

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 25.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket (XII)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

It is, I think, essential to bear in mind that the British land and property system has not failed by reason of anything inherent in the system, *although it is quite possible that certain defects in it would themselves have brought about their own remedies if artificial hindrances had not intervened.*

The system of private ownership and administration has been strangled, consciously and purposely, by international finance, in order to obtain control of the land, and every land agitation, from Henry George to Lloyd George and after, has been financed by bankers—not the kind of people commonly called bankers, who are mostly technicians, but international gangsters using bond issues in place of firearms.

It ought to be observed that it is just as sensible to say, "Dr. Brown must be a bad doctor, because he was hit with a hatchet by a burglar when he was coming from his club," as to say, in a world which was governed by money, that a land system was a failure when it was made the target for systematic attacks by the Money-Power. The distinction is of primary importance, inasmuch as it is certainly true that no system can flourish while unable to pursue its legitimate objectives save at the cost of sustained sabotage.

There is in essence not very much difference between the attempt to eliminate the small business in favour of the chain store and the so-called Co-operative Society, and the object is control, in both cases. What is remarkable is the immense vitality of the individualistic enterprise in the face of what would appear to be overwhelming odds. The defeat of the small man has been so difficult that sheer brutality has been invoked. "Only in war, or under threat of war—" can rapid progress be made.

There are two principles, however, which require attention in any attempt to deal with these matters. The first is the fetish of "efficiency."

It is a favourite trick of conjurers to direct your attention to their coat sleeves while the rabbit and the hat are placed upon the table. Otherwise you might think the hat looked heavy. In much the same way, Big Business does not waste any time in arguing on its own merits and personal likeability. It is much slicker than that. "Under war, or threat of war—" peoples are stampeded into a centralised reorganisation, and if, and when, it is discovered that waste, corruption, and disillusionment are rampant—well, that's just too bad, but we've done it now.

Entirely apart from the questions of social value, it is exceedingly doubtful whether such efficiencies as may in some cases attach to increased unit size, do not cancel out

even in industrial synthesis. However that may be, there cannot be a more fatal error than to separate an economic system from the fact of world wars. It is the Encyclopaedist fallacy once again. Neither economic nor social systems are in water-tight compartments.

It is not an accident that it is Russia and Germany which are at death grips—it is the direct and logical consequence of their economic and social monopolistic systems, and "Socialism" is quite naturally common to both of them. Germany was, if possible, more Socialistic in the days of the Kaiser and Bismark than at present, and German Socialists were regarded by the British Trades Unionists as the model on which their own activities should be modelled.

But this abracadabra of "efficiency" goes much further. If it really is as difficult to live on this planet as Big Business would have us believe, then, if it is worth while, we must, of course, sacrifice everything to "efficiency," by which I suppose is meant turning everything which is found in nature into something else. On the other hand, of course, we mustn't have too much efficiency, because that would cause unemployment. You will agree, that it's all very difficult, and that we ought to have some idea as to what we are trying to do, before we re-make the country "Under war, or threat."

All rights reserved.

To be continued.

Hydro Electric Development in Scotland

Note: Space is not available to deal fully, or indeed adequately with the issues raised by the Bill now before Parliament designed to give effect to the recommendations of the Cooper Committee's Report, and the following article does not attempt to do more than direct attention to salient features.

"If I were asked to specify the most disastrous feature with which the world in general, and this country in particular, is threatened, I would reply 'The rule of the Organised Functional Expert—the engineer, the architect, the chemist, amongst others.' As I am an engineer and retain the most wholehearted affection for engineering, I may perhaps be credited with objectivity in this matter."

— C. H. DOUGLAS in *The Social Crediter*, January 23, 1943.

The Report of the Cooper Committee (December, 1942) boils down to just that—the rule of the functional expert in the realm of policy. Trained as engineers or manufacturers, in their own sphere they are almost without exception experienced and competent. The recognised authority and competence which such functionaries obtain in their own sphere may be, and often is, a handicap to an outlook which transcends function. 'There is nothing like leather' and the Report inevitably advocates more production

and yet more production. The Committee appears to be unconscious of the end and aim of production, alike in peace and war. The mighty Grid system of Great Britain produced 23,000 million kilowatt hours in the year 1938, but it is only by accepting highly debatable premises that it can be agreed that this huge amount of energy was for the benefit of the people of Great Britain. Over half was used in factories for the production of goods, a large proportion of which were for exportation to other countries. Thus we made a gift to other countries of our labours, the electrical and other energy involved. If we merely obtained the raw material for further export, that was bad business.

As every industrialised country was fighting for export markets (with the least possible amount of imports) this economic fight culminated in war even though other factors confused the issue. Hence the general mess in which we now find ourselves. Even now during the war there is much evidence to suggest that war purposes are subordinated to financial considerations, export markets, and foreign exchange.

The terms of reference of the Cooper Committee make inevitable the findings for more and more production. But when it was suggested by one of the bodies giving evidence before the Committee—"That grants and loans from public funds should be made widely to single individuals or small groups to assist in the installation of small plants of 5-20 h.p., for domestic or small power use in, or in connection with, single houses or adjoining houses,"—the Committee replied "that we are unable to regard this project as practicable or desirable." Also, "The difficulties of administration would be very great." (Page 21, para. 24 of the Report.)

One must suppose that the Committee intend to convey by 'impracticable' the meaning of "physically impossible." This is obviously untrue on all counts. An industry which is capable of sabotaging practically three quarters of its generating stations and other electrical equipment in the three years before the war, and then substituting that huge colossus, the Grid, should not talk about such comparatively small projects as being impracticable.

Where the Report is wholly indefensible is in its intrusion at various points into matters which beg the question at issue. There is no virtue in work or production for the sake of work or production as an end in itself. Such Committees as the Cooper Committee have no standing on matters of high policy and would be strengthened by an explicit disclaimer to that effect. It is now probable that our production of electrical energy has risen to over 30,000 million units *per annum*.* If all production was directed to the purpose of consumption or use there is quite sufficient energy already available to ensure 'that age of freedom' (and leisure) to which the Atlantic Charter refers.

"For general purposes," it is stated in paragraph 46, "the most useful formula yet devised for estimating the demand for electricity for domestic and industrial purposes depends on the units consumed per head of population." The units consumed are governed by cost and purchasing power, and so the 'formula' is merely 'sound' finance propaganda.

Many more phrases could be quoted revealing the same financial background. Probably the most outstanding and ridiculous is contained in para. 24, where it is stated:—

*The last figures available are those quoted above for 1937-38: 23,000 million units.

"Water power as a source of energy has different economic and financial characteristics from those of coal and steam fired stations." Again propaganda for financial orthodoxy is tacked on to the physical characteristics of water power.

"The proposals outlined below will call for a measure of faith and foresight," says paragraph 42. Of course they will. They always have done so: jam tomorrow; never jam to-day. For the great majority of people it is necessary to obtain work before they can obtain purchasing power and so enjoy the results of their own past efforts.

The Report goes on to say (para. 42):—"We are bound to add that the final answer to the critics is to ask them what alternatives they have to offer which afford any similar prospect of arresting the decay which has already proceeded to dangerous lengths." The vital point in this quotation is contained in the words 'arresting decay' which could be countered by the further question, "what kind of decay?" In a country which only a few years ago was groaning under a burden of plenty, when at the same time we had an army of three million unemployed, wholesale sabotage was resorted to to get rid of this abundance. Food-stuffs, machinery, shipyards, cotton looms (10,000,000 of them), were sabotaged, and almost every industry could be cited to illustrate the policy of destruction prevailing. Yet the Committee asks 'what alternatives?' Does it mean to re-constitute in the Highlands the industry sabotaged in England? It is good to know 'that the critics are many and varied,' although many of the critics themselves seem to be in a fog as to the why and wherefore, and are thus easily 'led up the garden path.' Apparently the ordinary man can still judge by results, which of course, is the only certain way of judging any policy. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

With regard to what the Committee term 'administrative difficulties,' why is this excuse never used in relation to the assessment and collection of taxation? Further the 'administrative difficulties' associated with the prevailing policy of centralisation, planning and regimentation, which is 'against the grain' of individual interest everywhere, are both great and formidable. There is no valid reason why such individuals should put up with policies they do not want and do not like. The M.P. is still the representative of policy and he should be held responsible for the results attained. It is useless for either the people themselves or the M.P. to argue about technical methods. The experts will always beat them at that game. The spate of expert Committees with which we are afflicted at the present time is merely a reflection of the subtle tactics of 'interests' to queer the pitch of the M.P. as a representative of policy.

From the point of view of the Scottish, who are primarily concerned, perhaps the most charitable comment which might be made on the Report is: "We don't know where we're going, but we're on our way." W. A. BARRATT.

The Social Credit Scheme for Scotland (1933)

is available for distribution in Scotland.

Price 1d. (Postage extra)

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
49 PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

“TIMEO DANAOS . . .”

“I fear the Greeks, even when bringing gifts.”

The Greek-fearing seem to have become as rare as the God-fearing; but perhaps it's the same thing.

Social Crediters in close touch with this journal will recognise and heed the warning embodied in the first paragraph of *From Week to Week*. It was on January 2, in the same place, that we covered “under the threatened final insult that ‘*Social Credit has come.*’”

On December 3, according to a front page of *The New Era* (references to which newspaper have occasionally appeared in *The Social Crediter*), Dr. H. V. Evatt,* Federal Attorney-General and Minister for External Affairs, addressed “the luncheon meeting arranged by the Social Credit Movement of New South Wales. . . . The large dining room was crowded to capacity. This was Dr. Evatt's first public engagement since the strenuous days and nights [nights too!] of the Constitutional Convention. . . . Dr. Evatt was obliged to travel by car from Canberra. . . .” Mr. S. F. Allen, who presided, said Dr. Evatt “had every justification for cancelling the engagement, but he had kept faith. . . .” What Messrs. Giles, Barclay-Smith and Mrs. L. Beirne said has not yet reached us; but points from the report of Dr. Evatt's address to the assembled Social Crediters are as follows:—

Dr. Evatt, who speaks quietly, with an informal style, said that he was there to publicly pay tribute to a Movement which had done a great work in educating the people.

It was the Social Credit Movement which first drew attention to the strange and quite illogical paradox of poverty amidst plenty. That phrase crystallised a great human tragedy, not only in Australia but all over the world. The proudest nations hung their heads in social shame.

Australia, said Dr. Evatt, had prided itself on leading the world in Social legislation, but in 1931, unemployment in this country was relatively higher than anywhere else in the world. One out of every three persons was unemployed, obliged to subsist on sustenance or the dole.

“The second proposition that Social Crediters had put forward, and which was now generally accepted and appreciated, was summed up in the epigrammatic phrase: ‘That which is physically possible is financially possible.’ It had taken a great war and untellable human suffering to convince the people of that sound economic principle which you Social Crediters have propagated for so long.” (Applause.)

“I cannot follow all the activities and facets of the Social Credit Movement and the movements within the Movement, but on your main principles the rising tide of public opinion is with you. You have done your job. The old, false shibboleths in regard to money are due for interment in the grave in which they lie to-day.

“But there is one aspect to which I must draw your attention. What is physically possible is not always legally possible. . . .”

Dr. Evatt went on to suggest that the Constitution,

*Some material concerning Dr. Evatt's visit to England appeared in *The Social Crediter* for July 18, 1942.

“drawn up on the principle that absolute power corrupts,” stood in the way of the solution of the problem of “employment and unemployment.” The Commonwealth had “no direct authority over it.” In amending the Constitution [see *The Social Crediter*, February 20] his chief objective was to do away with the legal and constitutional difficulties “so that we may be able to deal more effectively with the crucial problems which will follow this war.” A further reference to unemployment was:—

“The tendency will be to paint the pre-1939 days as happy days. We must resist that tendency. Fourteen per cent. of the people were unemployed. Morale was low. Physically, an alarmingly high percentage of people were unfitted for war.”

To spare the blushes of our readers, Dr. Evatt's references to them (?) have been omitted from the above account. Let it suffice to say that Dr. Evatt “respects them, honours them and pays homage to them.” And well he might!

When (and that is the point!) not Dr. Evatt's, but another ‘quiet’ voice, addresses them at closer range, will they greet it with “prolonged applause”?

“Of course, the pioneers of a movement seldom get the credit for the work they have done, but no doubt they are fully rewarded by seeing their ideas adopted.”

Will they “see their ideas adopted”? Some already have. Had it not been for *The Social Crediter's* “astringency” [there are many other adjectives: to choose from this week's letters, there are “aloofness” and “elusiveness”] there would have been many more. We confess to astringency: an astringent is something that draws tight: that binds: that strengthens. Right-ho! And we have been aloof from compromising entanglements (so far!), from compromising benefactions and we have eluded capture. That these form a grave danger is undeniable; but the danger they constitute is no new danger. It is the old danger inherent in a ‘democracy’ of intelligence. The only workable democracy—indeed the only workable society—is one founded on community of policy. That issue has not been compromised. But of the future all we can say is that, by the Grace of God, we may be found *sufficient*.

The Secretariat, like Nature, does not compromise. Compromise is, essentially, an agreement between two or more persons that none of them shall get what he wants. Nature achieves her results by resultant, not by compromise. Particularly, we do not compromise the issue between ourselves and the monetary reformers. There is the gravest danger, particularly at the present time, of a diversion of energy from the vital and, if we (the race, not the Secretariat) are to survive, inescapable task of rectifying policy, to an attack on a mechanism which was itself the ‘headquarters’ of policy, but is so no longer. The importance of the money system depends on the *effectiveness* of its control, *i.e.*, the sanctions behind it.

Dr. Evatt's is merely a crude imitation of the Baldwin technique of calling your views his dearest aspiration, and passing a Bill to see they are never realised, a technique used with less dexterity by Mr. Mackenzie King. Let us hope that the object lessons abroad may quicken our minds for direr thrusts at home; for they are surely at hand. T. J.

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: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
 LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 9. No. 25. Saturday, February 27, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Simultaneously, the world over, references to "Social Credit" are appearing in the international-finance-controlled press. All of them suggest the repentant sinner who has now seen the light.

There could scarcely be a more dangerous symptom, although it indicates a stage which had to be reached and passed.

• • •

"The dark eleventh hour
 Draws on, and sees us sold
 To every evil Power
 We fought against, of old."
 RUDYARD KIPLING, *circa* 1911.

• • •

It is clear that the Scientific Method on which the nineteenth century placed a reliance which is now seen to be a little pathetic, is itself subject to the Law of Diminishing Returns. The great discoveries which lend themselves to the operational test of validity, the steam engine, the galvanic battery, the dynamo, the Siemens-Martin and Bessemer steel processes, were the work of a mere handful of investigators. For each of these, working with crude apparatus and little or no financial backing, there are millions turned out by the Universities and technical schools of every country having at their disposal every device that ingenuity can suggest or money buy. The outcome, apart from logical development and refinement of the main basic discoveries, is a mass of abstract theories most of which are discarded a few years after they are announced as epoch-making. Probably, of all the mass of "applied science" products with which the world has been deluged in the last thirty years, stainless steel cutlery, vacuum cleaners, and very doubtfully, wireless broadcasting, alone have much more than gadget value.

Of course, this does not mean that the Scientific Method is not a beautiful instrument in the right hands. Far from it. It merely means that bad workmen do bad work with any tools, and in addition, spoil good tools.

• • •

Napoleon said that the moral was to the material in war, as three to one. Well, we all know where the Arsenal of Morality is, anyway.

An anonymous defender of the Uthwatt Report writing

to the *Scotsman* of February 12, affirms, "The Uthwatt proposals have nothing in them to hazard the ordinary citizens' rights of tenure. Such suggestions crab the pitch for a very great game the Government has afoot."

Sez you!

• • •

We are indebted to our esteemed contemporary *The New Times* of Melbourne for the following extracts from Magna Charta, which, possibly by reason of them, has gone to the United States:—

EXTRACTS FROM MAGNA CHARTA (1215 A.D.)

10. If any one shall have taken any sum, great or small, as a loan from the Jews, and shall die before that debt is paid, that debt shall not bear interest so long as the heir, from whomever he may hold, shall be under age. And if the debt fall into our hands, we shall take nothing save the chattel contained in the deed.

11. And if any one dies owing a debt to the Jews, his wife shall have her dowry, and shall restore nothing of that debt. But if there shall remain children of that dead man, and they shall be under age, the necessities shall be provided for them according to the nature of the dead man's holding; and from the residue the debt shall be paid, saving the service due to the lords. In like manner shall be done concerning debts that are due to others besides Jews.

20. A freeman shall only be amerced for a small offence according to the measure of that offence. And for a great offence he shall be amerced according to the magnitude of the offence, saving his contentment [means of subsistence]; and a merchant, in the same way, saving his merchandise. And a villein, in the same way, if he fall under our mercy, shall be amerced saving his wainnage. And none of the aforesaid fines shall be imposed save upon oath of upright men from the neighbourhood.

28. No constable or other bailiff of ours shall take the corn or other chattels of any one except he straightway give money for them, or can be allowed a respite in that regard by the will of the seller.

30. No sheriff nor bailiff of ours, nor any one else, shall take the horses or carts of any freeman for transport, unless by the will of that freeman.

38. No bailiff, on his own simple assertion, shall henceforth put anyone to his law, without producing faithful witnesses in evidence.

39. No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseized, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any way harmed, save by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.

40. To none will we sell, to none deny or delay, right or justice.

45. We will not make men justices, constables, sheriffs or bailiffs unless they are such as know the law of the realm, and are minded to observe it rightly.

• • •

"After analysing the Archbishop's message of about 100 words, sentence by sentence, with the zest of a theologian on an important text, Mr. Hargrave asks: 'Is not all this a very great encouragement for us?'"

— "PETERBOROUGH" in the *Daily Telegraph*, February 15.

Well, you know, "Peterborough," the woodman who gives a little encouragement to the ivy may give quite a lot of discouragement to the oak! And *vice versa*.

THE BREAKDOWN OF BUREAUCRACY

Under this title, "The Social Crediter" publishes from time to time significant statements from non-Social Credit as well as Social Credit sources, concerning the development of the crisis forced upon the world by neglect of the principles which must underly successful association for objectives agreed upon by those associating.

The following is the text of an Address by the Principal of the University College of the South West, Exeter, Mr. John Murray, to the Incorporated Association of Head Masters, in London, last month. Mr. Murray is not, so far as we know, a Social Crediter.

Address to the Incorporated Association of Head Masters, London: January, 1943

When Mr. Taylor sent me the kind invitation to address you I accepted it gladly. But I have my misgivings. I very frequently speak on education, chiefly at prize-givings, when only one H.M. is present. One in an audience of 200 or 500 or 800 does not dismay me. An audience of H.M.s only is another matter. It is not only the audience; the character of the present controversies about education also weighs on my mind. The range of debate has been widened and the key sharpened by the intrusion of motives that are not educational. The crisis, still a little below the surface, seems to be advancing into major politics. For I doubt if the deliberations of Board of Education Committees, or other devices, can keep the issues out of the open arena.

It would be difficult, I think, in any other sphere of discussion to match the confusions and errors that beset education. For what is Education? Buildings, equipment, staff courses, curricula, examinations, are necessary means, but are not education. With them you can miss it; and you can have it without them. The essence of this matter is subtler. The true concern of education, I consider is with imagination. And what is that? I can give no exact or tidy answer but only indications. It is a fugitive, delicate, spontaneous manifestation, an intimate stroke of personal initiative. It is not always the agent's act so much as an event of which his mind is the scene. It enshrines, for instance, the curious transition, from puzzlement to clarity, from fumbling for a clue or a meaning to a firm grasp, from uneasy dimness to light and security. It is a moment of constructive vision, with the stress now on vision and now on constructiveness. Again, it is the release of a natural energy; it is an act, and the master-key of action.

For all its frequency and familiarity, it is unique, and a sort of miracle. This illuminatory incipency of mind I call imagination. You remember Socrates, of course, who was a born teacher; he claimed only to be a midwife of the mind. This incipency is as various as the modes of man's activity. There is the imagination of the hand, the sense of materials, of what can be done with them, and how. There is the scientific imagination that steals ahead of facts in presentiments of what causes will be like, of where they may be looked for, of what the linkages will be. There is, rarest of all, the mathematical imagination. There are the imaginations that give us the fine arts. There is the imagination that makes the athlete or the acrobat, the sense of balance, pace, momentum, whereby in some persons the entire system works harmoniously and beautifully with an almost untaught perfection. Lastly, the most widely diffused and the most urgent in the particular and the general interests, there is

the social imagination—the sense of what is in other minds and natures, the reciprocal focussing that builds up contacts into ties, and ties into conscience and a life.

The educator's business, to sum it up, in essence is to search out the roots of imagination in children. The roots are invisible, and often dormant. It matters little in what order they come alive. They ripen unequally and irregularly. The vivifying of imagination in one sphere often induces a vivifying in others. It is for the educator to discern and to encourage the natural stirrings. What the task calls for is obvious; a hopeful and affectionate helpfulness above all. The temptations of the practitioner are also obvious; to be dominant and didactic. It is so easy for him to forget the miraculousness of imagination, or to despair of it, and to turn aside to mechanising the circumstantials. Very often there seems no way but this mechanising to fill the time up. So handicapped is he by the defects or the delays of Nature, by lack of favouring conditions of health and vitality, of home and environment. It is not in reason that the schools should make up for deficiency in the very influences that are the *sine quibus non* of good schooling.

The educator must himself be a person of imagination, of at least two imaginations, the social as *sine qua non*, and some other or others in as high a degree as can be managed. It is not only the teachers. There are the committee men with their staffs, the bureaucrats at headquarters in London and the politicians. If the teachers themselves are liable to the mechanising fallacies, how much more liable are those others in their various degrees of remoteness?

From talking about what I think the living core of education, I turn to some of the present controversies. They are developing in an air of crisis. This atmosphere, as hardly need be said, owes less to educational realism than to stormy impulses invading ambitiously from the field of politics.

Public Schools and Boarding Schools

The most distinctive aim of English education is to promote the sense of community. Some teachers and some entire nations are content to instruct. The English, more ambitious, emulate certain Latin verbs which govern two accusatives,—the person taught and the thing. They strive after a double technique with a boy; as a pupil and as a person. They have certainly gone to great lengths with their chosen means. Only if the parties live, work and play together, these English think, can this technique get a grip, and to yield good results, it needs time. Community being a hierarchical idea, three years of boarding-school seems the minimum; a year of being nobody, a final year as a somebody,

and a year between—if no more can be had—of edifying prospect and retrospect. In any humane scheme of education, residence is not a luxury or an extra, but a well-contrived means towards a major end. Different boys ripen for it at different times; some early, some late, some never. Some would be ripe for it about the time of going to a University; but even if they go, most of the Universities are non-residential.

It needs hardly to be argued, I hope, that a spell of residential education improves a boy's chance of imbibing community, and of learning citizenship in advance. That is the lesson of the Public Schools for the nation. Foreigners are acutely aware of it; and cast about for how to imitate. Some of them think that the Public Schools have made England, forgetting that England first made the Public Schools. It is only at home among ourselves that doubts and grousing about them are heard. That is an English habit; they grouse hopefully and appealingly, in order to have their beliefs massaged. There is no secret, of course, about this lesson of the Public Schools for the nation. But certain conditions must be fulfilled; there must be the right leadership, the right atmosphere, the right spirit in the staff, the right control and method. The most fundamental condition is freedom for conviction and initiative to work. Without this freedom the Public Schools would not have developed, nor could they continue, nor could new schools adopt those open secrets with good hope. It is not by any ordinance of uniformity that these schools are a means of grace. They differ in most respects, including merit; and there are schools for all tastes; the variety is so great as to embarrass the choice of parents. Freedom is their corner-stone, the freedom of the school and the freedom of the parent. The system is so free as to be inherently experimental; and experiment is a prime need. Freedom seems to be the true element for the extremely personal venture of education, as I have tried to depict it.

The Boarding-school controversy, after all, rings a little unreal. Listening to it, one might gather that the disbelievers in Boarding Schools are in danger of having their children willy-nilly drafted into them, and that the believers are to be denied access to them. Either compulsion would be undemocratic. It would be undemocratic, even if the disbelievers heavily outnumbered the believers. Democracy is not a machinery for submitting all issues to majority votes, and then suppressing minority views and minority practice. That is totalitarianism, which can be watched at work on the continent. The majority vote is not an absolute good, or an end in itself. It is a mere means to an end, and this end is nothing less than wisdom, justice, and liberty in political things and personal comfort and security for the citizen. Democracy is a safeguard for alternatives and differences, in short for liberty, in this case the liberty, primarily, of parents to buy the education they prefer. In the clamour of experts, politicians, propagandists, and directors of education, who, though servants of elective democratic bodies, disregard the salutary rule by which civil servants are restrained from public controversy and agitation, the parents go almost unheard.

The chief fault of the Public Schools is their fewness. Their membership, being limited, becomes a privilege. But there are far more of them than there used to be, and they are much more mixed. Many are quite cheap, and many

will be cheaper. They are often charged with not being democratic. If only there were places in them, the existing schools and others that may be built, for a reasonable proportion of all the boys who would profit by joining them, the charge would be false. Even now, it is only true statistically, and only upon the totalitarian view of the majority-minority impasse which I have referred to.

Inside the schools democracy rules in the sense that a boy stands on his own legs, and is judged strictly for what he is. He finds his niche in that community, and imbibes as much of its citizenship as he is capable of. He goes out into the rough and tumble of life already in some degree a formed citizen. There would be less rough and tumble if more boys thus learned citizenship in advance. The Public Schools are often accused of dividing the nation into two camps, insiders and outsiders. But this distinction is a constant in all educated nations, whether they use day secondary schools, or boarding-schools, or both. If both were abolished here, the distinction would still persist but on a worse basis, more worldly and more philistine. The great desideratum is that the distinction should rest on a sound basis, such as a lengthy and searching education, and that more and more should become insiders, and fewer and fewer outsiders. An improving ratio of insiders is good evidence of progress in a nation. It is foolish to expect by any manipulation of education to smooth out social differences, if a searching education,—and, the more searching the better—is the best ground for differentiating. The boarding-school rests on the belief that community cannot be fully learned out of a book, or by class-lessons or propaganda; it comes not by talking about it, though talk can help, but by living it. Community is not civics, though there is no harm in civics; on the contrary. But civics is about a different citizenship, the adult rate-paying house-keeping sort, and knowledge of these sides of adult life is no substitute for understanding the social texture and drift of school life, and living up to the opportunities of school citizenship.

But the Public Schools, and boarding schools in general, are not the only means of grace. All and any English schools, whatever their handicaps and deprivations may be, and however grave, appear to seek after community. It is the bias of the blood. The social imagination, strong throughout the race, is to be seen at work here, there and everywhere, bravely and inventively, with penurious and pathetic economy; and it forms boys into practising citizens who will presently be good recruits for English democracy. Bad friends make worse democrats. Whatever else an English school may produce or fail to produce, citizens it must produce. When, I wonder, will the worse-circumstanced schools be given a special community grant?

Equalitarianism and Bureaucracy

It is better to conceive our democracy as a form of citizenship than as a form of Government. Starting points determine most arguments. Start out from the idea of Government and the State, and you may easily slip into totalitarianism, mistaking government for an end in itself and the State for an absolute. You may easily have too much of either. The truest democracy is a nation of friends. Of citizenship, of fellow-citizenship, of friendship there can hardly be enough, let alone too much. With this political orientation our English schools, striving after community,

as I have described, chime in well.

In these days of reconstruction we are threatened with an entirely new order in education. Equality is the key-note; equality of opportunity for children, guaranteed by all-round standardising, by equality of status for schools, and of salaries, I suppose, for teachers. Farewell to freedom and variety! "Parity of esteem" is the slogan. The easiest parity of esteem to achieve is, of course, parity of disesteem. But parity of esteem is a false idea. It is not in human nature to concede such parity to persons or institutions. Take husbands and wives, who might well have benefit of parity. But who ever esteems them alike? Take the Houses of Parliament, or government offices, or churches, or clubs, or Oxford Colleges, or railways, or butchers or barbers or candlestick makers. The human mind has a voracious instinct for differences. If they are there, it will find them. If not, it will invent them. When confronted by two persons or two groups of the same species, the natural man,—and that is everyone of us—believes the one to be better, if only he knew how, than the other. Esteem is the most discriminating thing in human life. Parity of esteem is a fable, the fancy of an arithmetical psychologist, an idea fit for statistics. It is certainly not a human motive. Esteem is always desired in the comparative degree. To be esteemed equally with another is as good as no esteem at all: it is, in fact, parity of disesteem.

I wish to put a question to the equalitarians. The fathers of democracy are the ancient Greeks, and among them chiefly the Athenians. Have the equalitarians, I wonder, considered the two books on Friendship in Aristotle's Ethics? He there sheds light from a novel angle on Athenian life, on the society for which no political framework but democracy could suit. Why did the Athenians need so much freedom? There was so much of it at Athens that you couldn't tell a slave from a freeman in the street, which shocked many from other parts of Greece. It was because the Athenians were gifted, diverse, enterprising and versatile, above most, above any; and unless they were free they could not be or do all that was in them to be and do. Friendliness was the substance of their working citizenship. Aristotle's emphasis on *philia* comprehends every sort of contact, those of sport, of business, of culture, the nobler ties, deep and lasting, or the brief, banal and trivial. Aristotle emphasises pointedly the entire range of contacts between unequals. Athens rejoiced in differences; and the warmth and force of her citizenship easily saved the differences and inequalities from becoming complexes. The pioneers of democracy were not equalitarians. Equalitarianism is not democracy, but the pedantry of democracy; and against such declension buoyancy, vitality and tolerance make the best defence.

The method of the proposed New Order is administrative simplicity and uniformity in unit areas of considerable size. Educational effort within those areas is to be bureaucratically subordinated to local committees and their officials. The signs are that both committees and directors would be masterful. The extreme voices in the movement threaten to abolish all Governing Bodies of schools, or at least to neutralise them. Some threaten to exclude from employment in the public services all those who have not been educated in the bureaucratic system of schools. The movement as a whole disregards the rights of parents.

All this can be studied in the orange sixpenny of the directors of education, *Education: A Plan for the Future*.

Administrative uniformity in a broad scheme of centralised power is, of course, a distinctive ambition of bureaucrats. I don't blame them altogether; for that, besides being their ambition, is the key to good administration in certain spheres. Strong central control with hierarchical subordination of staff and labour is often the basis, and the only basis, of effective working. But this hierarchical scheme would not suit English education, or the English. It may have its uses elsewhere. It is the German system; it was, long before the Nazis came into power, and it has lent itself admirably to their purposes. Without it they could hardly have made such a conquest of German education. It is, in fact, the totalitarians' opportunity.

But let us confess that the working of our democracy has occasioned, though it does not excuse, the bureaucratic ambition. The County Councils, themselves somewhat political bodies, can hardly be said to fill their education committees with a single eye to the fitness of the members for work on education. As the work steadily extends and diversifies, the laymen naturally find themselves at a growing disadvantage. They are tempted, and indeed obliged, to rely more and more on their chief official. It is the system, of course, that is wrong, so wrong that it ought to be altered. The current conceptions have been too simple. The nation has assumed that a uniform style of bureaucracy will answer equally in all branches of administration, as if what suited the bus system of a city, or the Streets Committee, would also suit the schools. The misfit is just as glaring in Whitehall. The responsible organ at the Board of Education ought to be a body recruited from educational practitioners of distinction, especially those from the highest levels of education, and from the educated professions and other persons of distinction. The best local thought and experience in education should similarly be organised into the local control of education, and not least the universities. If no reform on these lines is undertaken, the bureaucratic trend will strengthen, and the Directors of Education will have won. But that victory might itself lead to a reform on novel lines. If a highly placed official is to be virtually supreme in the control of education, he ought to hold his power direct from the electors, and not by the appointment of a body not well-fitted to instruct or guide him. America offers good examples of chief executives by election. In a broad view the election of Directors of Education by the popular vote would break no democratic principle.

I have pursued the two topics of equalitarianism and bureaucratism at considerable length. The danger that threatens, on the one hand from an exaggerated and morbid view of the place of equality in the democratic ideal, and on the other by over-reaching claims and encroachment by one of the elements in the technique of governing, can be summed up easily. It is freedom that is endangered, the freedom of parents and schools, and the freedom to experiment. The crisis extends far beyond the sphere of education, for it may be said to have reached that sphere from general politics. The challenge to lovers of freedom is no momentary or local diversion. This gathering is specifically concerned with the challenge in education. But you and your organisation are not alone in this danger. Many organisations and many individuals are only too well aware of it. They nurse their fears, and their courage, in isolation. They would be stronger, both for defence and for offence, by joining forces. A lead is needed. A lead, even a powerful lead, of course,

would only be a beginning. I look round this room, and wonder whether the beginning might not be made here. You have behind you a large and diverse body of schools, a comprehensive constituency. I ask myself whether you might not hopefully and advantageously give a lead for all defenders and lovers of freedom in education to unite. I leave you, if you like this question, to ask it of yourselves.

OBITUARY

Mr. A. T. Shippey

It is with deep regret that we hear of the death of A. T. Shippey of Colchester. Social Credit thus loses one of its champions in Essex and East Anglia. He was ever active and his fearless advocacy of what he believed to be right and based on Social Credit philosophy made him a factor seriously to be reckoned with in the Colchester Electorate.

Although his business must have required the major part of his time and energy, he was always ready to use his undoubted organising powers in the furtherance of the real interests of electors, whether local or parliamentary.

He was Secretary of the Colchester Douglas Social Credit Association and in this capacity organised the Electoral Campaign with much success. He wrote dozens of letters to the Press, to M.P.s, to local Councils. He was prominent in the Lower Rates effort and with the facts about local rates at his finger tips produced potent arguments, substantiating demands in personal interviews with Councillors and in discussions with ratepayers.

Before the war A. T. Shippey kept the D.S.C. Association very much alive in Colchester, organised many meetings in Colchester and was always ready to lend a hand to other Essex and East Anglian Associations, which help was always useful and timely. Nothing was too much trouble. His place of business was a Mecca for Social Crediters and his business stock of books always included copies of Social Credit literature—you could always get what you wanted at Shippey's.

Shippey was a certain and regular figure at Social Credit meetings and conferences in London. He had a thorough understanding of the philosophy of Social Credit, and it was chiefly by conversational argument rather than by speechifying expositions that he gave others the benefit of his experience and knowledge.

Social Credit has lost a well-informed advocate, an able organiser and a sincere friend. W. S.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is now in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The following Groups and Associations are registered as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

GREAT BRITAIN

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
 BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. A. Crothers, 17 Cregagh Road, Belfast.
 BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
 BRADFORD D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
 CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
 LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
 MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., T. H. Rea, 23 Clarewood Place, Fenham, Newcastle, 5.
 PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
 PRESTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., B. H. Ferguson, 46 Atherton Road, Fielwood, Preston.
 SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19 Coniston Avenue, Redbridge, Southampton.
 STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.

Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), WOKING and WOODFORD. Enquiries concerning these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

AUSTRALIA

- New South Wales** Hon. Secretary.
 NEW SOUTH WALES D.S.C. Assoc.:
 WOMEN'S SECTION
 DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH
 THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN
 (The above are closely allied)
 INFORMATION SHEET
 COWPER D.S.C. Group
 Miss Grace Marsden.
 W. H. Hand (Editor).
 J. McDonald.

South Australia

- ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group C. H. Allen.
 QUEENSTOWN D.S.C. Group D. J. Munyard.
 GLENELG D.S.C. Group H. W. Lee.

Western Australia

- PERTH D.S.C. Group A. Cook.

Queensland

- QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association A. W. Noakes.

Victoria

- COBURG S.C. Group A. J. O'Callaghan.

NEW ZEALAND

- PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association G. J. Billingham.

SOUTH AFRICA

- PORT ELIZABETH D.S.C. Group L. W. Smith.

CANADA

- VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group Mrs. Brooks.
 LIVERPOOL (Nova Scotia) D.S.C. Group T. E. D. Watson.