

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 36. No. 16.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1957.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

### Modern Science

By TUDOR JONES, Sc.D., M.D., F.R.S.E.

A REVISION OF THIS ESSAY, ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN THESE PAGES IN THE LATTER PART OF 1943 AND EARLY 1944, HAS FOUND NO MAJOR ALTERATIONS NECESSARY. DR. JONES HAS, HOWEVER, ADDED A NUMBER OF FOOTNOTES AND A POSTSCRIPT.

#### (XVI)

To cite again the Master of Balliol and his friends, the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford holds his office usually for three years and then "passes it on to the next Head of a College, in order of seniority as Head, who is able and willing to hold it." At Cambridge he is nominally elected from two names put forward by the Council of the Senate, and for two years. In both universities, he is "the Prime Minister, without a Cabinet and without a constituency." At Oxford, both the Vice-Chancellorship and his Headship are "a full-time job" and the routine work of at least one of the two offices "must be, as far as possible, delegated." "He possesses supreme power of interpretation of statutes and decrees, and an unlimited right of veto in respect of them, which he employs extremely rarely. . . ." "In particular, he is chairman of the Curators of the Chest, who control the university finances, and of the General Board of Faculties, which heads the organisation of university teaching. The possibilities of influence by a determined Vice-Chancellor thus opened up must be obvious. . . . There are many who believe that were the Vice-Chancellor, even with his present constitutional powers, able to contemplate a longer term of office, he could substitute a coherent policy for drift in the broad development of the university."

The Vice-Chancellors of the 'Modern' universities in England and of the Scottish universities are permanent salaried officials chosen by the Crown or by the university Court.

I have introduced these details from a responsible source, the names of which will be given, because of its insistence upon two points, the absence of a "coherent policy" and the opinion that both 'Prime-Ministering' a university and Headship of a College are full-time jobs. The group responsible for "The Government of Oxford" was constituted by themselves in 1929 to effect a "continuous appraisal of the governmental institutions of Oxford" in the belief that such a method was "much preferable to the spasmodic investigation by Royal Commissions. . . ." The members of the group were: Mr. A. D. Lindsay, Mr. A. B. Emden, Mr. W. D. Ross, Miss L. Grier, Miss S. M. Fry, Professor J. L. Brierly, Mr. K. N. Bell, Mr. R. H. Brand, Mr. Lionel Curtis, Dr. H. E. Craster, Dr. C. R. Harris, Sir H. Hartley, Mr. W. L. Hitchens, The Marquess of Lothian, Professor R. A. Peters, Professor F. M. Powicke,

Mr. A. H. Smith, Mr. B. H. Sumner, and Mr. H. V. Hodson and Mr. D. H. F. Rickett, Honorary Secretaries.

Dr. Lindsay was Vice-Chancellor of Oxford from 1935 to 1938, and although it is not wildly improbable that what one hears of the present demoralised condition of Oxford is the inevitable result of planners and planning somewhere, there is no apparent reason for placing the responsibility at his door. Of Mr. Ross, more later. Mr. R. H. Brand is managing director of Lazard Brothers and Co. Mr. Lionel Curtis was for some time Town Clerk of Johannesburg, and later a member of the Transvaal Legislative Council, then Beit Lecturer in Colonial History at Oxford. Dr. Charles Reginald Schiller Harris was Director-General of the Buenos Aires Great Southern and Western Railways from 1935 to 1939. Sir H. Hartley has been Vice-President of the L.M.S. since 1930 and Chairman of the Fuel Research Board since 1932. He has published scientific papers on chemical subjects. The late Marquess of Lothian died in 1940, after a career intimately bound up with the present and future histories of the British Empire and its culture. Professor Peters is a biochemist. Mr. Sumner was a member of the British Delegation to the Peace Conference and was on the I.L.O. at Geneva. Mr. Hodson was Editor of the *Round Table* from 1934 to 1939, and was Reforms Commissioner to the Government of India in 1941-42. "As far as the teachers and officers of Oxford and Cambridge are concerned, the system of government is a direct democracy. In London and the other universities it is a combination of an oligarchy and a representative democracy."

It would seem to be "fortuitous" (to use the word of "The Government of Oxford") that Vice-Chancellors with a long list of governmental associations took office in 1941 at both Oxford and Cambridge. At Oxford it was Sir W. D. Ross, Provost of Oriel since 1929. Like the late Sir Henry Jones, Sir W. D. Ross is a Moral Philosopher. His First Class Lit. Hum. was in 1900, and two years later he became a Fellow of Oriel, of which John Henry Newman was once a Fellow and Tutor. The first entry in *Who's Who* concerning matters far from Oriel Lane is for 1915-16, when Ross was Secretary of the N.E. Coast Armaments Committee. The following year he served in the Department of Inspection of Munitions and in 1918-19 he was Deputy Assistant Secretary to the Ministry of Munitions.

(Continued on page 3.)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

### FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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 and Editorial:* 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.  
 Telephone: Belfast 27810.

### Announcement

Commencing with the "English Edition" of *The Social Crediter* of the 2nd November, 1957, subscribers in North America have been receiving their copies from England and will continue to do so, instead of as formerly from Australia. This change has been made in order that subscribers may receive their copies of the paper more promptly, as the length of time taken for surface mail from Australia to the North American continent has been far from satisfactory. It is hoped this will be of benefit to these subscribers. Individuals will be notified at an early date of transfer of subscriptions, which should in future be made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd., in Belfast, Northern Ireland. Arrangements for subscribers in the United Kingdom, South Africa and on the Continent remain unchanged.

### The Development of World Dominion

During the period of the Socialist Administration in Great Britain, following the end of World War II, *The Social Crediter* analysed the activities of that administration in our progress to disaster; and emphasised over and over that a change of administration would not mean a change of policy. The Constitutional issue, philosophy, politics, economics and strategy were examined in the notes under the heading "From Week to Week." Written or inspired by the late C. H. Douglas, these notes are a permanent and invaluable addition to our understanding of the policies of opposed philosophies, and we propose to re-publish a considerable selection of them, both for their relevance to a situation which has developed but not otherwise altered under a 'new' Administration, and for the benefit of new readers of this journal to whom otherwise they are not readily available.

The date of original publication is given in brackets after each item.

When, if ever, the true history of these times comes to be written, there can be no doubt as to the feature which will mystify the writers of it. It is the surrender, without the consent, so far as we are aware, of Parliament, and certainly without the knowledge of the people, to a nearly anonymous body in Washington, known, we believe, as the Food Board, of the food supplies of these islands. The thing is so amazing that it beggars description. There has never been anything remotely approaching it in history, except perhaps Joseph's corn racket, and to say that the negotiators of the arrangements for and on behalf of Great Britain deserve instant impeachment for High Treason is not an opinion, it is a simple consequence of the definition of treason. We have been sold to the enemy, and are at the mercy of a bloodless war in which our conquerors do

not need to lose a man.

We can quite imagine that those extraordinary exhibits with whom we were cursed during the period in which the Oxford Union voted not to fight for King and country, and Mr. Attlee informed the Labour Party that their loyalties were to neither, suppose that they are showing a superior sense of world politics, but we feel fairly sure no American, still less Mr. Bernard Baruch, would agree, although the latter would do everything possible to encourage them in their belief. It has not taken eighteen months to demonstrate that the United States has every intention of reducing us to an inferior status to that of the Philippine Islands. Whether the ultimate idea is to force us into the outstretched arms of the Bear, or alternatively, to fight one more war for the benefit of Wall Street is not yet clear. But 1947 shows every sign of resolving the dilemma.

(December 28, 1946.)

Mr. Strachey is stated to be a quarter Jew, and whether this be so or not, only a small section of the population would be prepared to regard him as a representative Englishman or Scot, or whatever his formal nationality may be. But no one can deny him at least one outstanding quality—an effrontery almost bordering on genius. A man who will justify bread rationing on the grounds of (a) world wheat shortage, proved to be non-existent; (b) Coal strike in U.S., called off before it started; (c) Failure of U.S. transport, which, on the contrary, was actually improved by reduction of mineral traffic; (d) Lack of dollars, when we are paying dollars for supplies to U.N.R.R.A. for distribution to people who are killing and wounding British soldiers in Palestine and elsewhere, and paying royalties, not subject to tax, on Hollywood films whose general culture and tone is that of a Chicago ghetto, is not inconsistent; he is a romantic artist.

We cannot be accused of undue admiration for Mr. Churchill, although if we have to choose between buccaneers, we prefer his type. But it has always been a mystery to us why a hard-headed constituency such as Dundee would reject him, and yet elect a Mr. Strachey.

(January 18, 1947.)

### The Middle East

"We have heard a lot of views expressed in the House tonight, and they have all been based on the gratuitous assumption that Zionism is a good thing and therefore ought to be supported. I believe that Zionism is a bad thing. What is Zionism but expressed belief of certain fanatical Jews that they are the chosen people, who ought to have a national state in Palestine, a country which they left 20 centuries ago? This belief of the more fanatical Jews is a belief backed by big money in various parts of the world, particularly in the United States. I could not help feeling amusement at the emotional argument with which the hon. Member for East Coventry sought to arouse the sympathy of the House for this small nation, which has been backed by the two greatest powers in the world today, Russia and America, whose support of Israel is the only thing they have in common with one another."

—Mr. Norman Smith in the House of Commons, England, January 26, 1949.

### Social Credit

"Most Social Crediters must have been asked the question from time to time: 'What is Social Credit?' There is no short answer. Social Credit is a way of looking at things, a point of view that seems to bring every branch of knowledge into a new and more clear perspective. Equally, all knowledge is relevant to Social Credit."

—Bryan W. Monahan in *An Introduction to Social Credit*.

#### MODERN SCIENCE— (continued from page 1.)

Four years later he became Professor of Moral Philosophy, to be interrupted in 1932 by appointment as Chairman of the Tobacco, Baking, Furniture Manufacturing, Ready-made Tailoring, Shirt-making and Dressmaking Trade Boards. In 1936 he was made Chairman of the Departmental Committee on the Woollen Textile Trade in Yorkshire; in 1937 of that on the Health of Cotton Card Room Workers and on the Fair Wages Clause, being at the same time a member of the Departmental Committee on Holidays with Pay. He was a member of the Appellate Tribunal for Conscientious Objectors, 1940-41, and in 1942 became Chairman of the Civil Service Arbitration Tribunal.

The 'philosopher,' unable—unwilling?—to envisage an order which will work, goes out to help turn the wheels, as though an engineer unable to instruct an apprentice in the principles of locomotive engines stood by with a whip to teach the boy to push!

#### (XVII)

Also appointed in 1941 was Dr. J. A. Venn as Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge. He is a President of Queens' College, and is an economist of agriculture whose contribution to scholarship is a complete biographical register of all known Cambridge men from the earliest times to 1900. His book, *Foundations of Agricultural Economics*, reached its 2nd edition in 1933. Venn became statistician to the Food Production Department in 1917, and after 1919 was at the Ministry of Agriculture. He was Advisory Officer to the Ministry from 1923 to 1932, and was elected a Fellow of his college in 1927. He is a member of the Scientific Council of the International Agricultural Institute in Rome, and of various Departmental Committees of the Ministry of Agriculture, Colonial Office and Empire Marketing Board, and Chairman of the Cambridgeshire and Isle of Ely Agricultural Wages Board.

As *The Government of Oxford* points out, "subject to the intervention of death or resignation, the possible succession to the Vice-Chancellorship is known years ahead." I am not, of course, suggesting that the war was arranged for 1938-1945 in order that England should have the benefit of the services of Dr. Lindsay, Sir W. D. Ross and Dr. J. A. Venn—Planning, Armaments (and ready-made tailoring, shirt-making, dressmaking, etc.) and the Economics of Agriculture—as heads of its ancient universities for at least part of the time. Of nineteen Oxford Colleges, seven have Heads prominently connected with politics and administration. Four years after Sir W. D. Ross became Provost of Oriel, Professor W. G. S. Adams became Warden of All Souls. The Warden of All Souls is *ex officio* an elector to the Drummond Professorship of Political Economy, the Chichele Professorship of Economic History (advertised in

*The Times* last week as vacant) and the Chichele Professorship of Modern History. In the first of these offices, he and the Vice-Chancellor are assisted in their choice of a candidate by Sir Arthur Salter, Professor Carr-Saunders, head of the London School of Economics, Mr. R. V. Lennard, author of *Democracy: the Threatened Foundations* (1941), an historian of the economics of agriculture, Sir William Beveridge and Mr. Henry Clay, an economic advisor to the Bank of England since 1933. Presumably Professor Adams and Sir R. W. Livingstone, President of Corpus Christi, some of whose views have been published in *The Social Crediter*, will be available for the Vice-Chancellorship of Oxford before Sir William Beveridge's turn comes. Professor Adams was a member of the Committee to advise the Cabinet on Irish Finance in 1911, was with the Ministry of Munitions in 1915 and Secretary to the Prime Minister, Mr. David Lloyd George, from 1916-19. He edited the War Cabinet Reports, 1917-18, and has since been on five Committees and Commissions.

Is there any reason why high scholarship and intellectual attainment should not be placed freely at the disposal of the Nation? I can only answer that, in my opinion, the question embodies a most interesting suggestion, of which some notice might be taken, late as it is.

Since the late Sir Ernest Cassel's (a naturalised alien) reply to the late Lord Haldane, that he richly endowed the London School of Economics in order to train bureaucrats for the new order of Socialism is on record, there is no need to analyse its construction here. In what have lately come to be called the "Red-Brick" universities, Liverpool and Birmingham have 'political' heads, though Dr. Priestley's (the Shackleton and Scott Antarctic Expeditions and the Signal Service) is less obtrusive than Sir A. D. McNair's record\* which comprises the Secretaryship of the Coal Conservation Committee, 1916-18, that of the Advisory Board of the Coal Controller, 1917-19, and that of the Sankey Commission itself. Sir A. D. McNair is a Cambridge International Lawyer. Sir Thomas H. Holland at Edinburgh, Sir Hector Hetherington (a student of Sir Henry Jones's) at Glasgow and Sir J. C. Irvine at St. Andrew's have a long record of Public Service.

#### (XVIII)

Isn't it wonderful how quickly a beam of limelight becomes populated?

Sir Arnold McNair, on February 17, responded to the invitation of the editor of the *Liverpool Daily Post*, "though not a scientist," to write about scientific research from the University point of view. This is, I believe, the first popular appearance of the Vice-Chancellor of Liverpool University since his cautious exposition of Federal Union in the first year of the war. He said one of the two primary duties of a University was to extend the bounds of knowledge; that they must do this not only because of the value of the direct products of research, but research by teachers inspired and 'fertilised' teaching; and that a scientist working in a

\* Now, 1957, President of the Court of International Justice at the Hague to which office it attached the highest tax-free salary payable in Sterling.

university laboratory "is more likely to follow wherever the light leads him, without stopping to consider whether his work can ever have any practical application than the scientist working in an industrial laboratory." So the reader now knows that what leads the economists is—Light! He also says that "there is now evidence that the period of comparative starvation is about to come to an end and that the Government will in future see that the university laboratories are adequately equipped." This is a variation on the well-known quantity theme, as is also the suggestion that "when the war is over . . . the universities, properly financed, will be ready to resume their task and to raise the output of research and trained researchers beyond the pre-war level." I have already referred to Sir A. D. McNair's long connection with the political problems of the coal industry, and it is possible that "output" is an idea, early acquired, which has stuck in his mind. I can understand that the output of men properly trained (*i.e.*, in the opinion and to the specifications of big business, *e.g.*, I.C.I.) is not merely desired by Big Business but is necessary to it, and that the pretensions of Big Business to world control are unrealisable without it. I can understand the effect of Sir Arnold McNair's few moments as a (non-scientific) *prima donna* behind the footlights upon the Marx-sodden gallery. What I cannot understand (excepting by resort to the most uncharitable hypotheses), and what shocks me, is the complete detachment of this head of a university from all the *real* problems of modern education and his ready acceptance of a popular myth as the basis for his exposition. If there is one thing which is unquestionably of subordinate importance in discovery it is equipment. And to desist for one moment from the supremely difficult but necessary task of making this clear to planners, muddlers, messers and busybodies of all kinds (which, and not propaganda of the heresy, should be at the present time the primary concern of the head of an institution faced with "the greatest crisis of its history," *vide* Mr. Vere Cotton) is to play straight into the hands of those who are determined, and who have announced their determination, to shatter the whole fabric of Christian civilisation to its foundations—and deeper if possible, so as to ensure against any possibility of a resurrection at any time of a force which it is their aim to overturn and supplant. The destruction is intended to be final as well as complete.

The hall mark of a genuine original and creative idea that is not an idea about something which already exists in nature is chiefly that no mechanism exists to instrument it—and if it is found impossible to construct one (and usually from absurdly simple elements) the idea can be safely dismissed as not being a genuine new idea after all. Douglas's notion of price-adjustment and his ideas of a civil service of policy are excellent examples. Why *must* we heap equipment upon universities alleged to be run without a policy and *must not* elaborate machinery for the smooth working of the social order?

Discovery is an affair of discoverers, and even they cannot make a profession of it. But given the man, the requirements are simple. They are to live in an atmosphere which is not thoroughly corrupt, so that he may remain reasonably uncorrupted himself; to have an objective which is a real and intelligible objective to himself if to no one else, and to be secure in the pursuit of that objective at

least to the extent that no one can come along and substitute for it another objective altogether. "A bad workman does bad work with any tools, and, in addition, spoils good tools." Well, they're busy spoiling the good tools. But, as for a good workman, was it not once the last task of the apprentice to use his master's tools to make his own? The Zeiss micro-dissector is a magnificent instrument. You can pick the nucleus out of its cell with its aid. But so you can without its aid, if you know how to do it. I have never heard of a single material addition to knowledge that has resulted from picking a nucleus out of a cell, whichever way you do it. The vogue for things of this sort calls to mind how much modern 'research' is the work of adolescents, who are run in teams. Each little 'discoverer' is really only a fraction of a discoverer. Readers familiar with the current clap-trap about the 'army' of 'Science' marching on Giant Ignorance, *etc., etc.*, may have failed to discern through the haze the underlying feature of this instance of modern 'progress,' which is that the right hemisphere of the brain of the little 'discoverer' does not know what its left hemisphere is doing, and that both hemispheres together don't know why they are doing it. Policy, and policy in its most fundamental sense, pure, unadulterated individual initiative, should be, one would think, the body and soul of scientific inquiry. The fact that it is no longer so only shows how split the mind of society now is.

The full-time staffs of Universities in Great Britain, number nearly four thousand, of whom nearly nine hundred are professors. What sort of testimony is it to the competency of these men that, keenly critical as the majority of them are of the imperfections of their environment, even those of them whose speciality is investigation have not laid bare the true causes of the very things which impede and obstruct them in their own lives, the removal of which they know to be essential to any advancement worthy of the name? Concerned ostensibly with the advancement of science and the spread of knowledge, they have not even noticed the growth of ignorance, so that Mr. Christopher Hollis can write, "There has, in sum, hardly been a period of history during which the decline of everything that is meant by civilisation has been as rapid and as steady as it has been during the period of compulsory education."

It is important that the team-structure referred to above should be understood. A glance at the prospectus for any 'Honours School' (the public has access to all these things, in the reference departments of the public libraries) will reveal that when Tommy reaches the last rung of the ladder 'from elementary school to university' he has been led there through a 'prescribed course' which represents a small fraction of the 'subject' he professes. 'Research' now often forms a part of the last stages of this course. It is, of course, conducted under direction. From now on, Tommy may spend his life in routine investigations (among which may be some at least of the 'startling discoveries' of the newspapers). Or he may be taken onto a university staff, where, in theory, he has considerably greater freedom in alliance with much less knowledge of the world? What actually happens to him?

(To be continued.)