

"LET THE NATION RULE"

A PEOPLE'S RUNNYMEDE

TO ESTABLISH
A PEOPLE'S
COMMON LAW
PARLIAMENT

by

ROBERT J. SCRUTTON

A People's Runnymede

by [Robert J. Scrutton](#); (1941)

All biblical quotations are selected from Ferrar Fenton's translations direct from the original Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek.

Foreword

I will also give them a united heart, and a united course, and they will reverence me continually to their own benefit, and their children's after them, I will then record an everlasting Covenant with them—that I will not cease following them with benefits; I also shall delight to benefit them And it shall be a monument of delight and beauty, as formerly to every nation of the earth, when they hear all the benefits that I will confer upon them, and tremble with excitement at all the prosperity and peace which I will confer upon it!

Declare to the nations, and publish, and set up a standard! Publish it—hide not.—Jeremiah.

During the years between the first and second world wars half the population of the United Kingdom lived in poverty, one quarter were undernourished, a slightly lesser number suffered from deficiency diseases, and seventy-five per cent. of recruits for H.M. Forces were rejected as medically unfit.

But very few people felt any sense of personal responsibility for this condition. Less than twenty per cent. of the population took an active interest in politics and only sixty per cent. of voters used their franchise. There was little or no conception of a common social responsibility, or a common national purpose to direct the activities of the State to secure the peace, security, and happiness of the people.

Let us be frank about our social sins.

It required a war and the night raider to awaken our dormant sense of individual social responsibility. Now we are willing to give our services in the Home Guard and in the A.R.P. to protect the lives we had ignored in the days of peace.

It is now popular to talk and write about war and peace aims and the need for a common national purpose. We realise that a united effort is necessary for us to win the war. A united purpose is necessary for us to win the peace. Many people are writing and speaking about British peace aims which will provide us with a "Sixth Column" and succeed where our propaganda and diplomacy have failed in obtaining the support of governments and peoples.

We need a new national purpose: a policy so just and honest that our integrity is unquestioned and which will win the confidence and support of peoples of all nations to win the war with us, that we may work together to build a new world, a world which will be more secure and desirable than anything which the National Socialism of Germany can offer.

Sir Wyndham Deedes of the Ministry of Information wrote in *London's Awake* of January 8, 1941:

"The victory to be won in this war is a 'moral' one. But to achieve a moral victory, social, political, and ethical issues must be faced. In this field the 'State' has to tread warily, for it raises questions about which opinions greatly differ. The 'voluntary' organisations are in no sense trammelled. They can say what they please. And owing to the position they occupy in society, their preaching will not, I opine, be made in vain. Just as they originated the Social Services, which have been taken over by the State, so now let them evolve a policy of social justice. If something new of this kind does not come out of this war, to what end is it being

fought?"

The Government will not, or cannot, evolve a policy of just peace aims. So the people must do it. Almost every week a book or a manifesto is published, or conferences are held by religious bodies or the laity, expounding policies on peace aims. Each has its own particular bias—atheistic, religious, monetary, intellectual, political, or social reform under national or international headings. In my study I have over thirty books and manifestos representing every shade of intellectual, religious, and class opinion. All claim that their particular scheme is the only one which will provide a lasting peace and social justice, except those who suggest that all reformers should try to find a policy on which all can agree. This suggestion usually creates one more cause for dissension. Sir Wyndham Deedes says, "opinions greatly differ." But do they?

All these schemes and policies have been drawn up to prevent poverty, to remove the causes of war, and to build a happier and more secure world. The principles which underlie the various schemes are in all cases similar. Dissensions arise only when reformers try to give expression to principles in detailed plans for their operation in social life.

International and national financial and commercial combines, to maintain their monopolies and safeguard their private interests, will use their vast powers to prevent the social and economic reforms on which the peace and security of the world depend. Their private interests are diametrically opposed to the common interests of the peoples of the world. Vested interests are united in their determination to maintain the principles of competition and freedom to exploit nations and peoples for power and profit, but the good will of the world is disunited by the variety of its plans for removing these evils. This is one of the main reasons why human decency has been helpless and evil all-powerful. A united public opinion is essential to break the power of evil and cause right to be done.

The real problems of post-war reconstruction are not those of devising plans—many are available and many are right and sound, but they are incapable of uniting the people. No desirable major reform will be established without a strong public demand, but undesirable changes can and are imposed on an uninformed and divided people. The problem is to find a policy which will educate and unite the people on a right course of action. When this problem is solved public opinion will become irresistible and be able to bring about any reform it desires.

This problem is one which has confounded most reformers. It is easier to devise a scheme of reform than to devise and carry out a policy of public action which will cause it to be put into effect. But this difficulty must be tackled if peace and justice are to be established in the world when the slaughter is over.

The purpose of this book is to show how this problem may be solved. We offer our proposals after years of experiment and preparation, which involved visits to the homes of over a quarter of a million people in this and other countries.

We have said that disunity in the ranks of reformers is caused by the variety of their detailed plans for reconstruction, but they agree on the principles which underlie their plans and their purpose to prevent poverty and war. Before a plan can be put into effect the Government must make laws defining its purpose and controlling its operation.

If reformers agreed that the principles which unite them, rather than the plans which cause dissension, were first made the Law of the land the objects which their plans are designed to accomplish would be guaranteed by the power of the State. If the people were given the opportunity to choose a set of simple principles to be expressed in Laws supporting common justice and human need, and prohibiting the things which hurt them, they would give almost unanimous support. This claim is not a conjecture but a fact proved by careful experiment.

It is the right of a democratic people to make known the principles which should govern their lives, and it is the duty of Parliament to find the plans or call in experts to help to put them into effect. Let

us cease to quarrel over the details of peace aims and reforms. The winning of the peace depends upon democracy making known the principles which shall provide the foundation and the purpose of post-war national policy. A public demand that the principles of common justice are made supreme Law would make it obligatory upon the State to pursue that policy and to establish the necessary reforms.

We have found that a public demand for legislation expressing the natural laws of simple justice, which define the rights and duties of the people, and which prohibits evil and safe-guards right, not only unites the people but also provides a new basis for mutual trust, and a common aim which removes political and class dissension. When this policy was placed before the people of Coventry, and other cities, its simplicity and honesty of purpose won their confidence and support immediately.

Moral-civic laws of this nature would provide the nation with a constitutional purpose. The lack of such legal definition has left the people at the mercy of political, commercial, and international groups who have exploited their need for political and monetary gain.

Our "unwritten" Common Law provides the foundation for that which we have in mind.[\[1\]](#) During the last two hundred years our legislators and the judgments of the King's Courts have ignored or perverted the intention of Common Law. It must be vindicated. It must become a supreme "written" Law binding upon Parliament, defining our national purpose and protecting the freedom, security, health, peace, and happiness of the people. The common needs—the rights of man—would then cease to be subject to the fortunes of political conflicts and would be placed beyond the reach of human malversation.

In the year 1937 we placed these principles and this policy before the people of Coventry in the form of a Petition to His Majesty the King. The Petition asked for the appointment of a judicial court to conduct an investigation into the causes of poverty and war and to recommend to the House of Commons reforms based upon these principles. Every house in the city was visited. Ninety-three per cent. of the voters gave their support, including the clergy of all denominations.

It might be suggested that the people signed the Petition without understanding what it involved. This was not the case. Study groups were formed in many districts. Meetings were held in local factories, church halls, and at trade union branches throughout the city. A special train carried the petitioners to London, where the Mayor of Coventry led a deputation of Aldermen, Councillors, clergy, and business men at the head of a procession of 2,500 people to the Home Office, where the Petition was lodged.

The following grievances of the citizens of Coventry, and their charges of violation of Common Law and the Christian principle underlying the British Constitution by Parliamentary enactments and financial practices, were signed by the Mayor of Coventry, and lodged with the Petition, to be placed at a later date before a judicial court:

The Coventry Petition to His Majesty the King represents the opinion of all types and conditions of people in this city, the number of which is two-thirds greater than usually registers at a general election.

Every householder, clergymen of all communions, and the officials of organisations within the city were questioned on the essential points outlined in the petition: and it was their almost unanimous opinion that the King should be asked to institute a judicial inquiry into the law concerning money, both in regard as to what it is and its effect upon the economic, social, and spiritual life of the nation, and what it ought to be.

1. The Petition as a Matter of Conscience

The Petitioners feel that their support of the Petition is dictated by conscience, and they are advised that the Judges must consider the questions raised in the light not only of the law, but

of conscience.

The Petitioners do not wish to be generous with other people's property: nor do they beg for charity. They say that this nation is rich in all material resources necessary to its well-being, therefore the nation *must* be permitted to work upon these resources so as to utilise, preserve, and increase them. Because the nation *can* secure its well-being by producing wealth, it is the *duty* of the nation to do so. And the first step to that, is to examine the cause of the present circumstances where the means to wealth and the men to utilise them exist side by side but are kept artificially apart.

It will thus be seen that the general human conscience would demand the inquiry and reforms prayed for by the Petition. But the demand would also seem to be in conformity with the specifically Christian conscience as outlined in the Statement appended to the Petition and agreed upon by an increasing number of clergy and laity of all communions; and in particular with the objects of the Movement which is responsible for the Petition.

These Christian Social objects are:

No man, woman, or child shall suffer insecurity or poverty whilst there are available actual or potential resources to meet their needs.

Whilst any subject of the Realm needs food, warmth, or shelter, the curtailment of supplies by restriction of production or distribution; or by the destruction of actual goods; or by high prices or high taxation or inadequate incomes; or by the restriction of money supplies, shall be made illegal.

To hasten the growth of a true Christian Social Order in which God's Plan of fellowship and co-operation between men can be made manifest.

To provide security, liberty, and opportunity for all men and women to enrich the State by the development of their personalities and their spiritual and intellectual attributes.

To ensure that Christian facts and human need shall receive the first consideration of our legislators.

Human life is sacred. It shall cease to be made subservient to monetary expediency or to industrial or commercial exploitation. It is necessary that these institutions shall be reformed to serve human life in its highest capacity.

2. The Petition

It is the opinion of the majority of the Citizens of Coventry that Parliament is so completely occupied with the task of devising measures to keep the economic wheels turning from day to day that it has no time to go into the general mechanics of the system and to devise those reforms so necessary to the well-being and security of the nation. It is for this reason that the Petition is addressed to the King. It is not the intention of the Petitioners to attempt to override Parliament, but to cause to be instituted a judicial committee which can command evidence and recommendations from experts who claim that the necessary reforms can be made to abolish poverty in the midst of plenty and to remove the economic causes of war; and to place such recommendations before Parliament for its consideration after they have been thoroughly examined by experts qualified to judge their practicability.

There is an abundance of all commodities necessary for man's well-being, and reason forbids that their distribution is beyond the intelligence of man.

The cause of this maldistribution of the nation's abundance remains unexplored. The effects resulting from it have grown to such proportions in the way of bankruptcies, suicides, unemployment, and recurring trade stagnation that it has become imperative to examine the question with a view to immediate adjustment.

The present monetary system has led to intensive industrial and agricultural activity during the time of war and preparation for war; but during times of peace it fails to divert into creative and productive activities the energies which have been devoted to the purpose of destruction.

The Citizens of Coventry believe that the judicial inquiry for which their Petition prays could result in the elimination of the periodical slumps and booms and replace them with a continual and vigorous use of the national resources of human ability and natural wealth, and remove the irritant of war and the obstacles to the free exchange of wealth between nations.

3. The General Principles behind the Petition

The Petition was drafted in the democratic belief that all sorts and conditions of men and all forces in the country are equal before the law, and that no power or community within the nation, including the power of Money, can arrogate to itself a position in which it is irresponsible to law.

These principles were developed and refined in a Conference held at Digswell Park. This conference was assisted by, among others, the Marquis of Tavistock, Lord Northbourne, Sir Richard Paget, Sir Reginald Rowe, Lady Clare Annesley, Professor J. R. Marrack, Professor Frederick Soddy, Mr Arthur Kitson, and Mr. Jeffrey Mark.

The following are some of the findings of this conference: "In all forms of private commercial enterprise, purely monetary and financial considerations give an entirely artificial significance by pressure from vested interests and take precedence over all other considerations, including that of human well-being and the Christian conscience.

"There is no assurance that monetary policy shall conform with general economic policy. On the contrary, the power of money often gains at the expense of the producers of wealth; and it is in a position to dictate to the community the conditions under which wealth shall be produced and distributed.

"That the well-being and happiness of His Majesty's subjects, individually and collectively, is not the chief object of the operators of the financial system is manifest from the general forthcomingness of money in time of war and preparation for war and its desultory appearance in time of peace, when of all times men should be allowed to engage in the creation of wealth and the use thereof in the pursuit of happiness.

"In particular, the extent to which the power and influence of the Bank of England is exercised over the Treasury—and, through the mediumship of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, over the Cabinet itself—is altogether excessive. It was noted that the policy of the Bank, although exerting a dominating influence in agriculture, industry, and the affairs of the nation as a whole, was not subject to question or criticism in the House of Lords or the House of Commons, the Bank being registered and regarded as a private Corporation."

The Petition does not aim at subjecting the financial system to Party Politics. It is based on the idea that Money has its duties to Law and the common well-being.

"The public is uninformed or seriously misled as to the nature and extent of its powers and rights, owing to the fact that the educational and publicity processes of the country are becoming more and more controlled directly and indirectly, whether exercised through the mediumship of schools, universities, or technological and research institutes, or from the Press, platform, pulpit, and broadcasting services."

We appeal for these charges against finance and its associated institutions and practices to be investigated by His Majesty's judges, and that all evidence relevant to these charges shall be called upon.

It is the right and liberty of every subject:

that he shall not be dispossessed or impaired in the enjoyment of his prosperity or in the exercise of his trade, or in any way socially destroyed;

that he shall have safety and security to buy and sell without any unjust exactions or impediment; and

that he shall not be constrained to any unconscientious act;

that he shall possess the economic liberty to practice the social implications of the Christian faith in all departments of life.

The first and last of these rights are so elementary to the idea of natural justice that they are substantially contained in *Magna Carta*; although these rights appear to have been infringed continually over the last hundred years, no action has been taken in the Courts, and Parliament has passed many statutes recognising the chaotic position resulting from these infringements. There can be, however, no prescription to commit public nuisances, and the wholesale infringement of these rights is and must be a public nuisance, so that the inertia of the Courts cannot be said to have abrogated the right while the actions of Parliament have been those of pure expedience. Thus the wholesale unemployment of workers who are willing to work and for whose product there is grave public need (as for instance the products of agriculture to combat malnutrition) is *prima facie* an infringement of the rights set out above, and the fact that Parliament enacted measures for the relief of the unemployed is referable to the fact that such relief was an absolute necessity and does not mean that workers have waived their rights in consideration of the dole and public works.

After three centuries of unceasing demand by the people of this country, the right of free speech and the civil and religious liberty of the individual had been almost completely realised, but that modern economic and financial development has set up and continued to set up unwarrantable presumptions and privileges, vested in individuals, companies, and corporations, which had seriously restricted and which still continues to threaten the liberties of the people as a whole. These presumptions and privileges, whatever their effect and intention, were, for the most part, supported by the Law; but it was open to question whether any precedent or sanction could be found for some of them.

Presented by The Right Worshipful THE MAYOUR OF COVENTRY to the Home Office on the occasion of presenting the Coventry Petition to HIS MAJESTY THE KING. October 29, 1938.

The principles underlying the Petition were placed before Christian leaders and civic authorities in other towns. The Petition was signed by the citizens of Smethwick and a deputation of 2,000 people presented it at the Home Office. The principles appended to the Petition and contained in the above statement received the support of twenty bishops and 2,500 clergy of all denominations.^[2] The mayors and clergy of twenty-one cities and boroughs then called town meetings to place the Petition before their people: 250,000 people gave their signed support to the principles and the Petition, and similar petitions were taken up in Australia, New Zealand, and Canada.

Unfortunately war was declared before public opinion could be massed in sufficient strength for the Petition to be placed before His Majesty asking for the appointment of the Judicial Court.

This experiment is sufficient to demonstrate the common agreement of the people when the basic principles of reform are placed before them, and their willingness, not only to sign a petition but to form street and parish groups to study the problems of reform, and to support their petition by further public action.^[3]

It is interesting to note that though these principles are known as Christian they were adopted by Mohammedan groups, as a basis of a similar crusade to mobilise public opinion to prevent poverty and remove the causes of war, and to establish a Common Law of human justice equitable to all nations. Also similar movements sprang up in Belgium and France under the name of Parliament Christian.

In every case we found that British people and the people of other nations, irrespective of political, religious, national, or intellectual opinions, were willing to unite and press for the establishment of these principles as Common Law binding upon themselves and their governments, to establish the security of the individual, and as a basis for co-operation between the nations.

An endeavour has been made in this book to outline the problems which will beset the post-war world. To understand these problems it has been necessary to point out the failings of our Government and the economic and financial system and the commercial practices which have brought about the present condition of the world. This has not been done in the spirit of criticism, but to enable us to judge our future action from our past mistakes, and to lay the foundation of Supreme Common Law which will prevent such evils arising in the world after the present conflict.

Chapter One

Man's Inhumanity to Man

*We stumble in light as at dusk,
In prosperity fear as at Death!
Hope for Justice,—but find not—
For safety,—but it is far off!
For our crimes grow before You,—
By distorting, and breeding the wrong,
By false reasons sent out from the heart,
So Justice retires,
And right stands afar off,
For Truth falls in the Square,
And Right cannot come in.
And Truth has been lost.—Isaiah.*

This chapter is written for those who are not aware of the tragedies of the years following the Armistice of 1918 until the declaration of war in 1939, and also to present these in a new light, so that we may indicate the reforms which are required, and how they should be applied.

The tragedy of war was aptly put by President Wilson when he said:

"Peace? Why, my fellow-citizens, is there any man here or any woman—let me say is there any child—who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry? That war was a commercial and industrial war: it was not a political war. The reason that the war we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her; and the reason why some of the nations went into war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them. The seed of the jealousy, the seed of the deeply-rooted hatred, was hot, successful, commercial, and industrial rivalry."

Thousands of us now realise how incredible it is that, rather than adopt a co-operative commercial system for the benefit of humanity, we support a competitive system which brings endless sorrow and suffering to the world and sacrifices millions of human lives.

The balance-sheet for the First Great War was approximately:

Killed	9,998,771
Seriously wounded	6,295,512
Slightly wounded	14,002,039
Missing—including prisoners of war and those mutilated beyond recognition	5,983,600
Died in 1918 in the flu epidemic brought on by the war	10,000,000

There were also the millions of war widows and orphans, the millions whose minds were permanently injured, and the industrial, social, economic, and cultural havoc which set the race back by a generation.

The cost of the war in real wealth will never be fully known, but the financial cost will reveal itself to succeeding generations as an increasing debt due to accruing interest. The following figures show the progressing growth of the National and Municipal debts of this country since April 1914:

Financial year ended March 31	Total Deadweight Debt (in £)	Gross Outstanding Local Loan Debt (in £)
1914	649,770,091	562,600,000
1919	7,434,949,429	—
1925	7,597,848,053	864,882,000
1929	7,500,337,654	1,176,900,000
1934	7,822,298,060	1,404,400,000
1939	8,163,180,285	— [4]
1940	8,931,459,000	—

We have paid interest amounting to over £9,000,000,000, but the principal instead of decreasing has increased by over £1,000,000,000. We cannot escape the increasing debt without radical reform of our monetary policy.

We paid for the wealth of material squandered in the Great War in the energy and labour expended in producing it, but shortly after the conflict the workers and the manufacturers of Britain found themselves on the verge of bankruptcy because they owed *themselves* almost £8,000,000,000. The soldiers who won the war came home to find themselves and everyone else in the country owing £134 each as their share in the national debt.

It was explained in the House of Commons, in 1916, that Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Newfoundland, Trinidad, Jamaica, and Fiji owed between them £128,239,000 to the City of London for helping to win the war, and in the case of Australia, New Zealand, and Trinidad an annual Sinking Fund, whilst our oldest colony Newfoundland had to hand over to financial nominees the

right to govern itself.

The whole world found itself in debt to itself and unable to pay. All the money in the world was not sufficient to pay a debt which at no time had existed as tangible money, but merely as credit figures in ledgers.

The cost of the war in terms of human life, health and happiness, wealth and debt, and the trade depression which followed, staggers the imagination. According to a League of Nations report, millions of men and women throughout the world died of starvation because the debt system had ruined trade, and deprived them of the worthless bits of paper necessary to buy from the abundant store of food which surrounded them.

Burdened with this debt, humanity set out to repair the ravages of war. Even this tremendous obstacle to prosperity and human progress could have been overcome if human need had been a deciding factor in the laws and practices which devised and governed monetary and commercial policy. There is no effective legal definition of individual or social purpose, consequently the dominant policy of governments was not to preserve human life but to preserve financial and commercial *status quo*. In such a policy neither God nor man found a place. Man was sacrificed to maintain systems which destroyed him. The nation followed the example of the Hebrew who practiced usury and ignored the Divine law of common justice. The prophet could have repeated in our time:

"None pleads for right or decides for justice, but trust upon tricks and false speech so that their products make nothing but wrong. Their genius a contrivance of crime brings destruction and ruin. No justice is found in their trades. They distort their own roads and all who travel them never know peace."—Isaiah.

During the years 1909 to 1918 American industry produced 390 billion dollars' worth of goods for consumption, but the people who produced them were unable to buy them because the total of wages, salaries, profits, and dividends issued during that period in America totalled only 266 billion dollars of purchasing power. The missing one-third of purchasing power represented debt, and that amount of goods had to be exported or destroyed.[\[5\]](#)

During the years 1927 to 1928 Australian factories produced £416 millions' worth of goods, but distributed only £130 millions in wages, salaries, and dividends. All nations practised a financial policy which prevented them from buying their own goods and purchasing their own wealth, but forced them to seek markets in other countries.

The strong arm of financial law demands that the first call upon industry shall be to "pay its way," not to feed the people. Nations were faced with the decision of adopting a new monetary policy which would enable the people to buy the wealth of their labours, or to try to sell their goods abroad. Nations found themselves in the impossible position of trying to sell to each other surplus goods which none could buy. The bitter competition for foreign markets which broke out into open warfare in 1914 again threatened the peace of the world.

World trade was strangled by debt. It was in the ludicrous position of owing itself money it had not got. It could not sell its goods because it could not pay its people sufficient money to buy them.

The nations who tried to break through the debt ring by a direct exchange of goods, or by introducing a new debt-free monetary technique, were condemned by the supporters of orthodox finance.

In 1921 unsaleable goods were piled up in every land, or were being destroyed to save the financial-economic system. On every hand the financial demon was given preference and human need neglected.

The Gold Standard crashed and the economic system collapsed. Most of the nations of the world defaulted on their debts. 30,000,000 men were thrown on the streets unemployed because they had

produced goods they could not buy. Industries became bankrupt and the world plunged into a trade depression from which it has never fully recovered.

"Do not you remember the past nor reflect on preceding events?" said the prophet. We must remember the cataclysm of suffering which afflicted the world after the Great War. It will seem moderate in comparison with the universal blight of debt and impoverishment which will descend on the world when present hostilities cease, unless we reform our national life and are prepared drastically to reform our national and international policies.

If we want to make the world safe for man we must make up our minds what we want to do with him.

The operation of an economic system primarily for a monetary motive makes man subservient to that system. He becomes a pawn in an order over which he has no control, an inhuman process governing political and social life. Politicians then have to adapt themselves to serve economic and party expediency and so neglect the urgent needs of men and women. They are forced to jump to the crack of Party Whips, themselves organised to meet the requirements of financial powers. Politics, civic law, economic and educational institutions, and YOU are adapted to meet these requirements.

After this war these financial powers will seek to continue the competitive system which was the main cause of the conflict. Millions of men, discharged from war duties, will face starvation because they can neither work nor buy nor sell. They will cease to be even cogs in an economic machine. They will be a hindrance, the unwanted, the unemployed. They will be nothing at all, because world economics has never defined the purpose of their existence or provided a place for them.

Man has marched across the world with scientific strides and his brain has achieved a thousand things for his benefit. And yet, amid the resulting abundance of goods and food, nations have fought for raw materials and the necessities of life and passed through years of war, irreparable to time and progress.

We appeal to the reader's sense of Christian values. We appeal to his or her sense of logic. If man made the effort, he could abolish the major troubles of the world as from to-morrow. He has not done so because his political and economic schemes are attempted without defining what man is, or what is the purpose of his existence.

Man cannot intelligently govern Man, employ Man, or save Man, or even fight Man, unless he has some notion of what he wants to do with his life—as a Man.

Man is essentially a spiritual entity, and Jesus Christ, who provided the world with the most sound economic system it has ever ignored, particularly made this point. Man's spiritual origin is made manifest through his intelligence, his culture, his arts, and the whole genius of the human race—which should have set him above the animal kingdom.

Our financial, economic, and industrial systems merely safeguard their own existence. This existence is defined and protected by law. But human purpose, which these institutions are supposed to serve, has no such definition. Consequently we have a government of the people by finance for finance.

No success can attend any re-adjustment of social conditions if the problems are regarded as simply economic. Such measures can be justified only if assessed in the light of individual well-being.

And in view of the fact that economic and financial experts have continually shown their inability to foresee deplorable events arising from their systems, surely there should come to all of us the urge to demand new economic arrangements based on human interests?

It is man's natural evolution to progress through his spiritual and intellectual abilities. This is a natural law, which cannot be suppressed without his energy being directed into anti-social channels.

Therefore one might say that labour-saving machines and the ease with which man produces an abundance of all things necessary for his needs are in accordance with Nature's order. They should set men and women free to pursue leisured and cultured lives. The task of all of us is to prepare and build up a society which will provide every encouragement and opportunity for humanity to develop as free individuals to fulfil their true destiny.

The moral-civic laws which prevent the individual from injuring another must be extended and made binding upon all institutions and associations. It is indefensible that commercial and financial powers or the customs of society should be allowed to pursue a policy which causes millions of men, women, and children to suffer unnecessary poverty, degradation, disease, and death. Such evils are equivalent to manslaughter and murder. That society and man's institutions commit the crime does not minimise or excuse it. Its power to inflict injury and widespread devastation surpasses anything which personal crime can accomplish, and therefore should be condemned and prevented by the full power and authority of the law.

Before we begin to devise plans for reform to prevent evil and anti-social activities we must agree upon the principles which will provide a frame of reference for reforms and a constitution of government that will define man's natural rights to ensure that the right reforms will be made.

In this chapter we are dealing only with man and his purpose in society. We can agree without question that he invented his institutions to serve, not to enslave him. Therefore the first supreme law, binding upon Parliament and the people, to provide for human right and need and to fulfil the Christian precepts of the British Common Law, should be:

Man shall not be treated as subservient to monetary policy or to industrial and commercial exploitation.

The object of this supreme Common Law shall be:

To ensure that the principles by which the economic and industrial life of the community is governed shall be so reconstituted as to make it possible that social institutions shall serve the physical, psychological, and spiritual needs of man, and man be not subservient to them.

Chapter Two

Man *versus* the Machine

*Woe! you enactors of wicked decrees,—and pronouncers of cruel decisions,
To turn off the weak from their right, and strip My poor people of justice,—
To make widows their prey and orphans their spoil!
What will you do in the day of assize, which will come from afar with a crash?—Isaiah.*

Unceasing competition in the market with rival producers forces every industry to try to lower the cost of production in that they can sell their goods at a lower price than their competitors, and by this means capture more trade. To lower the cost of labour, high-speed labour-saving machines are used, but the "saved" wages defeat the object in view by depleting the purchasing power of the market. The law of cost accountancy requires that the needs of finance shall be met, not the needs of life. No "written" law makes it obligatory that the security of the worker shall be protected in the process, with the result that he loses his job and is deprived of his income. The real problem of the labour-saving machine is not that it causes unemployment, but that it deprives men of their incomes and the ability to buy the goods it has produced.

It has been calculated that during the nine years prior to 1927 mechanised development displaced 2,500,000 workers. But we should welcome the machine because it can release man from the ancient curse of toil merely to get bread for life. It has given him the opportunity to increase his

leisure, on that he may develop his personality by other activities and enrich society by his spiritual, intellectual, and cultural attainments.

The principle which we propose shall be the first and overriding British Law would acknowledge and enforce the natural right of all subjects of the Realm to enjoy the full benefits of their productive capacity and the social, medical, educational, and cultural amenities which their knowledge and association have made possible. This requires measures which, for instance, would prevent unnecessary poverty and insecurity. Is it possible for man with his knowledge and resources to do this? Can we provide the people with sufficient food, clothes, boots, healthy homes, and other necessities of life?

We can.[\[6\]](#)

Mechanical aid has made it possible for 80 men working the same number of hours to produce as much wrought iron as 900 men a few years back.

One man produces over 4,000 tons of pig-iron per annum; his father worked hard to produce only 800 tons per annum. Similarly 200 men replaced 3,000 in a new electricity-producing plant.

In medieval times it took 7,200 members of the Shoe Makers Guild five and a half days to produce 7,200 pairs of shoes. Now, under the necessity of "increased production and less costs," the same number of men produced 595,000 pairs in the same time. In Fleetwood, Lancashire, a boot-repairing machine re-soles shoes at the rate of 240 an hour (one in fifteen seconds).

A few years ago a bricklayer laid 450 bricks a day. One man can now lay 12,000 bricks in eight hours by using a machine. The machine which produced 600 cigarettes a minute in 1914 has been superseded by a machine which throws out 2,600 a minute with the assistance of three operators. It displaces 699 workers.

Another automatic machine does the work of 2,000 men and produces 73,000 electric-light bulbs every 24 hours.

The Boston Railway Company's flat-car handling device takes charge of 1,000,000 cars per year. One man can now carry out the work of 400.

Automatic drilling machines, each requiring eight operators, disemployed 2,000 men who used the one-hole at-a-time machine.

Manless ploughs in the U.S.A. guide themselves up and down the furrows without a conductor, and do 1,300 per cent. more work than the old machines and their farm labourers.

To-day with less than half the staff more than four times the number of motor-cars can be produced in three months than in twelve months in 1918.

Similar figures could be produced endlessly, dealing with fruit-picking, reaping, canning, fish-cleaning, engineering, counting, printing, and so on, showing that every task performed by man, or every new industry shortly after its inception, can be done more efficiently, and the output increased tremendously, with less and less human labour.

The labour of fifty slaves in ancient Greece enabled one family to live a luxurious, leisured, and cultured life. Mr. F. R. Low, editor of *Power*, estimated that engines operating in Great Britain prior to 1929 developed approximately 175,000,000 horse-power. On the basis of ten men equal one horse-power, each man, woman, and child in Great Britain has the equivalent of forty slaves prepared to give him or her all the necessities of life. Yet millions are less certain of obtaining even the bare necessities of life than the slaves of ancient Greece.

If the money of this country represented its real wealth of goods and services which the people produce and render, and was issued to them to enable everybody to consume and use their share of that wealth, the national standard of living would be more than trebled.

The above potential wealth of British subjects is not unreasonable. We have the statistics of the late

Sir Josiah Stamp. In 1930 he prepared an estimate of Britain's wealth. He gave our net capital as £18,045,000,000—or £450 per man, woman, and child. The capital wealth of the average family could therefore be, in terms of money, £1800.

Britain's income is £4,000,000,000 yearly—approximately £100 per head. Every family of four in this country could receive an income of not less than £400 a year, and with a capital of £1800 in the bank or in the capital services of the country.

Sir John Orr reported previous to the war that 10,000,000 people in these islands suffered from malnutrition and 4,500,000 had only 4s. per week to spend on food.

According to Sir John Orr and the B.M.A.'s standards the diet of half the population, and of considerably over half the children, of these islands was inadequate. The maternal and infantile mortality and the death toll of children and adults caused by deficiency diseases due to inadequate food staggers and shocks the imagination. To the everlasting shame of society we allowed thousands upon thousands of our fellows to starve. Half the population received insufficient money to buy the food necessary to maintain a decent standard of health; thousands upon thousands of our fellows became the breeding ground for every kind of ailment, disease, and plague; whilst our granaries and stores were stocked with food and our machines turned out an abundance of all things necessary for the health and well-being of the people.

We believe it was Professor Julian S. Huxley, Secretary of the Zoological Society, who said: "If I treated the animals in my charge as children are treated I would be summoned for cruelty to animals."

The weekly food bill of the great apes at the Zoo costs £1, 10s., but the unemployed man (Means Test) and woman were expected to feed and clothe themselves and pay rent out of 15s. a week. The pregnant ape receives from 6s. to 10s. a week extra nourishment, but we found before the war that 49.6 per cent. of Aberdeen's expectant mothers received no extras, and suffered from anæmia and ill-health. It costs 30s. per week to rear a baby ape, but our Parliament granted 2s. to 5s. per week to the unemployed to keep their children in food, clothes, and good health.

It is time that our laws demanded that the standard of living for human beings was increased at least to animal-level. But we can do much better.

In this chapter we are not considering the principles or laws which should underlie and govern monetary practice. This subject is dealt with later. For the moment it is sufficient to realise that the present economic and industrial system can provide the unemployed with adequate incomes only by the greater taxation of their more fortunate fellows. This is no moral reason for treating *enforced* leisure as a social crime, punishable with semi-starvation. On the other hand, it is a very good reason why the economic system should be changed so that everyone can be provided with sufficient for their needs.

Many good people would hate to admit that the system they have striven to preserve has no place for humanity. For human beings to be sacrificed in order to maintain a system which doesn't work and which degrades them is singularly stupid. If the economic system cannot distribute its wealth of supplies to all who need them without economic disaster, then there is adequate reason for replacing it with one which *will* function efficiently. No one, whatever their class or position, is secure when humanity must be sacrificed to maintain the system under which they live. Mankind has become a mere cipher in political and economic policy, and until it demands redress and moral-civic laws to preserve its rights it will lose every semblance of freedom and security.

Invention and discovery have made industry and agriculture progressive in the highest degree and able to adapt themselves to every demand made. But our economic system is unprogressive; its inefficiency is proved by every development of the labour-saving machine and the resultant increase of wealth, unemployment, and poverty. It does not measure up to the normal demands of life. Consequently the producer, the wage-earner, the unemployed, and the general public have become

the victims of defective monetary practice and legislation, overtaken by progressive and intelligent invention.

When he has faithfully fulfilled his obligation to society by providing its requirements the producer is ruined. His employees are thrown on the streets and become a lost market to the traders, because they must first buy with their labour the money to buy the goods for sale. In 1921 Mr. Lloyd George appointed a committee to discuss unemployment. For ten years from that time we had trade depression and one economic crisis after another. In 1931 Mr. MacDonald appointed another committee to inquire why there was unemployment. The necessities and the amenities of life, which the unemployed needed, were there in plenty, but as work could not be found 2,000,000 men became the "hard core of unemployment" and the food was destroyed. No attempt was made to balance the distributive system with the productive system. No attempt was made to base economic laws on moral laws. Mr. MacDonald's committee did not ask: "Is there plenty of food, warmth, and shelter in the world; if so, how might we organise its distribution so the people may enjoy it?" Instead they asked: "How much gold is buried in the vaults of the banks?"

Mr. MacDonald explained: "The reason why the bankers came was that the Cabinet asked for their advice, not on political affairs, not on politics, but on how a loan was to be raised. After all, that was their job." Mr. MacDonald should have said: "Here are the men who want food and here are the traders bankrupt because their goods are not bought, so reform the monetary system in order that the goods *can* be sold. After all, Mr. Banker, that is your job. When the goods are all gone we can put the unemployed to work making more." This is an instance of a statesman who could not conceive the idea of man's needs becoming the decisive factor in monetary policy.

We reiterate that human need must be the final arbiter in all decisions, because it must become the slogan of humanity if humanity would save itself. If this book does no more than bring to the mind of the public the significant fact that statesmen, in Parliament and at their endless conferences, *always* put political and economic expediency before human *need*, then the writing of it will have been well worth while. *This realisation is vital, for the whole calamity of the human race springs from the subservience of humanity to inhuman and immoral economic practices.*

There is sufficient evidence to prove that poverty can be abolished. Nobody need want for a sufficiency of the necessities of life.

Every man, woman, and child is entitled to a full life and to the freedom and security necessary to develop it.

We need not quibble about such a natural and incontestable right. Let us demand our second Supreme Common Law and make this right obligatory upon society:

No man, woman, or child shall suffer poverty or insecurity through no fault of their own whilst there are available actual resources or potential capacity to meet their needs.

The object of this law shall be:

To provide such a degree of liberty, security, and opportunity as will make it possible and natural for men and women to make their individual contribution to the welfare of the community.

Chapter Three

Destruction of Food and Life

If you do not obey the Law:

"You will be wronged and robbed daily and find no defender;

You shall plant a vineyard and not eat of it;

*They will kill your ox, but you will not be allowed to eat it;
They will steal your ass and never return it;
A people whom you do not know will consume the produce of your farms, and all your
acquisitions, and you shall be plundered and oppressed."*—Deuteronomy.

In the previous chapter we gave evidence showing that poverty could be abolished as from tomorrow; we also put forward moral and practical reasons why it should be forbidden by laws which no parliament or people can violate. Further enactments are required so that there can be no mistake as to their meaning, and also to enable the most simple-minded to understand them.

The disasters which befell this country and the world after the First Great War were due to a variety of causes: an economic system which was impractical and inimical to human life; to greed and to political and commercial corruption, and to fear of change. The greater evil is not the exploitation of human life for private profit and power, but that governments and laws allow the continuance of a system which any knave can use for his own gain at the expense of the many.

When our legislators plan the new world after the war we must see to it that there shall first be enacted laws to provide a signpost for Members of Parliament. Without a clear-cut issue between right and wrong, between human need and economic evil, they will be baffled and befogged by the conflicting interests, all of which will clamour for preference. Without a common standard of right our rulers will be unable to differentiate between good and evil; they will again try to balance the contradictory elements of an impractical economic policy and once more seek to preserve it at the expense of humanity. It seems that our politicians never learn lessons from their past mistakes. We need laws which cannot be violated to prevent them doing wrong and to make them do right.

Let us cast our minds back over the past. With their minds following the disastrous but familiar paths of the pre-1914 world, our rulers were unequipped mentally and spiritually for the new age in which they lived. With no legal definition of social purpose to guide them, every problem of reconstruction confused them, and their actions brought crisis after crisis upon the nation and untold suffering to the people.

They faced the task entrusted to them by denouncing each other.

On June 4, 1919, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald said: "There are more scoundrels in this Parliament than have ever been elected in the history of the House of Commons"

The previous year the Rt. Hon. George Barnes, reported in the *Scotsman*, told of his desire to put the Labour candidates up against a wall and, apparently, to shoot them.

Meanwhile Mr. Lloyd George placed before the nation the ideal of a new world. He said:

"What does a new world mean? What was the old world like? It was a world where toil for myriads of honest workers, men and women, purchased nothing better than squalor, penury, anxiety, and wretchedness—a world scarred by slums and disgraced by sweating, where unemployment through the vicissitudes of industry brought despair to multitudes of humble homes; a world where, side by side with want, there was waste of the inexhaustible riches of the earth I say to you that the children of the poor will have an equal chance with the children of the rich"

Accordingly, our administrators set out to build a new world. The first task, we were told, was to get back to normal. "Normal," though it was not intended, was the squalor and poverty mentioned by Mr. Lloyd George, who said, along with Mr. J. H. Thomas, Sir Auckland Geddes, and others, that prosperity depended upon increased production.

Accordingly the horses were harnessed to the ploughs, men clocked-in at the factories, where the furnaces were stoked, and the machines began to turn out an apparently endless flood of goods.

The storehouses gradually filled to the roof with everything that people could desire. So far was

good, but now confusion arose.

Mr. Clynes said that the purpose of increased production was to cause prices to fall so that all would get the benefit. Mr. Lloyd George said that prices wouldn't fall and the nation would get the benefit.

But all agreed that there would be no unemployed.

It was then discovered that the goods were not being sold as quickly as they were produced. The markets were glutted. The ploughs were put away and the land went out of cultivation, the factory furnaces burnt out, the wheels of industry slowed down, and unemployed men tramped the streets. Having produced abundance, their standard of living went down.

The country became a land of tenements where workmen hung about in their doorways and the goods they couldn't buy rotted in the storehouses.

In Westminster the problem sat before its originators. They talked of how to remove it.

The real need was to distribute the goods to the people; but for some reason it was considered almost immoral to give goods to people who were unemployed, even though they had made them. That the economic system did not provide the people with sufficient money to buy the goods was not accepted as a reason for reforming it. Politicians blamed everybody and everything except the faulty system.

Sir Auckland Geddes blamed the railwaymen and Mr. J. H. Thomas. Mr. Appleton said the miners were the cause. Mr. Barnes could not see how the moulders escaped guilt. Mr. Lloyd George put the whole thing down to shortage of railway engines and rolling stock. Then Sir Auckland Geddes changed his previous opinion; he said it was the drought. Mr. Clynes repudiated that as nonsense; the employers were at fault for jumping prices. Had he not said that prices would fall? Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Clynes told Sir Robert Horne that it was a matter of grave importance that there should be 1,000,000 people unemployed.

Everyone agreed, because they accepted the financial dictum that the purpose of life was to work to make goods for profit, not that work was necessary to provide food, and leisure was an opportunity to enjoy to the full the fruits of labour.

Three years later there were 2,300,000 unemployed.

But for the moment the ministers could see no way of getting the surplus food to the people unless they found them work. As no work could be found until the goods were sold they decided to sell them abroad. We therefore lent the foreigner money to buy our food. Then something had to be done to prevent him paying us back because, according to Sir Auckland Geddes, cheap goods from abroad were a menace—they would cause unemployment.

So a committee was formed to solve the problem by taxing imports. It sat for three years.

Meanwhile an economy campaign was started by Lord Rothermere and Mr. Horatio Bottomley. It was not explained how the surplus goods could be bought if the people were to economise and buy less, but we were told that the "saved" money would enable us to pay interest on War Loans. As always, the needs of finance must first be provided: that humanity must be sacrificed to meet this need was incidental. The inhumanity of this policy was not realised by politicians. All incomes, except interest on War Loans, were cut. Teachers' salaries, wages, and other forms of income were reduced. The workers had to pay more for their Health Insurance, and doctors who sought to heal sick panel patients were fined for "excessive prescribing."

Sir Henry Deterding tried to bring Westminster to see the real problem. "As in so many other 'complicated' matters," he said, "humbugs get a reputation by starting at the wrong end. What is called over-production is always an under-consumption crisis. There are millions of good people who would like to work in order to have automobiles, radios, better homes, and enough to eat. What is needed is more buyers."

He went on to speak of the population of the world. He estimated that 960,000,000 human beings were in a state of semi-starvation. He advocated earnestly that the purchasing powers of the masses should be considered. He pointed out that an increased purchasing power of only a few pence per day among 960,000,000 would solve the world's economic crisis.

"How long will it be," he inquired, "before this simple arithmetic is grasped?"

But the rule of finance demanded that interest on loans should be paid even if the people starved in the process.

It was decided that one of the causes of the trade depression was Russia, who refused to pay her war debts. On May 9, 1919, Mr. Churchill said that we must go to war with her. She must be taught how to live as "a genuine national democratic, modern State, where the people own the Government and not the Government the people, where there is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness open to all.

Mr. Bonar Law agreed. But the British workers refused to load munitions at the docks, and alarm spread before the threat of a general strike. The plans to fight another war to get interest on war loans were dropped.

The Russian adventure cost the British taxpayer £105,200,000 which might have been used to increase the standard of living.

Mr. Lloyd George afterwards discovered that Poland was the cause of the trouble and a trade pact was made with Russia.

In 1919 men were urged to work to increase production and bring down prices. In 1922 they were sacked to slow down production and force up prices. Then they were told to economise. When each piece of advice had been tried, and failed, Mr. Bonar Law said that the country needed a period of "tranquillity." Mr. Maxton and Mr. Wheatley objected to doing nothing and were expelled.

Five years went by, then Mr. MacDonald came into office. He told the poverty-stricken farm labourers and industrial workers that they could rest happy in the knowledge that stocks were firm and gold was safe. Mr. Snowden suggested that the workers should save money and invest it to start more factories working. We were told to get rid of the glut by not buying it up. Those who spent their money were called "squandermaniacs."

In 1923 millions of families were existing on 28s. to £2 per week. These people were advised to economise because, as Mr. Snowden said:

"We are bound to have to face an intensified competition in the world's trade in the future, therefore we are bound to do everything we possibly can now by cheapening our methods of production and by improving our methods in every possible way, so that when the revival of trade comes this country will be able to secure its fullest share of the improvement."

We were told the war had made us poor and we had got to pay for it. The taxpayer was paying £354,000,000 a year and was supposed to be drawing an interest of £360,000,000. In paying its War Debt to itself, by some curious jugglery with figures, the nation made a profit of £6,000,000 a year and became poorer thereby. We were told the money was being paid to the poor widows and orphans who had bought war loans. But in actual fact the bulk of the money was going to the small financial group who held the nation's credit in bondage.

Mr. Snowden was named "the wizard of economics." He attended many conferences. There were twelve of them. They were held to decide how much Germany should pay in reparations. There were two difficulties. If she paid with her cheap goods, that would throw the remainder of our employed out of work. If we lent her money after our usual policy then she would, as Sir Robert Horne said, be provided with the means of competing with us. The international financial system prevented co-operation and we could not allow the successful competition of other nations.

Mr. MacDonald wanted to give East Africa a railway and start upon a great electrical development

scheme for the coal-fields. Work had to be found, but it did not seem to matter whether it was for our own people or for the natives of Africa.

Mr. Snowden said "The return to a sound monetary system had established conditions favourable to the revival of trade," but trade did not revive.

The Minister of Labour wanted a universal eight-hour day in accordance with the Washington Agreement, as Mr. Lloyd George had wanted in 1919. The Home Secretary wished to introduce a new Factory Act.

Some Members grumbled over the taxes on razor blades, on gloves, and on anything and everything except the tax of almost £1,000,000 a day to pay War Loan Interest. A suggestion to tax bookmakers was considered to be wicked, so it was argued whether to put 1d. or 2d. on or off beer, on or off tea, or to rob the Road Fund. We were now in 1926, when our Members argued about everything which did not really matter, whilst big items detrimental to national security went by unchallenged. Mr. Snowden said that a return to the Gold Standard would bring prosperity.

On one occasion the Members seemed nauseated by the political sophistries and the endless voting for and against some trifling measure, whilst the real problems were ignored. Whatever the cause, thirteen Members staged a stay-in strike by entering the Lobby to vote and refusing to go out again.

In 1918 we had set out to build a new world. Instead, by 1926, England had become a distressed area.

On April 21, 1932, Mr. Winston Churchill, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, apologised to the House of Commons for his share of responsibility, and revealed that he was "forced" to sacrifice the people to the god of gold:

"When I was moved by many arguments and forced in 1925 to return to the Gold Standard I was assured by the highest experts that we were anchoring ourselves to reality and stability, and I accepted their advice. But what has happened? We have no reality, no stability. The price of gold has risen since then by more than 70 per cent. Look at the enormously increased volume of commodities which have been created in order to pay off the same mortgage debt or loan. This monetary convulsion has now reached a pitch where I am persuaded that the producers of new wealth will not tolerate indefinitely so hideous an oppression."

Never mind, said Mr. Snowden, "the long dark night is over." He followed this with: "We are faced with a grave national situation."

These endless inconsistencies of our leaders and their inability even to understand the situation, much less to solve its problems, brought about the great strike of 1926. At once the strikers' own political representatives denounced them. They said the strike was aimed at the community.

Financial groups were hurriedly organised against the strike.

The workers had agreed to wage reductions because the politicians had told them that their sacrifice would enable cheap coal to be produced and this would bring prosperity. But their sacrifice brought them years of poverty. It was not accepted that the people who had produced the cheap coal had the right to demand that the authorities should make good their promises of prosperity.

The strike was defeated, and the politicians said it was the cause of the depression.

Mr. Baldwin appointed a delegation to visit flourishing America to learn how to end the depression. America was pursuing a policy of easy industrial credit. Public purchasing power had been expanded by a national hire-purchase system. The people mortgaged their future incomes to buy goods in the present. The mortgages grew. When the debts were called in there was no money to pay them; the system collapsed. After that thousands of men and women lived on charity and hitch-hiked from one end of the country to the other. Unemployment reached a figure of 13,000,000.

When America could provide no answer to the problem, Parliament decided to do something about

the depressed areas. Miss Bondfield and Mr. Clynes started moving the unemployed from distressed places to more prosperous towns. Because these men were untrained they were paid a lower wage than the local worker, with the result that thousands of skilled workers in such towns as Coventry and Manchester lost their jobs.

The slump spread over the land. The M.P.s became alarmed. There was too much clothing, too much food, too many boots, and too many people wanting them. Countless schemes were tried to solve the problem, except those of a free distribution of goods or payment of higher wages.

We have a document dated October 29, 1927, in which Mr. G. W. Rickards, M.P. for Skipton-in-Craven, says: "Sir George Newman, the late Chief Medical Officer of Health, had reported an undiminishing stream of some 100,000 physically defective children entering schools each year. At least 75 per cent. of young men wishing to join the forces were medically rejected.

"Investigations showed that malnutrition before and after birth was the predetermining cause of adolescent and adult physical and organic defects in nearly 95 per cent. of the cases examined. The other 5 per cent. showed defects due to congenital disease or inherited tendencies to disease."

It was pointed out by Mr. Rickards that the Great War of 1914-18 cost Britain approximately £8,000,000,000 sterling; expenditure on the abortive treatment of consumption and on deficiency diseases had cost approximately £8,200,000,000, with no marked lessening of the annual death toll.

Both the money and the lives could have been rescued by a distribution of the excessive food supplies. We could always find money for war but not for life. If the money spent in fighting the 1914-18 war had been used for peace it would have provided every family in America, Canada, Australia, the British Isles, France, Belgium, Russia, and Germany with a house and five acres of land, worth £800. There would still have been left sufficient to give every town of 20,000 people a £1,000,000 library and a £2,000,000 university. A remaining sum of some £1,000,000,000 could have been given to hospitals and other social services. British agriculture could have been made prosperous to the end of time.

Mr. Rickards said that milk was being sold to manufacturers at 5d. a gallon (to make buttons, combs, and umbrella handles), and to the public for 2s. 4d. The monopolies controlling the Milk Board took the profit. He said: "That this profit should be wrung out of the starving bodies of babies and women with full Government consent should make every Englishman blush with shame." He made the same complaint regarding many vital foodstuffs.

Though Britain was fast becoming a C3 nation, because of the lack of sufficient purchasing power to buy food, the Government decided that £40,000,000 was too high a figure to pay to the unemployed. But, as financial interest demanded preference to human interest, there was no complaint about the Bank of England making £50,000,000 profit on Unemployed Insurance, or that bankrupt industries and starving men and women were paying approximately £300,000,000 a year interest on War Loans. It seems incredible that M.P.s spoke in the House in shocked tones when they discovered that unemployed men increased their pittance by working week-ends. It was also discovered that an unemployed man with an average number of children received the same as an employed man with two children. Made blind to the human factor by the constant pressure of high finance, and with no rule to guide them in decisions of right and wrong, our legislators demanded a reduction of benefit. All except twenty-three Labour men voted for the reduction.

Sir George May, of the Prudential Insurance Company, whose financial operations had closed down hundreds of industries, was appointed to a committee formed to show the workless how to economise.

The committee worked at top speed. They missed nothing except usurers' interest. They cut Maternity and Health Insurance grants, Education grants, and all incomes, doles, and charities.

Then came the Means Test. Judge Jeffreys must have smiled in his grave at being called a tyrant. With the powers of the Means Test behind them, inspectors violated the privacy of the homes of the

poor. They examined the larders or cupboards to see what food they could find. They told the occupants that they must sell their furniture, watches, and other prized possessions before they could receive their pittance from the Labour Exchange. Some of the inspectors even looked under the mattresses of the beds to see if there was any dirt there. A son at work striving to keep a family was often sufficient reason for stopping an unemployed father's dole. Unemployed sons lost their benefit and were told that their fathers must keep them. Consequently homes were broken up, because sons refused to deplete the meagre family income.

The homes belonged to the heroes who had fought at Somme, Ypres, and the Dardanelles, and who had been promised a land where they could live in plenty and security with their families. They expected bread, but Whitehall remembered them in stone.

After years of increasing economies, and the use of every device known to politicians to keep the payment of War Loan Interest at 5 per cent., it was suddenly reduced to 3½ per cent. What had been denounced as immoral was claimed to be moral and wise. The previous policy had been wrong; again the sacrifice had been in vain.

Lord Beaverbrook shocked the politicians by saying that we should cease payment of War Debt to America.

Mr. Churchill said we must pay in gold.

Mr. Snowden was horrified, and said such a policy would be disastrous to the value of sterling and would drag us down to destruction—meaning the financiers; not the industrialists, the traders, the poorly paid workers or dependants of the unemployed, who were already bankrupt.

It was agreed not to default on our debt to America but to pay by tokens of acknowledgment. By this means we should not "lose face."

Mr. MacDonald said the world had been struck by an "Economic Blizzard" and called another international conference "to face new historical economic conditions."

He took his economists among the fossils in the Geological Museum at South Kensington to hold his International Conference. The King opened the conference by trying to get the politicians and their economic advisers to face the reality of abundance in the midst of poverty, but no notice was taken of this sound advice.

The conference ruled out the possibility of war debts or financial policy having anything to do with the trouble. The results of their long and fruitless wrangling must have convinced His Majesty that it *was* "beyond the wit of man" to make good use of his abundance. The Museum became a Babel of 2000 representatives whose utterances could only end in confusion.

The stupid and perverse generation of world economists and politicians decided that if the nations had too many boots, too much coal, too much food, or too much of anything which the people wanted, the way to solve the problem was to cut incomes all round and stop the people getting them. Millions of people had already been sacrificed to the god of economic expediency. The goods *had* to be got rid of and the factories and the farms prevented from producing disastrous gluts.

It was agreed that as the world's producers could not sell their goods and pay their way it would be sound economics to pay them not to produce. Abundant production had presumably ruined the world, so the way to prosperity was to introduce scarcity by restricting production and by maintaining high prices.

The British Government began to pay people for *not* producing tin, the mine owner for *not* producing coal, and the farmer (if he was well informed) for not owning a farm, for not growing hops and other primary products.

Perhaps the gods had decided to destroy our politicians; in any case they seemed to take the preliminary step in making them mad. The immoral, anti-human policy of spurning God's gifts and destroying the necessities of life operated in this manner.

Production was limited by quotas. Potato growers were allotted the quota they would be allowed to grow. If they wished to get money for doing nothing they could transfer their quota to someone else and claim a transfer fee for not growing potatoes. If a farmer increased his acreage beyond the quota he was fined for each extra acre.

The owner of coal mines and other producers claimed transfer fees and made huge profits by producing nothing, whilst the unemployed were called lazy dogs who deserved to starve, and many traders and managers of industries whose businesses had been ruined, either by the slump or by the policy of rationalisation, sank almost to the level of the unemployed wage-earner.

The railway companies were paid 2s. 1d. for each pig transported from farm to curing factory. If the farmer transported the pig he got 1s. 8d. and the railway company the balance of 5d. for *not* transporting the pig; but if the farmer slaughtered his pig and took the carcass to the curing factory the railway company received the whole 2s. 1d. for doing nothing at all.

During the years of madness M.P.s cried that work must be found for the unemployed, but at the same time they insisted that less goods must be produced. So they scrapped thousands of Lancashire cotton spindles, and closed down factories of all kinds. They bought up fishing boats, ships, and shipyards, and scrapped them. Shipbuilding was restricted. Coal and tin mines were closed down.

The madness spread like a disease. In America, Congress voted millions of dollars to pay farmers to destroy pigs and not to breed them. The *Daily Express* (September 28, 1933) reported that the first great slaughter included 2,000,000 sows and 4,000,000 little pigs. The cotton crop was ploughed in, two-thirds of our rubber plantations were allowed to go out of cultivation; vast quantities of tea, coffee, wheat, and other commodities were destroyed.

We cannot give a detailed list of the wanton stupidities by the world's politicians; space will only allow us to give details covering about two years of the destruction of God's bounty.

The statistics of the fifty most important states of the world show that 2,400,000 people died of starvation in 1934. As a result of starvation about 1,200,000 people committed suicide during the same year. At the same time, owing to the collapse in prices brought about by the general shortage of public purchasing power, 267,000 truck-loads of wheat, 258,000 tons of sugar, 26,000 tons of rice, and 25,000 tons of beef were destroyed. This does not include foodstuffs destroyed by natural causes (*Prager Press*, Prague).

"Twenty million people are living below the economic level which ensures an adequate diet and proper health."

PIGS:

Holland destroys 100,000 pigs (*Evening News*, 13.1.32).

American farmers' first great slaughter includes 2,000,000 sows and 4,000,000 little pigs (*Daily Express*, 28.9.33).

CATTLE:

Denmark incinerates 25,000 cattle (*Sphere*, 25.3.33).

British farmers forced to kill too soon (*Daily Express*, 6.12.33).

Holland kills or exports to waste lands 200,000 cows (*Evening Standard*, 16.12.33).

Argentine destroys cattle (*Prosperity*, June 1934).

U.S.A. to destroy 6,000,000 dairy cattle (*Prosperity*, June 1934).

Irish may resort to slaughter (*Daily Express*, 25.2.34).

Irish Free State destroying 200,000 calves (*Prosperity*, June 1934).

SHEEP:

Sheep importers rebuked by Government (*Daily Express*, 31.12.33).
Australia sends Christmas presents of lambs (*Times*, 30.1.33).
New Zealand: 5000 lambs driven into the sea (*Sydney Sun*).

Owing to the Ottawa Agreement, Chilean authorities incinerate 500,000 sheep
(*Prosperity*, June 1934).

WHEAT:

Innumerable schemes for restriction. Canada, Australia, Argentina, and U.S.A. worried
about "too much bread" for 1936 (*Daily Express*, 28.9.33).

France fines farmers for increasing acreage (*Times*, 16.10.33).
Russian failure of crops brings better prospects (*Daily Express*, 12.1.33).
French farmers rewarded for feeding animals on wheat (*Daily Express*, 30.3.33).

MILK:

Westminster Abbey painted with milk (*Evening News*, 3.11.33).
Milk poured down drain (*Romford Recorder*, 3.11.33).
British Government to legislate with 40,000,000 gallon glut (*Daily Express*, 6.12.33).
U.S.A. farmers throw away milk (*Daily Mirror*, 2.3.33).
British farmers urged to feed more milk to pigs (*Times*, 2.1.33).

SUGAR:

2,000,000 tons withheld from market (1933).
Improving position by destruction (*Daily Express*, 28.12.32).
Hurricane helps in Cuba (*Daily Express*, 28.12.32).

COFFEE:

Brazil destroys over 26,000,000 bags (*Evening Standard*, 26.3.34).
Failure of destruction plan (*Evening News*, 15.3.33).
40 per cent. sacrifice quota in Brazil (*Evening Standard*, 26.3.34).

COCOA:

International plan for destruction (*Evening News*, 3.5.33).

HONEY:

U.S.A. make golf balls from honey (*Evening Standard*, 3.3.34).

COTTON:

Every third row ploughed in U.S.A. (*New Democracy*, October 1933).
U.S.A. plough in 25 per cent. (*Evening News*, 6.10.33).

FISH:

Herring glut threatens starvation (*Daily Express*, 13.11.33).
Southend sells fish for manure (*Daily Mirror*, 9.1.34).

WINE:

Portugal destroys 10,000,000 gallons (*Daily Express*, 3.6.32).

France welcomes mildew (*Evening Standard*, 14.7.32).

Hungarians order troops and police to drink wine to help wine producers (*Daily Express*, 2.11.32).

BEER:

Irish beer poured into gutter (*Times*, 15.12.32).

BRANDY:

Hungarians bathe in brandy (*Evening News*, 10.1.33).

SHIPS:

Scrapping more shipyards (*Glasgow Evening Times*, 27.4.33).

East Coast ports silting up (*Daily Express*, 15.6.33).

PORTS:

Tonnage reduction scheme (*Times*, 3.14.33).

FLOWERS:

Holland burns 15,000,000 bulbs (*Sunday Pictorial*, 13.11.32).

THE STATE OF COUNTRIES

AMERICA:

200,000 unemployed in Philadelphia on verge of starvation. Relief committee dissolves owing to lack of funds (*Evening Standard*, 1932).

New York faces total bankruptcy. Wall Street ultimatum: "Not another cent" (*Daily Express*, 17.1.33).

New York welfare council reports 633,000 poor with insufficient bedding for cold weather (*Daily Express*, 8.2.33).

Army of homeless boys roaming. "Brother, can you spare a dime?" (*Daily Express*, 16.1.33).

Unemployed war veterans trek to Washington (*Times*, 27.5.32).

140,000 families destitute in New York (*Times*, 28.3.33).

Legion of Despair. America's new menace. 200,000 young people on trek. Homeless girls. Recruits to army of crime (*Daily Express*, 2.11.33).

140,000 women tramps alarm America (*Daily Express*, 25.5.33).

Chicago school teachers unpaid. Demonstrations. Banks besieged (*Times*, 28.4.33).

Iowa farmers revolt against foreclosure of mortgages (*Daily Telegraph*, 1.5.33).

CYPRUS:

Peasants eating grass (*Prosperity*, 10.12.33).

CANADA:

Bumper wheat harvest in Saskatchewan. 30,000 people needing relief. £2,000,000

required to alleviate distress (*Evening News*, 20.9.33).

SPAIN:

Women allowed to use pledged sewing-machines in pawn-shops by order of Home Secretary (*Daily Telegraph*, 5.11.32).

HUNGARY:

Issue of "beggar money" by Hungarian Mint (*Evening News*, 27.1.33).

RUSSIA:

Thousands of Soviet peasants starved to death. Children left to perish. Dogs for food (Undated).

Children beg for food. Peasants die of starvation (*Daily Express*, 4.4.33).

UNITED KINGDOM:

Russian ship with food for England (*Daily Express*, 23.3.33).

100,000,000 tins of Russian salmon in English shops (*'Sunday Pictorial*, 16.4.33).

Prisoner tells Birmingham Magistrates that he and his family were so poor and so hungry that they were forced to steal cats and dogs for food (*Times*, undated).

Ex-Guardsman Coleshill admits to taking milk to feed his children (*Daily Mail*, 9.11.33).

Boy before juvenile court for theft. Family impoverished. Father unemployed. Boy underfed, and at fifteen forced to take in pupils for music (*Daily Mail*, 4.12.33).

Mother Perring charged with theft of 2d. loaf. Sways in dock for want of food (*Daily Express*, 19.2.34).

Mother Ryan charged with theft of milk for babies (*'Daily Express*, 14.2.34).

Unemployed man tells court of eating wild birds (*Daily Mirror*, 7.11.33).

Westminster Parish Hall converted into shelter for destitutes (*Sunday Pictorial*, 10.12.33).

Starving man in tears. Family fed by police. "I have walked miles looking for work" (*Daily Express*, 8.12.33).

10,000 fishermen ruined. Fish glut threatens starvation (*Daily Express*, 3.11.33).

Mother Gear starves for children. Kills her baby (*Daily Express*, 31.3.33).

Mrs. Bentley and daughter refuse to sink lower. No food. No home. Attempted suicide (*Daily Mail*, 8.4.33).

Unemployed Mr. Coiley commits suicide (*Daily Mail*, 1.4.33).

Mother Ormerode gasses herself at sixty-one for sake of son. "Too poor to start again" (*Daily Mail*, 28.3.33).

Mr. and Mrs. Stanley gassed. Half a loaf of bread (*Daily Mail*, 24.2.33).

"This is the only way out ... we are too old to start again. We are two lonely old people."

Mr. and Mrs. Collyer found gassed ('Daily Mail, 4.11.33).

Mother abandons baby for want of food. Notice on pram "Please take care of my baby" (*Daily Mail*, 20.11.33).

Mr. Oddie at inquest on Mrs. Stokes says there are far too many Tube tragedies (*Evening Standard*, 17.10.33).

Underground authorities extending precautions against suicides on railways (*Evening Standard*, 1.10.33)

One firm sues 10,000 people regarding hire purchase (*Daily Mirror*, 20.1.33).

Master mariner sells matches. "Dozens like me" (*Daily Mail*, 24.1.33).

Fifty homeless men rounded up in Manchester (*Daily Mail*, 21.7.33).

V.C. tells magistrate he has 2½d. (*Evening News*, 20.3.33).

Shipbuilders comb beaches for a living (*Daily Express*, 25.5.33).

Need we record any more details of human stupidities to convince ourselves as to the need for our third supreme law? This chapter has been a story of the blind leading the blind to destruction.

Dare we give our lives into the hands of our rulers when this war is over without first establishing just laws?

"To build and secure by Justice and Right, from now to eternal time, on the Power of God's Law So that kings shall rule justly and rulers do right, and the rash-hearted learn sense and the tongue-tied speak plain.

"Then the brute shall no more be called noble and the rascal no longer named honest. For the brute is a brute in his language and heart; he does low and vile acts, he disputes with the Law; he leads the faint souls astray and turns the thirsty from water: He plans to tangle the poor by using the schemes of the bad, and by false speeches and lying he defrauds Justice.

"But the noble plans nobly and on his virtue will rise. And Justice will inhabit the earth, the product of Righteousness will become Peace and Good work for ever, secure and safe; and My People will reside in sweet homes, with security, comfort and pleasure."—Isaiah.

During the years we have covered in this chapter the Law of Mammon has guided our rulers, depriving the people of purchasing power and destroying the fruits of their labour whilst they suffered from the need of them.

None will deny that these evil practices should be forbidden by a law which Parliament and the people must obey, so that:

The curtailment of supplies by restriction of production or distribution, or the destruction of food, or the curtailment of purchasing power shall be prohibited.

To ensure a progressive order of society adaptable to meet all contingencies, as was the original intention of the British Constitution and ancient Common Law, and to fulfil the social implications of the Christian faith upon which they are based, the object of the Law shall be:

On the basis of such a natural order, in conformity with God's purpose for man and natures to explore the possibility of a progressive Christian society.

Chapter Four

The Violation of Common Law

The foreigner who is amongst you shall climb up above you from station to station,—but you shall sink lower and lower!

He shall lend to you,—he shall be the head, and you shall be the tail; if you do not take care to practise the whole of this Law.—Deuteronomy.

We regret that so many malpractices have to be exposed dealing chiefly with our own country, but it is our own country we wish to see take the lead in simple sanity of living. Rectification cannot be made where the faults are unknown or misunderstood.

By the year 1931 the City of London had obtained almost complete control over money, credit, and industry. Behind the scenes it had been acquiring command of vital industries such as coal, cotton, iron, steel, and agriculture. It now came into the open with these possessions and violated the rule of Law by dictating to Parliament. The Federation of British Industries, which in 1919 spoke for some 18,000 firms and combines, and backed its demands with a capital of £5,000,000,000, boasted quite openly that it advises on the details of the Budget before it is placed before Parliament. This explains why certain amalgamated industries were exempt from income tax and given this advantage over independent industries and traders. So started the growth of those big combines which were to close down the small trader. They eventually assumed (as Mr. MacDonald prophesied and helped to fulfil) economic power which controlled absolutely the life of the people and imposed on them political and economic slavery.

The Government became the puppet of an unelected financial dictatorship.

In medieval times usury and the monopolistic control of national resources and the people's food supplies were illegal. If such laws of common justice prevailed to-day, or if the British Common Law had not been ignored by our politicians, all men would be free, secure, and at peace.

The years saw Parliament begin to rule by proxy. It frittered away its power by appointing non-elected persons to sit on Boards which controlled almost every department of national life. The powers of these Boards were contrary to the British Constitution and Common Law, in that they were allowed to assume parliamentary powers by making their own laws, by appointing their own servants to act as judges in their own case, and to impose penalties upon offenders against their own decrees, and by often preventing the defendant from obtaining redress at the King's Courts of Justice.

A flood of bills was passed in Parliament which virtually gave the money power control over our lives. Some of the bills were:

- The Electricity Supply Bill.
- The Finance Bill, 1935.
- The Industrial Re-organisation (Enabling) Bill.
- Licensing Laws. The Cotton Spinning Industry Bill.
- The Coal Mines Bill, 1936.
- Shops (Retail Trading Safeguards) Bill.
- Live Stock and Industry Bill.
- The Nationalisation of Tithes, Coal and Mineral Rights.
- The Incitement of Disaffection Bill.
- The Official Secrets Act.

These bills were supposed to place industry and agriculture on a sound financial basis. Much of the money used to finance their operations was obtained by taxing the people's food supplies.

Mr. Morrison, Minister of Agriculture, created three new Boards, one for Bacon Development, one for Pig Marketing, and one for Bacon Marketing. (In 1938 he took an extra million pounds from the taxpayer to breed half a million *less* pigs.)

In his book *'The New Despotism'* Lord Chief Justice Hewart said that permanent Government Departments draft bills which are deliberately confusing. Members of Parliament do not understand them, nor dare they question the suggestion of "experts." Take Mr. Morrison's pigs; no one tested his legislation by the one question of interest to the general public: "Will it give us more pigs and provide cheaper bacon?"

For many years the Labour Party had advocated nationalisation and the elimination of the middleman and small shopkeeper. It was the National Government, however, that adopted these measures. The Labour Party had at least seen them in an altruistic setting, but the National Government nationalised for the benefit of international finance, to the loss of the whole nation.

The ancient constitutional rights and liberties of the citizen were disregarded or violated:

1. That he shall not be dispossessed or impaired in the enjoyment of his property or the exercise of his trade or in any way socially destroyed.
2. That he shall have safety and security to buy and to sell without any unjust exactions or implement.
3. That he shall not be constrained to any unconscientious act.

The money power through their combines and boards:

1. Dispossessed men and deprived them of their trades and their right to earn a living;
2. Subjected traders to unjust marketing conditions both as to wares and as to services they had to offer for the general good, and
3. Constrained men by economic fear and force to exploit their fellow-men.

Let us examine one of these bills which, to use an apt phrase of Lord Hewart's, imposed their "legal lawlessness" upon the nation in the interests of international finance.

The Electricity Supply Bill enabled the Government to force the Mayor and Corporation of the City of Oxford to cease supplying its own cheap electricity to the citizens, so that they had to buy electric power from the Wessex Company at a far higher rate. The shares of this company were held by a holding company Edmundson and Co., whose shares are held by Banque Belge pour l'Etranger, the Cushen Trust, the Imperial Continental Gas Company, and the Prudential Assurance Company. Foreigners were granted the right to tax the people of Oxford and Oxfordshire.[\[7\]](#)

We have already given examples of the restrictive and destructive operations of the pig, potato, and other boards. English agriculture was sacrificed on the altar of Mammon. Farmers lost their earth. 4,444,000 acres of arable land went out of cultivation, so that the nation was deprived of the ability to feed itself. £400,000,000 of foodstuffs had to be imported, 75 per cent, of which could have been produced in this country. Two hundred years before England *exported* wheat. Under the new system agriculture suffered more restrictions and penalties than in any other country.

Some years previous to this the oil combines told the British Admiralty to use oil for the Royal Navy. Oil has certain advantages over coal, but the strategical and economic dangers of exclusive oil-firing outweigh completely the technical advantage which could have been retained by alternative firing, as suggested by some Members of Parliament. Except for two small oilfields in the British Empire all sources are foreign-owned. America herself owns 75 per cent, of the world's oil. Every politician knew that in the event of war the Navy would have to convoy oil tankers (and

the food which we were not allowed to produce at home) instead of protecting our shores. Now we pay the cost in the Battle of the Atlantic, and in the East, where we defend strategic positions and our pipe-lines.

The Charter which was granted to the Bank of England in 1864, giving it the sole right to create and issue the nation's money, placed the King and Parliament and the people under the yoke of a private international company, whose international directors recognise neither Motherland, patriotism, nor loyalty to the Crown; who never consider the needs of industry nor the people if their own private interests are at stake, and who have time and again financed the enemies of the country that gave them power.^[8] International finance, operating through the Bank of England, filched the nation's credit and issued it as a monstrous debt which has bled the people white and plunged the wealthiest nation in the world into poverty.

Charles I warned Parliament "that it was not the place where every hare-brained fellow might propose any laws of his own invention."^[9] He might have added, "neither is it a place where a hidden financial government shall pull the strings of puppet legislators, forcing through laws detrimental to national well-being." This practice has imposed upon the people a non-elected super-government, all the more powerful and dangerous because it is hidden, unsuspected, and largely unquestioned. By giving away its right to create and issue money, Parliament took from the people the protection of Common Law and betrayed them to the usurer. Bishop Burnet, in his *History of My Own Time* (1693), says "men fought bitterly against the founding of the Bank of England, knowing that the bank would grow to a monopoly. All money would come into their hands; and they would in a few years become the masters of the stock and the wealth of the nation."

Burke's ghost might ask Englishmen:

"Where have you placed the real power over moneyed and landed circulation? Where have you placed the means of raising and falling the value of every man's freehold? Those whose operations can take from, or add ten per cent. to the possessions of every man in England must be the masters of every man in England."

The prophecy was fulfilled. It has robbed the House of Commons of effective authority in monetary matters. To quote Bageshot's *The English Constitution*:

"The principal peculiarity of the House of Commons in financial affairs is nowadays not a special privilege but an exceptional disability. On common subjects any member can propose anything, but not on money—the minister can only propose to tax the people."

No wonder that the House of Commons wasted years wrangling whether or not it could raise sufficient money by taxing cotton gloves to solve the problem of money shortage. No minister had the courage to tell the people: "We cannot do anything about solving your problems because the financial system, and consequently the nation, is in the hands of a private financial company. It forces us to take from you almost £100,000,000 a day to pay interest on your own credit. For its own private advantage it raises and lowers the buying power of your money and the prices of your goods; it controls profits and wages; it determines the fate of commerce and industry by increasing or restricting credits; it forces governments to sanction the wholesale destruction of transport, productive plants, raw materials, and foodstuffs, whilst millions of people starve."

Financial power owns allegiance only to its shareholders; it acknowledges no other authority. It is a power with responsibility to none, with no compassion for humanity, and its sole love is money and power. It has no regard for the safety of the Realm. Operating from the City of London it lent Napoleon £5,000,000 to fight Englishmen at Waterloo.^[10] It gave birth to a new class in English public life, cohorts of the City of London who had no stake in English soil, who for greater profit financed foreign industries and closed down those in the land of their birth, and who sold their country for foreign markets to obtain a higher rate of interest. We give here a few examples of their activities covering all departments of national life.

In 1913, according to the calculations of the League of Nations World Economic Survey, more than £3,250,000,000 of English money was invested outside England. This figure, which we also quote for 1925, would have saved British industry if it had been invested in this country.

They lent our gold to Germany so that she might be better prepared against us in 1914

Mr. Noel Baker, M.P., records in *The Private Manufacture of Armaments* the admission of a German newspaper after the war of 1914-18, that "if in the first days of the war the French had penetrated to a depth of a dozen kilometres in Lorraine the war would have been ended in six months by the defeat of Germany."

But that would have meant the destruction of munition plants and blast-furnaces which had been captured from the French.

"So," said M. Barthe, in the French Chamber in 1919, "either owing to the international solidarity of heavy industry or in order to safeguard private interests orders were given to our military commanders not to bombard."

British M.P.s have asked: "Who authorised the French and British Forces not to attack the munition plants of the King's enemies?"

The British Forces were prevented by financial interests from using the British Farquhar-Hill machine rifle. The Proof Master admitted that he had orders to damage the rifle so that it would fail when tested by the Enfield and Small Arms Committee. When the rifle was tested by the Admiralty in competition with other machine rifles it passed with flying colours, whilst the others failed. An order was given for 100,000 of the rifles, but it would seem that "favoured" rifle manufacturers were more powerful than Government authorities. The order was cancelled and to-day our soldiers use the inferior Bren Rifle.[\[11\]](#)

They forced Great Britain back to the Gold Standard with disastrous effects upon our prosperity and world peace. For the profit of money-lending they dictated the terms of the Ottawa Conference and the economic nationalism which helped to plunge Europe into Fascism in 1932. Through Mr. Montagu Norman they facilitated the loans which financed German re-armament. On the eve of the present war they hindered our change-over from peace production to production for total war by doubling the Bank rate. Just before the war they floated a loan of £100,000,000 for Hitler. They allowed him to take Bank of England gold from Czechoslovakia to finance the present war. When they sent Montagu Norman, the Chairman of the Bank of England, to Germany for the innocent purpose of playing godfather to the grandson of Schacht, it was to assure that finance would win whichever nation lost the war.

Need we give further instances of the treason, corruption, and legalised lawlessness which have violated every principle of common justice and decency and brought calamity upon our national life? These examples should be sufficient to make every man and woman living under the insecurity of the British Flag demand legislation which will protect them from the machinations and dangers of irresponsible financial powers, inhuman systems, and insincere or foolish politicians.[\[12\]](#)

The principles which we claim should be made law are a modern expression of the British Common Law. If they had been supreme "*written*" Common Law, instead of "*unwritten*" Common Law[\[13\]](#) which can be so easily ignored, the harmful government and the evils we have instanced would have been checked at their inception.

If it is morally right to enact laws which prevent one person from injuring another, then it is equally right that laws should prevent the State or powerful private groups from injuring the community. None can deny this necessity to protect citizens from the power of huge financial organisations, from the devious control of secret interests, the brute force of wealth, and the deceit of political chicanery. Until moral-civic laws define the rights and obligations of British subjects and protect legitimate interests, and penalise individuals and organisations which offend against them, neither men nor nations will live in peace or security.

Supreme Laws must define the duties of Parliament in such a manner that they cannot be misunderstood, disobeyed, or avoided. Before this can be done we must make up our minds what we want to do with our lives and what we want the State to do for us. It is a sad commentary on human intelligence that every institution known to man has its purpose defined by rules or legislation, but the purpose of human life and the object of human society has no legal definition. It has been said by an eminent legal authority that 80 per cent. of our laws were devised for the protection of financial contracts and the advancement of financial interests, but less than 3 per cent. for the protection and the progress of human life. Christ gave life a purpose and came to fulfil its law, but we have ignored it, as we have ignored the British Common Law which sprang from it.

What is the purpose of our lives? On this purpose must depend the purpose of the State. What is the purpose of man and society? Men formed communities for mutual protection and benefit, not to provide a minority with the opportunity to oppress the majority. They came together to enjoy the security, the increase of food, the warmth and shelter, and the increased leisure and amenities which their association made possible.

The State is the people. The life and the wealth and the body of the State are of the people in association. By their organisations and their productive and cultural activities they give the whole of their life to the State; but apart from protection against certain forms of wrongful imprisonment, robbery, fraud, and physical violence they receive very little in return. We are free to practise Christian precepts in society and in business, but the practice of them is often a means of economic suicide. At a General Election we are free to choose between the policies of the political parties but *not* to choose the things we really want.

It is the natural right of every British citizen to inherit a share in the wealth of the State, but the vast majority have no economic rights whatsoever. They are born dispossessed. They are free to sell their labour and brains *if* someone wants to hire them; they can engage in business and commerce *if* they have the necessary capital; they are free to sell within limits. But legal and commercial processes and the monetary system prevent millions of men and women from engaging in gainful occupations, and deny the majority of them a just reward for their labours, and, in so doing, violate the fundamental principle of Common Law and Equity.

The first and only practical purpose of human society is to enable the community to produce as, when, and where required, with the least possible amount of labour for each product, the greatest possible amount of wealth, and to distribute it in such a way as to secure for each individual the greatest possible freedom, security, and leisure, that he may develop his character by the exercise of such virtues, by the creation of such beauties, by the pursuance of such knowledge, and the enjoyment of such happiness as his spiritual qualities, his intelligence, and labours have placed within his power, and for the race, attainment of the highest perfection and glory.

This conception of the ideal State is the only worth-while purpose of human association—it is man's only salvation. This is a hard fact which must first be understood, and then attained by a quickening of the imagination. The pioneers of mankind have all been dreamers who have made their dreams reality by the power of an overmastering ideal behind them. First the conception of human purpose, then the reality.

Our present economic policy, with its false philosophy of the survival of the fittest, has proved itself to be self-destructive. Its material conception has degraded the spiritual nature of man; it has encouraged his worst and stifled his best; it has caused him to use the finest product of his genius to destroy life and has hindered his efforts to nurture it. It has set class against class, master against man, trader against trader, and nation against nation. During the last four centuries it has brought poverty and misery to millions and has cursed this country with 293 years of war.

There can be no doubt as to which is the most practical conception of social life: the materialism which destroys man, or the spiritual ideal to nurture and develop his life. In the countries of dictators social purpose is clearly defined. Every means of publicity is marshalled and directed to

the task of instilling it into the public mind.

If social purpose can thus be defined to suppress human personality, it can also be defined to release and expand it. Only the clear vision and the power of this ideal can save man from the false ideologies, pseudo-democracies, and unsound economic theories which are destroying him. Man must be liberated and protected, and his life purpose defined by a written Constitution of the Realm. It can be done by lawful repeals, amendments, and legislation sanctioned by the British Constitution itself. The power to amend and repeal laws has in the past been used to destroy the finer aspects of the British Common Law and Constitution—it must now be used to purify it.

The enactment of the three supreme laws which we have considered in preceding chapters would prohibit the evils of the old order and provide the foundation for the new society we have envisaged. A final supreme Law is necessary to raise the spiritual, mental, and physical problems of human well-being above the factions of party politics and private and monetary expediency, to ensure that social purpose as defined in these laws and their accompanying "Objects" shall be binding upon our legislators.

This final law, like those which have preceded it, is to be found in the British Common Law or in the formulation of great principles which underlie it. The old maxim we have quoted from *The Law Formal* should be read again, substituting the word "Parliament" for "King." The principle that the King is under the law has put the law for ever on the side of equity and justice. Parliament took over the administration of the State to ensure that the King would rule under the Common Law, but it has ignored and misapplied the Law it was entrusted to obey more than any King dared to have done.

The forerunners of our Parliament did not leave us in any doubt as to what we should do if the King broke the rules of Law. The most striking clause in the 61st Article of Magna Carta was that in which John was made to admonish the people to rise against him if he broke the Law and again bring him to lawful ways. This was repeated with great distinctness when confirmed by Henry III.

[\[14\]](#)

This legalising of rebellion is the bedrock of our democratic institutions. It was accepted by Parliament. To this extent Parliament was limited; it must not violate the Common Law by allowing party or private preference to deprive the people of their natural right to live a full life and shall at all times protect them from oppression and harmful exploitation. The Constitution makes our duty plain; to follow the example of our forefathers when their rights were encroached upon, by reasserting the basic principles of our ancient Common Law and customs and interpreting them in the language and setting of the modern age and applying them to the problems of the day.

Sufficient evidence has been brought forward to show that under the present economic régime it is impossible for the Government to control the conflicting elements of the system under which we live, or even to foresee the deplorable results arising from their actions. The absence of a basic law of human welfare to which all legislation must conform has left Parliament without a guide through the maze of conflicting problems which constantly afflict the people, and without any criterion of right and wrong by which Parliamentary bills and measures may be tested. There are many M.P.s who would welcome the enactment of supreme law which would check harmful legislation at its source, and to which they could appeal when in their judgment Parliamentary measures may hurt the nation.

When Miss Megan Lloyd George challenged the Civilians' Compensation Bill (Personal Injuries (Emergency Provisions) Act) on May 1, 1941, as violating the equity of the Common Law of England, she appealed in vain to regulations which it has become customary for the Government to ignore. Neither legislation nor the people can ensure that justice shall be done until the fundamental principles of common human right are defined and established as the inviolable law of the Realm. Both on practical and purely moral grounds there is every reason why we should reaffirm the Common Law in this final supreme Law and Object in such a way that it shall be binding upon our rulers to observe, by defining social purpose and providing guidance in all legislation, so that

economic security, the happiness, and the physical and spiritual needs of the people shall be the first claim upon all social, industrial, and commercial effort.

Therefore:

The primary responsibility of the State shall be to ensure that every subject of the Realm shall be free to contribute to the community according to his ability and shall receive sufficient purchasing power to provide for all his needs;

with the object:

To ensure that the aforesaid laws and objects shall receive the first consideration of the legislative authorities.[\[15\]](#)

Chapter Five

The Peace We Lost

*Preach against the preachers of their own inventions.
They have not mounted to the breaches; they have not defended the walls
You see deception and divine a lie.
Have you not invented a false vision?
And divined a lying tale?
Therefore because you speak falsehood and invent a lie,—
I am absolutely opposed to you.
My hand will be against the preacher of false visions
And the diviners of a lie.
They shall not come to the Council of My People,
Because they have deluded My people by exclaiming, "Peace!"
When there was no peace.—Ezekiel.*

The causes of poverty and war are so closely interwoven that it is impossible to isolate any one factor and say this is the direct cause of either of the evils. When the world solves one of these it will remove the main cause of the other.

There is no difficulty in agreeing upon the principles which should be included in any plan of reconstruction after this war to preserve peace and provide the foundation of a new and happier world. The quotations from the speeches of the world's statesmen contained in this chapter demonstrate that these principles are known, but because of the pressure of vested interests they have constantly refused to apply them.

The delegates who attended the numerous peace conferences following the Armistice of 1918 were bound hand and foot by instructions to "protect national interests and prestige." These instructions turned peace conferences into war conferences. The delegates had to accept as a basis for their discussions the bitter underground struggle for world markets which made war inevitable.

Mr. MacDonald, who honestly loved peace and the poor, set the pace for war by explaining that because of our isolated position we must be strong on the seas to ensure that we got cheap food from abroad in time of war. At home our farmers complained that they could not afford to grow food in competition with foreign markets, and the milk producers made umbrella handles and buttons from their produce because mothers of ill-nourished and diseased children could not afford to buy it.

We had to get cheap food from abroad, we were told, in order that foreign markets would buy our industrial products. We had to capture the foreign markets in order to pay for the cheap food from

abroad, and, consequently, we needed a strong Navy to protect the food coming to our shores in the event of war.

America and France wanted the same freedom of the seas which the British battleship gave to Great Britain, so that their people would not starve in war-time. France refused to be starved into submission and insisted on a great submarine fleet. All were afraid of an unknown foe. Germany's navy had been sunk to the bottom of the sea, her army disbanded, her Empire dismembered, and every conceivable economic measure adopted to keep her in subjection. No enemy could be found against whom the Allies could arm, but they left the Disarmament Conference agreed that their navies should be made stronger.

As the countries were not prepared to make themselves as weak as disarmed Germany, Sir John Simon proposed that Germany should be made as strong as other countries. A strongly armed Germany provided all nations with an excuse to make more armaments in order to preserve peace so that their starving peoples might eat, at least when war came.

In 1921 America had demanded more battleships and France more submarines. In 1934 they all demanded more aeroplanes. Peace must be safeguarded. Finally, they all agreed to rearm to guarantee food in war-time. Britain was afraid of the French submarines, so it was suggested by Sir John Simon in his White Paper (1934) that Germany should arm to preserve the balance of power.

"The first proposition is that Germany's claim to equality of rights in the matter of armaments cannot be resisted, and ought not to be resisted. Secondly, no practical solution can be found on the basis that all nations throughout the world immediately abandon all weapons denied to Germany by the Treaty of Versailles."

Then Hitler began to build the greatest fighting machine the world has known. He said on April 28, 1939:

"The rest of the world began to increase still further their already enormous armaments, and not until 1934, when the last of my comprehensive proposals—that concerning 300,000 as the maximum size of the army—was ultimately turned down, did I give the order for German rearmament, which was now to be very thorough."

When the League of Nations was created as the practical expression of a great ideal, all the nations wanted peace. When they met at the conference table they prepared for war. The reason why the world could not preserve peace in spite of its desire for peace was because the economic system forced the nations into commercial conflict. Shortly after the Great War one of our Agricultural Sub-Committees reported:

"We hope and pray that the greater sanity of nations and their increased obedience to the Divine Law may save our country from any repetition of the hideous catastrophe which has to-day overwhelmed Europe, but we can feel no positive assurance that this will be the case, and we do not think that we should be faithful to our trust for our descendants if we omitted to take any practicable measure to increase the national safety in a future time of need.

"We can well imagine that in some future struggle the comparative dependence of the United Kingdom on a supply of food from overseas might be a determining factor of victory."

Did the Sub-Committee understand the meaning of the Divine Law? International Finance dominated the policies of the leading Powers and forced them to break, as Mr. Asquith put it, the Divine Law by "economic penetration and commercial and financial control of vitally important industries." A friendly exchange of goods and raw materials in accordance with the needs of nations would have fed the world's hungry millions and preserved peace. But starving humanity was ignored and goods were left to pile up in the storehouses and the ports of the world.

The world's economic system began to crash. But the economists and statesmen were blind to the cause. They told the United States and the Argentine that their bumper harvests threatened the world with the danger of starvation from too much food.

Sir Samuel Hoare said:

"It is the fear of monopoly—of the withholding of essential colonial raw materials—that is causing the alarm. It is the desire for a guarantee that the distribution of raw materials will not be unfairly impeded that is stimulating the demand for further inquiry I feel that we should be ready to take our share in an investigation in these matters."

The solution to the problem of overstocked markets was obvious, but Mr. Herbert Morrison attacked Mr. George Lansbury when he suggested that we should conduct ourselves like Christians by feeding the poor. Mr. Lansbury asked:

"What is the cause of war? It is the need for expansion; the desire for that which other countries have—raw materials and markets. But why should these countries fight for these objectives? Why not get together and pool the resources? We Britons could give the lead and offer to other countries a share of products. There are plenty of raw materials and markets for everybody, and instead of nations preparing to fight and scramble they should sit around a table."

Again and again attempts made to lead the world to sanity of living ended in failure.

Lord Marler asked the Government what steps were being taken towards meeting the inequalities in international distribution of raw materials. He asked

"the Government to consider the just distribution of raw materials and markets at once and not wait until there were threats of direct action and war Until this was done they could not get rid of the tension in Europe and the whole world It was bigger than a mere Colonial problem Peace could not be lasting unless it was based on justice, and that meant economic justice; and the people of the U.S.A. felt extremely strongly on this matter."

Viscount Samuel said:

"The British Commonwealth undoubtedly had the chief responsibility in this matter of the supply of essential raw materials Governments in possession of raw materials (should) declare their general policy to be not to use their powers of restricting supplies so as to put pressure on any other country."

We had to choose between two distinct courses. One was to say that war was probably inevitable, and so envisage certain countries as possible enemies and keep them as powerless as we could. The other was to say that war need not be inevitable, and our duty was to remove causes that would tend to war and do what was reasonable to meet any legitimate request, no matter from whence it came.

The Earl of Plymouth said, "The collaboration of the United States was of particular importance." They held the bulk of the world's gold. But Lord Snell said:

"It was clear that His Majesty's Government had no intention of facing these difficulties in spite of the urgency of the problem Placed as we were we had a special responsibility, and the co-operation of all nations would not be obtained by waiting for a spontaneous advance. Somebody had to take the lead, and it would be possible for the Government to ask that in some form or other this matter might be explored."

Such suggestions were beyond the pale—to share and share alike was too big a price to pay for human happiness and peace.

In 1931 there were ominous rumbles in the Far East. A Japanese delegate at Geneva said to the *Daily Telegraph*:

"Unless the League Council can find a means of safeguarding Japanese interests in Manchuria, we must remain there. Moreover, we must have space to breathe somewhere. Our population is increasing to such an extent that there is no room for all Japanese in Japan itself."

Mussolini said: "We must expand or explode!"

Herr Hitler said: "We must export or die!"

The difficulties of Italy and Germany were how to obtain raw materials and food supplies.

Translated, the League of Nations said:

"We cannot help you in your economic difficulties. We are sorry that your population is overcrowded and that you have great difficulty in obtaining the necessities of natural life. It is unfortunate that a handful of nations control most of the resources you need and will not share them with you but, *if you cannot obtain them by peaceful means you must not fight for them.*" The actual wording of Article 16 stated bluntly:

"Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard to Articles 12, 13, or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League."

Various member nations of the League resigned and resorted to war to obtain what was denied them by friendly intercourse.

It is hypocrisy to condemn economic or military aggressor or dictators, no matter how ruthless they may be in their commercial or military wars, if we will not remove the economic causes of the aggression or the conditions which give rise to dictatorships.

The nations which were in the category of the "have nots" were treated as we treat our unemployed. "Our economic policy has no provision for exchanging goods and services without the use of money, but as the system cannot give you the money we must withhold the goods you need. We are sorry for your condition, but bear your troubles peacefully; any attempt at violence to obtain a sufficiency of food, warmth, and shelter will be crushed by the forces of law and order."

This is the only implication we can give to Mr. Eden's words on September 20, 1937, after Germany and other countries had asked for assistance in solving their food problems:

"I am afraid no modification of the British or any other preferential system can provide an adequate remedy for the difficulties of those countries which, by maintaining exchange control, find themselves at a disadvantage in obtaining imports of raw materials and other things which they require. For as the Committee's report clearly shows, the principal difficulties of these countries arises not in obtaining raw materials, whether from colonial areas or elsewhere, *but in paying for those raw materials.*"

The great commercial nations—America, Great Britain, and France—had lent, and were willing to continue lending, money to foreign countries so that they could buy their goods. But Italy had learned her lesson by past experience and refused to entangle herself in debt. She occasionally ignored orthodoxy and fed her people by exchanging abroad her industrial products for the food she could not produce herself. Russia also offended against the commercial powers by exchanging goods for goods. They were condemned by the world's economic experts. Barter was not accepted as legitimate trade. It did not gather interest. Trade was trade, in the opinion of the money power, only when men stood at ports entering cargoes into ledgers headed "Imports and Exports." Barter only fed people.

Germany, like Italy and Russia before, was trying to escape the entanglements of world debt. England was quite willing to lend money to buy raw materials, but they insisted upon exchanging goods for goods. They would not be drawn into the system of increasing debt, booms, and slumps. *The Times* has since said that Germany's barter system made her an aggressor in the world market. [16] She was trying to break the credit ring of the money monopolists by the force of economic sanity—and that was unforgivable. She was acting like the worker who went on strike against a system which deprived him of adequate food supplies though he was quite willing to exchange his labour to pay for them.

In 1937 Hitler had said:

"Germany will enter into no more obligations to pay for her goods imports than she is capable of fulfilling. The German Government thus takes the standpoint of the respectable merchant, who keeps his orders in harmony with his power to pay."

He said:

"We laugh at the time when our national economists held the view that the value of a currency is regulated by the gold and securities lying in the vaults of a State Bank; and more especially we laugh at the theory that its value was guaranteed thereby. We have instead come to learn that the value of a currency lies in the productive capacity of a nation."

The world financial monopoly stood aghast. If Germany succeeded in her plan of economic penetration, other nations might follow her example. The whole world would then exchange goods for goods on a basis of equality and good-fellowship! No one would want to borrow, and the financial pyramid of debt, from the apex of which Almighty Finance ruled the world, would collapse! Humanity would be well-fed, but the financiers would lose their power.

The politicians said that the barter system of Germany and other peoples was sure to fail. It *had* to fail to prove orthodoxy right. The war between rival monetary policies began in earnest.

In 1933 one-third of America's cotton crop had been ploughed into the earth. In other parts of the world two-thirds of the rubber plantations were allowed to go to waste. Many countries wanted cotton and rubber but had no money with which to buy it. They were willing to exchange goods for these commodities, but direct trade (upon which High Finance could not exact its toll of debt and interest) was not satisfactory, so the planters tottered into bankruptcy, whilst Germany, with characteristic thoroughness, used substitutes for cotton and produced synthetic rubber. When denied oil she produced it from coal.

If the German monetary experiment had been allowed to develop on the basis of a friendly exchange of goods it would have provided the world with useful information to assist it in solving its commercial problems. What may have been a laudable effort on the part of Germany has become a world war—a war of ideas in which Hitler strives to form a European economic monopoly opposed to the financial monopolies of the world, and does not hesitate to use every means to gain his goal of world economic power.

About this time many other nations began to break through the money ring. Germany not only threatened the markets of great trading nations but she had set an example which other countries were not slow to follow. First Russia had incurred hostility for refusing to pay her debts. Now Germany was incurring hostility for refusing to contract new ones.

Before Germany began her economic policy the one-time Allies had been glaring at each other with fear and suspicion; everyone was afraid of someone—an unknown foe—but now they had found their enemy.

Statesmen began to prepare the public mind for war. No mention was made of the real causes of the crisis, the bitter scramble for world markets, the trickery, and the inhuman methods used to obtain

spheres of influence for surplus investments and for increasing the burden of world debt. Statesmen were again preparing to sacrifice the youth of their country on the bloody altar of Mammon. As in peace, so in war. Humanity must be sacrificed to save a worthless economic system.

Once again the peoples were told that if they destroyed the leader of the German nation all would be well with the world. Germany worshipped its leader. Britain trusted its Government. Both peoples believed their leaders would save the world. It was a tragedy of faith in men. One nation has to fight for new economic and political systems and is willing to use any means to get them; the others to preserve old ones—but the solution lies in neither.

Once again men, women, and children are being mown down in bloody swathes because the ports and granaries of some nations were glutted with goods and others empty. Surely the wrath of God will descend upon the statesmen who will not give humanity any secure place in the world where they can be fed and clothed, and live without fear, but by their practices must aggravate each other, and each generation strew the fruitful earth with the corpses of their children.

On public platforms politicians talked empty words. Rarely was it suggested that the surplus food might be distributed amongst their own people; instead they were preparing to fight other nations to make them buy it. One cannot blame the politicians who got their economics from text-books which have never been changed for over a hundred years. They had been taught to think in terms of economics, not in terms of human need. They talked moral platitudes but never seriously thought of linking economics with moral justice.

Ludwell Denny in *America Conquers Britain* indicates the irony of a situation which impoverishes the exporting nation and produces war abroad.

"It seems to mean that if we work very hard, we can send more wealth abroad and thus acquire more capital abroad, and thus possibly receive still more capital abroad, and so on, generation after generation without finding any way whereby we, or our children, or our children's children, can benefit greatly by our increased productivity.

"According to this theory, our own standard of living must remain the same as though we had never produced all this 'surplus' wealth. The complacency with which this theory is accepted is amazing."

Under the existing system, the impossibility of sharing out the raw materials and resources of the world in accordance with the needs of the people of each nation, the impossibility of the people of any country being able to purchase and enjoy the wealth they are able to produce, would seem too obvious even to question.

If a nation cannot sell its goods to its own people then it must try to sell them abroad; if this cannot be done then the people will find themselves without jobs until the "surplus" goods are sold, and suffer poverty in the midst of their abundance. They must fight for foreign markets as it is impossible for all nations to increase their exports and to decrease their imports at the same time, so there can never be peace. Our statesmen do not tell us this simple truth.

Behind the alleged motives of dictators, national pride and honour, radical and religious antipathies, external dangers, and the sedulous fostering in consequence of human pugnacity and quarrelsomeness which produce war, economic causes of a much more humble and sordid nature are always at work. But the people are led to believe that they fight to preserve national honour. Yet what honour can any nation possess when its very life depends on a ruthless economic expansion where all decent human values and the well-being of the peoples of other nations are forgotten?

To gain a foreign market means the loss of that market to another nation. The nation which loses its foreign markets suffers trade depression. The standard of living of its people must be lowered in order to undercut the prices of other nations in the world market. What honour is there to a victorious commercial nation whose success has brought disaster and misery to millions of people

in another country?

In the preceding pages we have reviewed the causes which led to this war. Driven by economic pressure nations have sought to obtain, through political control obtained by war, the markets and raw materials they could not obtain through normal competitive channels. The signs of the times were written in blood, but statesmen averted their eyes and led a foolish world to Armageddon.

Will they fail us again when the present conflict is over? The answer depends on us, the common people. We have to make known the principles upon which peace shall be founded, and see to it that they are applied by our rulers. In the past they tried to establish peace upon the rotten foundations of greed, revenge, lies, and deceits; their corruption and subterfuges have brought us to war.

Can we trust them again to make "peace"? They proved themselves incapable of learning the lessons of the past; they ignored the warnings and advice from those Members of Parliament and others who loved their country. Neither pity for the poor nor the honest desire of the common peoples of the world for peace was allowed to guide them in choosing between right and wrong. Dare we again place our lives in their hands without some means of determining that they will do no wrong? We must insist upon international laws which will ensure that our lives shall not be used as pawns on the chessboards of national and international politics, and which will prevent our rulers from following the well-known road to destruction.

When the war is over nations will again send their delegates to an international council to consider the problems of peace. They will again be faced with two alternatives: To decide whether the post-war world will be another tragedy of civilisation with peace but an interlude between wars, or an era of human progress, happiness, and security.

Either the needs of human life will decide the terms of peace, or the world will again be divided into spheres of influence for favoured nations. Powerful international, commercial groups will fight for a monopoly of world trade, markets, and raw materials; commercial war will bring its attendant evils of trade depression and poverty amidst abundance, and will eventually lead to military war. Or the needs of humanity will receive preference and the resources of the world be made available to all nations in accordance with the physical and cultural needs of their peoples.

The choice will be as simple as that, but financial preference will seek to complicate the issue. The common man will have his mind confused by talk about indemnities, "paying for the war," balancing national budgets, and a thousand other things which neither he nor the majority of politicians understand. The financiers who create our war debts at the cost of pen and ink will demand their pound of flesh and the right to exploit humanity, as in pre-war days, at the cost of draining the life blood of the nations. The financial institutions, which could not finance peace but can create £12,000,000 each day for war, will demand that their domination be maintained. If their demands decide the issue of peace, human life and happiness will again be sacrificed on the altar of Mammon.

We must raise the banner: HUMANITY FIRST!

Human need, or human greed—that is the decision our Ministers will have to make; the road to destruction and death, or to peace and world co-operation.

We must make and keep the choice as simple as that. The world must be made safe for humanity; it must cease to be the arena where finance and commerce fight for supremacy with humanity as its legitimate prey.

A people united in this simple demand, refusing to be led astray by thoughts of revenge, or by the shibboleths of national prestige which so often cloak dishonourable and inhuman practices, will confound those who seek to continue the evils of the pre-war world. There is strength in simplicity. We must not be led astray by the complications of international settlements and world trade. The inter-locking interests of world monopolies, whose struggle for supremacy has brought such dire calamity upon the world, are in themselves both the complications and the causes of the

complications. These complications we must sweep away, so that commerce shall be based upon the simple rules of law and order, of a world co-operating to feed the people, rather than the rules which govern an all-in fight. Even to consider the complications and demands of the old order means accepting and compromising with its evils.

To be practical we must be simple. The true purpose of production and trade is consumption. If 40,000,000 people live in one country and 100,000,000 in another, it will not be beyond the wit of man to calculate the quantities of wheat, wool, cotton, coal, and other necessities required to feed and clothe them and provide the amenities of a secure and cultured life. The resources and productive capacity of the world are far greater than its needs. After the war the common needs of humanity (similar to the simple principles which we have proposed shall become British Common Law) must be established as international law and made binding by the people upon their rulers. Only by this means can the needs of human life be made the deciding factor of world settlement.

Statistics of potential productive capacity, of the sources and quantities of raw materials, and of national populations and their needs are available. It is only a matter of arithmetic to discover the quantities of goods and services to be produced and distributed to provide for the needs of all. Then enmity, distrust, and fear between nations will be replaced by friendship, trustworthiness, glad service, and universal peace.

Something very simple and vital is necessary to win the support and confidence of the masses. If we are to lead them out of the morass of conflicting opinions amidst which they are struggling—hatred, revenge, fear, and distrust—we must teach them to demand simply that the world settlement shall be planned to provide every man, woman, and child with a sufficiency of the necessities of life. That human need must decide peace plans, not the demands of private interests of favoured peoples. All men have the right to life and happiness. Unless this is done, financiers and politicians will again betray them to struggle without guidance amid the ravages of mental, moral, and physical starvation.

The simple basic facts of existence can be understood by all. Everyone knows the difference between right and wrong. This simplicity can "move the world." The facts of life essential to man's existence and his numerous relations and progress cannot be ignored with impunity. Vital truths that conflict with established customs and interests, but which affect the life of a nation and the peace of the world, cannot be suppressed for ever. History shows that these simple truths of life must provide the foundation of the common customs of the world, or they will break violently through the restricting limits and bring disaster to civilisation. With very few exceptions, all international disasters have originated in conflicts between natural individual need, and the prevention of its fulfilment by political, religious, civic, or economic customs.

Unless the masses of the people are united in a demand that their common needs shall provide the deciding factors in all post-war negotiations, nations will send their delegates to the peace council with instructions similar to those which decided the terms of the disastrous peace settlement of the First World War. Conflicting interests will make it impossible for the delegates to differentiate between good and evil in accordance with a common standard of right. Only the peoples of nations united by their common needs can provide that standard. Without such a signpost the delegates will be baffled and befogged by conflicting interests all clamouring for preference; they will be unable to make any clear-cut distinction between right and wrong, between human need and commercial evil.

International Law—a New Magna Carta of Humanity—must be agreed upon by common consent, so that peace delegates shall have a clear-cut issue upon which to draw up the terms of peace. Then governments and delegates, with the power of united peoples behind them, can defy the powerful international groups which have hitherto decided the fate of nations. Nations can then get down to the task of making the world safe for humanity. Fears and irritations will then give place to justice and co-operation; poverty in the midst of plenty will become an evil of the past, and the economic cause of aggression and war will be removed by giving all peoples access to the world's goods and

services in accordance with their needs.

The simple watchword of the future must be emblazoned throughout the world: THE NEEDS OF HUMAN LIFE MUST DECIDE THE TERMS OF PEACE. This simple demand must be repeated again and again, until the world's rulers recognise that no compromise or excuse can be accepted by the people. Thus and thus only will the prerogative of the peoples' will prevail and civilisation enter a new era of peace, contentment, and progress.

The history of the League of Nations showed that neither verbal promises nor the signing of covenants of international law are sufficient guarantee of obedience. The failure of the League was due to the absence of the means of compelling member nations to keep their moral obligations. This weakness betrayed a corresponding moral and legal failure in the nations' own systems of government, wherein the people have no means of compelling their rulers to obey Common Law.

The weakness of national constitutions can be cured by supreme laws which enable the people by public declaration to check at its inception any violation of common right and justice, whether committed by a government or by a public or private institution. The procedure of public declaration by referendum is described in a later chapter.

If the principles of international justice were also made an integral part of national constitutions, in the form of moral-civic laws defining the object of international policy, the people would be empowered to compel their governments and commercial organisations to act in accordance with the law. The common people have little to gain by war and everything to lose. When all needs can be provided and international problems be solved amicably by instructing their governments to obey the laws of national and international policies, the people will use their power to compel peaceful negotiations.

We cannot stress too strongly the weakness of agreements and covenants to keep the peace by submitting international questions to an international court, if such agreements and covenants depend merely on verbal or written promises. No national court of justice could dispense justice if citizens were merely pledged by verbal or written promises to keep the peace. In such a circumstance wrongdoers would ignore the courts and the police, as nations have ignored the League of Nations and the threat of force which it had no power to use. We cannot discuss plans for an international police force until we know under what circumstances it will be used, and until the peoples of the world are empowered by law to compel their governments to provide and use such a force when the international covenant is broken. We dare not establish such a force until the people have the power by law to determine that it shall be used to enforce obedience to the covenant, otherwise there would be danger of international or national powers using it on their own behalf, as they have used the armed forces of nations in the past.

We dare not design any plans for a federation of nations, or any form of international institution for maintaining peace, until the objects of such institutions have been defined and will be controlled by the principles of common right and justice and established by laws in the constitutions of nations. Such laws must provide a common human purpose similar to those which we have proposed shall become supreme British Common Law, leaving all nations free to work out the details of their application and their own destiny in accordance with their national culture and the common consent of their peoples.

Similar to our proposed national laws, they must empower the people to prevent the corruption of governments, the monopoly of raw materials and goods and services, and make it obligatory to establish such monetary and commercial reforms that all the necessities of human life and progress shall be made available to all.

An enduring peace and international contentment and progress could be assured by the British Government and the British Commonwealth of Nations demonstrating by example to the world the honesty and integrity of its peace aims by accepting the following principles as the basis of any plans for post-war reconstruction and establishing them in fundamental laws governing their

international policy, and by inviting other nations to co-operate in a similar purpose:

1. The economic security, happiness, and the natural physical and cultural needs of the people shall be the first claim upon all social, industrial, and commercial effort: and in all international negotiations these simple human needs shall take precedence over every other factor.
2. Removal of the principal causes of war by giving all peoples access to world resources and raw materials, and enabling them to exchange goods and services freely with each other in accordance with their natural needs and the common good, irrespective of national boundaries.
3. International irritations caused by tariffs, quotas and the vulgar seeking to profit at the expense of other peoples can be avoided.
4. The traffic in currencies by private individuals and organisations in such a way as to injure the welfare of any people shall be prohibited.
5. No man or woman shall be deprived of liberty or security because of his or her religious belief or practice.
6. All peoples shall have representation at the International Council Table, where their representatives shall meet as occasion demands, and that at such meetings the nations and peoples shall accept these principles as final arbiter in all decisions.

Chapter Six

Common Law and Common Right

*The Laws will never depart or go from you.
They are not in heaven nor across the sea.
We may hear and practise them for the matter
Is very close to you and in your heart to practise.
Look! I put before you to-day Life and Prosperity,—
Or Sin and Death! What I propose to you is Life!
I place Life and Death before you,—
The Blessing and the Curse! Therefore choose for
Yourself the Life,—that you and your posterity may live!—Deuteronomy.*

*From Me will come the Law,
Justice light the troubled Tribes.
Hear you who know the right,
Men with My Law at heart.—Isaiah.*

Many Members of Parliament are chary of admitting the existence of a rule of moral-civic law when its regulations conflict with the instructions which they receive from their Party Whips.

When Miss Megan Lloyd George in May 1911 stated in the House of Commons that the Personal Injuries (Emergency Provisions) Act contravened the Common Law, a number of indignant voters brought the matter to the notice of their M.P.s. It is interesting to note that on this occasion very few Members were able to give intelligent or convincing replies to their voters' questions. In most cases the Members tried to persuade them that the Common Law was "unwritten" or had fallen into

disuse, or in any case "no one understands the Common Law." The replies were examples of the convenient fiction used by Members of Parliament to persuade people that they possess no common rights other than those provided by legislation. On this occasion the voters refused to accept the deception, and explained that the Common Law made no distinction between the sexes and the value of human life and limb, and happiness, and within the meaning of the Law a woman was entitled to the same compensation as a man for injuries received through enemy action.

This is one of the many instances of the reluctance of M.P.s to admit that there exists any ruling of right and wrong, or of common justice or injustice, or of equity or inequity that is superior to Parliament and should guide them in the making of laws. The light-hearted and thoughtless manner in which they make statute laws which contravene the principle of the Law condemns them as not being fit for their high office.

Apart from the fact that conscience alone should be a sufficient guide to M.P.s not to offend against common justice, it is incorrect to say that there exists no written Common Law.

It is not necessary to possess more than the average amount of intelligence to understand the Common Law and the relation between it and statute law. The origin of the former has been lost in the dim mists of antiquity; it is a code of common right and natural law expressed in broad principles, and providing, together with the rules of equity, the main foundation of the British Constitution. Statute laws began with the reissue of the Magna Carta in 1225 in the reign of Henry III, and are for the most part Acts of Parliament by which legislators have sought to express some aspect of Common Law principle. It is generally correct to say that the Common Law makes known the rights and duties of the subject and deals broadly with all aspects of individual and national life, whilst the Statutes of the Realm seek to interpret and apply to modern conditions some particular branch of the Common Law without contravening its general principles. For instance, no statute prescribes in general terms that a man must pay his debts or pay damage for trespass or libel or slander. The common right to compensation is a regulation of the Common Law, whilst statutes (except where they re-state in the form of code some branch of the Common Law) interpret and deal with details.

The most fundamental part of our body of law is Common Law, and it would be correct to say that it defines the purpose of statute law. If the former were swept away the latter would provide us with a tangle of disjointed rules taken from their context, and with no provisions for the most important relations of life. Our judges would be in the curious position of having statutes by which to dispense right and justice which had no legal existence.

The Common Law was first codified by our Anglo-Saxon kings, then by William I. Since the time of Edward I it has been in writing or print. It can be found, often misrepresented and misapplied, in the reported decisions of the judges of the English Courts, and also in the Great Charter and similar State documents.

But law reports and charters did not establish the Common Law. One cannot establish nor grant customs or natural rights which were in existence long before the records were made. Law reports and charters can only acknowledge, interpret, and reassert them.

It is both morally wrong and politically unsound for legislation to give powers to or to acquiesce in any practices by private monopolies which render void the regulations of the Common Law which says:

No freeman may be seized or imprisoned or dispossessed or outlawed or in any way destroyed except by the legal judgment of his peers.

A freeman shall not be amerced but according to the degree of the offence and saving his contenement (excepting his subsistence): a merchant shall be amerced in the same manner saving his merchandise.

All merchants shall have safety and security in coming into England and going out of England, to buy and to sell without any unjust exactions.

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

The economic and commercial practices and the legislation which cause, or allow, food to be destroyed whilst people are in need, which deny men the right to trade or to earn their living, which conceal the illegal taxation by private financial corporations, by which M.P.s contravene the Law by judging in their own case, and by which great monopolies exploit human life for private gain, causing untold misery and suffering, are all examples of violation of the ancient precepts of Common Law. There is every reason why Common Law should be clearly defined and set above statute law, and why statute law should interpret clearly and fairly the spirit of the Common Law.

We are not concerned with the many branches of Common Law but with the spirit which places the security, freedom, and happiness of the individual and the peace and progress of the State before all else. Common Law acknowledges the sacredness of human life and prohibits the placing of a money or economic value upon human happiness. This Regulation must not only be maintained but be made supreme in all departments of life, so that individual ability and the nation's capacity to produce goods and services, and to provide educational, cultural, and spiritual equipment, shall be the only limitation to personal security and happiness.

It is this spirit of the Common Law which we seek to preserve and to express in the Principles and Objects we propose shall become the supreme Law of the Realm, and provide the foundation and the purpose of all political, social, industrial, commercial and monetary effort.

A fundamental and inflexible Law is necessary to protect and to define the general purpose of society, but it would be disastrous to attempt to make it govern the detailed activities of life. Statute law must continue in the role of the "addenda and errata of the book of Common Law." Common Law must deal with the basic principles of life; the supreme authority of right and wrong, of justice and injustice, and of the rights and duties of the individual and the community; it must express those laws of nature which have been common to man since he inhabited the earth, and which are the unalterable laws of Nature and, if man will obey them, will protect him until the end of time. Statute laws must deal with the detailed application of the inflexible principles of Common Law. Such complementary laws can be enacted to meet the changing conditions and needs of society and to ensure that new resources and new knowledge shall be used to enrich the social life, and such can be repealed when they become redundant or a hindrance to a progressive community.

The present supremacy of the statute-making power of Parliament is not a logical or even practical necessity, but it is certainly dangerous to have such unlimited power over the life of a nation in the hands of our legislators with no effective safeguard against misuse by unscrupulous, foolish, or ignorant men. Neither Congress nor the State legislators under the Constitution of the United States have such unlimited powers.

In the seventeenth-century report we read:

"It appears in our books that in many cases the Common Law will control Acts of Parliament and sometimes adjudge them utterly void; for whenever an Act of Parliament is against right and reason, or repugnant or impossible to be performed, the Common Law will control it and adjudge such Acts to be void."

To-day when the Common Law comes into competition with Statute Law it is the latter which prevails. When our fourteen Common Laws are made the frame of reference for all legislation and national activity, this ancient practice of Common Law supremacy will be re-established.

The need for Government departments to be brought under the rule of Law and to combat the present "reign of lawlessness" was emphasised in the late Lord Chief Justice Hewart's book, *The*

New Despotism.

A. V. Dicey, K.C., in his *Law of the Constitution*, long ago warned the nation of the growth of Parliamentary despotism and civic lawlessness:

"The ancient veneration for the rule of law has in England suffered during the last thirty years a marked decline. The truth of this assertion is proved by actual legislation, by the existence among some classes of a certain distrust both of the law and the judges, and by a marked tendency towards the use of lawless methods for the attainment of social or political ends

"Recent Acts have given judicial or quasi-judicial authority to officials who stand more or less in connection with, and therefore may be influenced by, the government of the day, and hence have excluded and in others indirectly diminished the authority of the Law Courts. This tendency to diminish the sphere of the rule of law is shown, for instance, in the judicial powers conferred upon the Educational Commissioners ... on various officials by the National Insurance Acts ... and on the Commissioners of the Inland Revenue and other officials by the Financial Acts

"The Parliamentary Act of 1911 [he says]—

"Enacts 'that any certificate of the Speaker of the House of Commons given under this Act shall be conclusive for *all purposes and shall not be questioned in any Court of Law*.' (Our italics.)

"This enactment, if strictly construed, would protect any Speaker who, either from partisanship or to promote some personal interest of his own, signed a certificate which was notoriously false from being liable to punishment by any Court of Law whatever. No doubt the House of Commons has been historically jealous of any judicial interference with persons acting under the authority of the House, and has on more than one occasion claimed in a sense to be above the law of the land ... such claims have rarely been of advantage or credit to the House."

The function of the Speaker should be that of an impartial judge, not that of a partisan empowered by Parliament to overthrow even the Courts of Law. The writer continues:

"The rule of a party cannot be permanently identified with the authority of a nation or with the dictates of patriotism ... eminent thinkers are to be found who certainly use language which implies that the authority or the sovereignty of the nation, or even the conception of national will, is a sort of political or metaphysical fiction which wise men will do well to discard

"The Parliamentary Act enables a majority of the House of Commons to resist or overrule the will of the electors or, in other words, of the nation But that the widespread demand for an appeal to the people has received no attention from the majority of the House of Commons is also certain. No impartial observer can therefore deny the possibility that a fundamental change in our constitution may be carried out against the will of the nation."

Not one in ten thousand people understood all that the Parliamentary Act implied. If they had it would never have been passed. It changed the original purpose of Parliament almost beyond recognition. It left parties to squabble over things which do not matter, and placed the power of Parliament in the hands of the Cabinet and created a constitutional despotism. No private member can carry a Bill through Parliament without the support of the Ministry of the day. The Prime Minister can curtail the opportunity for discussing legislation which in his opinion is inopportune. We have a House of Commons which neither claims nor practises real freedom of discussion, and there is no sure means of obtaining from a Ministry answers to questions which vitally concern the

interests of the nation. As Mr. Dicey says:

"This is not from a constitutional point of view edifying or reassuring It is at least arguable that important changes in the conventions, if not in the law, of the constitution may be urgently needed; but the reason for alarm is not that the English executive is too strong, for weak government generally means bad administration, but that our English executive is, as a general rule, becoming more and more the representative of a party rather than the guide of the country."

The example of legal lawlessness set by Parliament has encouraged the growth in England of a doctrine of civil law-breaking which perplexes moralists and statesmen. Large classes of otherwise respectable persons hold the belief, and act on the conviction, that it is not only allowable, but even praiseworthy, to break the law of the land if they are pursuing some end which seems to be just, desirable, or gainful.

It is within the memory of persons now living that a breach of the law of the land was considered to be an act of immorality. This immorality has permeated Parliament, commerce, and every department of life, so that the unscrupulous prosper and the scrupulous law-abiding citizens become their legitimate prey.

Parliament must be bound by the Constitution to make enactments in accordance with a high moral code of right and wrong, and when in doubt seek the advice of a High Court of Common Law. There are many cases of Parliament receiving judicial advice on great issues or ordering the repeal of laws harmful to the community. For instance, we find in *Compendium of the Law of Real Property*, p. 231, that:

"Nothing in the history of English Law better illustrates the actual legislation by the courts than their treatment of the Statute De Donis. They, rather than the Parliament, represent the will of the nation . . . and their action was sanctioned by King and people. Nothing in English Law is better known than these facts, but it is amazing that their true significance should be so little recognised. Mr. Scrutton is not going too far when he says, 'The class legislation of Parliament was defeated by the national legislation of judges,' *Land in Fetters*, p. 76. For the opposition of the judges here is direct, conscious, successful, and generally approved. It is directed against an odious piece of 'class legislation' which the Parliament has formally enacted in words too clear to be misunderstood, and has refused again and again to repeal. And there can be no question of the intention of the makers of the Act The judges are trying to defeat that intention, not to give effect to it. They are guided by considerations of what is expedient for the community."

There are also many cases of citizens, or groups of citizens, appealing to a High Court of Common Law when all else had failed to give them justice. There is the case of the Hickleton miners. In June 1937 their colliery was amalgamated with the Doncaster Collieries, Ltd.; the miners resented the changed and unjust conditions of employment introduced by their new employers. In October the men came out on strike, but their Union would give no help. One thousand eight hundred and sixty men were prosecuted by the owners for breach of contract; they lost their case, and were fined and assessed in damages. The men refused to accept the decision. They declared that their contract had been made with the Hickleton Colliery owners, who might choose to sell their own property but they could not treat men like chattels and sell them by contract. By attempting to do so they violated the rights of free men. They claimed that they were not just labour-power to be transferred like the coal and the machinery. Their Branch Secretary, Walter Starkey, was prepared to fight on these lines without the support of the Union. The men raised a fund and appealed to the High Court. They lost. They raised more money and went to the Court of Appeal. They lost again. They mortgaged their funds, their buildings, and their homes, and appealed to the House of Lords. The Law Lords recognised the fundamental principles of human freedom and justice inherent in the British

Common Law. By a four to one decision the men won their case. It had been fought and won, at real cost and risk, by a united and self-organised group of working men. The Law of the land was vindicated.

And yet we have evidence of men and women robbed of their homes, property, and every possession; of widespread and incredible injustices which have brought suffering and poverty to thousands in every class of society, but in none of these cases has the Law of right and justice been triumphant.

Very few civic rights and liberties of which the British people boast so confidently have statutory existence. Many are only principles or Constitutional rules established by custom, often assumed as a right because they are not denied, such as the right of public assembly, *i.e.* public meetings, etc. This, then, is the nature of our boasted bulwark against injustice and despotism, and the reason why it has failed so lamentably to preserve common justice and prevent the encroachments of financial, political, and departmental bureaucracy.

Not one in one hundred M.P.s acknowledge, or even understand, the spirit of the Common Law and Constitution, or the ancient traditions upon which they are based.

We are not concerned with the many interpretations of Common Law nor with its actual or theoretical powers, but with the fact that it has failed to provide the protection it was designed to give and, owing to its vagueness, has permitted legislators to divert the nation from its true destiny. Unscrupulous as well as honest but foolish men have taken advantage of its ambiguity to enact laws, confer powers, and introduce practices which have injured the national life, and which are contrary to Christian social precepts and the British Constitution.

The history of the growth of the Constitution is bound up with the Englishman's struggle to prevent tyrants from depriving him of his rights. The inability of the Constitution and Common Law to protect the nation from the evils we have brought forward in this book has been largely due to the failure to record in modern documents the rights and duties of the people and their rulers. The nearest approach to a written Constitution is, as A. V. Dicey, K.C., says in his *Law of the Constitution*,

"... the celebrated 39th Article of the Magna Carta which should be read in combination with the Declaration of the Petition of Right [suspended for the duration of the war.— Author] ... these enactments (if such they can be called) are rather records of the *existence* of a right than statutes which confer it Individual rights are the basis, not the result, of the Law of the Constitution."

Rule by Common Law has been usurped by the Cabinet, which, as Sir John Simon says,

"has greater power than the House of Commons It is impossible to find the slightest allusion to the Cabinet in any Act of Parliament ever passed ... the title of Prime Minister is even to-day unknown to law. But nowhere is there to be found an individual with powers so great."

It is the Inner Council of British peoples throughout the world; and the arbiter of their destinies. It is the Sovereign in Commission which has taken to itself almost the entire power of the House of Commons; which has violated Common Law and justice, and has endangered national security and well-being by giving preference to private interests in a manner no king would have dared to have done. We have no effective means of calling it to account for, as Mr. Dicey says:

"Its principles and its constitution are not fixed by any rule of practice. It keeps no record of its proceedings The relation of an individual minister to the Cabinet, and the Cabinet to its head and creator, the Premier, are things only known to the initiated."

The inner activities are as much a mystery as the functions and powers of the Secret Cabinet of the

Bank of England.

The British Constitution fails to protect our rights and liberties because, as Sir John Simon pointed out during a lecture in Paris in 1935:

"Strictly speaking there is no British Constitution at all. Parliamentary forms necessary to repeal Magna Carta are exactly the same as the Parliamentary forms for putting a dog in quarantine."

Need more be said as to the necessity for having a written Constitution of Supreme Common Law, the existence of which politicians cannot deny and which will prevent the rights and liberties of the people from being taken from them by a procedure as simple as that of removing an inconvenient dog? We have had the experience of "our intangible bulwark of liberty" being swept away quite recently by the Emergency Powers Act with but scarcely a dissent in the House of Commons. Rule by the precepts of the ancient Common Law would have given our legislators greater powers than the Emergency Powers Act, and would have maintained many of the liberties denied to-day. If the spirit of the Common Law had prevailed Parliament would not have failed to have broken the financial and commercial monopolies which to-day hinder our war effort by holding up the production of war materials.

The rules which regulate the conduct of the sovereign power of the Ministry are merely conventions of the Constitution, and consist of functions, understandings, habits, and practices which cannot be enforced by law. They are only constitutional moralities, and as such can be ignored, or changed to suit the convenience of the financial overlords who dictate the business of Parliament. It has been asserted that no Act of Parliament is valid if it is opposed to the dictates of private or public morality. This is still claimed to remain the intention of the British Common Law and Constitution, but no modern judge would listen to a barrister who argued that a statute was invalid because it was immoral, or because it violated the Christian conscience or the will of the electorate.

Unless the British people awake to their peril and take action they will lose what vestige of the rights and liberties they possess, even the right of the British subject to seek damages and redress for breaches of the law, as was urged by Viscount Simon, the Lord Chancellor, before the Select Committee on Crown Offices on June 19, 1941, when he sought the abolition of the right of the "common informer."

When Common Law is made supreme any single British subject can repeal any legislation and check any public or private action which violates it. But to ensure rule by popular consent further reforms in the Constitution will be required, by which the people may give their consent to, or reject, statutes, plans, or policies designed to put the Law into operation.

Chapter Seven

"Your 'Educated' Cause Shame, Terror, and Disgrace"

*None plead for the right;
None decides for the truth;
They trust upon trick and false speech; conceive
Mischief and bring forth deceit;
Their products make nothing but wrong in their hands.
Their feet run to evil and haste to shed innocent blood.
Their genius a contrivance of crime,—
In their haunts are destruction and ruin.
They know no path of Peace;
No justice is found in their trades.
They distort their own roads*

And all who travel them never know peace.—Isaiah.

To ensure that common consent shall prevail, Common Law Councils should be established in all political constituencies, where the public can hold "watch and ward" over all legislation and commercial and political activities. These public assemblies would bring Parliament into regular touch with public opinion. They should be impartial in composition and free from Ministerial control and the influence of political parties. They should be so constituted as to be able to ascertain the measure of public opinion, make known its results, and bring the influence of the electorate to bear upon our legislators. Such an institution should be able to tell the Government definitely and clearly its verdict, and be able to enforce it.

We have outgrown the idea that a political contest is to give unlimited authority to our political representatives. It is the right of the people to make known the principles upon which their lives shall be governed and it is the duty of M.P.s to carry out the technical details to put them into operation.

The function of these assemblies would be to investigate all local and national evils and proposed legislation, and to test them by the precepts of the Common Law, and if they did not conform with them to take such public action as may be necessary to check the offending practice or legislation.

A further function would be to test the statements of our legislators. It is a vital necessity to national security and public well-being that our legislators shall make their public statements in accordance with truth and actual facts. Public memory is so short that it may be necessary to remind the reader of certain political statements and by their example demonstrate the urgent need of means to ensure political honesty and efficiency. If this is not done the British people will lose the peace as effectively as if they had lost the war.

It seems inconceivable that there are questions of conduct and character of M.P.s which cannot be impartially investigated by any committee of the House of Commons; that a Minister, for instance, by his incompetence or deliberate knavery might allow, or cause to develop, an international situation which would plunge his country ill-armed and unprepared into war with a powerful nation, and still be allowed to retain office in the Cabinet.

The increasing immoral force of the party system in England and throughout the British Empire has broken all bounds of honest conduct. Our Parliament is supreme in all matters of good and evil, but the art of good government has almost been forgotten, while evil practices are becoming almost time-honoured in the British Constitution. For the integrity of the nation and the well-being of the people the actions of our legislators must be checked by Supreme Law and by an informed and active democracy.

The Prime Ministers Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Baldwin saw no dishonesty in the continuance of an international policy which they knew would plunge England and the world into war; nor did they care that, if they must pursue such a policy, something more than an increase in naval strength was needed. They betrayed the general good will and desire for peace by aggravating international distrust which every year brought us nearer to war, with the result that their deceit caught them in the cleft stick of a public demand for limitation of armaments and inevitable war.

In 1935 Mr. MacDonald saw no inconsistency in promising an air force equal to that of Germany and at the same time promising "no great armaments."

A year later "honest" Mr. Baldwin admitted the urgent necessity for rearmament to protect ourselves in the war developing from a faulty international policy, yet fought a re-election on the popular cry for disarmament.

"I cannot think," he said, "of any charge which would have made the loss of the election, from my point of view, more certain. We won the election by a large majority."

His colleagues and the Government benches accepted without protest this piece of dishonesty.

Similar political dishonesty resulted in the British Empire being inadequately armed when it defied the world's mightiest engine of destruction. It was a foregone conclusion that our armies would suffer defeat in Norway, France, Greece, Crete, and elsewhere.

If there had been public forums, or Common Law Councils, to make known the true state of affairs to the people, what would have been the popular reaction? Would the electorate have been capable of judging on the issues which led to the declaration of war? If they had had the opportunity to choose between an international policy which led to war or an economic policy based on friendly co-operation between nations, what would their decision have been?

The electorate would have protested against a policy likely to lead to war and at the same time leave the nation ill-armed and unprepared.

The Government knew that Germany was creating the most colossal war machine the world has known, but the Ministers deliberately lied to the House of Commons and to the nation.

The press was silent.

Mr. Baldwin said: "My lips are sealed. But if these troubles were over I would make such a case that no man would go into the lobby against me." What did he mean? He must have meant that he and his colleagues were responsible for economic chaos at home and war abroad and for allowing their country's defences to fall into such disrepair that the nation was perilously close to defencelessness.

The people were fooled.

By all means let us have public forums where the people can be told the truth. Cut away all political deceit, secret diplomacy, treason, and betrayal for private interest, so that we can live and act like Christians in peace and prosperity with our fellows.

Great Britain could have led the world in peace or war. In 1927 Colonel Pile strikingly demonstrated to the Government the potentialities of mechanised warfare, but his new military arm was broken up in 1928. Major-General Fuller was the army's most prominent exponent of mechanised warfare; his brilliant tactics were adopted by Hitler, but he was retired by our statesmen in 1933!

Brigadier Hobart blazed the trail which the German armoured divisions followed with such dramatic success, but he was only allowed to use his great abilities in the Home Guard. Major-General Brooke, whose great ability made him the natural choice for carrying out the reorganisation of our anti-aircraft defences, was given the post of developing mechanised forces for which he had inadequate knowledge!

Public memory is short because political propaganda and Press sensationalism is deliberately contrived to make it forget, except when it suits their purpose to make it remember. The confusion caused by the deception and the stupid blunders of our statesmen and certain members of our civil services are calculated to deceive and confuse the wisest of men, and will continue to do so until democracy is provided with the means of obtaining correct information on these issues.

When the public woke up and realised the danger of war our statesmen adopted a new policy. Let us take five men whose dangerous deceptions would have been immediately revealed and checked by the suggested Common Law Councils.

Sir Samuel Hoare, a Cabinet Minister for eighteen years, three times Air Minister, also First Lord of the Admiralty and Foreign Secretary, said in October 1938, when he knew that our defences were totally inadequate:

"We are perfectly prepared to have our record examined as to our defence preparations. We are determined to fill up the gaps which have shown themselves in our defensive armaments."

In February 1939, when certain sections of the public called him to account and criticised the

absence of speedy rearmament, he said, "These jitterbugs ... these panic-mongers, are doing the greatest harm." In March 1939 he gave the nation this lie:

"The long period of preparation has come to an end and the results are now emerging with ever-increasing effect. I am confident that we could not be defeated in a short war by any knock-out blow, and that in a long war our almost inexhaustible resources will ensure the victory."

He made this statement when he must have known that our preparations were insufficient, and that in the event of war our expeditionary force must leave our shores insufficiently armed and lacking the necessary support of aeroplanes and tanks. He helped to cause the failure in Norway and the Dunkirk debacle; the "jitterbugs and panic-mongers" would have prevented the defeats.

Sir Kingsley Wood, appointed Air Minister in May 1938 and in 1940 succeeded by Sir Samuel Hoare, was equal to his successor in deceiving the public. "This year we shall have a record year," he said in 1939. "We are becoming more powerful in the air every day." A month later he said: "By the end of this year production of aircraft will be 400 per cent. higher than was anticipated a year ago for twelve months hence." When the twelve months had gone by he said:

"We have been also engaged in preparing that further great expansion of strength which we know will be required. I therefore take the view with some confidence that even on a numerical basis the output of aircraft now accruing to us and to France is to-day in excess of that of Germany."

These are the words of a man who failed the nation. To-day, to our cost, we know that this statement was untrue.

In January 1935 Mr. Neville Chamberlain said:

"If we are to make our contribution to the general sense of security in Europe, we must at all events be sufficiently armed to be able to do so."

Two years later he said:

"I must frankly admit that progress is not yet as fast as I should like, but it soon will be. A great deal of preparatory work still remains to be done. I am glad to say that this preparatory stage is now practically completed and that production has begun in earnest."[\[17\]](#)

In December 1937, when seventy-five per cent. of our young men who tried to enlist in H.M. Forces were found to be unfit for military service owing to ill-health, resulting from years of unemployment and consequent malnutrition[\[18\]](#) he said:

"The country is strong. She is getting stronger every day. Our strength makes it easier for us to appeal to others to join us in applying our common sense to these problems."[\[19\]](#)

In March 1938 he said:

"The almost terrifying power that Britain is building up has a sobering effect on the opinion of the world."[\[20\]](#)

Perhaps he was referring to the shadow factories capable of turning out thousands of aeroplanes per week which had been built and fitted with costly up-to-date machinery, but were destined after twelve months of war not to turn out a single machine or engine.

In 1938, after Munich, he said: "This is Peace in our time." After Munich he said: "I bring you Peace with honour. Out of this nettle, danger, we pluck this flower, safety." He also said: "I have no hesitation in saying, after the personal contact I established with Herr Hitler, that he means what he

says."

On December 31, 1938, reviewing the events of 1938, he said:

"A year marked by such underlying goodwill is one which leaves behind it no grounds for pessimism."

In March 1939, after Czechoslovakia had been seized by Hitler, he said:

"I cannot believe anything of the kind which has now taken place was ever contemplated by any of the signatories to the Munich agreement."

On April 3, 1940, Mr. Neville Chamberlain made the most stupid statement of all:

"One thing is certain," he said, "Hitler missed the bus."

A month later he discovered that he had missed the bus himself and Hitler's armies were overrunning Denmark and Norway, and defeating our ill-armed and ill-prepared troops wherever they met. When an indignant nation had ousted him from the office of Premiership he interviewed representatives of the American Press, June 29, and had the audacity to blame the British workmen for the defeat. He insinuated that they had been slacking in the task of producing aeroplanes and bombs:

"I always knew [he is reported to have said] that you could not get absolutely one hundred per cent. effort in Britain until the bombs started falling Every workman suddenly realised that on his individual efforts depended quick necessary supplies."

Lord Caldecote, one-time Sir Thomas Inskip, a personal friend of Mr. Chamberlain, was appointed for the task of co-ordinating the defences of the nation in the greatest war upon which we have ever embarked and against the most powerful enemy we have ever known. He failed in his task so was made Secretary for the Dominions. In March 1936, when Britain's military genius had been thrown on the scrap heap, he was given the task of co-ordinating our defences, he said:

"I may say, with all sincerity, that it never occurred to me that I was likely to be asked to accept these responsibilities. Nor did it ever occur to me—I can say this in all seriousness—that I would ever be able to discharge these duties even if they were offered to me I do not claim to be a superman."

In May 1936 he complained: "Sometimes I do not feel very well equipped for my office." In 1937 he hoped "we shall never again as a nation make the mistake of allowing our defences to fall into a state of disrepair, which I am afraid was the case up to two years ago."

On October 12, 1938, he said: "Mr Churchill has spoken about Ethelred the Unready. There is nothing unready about the Air Force ... our citizens do not want to be hoodwinked, I believe that we have at last got on the road to friendly relations with Germany."

In December 1938 we were told: "Britain possesses the best anti-aircraft defences in the world": and on August 3, 1939, we were assured that, "War to-day is not only not inevitable, but is unlikely. The Government have good reason for saying that."

Lord Baldwin, when he was Prime Minister as Mr. Stanley Baldwin, invented a slogan of "safety first" whilst depriving the nation of safety.

"No power on earth [he said in 1932] can protect the man in the street from being bombed This is a question for the young men, far more than it is for the old men. When the next war comes and European civilisation is wiped out ... then do not lay the blame on the old men. Let them (the young) remember that they principally and they alone are RESPONSIBLE for the terrors that have fallen on the earth."

In this speech he set an example for Mr. Chamberlain to follow eight years later, by shifting the blame for his mistakes and guilty administration on to the shoulders of the general public he had deceived and lulled into a false sense of security. The utterance was made callously. His policy made for war, yet he helped to deprive the nation of the means of adequate defence against attack. His policy and that of his associates had through the years been bringing the nation nearer to the holocaust of war. The writer was responsible for a quarter of a million people signing a statement protesting against his policy. Tens of thousands of other people protested, yet he denied responsibility. He was willing to sacrifice deliberately, or through stupidity or ignorance which singled him out as being unfit for his high office, the thousands of young men whom he blamed for his own mistakes.

In March 1934 he boasted that: "This Government will see to it that in air strength and air power this country shall no longer be in a position inferior to any country within striking distance of our shores."

In November 1934 he continued his policy of deception: "It is not the case that Germany is rapidly approaching air equality with us. Her real strength is not fifty per cent. of our strength in Europe to-day."

In May 1935 he said: "No Government in this country could live a day that was content to have an Air Force of any inferiority to any country within striking distance of our shores."

But on October 31, 1935, whilst hunting with the hounds he endeavoured to run with the hares and said in a message to the Peace Society: "Do not fear or misunderstand when the Government say they are looking to our defences. I give you my word that there will be no great armaments."

In 1936 he said: "Now supposing I had gone to the country and had said: 'Germany is rearming; we must rearm.' Does anyone think that this pacific democracy of ours would have rallied to that cry? Not at that moment."

Then he made the admission which we have already quoted, that he had sacrificed the safety of the nation for party expediency in order to win an election for his followers.

These political blunders were definitely not caused by ignorant men. They knew what they were doing. They deliberately sacrificed human life for party interests, prestige, and high office. Any one of these blunders, lies, or deceptions if made known to the people at the time would have been instantly condemned.

Chapter Eight

Public Watch and Ward

In your Common Assembly:

"Teach My just Laws: free those who are wrongfully

Bound, loosen your slaves from their yoke, seek

Out and free the oppressed, remove every wrong,

Give to the famished food, those whom you see naked clothe.

Then your light would break forth like the morn,

And before you your bounty would march."—Isaiah.

Many volumes could be written on the need for the establishment of Common Law Councils as a means of checking our statesmen and guarding their conduct. The examples which we have given should be sufficient.

As Mr. Churchill stated in May 1936: "The use of recriminations about the past is to enforce effective action at the present."

At the end of hostilities the lack of a strong, clear social purpose may fatally affect reconstruction. The promise of a new world order of justice, prosperity and lasting peace will remain a wishful dream unless there is a large body of people whose hearts and minds are possessed by the vitalising liberating conviction about true social purpose and the nature of spiritual and human values.

Theories and schemes which ignore the basic principles of human need and spiritual purposes have too long confused and divided public opinion. If we are going to have the promised reforms and build a better civilisation we must make up our minds as to the meaning and purpose of life. It will be a vital matter to the future peace of the world whether our dominant social purpose is one which acknowledges and accepts human standards and values, or one which negates and suppresses them.

Spiritual and human values must be embodied in a national philosophy. They are contained in the Common Laws and Rules we have to put forward. Everyone must agree that the nation must be governed in accordance with the principles of honour, justice, and Christian worth. Let us then insist that these principles become the criterion of which all bills before Parliament and all public questions are judged, condemning all legislation or proposed legislation which omits or negates them. Human life must be considered and treated as sacred.

Our political leaders assure us that great changes will take place after the war. We want to know where those changes are going to lead us. If human need is not given first consideration nothing will save Western civilisation from bankruptcy and disaster. A revolution is needed; but that revolution must first take place in men's ideas and hearts. We must have courage to match our ideals. Idealists are only impractical when they do not bring their ideals to earth. We must avoid the error of reformers who seek to explain all history and humanity in economic terms instead of human values. Human values, which were emphasised so strongly in the Middle Ages, have been forgotten. Mankind adopted for its destruction the inhuman conception of the "economic man," a soulless theory which has sacrificed human life to the metaphysical abstraction of an economic theory. Both the material and the spiritual needs of man must be taken into account when rebuilding the new social order, economic security must be guaranteed to all men as their natural right and, what is more important, the human mind and spirit must be given freedom to expand.

The proposal that all legislation, laws, and social practices be publicly examined in the light of the simple Christian social principles of Common Law has been likened to the activities of the Courts Christian of the Middle Ages. These Courts sought to keep alive the Christian tradition of liberty and of social justice. They taught men that constant vigilance was the price they must pay for liberty and security. In those days laws expressed man's simple everyday needs and desires. Unlike the modern man, he was not confused by theories, schemes and policies, but based his laws on the reality of human values.

When an attempt was made to filch their rights they reasserted them in charters and new laws. Courts Christian examined social practices in the light of Christian values and condemned what did not conform with them. They made no claim to expert financial or economic knowledge, yet their efficiency was remarkable and their decisions devastating to those who sought to injure the individual or common life.

They were efficient because they devised no complicated laws likely to confuse the principle at stake, but took the fundamental requirements of life and applied them directly to legislation.

When merchants stood outside the villages and bought up the goods being taken to market, then sold them at inflated prices, no attempt was made to devise schemes to prevent the evil practice, or to establish the doubtful blessings of committees, such as modern Marketing Boards, to control the buying and selling of commodities. Instead, the practice was made illegal. There was no excuse, no prevarication, no possibility of one section of the community obtaining an advantage to the loss of another, and no method of circumventing the principle at stake. The forestallers were beaten simply by making a principle law. When an attempt was made to monopolise production or trade in a way detrimental to public well-being, such monopoly was made illegal. Similarly, the menace of usury

was effectively dealt with by making usury illegal, while the interests of the producer and the consumer were guaranteed by the establishment of the "just price."

The Industrial Revolution and complicated economic theories have destroyed the simplicity of social expression, of honest trade and laws.

This directness and simplicity and honesty in legal expression is contained in the principles which we propose shall become the Common Laws of Great Britain and also the criterion of judgment in the people's Common Law Councils, to ensure that all legislation, social practice, and public administration shall conform with them. Only by this means will national life develop in accordance with natural laws and on this sure foundation build a new and secure civilisation.

No honest man or woman will refuse to accept these fundamental laws. No politician can deliberately attack them, because they state expressly the claims for which they are supposed to stand. The denial of these principles would be the denial of democracy and everything politicians have boasted to be contained in our Constitution.

No Christian minister can refuse his support without denying the trust and the duties which he dedicated himself to honour when he was ordained as a minister of Christ.

Politicians and economists might protest that they know of no economic scheme by which these laws can be put into operation. Their protests will be unavailing.

As we have already pointed out, the task of a democracy is to lay down the principles which shall underlie all plans for reforms, and it is the duty of our legislators to express them in statute laws, and to discover the experts who will devise schemes to fulfil them. If they cannot devise the necessary reforms, we must make known the many economists and practical humanitarians who can.[\[21\]](#)

Common Law Councils would also train the people in civic and moral duty.

When analysing local and national evils, and proposed reforms from the basis of the Common Laws and Rules which we have proposed, common judgment would be assisted by supplementary tests which are generally accepted as governing the rights and the obligations of citizenship and the duties of legislators.

There are three tests of representative government: equality of rights, equality of taxation, freedom to come and go.

There are three things which require the common consent of the nation: the repeal of laws, introduction of new laws, and declaration of war.

There are three rights which are every man's inheritance: the right, wherever he is, to the protection of the State, equal privileges, and equal restrictions and obligations.

Every subject of the Realm has three natural rights, the refusal of which no law will justify: sufficiency of food, warmth and shelter, adequate education to develop his spiritual and intellectual attributes, and equal opportunities to use his abilities to develop his character, his craft, and his natural genius to enrich himself and the State.

There are three things which the State shall guarantee: security for life and limb, security for property, security for natural rights.

There are three things necessary for the security of the State, the safety of which depends upon public awareness and action: just administration of just laws, honest Parliament, national courage and morale.

There are three causes which ruin the State: national apathy, inordinate privileges, corruption of society.

There are three things necessary to preserve the solidarity of the foundations of the State: law,

peace, and co-operation.

There are three things necessary for harmony and national life: freedom for personal expression and initiative, respect for the State and its laws, respect for the sacredness of the human personality.

There are three things from which every subject is entitled to the State's protection: exploitation by others for private gain, faulty or injurious national economy, aggression.

There are three sacred things by which the Government and the people should bind themselves: love of God and of one's neighbour, perfection of the individual life by truth, love, and just dealing, personal responsibility for the progress and the perfection of the State.

There are three things obligatory on every subject to observe: knowledge of the Common Law, active interest in legislation and social practice, individual judgment of social and parliamentary practice in the light of the Common Law.

There are three things necessary to enable the citizen to live in accordance with the above precepts: they shall be defined in written law, shall be distinguished for their clearness and brevity, and shall be so simple in expression as to be intelligible to all men.

This ideal state of citizenship is not too high an aim.

In many towns in this country groups of citizens representing all classes and walks of life have met in their local Common Law Councils, or in the national People's Common Law Parliament, and demonstrated their ability on many occasions to analyse public action from the criterion of the proposed Common Law with the assistance of these precepts.

On every occasion there has been an amazing uniformity of decision. We have demonstrated again and again that, given the opportunity, the masses of our people assisted in this way will always judge correctly between right and wrong without hesitation.

We have demonstrated, times without number, that when men and women meet in these Councils they willingly leave behind political, religious, and class prejudices and unite to judge from the basis of simple and honest human rights and obligations.

These Councils are already in existence in various parts of the country and their members represent all manner of organisations which accept our modern expression of Common Law.[\[22\]](#) They are engaged in many activities whereby they assist the general public in their vicinity in solving the many problems which have arisen through war conditions. Though their war activities are many and varied, their main concern is to educate and mobilise public opinion in preparation for post-war reconstruction which will ensure lasting peace and security. Their task will be to examine every proposal put forward by Parliament to see that it conforms with the principles of common justice and human need.

The Common Law Councils will also be concerned with initiating proposals for reform.

In either case the Councils will recognise only two tests or limitations to any proposal. First, is the proposal in accordance with common justice and human need; and secondly, is it physically possible to carry out the proposal? Sectional or private interest will be disregarded in all decisions.

If a proposal is physically possible it will have to be made financially, economically, or politically possible.

There are many uses to which Common Law Councils can be put in preparing and in building a new world after the war.

It is generally known that pre-war economic and commercial conditions caused the sabotage of numerous inventions and discoveries which would have enhanced the security and increased the leisure of the individual and enormously enriched the State.

These inventions and discoveries cover every department of national life and knowledge.

Engineering, architectural and social science have never been free from the stranglehold of monetary limitations. Set free, the genius of the race would provide every conceivable need of humanity in abundance, and at the same time increase man's leisure so that his main activities may be turned to the development of his personality rather than that of earning a living.

Common Law Councils would make it their business to make known all inventions and discoveries which would nurture human life and demand their use for the national well-being.

The purpose of the People's Common Law Parliament (hereafter called the P.C.L.P.) is to bring a new spiritual and social purpose into the lives of the people; to raise all questions of the spiritual and physical well-being of the people above the level of party politics to that of true statesmanship; to establish government under Supreme Common Law and Referendum among the peoples of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The P.C.L.P. supports no technical scheme or policy of reform. It deals with basic Christian principles which underlie all schemes and reforms inspired by people of goodwill, and upon this basis seeks to unite all people irrespective of political and religious loyalties.

Its method is to open branches—Common Law Councils (C.L.C.)—in each constituency to provide an open forum for all organisations and for the general public. At each assembly Parliamentary questions and social evils will be examined from the basis of the Supreme Christian Common Law, Rules and Precepts laid down in this book. The findings of each assembly are submitted to the electorate in the form of a Referendum or a Resolution to be placed before the House of Commons to ensure that the principles involved shall be made effective by legislation. In the event of a Member of Parliament consistently ignoring the referendums of his constituency, the electorate will be called upon to elect a candidate at the next election who will work with his constituency and pledge himself to carry out the wishes of his electors as expressed in Assembly by referendum or by any other means adopted to ascertain public opinion.

The word "referendum" comes from Switzerland. In one sense it is used as meaning the principle that Bills should not become Acts of Parliament before they have been submitted to the vote of the electors and received the consent of the majority. The other sense in which we use it is for a matter brought up not by Parliament but by the people. For instance, there are many people who have ideas for reform; there are also many medical discoveries and treatments unknown or not made available to the public; there are inventions and discoveries which would make this country quite independent in its food supply—but there is no effective means of bringing these things before Parliament, or of breaking through the rings of vested interests which prevent their use.

The general public need not understand the political, economic, or technical aspect of any case, but the *principle* of what they seek to accomplish is a thing which all can understand. In this connection a referendum could be taken on the principles involved, insisting upon an examination of the practical possibilities of the reforms or discoveries. If they can be used for national benefit they shall be debated irrespective of any private interest which might oppose them.

There are certain fundamental ideas of right and wrong which all progressive people recognise. It is obviously morally wrong—and under the P.C.L.P. would become politically wrong—to destroy food, exploit people, and make law such things as the Means Test. Seeing all matters of national import in the light of the principles made law by the P.C.L.P., all people would be in a position to judge and instruct their M.P.s by means of these referendums. That one man is more educated or more intelligent than another is a moot point when dealing with principles which could be understood by school-children. All the public would require to know could be explained to them by the P.C.L.P. or by their local C.L.C.

If a reform was required it would not be necessary for the people to discuss the technical details for putting it into operation. They would be provided with statistics showing that the nation's knowledge and productivity could provide the ability and the materials necessary for the reform. The people would be taught to demand that whatever is morally right, necessary, and physically

possible shall be provided.

Parliamentary Bills and election programmes would receive careful scrutiny. The possibility of public misunderstanding or political dishonesty would be obviated. For instance, if a Bill or political programme seemed to promise, or actually promised, "That every man, woman, and child shall be entitled to sufficient food, warmth, shelter, medical attention, education, etc.," its true worth would be revealed to the public by the local C.L.C. Man has always been entitled to these necessities—but that has not guaranteed his receipt of them. The P.C.L.P. would then send out a Referendum through which the people would instruct the Government or the political party to change the words "be entitled to" to "shall receive."

No one could gainsay the honesty of this suggestion and no M.P. would dare to reveal that there was no intention to carry out the promise by opposing the change in wording.

The political parties which have published their programmes for post-war reconstruction using such terms as "All nations shall have access to raw materials" are as guileful as the above example of a political statement. Nations, like men, have always had access to raw materials and markets, if they have the "money" to buy and are willing to compete with each other. No post-war programme will ensure world peace unless it is so designed that it guarantees national needs on the basis of human requirements, such as we propose in our International principles.

The use of a referendum is often opposed on the ground that people are too stupid to judge vital questions of national and international import.

The objection is guileful. Such problems, if they are put before the public at all, are invariably couched in misleading terms and legal phrases which (as the Rt. Hon. Lord Hewart, late Chief Justice, has said) even our Members of Parliament do not understand. The P.C.L.P. will dispel the miasma of Whitehallese; will insist upon legal documents which can be easily understood; and create an informed public opinion through its forums, referendums, and literature. Based upon principles, the judgment of the people would be more sound and honest than those of the majority of present-day Ministers.

Let us now consider what would happen when the Government proposed to pass a Bill into law, first assuming that the eight Principles have been incorporated in the British Constitution as the Supreme Common Law.

The Bill would first be considered by the P.C.L.P. The electorate would be invited to attend the local C.L.C., where the objects of the Bill would be explained. It would be the business of the P.C.L.P. to see that the Bill was in accordance with the Supreme Law with which we have been dealing. The referendum would then be drawn up by the Referendum Committee and passed on to the electorate. The referendum would contain only the salient objects of the Bill. The people would then be made fully conversant with the Bill and any of its defects, and would be asked whether they wished to give their assent.

The referendum would, when the occasion warrants, be drawn up in the form of an Assent and/or Enabling Act. It would give the Government permission to make the Bill law, and also state what must be accomplished. The Government would be held responsible for any failure to obtain the object in view and would be required to revise its methods or plans for putting the law into operation until the desired results are obtained.

Neither the P.C.L.P. nor the electorate, when acting in conjunction with it, need decide upon the details of the new law or reform, or in any way interfere with the policies of political parties beyond stating the principles under which they would be governed.

The right to call for a referendum will not be that of the Government alone or the P.C.L.P. Local Common Law Councils will have the right to question any social practice. If by a majority vote the question calls for some reform of social policy a referendum will be placed before the electorate. This would enable the public to take the initiative in calling for any needed reform. Such

referendums may be local or national, and would be directed to the County or County Borough Councils; Borough, Urban District, Rural District, and Parish Councils accordingly.

The People's Common Law Parliament can become an established part of our constitution simply by recognition, practice, or function, and is, indeed, at present in the process of such establishment.

The rules, regulations, methods of procedure, and the objects of the P.C.L.P. given in the Appendix are an outline of an organisation which is actually practising the constitutional innovations we wish to establish. The object of its originators is to set up Common Law Councils and through them to educate, mobilise, and direct public opinion until the laws and institutions they practise become part of the British Constitution.

The great distinction between local political party machinery and branches of the P.C.L.P. will be that the latter will not represent any party or section of society, but will work for the well-being of the nation as a whole, and make the voice of the electorate the decisive factor in all decisions, and upon all issues.

It is a fact that electors to-day cannot override Parliamentary decisions because political parties have taken care to ensure that no effective means shall exist. The P.C.L.P. will rectify this. On purely moral grounds it will have an enormous influence on the Sovereign Parliament, because such a body of high-principled citizens, representing the nobler aspirations of their fellow-men, cannot be ignored in the face of the publicity which will be given to their representations.

Chapter Nine

A Personal Security Enabling Act

*Ho! All you thirsty come on to the waters;
And you, without money, come buy corn and eat!
Come! buy corn without cash, wine and milk
Without cost!*

*Why should you pay money, and not have the bread?
And why should you labour and never be fed?
Attend to and hear Me, and eat of the best,
And nourish your lives on the richest of food!—Isaiah.*

Here is an example of how Supreme Common Laws could be put into effect by means of a supplementary law in the form of an Enabling Act. Neither this Act nor the suggestions for carrying it out are put forward here as a policy of the People's Common Law Parliament. We are only concerned that plans, emanating from the Government or any other source, for post-war reconstruction must fulfil the requirements of our modern expression of Common Law. The following example is given to show how a public demand for principles to be made law can be made to guarantee any desired reform without entering into the details of its application. The spirit of the Supreme Common Law is that every man, woman, and child shall receive a sufficiency of the necessities of life and that it is their right that the State shall provide them. Most reformers accept this principle as the object of their reforms, though they may quarrel over methods of carrying them out.

The Personal Security Act is designed to make this general Law operative in society. It could be debated in the Common Law Councils, then be submitted to the people in the form of a referendum for acceptance, rejection, or amendment.

"All able-bodied British subjects, of both sexes, on or after the age of eighteen years, may, as a continuation of their education, join a Vocational Training Guild preparatory to entering a

Commonwealth organisation for a period of not less than eight years, to produce with a minimum of labour and a maximum of efficiency sufficient goods and services to provide the whole population with the Necessities of Life, and to distribute them free without sale or purchase to every subject of the Realm."

This Enabling Act seems simple, but the benefits flowing from it are manifold. When considering it in the Common Law Councils the members would be asked to work out for themselves its prodigious advantages before beginning their customary hunt for disadvantages and, whether sceptical or enthusiastic, neither to accept it blindly for its dazzling promise nor to dismiss it summarily for any real or imagined difficulties of putting it into operation.

The sponsors would maintain that in the form presented the Act would:

- (a) preserve the best elements of socialism and capitalism;
- (b) abolish poverty by providing the basic necessities of life free to everybody;
- (c) provide a framework from which transition could be made to further social development; and
- (d) in all these points conform to the principles of Supreme Common Law.

Having established the validity of the Act in the light of the Principles of the P.C.L.P. the sponsors would be free to expand their proposal and the members to discuss its implications and effect on the community.

1. The sponsors would show that in its proposed form the Act would solve the problem of unemployment. Unemployment Benefits, the Means Test, Widows' Pensions, Old Age Pensions, and costly Social Services, and all forms of charity, would become unnecessary. Saving for a rainy day would become an anachronism of the age of economic fear. Women would receive economic emancipation.
2. The Act would enable young people to remain at school until the age of eighteen without becoming an economic burden to the parents, and afterwards take up their apprenticeship to be trained in their chosen vocation.
3. Each year fresh relays of young men and women would leave the Vocational Training Guilds to give their services in an industrial organisation. An endless flow of goods and services would leave their hands and be distributed over the entire population to provide everybody with all the Necessities of Life.
4. The organisation of Young Workers in the public service, together with their leaders and older volunteers, would be called the "Commonwealth," to distinguish it from the national activities where goods and services are produced, bought, and sold for money.
5. Having completed their patriotic public service and earned their economic independence whilst still young, they would graduate from apprenticeship to Full Citizenship. Thenceforward they would be free of all economic obligations to society and would receive from those who had replaced them in the Commonwealth a full supply of goods and services constituting the Necessities of Life.
6. Having earned economic emancipation they would be free to do as they wished with their lives. They may pursue the activities of commerce outside the activities of the Commonwealth—that is, work for a wage or salary. The Full Citizen may engage in the pursuit of fame, leisure, sport, trade, culture, pleasure, or any other aim that attracts him or her.
7. Commerce would be free to produce and to trade in motor-cars, aeroplanes, gramophones,

wireless sets, cameras, silks, tobacco, fine furniture, antiques, gems, furs, foreign travel, and a thousand and one things. Some men would work for profit, but they would not impair anyone's security. Others would work for wages, but as the money would not be required for necessities it would constitute a cultural or luxury income. Some would go back to the Commonwealth as leaders and technical experts, where they would receive a salary. Others would follow a profession of the fine arts. Everyone would have equal opportunity.

8. Money would be used in commerce to produce and to trade in luxuries, and in raw materials and surplus manufactured goods and services over and above those needed by the Commonwealth to provide the Necessities of Life for the population, and for export.

9. Money would not be used in any activity of the Commonwealth. Necessities would not be bought and sold; they would be free to all, not in money, but in actual goods and services, *i.e.* food, clothing, shelter, light, warmth, domestic utensils, medical treatment, travel, and transport. The only exceptions would be the salaries of the directors, teachers, etc., and pocket-money for the workers.

10. These necessities would constitute the social inheritance earned by the Full Citizen whilst in the Commonwealth. He alone would be entitled to them; he could not be robbed of them; they could not be transferred, sold, or given away. Business failure or trade depression would not endanger his security; since this would be practised voluntarily on his part and would have no connection with his inheritance.

11. The organisation of the Commonwealth could be on a voluntary basis. All British citizens would be given the opportunity to work in the service of the State for eight years to earn lifelong security.

12. Some young people would wish to be free to work for a salary at an occupation outside the sphere of the Commonwealth. There would be no reason for not granting this freedom of choice so long as there were sufficient volunteers to produce the Necessities of Life. Arrangements would also be made to enable people to enter the Commonwealth at a later age than eighteen years. Everything should be done to provide for individual freedom of choice, relying upon youth's loyalty and sense of public duty to serve the common good. Patriotism would have a new meaning. When any gaps in the ranks of the Commonwealth threatened to hinder the production and distribution of necessities, men would flock to the public service to fill the breach. The call to the colours would be to preserve life and security, not to destroy them.

13. It would be claimed that this dual form of society would be based upon the ideals of true social service, with its duties, freedom, and absolute security; and the variety and benefits of normal commercial activities without their evils. It would establish a planned and efficient national organisation for the production and distribution of the Necessities of Life without the evils of bureaucracy; and commerce without the exploitation of human life for private profit.

14. In the Commonwealth an army of strong, lively, and well-trained young workers (and those who wish to offer their services, say at the age of twenty-one or later, because of the need for a longer period of vocational training, or for some other reason), with their teachers, technical experts, planners, and directors would provide the nation with its essential goods and services.

15. Progress would be made possible by using up-to-date machinery and organisation and by the nation's able-bodied citizens working in one grand concerted effort. Hundreds of inventions and discoveries and high-speed machinery now awaiting use would be utilised by the Commonwealth organisation, and would not (as now) be held back for lack of capital or be bought up or shelved by firms to prevent their rivals using them. The waste, confusion, competition, graft, and corruption of our anarchic industries would cease. Production would be organised on a scientific and efficient scale. The workers would multiply output a thousandfold by performing the normal day's work of six hours which would be expected of them under any form of society, and earn full citizenship and lifelong security after eight years.

16. School training would cease to prepare Youth merely to earn a livelihood—this would be a

function of the Commonwealth. The purpose of education required by our principles of Common Law would be to train Youth in citizenship, to awaken and to develop its latent genius, and to discover what each individual can do best and to make that his or her life-purpose, enriching both the life of the individual and the community. Without the care of seeking to fit Youth for a livelihood, education would train him or her to live nobly, to develop character and individual life to its fullest, and fit him to use to the best advantage the endless opportunities which the new form of society would offer.

When the sponsors had thus outlined the objects of the Act, and the benefits it would confer, some people might feel that the Act should make it obligatory upon all young citizens to serve their apprenticeship in the Commonwealth before entering into commerce. Others might prefer the freedom of choice for which the Act provides. Some might object to the dual form of society which allows work for profit to remain. In this case the President of the Council would remind the members that the Act should be considered in its relations to our Principles, which when made Law would prohibit the making of profit at the loss or injury of another. Also the sponsors would point out that under the Act no one could profit by the production or distribution of the Necessities of Life. Tariffs, private monopoly, foreign entanglements, and political interference would cease to endanger the people's security—the Supreme Common Law, Constitutional Rules, and the international Principles and Personal Security Act would abolish these evils. Financial exploitation, greed, the lust for power, banking rates of interest and usury, trade booms and slumps, inflation and deflation, and the whole of the iniquitous practices of the financial system would cease to gamble with man's life—his necessities. No man or group of men would have power by their commercial activities to injure their fellows or the nation. These explanations would, no doubt, cause the objections to be withdrawn.

One of the first problems of reformers is to ensure that poverty shall be abolished and that the element of injurious competition and profit shall be removed from the production and sale of necessities. To-day traffic in human life is (supposed to be) forbidden by Law; traffic in human necessities—which amounts to the same thing—would be abolished by the Personal Security Act.

This Act suggests a method of introducing a great reform with a minimum of dislocation.

After full discussion and clarification of the proposed Act a referendum would be taken. On receiving popular consent the Act could pass into Law in its original form. If, however, any of the above objections were revealed, the necessary changes could be made by alteration or amendment to the Act. Or popular opinion might agree that the required changes be made on notice being given from the C.L.C. after another referendum had been taken, when the general reform had been in operation for a trial period. The success of the plan having been demonstrated, it might be decided that further spheres of production and distribution be taken over by the Commonwealth.

At all stages, the operation of the Act and further developments or changes would be subject to close examination in the Common Law Councils and in Sovereign Parliament, where close co-operation would be attained through the Members comprising the Referendum Bloc. Public apathy and political incompetence would be replaced by constructive criticism and informed and enlightened enterprise, at once sensible of caution and appreciative of initiative.

At any moment the public could require further revision or reforms by referendums, without the necessity for a political campaign or waiting five or more years for a change of Government.

Under the watchfulness of the Councils, machinery would be set up when necessary to deal with any individual hardships or local dislocations or anomalies arising from the incidence of the Act.

The proposed scheme having passed the test of the Supreme Common Law principles and obtained the people's consent, the constant vigilance of the C.L.C. would guard against the possibility of its application in any way or at any time defeating its original purpose.

In the same way, if at any time, or in any change of circumstances, its repeal or revision were

deemed desirable, this would be discussed in Council and be accepted or rejected by consent of the people on referendum.

We have endeavoured to give, without being too tedious, an idea of the People's Common Law Parliament and Councils in action as an integral part of the British Constitution. The objection might be raised that the people have not sufficient knowledge to decide on affairs of State. We would remind the reader that the people would only decide upon the principles and objects of reforms. We would also point out that the majority of Members of Parliament lack the necessary knowledge. Both the people and their rulers have to be taught to consider all questions from the basic principles of human welfare and by this means define the object and provide the frame of reference for reform. Then men and women selected for their integrity and ability could be appointed to work out the details of the reforms within the frame of reference thus provided.

There is naturally more in it than we can tell of here. It must be realised that many things which cannot be foretold would automatically evolve from the inauguration of this new constitutional institution, new social purpose, and new social order. When the basic troubles have been removed and the foundation of the new social and economic order laid, hundreds of minor problems would vanish or solve themselves, giving us a New Britain where the load of care, misery, fear of loss of livelihood or security would be lifted from the hearts of men and women. Peace and plenty would, as the Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill, has said, give strength and inspiration for the "Forward March of the Common People."

The Personal Security Act is a variation of a plan by Prestonia Mann Martin, in his book *Prohibiting Poverty* (New York). If such a plan was placed before the people it might not receive their consent or, on the other hand, it might receive public acclamation. This scheme is but one of many from which the people should have the opportunity of choosing. We sponsor no scheme, but follow the advice of the late King George V to the World Economic Conference (South Kensington, London) that "It cannot be beyond the wit of man to use the vast resources of the world to ensure the material progress of civilisation" and to bring peace and security to mankind.

Chapter Ten

A People's Social Reform Ministry

*Prepare it rest, prepare it peace:—
For peace it trusts in you.
Straight is the path for righteous men,
You smooth the good man's road:
Such, Lord, the path of Your decrees:—
We trust upon Your Name.
My soul reflects upon Your acts,—
To find Your teachings clear,
To teach the peoples of the World,
To purify the Earth.—Isaiah.*

The first essential to any reform is ways and means of arousing public support for its establishment. Planners like to feel that their schemes are sound and scientific. They often forget that a sound and scientific policy for arousing public support is also necessary. We must begin from the beginning and accept the masses of our people as they are; mostly incapable of judging whether a scheme is sound or unsound and easily led astray by political and party interests.

It is the bitter experience of reformers that detailed plans of reform, irrespective of their soundness or desirability, arouse political, intellectual, and religious divisions of opinion. Only simple principles of common need, right, and justice which underlie all desirable reforms can bring the

people together.

There must be a campaign to educate the public to think and to act and to judge between right and wrong. The people must be made morally and politically conscious. They have to be provided with a means of enabling them to speak and to act with the authority of an informed and united people in close touch with their political representatives.

The simple principles of human need which we seek to make supreme law, the Common Law Councils, and the Referendum System provide the means of doing this.

The policy of action which has been outlined requires the reformer to take up large-scale organising. In comparison the task of drawing up a plan of reform is easy and pleasant. Those who will take up the difficult and often disappointing task of awakening and educating public opinion, do so. Those who prefer something easier usually sit down in their chairs and plan.

Scarcely a week goes by without someone calling at our office with a book he has written on social reform or representing an organisation advocating a plan. They all invite us to adopt their plan in preference to others. Almost without exception we find they have shirked the greater problem of leading humanity from its present condition of ignorance, inertia, and dissension to the point where it is awakened and united in sufficient numbers to cause a reform to be put into operation.

We don't ask you to accept the Personal Security Plan, or any other plan, but the principles of common justice which underlie it. If you are interested in plans or in developing reforms which conform with our principles, then help us to establish our Social Reform Ministry and work quietly in the background until the public is ready for you. There the pioneers of all the professions, arts, and sciences can meet to plan and clarify the details of reforms upon the foundation of the principles which unite us.

Apart from the tragedy of destruction, the war has given us a wonderful opportunity to begin again with a fresh start. When the Great Fire of London cleansed the ancient city of plague and its clutter of disease-ridden hovels, it gave Sir Christopher Wren the greatest opportunity any man could desire. He planned to raise a splendid London from the ruins of the old, with spacious squares, gardens and streets, and beautiful buildings. But Londoners' civic pride was overcome by greed and commercialism and he was forced to revise his plans. A better London arose, but not the noble city he would have built.

When the war is over statesmen will have a far greater opportunity—an opportunity which comes but once in a thousand years—not merely to rebuild a city but to raise a new political, economic, and social order from the dust of the old.

A Social Reform Ministry must be set up. It must contain men and women dedicated to future humanity. Our foolish rulers failed to give us prosperity and peace, and failed to arm us for the war brought upon the nation.

They must *not* be allowed to fail in preparing us for peace and reconstruction or we shall lose that peace as we lost the last one. Once they tossed aside the golden opportunity for reconstruction. We must see that this does not occur again.

Peace is more important than war. A Ministry must be set up now and it must contain men and women dedicated to the task of rebuilding for the security and happiness of man. It must have the finest brains at its disposal. In this country we have vast reserves of intellectual ability in social and political science, in engineering, architecture, education, medicine, and in all the arts and sciences. There are people of first-class ability, of lofty attainment, and integrity of purpose. Their arts are those of peace, not of war. Many are unknown to the public because the foolish, rushing, commercial world is only interested in the personal profit to be obtained by exploiting the genius of the race rather than in the gifts which could be given to the community.

There is room for them all in this Ministry whose effort will be wider, finer, and more lasting than any war can be. People who seek office by the power of money or by insidious wire-pulling, but

with no mental equipment or aptitude for the greater tasks of peace, must have no place in this Ministry. We need people who can and will plan for the happiness and security of man.

When this war is over hundreds of thousands of engineers, teachers, architects, and scientists thrown out of the Forces will be looking for work. This talent must not be wasted. Plans and maps must be prepared for rebuilding London and other great cities, and for garden-cities throughout the country. They must be given to our young architects with the instruction—build beautiful and healthy cities for the people.

Our educational system must be overhauled to abolish ignorance; to awaken in future generations the desire for fellowship and co-operation rather than competition; to help to replace social apathy with a natural response to the duties of citizenship. The new education must before all else teach men and women how to live; it must stimulate and encourage the latent genius in man and give it that direction which will seek an outlet in the service of man in enriching society. This new purpose in education is the only practical foundation upon which men can live together in harmony.

No class must be educated to be the master of another. Talent and ability will provide the natural leaders in all departments of life. Equal education and opportunity must be given to all. Our planners for the future of the world cannot afford to give anyone a position of authority and power merely on account of his birth, unless he also has the necessary qualifications. Such a pre-war attitude would be a reckless wastage of our country's intellectual resources and capacities. The new purpose in education extended to training in trades and commerce will cause men to find their own level and rise to their potential heights, and thus give the world a new aristocracy of service and achievement. The folly of the old system must go for ever.

Our Ministry must draw up the blue-prints of the new social and commercial order. It must call together those who produce the nation's food, clothing, the people's homes, and all the amenities of civilisation, and instruct them: "Here are forty-five million people who require so much food, clothing, housing, etc., of good quality. Produce the goods and the cost will be guaranteed."

The economist must be shown the plans: "Here are the producers and distributors ready to do their part. Your task is to devise a new monetary technique to finance production and to distribute the goods to the people who need them."

The blue-print of the new world must be designed with divine simplicity of purpose and with no other motive than to serve humanity and to give it that full secure life without which a noble race will never inhabit the earth.

The Members for our Ministry will not be found in Whitehall among the unimaginative minds of those who inhabit the Government departments of to-day, or among civil servants whose imagination has been deadened by many years of working under the dead-head bureaucracy which stultified their initiative and enthusiasm. Officialdom cannot be trusted to form our Ministry of the future, for it would be shackled by bureaucracy and the policy of the present economic order. Such has been the fate of the Brain Trust of Scientists which was brought into being to serve the war effort.

Our Ministry must be organised outside of political interference and receive directly from the people power to put its plans into effect.

The drawing up of plans without a process of putting them into effect is wasted effort and the cause of much disappointment and disillusionment. Our Common Law Parliament will provide the means of placing such plans before the people of every town and village and of arousing them to demand that they are put into effect.

Whilst we are engaged with the immediate task of building up public opinion, educating and directing it, the plans of experts can be prepared in readiness to be placed before the people in their Common Law Councils in the form of simple supplementary principles of reform. When the people have been taught to think they will enthusiastically discuss what experts have to say. At present,

most of them are incapable of thinking or of judging plans.

In our public activities let us stick to principles and not bog ourselves in endless intellectual argument. The great task before us—and it is a great and immediate opportunity—is to produce a psychological counter-offensive against the enemy by uniting our people on principles and insisting that they become Law to provide the foundation for a new world of personal security and freedom. We can place before the world an honest policy which will enable the national life of all nations to be evolved so that every individual obtains a more free, happy, and secure life than is possible in a totalitarian state.

Chapter Eleven

Will You Help?

*Has there ever been such a great event as this?
Or has there been heard its like?
A people who heard the Voice of God!
So keep his institutions,
That you may prosper, and your children after you.*—Deuteronomy. (The First Oration of Moses when he established the Law.)

We would finally say a word to those sceptics and cynics who would question the possibility of united public opinion. We appreciate their scepticism because history has shown us that people seem invariably unable to come together to correct unjust authority, for they stand too much in awe of that authority.

But there has been little enough to unite them—just a few promises which have not been fulfilled.

In the autumn of 1938, the founder of the People's Common Law Parliament called a small meeting with some friends. They lived in Coventry. There were six of them, and they organised and carried out the public activities outlined in the Foreword of this book. They were determined to put a Petition before the King. They drew up the principles given in this book. These were the laws upon which humanity should be governed. But there was more than that, for these principles were derived from the Magna Carta and the Petition of Right and were the recorded rights of all Englishmen.

That done, there arose the difficult question of obtaining the support of the people.

It was not nearly so difficult as had been imagined. So much is condemned before even the endeavour is made. There is only one thing the people always need—a leader—someone to start the idea.

In Coventry and other towns the people were not asked to support some movement or organisation with which they would never have any direct contact, and about which they would not hear any more. They were asked to support certain principles which should govern their lives; they were asked to support something which they understood and which would provide for their personal and intimate needs.

And the result of the experiment?

The support was colossal. If six people could accomplish so much, what would be the result of the loyal co-operation of a thousand active people? We leave it to the reader to judge, and to give or withhold his or her support.

To those of you who will help us we say: "You can do the same as the first half-dozen people." Form the nucleus of a Common Law Council, or offer service in one of the technical departments of the P.C.L.P. Get together where you can and mobilise public opinion. Defy the hindrance of the war,

for these things can be obviated.

If you are too indifferent to do these things, or too cynical, then at least help those who *are* constructive by holding a mind sufficiently open to realise possibilities. But that is not the spirit we need.

We must do things now. It is no good waiting until after the war. Sir Kingsley Wood in his Budget Statement on Monday, April 7, 1941, finished with:

"... I have tempered the full rigour of my proposals not only to ease present conditions by an expansion of the policy of restricting the increase of prices to a minimum, but also to arrange for post-war repayment *to meet the trials and difficulties after the war.*"

Lord Derby has told schoolboys that after this war there will be a commercial battle for world markets—"Fit yourself for the battle." We deprecate a return to the anarchy which plunged the world into its present orgy of slaughter. Are we fighting for the right to cut each other's throats, or for some more noble objective?

Having no clearly defined national purpose to enable them to distinguish between right and wrong, between fundamental justice and injustice, between a destructive or a constructive policy, the opinions of Government spokesmen are divided and confuse the public mind. It seems that on the one hand we are being prepared for no change in our destructive economic policy, whilst on the other hand we are advised to prepare for something new.

It is not difficult for *you* to choose between right and wrong. You *must* come with us and prevent a further repetition of history. It is vital that we organise NOW.

The forces of corruption which have caused this war and the last have been organised for years. They are still organised. At the end of the war they will immediately assert themselves to build their own fortunes and consolidate their power. The moneylender will reopen his offices in the City. Well, it is up to us, to you, to see that his offices remain empty.

It is for the ordinary man this time to determine whether the world shall again be at war in twenty years. We are "the ordinary man."

• • • • •

We wish to hear from you if you are with us. We know that war conditions dislocate most of our lives. But if you have something to offer in ability, ideas, or enthusiasm we wish to know you. You may find us at: The People's Common Law Parliament, 5, Endsleigh Place, London, W.C.1.

Appendix A

The Divine Origin of the British Common Law

*I teach you the constitutions and decrees
Which the EVER-LIVING commands you to practise.*

Guard them, and practise them;—

For they will make you wise and intelligent

In the eyes of the Peoples who hear of all

These constitutions, who will say:

'This is a wise and intelligent People—

This Great Nation!'

And what nation is so great as to possess

Institutions and just laws, like the whole of this

Law which I place before you to-day?—Deuteronomy. (The First Oration of Moses when he

established the Law.)

It is claimed, and not without justice, that the People's Common Law Parliament is reviving the Christian faith and the institutions of the British Constitution and of the Common Law, and is defending them. Its activities have caused many people to inquire into the origin of the British Common Law and have aroused an interest which this Appendix is intended to satisfy, possibly to stimulate.

There is not space to deal exhaustively with the subject. Only an outline can be given, but sufficient to demonstrate how our Common Law has been handed down to us from the dim past of early human history, finding its highest expression in the social precepts of the Christian faith, precepts which gave birth to the democracies of the world.

The war which began in the year 1914, and which has never yet ceased, saw the crash of many European empires and thrones. It denoted the death-agonies of the Old World Order, including autocracy and pseudo-democracy. Both were discredited throughout the world—one for its subjection of human life to a pagan order and the other for its inefficiency.

Neither autocracy nor pseudo-democracy is the real cause of the poverty, misery, unemployment, war, the ugliness and chaos brought to a beautiful world of plenty. The cause lies far deeper than mere systems. Systems spring from ideas. Beneficial and humanitarian systems spring from ideals. Humanity has been destroying itself by its own dialectic for setting up man without a moral guide, with the result that he has been negating himself. He has affirmed paganism and denied Christianity.

Without God, or if the reader would prefer it, without a high moral code, man and his systems go to the devil. This danger was realised by our forefathers. Therefore their customs and rules of conduct (which gave us the main body of our Common Law) were practised to establish a code of social and individual life based on the Divine Laws revealed by God.

Many well-known authorities could be quoted to confirm this statement. Blackstone, the eminent authority on jurisprudence, says of the Common Law:

"This law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God Himself, is, of course, superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe in all countries and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original. This has given manifold occasion for the benign interposition of divine Providence, which, in compassion to the frailty, the imperfection, and the blindness of human reason, has pleased at sundry times and in divers manners, to discover and enforce its laws by an immediate and direct revelation. The doctrines thus delivered are called the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the Holy Scriptures."

In these days, when few people read and less understand the New or the Old Testament, it is not generally known that the Bible contains a system of economics and social life which in comparison makes ours look cumbersome and foolish.

People often say that we have tried everything but Christianity. What do we mean by the way of life which we loosely describe as Christian? Christ came to fulfil a system of Laws which can be found in its completeness in the Old Testament. It is a system of economics more practical than anything yet devised by man.

The statement often heard that the Sermon on the Mount cannot become practical politics reveals abysmal ignorance of the system of Laws to which Christ referred. Christ said:

"I come not to destroy the law ... but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no way pass from the law, till all is fulfilled."

It is a national tragedy that the ministers of Christ have given great prominence to the mysteries of the "faith" and failed to give an intelligent and reasonable understanding of its laws which Christ came to fulfil. This omission has been mainly responsible for the absence of statutory definition of social purpose to guide our administration and to protect the people from political and commercial exploitation. The British Constitution, its Laws, and the rights and duties of citizenship cannot properly be understood without reference to the Hebrew Laws from whence they sprang. Religious education in schools has little practical value when the Bible is studied merely from its historical aspect. A child taught to understand the social implications of the Divine laws would instinctively become a rebel in our modern pagan society.

The early English kings realised that these laws provided the most practical and natural economy revealed to man. All other systems had failed to give man security and peace or to release man's mind and spirit to fulfil his true destiny on earth.

The British Constitution and the Common Law were designed to protect the heritage, and the freedom and justice of the people; to provide a code of conduct, and to establish a national purpose.

Many statesmen recognise the inadequacy and stupidity of the present system. The great practical idealist who tried to found socialism in this country knew that under our present administration his cause was hopeless. In the midst of his political success Keir Hardie said:

"I feel sick at heart with politics, and all that pertains thereto. If I were thirty years a younger man, with the experiences I have gained during the past thirty-five years, I would, methinks, abandon house and home, ... if need be, to go forth among the people to proclaim afresh and anew the full gospel of the message of Jesus of Nazareth. We are all of us, somehow or other, off the track."

We cannot talk loosely about a Christian social order. We must know something about the laws upon which it should be based. There are certain basic laws upon which the whole of the Divine commandments and statutes hang. They deal with devotion to God—or, if it be preferred, a radical system of high moral principles—and fellowship and co-operation with one's neighbour.

The supplementary laws of Moses were specialised and peculiarly suited to the time, place, and conditions of the Hebrew nation. Many of them, like our ancient Common Law, could not be applied to a highly industrialised nation without revision, but the spirit of the following statutes provides the basis for just and humane laws for all time:

The Executive and Judiciary. "Judges and officers shalt thou make and they shall judge the people with a just judgement. Thou shalt not wrest judgement; thou shalt not respect persons, neither take a gift; for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of righteousness."

The above statute protected the people against corrupt administration and distinction between rich and poor.

It was the intention of British Common Law that justice should be free and without distinction of persons. Though this intention can be found in the Magna Carta, and has survived in principle up to the present day, legal procedure has become so costly and statutes so perverse that, in spite of free counsel for the poor and honest administration of the law, justice is often too costly to obtain. Under the Divine Law, administrative justice was further safeguarded by supplementary enactments or rules, under which the State paid all legal costs and forbade any other source of emoluments to either judge or counsel.

The ancient prophets warned us that if we did not keep the law of common interest, and gave inordinate power to privileged persons or sections of the community, it would result in the exploitation of the nation and the suffering we experience to-day.

The instructions to the judiciary are found in Deuteronomy i, 15-17: "Thou shalt judge righteously." "Thou shalt not respect persons." "Thou shalt not be afraid of the face of man." "Thou shalt not wrest judgement." "Thou shalt not take a gift."

"That which is altogether thou shalt follow that thou mayest enjoy thine inheritance."

This statute, which is vital to national well-being, has been ignored by our legislators. Our national life and security has been sacrificed for the benefit of party interests and monetary and monopolist powers, and the people have been deprived of their inheritance and economic security.

When a wrong or murder was committed all the inhabitants of a Hebrew city or community were adjudged guilty until the criminal was apprehended and punished. Civic pride thus worked to the end that the criminal or criminals were brought to justice. Every person was held responsible for the sins and omissions of society. There was no such thing as social apathy. Both personal and communal sin were punishable by Law.

We do not willingly admit to-day that every person should share responsibility for the crimes committed by the community in which he or she lives, or that the community is responsible for the majority of personal crimes. Christ and the prophets sought to stimulate a consciousness of personal responsibility. The Christian Church concentrates upon personal sin, with the result that the majority of citizens are unaware that social and political apathy are among the greatest of sins—sins against the Holy Ghost. This Law supported by a conscientious Church could have prevented eighty per cent. of prevailing evils.

This sin of modern society allowed tens of thousands of our fellow-men to starve in the midst of abundance with scarcely a protest from the public. We keep Divine Laws in regard to the concealment of criminals, manslaughter, and the keeping of vicious animals, but fail in the great enactments so necessary for the happiness of the people and the security of the State.

Courts of Appeal and Civil Service (Numbers i, 47; ii, 33; viii, 25; xxvi, 62). Religious and civil servants were not required for military service. They took up their duties at the age of twenty-five and retired at the age of fifty years.

The salaries of religious ministers and civil servants (Levites) were paid out of State revenue derived from tithes. The Levites did not inherit a portion of the land like the other tribes. Because they were the ministers of God's Laws and the servants of the people they were not allowed to engage in commerce, agriculture, industry, or any activities likely to tempt them from their higher duties. The laws governing their ministry placed them beyond the reach of bribery and corruption.

Every judge and jury in the Courts where the British Common Law holds sway is bound by the principle that "no man shall be a judge in his own cause." But this principle is rarely applied to Parliament, the highest Court in the land.

The British Common Law conforms to this statute, but the rules and laws and the omission of laws governing Parliamentary procedure, civil services, and religious institutions render it ineffective. [\[23\]](#) We have already dealt with some of these omissions. There are many more.

The Federation of British Industries is powerfully represented in the House of Commons and consistently prevents necessary social reform. Mr. Greaves, in *Reactionary England*, says that the F.B.I. plays a great part in controlling the decisions of the Government and that:

"It has not hesitated to boast of its successful influence upon the Government By the creation of the Tariff Advisory Committee, with power to alter tariffs without reference to Parliament, the Government has in fact handed over to a body in close association with the owners of industry an important legislative function."

We find in the F.B.I. Bulletin *Taxation Notes*, March 1937, that every year it sends to the Chancellor of the Exchequer before the Budget Statement a memo, on the views of industry on taxation and the

reforms that it desires. M.P.s are provided with these notes and use them to influence the decisions of the Government. In March 1938 these notes instructed Members of Parliament to vote in favour of no addition to direct taxation for the financing of air-raid precautions and that expenditure by manufacturers in their factories should be allowed for by diffused Income Tax. Similar financial considerations condemned to death by bombs and plague many thousands of the citizens of this country by preventing the provision of adequate and sanitary air-raid shelters.

Mr. Gladstone once said:

"We decline to recognise any class whatever, be they peers or be they gentry, be they what you will, as entitled to direct the destinies of this nation against the will of the People."

Would that our Parliament had lived up to this ideal conception of democracy.

Time and again efforts have been made to check the financial tyranny of vested interests in Parliament. In 1852 when Lord Chancellor Cottenham decreed in favour of a canal company in which he was a shareholder the decision was overruled by the House of Lords. The judgment of Lord Campbell illustrates the vigour with which the ancient principle of justice was upheld even against a Lord Chancellor. When the wrong had been righted he said:

"This will be a lesson to all inferior tribunals to take care not only that in their own decrees they are not influenced by their personal interest, but to avoid the appearance of labouring under such influence."

In a report published by a Committee of the House of Lords in a case in which Lord Murray of Elbank was implicated the following conclusion was reached:

"We think it is within our province to express our strong opinion that there should be henceforth an inflexible rule to preclude those who hold any public office from entering upon any speculative transactions in stocks and shares" (Perris, *The War Traders*, 1914).

Perhaps the Divine ruling on this point was most ably expressed by a distinguished German lawyer (Weber, *Rechtswissenschaftliche Beitrage*, Berlin, 1931):

"Whenever a Member of Parliament is closely connected with business circles outside, and especially with a particular concern, it cannot be disputed that there is a danger of the conflict of his political duty with his private interests being decided in favour of the latter."

In the reign of George III an Act of Parliament made it an offence for a Government contractor to sit in the House of Commons. The purpose of this statute was to prevent the conflict between the private interest and public duty of an M.P. which would otherwise inevitably arise. This high principle of justice has not been adhered to, consequently the life of the nation has been endangered and democracy has become a tragic farce.

The violation of the principle that "no man shall be a judge in his own cause" has on more than one occasion almost split the British Commonwealth of Nations into hostile units.

The *News Chronicle* commenting on the tyranny of Westminster said:

"It is monstrous that, because New Zealand happens to have a 'Labour' Government which has initiated certain experiments, big business in this country should threaten to force the Government into reprisals. Such an action is a menace to our constitutional government and to the independence of the Dominions as guaranteed in the Statute of Westminster."

This tyranny is possible mainly because the great international financial houses have their representatives in the House of Commons, and more than 80 M.P.s hold over 100 directorships in the British Empire and foreign countries. By their economic and financial power they were able to

threaten the Government of New Zealand because its policy for social and financial reform was not to their liking.

That the time has come when human need should be placed before private interest was emphasised by Mr. Harold Stannard in *The Times*, May 27, 1928. He was commenting on how the people in the West Indies had been reduced to abject slavery, to conditions perhaps worse than the beasts of the field, to fill the coffers of their financial overlords in this country. He said:

"It is time some of the money which was removed under a conception of Empire which our consciences now repudiate should be put back Both the policy of betterment and the methods by which it can be carried out must ultimately derive from England What is needed is a wave of moral enthusiasm in England, sweeping through the House of Commons and flooding the Colonial Office, such as that which abolished slavery."

The British people would welcome such a movement. A spiritual crusade is necessary to make the laws of moral-civic justice and the needs of man the controlling factors in all national and international policies. Mr. Hobson once said:

"The power of imperialist forces within the nation to use the national resources for their private gain, by operating the instrument of State, can only be overthrown by the establishment of a genuine democracy, the direction of public policy by the people for the people, *through representatives over whom they exercise a real control.*"

This control can be obtained and exercised in Common Law Councils where the truth can be made known and by means of a nation-wide system of referendum and public initiation so that the greater number shall be served and not be sacrificed for the benefit and the power of the few.

The Englishman's boast that no man shall be imprisoned or his liberty or security be curtailed except in accordance with the law of the land is a deception when privilege and private power cause laws to be enacted which restrict his rights and when his opinion is neither sought nor considered in their drafting.

We were warned that any person engaged in worldly activities (commerce, trade, industry, etc.) whilst serving common interests in Parliament or in the Civil Services would turn these public offices into dens of corruption and the nation would suffer in the consequences (Numbers xviii, 22).

Obedience to the Divine Law would have given us legislators whose sole purpose would be to serve the community. Only honest men would then be found in positions of authority. Christ's commandment, "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant," would be faithfully obeyed.

The Civil Service administered the Law through legal departments, the Treasury, local governments, etc. (Deuteronomy xii, 19; xiv, 27-29; xxvi, 12; Numbers xviii, 21-26).

The Courts of Conscience. The duty of the minister of religion was to teach the Law. He was responsible for stimulating and directing the moral and social conscience of the nation and for checking any individual and causing to be corrected any social or administrative practice contravening the Law.

Many clergymen have complained bitterly that communicants, whom they trained from childhood to live the Christian way of life, within a few short months of entering their business careers as devoted Christians, confess their troubled conscience. The code of commerce demands lies, deceits, and oftentimes downright dishonesty. "What can I say to them?" a clergyman with whom we discussed this matter asked us. "Must I tell these young people to refuse to lie, deceive, or act dishonestly and consequently risk losing their jobs?" We found that the clergy were sometimes forced to compromise with their conscience and their communicants had to follow their example. Why? Why must the clergy open the citadel to the Devil when a Christian revolt could save the world?

The British Constitution grew in accordance with the Hebrew pattern when courts of conscience and the House of Convocation were established. If the clergy had used Convocation courageously, as they sometimes used the medieval Courts Christian, Convocation could have become an invincible power for good.

"If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment [said the Hebrew law] thou shalt come unto the priests and unto the judge and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee."

The Hebrew went to the priest when a difficulty occurred which was not provided for by the laws and statutes, or when problems arose from practices not in strict accordance with the high moral code of the Divine Law.

This custom was largely responsible for the setting up in the Middle Ages of Courts Christian, where the priests and the laity solved difficult personal and social questions by the direct application of Christian principles. The English Courts of Equity also gave judgment on questions not covered by enactments. Unfortunately, the moral value of these courts was largely destroyed by Case Law.

The means of obtaining guidance on any moral point or social practice which troubles the conscience of the British subject still obtains in our Constitution, but the machinery which might have been used for calling in administrative powers to prohibit evil has been so long neglected by the Church that it has fallen into disuse and its original purpose been almost forgotten.

Every Englishman has the legal right to receive from the vicar of his parish instruction upon any matter which troubles his conscience. This right does not apply to spiritual subjects only. If any subject of the Realm finds that the practice of his vocation, trade, or profession is at variance with his conscience as a Christian, he can claim spiritual guidance.

If every person sought spiritual guidance when he found the commercial world required him to act dishonestly, or to harm another, our vicars would have the majority of the adult population on their doorsteps.

The clergy have the remedy in their hands. They can place the complaints of their parishioners before their Church Councils, and if necessary seek the support of the Lower House of Convocation to have the matter brought to the notice of local employers, civic authorities, or groups of citizens whose actions or practices contravene Christian social precepts. In any case where such a demonstration failed to secure a remedy, the Higher House of Convocation could be invoked for the Bishops to place the matter before Parliament or the Privy Council—or if necessary petition the King, the Defender of the Nation's Faith. The whole conscience of the nation could thus be mobilised to ensure that Christian right be done. The power of the House of Convocation has never been used to this extent. It failed in its great trust.

One of the original functions of the House of Convocation was to provide a moral check upon Parliament and society in general. It could have enabled the Church and State to work together to build a true Christian social order. So important was its function considered to be that it was the custom for the King to open Parliament and the House of Convocation on the same day. To-day, however, Convocation is little more than a time-wasting institution shorn of its ancient authority and rarely protesting against social evils. Some clergy have said that the People's Common Law Parliament has taken up the duty which the House of Convocation has failed to perform.

Economics. "The earth and the fulness thereof is the Lord's."

The soil was shared among the Hebrews and the law of inheritance established. Every family had security of tenure to enjoy the fruits of their land and their labour.

The Commandments forbade any man to covet or to steal the house, cattle, land, crops, or anything which by right of inheritance was the property of his neighbour.

Before the Norman Conquest there was a striking feature in the English Constitution which did not obtain in any other European country—the power of the common people's Witan or local assembly, and their common property in the soil. The soil was held in trust by the King under God for the people and conveyed to them, and justice was done through the chiefs or lesser kings of the tribes in accordance with common law or custom at the assembly of the Witan. The people held their portion of land as a natural heritage.

The Divine Law forbidding the removal of a neighbour's landmark was strictly obeyed in Anglo-Saxon England. But it was flagrantly violated from 1066 onwards, and particularly by the Enclosure Acts of the eighteenth century which robbed the people of their Common Lands.

It was the Divine command that the soil should not be stolen from the people nor should it be sold for ever, but should be given back to the original possessor at the Jubilee Year. The people in Britain gradually lost their heritage in, or claim to, either their portion of the land or the fruits of their labours. Their rulers sold the people's birthright to usurers and to the privileged classes so that their heritage has become a national debt of about four hundred pounds per head.

Our vaunted social services—such as unemployment benefit, sick benefit, free medical attention, old age pensions, holidays with pay, and many others—have all been introduced within living memory, but they were social services established by Divine ordinance among the Hebrews as a natural right which the recipient enjoyed without the stigma of poverty, dole, or charity.

The Hebrew enactments protecting inheritance and personal property were strictly enforced. Stealing was made very expensive for the thief: he had to make restitution sometimes treble of what he had taken. If the thief could not make restitution he had to work out the cost in labour.

The Laws of Taxation and Public Revenue laid down by the Hebrew priests make ours look stupid in comparison.

Possessions were not taxed. With the exception of a small annual poll tax, taxes were levied on increase only. If there was plenty, everyone enjoyed the benefit of his production and industry, and any surplus was placed at the disposal of the needy whether native or foreign. Abundance was synonymous with national prosperity. That plenty could cause an economic crisis, or that poverty could exist in the midst of plenty, was inconceivable and unknown until the law was broken.

The annual poll tax of half a shekel (twenty gerahs) was paid by every male from the age of twenty years. Taxation was levied by tithe on the increase of the produce of the soil, of cattle, sheep, and industry. On the seventh year all land lay fallow to recover good heart, whilst the people lived on the food stored according to the Law. Leviticus, chapter twenty-five, gives the details of this remarkable working plan, so difficult for overworked modern minds to conceive.

One day of rest per week and every seventh year were set apart to encourage the spiritual and cultural activities of the race. During these rest or holiday periods incomes in kind were derived from the stored produce, thus establishing holidays with pay which we have only lately realised are necessary for a progressive civilisation.

The efficiency of the system depended absolutely upon the keeping of the whole Law. Omission which allowed lust, greed, and deceit to enter in eventually wrecked the nation and, as in our modern times, robbed the individual and the nation of security.

The whole economic policy was founded on two basic laws: that which forbade usury and that which released debt every seventh year. Both these laws are violated by modern society.

When our Government at the end of the eighteenth century gave to a private group the sole right to create and issue money it sold the national heritage to usury and placed the nation in the impossible position of trying to borrow itself out of debt. When after the last war our Government allowed Europe to repudiate its debt it was an admittance that usury had brought disaster and was ultimately impracticable.

These two Laws protected the Hebrew nation and anyone who had been exploited by his fellows. In the Year of Jubilee all debts were forgiven. To-day we pray, "forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." In obedience to the Divine Law no British subject is imprisoned for debt, but inability to pay debts within the period ordered by the Court is often construed as contempt of court, and for this offence thousands of British subjects are imprisoned every year. Our laws pervert the intention of the Common Law and poverty and bankruptcy are treated as social offences. In a competitive system based on usury and profit many must lose so that the few may gain. To punish those who lose in the struggle is highly unjust and encourages deceit, trickery, dishonesty, and all kinds of sharp business practices wherein the Devil and the Law punish the hind-most. The victim having been caught in the meshes of a financial system, which from its very nature can only give gain to one by the loss of another, is henceforth harassed and hindered in all commercial activities by the laws of the land.

The Divine Law and the spirit of the British Common Law forbids such monetary and commercial practices.

In the past, when our Government had explored every avenue and used every method of coercion it could devise to force nations to pay the usurers' pound of flesh, bringing incredible suffering, poverty, and misery to millions of people, only then did it acknowledge that the forgiveness of debt was sound economics.

The Jubilee Law of forgiveness was necessary to preserve man's inheritance. It was given to a nation whose mission was to bring the whole world to God and establish His Kingdom on earth. When the Holy Nation failed in its mission, Christ came to fulfil the Law and the Commandments and to give the Law to all nations. In the modern world, where all nations are dependent upon each other, the practice of usury by any one unit brings disastrous repercussions upon every other.

The Divine Statutes permitted loans, but no interest could be levied nor property be confiscated in payment. Both he who lent and he who borrowed were protected by strict, sensible, and human laws. Human need, not private greed, was the factor which determined the laws governing the internal economy and international relationships (Deuteronomy xv, 1–11; xxiv, 6–18; Leviticus xxv).

Civil Law. The Divine Statutes governed the land, employment, contracts, commerce, property, social relationships, public health, and education. The land laws provided security of inheritance and tenure. If by stress of circumstances and poverty a man was caused to sell any part of his inheritance, it was returned to the family in the year of Jubilee (Leviticus xxv, 23).

Employment was decided by voluntary contract, with specific terms of service providing for payment of wages, workmen's compensation, and for holidays (Deuteronomy xxiv, 14–15). The laws of Public Health provided for individual and public hygiene and the control of infectious diseases (Leviticus xi, 25–47; xiii, 14). The laws for agriculture will be found in Leviticus xxv, 2–7, 23; Numbers xxvi, 53–55; xxxiii, 53–54; Deuteronomy xi, 6–17; xix, 14; Exodus xxiii, 10–11).

The Principles which we propose shall be made the supreme Common Law of the British people are a modernised version of our unwritten Common Law. Compared with the following modernised précis of Divine Law they will be found to be similar:

All men are equal in the sight of God in so far as material and spiritual necessities are concerned, but unequal in the development of mental and spiritual qualities.

Man is born with natural and equal right to enjoy during childhood, adult, and old age the food, warmth, shelter, education, and all the amenities which the community in which he lives can provide.

National prosperity shall be determined by the actual productive capacity of the nation as a whole and not in accordance with any fictitious monetary value.

To enjoy his inheritance, man must keep the Laws; do right in the sight of God, and co-operate with his fellow-men.

Man shall not live by bread alone, but by the development of character through mental, psychological, and spiritual growth attain a full perfect life.

Man shall enjoy every good thing and share it with the stranger in his land; he shall use just weights and measures; export his surplus by equal exchange; shun fictitious and fluctuating monetary measures or practices by which prices and purchasing power may be manipulated for private gain to the loss of another.

No man should cause or leave another to go hungry, but the hungry should drink at his neighbour's vineyard and eat the corn of his fields.

The State provided a sufficiency of food, warmth, and shelter for the young, the fatherless, the widow, and the stranger.

None shall oppress or exploit the wage-earner, the poor and needy, or any section of the community.

It was illegal for the Hebrew to destroy food supplies or to use them to manufacture instruments of war. It was illegal to contaminate food or to destroy its nutritional value by adulteration or any other practice. It was illegal to invest surplus wealth or to take usury of money, food supplies, or any form of property.

False witness, slander, and libel were made illegal, and the claim for damages established. The British Common Law which made an Englishman's home his castle, now violated by the "Emergency laws," was established in the days of Moses, when it was illegal for any man to enter another's home without his consent.

The Divine Law provided the basis for our Habeas Corpus Act and our jury system.

It was obligatory on any man witnessing the confiscation of another's property either by violence or fraud to report the crime to the proper authorities, who would punish the offender and reinstate and reimburse the victim. In the modern equivalent—it shall be illegal to confiscate property in payment of usury or to juggle with prices, shares, and incomes, or to deprive any man of his livelihood or the tools of his trade.

The prophets taught the Hebrews that if they co-operated one with the other, and did not practise usury or seek to oppress and exploit each other, they would enjoy the fruits of the earth, and their baskets and larders would be filled; but if they broke the Law, their produce, their cattle, and their houses would be taken away from them by men who would rise up and bind them in bonds of usury, control their economic system, monopolise all forms of production, and who would practise corruption and treason amongst administrators.

The Law commanded that every Hebrew should not only vigilantly observe the Law but also take an active interest in political, civic, and religious activities. The Hebrews were told to learn it by heart, to teach it to their children, and make the Law the criterion of all supplementary enactments and customs.

The Hebrews were warned that social apathy was a crime against God and the State, and would result in the loss of all liberty and possessions and end in enslavement. In Saxon England, before the Norman Conquest and in a lesser degree afterwards, the popular Witan maintained public

vigilance. The Witan has its modern equivalent in the People's Common Law Parliament.

Sir John Fortescue, Chief Justice of the King's Bench in 1442, who taught Edward Prince of Wales the Common Law and Statutes of England, explained point by point how they were derived from the Divine Law. He also explained why the Laws of England were superior to any other Laws in the world, and why non-observance of these Laws would bring about the conditions we are experiencing in this generation.[\[24\]](#)

The Common Law of England, or the Law of God, was revealed to other nations besides the Hebrew. It was codified by Hammurabi, a contemporary with Abraham. In the Book of Jasher, mentioned in the Book of Joshua though not included in the Bible, we find that Abraham learned the Law which was introduced into his father's house in Ur of the Chaldees.

Archæologists delving in the ruins of the ancient world are continually coming upon the Code of Divine Law, written by the law-givers and the prophets of many nations. Some of these codes were written before the Babylonian era, and copies may be seen in the British Museum.

The reader may accept Blackstone, the great authority on jurisprudence, that the Common Law has been revealed by God through His prophets for man's salvation in all ages, or that it is a natural code of man's rights and obligations adopted by communities from the earliest recorded times because it provides the only practical basis for men's relations one with another to ensure prosperity, security, and peace. In either case no one will deny its practicability and justice.

National Pride. If any people in the world have cause to be proud of their blood and their national tradition it is those who inhabit the British Isles. Our Common Law existed as far back as the history of this country can be traced and is then lost in legend. Legend says that, at the time of Abraham, Hu Gadarn founded the Druid faith and laid down the Code of the Trinity, which was similar in many respects to that of the Hebrews, and found its highest expression in the Mulmutine Code in the fifth century before Christ. Old legends tell us that the Common Law was read by King Billinis from the gates of his castle, in the spot now known as Billingsgate, one hundred years before Christ, and by King Lud at Ludgate Castle seventeen years before the Romans invaded this country. The Mulmutine Code, the King Alfred Laws, and the Common Law expounded by Blackstone rest on the same foundation.

England has given great benefits to the world, but has introduced great evils. The people of these Islands preserved the Common Law for the world throughout the Dark Ages of Europe. When the new era dawned England reasserted the Common Law of natural rights and justice and taught it to one-quarter of mankind. To our great shame we also perfected the international Financial Law which destroyed the Hebrew, Babylonian, and Roman civilisations, and finally the benefits which the British Common Law would have given to the world.

In the midst of this greatest tragedy of our race, when Britain defends herself against Europe in arms in a war brought about by an unjust economic policy, our Government is forced to abolish the remnants of Common Law in order to defend the residue of its liberties. It would seem poetic justice that Britain, in her dual character of teacher and preserver of the Common Law and champion and guardian of an evil monetary policy which destroys its benefits, should be forced to defend the principles of Democratic Law from the evils caused by the economic policy she gave to the world.

The British people are now at the cross-roads. They must decide between God and Mammon—between the liberation of man or his suppression. This decision cannot be made on the battlefield. The common people must make the choice in their war and peace aims.

It is claimed, by democratic and dictatorial nations alike, that democracy has had its day; that it has lamentably failed to do what was expected of it.

In the realisation of failure there is the terrible danger of the British people adopting some form of pagan dictatorship after the Continental pattern, and of submerging the Common Law in a system

which makes man a mere cog in the machinery of State. Every man and woman should be prepared to protest with burning indignation against such national blasphemy. It is the duty and obligation of the British people to establish a true democracy based upon the natural laws which Christ came to fulfil.

A dictatorship is not a sign of progress but a sign of retrogression. Salvation does not lie in dictatorship, nor in a pretence to a democracy, but in the establishment of a social order based upon Supreme Laws which are inviolable by Parliament or by any institution of man.

We have discovered to our cost that there can be no national efficiency under our old system of pseudo-democracy, but a democracy protected by Supreme Common Laws and Common Law Councils in every political constituency, can be made efficient and our nation prosperous.

A wealth of genius would be liberated, and bring to birth a social order in which a free and secure people, by their high purpose and the variety of their interests and attainments, would surpass anything which a dictatorship might produce.

Appendix B

The Constitution of the People's Common Law Parliament

Explanatory Note

There are certain fundamental principles with which all legislation must conform if man is to be free to fulfil the purpose for which he was created. In the Christian view, each man and woman is born with a set of rights which no action of any predecessor can take away from them. These principles and rights are commonly called Christian since they find their noblest expression in the teachings of Jesus Christ, but they are accepted by all civilised people whatever their faith.

The founders of this Movement are determined that these Christian principles and rights shall, by purely constitutional means, become the law of the land, for they are convinced that the overwhelming majority of the people of this nation and Empire would give their unhesitating assent to them. And they are likewise determined that the whole influence of this nation and Empire shall be directed towards securing that such of these principles as are international in scope shall be accepted by the comity of nations in order that the benefits of Christian Justice may be enjoyed by all mankind.

This country is committed to a belief in the right of free and civilised people to govern themselves. The people of this Realm exercise this right by electing representatives to govern them in their name and by their authority. It is of the essence of democracy that the people decide the general principles upon which all legislation shall be based and that their representatives translate these principles into practice by devising schemes and enacting laws which will make the will of the people effective.

It is not the duty of the people to devise schemes, but it is their right to assert principles, and the task of elected experts is to formulate methods of government in accordance with such principles whether they privately agree with them or not.

This essential right of a democratic and free people to determine the principles upon which they shall be governed has been largely surrendered, obscured, or usurped. The electorate is given a choice of parties instead of a choice of principles; human rights and dignity have dissolved in a welter of political jargon, and conflicting parties have aroused sectional interests to the detriment of the common weal.

Candidates for Parliament are, and have been mostly, tied by allegiance to one or other of the great political parties, who demand from their nominees adherence to political doctrines which come under the head of schemes rather than principles and which the people are unable to comprehend

and unqualified to judge.

Moreover, when election pledges are broken or evaded the people have no effective constitutional means of expressing their dissatisfaction until the next general election. The voice of the people is, in fact, heard only when some action of the Government is resented to such an extent that a public outcry is provoked.

This state of affairs shows that this country is democratic only in a very limited sense of the word, and that it is necessary for the people to reassert their right to govern themselves by establishing as a Covenant between themselves and their elected representatives the basic principles which must be adhered to in the framing of all legislation.

The co-operation of the people of this Realm is invited in setting up the machinery by which their human rights may be preserved and their general will be incontrovertibly expressed.

The People's Common Law Parliament seeks to make the following principles the basis of the Common Law of the British Isles, the Dominions and territories in the control of Sovereignty of Britain, or of any Dominion, and also of any other nation so far as any will co-operate to establish the basis of moral government and the science of national and international economy based on human need and moral justice.

THE NATIONAL PRINCIPLES

1. Man shall not be treated as subservient to monetary policy or to industrial and commercial exploitation.

The object of this supreme Common Law shall be:

To ensure that the principles by which the economic and industrial life of the community is governed shall be so reconstituted as to make it possible that social institutions shall serve the physical, psychological, and spiritual needs of man and man be not subservient to them.

2. No man, woman, or child shall suffer poverty or insecurity through no fault of their own whilst there are available actual resources or potential capacity to meet their needs.

The object of this Law shall be:

To provide such a degree of liberty, security, and opportunity as will make it possible and natural for men and women to make their individual contribution to the welfare of the community.

3. The curtailment of supplies by restriction of production or distribution, or the destruction of food, or the curtailment of purchasing power shall be prohibited.

To ensure a progressive order of society adaptable to meet all contingencies as was the original intention of the British Constitution and ancient Common Law, and to fulfil the social implications of the Christian faith upon which they are based, the object of the Law shall be:

On the basis of such a natural order, in conformity with God's purpose for man and nature, to explore the possibility of a progressive Christian society.

4. The primary responsibility of the State shall be to ensure that every subject of the Realm shall be free to contribute to the community according to his ability and shall receive

sufficient purchasing power to provide for all his needs:

With the object:

To ensure that the aforesaid laws and objects shall receive the first consideration of the legislative authorities.

THE INTERNATIONAL PRINCIPLES

The People's Common Law Parliament urges the Governments of this Nation and Empire to use their influence with other nations to secure the adoption of the following Principles as the basis of international co-operation:

1. The economic security, happiness, and the natural physical and cultural needs of the people shall be the first claim upon all social, industrial, and commercial effort: and in all international negotiations these simple human needs shall take precedence over every other factor.
2. Removal of the principal causes of war by giving all peoples access to world resources and raw materials, and enabling them to exchange goods and services freely with each other in accordance with their natural needs and the common good, irrespective of national boundaries.
3. International irritations caused by tariffs, quotas, and the vulgar seeking to profit at the expense of other peoples can be avoided.
4. The traffic in currencies by private individuals and organisations in such a way as to injure the welfare of any people shall be prohibited.
5. No man or woman shall be deprived of liberty or security because of his or her religious belief or practice.
6. All peoples shall have representation at the International Council Table where their representatives shall meet as occasion demands, and that at such meetings the nations and peoples shall accept these principles as final arbiter in all decisions.

The People's Common Law Parliament will consist of representatives from Common Law Councils in the same constituencies as those for the Sovereign Parliament. These representatives will be pledged to the national and international Principles of the P.C.L.P.

The P.C.L.P. and its Common Law Councils will test all legislation, and all economic, industrial, and social practices against these principles. The influence of the P.C.L.P. will be made effective by a variety of methods:

1. By representations made directly to the Government or Members of Parliament responsible for any measure violating the principles.
2. Through speeches and votes of pledged Members in the Sovereign Parliament itself.
3. By mobilising public opinion through the Referendum organisations in favour of the assertion of the principle involved in a particular case, and against any Government or Member remaining recalcitrant.

Whenever anything is found to be in conflict with the principles, a statement shall be drawn up

setting forth the complaint, the grounds of the complaint, and the principles involved, together with a demand that the grievance be remedied. The Members decide which of the three normal methods of the P.C.L.P. shall be used to bring the matter effectively before the authorities concerned.

The Order Paper for the P.C.L.P. is drawn up by the Agenda Committee appointed by the delegates. The order of precedence is as follows:

1. Questions raised by any member of the Governing Council, whether in his private capacity or as chairman of one of the Departmental Committees in the course of its routine examination of current and existing legislation. All such questions are included in the Order Paper.
2. Questions submitted by local Common Law Councils, whether normally through their delegates, or to the Agenda Committee direct.
3. Questions raised by individual delegates in the P.C.L.P.

The questions on the Order Paper are debated in the P.C.L.P. according to ordinary parliamentary procedure. The conduct of the debate is governed by the President, who shall be any member of the Governing Council appointed by that Council. The method of voting shall be decided by the Agenda Committee unless the members of the P.C.L.P. decide otherwise.

The general public may attend all Assemblies of the P.C.L.P. but may not speak or vote.

THE COMMON LAW COUNCILS

The P.C.L.P. will bring representation direct to the Sovereign Parliament through their Common Law Councils in the various constituencies.

The object of the local Common Law Councils are:

1. To influence their local M.P., of whatever party, to support the P.C.L.P. and the Referendum Bloc in the House of Commons; to bring their candidates to accept the principles; to give an unequivocal public pledge not to support or vote for any measure which is in conflict with them; and to advocate that these principles be the basis of Supreme Common Law.
2. To make representations to their M.P. on any matter where he violates or ignores the principles. To communicate to the electorate any refusals on his part.
3. If an election is imminent and no candidate is prepared to accept the principles the constituency will be invited to put up their own candidate, who will be publicly pledged to abide by the principles and to obey the will of his constituency.
4. To provide machinery by which any M.P. may know at any time the opinion of his constituents on any matter.
5. To set up a Referendum Committee under its control to raise funds for the Referendum work and to organise the requisite canvassing of all voters in the constituency.
6. To choose a delegate to sit in the P.C.L.P. through whom communications may be constantly maintained.
7. To debate all matters of local interest in the light of the principles and, where local conditions or by-laws violate these principles, to make representations to the individual society, firm, school, company, council, or corporation concerned. To direct a local Referendum on the question when opposition is encountered. If still further action is

necessary, to communicate the Referendum to the Agenda Committee of the P.C.L.P.

8. To take any further action consistent with what is herein laid down and likely to be conducive to a Christian democracy.

All organisations pledged to support the principles may appoint representatives empowered to vote. Representatives of the unorganised public are appointed with similar powers and in numbers not less than those representing organisations.

Working unitedly in their local Common Law Councils, reformers and organisations would create an influence more powerful than is possible for them in their present disunited condition.

Each Common Law Council appoints its own President, its own delegate to the P.C.L.P., its own Referendum Committee, and its own provisional candidate for the Sovereign Parliament (who shall stand for election if none of the existing candidates will pledge himself to the principles or carry out the will of his electors), save that this last appointment is subject to the approval of the Governing Council of the P.C.L.P.

Common Law Councils are empowered at their own discretion to employ their Referendum organisations to draw attention to local evils, provided that such use does not clash with any national Referendum.

The general public may attend the assemblies of their local Common Law Council, and, though they may not vote, they may speak if business and the chairman allow.

In order to preserve the non-party-political character of Common Law Councils all organisations may be represented on the Council but no political parties. This ruling is necessary to prevent Members of Parliament, or political parties, from judging in their own case, and also to preserve the distinction between legislative bodies and the P.C.L.P. which shall become the moral check and guide upon legislators. Members of Parliament would be allowed to attend these Councils only as witnesses, or to be questioned by the members of their constituency.

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

The Governing Council of the P.C.L.P. acts as a kind of second chamber in that its members are not members of the P.C.L.P. (although they retain the right of attending its debates and of speaking) but exercise the right of veto in case the members of the P.C.L.P. should themselves violate the principles. No statement prepared by the P.C.L.P. can be published, nor any Referendum made thereon, without the Governing Council's consent. This power of veto is designed to protect the integrity of the Movement from any attempt to betray or side-track it from within.

It is thus not important that the members of the Governing Council should be well-known public figures but it is imperative that they should be completely trustworthy, incorruptible, and disinterested; completely loyal to the principles and unaffected by threats or by considerations of personal profit or advancement.

The members of the Governing Council thus act as guardians of the principles on which the Movement is founded; but their routine work will be in charge of Departmental Committees which have the duty of examining all legislation and social evils and reporting their findings to the P.C.L.P. The entire field of human activity and organisation is divided into convenient departments with an expert committee responsible for each. The Privy Council provides a useful analogy, with its Boards of Trade, Health, Education, and Departments dealing with Civil Services and Representatives of the Royal Family, His Majesty's Government and the Church.

When any business is debated in the P.C.L.P.—*e.g.* malnutrition, general insecurity, etc.—it is not the business of the Assembly to prepare plans to reform these evils, but first to make the evils known, and secondly to ascertain the ability of national effort or knowledge to remove them; thirdly to demand the repeal of the harmful legislation, or new enactments which will prevent the offending

practice or make the necessary reform obligatory.

It is constantly coming before the notice of the P.C.L.P.'s Public Welfare and National Health Department that new medical treatments for various diseases have been and are being discovered. It has been proved that many of these can cure certain diseases which have baffled medical science, but for a variety of reasons these discoveries have not been made available to the public.

The following is one of many instances of the public being denied advanced medical treatment. In November 1940 Mr. Bevin revealed that a machine which passed short-wave high-frequency currents through the body had cured a thousand people of colds after a few minutes' treatment, and had proved invaluable in dealing with catarrh, pneumonia, and chest troubles affecting young children. By a Government ban this instrument is prevented from becoming an asset to counteract war conditions. It might interfere with short-wave transmission or be converted into a wireless transmitting apparatus! Any expert on the subject could immediately discount this excuse.

It is the task of the National Health Department of the P.C.L.P. to examine all new medical treatments and through the public activities of the P.C.L.P. to make them available to the people when warrantable.

By the routine work of the Governing Council, through departmental committees, all legislation, statistics, discoveries, and advanced knowledge will be examined, and the findings placed before the P.C.L.P. and the people. Each department is in charge of a member of the Governing Council, or a member of the P.C.L.P. appointed by him to act as his deputy chairman whenever he is unable to be present. The members of each committee are chosen by the members of the P.C.L.P. from among their number. The chairman of any departmental committee may direct that any expert (even though not a member of the P.C.L.P.) be called to give evidence before the committee in order to assist its investigations of any matter falling within its province.

REFERENDUM ORGANIZATIONS

The Governing Council appoints from among its number or from the members of the P.C.L.P. a Referendum Committee; this is responsible for ordering a national referendum on a statement whenever the P.C.L.P. so directs. The Referendum Committee communicates with all local Referendum Committees, who must undertake the referendum in the form stated and as soon as possible. Results must be reported to their respective delegates of the P.C.L.P.

After a national referendum has been taken the P.C.L.P. votes on the matter in question, each delegate voting according to the people he represents.

It will be noted that the Referendum organisation is an instrument of tremendous force, capable of overthrowing any government which rejects the principles, and almost certainly of preventing the re-election of any Member of Parliament who speaks or votes against the will of his constituents.

PARLIAMENTARY REFERENDUM BLOC

This bloc will be composed of members of all political parties, also of Members of Parliament elected under the auspices of the People's Common Law Parliament. Their first duty will be to obtain the enactment of Supreme Common Laws and the establishment of the right of Referendum in the British Constitution.

The P.C.L.P. will use the organisation provided by the local Common Law Councils to take up regular referendums from the electorate. They will deal generally with social evils and reforms, but in particular will aim at securing the establishment of Supreme Common Law and the legal recognition of the use of referendums to obtain the consent of the electorate before any major Bill or reform becomes Law.

Such referendums will be placed before the House of Commons by the Referendum Bloc. Members of this Bloc may apply to the P.C.L.P. to take up a referendum on any matter on which they wish to ascertain the opinion of their constituents. This suggestion has been received with interest by many

members of the House of Commons.

The Referendum organisation and its activities would create an almost perfect election organisation, being in constant contact with every voter. It would deal with matters near to the heart of every man and woman, and reveal the honesty or dishonesty of political policies and Members of Parliament, and make known the truth concerning all national problems.

If an M.P. were foolish enough consistently to ignore his constituency and oppose its expressed wishes the electorate would be invited to select their own candidate for the next election. What would most probably happen would be that political parties, recognising the danger, would instruct M.P.s to obey the referendums. As a result, instead of parties working against the electorate for private ends, they would compete with each other to carry out its wishes.

The leader of the Referendum Bloc will be more certain of his ground when he makes a statement in the House than any Prime Minister in history. In a pile of referendums will lie the authority of the people for whom he speaks. His moral authority must become more powerful than the Prime Minister's, for the natural rights of the people must take precedence over all else and must be the outstanding and all-powerful authority in Parliament.

What is suggested here is a practical proposal and not a theory. The referendums of the P.C.L.P. will begin in small trickles from all parts of the country; gradually gathering momentum they will become an overwhelming public demand.

Notes

1. ↑ "Unwritten" is a legal expression which gives an incorrect impression to the lay mind. See Chapter Six.
2. ↑ Three years later similar principles, in a Ten-Point Peace Plan, were published in *The Times* with the signatures of the four leaders of the three main religious denominations, agreeing that they should be included in any plan for post-war reconstruction.
3. ↑ Since the outbreak of war these study groups have been developed under the name of Parliament Christian, or the People's Common Law Parliament, whose policy and activities we put forward in this book.
4. ↑ Not available; latest figure, 1937, £1,481,000,000.
5. ↑ National Bureau of Economic Research (*Incomes of U.S.*), No. 2, pp. 242-248.
6. ↑ The following figures indicate potential productive capacity up to 1935. In many instances new high-speed machinery doubled this capacity by 1939 and quadrupled it under the spur of war.
7. ↑ Oxford Corporation (Electricity) Bill, 1938.
8. ↑ For an examination of the relationship between the Bank of England and international finance see Mr. Jarvie's *The Old Lady Unveiled*, pp. 11, 12. "It will be found that out of twenty-six directors, including the governor, nine are associated with Anglo-foreign merchant banks, and six with important foreign or international concerns" Out of the 26 directors, "only eight are partners in industrial companies which are British, more or less. The Treasury is not represented, nor are any of the great English joint-stock banks."
9. ↑ "It is not my case alone," Charles I said at his trial, "it is the freedom and liberty of the people of England. And—do you pretend whatever you will—I stand more for their liberties. For if power without law may make laws, may alter the fundamental laws of the kingdom, I know not what subject he is in England that can be sure of his life or anything that he calls his own" (*State Trials*, iv, 1082).
10. ↑ *Gourgaud Memoirs*, and *A Portrait of a King*, by MacNair Wilson.
11. ↑ Lieutenant-Commander Fletcher, M.P., House of Commons—*The Times*, March 23, 1938.
12. ↑ These defects in our easy-going British Constitution were pointed out by a legal contemporary, *The Law Formal*, August 27, 1938: "National amiability has ... the defects of its qualities, for it undoubtedly leads to toleration of gross abuses in public finance This

is bound up with a certain sense of disconcert in public life which foreigners call hypocrisy, and which certainly screens a number of scoundrels who know how to defeat the law and square the Press

"The House of Commons has fostered various kinds of corruption, such as the Inclosures of the eighteenth century, the neglect of canals in the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, corruption is still subject to exposure in the Law Courts and judicial independence still remains our principal security for public integrity. Whatever tyranny may threaten us, the old maxim is still valid: *'The King ought not to be under any man but under God and under the Law; because the Law makes him King Let the King render to the Law what the Law renders to him, that is dominion and power; for he is nothing if his will rules and not the Law.'*

"At the close of the eighteenth century the industrial revolution resulted not only in a financial tyranny stronger than that of the landowners but also in the inhuman condition of mines and factories."

13.↑ See Chapter Six.

14.↑ "... it shall be lawful for every one in our realm to rise against us and to use all the ways and means they can to hinder us; to which we will that each and every one shall henceforth be bound by our command ... so that they shall in no way give attention to us, but that they shall do everything which aims at our injury and shall in no way be bound to us, until that in which we have transgressed and offended shall have been by a fitting satisfaction brought again into due state, according to the form of the ordinance of the aforesaid."

15.↑ A suggestion of the supplementary laws and Enabling Acts necessary for the operation of these four supreme laws will be found in Chapter Eight.

16.↑ From *The Times*, October 11 and 12 and November 13, 1940: "One of the fundamental causes of this war has been the unrelaxing efforts of Germany since 1918 to secure wide enough foreign markets to straighten her finances at the very time when all her competitors were forced by their own debts to adopt exactly the same course. Continuous friction was inevitable."

Germany adopted a new monetary policy after which, *The Times* says, "Germany ceased to experience any serious financial difficulty."

In this country the people suffer the burden of heavy and increasing taxation, but in Germany, says *The Times*:

"Nothing is ever heard of the necessity of increasing taxation, compulsory savings, or the issue of enormous public war loans. Quite the contrary. Recently an important tax was abolished. Public savings bank deposits touch new monthly records again and again. Money is so plentiful that the interest rate on the Reich loans could recently be reduced from 4½ to 4. per cent. Hitler seems to have discovered the secret of making something out of nothing, and to have evolved a system based on perpetual motion."

"These changes," we are told, "may well call for drastic readjustments in our established conventions. A hidebound persistence in methods and doctrines which were sound fifty years ago may easily prove as costly in the financial and economic field of actual war. It might not lose the war; it would certainly lose the peace."

17.↑ Mr. James Griffiths, M.P., House of Commons, January 21, 1941:

"We are paying the price for the last twenty years in allowing our industrial equipment to rust and to rot. For twenty years we lived in a period when coal mines, workshops, and shipbuilding yards were being closed down. By whom? By the financiers of this country who are in this House to-day I want the nation to remember that for twenty years we have pursued a policy of restricting and cutting down production, and now we are paying the price for it. I will give one example. What would this nation give to-day for a shipbuilding

yard at Jarrow? Who closed down Jarrow?"

- 18.↑ In the best diary of the Second World War yet published (U.S.A.) William L. Shirer, who accompanied the German armies in Belgium and France, etched this unforgettable picture in his May 19, 1940 entry:

"Returning from Brussels to Aachen, we ran across a batch of British prisoners They were herded together in the brick-paved yard of a disused factory. We stopped and went over and talked to them. They were a sad sight. Prisoners always are, especially right after a battle But what impressed me most about them was their physique. They were hollow-chested and skinny and round-shouldered. About a third of them had bad eyes and wore glasses. Typical, I concluded, of the youth that England neglected so criminally in the twenty-two post-war years when Germany, despite its defeat and the inflation and six million unemployed, was raising *its* youth in the open air and the sun."

- 19.↑ If the people had reviewed the situation in public forums what would their reply have been to the following:

"Was it common sense for this country to export over £5,641,000 worth of fighting aircraft, guns, and munitions, when we were admittedly short of them?" (Mr Montague, House of Commons, March 15, 1938.)

- 20.↑ "Of these bomber squadrons not more than 27 have modern aeroplanes ... 31 are equipped with Hines ... they have a range of not more than 160 miles ... how are you to pretend that your answer to an air attack will be to bomb the other country? ... We get propaganda of Hurricanes going at 412 miles an hour People think when we speak of 30 fighter squadrons that we have 30 of these new Hurricane squadrons. I suppose we have not more than two fitted with monoplanes (Sir H. Seely, House of Commons, March 15, 1938).

"We were not so well off in tanks as the enemy If we had had more tanks at the beginning of the war, if we only had *the completed designs of the tanks at the beginning of the war, then—*" (Mr. Attlee, House of Commons, May 6, 1941).

- 21.↑ See Chapter Nine.

- 22.↑ See Appendix B.

- 23.↑ The Act of Settlement covers some of these precepts. It also made it unlawful for any person who has an office or place of profit under the Crown, or receiving a pension from the Crown, to serve as a Member of the House of Commons. At the time of writing this Act has been suspended, as a war measure, we are informed. Thus a Member of Parliament, whilst receiving a salary of £600 a year for carrying out the wishes of his electors, may give the whole of his time to some other salaried occupation under the Crown and wholly neglect the needs and wishes of his constituents. The suspension not only violates the Act of Settlement but the fundamental constitution of democracy.

- 24.↑ Sir John Fortescue's *Commendation of the Laws of England*.