

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 11. No. 10.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1943.

6d Weekly.

## MODERN SCIENCE (IV)

Lord Hankey has been descanting, in the *Sunday Times*, on the marvels of modern therapeutics, with the assistance of data provided by the Secretary of the Medical Research Council, Sir Edward Mellanby, via the Ludwig Mond Lecture for the current year, delivered in the University of Manchester.

Those who are aware of Lord Hankey's former connection with those Marines proverbially a fit subject for enlightenment, may anticipate that the mention of such a galaxy all in one breath is intended to be vaguely disparaging to modern therapeutics. By no means. The question to Big Business, and by that I mean centralised control of a function in all its forms, thus comprising the Medical Research Council, and even the University of Manchester, as well as I.C.I. and Unilever Limited, is not, or should not be, 'do you make this, that or the other?' e.g., soap, or satanic acid. It is, or should be, 'yes, and what besides?' And, failing an answer to that question, the most resolute, persistent and minute investigation should be made, if we want to go on living, with or without the odd card from the odd sleeve (such as 'penicillin'), to discover exactly what it does do. It is the politically-uninstructed view that a poisoned well is a well without any water in it that is chiefly responsible for the dangerous notion that there is no such thing as a poisoned well. So I pass over (albeit without either very great enthusiasm or indeed complete conviction) Lord Hankey's theme, together with the title he chose for his article, although that is in itself not uninteresting—*The Unseen Enemy*—, and even Lord Hankey's candid admission that his subject, the efficacy of scientific research and, more particularly, the efficacy of scientific research under the control and direction of the Medical Research Council, is not his pidgin, noting, however, that the "considerable use" Lord Hankey has made of the Ludwig Mond Lecture is "with permission." Even the asterisk, nervously explaining that the *British Medical Journal* published the lecture on September 18, three months after its delivery, I overlook, so far as comment is concerned. Quite possibly Lord Hankey is a regular and delighted reader of that bye-product of drughouses.

What attracts my attention is the word 'inspiration' in the statement at the close of the article that men and women are "devoting their lives" (never mind to what they are devoting them, since that is in the long run, if not in the short, hypothetical) "under the inspiration of the Medical Research Council."

I am very much afraid that that may be true; but I hope it isn't.

Several years ago now, about 1932, but it may have been earlier, the scientific correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, for some reason which is as much of a mystery to me now as it was at the time, explained how and why a 'new' scientific discipline called 'bio-chemistry' (by the bye, this has nothing particularly to do with homeopathy) was advancing in the universities (and, incidentally, outside as well). The argument ran as follows:—During the war, large numbers of physicists and chemists had been trained for service in connection with the effort to re-establish the industry based upon commercial exploitation of the by-products of the distillation of coal-tar. The correspondent wrote 'physicists,' though there was not much 'physicist' about it so far as this country and its medical resources were concerned: to judge from personal observation, which is necessarily fragmentary, the 'physicist' side of the matter concerned Russia more than Great Britain. In any case, the argument ran that this body of trained men contained many of great intelligence and resolution, who might have made considerable trouble 'for the government' if they had not been cared for. The higher reaches of physics and chemistry (industrial) could absorb a proportion of the first-class men on a peace basis; but had no use for the second-raters. Biology was in a bad way. (It still is.) So what could be more desirable than to induce those who had responsibility for medical teaching and research to 'co-operate' with the discards, to the enrichment of biological science and the benefit of the men concerned? It is to the credit of the *Manchester Guardian's* scientific correspondent at that time that when asked why a field of 'science' which had not advanced as far as desired with the use of first-class brains should do any better with the imports of lower quality, he retreated. Let us admit, even though it be mainly for strategic reasons, that the 'bio-chemists' have not done so badly, and have at least contributed to the solution of the unemployment problem by training and making work for additional regiments of 'scientists,' would it be fair to say that all these have been 'inspired' by I.C.I.?

The extent to which this single episode has contributed to the currency of the central notion of dialectical materialism as a rule, or 'law' of society is beyond my powers to estimate; but this and other 'demonstrations' have something to do with it. The 'bio-chemists' fought a hard battle, which is not yet at an end. They were well-fortified with grants and endowments\* for their work (the former through the instrumentality of the Medical Research Council, and the latter through obscurer channels known only to Vice-Chancellors); the press wrote them up ubiquitously; com-

\*Was it not one of the late Sir William M'Cormick's reports of the work of the University Grants Committee which admitted the existence of "compromising benefactions"?

mercial advertising raised their stock; novelists romanced about them; the schools learned from them (and whatever a school manages to learn it teaches!); they 'raised new problems' which appears to be the chief role of General Smuts's friends everywhere. A 'reorientation' had been effected which had the widest consequences, professional and intellectual. Professional for the art of medicine; intellectual for the intelligences of students, who now begin what should be their introduction to the *applications* of knowledge fully-fledged with opinions concerning what they should be taught and why they should be taught it. Neither Lodge nor, I believe, Larmor ever attended a course of lectures in 'science' as undergraduates, and certainly never studied a science at school. Faraday's introduction to science was to listen (by favour of a customer of his master's) to four lectures by Sir Humphry Davy, on hearing which he wrote 'in my ignorance of the world and simplicity of my mind' straight to the President of the Royal Society, and got "No answer" from the porter of that august institution. But nowadays we teach opinions first; and facts, if at all, afterwards, when their meaning is likely, by long familiarity, to be clear. Is this, too, 'inspiration'? And these opinions are not such simple matters as whether or not Shakespeare awakens in the reader a sense of the dignity of man's life in society with others, or whether Homer's descriptions of natural events are beautiful, or from what the demonstrations of Euclid derive authority; but upon the ultimate nature of man and the universe: a cryptic, occult metaphysics enshrined in a half-knowledge of a few experiments, indescribable by the witness himself except in broken English, with hints and gestures rather than by word of mouth at all.

"The British Association's Committee on Post-war University Education has issued a memorandum which estimates the probable shortage as over 120,000, if provision is made for the teachers needed in universities, young people's colleges and polytechnic schools, and in adult people's colleges—in other words, those needed to cover the needs of the population between the ages of 2 and 22."

(— *The Economist*.)

What are "the needs of the population" between the ages of 2 and 22?

History and biography (which might be called merely history in the particular) show that nothing excepting a right man is necessary for the production of an 'educated' right man but firstly to live as a freeman, not as a slave or dependant, in good though varied company, and, secondly, to participate, as a responsible functionary in one of the recognised techniques, from the use of which arises the wealth of the members of that company, whether it be physical, tangible wealth, or wealth in some other form (not money). The second necessity is subtly subordinate to the first, and is (so far as the education—or progress—of the individual is concerned) merely to prevent his fall from the status of a freeman into a condition of dependency upon others.

All the rest is but adjuncts and assistances, not one of which, nor all together can be substitute or replacement for the necessaries. And the more mass-produced, mechanical and indiscriminate these adjuncts are the more they pollute the wells of truth; distort, falsify and finally destroy the

mind subjected to their operation. After a long, tortuous but nevertheless continuous process of "softening-up," which may have commenced at the Reformation and has certainly been speeding ever since, the Universities for what they are worth are marked down for destruction. They are ready for "the kill."

In my opinion this should at all costs be prevented. And it can be prevented.

*To be continued.*

TUDOR JONES.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: November 2, 1943.*

### OLD-AGE PENSIONS

*Mr. Maxton:* The National Federation of Old Age Pensioners have asked me to present to the House a Petition on their behalf. This Petition is signed by over 4,090,000 electors from various parts of the country. They say in their Petition:—

"We the undersigned do solemnly protest against the Government's Old Age Pensions and Determination of Needs Bill and consider it is a denial of the will of the people. Wherefore your petitioners pray that a new Pensions Bill be introduced immediately providing for a pension of 30s. per week for all at 60 years of age, to be given unconditionally, thereby ensuring justice and freedom from want in old age."

This Petition has over 4,000,000 signatures, and I have very great pleasure in presenting it to the House.

*House of Commons: November 3, 1943.*

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

*Mr. McGovern:* May I ask the Deputy Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the Motion on the Order Paper in which I seek to get the old age pensioners the opportunity of speaking at the Bar of the House; and whether he is prepared on behalf of the Government to say that time will be found for its discussion?

[*That Mr. H. W. Tyrrell and Mr. A. Gelder, of the Old Age Pensioners' Association, be heard at the Bar of this House, on Thursday, 4th November, in order to urge their claim for an increase of pensions and a reduction in the age when such pension is granted.*]

*Mr. Attlee:* The practice of instituting Debates on the presentation of Petitions has, in modern times, fallen into desuetude, and my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister does not recommend at the present time, that it should be revived.

*Mr. Maxton:* I do not know how far it has fallen into desuetude, but does the right hon. Gentleman think that it is right and proper that, when an important section of the citizens of this country ask to appear personally at the Bar of this House to plead their case they should be treated in that off-hand manner, and will he get the Prime Minister to reconsider it with a view to having two representatives of the huge number of old age pensioners in this country who have presented their case decently and in order to have a further opportunity of stating their case?

*Mr. Attlee:* The petition has been presented and of course will be considered, but I have given my hon. Friend

the Prime Minister's view with regard to this matter of speaking at the Bar by petitioners. He has not, in the interests of Parliament, thought it advisable.

*Mr. Tinker:* Is not this really a matter for the House of Commons? This is something which they have a right to insist upon. The answer was that it has fallen into desuetude. I would say the thing is done away with altogether. If the House of Commons think it should be done away with, then they ought to say so.

*Mr. Maclean:* The right hon. Gentleman has just referred to the right of every citizen in the United Kingdom to appear at the Bar of the House. That was always the right of the individual.

[Discussion on another subject intervened.]

*Mr. McGovern:* May I ask further to the point with regard to the appearance of the deputation at the Bar, would the Deputy Prime Minister ask the Prime Minister, in view of the importance of this occasion, while not agreeing to all trivial affairs being brought here, that this urgent and important matter should be presented? Surely if two Houses of Representatives in America can hear the Prime Minister, then the Prime Minister can hear the old age pensioners and their views.

*Mr. Attlee:* I am quite sure the Prime Minister will give these considerations due weight.

*Mr. McGovern:* On a point of order. May I ask your leave to move the Adjournment of the House to call attention to a matter of urgent public importance, namely, that the Government should provide an opportunity for the House to receive a deputation, representing over 4,000,000 petitioners, on behalf of the old people of this country, and that they may be heard at the Bar of this House in support of their Petition?

*Mr. Speaker:* I am afraid I cannot give my assent to that. It must be perfectly obvious to everyone that an opportunity will be afforded the House before very long when all these matters can be discussed.

*Mr. Stephen:* Might I ask you to consider, Sir, whether, in view of the fact that it is of the utmost importance that this question should be put before the House by the old age pensioners in order that the Government might have the opportunity of considering it, there will be new legislation in order to satisfy the demands of the old age pensioners? Is it not therefore a matter of urgency that their representatives should have this opportunity of putting the case for all those millions of people in this House?

*Mr. Speaker:* I cannot accept that view; this is not a matter for my intervention.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM

*Mr. De Rothschild* asked the Minister without Portfolio what were the services to which he referred as being in need of extension and improvement in paragraph 3 of his letter of 22nd September, addressed to the Association of Municipal Corporations, which has been widely circulated; what is the nature of the fundamental changes which he indicated might be involved; and to what extent these changes will affect the position and powers of local authorities?

*Sir W. Jowitt:* I should not like any words of mine to

appear to set definite limits to the field within which improvements in our local government services after the war should be considered, but I may mention by way of illustration the changes in regard to public health and public assistance services involved and the Beveridge Plan and the Government's education proposals, recently laid before this House. The changes in the position and powers of local authorities involved in the last mentioned proposals have been set out in the relevant White Paper. The implications of the Government proposals in regard to public health and public assistance will become apparent when these are similarly laid before the House.

*House of Commons: November 4, 1943.*

### BASIC ENGLISH

*Sir L. Lyle* asked the Prime Minister when the Committee of Ministers set up to study and report upon Basic English are expected to reach their conclusions?

*The Prime Minister:* I hope to receive the recommendations of this Committee before very long.

*Sir L. Lyle:* When we do get this Report will the B.B.C. be asked to adopt it, or will they still continue to use Basic B.B.C.?

*The Prime Minister:* Basic English is not intended for use among English-speaking people, but to enable a much larger body of people who do not have the good fortune to know the English language to participate more easily in our society.

*Mr. Gallacher:* Will the right hon. Gentleman consider introducing Basic Scottish?

*Mr. Wedderburn:* Does Basic English include the word "triphibious?"

*The Prime Minister:* I have tried to explain that people are quite purblind who discuss this matter as if Basic English were a substitute for the English language.

### Industrial Centralisation in the United States

In the United States, 200 corporations controlled 60 per cent. of corporate assets by 1933. In the war development the granting of contracts to the biggest companies has increased further the concentration. In 1938, the President said in the course of a message about monopolies: "Of all the corporations reporting, less than five per cent. owned 87 per cent. of the assets of all of them; one tenth of one per cent. owned 50 per cent. of the combined net income; four per cent. earned 84 per cent. of the total net profits."

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

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 2s. (Postage extra).

## 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. 11. No. 10. Saturday, November 13, 1943.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The Chief of AMGOT, the International Government which takes over Civil Control of conquered territory, is Lord Rennell of Rodd. He was Manager of the Bank of International Settlements before the war. As the American patriot, Mr. Montagu Norman, would say to his friend Dr. Schacht ("the most oleaginous rascal I have ever met"), the dogs bark, but the Caravan rolls on.

In common with evidence from every part of the world, the proceedings of AMGOT make it clear that there will be no betterment, but only progressive deterioration, in social conditions until the idea of personal, as distinct from functional dignity, is restored. High-handed requisitioning of private property is the complete inversion of the ideas for which Englishmen have fought for centuries. It is unilateral action which the so-called democratic Governments are loudest in protesting that they will not countenance.

Out of three Members of Parliament who addressed the boys of Rossall School recently two were Jews.

Our local newspaper humorist heads the announcement of the Moscow "Agreement," DECISIONS TO HASTEN END OF WAR. We have always felt that the best way to stop the Germans fighting was to keep on telling them that the troubles they are now enduring are nothing to those they will have to endure when they're beaten. Goebbels must feel that his Spiritual Home is a three-power conference of the Allies.

It is not widely recognised that practical farming and the political economy of practical farming, are two almost entirely separate subjects. Just at present it is becoming the fashion to say that guaranteed prices are the solution of the farming problem. Nothing could be more fallacious. Until it is recognised that you cannot arbitrarily fix a price for a given article without fixing every cost in its production, and that costs vary from place to place, every interference with the price of one range of product sets in motion uncontrollable reactions in the price of other products, as well as in wage claims.

You can *Compensate* a price.

Of all the countries which have, in the last fifteen years,

made Social Credit ideas a serious political issue, New Zealand had the greatest opportunity to carry them to brilliant success. Instead, New Zealanders alone consciously identified them with the Labour Party. To say that the result has been pathetic is true, but not comprehensive. It is not merely that a large body of enthusiastic and capable Social Crediters has failed completely to achieve any result. But it is, in addition, a demonstration almost frightening in its completeness that these so-called Labour Parties are everywhere the tools of the clever and unscrupulous group who, according to Walter Rathenau, rule everything, and appoint their successors.

Nash, the New Zealand Finance Minister now at Washington, hardly troubles to disguise his liaison with the international bankers; and the restive group of Labour Members who are beginning to feel the draught from their unsatisfied constituents appears to have been captured by a Mr. John A. Lee, obviously the local version of the C.C.F. and Commonwealth Party, whose adoration for Russia is only equalled by his passionate attachment to the Jews.

It is significant that the Social Credit Movement in New Zealand rose to its peak of promise and effectiveness under Captain Rushworth, M.P., a representative of what in England might be known as Tory Democracy; and it has been wrecked by the titular representatives of the portion of the New Zealand electorate which it was primarily designed to benefit.

President Roosevelt has received unmistakeable notice to quit, by the election of twenty-seven Republican State Governors. The repercussions of this situation are likely to be so far-reaching as to raise it to an importance exceeding that of a military victory or defeat of the first magnitude. In combination with the intransigent decisions of the Moscow Conference the British Cabinet may reasonably ask of itself "Where do we go from here?"

As this is a Planned World and the Plans have been recorded in the Pyramids, couldn't we dispense with Mr. W. S. Morrison and his Ministry of Town and Country Planning? Or are they part of the Plan?

### Five-pointed Star

The Union Jacks of the War Savings posters, "defaced by the addition of a gold and silver star in the top right-hand corner," were the subject of a question by Lady Apsley, who asked who had authorised the change. Sir John Anderson said that the device had no heraldic significance, and the question of authority did not arise, and that the National Savings Committee had decided that in the future the star should be separated from the flag. Lady Apsley expressed the concern of those interested in heraldry at the unauthorised change, and asked for an assurance that it was a new device and did not portend any unauthorised change in our national financial policy. Sir John Anderson repeated that it had no heraldic significance whatever, and replied, "No, Sir," to a supplementary question from Lieut.-Colonel Sir Assheton Pownall, who asked whether the introduction of these stars had any Lend-Lease significance. Mr. Gallacher asked whether the Minister would see that these stars were transferred to North Africa, where they were in great demand.

## The Fundamental Choice

Sound judgment consists in the placing of things in the correct order of priority or value, that is, in the correct relation to one another. By "things" are meant events, emotions, conclusions. And in the final analysis—because, in time, we can only do one thing at a time—sound judgment boils down to right decision as between alternatives, this or that line of action; to the correct exercising of our inalienable right "to choose or refuse one thing at a time."

Now the first choice we are called on to make is concerning the value, the reality of this visible, tangible existence we lead in time, *i.e.*, the physical universe. You may ask: What part has choice got in that? There is no alternative—unless you call death an alternative. We had no choice in our birth, or as to the plane on which it occurred.

Yet there is a choice, and a very vital one. One way in which it might be expressed would be to say that it is between alternative assumptions regarding reality, life: The choice between setting an *absolute* value upon the events and emotions that go to make our conscious existence here, and setting a *relative* value only upon them. That statement needs some elaboration. For instance, it amounts to setting an absolute value on existence, as we are able to see and hear and touch it, to conclude and act as though it were everything. Or (equally absolute) to regard it as nothing—at the best a vale of tears.

In reality there is no difference whatsoever between those two superficially opposed assumptions; their apparent opposition and all action arising out of it, have no positive value and can lead to no positive results. And yet, it is just over their supposedly real "difference" in value and importance and sequence that nations can be persuaded, no doubt by interested parties, to go to the extremes of war. What are these assumptions in their widest differentiation? At one end of the stick the hedonist (so-called materialist), and at the other, the "religionist" (moralist)—both equally ideological and abstract; the creeds of both are absolute assertion and therefore amount to the same thing as regards this fundamental and all-important choice that life presents, which essentially does not lie between two absolutes, but between placing an absolute value, or else a relative value only on everything that presents itself to our judgment.

The attribution to natural phenomena, and our deductions from them, of *absolute* value is the basis of all ideological contention, which is not only endless but far worse—meaningless. It is in fact a substitute for the true employment of individual judgment, as well as a subconscious evasion of the dreaded responsibility involved in making a real and unqualified choice, not between the labelled dogmas, such as asceticism and hedonism, or individualism and collectivism, or for that matter Nazism and Communism, but between openly declaring ourselves for absolutism of any kind, or else adopting, and making an active stand for, the relative view of life, as the closest to reality and the facts as so far revealed.

Within the ranks of ideology, that is, the realm of abstraction, no one thing is more vital than another (it might be called the realm of six-of-one-and-half-a-dozen-of-the-

other, or heads-I-win and tails-you-lose; what Chesterton described as progress in all directions at once) because ideologies, as such, all represent static (absolute) concepts of an obviously dynamic situation. Life, consciousness, is a moving, fluid condition; no final, absolute pigeon-holed conclusion, but a flow—a ceaseless, insistent demand for judgments and valuations. *In that movement itself*, in that unending need for the exercise of responsible choice and decision as to the relative value or importance of one of two lines of action, or of alternative interpretations of phenomena, lies Reality—which might be defined as the maximum degree of consciousness that each and every individual is capable of.

The reason that factuality experiences such heavy going in this world (as anyone who attempts to make a stand for it must admit it does), must be due surely to the dread that exists of this relative view of life and of our own nature, which this relative view entails—just of that quality of fluidity, of ceaseless, never-ending movement. Something in us, with which we have to contend, seems to long for an existence containing no more responsible activity than that of "pushing up the daisies," an existence where every anxious question is finally settled and pigeon-holed. We find it next to impossible to face the fact that life is not like that; that in reality, as far as our understanding goes, we know nothing and nothing is settled, and that to be really true to ourselves we can afford to be wholly (absolutely) identified with no camp but, inhabiting a sort of mental no-man's-land, must accept no discipline but that of our own judgment.

We shrink from the necessity of facing up to each moment, and every moment, as it comes along, looking it squarely in the eye and accepting it for what it is—its "badness" along with its "goodness," and being able to rejoice in the mere fact that life still has a kick in it, and is capable of imparting it to us.

Rather than accept those conditions—conditions of reality, they might be called—which our reason must tell us are the only possible conditions of anything vital; rather than make that choice, we prefer to construct dogmas and absolute, one-dimensional formulas of, and for life, and to go to war with one another respecting their rival and abstract value, heedless of the fact that in the process all the relative (real) values created by society, instinctively mostly, and with infinite toil, throughout the centuries, are being blasted to bits.

N. F. W.

## Output of Nationalised Collieries

On the grounds that it was not in the public interest, Major Lloyd George, the Minister of Fuel and Power, replying to a question in Parliament, did not give the output figures per month for the Clifton and Point of Ayr Collieries prior to and since the Government's taking them over, but admitted that while in one case there had been an improvement, in the other "owing to the condition in which the colliery was, a tremendous amount of development work had to be done."

Some curiosity was expressed as to what was the public interest which prevented the giving of the exact information asked for.



## Planning the Medical Profession

The following passages on the proposals of the British Medical Association and those (as yet unpublished) of the Ministry of Health, for the reorganisation of the medical profession are taken from BULLETIN No. 6 of the Medical Policy Association (London):—

THE METHOD OF THE MINISTRY:— . . . the [Ministry of Health] White Paper is likely to contain some variant of the plan whereby doctors are to be controlled by organisations with which the Ministry is already closely connected. For example, hospitals might be advocated as the centres of organisation, in place of "Health Centres." Same intention, different method. The plan will be one or another type of State Medical Service. It will make provision for the close control of certification. There will be some form of "central authority" and/or local authorities, who will be responsible, as the phrase goes, "through the Minister to Parliament"—just as any such authority is. If you want redress, you try to get your Member to get enough support to bring pressure to bear on the Ministry to bring pressure to bear on the Authority to bring pressure to bear on the Official to alleviate your distress, always providing it does not conflict with Policy. It's as easy as that. Remember the capitation fee?

The general function of the Authority will be to "administer" the service. It will do this by issuing regulations ("government by regulation") covering matters such as certification, what work general practitioners may, and may not, do, conditions of "promotion," conditions of appointment, composition and functions of Medical Boards together with rules covering their procedure, standardisation of forms, collection of statistics, remuneration of Medical Officers, etc., etc. To say nothing of Disciplinary Machinery and Investigation of Complaints (to be submitted on form XY/B.43(a)1.). A good general idea of what it will deal with (by degrees, but quite inevitably) can be got by reading the appropriate Paras. of *King's Regulations and Air Council Instructions for the Royal Air Force*, which may be purchased from H.M. Stationery Office. (The R.A.F. Medical Service is a form of S.M.S., and it is worth noting that its administrative personnel are practically all doctors, so that it is a S.M.S. "run by doctors.")

THE METHOD OF THE BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION:—We know, from Bulletin 5, and from things which Dr. Hill, who seems to be the official spokesman for the Executive, has said, that the Executive, like the Ministry, stands for central control of the profession; but it goes further—it wants bigger and better control—one really big powerful "machine" (to use Dr. Anderson's word), capable of exercising authority over about 60,000 doctors. That would give you about one chance in sixty thousand of controlling the "authority," if it was an elected authority, and did not surrender its power to its permanent officials, its private bureaucrats. No elected authority can carry on without non-elected permanent officials.

In the *British Medical Journal* for July 17, Dr. Hill is reported to have said that "the profession believed that at the centre, whether in the form of a department or a corporate body, there should be an organisation concerned solely with health and administration of all the health functions of a central government" (our italics). This Dr. Hill

regards as "fundamental." We agree with him that it is fundamental, and are duly grateful to him for the added warning he has given us of Executive intentions. Obviously the Minister could hardly quarrel with that statement. It only remains for them to settle between themselves, taking the profession into their confidence in due course, the details of "machinery," and the question of the personnel who are thus to be elevated into the coveted positions of dictators over the medical profession.

But on what authority does Dr. Hill state that "the profession believed"? In an earlier statement (*B.M.J.*, May 22, p. 62) he was telling us that "We must steel ourselves for changes which we may not like." Is it Dr. Hill's business to tell us to "steel" ourselves for what we don't want, or is it first to ascertain, and then to advocate, those things which we *do* want? It is pure nonsense to say that the profession "believes"—unless, of course, Dr. Hill thinks that we have been hypnotised into that belief; there has been enough propaganda to justify him. The fact is that the profession has never had an opportunity to vote on the straight question of Control; that question has never been put to it except hidden in schemes like the Grey Book. We are simply told, in the hope that we will believe it, that a Central Authority is "inevitable"—like Hitler's victories. It's the same technique.

So the result at which the Executive is aiming is a Central Authority. The method is a "corporate body" or a "department." The effect would be—issue of regulations, control of certification, control of appointments and promotions, forms and more forms, discipline—for the rest, see under Ministry above.

Both the Ministry and the B.M.A. Executive want the same thing—an "organised" medical profession run by a central authority. One result, two methods. The profession will be asked to choose the method by which it will become subject to a central authority. Each method, of course, will have its selling points—pensions, holidays with pay, "free choice," no surgeries to keep up, maintaining privacy, doctor-patient relationship, etc. But both will have forms, and statistics, and standardised certification, the ownership of medical records by "the State," control of income, a hierarchy of authority, seniority.

There is no doubt that a contributory scheme that would "spread" medical expenses, and thus remove the basic cause of all this trouble, could be evolved for those who need or want it, and such a scheme need not involve any form of central control over doctors. And nothing would annoy the "planners" more. At this stage it is entirely premature to put forward any concrete method by which such a scheme could be implemented, but it should be realised that such schemes are in operation in various places, and at least one suitable one has been formulated which would meet the conditions of this country. Until the policy of the profession as a whole, for freedom or control, has been unequivocally stated, consideration of specific plans is futile. What is required first of all is a clear realisation of the intention—the policy—of the "planners." When the profession's basic policy

is stated will be the time to formulate a method to implement it.

... To summarise the results which could be expected from the Ministry's and the B.M.A. Executive's "plans":—

1. Doctors would be brought under a central authority (Board, Department, Corporate Body, Local Authority) which would be concerned (not all at once, but eventually) to introduce as much uniformity into the methods and results of medical practice as possible. That is because it is easier to "administer" a service which is standardised in all its parts. Standardisation of motor-car parts made mass-production possible. Statistics, and therefore diagnosis in accordance with official classifications, and a diagnosis for every patient, duly recorded and passed on; invalidity according to schedules; medical classification to suit different grades of work—all these things would be of primary importance and would be the subject of one regulation after another.

2. Control of policy would be centralised. The authority would be administrative chiefly, and either itself advisory (Ministry method), or (B.M.A. method) advisory in conjunction with an "elected" body, on matters of policy to the Minister (Minister of Health or Minister of Social Security). We have referred to the well-known phrase "responsible on matters of policy through the Minister to Parliament," which means that the Authority and the Minister whack up policy between them. Control of policy is great fun—it is telling people what they have to do.

3. Subject to direction on matters of major policy, the central authority would have the power to make *and enforce*, regulations (see Lord Hewart—*The New Despotism*).

4. The seniority principle would be introduced—*i.e.*, each doctor would be responsible to the next senior, but would be responsible for those junior to him. This is the most effective method known for destroying personal responsibility. It is sometimes known as the *Führer-prinzip*. The system would come in, probably, fairly gradually, and the authorities would concentrate, to begin with, on applying it to the intake of junior doctors. Present elder practitioners could expect to have a certain amount of responsibility delegated to them, especially if they were Army trained. In this way responsibility to higher authority would be substituted for responsibility to patients. The theory is that the highest authority in a given area (or region) is responsible to the central authority for what happens to patients. It is therefore his duty to call for and forward reports on juniors, when a complaint comes in; and he in turn may be "directed" to discipline the junior concerned.

5. Initiative would be killed, because any new idea

would have to be referred to the central authority for its approval and permission; in those august regions the idea would be considered "in the light of the Minister's policy." ("I am directed to inform you that your application to . . . has been rejected since it is not the Minister's (or perhaps Government's?) policy . . .").

It is vital to understand what is likely to be the end result of the policies now to be put forward, and to decide whether that is the result desired. It is essential to look beyond *methods* to the fundamental *policy*, and to leave side-issues—pensions, holidays, health-centres—out of account until you have decided what major results you want. Democracy is the choice, not only of results, but of the order in which they are obtained. Pensions and holidays are "terms of service"—or perhaps they are better described as "terms of servitude."

Remember what Lord Acton said: "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." Before you surrender the power to make your own decisions, and give a central authority power to make decisions binding on you, make sure that that is what you intend as the result of your vote.

*"THE PRICE OF FREEDOM IS ETERNAL VIGILANCE."*

#### PROPERTY *versus* SLAVERY

The Socialist, Colin Grant Clark (Winchester and Brasenose College), who thrice contested constituencies in this country in the Labour 'interest,' has, since 1938, been Director of the Bureau of Industry, Financial Adviser to the Treasury and State Statistician for Queensland. He has been saying (in Sydney) that "Security is attainable only by one of two methods, either the ownership of property or the acceptance of slavery—the latter probably under some such disguise as 'permanent employment.'"

Mr. Clark should write home about it to North Dorset, Wavertree, or South Norfolk—or any other constituency where Beverage may be needed.

#### "CERTAIN THINGS THAT HAPPENED"

"In the teaching of Christianity young children are given an initial prejudice by being supplied with a wrong interpretation of the early part of the history of their religion. If Churches closely investigated the beginning of Christianity they would obtain a more correct and true version which would not put on Jewish shoulders responsibility for certain things that happened. Children would then grow up with less bias against the Jew."

—RABBI B. CHERRICK at a "Southport Brains Trust."

### RECONSTRUCTION

*The "Glasgow Evening Times"*  
Articles of May 1932

By Major C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 6d. (Postage extra)

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

A new impression of the leaflet *The Representative's Job* is now available, price 1d per copy, postage extra.

## Argentina

According to the *Daily Herald*, quoted by the *Jewish Chronicle*, the Ramirez Government has 'begun a nationwide persecution of the Jews,' including "the closing of all Jewish organisations throughout the country, deportation of prominent Jews who have become naturalised Argentinians and harrasing of native-born Jews, apparently in an effort to cause them to leave the country." *The Times* reports the 'freezing' by the United States Government of the funds of two Government-owned Argentinian banks.

The naive suggestions of the "national" dailies receive little support from the story told in a lengthy article in *The Economist* for November 6. There the part played by the Import-Export Bank takes precedence over the "canker of Nazism" and the veil wears so thin that the nationalist and the national-socialist appear as two entities, not one, whose policies, so far from being identical are the exact opposite of one another—"Hitler's policy is a Jewish policy."

Says *The Economist*: "At a time when other markets [for Latin American raw Materials] had dwindled, the United States began buying on a great scale in Latin America. This purchasing was not simply a question of buying up what the Latin American states were already producing. The Americans prospected for new materials. They rediscovered Brazilian rubber. Wherever they found supplies of the raw materials they needed—and they needed practically everything—the Import-Export Bank or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation advanced the credits to get the exploitation of the needed materials under way. Exploitation demanded better communications. The lack of them had been the greatest single obstacle to inter-continental relations. Now a start was made to develop a network of railways and roads across the centre of the continent.

"In all this, Brazil profited more than any other state. For one thing, its Government has welcomed American help. For another, it possesses the richest mineral reserves in the continent. Again, it is the state which must gain most from improvements in communications. It has the largest territory, it has frontiers on more of the other republics than either Argentina or Chile, and any regional development based on increased industrialisation and the exploitation of new areas or new raw materials is almost bound to centre on Brazil.

"This has, in fact, occurred. Two new economic areas are coming into being in Latin America, both regional in character. One is the Amazon region, where Brazil, with a 100 million dollar loan from the United States, is embarking—the length of the navigable Amazon—on a vast economic development scheme, which will serve the other Amazon states, Bolivia and Peru, as well. The other area is in the south. . . .

"All this is profoundly disturbing to Argentina. The two great obstacles to Argentine independence and pre-dominance—growing United States influence in South America and the creation of strong regional groupings under other than Argentine leadership—have grown greater with each year of the war. The two trends meet in Brazil, which is using United States support in building its new spheres

of influence. This support is not merely economic. The Brazilian armed forces are getting modern equipment from the United States and are gaining great strategic advantage from the fact that the nation is a belligerent. Argentina cannot keep level with this development unless it, too, accepts lend-lease aid and with it a tacit admission of United States influence and leadership. But to accept American help and the whole Rio policy—of breaking relations with the Axis—would entail a moral defeat which the exasperated nationalists in Argentina could not stomach."

It looks as though Wall Street's agony were Argentina's opportunity—not to extend the evil but to overcome it. But the Brazilian guns sound nasty.

A *Times* report states that the Argentine Central Bank is recovering its gold at present from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

### ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...8d.	
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell.....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet) .....	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.) .....	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	1d.
The Representative's Job .....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

FROM K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.