

By H. E.

In these days much is said about TRUTH, RIGHT and EVIL and this article is an attempt to state what, for me, is conveyed by these terms. The line of development follows "The Direct Beam" ("The Social Crediter," October 12, 1940) the definitions then given of UNDERSTANDING, OBJECTIVE, and ACTION, and their incessant interplay in human Being. Such definitions must involve the arbitrary isolation of parts of the flow of living of which the only complete exposition is life itself; but it seems that a point of view which relates these abstractions to reality should be attainable. It is certain that their incorrect use is one of the more potent forms of the technique of delusion.

Whatever his degree of understanding or spiritual attainment, man is linked to the earth, his mind is dependent on his body and his body on food from the soil. Tools for his hand have a parallel connection: the pencil fits the hand and the spade is adjusted to his strength otherwise they are discarded, and although the implements of the mind—*words*—have not this advantage of the automatic rejection of those which do not fit, they also must be linked up to something which has real existence. To lift a stone is to experience what is called its 'weight,' and it is convenient to have a word for that abstract quality—but 'weight,' has no meaning apart from something which has it. 'Two and two make four' has no significance without reference to something which can be counted, and that holds good for any mathematical expression; the connection may be remote, but it is there, otherwise figures or formulae are meaningless.

When detached from reality abstract terms delude understanding, devitalize objectives and disintegrate action, but when defined and understood they are tools, and like other tools are meaningless unless they are used; and use implies a purpose.

Man's existence is an exploration of things outside himself, of the universe, in which he applies his knowledge in action to get what he wants out of the universe—that is his life—and the purpose of words is to forward it; but because of the hazy and variable meaning attached to them abstract terms often hinder rather than help. *Truth* and *Error*, *Right* and *Wrong*, *Good* and *Evil*, these should be useful words but have become the subjects of misunderstanding, dispute and deception. What is their place as implements to forward and consolidate this exploration?

Truth is sometimes supposed to be the final and exhaustive description of an object or an event, but that is impossible, for no one can accomplish more than a 'point of view' definition. To a shepherd his sheep dog is different from the description which might be given by a veterinary surgeon, a biologist, a physicist, or by the postman. Each of these may be exact (*True*) within its sphere, and adequate for its purpose, but it has a purpose. Complete detachment is super- or sub-human, it is detachment from purposes which are irrelevant which is possible and useful, not from all purpose. 'Abstract Science' which is often supposed to present this attitude, consists in the abstraction and correlation of certain aspects of reality, the objective on this plane, as evidenced in practice, being to reduce reality to statements which contain the least possible number of terms. So translated nature may be used with portentous effects. The shepherd's control of his dog does not imply more than that he has grasped those aspects of the beast in which he is interested, and the control of nature by science is of the same quality. A different point of view shows that

each object and event is unique and so defies classification and eludes definition by scientific as by other men. The shepherd's understanding of his dog has its purposes, and for them it may be as sound a comprehension of that segment of reality (the dog) as the most meticulous of scientist's statement is for his.

Definition which is exhaustive cannot be encompassed, nor is it possible to define an object or an even without a purpose. *TRUTH* is the success of *UNDERSTANDING* in the apprehension of reality in respect of an objective: *FALSITY* the failure. *Truth* is not in itself an objective, nor is it concerned with the direction of the aim which invokes it.

"*RIGHT* is that which works," and refers to the means which provide any given objective. In the life of an individual objectives are in incessant competition and distinction is necessary as to which is under consideration. If an aim is made to get up at 7 a.m. and that does not occur the means taken to that end are *Wrong* but what has happened is that the objective of more time in bed has supervened to which the means taken are *Right*. In all activities controlled by men the result is the sum of effective intention: i.e. the sum of action taken in accordance with the objective in the ascendant at the moment of action. If a Government sets out to provide conditions which will ensure freedom and security for its citizens, and produces a servile and dependent community the action taken is *Wrong* in relation to the stated objective: but it is the sum of the action taken by each Member to some other objective—whether that be deliberately opposed to the declared intention, the desire to maintain a system which is incompatible, or merely the wish to gratify the Party Whip. The action taken by each M.P. is *Right* in relation to the objective which rules him at the moment but it is *Wrong* in respect of his responsibility as representative.

"He who is not with me is against me": individual life is a flow which must have direction for or against man's objective. And declared intention unless made effective is nothing. It is the result which is the measure of intention and by the result its direction is made clear.

RIGHT is the success of action taken towards an objective: *WRONG* the failure. *Right* is not in itself an objective, neither is it concerned with the direction of the action which inspires it.

From this point of view the universe is a limitless nexus of possibilities, trains of events which happen and which man in combining and re-combining may use; he cannot create them. He cannot alter this grain which is in the nature of things, but as his knowledge grows he can turn his action this way or that, and along whichever path he takes he will find his *Truth* and in finding it he will do

his *Right*. The way he chooses may lead to that release of spirit in which is individual fulfilment, whether it is found in human relationship, in the English countryside, in Bach's Concerto in E. Major, or otherwise. Or his path may bring him to the subjection of that spirit whether by submission to hypnotic sanctions* or to bondage by "finance"—or to its early dissolution by tri-nitro toluene. For nature has complete detachment, "Seek and ye shall find": but there is no direction, that must come from man himself.

Good and *Evil* are concerned with the direction which man chooses, with the objective at which he aims; and whereas the subject of *Truth* and *Right* is the impersonal universe of which man is a part, the subject of *Good* and *Evil* is man and his Being with respect to his status as a part, i.e. to the conditions on which he is an individual.

The primary condition is Life and Death which, as individual experiences, transcend analysis. Observation shows them as an interwoven pattern in which all living creatures appear and disappear, the continuance of their existence being dependent on the extinction of other units of life. Life proceeds headlong and is checked by death which provides material for new life—with innumerable and sometimes circuitous variants this is the theme which persists. Yet everything which lives has an impulse towards retaining life and works to the end that it may be prolonged. Action towards this objective is the origin of species, each of which has developed and embodies its own technique, acquiring in body, brains and blood instinctive reactions towards life and away from death. It is from these depths that man, gaining the capacity for abstract ideas, has precipitated the conception of *Good* and *Evil*.

In the jungle *Good* and *Evil* have a simple outline, to kill or to be killed, and it is out of his contact with other men that this jungle-*Good* has become enlarged, the focus of this enlargement being co-operation for a common purpose. To give this purpose precision and to bring it towards fruition has been the endeavour of the see-ers among men,

*As defined by Major Douglas in *Nazi Challenge to Democracy*, in *The Social Crediter*, November 9, 1940.

of whom few have reached the formidable realism of that statement which strikes at the roots and fulfilment of man's aims: "The Kingdom of God is within you." *Good* is not to be found otherwise than by your own fulfilment of your own aspirations, and the nature of man is such that therein also lies the fulfilment of the common purpose. The human creature has within him the desire to live, and to live "more abundantly," and his own nature contains powers whereby that desire may be fulfilled. That is the moving force which has so far sustained man against extinction, and it is that which, clarified and made effective will attain to further reaches now out of sight. It is a force the understanding and use of which is only possible with something of the faith with which the words were uttered—that the untrammelled pursuit of happiness by others is the necessary background of, and indeed part of our own.

GOOD is individual success in living according to man's objective, not in the sense of bending to something exterior but in Being (in understanding, in objectives and in action) in harmony with that objective. *Evil* is Being in accordance with an objective which is counter to man's. *Good* and *Evil* are not in themselves objectives.

"In my opinion, we want, first of all, security in what we have, freedom of action, thought and speech, and a more abundant life for all. Every one of these is possible, and every one of them in the present state of progress of the world can be reduced to the possession of more purchasing power, so that it is not too much to say, even though it may sound banal, that the first objective of a democracy should be a national dividend."

C. H. DOUGLAS.

So is the objective reduced to a substantial proposition. *Truth* is attendant on *Good* and *Evil* and *Right* brings either into Being, but it is the Objective which governs all, and that is not a cloud in the sky or an abstraction but is something real and then something real again in each man's life—without which those abstract terms are a snare and a futility.

EYE ON PARLIAMENT

The following passages are taken from the House of Commons Official Report (Editor, P. Cornelius), known as 'Hansard'. The date and occasion of the words are given above each section, and the speakers' names by the side. The number of columns occupied by the printed report of each section cited is also given. Lack of space imposes a severe limitation on the selection of matter for reproduction.

December 10.

Oral Answers (31 columns)

NATIONAL FINANCE

GOLD STANDARD

Mr. Stokes asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will give an assurance that no undertaking, specific or implied, has been or will at any time be given to the United States of America that this country will return to the gold standard after the war without first consulting this House?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Kingsley Wood): There has never been any question of giving any undertaking of the kind suggested.

AGRICULTURAL CREDITS (BANKS).

Mr. De la Bere asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will call a conference with the banks in connection with the sum of £50,000,000 outstanding from agricultural borrowers to the clearing banks to consider converting this into agricultural deposit

receipts on a similar basis to Treasury deposit receipts and then funding them on a four-year basis with interest at 1 per cent. for the purpose of assisting in securing the maximum output from the farmers?

Sir K. Wood: The conditions under which the banks lend to agricultural borrowers are so different from those under which they lend to the State on Treasury deposit receipts that I am afraid I could not adopt my hon. Friend's suggestion.

Mr. De la Bere: Is my right hon. Friend aware that the Government have urged that more and more food should be grown throughout the country, that the clearing banks should make some contribution, and that contribution involves sacrifice? Why is it that food supplies should be allowed to be handicapped through no initiative being taken to compel the banks to assist agriculture?

Sir K. Wood: I cannot accept the view expressed by my hon. Friend.

Mr. De la Bere: Nevertheless, it is true.

POST OFFICE.

LETTERS, NORTHERN IRELAND.

Dr. Little asked the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the serious complaints continually being made as to the delay in the delivery of letters to and from Northern Ireland, in some cases five or six days in transit, he will look carefully into this whole matter with the object of having the delivery of these letters greatly expedited?

Captain Waterhouse: Letters passing between Great Britain and Northern Ireland should take three days in transit, excluding Sundays, but there are sometimes delays due to causes external to the Post Office. I shall be glad to make inquiry if the hon. Member will furnish me with particulars of specific cases in which there has been delay.

CIVIL DEFENCE (DETENTIONS)

(40 columns)

Mr. Stokes (Ipswich): I wish to raise a matter, about which I have given notice to the Home Secretary concerning British persons for the most part who have been detained under Section 18B of the Emergency Regulations. I also took the trouble to send to the Under-Secretary particulars of the case to which I am going to refer, and they were despatched by hand on Saturday morning, but I understand from the Under-Secretary that the letter has not arrived. I therefore regret if I put the Home Secretary to some inconvenience, because it is undesirable that names should be mentioned. . . .

I raise the matter as one of principle and not with any political sympathy with persons involved, because they are, most of them—and there are some 1,600 of them—members of what

is known as the British Union of Fascists. I have very little for which to thank that organisation, or its associates on the Continent. In fact, on one occasion I was very nearly done to death by them in one of the countries with which we are now at war. . . . But this is a matter of principle, and all persons have their rights, whatever their political beliefs; in fact, by the Measure which this House passed we have witnessed the complete suspension of Magna Carta. . . . we have been urged again and again that our freedom is in peril and that we must defend it with all our might. My anxiety is that in defending it we might lose it altogether. Restrictions on liberty are inevitable in time of war, but we have to be on our guard. I personally, in the circumstances, do not think that the Regulations are unreasonable, but I submit, and I hope to prove, that the administration of that has been hopelessly bad, and if, in the cases of certain people who have experienced them, one quarter of what they have told me is true, I would support their view that the administration savours too much of the Star Chamber and the Gestapo. . . .

For the convenience of Members present I will explain the method of detention and procedure. A man is put under detention by the order of the Home Secretary very often because of rumour or suspicion or anonymous letters. Very often the man or woman languishes for months in gaol. If they appeal and appear before the Advisory Committee, the Advisory Committee sit, with military officials present to hear what goes on. The unfortunate thing about appearances before the Advisory Committee is that no legal adviser is allowed to be present to represent the person who has been detained and who may have appealed against the detention. That is entirely contrary to our ideas of justice, and the Government are wrong in adopting that attitude. I appreciate, at the same time, that it might not be possible for reasons of security to make available to a legal representative of the detained person a full dossier of the facts which have been put before the Advisory Committee, but I am sure that an arrangement could be made whereby that difficulty could be overcome by allowing a legal representative to state the case for the applicant. Most people who have not been in the political arena are terrified of appearing before boards and are quite incapable of representing their own case, specially in circumstances which these people have to endure with

no real or clear idea with what they are being charged. . . .

[Mr. Stokes then went on to give in detail some of the cases in point. This formed the major part of his speech. He then continued:]

One hesitates to criticise any Department in a wholesale fashion, but it does seem to me that the Home Office have adopted a cold fish indifference to these people. Something is being done about aliens, but only because such a fuss was created about the matter in this House. I suggest that the Home Office should adopt a similar procedure and appoint someone to examine the whole question of dealing with detainees under Regulation 18 (B). People should be allowed legal representation before the Advisory Committee, even if the lawyers may not receive the complete dossier available to the committee. Secondly, if as a result of their appearance their detention is recommended, they should be told the reason and given an opportunity of replying. If the Home Secretary will not agree to that, what policy does he propose to follow? If their continued detention is recommended and they are not to be told why they are detained, does the Home Secretary propose, if the war goes on until 1945, that they shall remain in gaol without knowing the specific reasons for which they are detained? It seems to me to be very unjust, and contrary to all our ideas of justice. Cannot persons, pending their appearance before an Advisory Committee, be let out on bail if suitable assurances be provided. Such a procedure would be in accordance with the principles of British justice. Then punitive detention should cease. The Parliamentary Secretary said that he had inspected camps and that I had not. That is quite true, but has he spent 24 hours there? I know some of the humbug which goes on in factory inspections. . . .

Fifthly, I ask that arrangements should be made for wives and husbands to be detained together. If this is allowed to aliens detained under these Regulations, I cannot see why the same privilege should not be extended to British detainees, especially having regard to the fact they are so few in number. . . .

I ask that the Home Secretary should give this matter immediate attention. It has caused an appalling amount of pain and suffering to an enormous number of people who in

many cases, are not guilty at all. In some cases there are wives left destitute. I ask for a review of the whole proceedings so that injustice, where it exists, may be brought down to a minimum. . . .

[In the debate that followed Mr. Stokes was vigorously supported by Earl Winterton (2 columns: "I can see no reason for treating foreigners more favourably than British people. There seems rather a tendency to pay more attention to the grievances of interned aliens than to the grievances of interned British people. Both should be treated on the same basis of fairness and impartiality."); Sir Irving Albery (2 columns); Mr. Lyons (3 columns); Mr. Loftus (2½ columns) and Mr. Silkin and Mr. Mander. Miss Rathbone interposed (1½ columns) an appeal for free legal aid for interned aliens and Mr. J. J. Davidson desired to strike a note of warning (2 columns).]

Mr. Morrison: . . . I say to my hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Stokes) that the state of mind in which he made his speech to-day, that classical liberalism—I use the word not with a capital letter but in the ordinary philosophical sense—which maintains that there must be this, that and the other right maintained in all circumstances—will not win a war. I want to tell him frankly that if you run a war in that way you will lose it. If he tries to run a social revolution in that way he will lose it. When will my hon. Friend learn from the lesson of Germany? What is the lesson of Nazi Germany? It is that the Republican politicians of that time were too soft—not that they were too hard—in applying in what was a revolutionary situation classical liberal doctrines and so on. . . .

Mr. Stokes: My right hon. Friend will bear me out that when I opened the Debate I did not complain about the Regulations but about the administration. I admitted they were necessary in the circumstances.

Mr. Morrison: That is true, but when it came to administration it was true also that he wanted to import into that administration the maximum of normal legal procedure. . . .

If hon. Members swallow an exceptional regulation they must swallow some of the exceptional procedure that follows from it. You cannot have one without the other. The hon. Member for Ipswich wants the best of both worlds. He put up a case. I watched hon. Members while he was speaking,

and I know that he was not without his effectiveness. I hope hon. Members will forgive me when I say that I have experience of the correspondence of my hon. Friend, both in this office and the last office which I held. The letters were always welcome, charming and interesting, but—I hope he will forgive me—I do not necessarily assent to the points of fact that he made in his statement. After a somewhat intensive experience of this correspondence I am bound to say, with every respect and indeed every affection, for my hon. Friend, that fact is not his strong point.

Mr. Stokes: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly quote fact or case?

Mr. Morrison: There is only one that occurs to me at the moment, but I am sure that on notice I could find quite a number. The lavatories at Holloway Jail are a case in point in which he put a Question on the Order Paper without being reasonably sure that he would get the answer he expected. He went wrong on that point. I can only say that I cannot deal with the point, for reasons which he very kindly explained. I only want to safeguard myself against any assumption that I accept his facts, because my experience is that my hon. Friend is not always meticulously accurate on questions of fact. Nevertheless, that will not prevent me from looking into these allegations with every fairness and consideration. . . .

The point has arisen about legal defence, assistance or aid at the hearing before the advisory committee. I think there has been a general assumption that when these rules were elaborated my right hon. Friend provided that in no circumstances would a lawyer appear. In fact, he did not do so. What he did provide was that if the advisory committee came to the conclusion that, in the circumstances of any case, there would be advantage to the proceedings by the bringing out of facts, and that this would result from legal assistance being available, that tribunal or committee had the right to say that such legal assistance could be provided. That was so. It is still so. It is not the Home Secretary who settles whether that legal assistance shall be available or not, but the committee outside.

Earl Winterton: This point is very important. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will be good enough to tell us—I do not say this in a sarcastic sense—in how many cases these persons

have been allowed to have legal assistance. I do not want to anticipate his answer, but I see no earthly reason why the hon. and gallant Member for Peebles and Midlothian (Captain Ramsay) was not allowed legal assistance, if the situation is as my hon. Friend describes.

Mr. Morrison: I do not want to particularise about any given case. Everybody must be treated as equal in these matters. I agree that there has been a limited number of cases in which that facility has been agreed to by the tribunal, a very few cases. If you ask my opinion—

Earl Winterton: Have there been any cases?

Mr. Morrison: My hon. Friend the Under-Secretary tells me that there has been a limited number of cases where the committee has heard a solicitor or barrister on points of law or of evidence, but quite a limited number.

Earl Winterton: I am sorry, but I feel I must press this point, because I think that my hon. Friend has quite inadvertently given a wrong impression to the House. Has there been any case where a man has been allowed to have a legal representative in the ordinary sense of the term, not to decide points of law, but to represent his case?

Mr. Morrison: I do not go beyond what my hon. Friend advises me and what I have just said. In the ordinary sense of legal advocacy as in the ordinary court of law, the answer is that the committee has not so far permitted that to happen. . . .

Mr. Stokes: The point is that these people are not capable of representing themselves and ought to have the assistance of a lawyer even if he does not have access to the full dossier.

Mr. Morrison: They are allowed consultation with their legal advisers in preparation for the case, but cannot have legal representation in the ordinary sense before the tribunal without the special consent of the latter.

Mr. Stokes: They are not told of the evidence.

Mr. Morrison: They do get seven days' notice.

Mr. Stokes: Of the evidence?

Mr. Morrison: No, not of all the evidence. My hon. Friend is still mixing Defence Regulation 18B with classical Liberalism. Regulation 18B is not classical Liberalism at all; it is war legislation and State security. It

is no use mixing the two things. . . .

Miss Rathbone: Has the right hon. Gentleman ignored the possibility of providing free legal assistance for poor persons?

Mr. Morrison: We are getting on. It is now argued that I should provide legal assistance for Sir Oswald if he wants it. (Hon. Members: "For poor persons.") Or for a poor follower of Sir Oswald. I really do not see the point of it.

Mr. Davidson: Does my right hon. Friend not grasp the point, that if a man is a member of the British Union of Fascists under Mosley, was opposed to the constitution of this county, and strutted about in a black blouse and trousers, we ought now to provide him with legal assistance out of public funds?

Mr. Morrison: I am glad that my hon. Friend has put the argument so plainly. I do not see why I should do it.

Earl Winterton: I, of course, appreciate the sarcasm of my hon. Friend the Member for Maryhill (Mr. Davidson); but what is the difference between the case of the ordinary criminal and the case of a Fascist or a Communist or anybody else? The ordinary criminal has the advantage of the Poor Persons Act.

Mr. Morrison: I thought that the burden of the argument so far had been that such a man was not an ordinary criminal, and should not be treated as one.

Mr. G. Strauss (Lambeth, North): He should not be worse treated.

Mr. Morrison: Is my hon. Friend the Member for North Lambeth (Mr. Strauss) pleading for this policy of free legal assistance for members of the British Union?

Mr. Strauss: As I have been challenged, I say that certainly these people who are suspected, but who are not convicted of any offence, should not be treated worse than any criminal.

Mr. Morrison: I am bound to say that we make progress as we go along. This claim is as my hon. Friend the Member for Maryhill has put it, perfectly properly and accurately, not sarcastically at all. I do not see why in this class of case the State should go to the expense of providing legal assistance for members of the British Union, or, indeed, for any other detained persons. I do not think it necessary or expedient, and it would introduce

into the whole machine an element of delay leading to a much more serious situation than that existing at the present time.

Mr. Stokes: The right hon. Gentleman represents the case as referring to the members of the British Union only. But we are not concerned with the organisation of which they are members. There are all sorts of people. I have given cases of people who have been detained because they are members of the British Union and others who are not, and they are not allowed legal representation.

Mr. Morrison: I have given my answer to cover all of them. I think that my hon. Friend will agree that most of the cases he quoted were those of members of the British Union—

Mr. Stokes: Certainly.

Mr. Morrison: —in which he was pleading on their behalf in this House.

Mr. Stokes: Oh, no.

Mr. Morrison: The hon. Member was pleading for consideration in cases that he thought were grievously treated.

Mr. Stokes: Not because they were Fascists.

Mr. Morrison: I did not say so. I said because they were members of the British Union. I have given the answer that, whether they are members of the British Union or not, I do not think it would be right or expedient that the State should provide legal assistance in these cases. While the tribunals are free to permit legal assistance in given cases, I think they are right not to encourage it because it would lead to delay.

Mr. Beverley Baxter (Wood Green): In the opinion of most Members of the House the right hon. Gentleman is not quite aware of the seriousness of the ruling he is laying down. He is playing right into the hands of men like Mr. Joseph Kennedy, who says that democracy has ceased to exist in this country. I really urge the Home Secretary to think over the implications of what he is saying rather than come to a decision just now.

Mr. Morrison: I can only say that I expressed the view and I adhere to it absolutely and firmly, and I am afraid I am not to be moved from it by considerations of Mr. Joseph Kennedy.

Mr. Baxter: Or the House?

Mr. Morrison: The House certainly has its own way of doing things.

I do not know how long the hon. Member has been here, but I expressed the view quite strongly that this is not a case of the committee prosecuting an interned person but of reviewing his case. The question of defence does not arise, but if the tribunal thinks that in a given case the person concerned should have an opportunity of fortifying himself with certain legal assistance, it can give it but I am not going to issue any instructions that it should do so generally. . . .

Earl Winterton: I say this in a most friendly way, but I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will not fall into the error into which some of my hon. Friends behind seem to have fallen. These Regulations are not intended *per se* to deal with the Fascists, but with all persons of subversive action. He continues to talk as though he brought in the Regulations to deal with Fascists.

Mr. Morrison: In the first place, this Regulation has to deal with persons of that class.

Earl Winterton: With all subversive people, including Communists if necessary.

Mr. Morrison: All subversive people of hostile origin or association. If I have referred to the Fascists, it is because the vast majority of these people are Fascists. . . .

A number of points of detail were raised in the Debate, and I will investigate them or cause them to be investigated at the Home Office. The matter of reasons for detention were raised. Of course the Order made by the Secretary of State authorising detention does tell the person concerned very briefly the nature of the Regulation under which he is apprehended, although it does not tell him the particular charges; but before he goes to the tribunal, he is given particulars of the reasons which have led to his apprehension. Broadly speaking, I am inclined to think that procedure is fair. . . .

In conclusion I will only add this. I am sure that the House will assent that it is right that we should have had this discussion. I welcome it, although I dare say the enemy's machine will make use of it. But it should not worry us. Everyone will agree, whether he is a critic of the administration or not, that at any rate this is a matter in which there is no comparison between our methods and the practices of the enemy facing this country.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

BIRMINGHAM and District Social Crediters will find friends over tea and light refreshments at Prince's Cafe, Temple Street, on Friday evenings, from 6 p.m., in the King's Room.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Association: Weekly meetings every Tuesday evening at 7-30 p.m. at the Friends Meeting House, King Street, Blackburn. All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow, Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats. Enquiries to R. J. Northin, 11, Centre Street, Bradford.

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER is obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Meets regularly on the first and third Sundays in the month. Time 2-30 p.m. Enquiries to Secretary: Miss J. E. Taylor, 11, Nook Rise, Liverpool 15.

LONDON LIAISON GROUP. Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association. It is important that all Social Crediters on Tyneside should maintain contact. Write Hon. Secretary, R. Thomson, 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; or 50, Ripley Grove, Copnor.

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.

The Social Crediter

If you are not a subscriber to *THE SOCIAL CREDITER*, send this order without delay.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd.,
12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

Please send *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* to me

Name

Address

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-
 „ Six „ „ 15/-
 „ Three „ „ 7/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer,
Social Credit Expansion Fund,
c/o The Social Credit Secretariat,
12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

I enclose the sum of £ : : ,
as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name

Address

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND.)

Name.....

Address.....

**TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE,
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.**

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Advisory Chairmanship of Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute

£ : : , { per month,
per quarter,
per year,

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

I herewith enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the above mentioned funds.

Signature.....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.)

Books to Read

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy
(edition exhausted)
- Social Credit 3/6
- Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
- The Monopoly of Credit 3/6
- Warning Democracy
(edition exhausted)
- The Tragedy of Human Effort ... 6d.
- The Use of Money 6d.
- Approach to Reality 3d.
- Money and the Price System ... 3d.
- Nature of Democracy 2d.
- Social Credit Principles 1d.
- Tyranny 1d.
- and
- “This ‘American’ Business” 3d. each
12 for 2/-

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster 4d.
- The Nature of Social Credit ... 4d.
- Debt and Taxation 2d.

ALSO

- The Douglas Manual 5/-
- The Economic Crisis:
Southampton Chamber of
Commerce Report 6d.
- The Bankers of London
by Percy Arnold 4/6
- Economics for Everybody
by Elles Dee 3d.
- The Power of Money
by J. B. Galway 3d.
- The Purpose of Politics
by H. E. 3d.
- Tax-Bonds or Bondage and the
Answer to Federal Union
by John Mitchell...1/- (Postage 2½)

Leaflets

- Invincible Britain
by John Mitchell2d. each,
1/6 doz.
- What We Are About
by H. E.....50 for 1/6
- Hitler and Churchill Finance
by John Mitchell.....50 for 1/9
- Bomb Hitler !
by C. H. Douglas.....100 for 1/3

All from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

BELFAST D.S.C. GROUP

Group Meeting on January 7, 1941
In the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at
8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon Sec.,
17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications,
Ltd., at 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.