

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 14. No. 3.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

It is evident that we have done Socialism a grave injustice in equating it to the Work-State. Of course, it is the Won't-let-you-work-State. *Punch* illustrates this in a cartoon of Alice looking up at the Cheshire Cat, whose grin is formed by the word "Housing." Alice complains, (and so do we) "I wish you wouldn't keep appearing and vanishing so suddenly; you make one quite giddy."

If something is not done to divert our megalomaniacs from schemes like the detested Highland Hydro-electric Power projects, and to force them to let builders build houses, instead of struggling with Forms, the explosion will be startling.

All serious students of affairs must realise that "the climate of opinion," and "the technique of organisation" are two of the major factors of a civilisation: and that the civilisation we recognise as European is the result of a special relationship between these two factors which we ascribe, and rightly ascribe, to something we call Christianity. What is not so widely appreciated is that there are two Christianities, the Judaic and the Graeco-Roman. It would be simple to say that one is not Christianity at all, but it would not be wholly correct. It is correct, however, to say that the culture which is being sacrificed in Europe to-day is the flower of Graeco-Christian influence; and the engines of destruction which are laying Europe waste derive their terrible efficiency from the incarnation of Judaeo-Christianity in modern industrialism. Whether both Peter and Paul are essential to the Kingdom on Earth, we do not know; but it is easy to see that if they are, the words "I came not to bring peace, but a sword" require no further explanation.

It is far from unlikely that one key to the World problem is involved in these matters. Only a simpleton would suppose that twenty-five years of anti-god societies have seriously modified the influence of a thousand years of Greek Orthodoxy on the essential Russian peasant; the soulless efficiency of the Prussian has been nurtured on the iron predestination of Luther, Calvin, and Huss. Yet Byzantium is over-running Geneva, the jewelled cope is triumphing over the black gown. And it is obvious that the conflict is in Russia itself, just as much as between Russia and Germany.

For the second time in a few months, *The Nineteenth Century* publishes in its current number an article—"Quality and Equality" by Robert Fordyce Aickman—which shines like a good deed in a naughty world, and comforts as the sound of the curlew over the moor, the sanest sound we know. The article should be read; but its trend may be grasped by considering: "We have nearly all fallen into the clutches of six myths. . . the myth of equality. . . the myth

that work is intrinsically good and beneficial to the workers' soul, whereas it is the Curse of Adam. The myth that heredity is in some way (hard to define) superseded. Shall we call this the illusion of merit? The myth that there are no rare spirits whereas society is held together and all good things advanced by exceptional individuals. Mass movements are the perpetual movement of the Gadarene swine. The myth of the more the merrier. The myth of. . . the desirability of uniformity. Whereas individualism is the basis of all quality, and can only flourish in freedom. Equality is the great enemy of quality."

“On the advice of his Nazi metallurgical expert, he concluded a contract with a large engineering firm which had built the Hermann Goering Werke, and one of Britain's great steel plants. He hired this concern to survey the field in Argentina.” — February *Readers Digest*, p. 65.

The name is Mandl.

The most cursory survey of the minority, or unmuzzled, Press is sufficient to indicate that its editors are unanimous in their opinion of the "B."B.C. In common with certain easily identifiable newspapers, that institution presents current events in a manner which would suggest, and can only be intended to suggest, that "Britain," the wearied Titaness, is old and sick; and that her one desire is to make a deed of gift of her possessions, material, moral, and historic, to the younger, brighter, braver allies who are winning the war for her. The "Canadian" Army, which is two thirds English and Scottish, has the usual assignment to do the nearly impossible and the inevitably unspectacular, and so of course needn't be mentioned; it is natural that the Highland crofts, denuded of their men, should resound with the wonderful deeds of the American Army; and if there are any British Generals on the European Continent, we haven't heard of them lately. As for the R.A.F., it daren't go up in the day-time.

You say you'll meet the Staff of the "B."B.C. at the barricades, Clarence? No you won't. They won't be there. While their dupes are being shot down, the bigger fish will be in the best hotels of New York, Chicago and Hollywood, explaining to select audiences how they "worked discreetly but with all their might to undermine the sovereignty" and the prestige of once-great Britain, and how nobly the refugees from Hitler's tyranny assisted them.

—"Daddy, how far is Toronto from Edmonton?"

—Daddy (after reading all about the 'Rise in influence of the C.C.F.' in *The Sunday Times*): "Oh, about one thousand, nine hundred and fourty-four lie-years."

PARLIAMENT

House of Lords: March 6, 1945.

CONTROLS AND REGULATIONS

Pressure on our space forced us last week to postpone the publication of the following further passages from the speech of the Earl of Stanhope and passages from Lord Geddes's speech:—

Earl Stanhope: (Continued):—

I belong to an organisation which was started by a Member of another place called The Fighting Fund for Freedom. It is not the same organisation as that bearing a somewhat similar name which was referred to by some of your Lordships in a debate last week. That organisation had a German origin. This is entirely British. It is really very remarkable the amount of support which the movement has received from people of all classes and in all walks of life. It is quite clear that there is a very strong feeling indeed in this country that these rules, regulations and returns have got to come to an end as soon as possible. All of us recognise that they have got to continue in operation for some time to come, until the disappearance of shortages and so on make it possible to bring about the return of conditions to normal. Any member of your Lordships' House who has served in a Government Department knows well, however, that once a rule or regulation comes into being it is always extremely difficult to bring it to an end. There is always a certain number of privileged people who are engaged in dealing with these returns, and if the returns are brought to an end then their jobs come to an end also and they have to look for others.

One of the reasons why I hope that these things are going to be brought to an end is this. I am convinced that the cost of Government has got to be cut down very materially as soon as the war is over. That can only be brought about by reducing the number of civil servants. I look to the time when there will be as drastic a demobilisation of the Civil Service as of the Fighting Forces. I am not quite sure that my noble friends on the Labour Benches would entirely agree with that view because, if a policy of nationalisation is favoured the number of civil servants will have to go up, not down. Perhaps that is why they are treading on the nationalization pedal somewhat delicately at this moment. Many of these civil servants, of course, have done most admirable and devoted work. But, there are a great many others who are not by any means up to the standard of the Civil Service, as we know it. . . .

. . . I understand that, quite shortly we are to be faced with a General Election. The Government, therefore, are not in a position to give any pledge as to what the future Government may do when the war is ended. But the noble Marquess does not ask for any such pledge. All he does is to ask that the rules and regulations which are required shall be put into legislation as soon as possible. I am not given to prophecy, but I feel that I am justified in saying, from what I hear on all sides, that, if any future Government keep on any of these rules and regulations without showing just cause, their return to office will be put off to a very remote period indeed, because they will not be readily forgiven. . . .

Lord Geddes: . . . There is another type of control. I have been meeting with it in the last few weeks—two perfectly incompatible policies being run by the Government, one a

policy of full employment, rising wages, great purchasing power, and so on, and the other a policy of deflating the prices paid for raw materials such as cotton. You cannot run those two policies together, yet that is what has been attempted in the last few weeks, each under Government pressure amounting to some form of indirect control. These vices—because they are vices—of government which necessarily arise during a period of war must, if we are to be healthy as a State and free as individuals, be eradicated, and the only way I can see is the way we did not follow last time, and that is to do away with the great body of war-time controls, and establish by law such controls as are necessary for the peace. In that way we can get back all those parts of our freedom to which it is possible to return. We are going to have less freedom than we had before in many ways—we all know that—for a time at least. That may be very galling, but do not let us have more of our freedom taken from us than must be taken in order to regain stability in the economic life of the nation.

It is going to be a hard and difficult world for all of us after the fighting is over for a period of which no one can foretell the length. People's tempers are going to be short. Many people are very tired, many people will have terrific problems to meet and to overcome. If the Government allows to continue all the petty restrictions, which really do no good at all once the fighting is over, they will add to that irritability, and if we get a thoroughly irritated and exhausted country then we do not know what will come out of the mental state of the people. . . .

On Question, Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House of Lords: March 8, 1945.

CONTROLS AND REGULATIONS.

Lord Addison: . . . I well remember, being in office at the same time as the noble Lord was at the end of the last war, that we were snowed under, if I may so express myself, with applications for release. As a matter of fact, whilst we all welcomed such releases as were properly securable, in fact at the end of the last war we were far too generous and thoughtless in granting releases. . . .

"be generally terminated as soon as military necessity no longer justifies the maintenance of any of them."
Your Lordships will notice it is military necessity; economic necessity is not mentioned. . . .

. . . The noble Marquess also said, when speaking of identity cards, that they seemed to wear

"the authentic badge of democracy, with its passion for registering, filing, docketing, and generally tidying-up men and women as if they were so many cards in a card index."

That is a very well-turned phrase; but what about Beveridge? There was a Liberal Party Conference the other day, and this Conference, I am glad to say, supported Sir William Beveridge, with a few trifling protests, lock, stock and barrel. What does that mean? There is to be so much for each child. There must be registration from the cradle onwards. There is unemployment insurance; there are the health provisions, the sickness and retirement provisions, different pensions for spinsters, old age pensions and so on; there will be registration for all manner of purposes; under the Beveridge scheme we shall be registered, filed, docketed and card-indexed from the cradle to the grave. It cannot be done in any other way. What in the world is the noble Marquess object-

ing to? He will only be getting out of the frying pan into the fire if he gets rid of his identity card. I do not think that his objection to registration is very material.

Let me give another illustration of the necessity for some kind of control. The noble Viscount, Lord Samuel, has been a champion of planning, and we owe a great deal to him for his championship of planning. The idea is that planning shall be such that by regulation or otherwise it will be secured that factories, for instance, are put in suitable places, and that we do not have the concentration of one type of employment in one place, with all the miseries in a time of slump which we have seen in the past. That will mean detailed regulations, administered by the Minister responsible to Parliament. Planning will mean that kind of thing on a very large scale; that is inevitable. But the regulations will not be passed in detail and incorporated as such in Acts of Parliament; you will have to authorise a responsible Minister to do the work. If he does it properly, he will have our approbation; if he does not do it properly, I hope that he will be dismissed.

The noble Marquess said early on in his speech:

"I do not propose to deal with those controls which operate at the dizzy heights of big business and high finance; I propose to leave those to others who have more personal experience than I of day-to-day life upon Olympus."

For my part, I have no experience of "day-to-day life upon Olympus," but as a matter of ordinary experience I am sometimes interested in finance, and I would call the attention of the noble Marquess to his own action on the very day on which he made that speech. On Tuesday last, about an hour before he spoke, there was carried without a hostile vote in this House the Second Reading of the Local Authorities Loans Bill. It was brought before the House by the Lord Chancellor with his accustomed clarity, and it was explained to us that by this measure the Treasury would exercise control over the biggest borrowers of all, the local authorities. The Lord Chancellor told us something of what was in mind. Let me remind your Lordships of the first clause in this Bill, to which the noble Marquess agreed without any protest at all. That was within an hour of his getting up to speak. Clause I says:

"Notwithstanding anything in any enactment it shall not be lawful for a local authority, without the approval of the Treasury, to borrow money otherwise than from the Public Works Loan Commissioners."

That is very drastic. It goes on:

"Provided that the Treasury may by regulations direct that, subject to the provisions of the regulations, nothing in this section shall apply to borrowing in such manner, for such purposes or from such sources as may be prescribed by the regulations."

The noble Marquess, who abhors regulations, assented to that drastic proposal within an hour of his getting up.

What does the Bill provide about the regulations? Does it provide that they are going to be meticulously discussed by Parliament? Does it provide that they will only be passed (using his own words) "after due deliberation and debate"? I turn to Clause 8 of the Bill which tells you about these regulations. It says:

"All regulations made under this Act shall be laid before Parliament as soon as they are made, but Section one of the Rules Publication Act, 1893, shall not apply to regulations so made.

"If either House of Parliament, within the period of twenty-eight days beginning with the day on which any such regulations are laid before it, resolves that the regulation be annulled, the

regulations shall thereupon become void....

In other words, the Bill does not even require that there shall be an affirmative Resolution; it does not even require that the House shall say "I agree:" all it requires is that the House says nothing. There is no meticulous examination required of regulations. I think we are entitled to look for a little more consistency....

... I have not forgotten the last war and what happened afterwards, and unless we continue, without a hiatus, a large measure of control over many things we shall be let in for the same kind of boom and inflation and slump as occurred after the last war....

Lord Remell: ... before coming to one or two of those suggestions I would like to go back, because it is relevant to what has just been said, to what the noble Earl, Lord Stanhope, said on Tuesday last about the scope of this Resolution. He regretted that it had not been drafted in somewhat wider terms. It was specifically drafted in the narrower terms in which it appears so as to avoid the suggestion (which I am afraid, nevertheless, has been made) that the object of the Resolution, if accepted by the Government, is to sweep away over-night all controls. No one would really suggest that that is at all possible, nor indeed is it what the Resolution says....

... He added, "I do not like the sort of freedom involved in this Resolution." Well, we do. I am not perhaps altogether surprised to hear that remark fall from the lips of Lord Addison, but I should be very surprised to find that the majority of your Lordships here would agree with it. The object that we have in view is surely to live in a country where the maximum freedom is possible, compatible with a standard of well-being to which we nearly all subscribe. That is not quite what Lord Addison said. He said: "I do not like the sort of freedom involved in this Resolution." There is, of course, nothing in this Resolution which suggests that misdeeds may be committed by large corporations or by private persons. What there is in this Resolution which is very important and very germane to the discussion is how far any Government, by the use of rules, regulations and controls, can make people good against their own wishes; in other words, whether, by continuing the policy which has been adopted, of necessity, during the war, we are to try the blue sky laws which have failed in the United States....

... The noble Marquess on Tuesday was guilty of a characteristic understatement and not an overstatement of his case. He spoke of there being 1,400 to 1,500 regulations in 1944. In a compendium which I have, and which is accessible to all your Lordships, of all the rules and regulations which have been made during the last five years of war, there are references to 10,000 orders and regulations, 220 Acts of Parliament, and 300 leading cases. That is the body of legislation, the body of rules and regulations, which an ordinary citizen is required to know lest he unwittingly transgress. That, surely, in itself, is quite sufficient to justify what Lord Geddes said on Tuesday. It creates a feeling of exasperation which, in the long run, can only bring an administration into disrepute. We know, and those who have had any public administrative experience know, that the art of government is not in knowing how to make laws but in knowing what laws to make, what laws are necessary and acceptable to the citizens and will be obeyed;...

(Continued on page 7)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 14. No. 3.

Saturday, March 24, 1945.

Mr. Mackenzie King, etc.

Unless the impression to be derived both from Canadian and British press sources is deceptive, Mr. Mackenzie King is playing a dangerous game which may make Anglo-American relations a major post-war problem. Perhaps the simplest method of appreciating his tactics—the strategy probably derives from much more important quarters—is to note that the Liberal Party (with capitals) in Canada, as in nineteenth century England, is for the public “a progressive, forward-looking” party, and for the international financier and loan monger a perfect instrument by means of which to impose predatory taxes and to pin down the agricultural interest by setting the factory system in opposition to it.

Exactly how Mr. King came into power after the 1914-1918 War is difficult to explain; but that there is a connection between his long terms of office, and still longer period of influence, and the visit of Rufus Isaacs to Washington, must be obvious to anyone who will consider the continuous surrender of British Empire interests since that calamity.

Just as the Liberal Party under the guidance of Mr. King has been the instrument by which to work for the transfer of Canadian interests from the Empire to the Republic, so Quebec has been the major instrument in keeping the Liberal Party in power at Ottawa. It should not be overlooked that Roman Catholic, French-speaking Quebec is always accused of being atavistic and reactionary; its interests and its structure are much more akin to “the solid South,” the electoral basis of the power of Roosevelt and the Democratic Party, the U.S. equivalent of the Liberal Party, than to those of Ontario and the West.

As in Great Britain in the nineteenth century, in fact, “progressivism” is simply debt-mongering. Canada is beginning to recognise this; Western Canada is “taking steps;” and Mr. King is playing in with the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Quebec to capitalise the foolish isolationism of that Province into a breakaway movement. *L'Action Catholique*, the organ of the Hierarchy, in its issue of February 3, stated categorically that the Mackenzie King Government was considering Canadian independence from “Britain,” and it is probably well-informed. “Independence,” would, of course, be a very short intermediate step to absorption in the United States, and would put an end, once and for all, to “this Social Credit nonsense.”

In this connection, it is important to notice once again the cleavage between the politics of the Roman Hierarchy, and that of the minor clergy and the laity. Other people

besides Mr. Mackenzie King may be digging their political graves over this matter.

Our Political Methodists

We have frequently suggested in these columns that, whether as a result of mass “education,” or from some deeper cause, the political instinct of the average inhabitant of these islands is deteriorating. One instance of this is the curious inability to apprehend that a “result” is a synthesis of “methods;” that the greater includes the less; and that therefore to “demand results” is to permit all methods and all parties, instead of one method and one party. It is most remarkable that those people who seem most anxious to insist on method, complain bitterly when Mr. Churchill, with complete success, invokes a Vote of Confidence against them—the “Demand Results” policy in operation. It is hardly less remarkable that we, who can at least claim some slight engagement with the money problem, have to struggle against a mass of “monetary reformers” who cannot see that “monetary reform” is a method and a party, and must be swamped, however important it may be, and is, by a synthetic policy which is determined to use all methods and all parties to achieve a result.

The international money lenders would have been incapable of the achievements they have consummated, and the inferno we now experience in consequence, if it had not been for the assistance of a mass of half-baked “methodists” whose kindergarten ideas could be twisted into anything but a desirable result.

Those people who think that Mr. Churchill’s methods are wrong (we disclaim an opinion on this aspect of the matter at this juncture) should make up their minds as to whether their executives, of whom he is ostensibly the chief, are in fact trying to get the result desired. If not, then who will do better? Then, out with Mr. Churchill, and in with Mr. Darkhorse. Obviously, the first step to this end is to formulate the result desired. If this has been done, the fact has escaped us.

As to “methods,” our assistant leaders have been explicit, and to parody George IV on his Generals, we don’t know what our competitors think, but they terrify us. The bed-rock “method” is to export 50 per cent. more than in 1939. No-one seems to know whether this is in volume or price-values; who is to have it; why we should assume that we export at a profit when in fact, over-all, we have been exporting at a loss for many years; what is meant by exporting at a profit even if we do export at a profit; what we are to be allowed to buy with the “profit” and what happens if someone steals all our markets.

Truly, the war has been dangerous; but the prospect of “peace” is appalling.

INFORMATION

The following articles and books are mentioned:—

German Philosophy at Oxford (T. S. Gregory in *The Tablet*, March 10, 17, 24).

“Quality and Equality” (Robert Fordyce Aickman in *The Nineteenth Century*).

The Thousand-year Conspiracy, by Paul Winkler. (London: Herbert Jenkins.) (This work will be placed in the S.C.E.F. Library.)

The Dividing Line

By B. M. PALMER

"At his breakfast he reads the officially inspired news, and glances at the Food Facts, Dig for Victory, National Savings or Make-do and Mend Advertisements in the adjoining columns of his morning paper; on the way to work he passes posters requesting him to keep his cold to himself, inviting him to have his children immunised against diphtheria, or instructing him how to extinguish a fire-bomb; at his factory he may be surrounded with official pictures which bring out the military significance of his work, or he may be addressed by an R.A.F. Pilot or a Tank Officer about the military uses of the product he helps to make; on his Radio he may hear talks on cooking, gardening or A.R.P.; at his bookstall he may find official publications describing the Battle of Britain or the Libyan campaign; at the cinema he may see documentary films about the Battle of the Atlantic or the Balloon Barrage."

In these words the February, 1945, broadsheet of PEP, No. 230, sums up the achievements of five and a half years of war.

We know that the war was envisaged as a means to an end other than military victory. We were told by this same broadsheet of six years ago that a war was necessary to enable the government to embark on large-scale planning. And now, "Is there a future for the official information services?"

"The broadsheet seeks to answer this question. Its conclusion, that much of what has grown up in war should be retained, follows in part from the proposition, by now largely agreed, that the Government is bound to perform a larger function in the social and economic life of the community than formerly. It would be pedantic, and indeed in practice unworkable, to accord to government this larger sphere of action and to deny it the corresponding right to make its purposes and methods effectively known; it would be anachronistic to suggest that the need can be wholly met by full reporting of Parliamentary Debates."

"Historic" is the adjective, all the more suitable because it is a favourite with the "B."B.C.—"historic" is the only correct description of the occasion on which Magna Charta, Habeas Corpus and the Bill of Rights have been superseded by the official statement of PEP that it is the *right* of the Government to make its purposes known, and that from henceforth its functions, *i.e.*, powers, are bound to increase, and that the Ministry of Information will now be needed to supplement Parliamentary Debates. We learn that the conclusion stated above was adopted by PEP's Government Information Services Group, the same group which was responsible for *Foreign Publicity*, PLANNING, No. 213; the names of course, are not given, although there is no longer any attempt to hide the fact that there *is* a group behind the scenes.

Nearly ten years ago we heard *The Tragedy of Human Effort*;^{*} and no one who does not understand the principles outlined therein will be capable of assessing the evil of this broadsheet, or of measuring the long road that we have travelled in retrogression from our vaunted democracy, which, whatever it may have been in the past, is certainly of no account now. For these are the principles that are

stated by PEP, as beyond dispute:—(I give them in order in which they appear in the broadsheet).

- (1) Official inspiration of the news is accepted as right and proper;
- (2) The functions of Government will become larger;
- (3) The Government has a right to make its purposes known;
- (4) An exceptionally well-educated and intelligent minority will always understand what the government is doing, but for the great majority full and simple explanations must be given of what the Government has done, is doing, and wishes to do;
- (5) Explanations cannot be left entirely to the initiative of newspapers and book-publishers.
- (6) The administration is entitled in the public interest to take its own view of what requires explanation;
- (7) The Government should be kept continuously aware of the citizens' point of view.
- (8) Government Departments in future might do well to call their chief executives Directors of Information, or Information Officers.
- (9) Parliament will always be the chief means both of informing the Executive of the state of the public mind and of informing the public of the purposes and ideas animating the Government.
- (10) It is true that the work of Parliament as mirror, educator and instructor can by no means completely cover the range of what is necessary. [Parliament as Educator!]
- (11) The Ministry of Information has found valuable work to do... as itself the performer of a centralised task of public information, independent of any particular department.
- (12) The Press is the most powerful single weapon of publicity, and the B.B.C. News Service is scarcely less important.
- (13) Informed leadership is the essence of democratic government.
- (14) In the public opinion survey a new and important method of investigation in the social sciences is coming into being, and the Government should not be wholly deprived of its advantages.

It is suggested that the above statements should be read over a few times, with a mental replacing of the word "Government" by "The Fuehrer," or "Stalin" or "Churchill" or the "Comintern" and that the effect should be studied.

"But surely that is quite different. The Government is not just one man. Besides, we elect our Government."

"Do we?"

"Have you considered which candidate you will vote for if you wish to give an emphatic vote *against* the National Health Insurance Scheme?"

The point is in most cases entirely lost sight of that the "Government" might be any collection of persons from Old Nick to a committee of Archangels: but if there is no relationship enabling sanctions regarding policy to be imposed on the Government by the electors, then the evolving State will be one of pure and complete Totalitarianism.

The Realm was in the past understood to be threefold:

*Speech made by Major C. H. Douglas in Liverpool, October 30, 1936.

this is in the inherited memory of many of us; we gather it from Old Laws and customs; it is in the Book of Common Prayer for those who look for it; we have been accustomed to think of body, mind and spirit; in each complete individual there should be a nice balance between what we do, what we know and what we are. Major Douglas reminded us ten years ago of what we had almost forgotten as a race—that the Government of the Realm must also be threefold if it is to embody the objectives of the people—"Action on or through an organisation involves three ideas—the idea of policy, the idea of administration, and the idea of sanctions, that is to say, power."

The date from which we as a movement began to remember, to understand and to act upon these things will be the turning point in the world's history.

Major Douglas in his later books has made it clear that it is a correct relationship of these three ideas which must be established. In every Government throughout the world there is policy, administration and power. Not one of them may be destroyed. But all may be *usurped*. The usurpation of policy means Totalitarianism; the usurpation of administration means bureaucracy, and the usurpation of power means the Slave State.

During at least the last hundred years there has been a growing tendency to concentrate upon the idea of administration as apart from policy and sanctions, until to-day administration is everything, and few people understand what policy and power are. They are hidden. It is by no means accidental that during this same period a system of education has grown up which lays undue emphasis on mental processes, to the neglect of body and spirit (crafts and arts—I deliberately reverse the accepted order) with the result, as Mr. Eric Kempson has clearly shewn us, that all the best brains are drawn into administration, sociology, or the service of monopolies. And what happens to the best brains? They become distorted, their owners are blind to everything that cannot be assessed by what is known as "scientific" means, but which in many cases is more nearly allied to deductive reasoning from premises which to say the least are questionable. It is a monopoly of the intellect.

The members of the anonymous group responsible for No. 230 of PLANNING clearly belong to the "intellectuals." The whole essay is a statement of the right of the intelligentsia to administer. The writers do not concern themselves about either policy or sanctions. Bureaucracy never admits that it is the servant of a dictator until it comes to liquidation. Then it squeals. Note that almost throughout the brochure the word "purpose" takes the place of policy—purpose belongs to the future, with which all bureaucrats and socialists are mainly concerned—except in one place (page 11), where the following exceedingly curious words appear:—

"What is policy? Is it Ministerial kite-flying about which a Department may be cross-questioned? Or is it a Bill introduced but not yet passed? Or is it legislation already enacted but perhaps hotly attacked by the critics? When one has said that in any and all of these cases it is the duty of a Department to confine itself strictly to exposition and explanation one has not disposed of the matter. Even if one could ensure that exposition was never affected by selective bias, there still remains room and need for discussion. Take as example the crucial question whether a White Paper on a complex subject issued in advance of

legislation should be expounded Departmentally for the benefit of the Press and the public."

Policy in the minds of these writers, is something decided behind the scenes, already embodied in legislation before it is made public; it is then the "duty" of a Department to explain the technical details so that the people may argue about the best *means* of enacting what has already been decided above their heads. *Deus inversus*—here is devil-worship indeed, when all that is allowed the victims of any scheme is discussion as to the least painful method by which the torture may be applied. There is also the parish-visitor-cum-slumming attitude indicated by the word "duty" which appears more than once.

Bureaucrats, Socialists and the Intelligentsia are agreed on many points, but perhaps on none more firmly than that the Victorian era was one of the Dark Ages: but they themselves are the inheritors of possibly the only completely undesirable trait of that much maligned period—a prudish determination to interfere in every one else's business, especially the business of those more ignorant and poorer than themselves. For the idea that these parish-visitors are striving to establish a "classless society" or "equality" is only part of their window-dressing. All who understand the Realm of England know that there is only one true equality—equality before the Law, and that all, from the humblest among us to the Sovereign himself have here their inalienable civil sanction. But change the tense of the last sentence to the past—the sanction of Law has gone, abolished by Order in Council, equality has gone, for Bureaucrats stand *outside* the Orders,* as highly competent administrators, confident that every moment not spent by them administering is a moment wasted. Our judicial and legal system is now replaced, (the parish visitor attitude once more) by *Citizens' Advice Bureaux* (my emphasis—and note the continental phraseology.) To continue quoting:—(Page 28) "For these voluntary bodies there will always be a most important place since frequently the problem afflicting a citizen is one *concerning his relationship with the Government—his individual rights and wrongs*. Official information, however helpful and friendly the spirit in which it is tendered, cannot meet these cases. There must be places where the citizen can talk to advisers not merely skilled and sympathetic, but such that he can accept them as being *on his side of the dividing line*."

THE DIVIDING LINE! "Once it is conceded that sovereignty resides anywhere but in the collection of individuals we call the public, the way of dictatorship is certain." (C. H. Douglas.)

That line we will keep, but we will reverse the order so that those now pluming themselves as being above it, shall be below, our servants indeed.

Railway Thefts

The amount of claims paid for the nine months ended September 1944 by the four main railway companies, in respect of loss and theft of goods in transit was as follows: G.W.R. £235,500; L.N.E.R. £526,000; L.M.S.R. £887,500; S.R. £109,250.

— *Regional Industrial Bulletin*, March 5, 1944.

*The Diplomatic Privileges Bill is the first step in providing immunity for all officials, no matter what their nationality.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

... we say that where these regulations have to be altered or amended because they have to be continued not on account of military necessity but for entirely different reasons, those different reasons should be stated at the time the regulations are re-enacted. We should not slip into the position in which we are now, which is implicit in what the noble Lord, Lord Addison, himself has said, and use war-time regulations to carry on a policy which has neither been discussed nor necessarily approved. It is precisely that to which we object—namely, that orders arising out of the Defence Regulations which are therefore justified by military necessity should be carried forward for entirely different reasons without anybody having had an opportunity to discuss them. It is this opportunity for discussion that we ask for in the latter part of this Resolution—namely, that where they are required to be continued they should be discussed in Parliament and enacted...

The Lord Chancellor (Viscount Simon): ... There has undoubtedly been a very considerable shifting in the views of people of all Parties, at any rate certainly of the older Parties, as to the point at which the line must be drawn between the claim to unrestricted individual rights and the interests of the community. I am old enough to remember, so is my noble friend Lord Samuel and my noble friend Lord Addison, and I dare say others, a time in Parliament in 1910 and 1911 when it was far from being the case that national health insurance was accepted on all hands as a sound principle in a democratic State. Indeed, I am not quite sure, if we go back as far as that, that every Party would have been equally enthusiastic in declaring itself to be democratic. I can remember a time when the then leader of the Party in opposition declared publicly in the House of Commons that if he and his friends had their way they would "repeal the National Insurance Act tomorrow." It is true to add that he wrote to *The Times* next day and explained he did not wish to be so understood; but that is what he said...

... Now let us consider a matter upon which everyone is agreed—a matter upon which there is no difference between us, no matter to what Party we may belong. Everyone, I think, fervently believes that the way to national salvation after the war is greatly to increase our export trade. I must say that I most sincerely hope that we shall be able to do so, but I think the problem is not only a very important one but also a very, very difficult one. If you are going to do everything possible after the war to secure that our manufacturers produce for the export trade, is it not possible—I do not say more—that it may turn out to be important to exercise some control of the sort of work that is done and the sort of employment that is encouraged. There may be a very attractive line of a certain character—namely, producing luxury articles—which will fetch large prices and yield large profits because they will be attractive to a limited number of the population. But producing those luxury articles will not necessarily help the export trade. It may well be that in this vital business of building up our export trade some measure of regulation will be needed...

... I think it is a pity for us too readily to adopt the argument that what has been going on in this country during the last three or four years, as regards regulations and controls, is turning this country, as it were into a total-

itarian State. We really do not do justice to our own institutions and to the character of our own people, if we imagine that, in fact, the operation of these things is such as to put us in the position of the slave-driven, slave-regulated German citizen under the heel of the Nazi Government. Just look at the difference. In each House of Parliament, quite constantly, discussion arises about some particular regulation. Challenge is made, and the Minister concerned has to defend it. In a great many cases, it is open to one House or the other to table a Motion which, if it is carried, will absolutely destroy the regulation. English people do not accept these regulations as though they liked to be bullied...

... we shall need to continue in some form or other a great many of these regulations. They will be absolutely necessary in view of shortages, in supply, of the export trade and so on. Indeed, if, as I think commands the warm approval of the great majority of the population, social improvements on the lines suggested in a number of great Reports and White Papers are carried through, I venture to prophesy that it will be found impossible to avoid a great many regulations which are not in terms passed as Acts of Parliament. If we have planning in this country, it is certain that we cannot pass through both Houses of Parliament every single order and direction and rule which will be required...

The Marquess of Reading: ... I accept his assurance, of course, that on the general question of the liberty of the subject his heart is still situated in its orthodox habitation...

In view of what the Lord Chancellor has said, I think that your Lordships will agree that this has been an interesting, a valuable, and an important debate. It has given noble Lords an opportunity to air their views and perhaps to clear their minds on what is a difficult and controversial subject; but having, by accepting the responsibility of this Motion, given the House that opportunity, I propose now to ask the leave of the House to withdraw it.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Australian Letter

(From Our Correspondent)

Canberra, February 5.

The Deputy Prime Minister yesterday opened the Henry Lawson Labour College, the aims of which are (1) to equip young people to assume office in their unions, and (2) to raise the standard of men and women entering politics under the Labour banner. The College is in Sydney.

Among the subjects in which instruction is to be given are English, Journalism, Public Speaking, Economics, the Theory of Practical Socialism, the History and Organisation of the Australian Labour Party and Trades Unions, Arbitration Court Procedure, and the History, Structure and Methods of Australian Government.

The *Daily Telegraph* (Sydney) the other day (January 31) carried a considerable article entitled "How Did They Live Before There Were Planners?" by George L. Schwartz, Cassel Lecturer in Economics at London University. Douglas Frank Hewson Packer, at present Director of Personnel, Allied Works Council, is managing director of Consolidated Press, Ltd., which publishes the *Telegraph*. (Incidentally, the *Telegraph* spells *Cassel* with two I's, thus obliterating

one sign of its German origin.) The following are extracts:—

“Since most of the people who demand the abolition or supersession of the capitalist system, and its replacement by a planned economy, are quite incapable of explaining what they mean by the capitalist system, it is not surprising that they are equally ignorant of the nature of their remedy.

“What is planning? The term is now loosely and freely applied to any and every project involving an alteration in human conduct or a change in the social environment.

“There are plans for Industry, with a capital letter, for nearly every conceivable branch of industry, for agriculture, for transport by land, sea, and air; plans relating to the size and distribution of the population; plans relating to the ownership and use of land; plans for currency, finance and investment; plans for regulating external trade; plans for social insurances and social services; plans for housing; for education; plans for fuel, power, lighting, and water supplies; plans for employment; plans for leisure and entertainment.

“The first justification put forward for planning is that it will substitute order for chaos.

“The capitalist system, the system of private enterprise, of free enterprise, doesn't work. The proof of this is that in the minds of the planners it cannot possibly work. Free, individualist enterprise is necessarily and inevitably formless and unco-ordinated, and therefore chaotic.

“Let us consider the problem of supplying the citizenry with footwear. To the mind of H. G. Wells it seems obvious that only a centralised, blue-printed scheme for the production and distribution of boots and shoes could provide a solution.”

“Somebody must envisage the problem as a whole. This is an operative phrase with the plan-mongers, envisaging the problem as a whole. Somebody, or some small manageable group, must start with the information that 45,000,000 people are involved, and that an average of three pairs per head per annum are a requirement or desideratum. Therefore, 135 million pairs of boots and shoes must be produced annually. These must be available in a range of sizes and styles which must be prescribed beforehand. The output must be allotted to a definite number of workers, and absorbing a definite amount of materials. With central direction and co-ordination the number of selling outlets, with their respective turnovers, could be calculated and determined in advance. A system which relied on the unco-ordinated activities of uncounted individualistic boot-producers, each acting in blind ignorance, both of the total situation and of each other's contribution to it, must contain such enormous possibilities of error as would condemn it, both by the ineptitude of its performance and the direness of its results.

“But the facts are that, for as long as any of us alive can remember, the population has been progressively better shod up to to-day, and at no time has chaos prevailed in the business of supplying footwear. No one can quote years in which only left boots were produced to the exclusion of their companions on the right, no one can give instances of blatant omission to provide for a sex, age or size; there are no cases of glaring gaps in distribution over time or space. By some mechanism or other, the combined actions of independent producers have been regularly, if broadly, related

to the combined demands of independently acting consumers.

“There has, in fact, been co-ordination of effort. Nothing is more crude, nothing is more ignorant, nothing more erroneous than the assumption that the co-ordination of the planners is the direct antithesis of the competition associated with free private enterprise. Private ownership—from which private enterprise derives—compels and facilitates the co-operation of human beings. It facilitates co-operation by making it depend upon innumerable separate agreements between individuals and groups of individuals, instead of decisions arrived at by society at large. Under analysis and in practice, competition stands revealed as a most potent instrument of co-ordination. It is not altogether a disorderly world in which you can safely arrange in the new year for a book on *The Chaos and Anarchy of Free Enterprise* to appear in the forth-coming autumn list.”

“After the fourth long and dreary winter of the war and the British public, hungry for a little color in its life as it emerged from the protracted black-outs, eagerly anticipated the arrival of the spring flowers. The Government thought that it was necessary at that particular juncture to forbid the transport of daffodils by rail. Expelled from the goods van, they started to travel surreptitiously on the passenger luggage-rack. This in turn was forbidden, and the dealers sent them by sea. From the sea the ban drove them on to the roads, and when carriage in motor trucks was forbidden, the suppliers promptly organised relays of cyclists. And all the time the public went on buying. Call it naughty of them; call it wicked of the dealers; but don't say that private enterprise lacks energy and initiative.”

“One last criticism of planning and the accompanying argument for planning. Free enterprise lacks aesthetics: it makes for an ugly civilisation. The Scott Report is an eloquent plea for planning to rescue the amenities of the countryside. The introduction contains [a] quotation from that arch-planner, Mr. H. G. Wells [on the beauties of the English countryside]... Am I unfair in claiming this as a magnificent tribute to free enterprise, even if acknowledging the contribution of nature? This is the picture afforded of an England supposedly sacrificed to and devastated by the Industrial Revolution. Are our towns so ugly? Was nineteenth century taste so debased? I hesitate to pronounce. The Crystal Palace was the stock laughing joke of the aesthetes for generations... In any case, where did the State, which in future is to lay down planning, stand in relation to private taste in these matters? The State put up the Albert Memorial and the South Kensington Museums. Are post offices and town halls the one redeeming feature in our architectural legacies from the nineteenth century? Was not Berlin a planned city of nineteenth-century inspiration and development?”

Sandwiched in the midst of this Hayekian tilt are some paragraphs in another vein, which may or may not reveal the expectations (and plans) of the Beveridge Liberals. Whether they do or not, I may send some account of them later. Evidently some hard thinking is going on behind the L.S.E. façade, and, for some reason, Australia is to be made a sounding-board for the results.