

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 11. No. 14.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

## MODERN SCIENCE (VIII)

You can carry an idea, possibly, to its conclusion. The essence of the grave matters we are discussing, it seems to me, is that you can't carry an idea to another idea's conclusion; and you can't carry an idea past its own conclusion. This it seems is what our politicians are trying to do, using 'education' as their field of action. Any idea, not merely some ideas, which may seem to have general application, can rule the mind, transform the character, and make or break the individual who entertains it. Wilkins, John Wallis, Seth Ward, Thomas Willis, Christopher Wren, Goddard, Ralph Bathurst and Robert Boyle were "satisfied that there was no certain way of arriving at any competent knowledge unless they made a variety of experiments upon natural bodies. In order to discover what phenomena they would produce [sic] they pursued that method by themselves with great industry and then communicated their discoveries to others." Their 'invisible college' grew in ten years into the Royal Society. I see no objection. Indeed, the idea seems, even now, capable of a wide extension of application. What is extraordinary is that those who are crying out for "a more liberal policy of Government encouragement of industrial research and support of the universities and technical colleges" (Sir William Bragg in *The Times*) seem indifferent to the application of the experimental method to remove the perplexities of their fellow 'scientists,' the economists. Ideas are, of their nature, revolutionary, and while human reason is cultivated, it will continue, in Newman's words, "to combine, to centralise, to look forward, to look back, to view things as a whole, whether for speculation or for action." Newman, however, preferred the opposing simplicity "which is the state of mind which does not combine, does not deal with premises and conclusions, does not recognise means and their end, but lets each work, each place, each occurrence stand by itself,—which acts towards each as it comes before it, without a thought of anything else. This simplicity is the temper of children..." To teach a child to read is to carry a practical idea to its conclusion. To keep a child tied up in a school without teaching it to read, to lead it to the condition in which it will say that it can read when it cannot, and believe that it is reading when it is merely repeating what it does not understand and cannot interpret or usefully apply, is to carry another, and an alien idea to its conclusion. "Be it known," said Bacon, "how vast a difference there is . . . between the Idols of the human mind and the Ideas of the divine. The former are nothing more than arbitrary abstractions; the latter are the creator's own stamp upon creation, impressed and defined in matter by true and exquisite lines." Matthew Arnold may have been right when he said that the middle classes had arrived, "proud of being able to say what they like, whilst

indifferent to the fact that they have nothing whatever to say." The weak word is 'indifferent.' Arnold was himself indulging in a genuflection to one of his idols. The 'middle classes' were unconscious of what was happening to them. They saw themselves as carpenters when they were only wood.

"I have received, from a highly respected quarter, a very strong recommendation of a young man of twenty-two years of age, much thought of by Schelling [suspected of being the author of the German version of the *Marseillaise*]. He has made himself known by a new edition of the *Hitopadesa* from the Sanscrit, and is a general scholar, altogether distinguished. He desires to live some years in England. . . ." The young man did. He was Friedrich Maximilian Müller, God-son of Mendelssohn, and afterwards the Oxford Professor, Max Müller. The letter is by Baron Bunsen, the Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary of William IV. Max Müller wrote an editor's preface to the *Memoirs of Baron Stockmar*, which stated that Stockmar had two political ideals: "first to see Germany united under Prussia; secondly, to help establish a unity of purpose between Germany and England." According to family tradition, Stockmar was descended "from a Stockmar who accompanied Gustavus Adolphus from Sweden to Saxony, and settled there." According to his son, he was one of those "who looked upon themselves as the servants and instruments of a higher Law, not as the arbitrary rulers of human affairs." The son's biographical sketch, introducing the *Memoirs*, ends with the following passage from one of Stockmar's letters: "The peculiarity of my position compelled me always anxiously to efface the best things I attempted and sometimes succeeded in accomplishing, and to conceal them as if they had been crimes. Like a thief in the night, I have often laid the seed corn in the earth, and when the plant grew up and could be seen, I knew how to ascribe the merit to others, and I was forced to do so. Even now people often tell me of such and such things, and how this or that arose and came to pass, and in so far as they speak of the second stage of their production, they are right enough. But those good people know nothing of the first stage. The growth of a plant requires air, light, warmth, etc.; and so it might seem to these different elements, that without the influence of each of them, there would have been no plant at all, and as far as they go, they are right enough. But the first and chief merit is undoubtedly due to him who, of his own motion, and solely for the eventual benefit of others, laid the seed corn at the right time in the right soil. If then, men and circumstances generally combine to envelope in night and darkness the best of my conceptions and ideas and the undertakings founded on them, so that not the faintest suspicion of their origin is possible, that will hardly annoy me."

The final comment of the son is of interest: "He was

content to remain always half-hidden before the eyes of posterity. Faithful to his spirit, this book also lifts the veil but a little."

Yet, it does lift it a little: "Both the King [Leopold] and Stockmar did not regard the future they desired for the Prince [Albert], merely as one of external advantage and brilliancy, but connected with it solemn and difficult claims, and from a high point of view considered the plan of previous preparation [for the marriage of Queen Victoria] conscientiously and maturely." When the Prince Consort died, Stockmar wrote: "An edifice, which, for a great and noble purpose, had been reared, with a devout sense of duty, by twenty years of laborious toil, has been shattered to its very foundations."

The propaganda for Mr. Butler's education plans suggests that Stockmar was unduly pessimistic.

TUDOR JONES.

(To be continued.)

## Points from Parliament

House of Commons: November 30, 1943.

### BRITISH SERVICE COURTS, UNITED STATES (JURISDICTION)

*Mr. Rhys Davies* asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Britishers serving in His Majesty's Forces stationed in the United States of America are tried for civil offences by British military courts on the spot, as is the case of American troops stationed in this country?

*Mr. George Hall*: His Majesty's Government have been advised that the United States authorities are of the opinion that British Service courts and authorities in the United States have the right under United States law to exercise jurisdiction over members of their forces in respect of Service offences. In some cases members of His Majesty's Forces in the United States charged with offences against United States law have already been tried by British Service courts and in others by United States Courts. I understand that in order to facilitate the exercise of such jurisdiction, it is necessary for the United States Government to pass legislation, and that such legislation in the form of a draft Bill for Congress has already been prepared.

House of Commons: December 1, 1943.

### KING'S SPEECH: DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS

Order read for resuming adjourned Debate on Question.—[24th November.]

That a humble address be presented to His Majesty as followeth:—

Most Gracious Sovereign,

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your

Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."—  
[*Commander Brabner*.]

Question again proposed . . .

*Mr. Woods* (Finsbury): I beg to move, at the end of the Question, to add:

"But humbly regret the decision of Your Majesty's advisers to release Sir Oswald Mosley, which is calculated to retard the war effort and lead to misunderstanding at home and abroad."

[*A survey of the points raised by those backing the Amendment shows that the main argument in their armoury was the bad psychological effect Sir Oswald Mosley's release would have on opinion at home and abroad. The point was made with great emphasis by Mr. Woods (Finsbury), who moved the amendment, Mr. Parker (Romford), its seconder, Mr. Chater (Bethnal Green), Mr. David Grenfell (Gower), Mr. Gallacher (Fife, West) and Dr. Haden Guest (Islington, North), whose sharp exchange with Captain Thorneycroft has not been widely reported:—*]

*Dr. Guest*: . . . Does the Home Secretary realise that in those conditions, when we are fighting the foul evil of Fascism, of which this man Mosley had made himself the devil priest and prophet, it is not the time to release the man whose release can only encourage the forces fighting against us? Did the right hon. Gentleman take into consideration, or did he not, the effect his decision would have on the men and women in the battle line, in the factories, on our Allies and especially on the Communists in Russia, that great nation whose whole policy is conducted according to the tenets of Communism—

*Captain Thorneycroft* (Stafford): Do I understand that the hon. Member is suggesting that the Home Secretary should take into consideration other factors than those which were set out by Parliament in Regulation 18B?

*Dr. Guest*: I certainly suggest that the Home Secretary should take into consideration all the relevant factors—

*Captain Thorneycroft*: None are relevant.

*Dr. Guest*:—which concern the question of the release of Sir Oswald Mosley and might at least have taken these matters into consideration before issuing a statement to the Press and allowing it to be broadcast before Parliament had met. He should have made this statement to Parliament after very careful drafting. That is a very important point indeed.

*Captain Thorneycroft*: It is an entirely different point.

*Dr. Guest*: Does the hon. and gallant Member consider that the Home Secretary should have put forward this proposal to release Mosley on what appeared to many medical men as trivial medical grounds at a time when millions of Jews are being tortured to death?

*Captain Thorneycroft*: What has that to do with it?

*Dr. Guest*: Can the hon. and gallant Member dissociate the fact that this man was the leader of Fascism in this country, that he inspired the Fascism here and that others may perhaps be inspired to worse atrocities abroad because he has been released—can he dissociate that from the question of Mosley's release? I suggest that he cannot.

*Captain Thorneycroft*: May I interrupt again?

[*Dr. Guest did not give way.*]

*Other points made by those backing the Amendment were based on technical grounds, questioning the medical*

*opinion cited, and moral grounds—that Sir Oswald Mosley was a Fascist and a bad man.*

*The opposing view—which was, broadly, that public safety once being assured, the arguments advanced were all irrelevant to the main issue, which was integrally concerned with the restoration of that freedom of the individual for which we are fighting—was best expressed in the speeches, extracts from which are given below:—]*

Major Stourton (Salford, South): I cannot help regretting that it has been found necessary to hold this Debate at all, when there are so many other important questions which might have been put before the House. I think that the subject of the Amendment is symptomatic of a mild form of war hysteria, of which the Hereford birching case was another unfortunate example. I could not disagree more with any Amendment than with this one. I do not believe that anyone outside Bedlam could really believe that the release of Sir Oswald Mosley is

“calculated to retard the war effort.”

or that it is likely, further to quote the Amendment, to “lead to misunderstanding at home and abroad”—that is, among people in responsible circles. I would like to bring the House back to a sense of reality. I am not in the least concerned as to whether it is Sir Oswald Mosley—with whom I have no acquaintance—or a Tory, or a Communist or the Archbishop of Canterbury himself whose release is involved, but I maintain that the Minister of Home Security was perfectly justified in releasing Sir Oswald Mosley on the principles of equity and humanitarianism, which I am glad to say have been invoked to demonstrate once more to the whole world that we believe in fair play and justice to all. Sir Oswald Mosley has been held for more than three years, with no charge against him. He has been detained under Regulation 18B, which is at best a most repugnant Regulation to every man who bears the name of Englishman. Moreover, it has been stated by no fewer than five eminent doctors that his life would be in jeopardy were he to be further detained. In view of what has been said by the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment, it is significant that I have not received a single letter protesting against the release from my own constituency. And there is no more democratic constituency in the country, and no constituency where the people exhibit more political wisdom.

The Minister of Home Security had certain other alternatives. These were not alternatives which would be acceptable to people in this country. They were alternatives which would be favoured by the Nazis and Fascists whom hon. Gentlemen opposite profess so much to dislike. The first was that he be shot out of hand. Does that appeal to any hon. Gentleman opposite? I hope not. The second alternative was that he should remain in detention and be allowed to rot and perish in his cell. These are not British methods. I feel some slight alarm at the thought that, by implication at any rate, the Mover and Seconder of this Amendment have some sympathy with those principles, which I should have thought would be most objectionable to any Member of this House. I close with this warning: if ever the day comes when the Government of this country is influenced by and truckles to the clamour of any noisy and insignificant section of the community, such as has worked up the agitation which has caused this Debate, on that very day the death knell of democracy will have been sounded in this country. My last

(Continued on Page Seven)

## SMUTS USES EXPLOSIVES

The speech by J. C. Smuts on an unspecified day of the week ending November 27 and variously described as “to M.P.s,” and to the Empire Parliamentary Association, a semi-official body, had curious features:—

(1) The son of Jacob Abraham Smuts was “only thinking aloud;” but the Press, national and parochial, distributed his thoughts, to which he “does not necessarily wish to be held,” as their own exactly, and “striking and realistic” views which seemingly it would be indecent to present otherwise than oracularly.

(2) He announced that there may be no peace conference. If surrender is “unconditional,” why should there be? The representatives of belligerent countries confer about terms, *i.e.*, conditions. No conditions, no conference about conditions. So, this ‘peace conference doubt’ may be read as merely a doubt about the present position of unconditionalism in high (financial) quarters, or as an insistence upon unconditionalism and all its consequences for England. We are suddenly to have “nothing in the till.”

(3) The rest of the speech, as reported, was a threat of difficulties ahead, testing our “wisdom, far-sightedness, statesmanship and humanity probably for generations,” with a “satisfactory” outcome only after “continuous” and “prolonged” this, that and the other. The oleaginous relish with which Smuts invariably presents this kind of dish is his favourite medium and identification mark. (See *Freedom*, the address he delivered to St. Andrews University students on October 17, 1934, a brilliant essay in the technique of the ‘ceaselessly-effective lure’). That Smuts should have returned to this theme at the present time may be the first clear indication, from as close to the Sanhedrim as we are likely to get, that World War II has gone wrong after all, and the only hope of its authors now lies in the creation of such a din of discordant noises as will madden most of us, and in which, at any rate, no sane voice can be heard: a noise, which is, to quote our ‘imperial’ visitor, “so vast, so complicated, so difficult and intractable” as to make even an armistice not quite practicable in any but a local and temporary sense. If not it is just a piece of fist-shaking at the Prime Minister’s back in North Africa. T. J.

## ABERHART MANNING

*The memoir of Mr. Aberhart published in the EDMONTON BULLETIN, and that journal’s report of Mr. Manning’s speech on policy broadcast on his becoming Premier of Alberta.*

With portraits of Mr. Aberhart and Mr. Manning.

Price 9d (Postage extra).

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

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 11. No. 14.

Saturday, December 11, 1943.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

YOU HAVE BEEN WARNED: A correspondent of a well-known weekly contemporary writes that a firearms licence which he has held for twenty years has been withdrawn, the only reason given being that it is now "Government" policy to deprive all private individuals of weapons. After Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, both without the formality of Parliamentary Debate or Repeal.

• • •  
 "They that would give up essential liberty for the illusion of temporary security, deserve neither liberty nor security."—BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

• • •  
 "In practical terms this means the British are not likely to get Hong Kong back, and in Malaya and the islands they and the Dutch must return under conditions far different from those prevailing in November, 1941. It means an ultimate change in India. . . . This is the only answer we of the West have for the Japanese story."—*San Francisco Chronicle*, October 21, 1943.

• • •  
 In practical terms this seems to mean that we are fighting the Japanese in case they bomb Pearl Harbour again. Or perhaps it's just to provide full employment.

• • •  
 "Political Freedom cannot exist except when it is founded on industrial freedom. If a private group controls a man's livelihood it can control both his actions and his philosophy. And so with the progression of the disease of cartelisation. A new political philosophy arises justifying centralised planning of production and distribution. . . .

• • •  
 "Socialists eagerly advocate this new order. Their only quarrel with industrialists is in the selection of those who will manage the brave new world. Socialists want to recruit the managers from the ranks of the academic thinkers sympathetic with the under dog. Industrialists want to choose them from the cartel leaders. Both groups are ready to abandon industrial democracy. Thus a culture which is willing to embrace a political dictatorship spreads over the thinking of the nation."—THURMAN W. ARNOLD: *Germany's Master Plan*, p.8.

• • •  
 General Smuts (Christian Smuts, as Lord Woolton would laughingly say), has been acting as Mercury between the Masters of the World and the Empire Parliamentary Associa-

tion, and telling them what has been decided for us. ("The understanding between Capetown and Washington is close.")

Oddly enough, we heard it all before the war. Russia is to dominate Europe, the British Empire is to be split up, and the United States is to dominate the rest of the world. There is to be no peace conference but a series of conferences to fix everything without fuss. Once-great Britain is wahnnderfal, but finished.

We feel that this ought to be circulated to the troops. Some of them may not be Grand Orient Freemasons with large holdings in gold shares. They will no doubt be delighted to learn that they're fighting for the booby prize.

• • •  
 The minerals of "Britain" have now been acquired by the international cartels, *via* the "nation," for less than the cost of six days of war. This will enable the British public to get less and worse coal at higher prices, and avoid the danger of the royalty-owners' mineral surveyors making injudicious remarks about what is going on.

It is significant that what is probably the most vicious industrial (as distinct from financial) organisation in the world, the *Interesses Gemeinschaft Farbenindustrie Aktiengesellschaft* (Community of Interest of Dye Industries, Incorporated) commonly known as *I. G. Farben* does not specify German community of interests. Notice that I, the initial of international, occurs in the title of *I. G. Farben*, I.C.I. (Imperial Chemical Industries) and E. I. du Pont, the "American" edition of *I. G. Farben*.

• • •  
 "When, by a process of law, the common people lose their homes, they will be more docile and easily governed through the strong arm of governments applied by a central power of wealth under the control of leading financiers. This truth is well known among our principal men now engaged in forming an imperialism of capital (finance) to govern the world. By dividing the voters by a political party system we can get them to expend their energies in fighting over questions of no importance. Thus by discreet action, we can secure for ourselves what has been so well-planned and so successfully accomplished."—*Bankers' Magazine* (U.S.), August 26, 1934, quoted by Major A. H. JUKES, D.S.O., O.B.E., at Vancouver, B.C., June 15, 1943.

### CRITICISM OF SMUTS

*The Times* of December 7 begins its second leading article as follows:—

"Some criticism of General Smut's address to the Empire Parliamentary Association published last week rests on an evident misapprehension. General Smuts made it plain beyond—it would have seemed—any possibility of error that he was not speaking for the British Government or for any member of the British Commonwealth, that he was not indeed making a pronouncement of policy at all. He explicitly described what he had to say as 'speculative,' and referred more than once to its 'explosive' quality. A question which has been put down in the House of Commons should serve to remove the last trace of misunderstanding of the nature and purpose of General Smuts's address. Other critics . . ."

## The Challenge to Albertans

*The substance of a broadcast address by  
the Hon. E. C. MANNING, Premier of Alberta.*

In this series of broadcasts, as your Premier I want to speak directly to you, the people of Alberta, who are the supreme constitutional authority in all matters coming within our Provincial jurisdiction. I want to speak to you as your employee, your servant, having the responsibility of leading your elected government which exists solely for the purpose of administering your affairs in accordance with your collective will.

I know that democratic government has departed a long, long way from that conception of what it should be. But I am suggesting—in fact, ladies and gentlemen, I am urging with all the power at my command—that we in Alberta should give vigorous leadership in this matter, so that by establishing a virile and properly functioning democracy here in our own Province, we shall blaze the trail for the rest of Canada.

That might seem an ambitious task to tackle. Perhaps it is, but it is a very essential task. We know that it is just so much humbug to talk about a new democratic order after the war unless the foundations for it are firmly laid before the war is ended. We know that a functioning democracy in all its fullness alone will provide those foundations. We know that in laying those foundations a start has to be made somewhere. I am urging that we get busy right here in our own Province. We all have a dual responsibility to the men who are fighting on the battlefronts of the world. First we must see to it that they receive all the weapons, the equipment, the food and the reserves they require to finish their part of the job. I believe that we are alive to that duty. But also we have our part of the job to do. It is our inescapable responsibility—the responsibility of every one of us—to ensure that when our fighting men return victorious we shall welcome them back to a post-war democracy in which they, and every Canadian, will have the permanent security and the individual freedom that is rightfully his birthright. If we fail in this we shall not only break faith with them and with our children, but we shall be inviting social and economic chaos on a cataclysmic scale.

That is the issue which each one of us has to face fairly and squarely. The question is: "What are we going to do about it?" It is no use shutting our eyes to the fact that we have not, and we never have had, a properly functioning democracy in Canada. If Government in Canada had been in accordance with the will of the people, then Canadians would have consistently obtained the results they wanted from the management of their affairs. But we know from bitter experience that the people have consistently had to put up with results they did not want in terms of degrading unemployment, grinding poverty, general insecurity and all the other odious features common to most countries during the pre-war depression years.

Something has gone wrong with democracy, but instead of facing the facts fairly and squarely we are rather apt to put the blame solely on our governments. Actually, we all are to blame—because, in a constitutional democracy the people, as the supreme authority, must assume full responsi-

bility for everything which is done in their name. Instead of the people guarding their authority jealously and exercising that authority with a proper sense of responsibility, they have allowed a private money monopoly to establish itself and to assume powers which make it a virtual dictatorship, riding roughshod over the people's authority and privileges. Why has this condition come about? Simply because the understanding and the social thinking of the people themselves have fallen away behind the technological advances we have made in the processes of production, transportation, communication, and so on.

In my last broadcast I mentioned that authority and privilege carry with them corresponding responsibilities—and because the people of a democracy are the constitutionally supreme authority, they must recognise that they also have to assume supreme responsibility. And if they are to assume their responsibilities they must be informed.

If, then, we are going to tackle this task of making democracy in all its fullness a functioning reality in Alberta, then it means that you personally and all the rest of us who constitute the people of Alberta, will have to assume our personal share of the responsibility for the management of our Provincial affairs.

That, ladies and gentlemen, will make demands on each one of us. We shall have to devote both time and thought to it.

But what if it does make some small demand on our time to make democracy a reality? Surely that is a small price to pay for the benefits obtained. Men will gladly give up their work, leave their homes, get into uniform, undergo rigorous training and risk their lives to defend democracy against attack from a foreign enemy. Is it too much that we should devote a few hours a month by way of study and work in order to make democracy a functioning reality so that all the sacrifice of life and happiness in its defence shall not have been in vain? I have complete confidence as to how you will answer that challenge.

In the task of establishing a properly functioning democracy here in Alberta, the first step is for you, the people, to learn to realise that you are the constitutionally supreme authority in all matters coming within Provincial jurisdiction. You are the masters in your own constitutional sphere. It is for you to learn how to determine what it is you want. It is for you to lay down what results you want from the management of your affairs. It is the duty of your representatives to bring your instructions to the Legislative Assembly, and it is the duty of your Government to take the necessary action to ensure that your affairs are administered in obedience to your collective will.

But the matter does not end there. If your Government acts in obedience to your will, and any private vested interests or anybody else, for that matter, deliberately obstructs your Government's efforts on your behalf, then you, the people, as the constitutionally supreme authority, should join with your Government to assert your authority. Only in that manner can government in obedience to the will of the people be made effective.

That is the relationship which should exist between the electorate and their Government in a democracy, and that is the relationship which I shall do everything within my power to bring about in the sphere of our Provincial affairs.

Your Government is not only ready but anxious to do its part. I hope that you, the people, are likewise ready and anxious to do yours.

It will be for you to tell us what you want us to do—and to the extent we may meet opposition in carrying out your collective will, to use your influence and power in joining with us to overcome that opposition.

That brings me to an immediate problem with which you are faced.

Under existing conditions the majority of the people have no effective means for expressing their collective will. To the extent that the farmers are organised they can do so to a limited degree in regard to agricultural matters. To the extent workers are organised, they can express their wishes on labour questions. But there is no organisation through which the people as a whole can state their collective will.

It seems to me that in this matter democracy has fallen down badly, for how can the people function as the supreme constitutional authority unless they are effectively organised to give expression to their wishes and to obtain obedience from the institutions which exist to serve them?

The next matter to which I wish to draw your attention is the utter futility and danger of the petty political intrigue which has been the curse of this country in the past. It is fantastic to imagine that we can have a properly functioning democracy—that is government in accordance with the will of all the people—under a political system which divides the people into various opposing camps each fighting the other. It is a principle of Christian teaching which is fundamental to our democratic ideals that a kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation. We have only to look back to the plight of the democratic countries before the war, and we will realise the havoc created by all the intrigue of party politics. Surely the tragedy of France should be a warning to us. So my appeal to each of you is to use your personal influence to bring a new dignity into the political life of our province. Let us get rid of the mean intrigue, the mischievous scheming, the bitterness and all the degrading features that have dragged politics into the gutter of public disrepute. It can be done—if we have the will to do it.

Actually there is no need for all the strife of party political intrigue in Alberta. The overwhelming majority of the people are really united in regard to the results they want. There is no clash of general interests. Everybody wants full economic security with the maximum of freedom in terms of adequate but equitable prices; decent wages and working conditions, security in the home and on the land; security in unemployment, sickness and old age; freedom from burdensome debt and harsh taxation, and freedom from regimentation and State domination of their lives.

We have a wonderful Province. There is no part of the earth's surface so richly endowed with natural resources as this area we call Alberta and the territory which lies immediately north and which should be included within our Provincial boundaries. The possibilities of development and progress are unlimited—in fact they stagger the imagination.

In short, we have all the means for realising the results that the overwhelming majority of our people want. The barriers which stand in the way of their realisation are al-

most entirely in the financial field. The resources are there, we have a virile people capable of developing those resources. There are no insurmountable physical obstacles. The one major problem is a money problem.

Surely the disappearance of money shortage under war conditions should demonstrate to us beyond any shadow of doubt that all the poverty and restriction which was imposed upon this country during those depression years through lack of money was an inexcusable outrage.

To sum up, when we get right down to the brass tacks of the situation we find that the overwhelming majority of the people are in reality united in regard to the results they want, and that we have all the means available for obtaining those results. But we all are confronted with a common obstacle to their realisation—namely, the overriding monopoly of finance.

Surely this is a challenge to the people to unite in expressing their collective will and to take common action to overcome any attempt to usurp their authority and thwart their purpose. Such united action by the people would be invincible. But if the people permit themselves to be divided into various political camps each fighting the other, what hope—I repeat, what hope—is there for them to exercise their democratic authority to break and to overcome the powerful and well-organised forces of the financial combine which to-day dominates the management of their affairs?

Therefore my appeal to you tonight is to give these matters your most earnest consideration. Let us rise to the challenge which faces us, and remembering our responsibilities, let us go forward together, united and determined, to establish here in Alberta a properly functioning democracy which will serve as a firm foundation for a post-war order of which we shall have just cause to be proud. The opportunity of a life time is ours—let us seize it.

### OUR BRAVE BUREAUCRACY

At the Dewsbury, West Riding, court recently, a representative of the Board of Trade said that traffic in coupons was increasing, and that prosecutions would be continued until it had stopped.

The occasion for this brave display of firmness was the prosecution of an old age pensioner who sold his clothing coupons for five shillings to buy something to eat.

He was so poor that the Bench dismissed the case against him and remitted the costs.

### THE BEVERIDGE PLOT

*An exposure of the network of oppressive restrictions which comprise the Beveridge Plan for 'Social Security.'*

Price: 3d. (postage extra)

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

## PARLIAMENT

(Continued from Page Three).

sentence is a word of advice, if I may offer it with all humility and respect, to all the Members who have put their names down to the Amendment before the House to-day, to clear their minds of cant and let us get on with winning the war.

*The Attorney-General (Sir Donald Somervell):* . . . It was noticeable but not surprising when one looks at the terms of the Amendment that neither the Mover nor the Seconder referred in any part of their speeches to the Act of Parliament or the Regulations under which Sir Oswald Mosley was detained. The overriding power is to be found in the Act itself, and it is in these words:

"That Regulation may make provision for the detention of persons whose detention appears to the Secretary of State to be expedient in the interests of the public safety or the defence of the Realm."

That is the power, and that is the limit. I again disagree with the Mover and the Seconder when they suggest—or as the Mover suggested—that this Motion on the Paper does not raise, as it were, the general background, scope and purpose of 18B. I think it does. . . . Parliament . . . when it passed the Emergency Defence Act and when it approved in a modified form the originally submitted Regulation 18B, restricted the use of the power to the one purpose of public safety. I include, of course, Defence of the Realm under the general heading public safety. The men, therefore, who have been detained are not convicted prisoners; they are not undergoing punishment as such; it is unpleasant but they are not there because we want them punished. I think it is a fact that for practical reasons it was necessary, in the first instance, to send all these men to one or other of our prisons, and this fact may have given rise to some misunderstanding. As is known, later camps were provided, and some went to the Isle of Man, and so on, but they are not prisoners convicted of any crime.

. . . Let me turn to some of the speeches and the Amendment itself in which reference was made to repercussions throughout the world. Once the Home Secretary has satisfied himself that it is no longer necessary to detain a man for the public safety, he has no right to detain him just because his release will cause repercussions throughout the world. Supposing I got up and told the court that the Home Secretary had come to the conclusion that it was no longer necessary in the interests of public safety to detain a man, but that he was afraid of the comments that might be made and of repercussions in other countries, and that there would be misunderstanding in this country, and therefore wanted to keep him in detention, the answer would be that that detention had become unlawful . . . the hon. Members, the Mover and Seconder, paid tribute to the Home Secretary. They said that he had proceeded in this matter according to the principles of justice. They paid tribute to his political impartiality, but they went on to suggest that he should have taken into account these wider considerations. The hon. Members said he should have hesitated because of the repercussions and that he did not realise how people would react. I would respectfully submit to them that they should reconsider their attitude to this matter because, I believe, that on consideration they will be able to convince themselves that

these are matters on which this House has precluded the Home Secretary from considering in the administration of his duties. . . . The hon. Member for North Islington (Dr. Guest) spoke of very special treatment. It is not true. Other persons, when it was reported that detention was likely to cause permanent injury to health, have been released on the same lines and on exactly the same principles. In fact something like 600 of those originally detained in the dire and dark days of May, 1940, have been released. [An Hon. Member: "Why not release them all?"]. We have come down from 600 in this particular category of people to about 30. . . . These men are not convicted prisoners. They are detained for purposes of national safety under a power which for any other purpose is odious to us all. The most detested feature of our enemies is the concentration camp. This is, if you like, an administration of this Regulation which is humane. It takes account of possible permanent danger to health in cases where that can be avoided, subject to the national safety. I suggest that the Amendment is misconceived and is based on the view that the Home Secretary can take into account things which by the law, and I believe by the overwhelming wish of the House, he is precluded from and should not have regard to.

*Commander Bower (Cleveland):* . . . The hon. and gallant Member for South Salford (Major Stourton) said he had had little or no representations from his constituents on the subject. The same has been my experience. My constituency is on the North East coast. People there, I am glad to say, are very busy working. I have had one communication from them, and that came from the Middlesbrough Co-operative Society. But there has undoubtedly been feeling aroused elsewhere, and as one Member has said, among all classes of the community.

I want to put this consideration briefly to the House. We are after all representatives of the people, and this is the High Court of Parliament. We have a double informing function, that of informing His Majesty's Government what people are thinking and also the function of informing our constituents when they are going off the rails, as they have done in this case. After all, there is behind this the old fundamental British justice which has been fought for so often in the last 600 or 700 years. One of the cardinal principles of that justice is that no man is guilty until he has been tried and found guilty. Almost every speech in support of the Amendment has made the entirely unwarrantable assumption that Sir Oswald Mosley has been found guilty. As I have said, it would appear that there is a strong *prima facie* case that he is guilty, but he has not yet been brought to trial, and I cannot see that in the old traditions of British justice any of the considerations which have been put forward about the effect on the Allies and so forth should have the slightest effect in determining this matter. The other day, in common with many other Members, I had the opportunity of interviewing a large number of the delegates who came and infested the Lobbies. Curiously enough, I do not quite know why, I seemed to be lucky or unlucky, whichever way you look at it, and they all happened to be Communists. I do not know quite how that happened. We had an interesting talk, lasting about 40 minutes, so interesting that they failed to be in time for the meeting which, as the hon. and learned Member for Carmarthen (Mr. Moelwyn Hughes) said, so spontaneously happened at Caxton Hall, attended by the hon. Members for West Fife (Mr. Gallacher) and North Hammersmith (Mr.

Pritt) and, I believe, others. I found among those young Communists the worst advertisement for our educational system that could possibly be imagined. Every single one I talked to was under the impression that Sir Oswald Mosley was interned as a criminal because he was a Fascist and that he was being let out, and nothing would persuade them that that was not so. . . . We as Members of Parliament have a very great responsibility. These people who are upset are acting under stress of emotion, and why blame them? They have been working hard all these years. We have seen this wave of unofficial strikes. The nerves of the people are getting ragged. I firmly believe that if they were properly instructed about what has really happened in this case and the steps the Home Secretary has taken—and this House has three times fortified him in possession of these powers, and the Court of Appeal in the Liversedge judgment and other cases has fortified him—I believe that if they knew that they would agree that this is a storm in a teacup. . . . I say with all respect to Members who intend to support this Amendment to-day that the dust of this storm will very soon subside. One thing will remain. If there is a Division, the Division list will be a clear indication for future reference of those hon. Members who wish to use extra-constitutional powers for the purpose of imprisoning without trial their political opponents.

[Mr. Morrison's reference to newspapers which "walked round the clock" is worth noting:—]

The responsibility for the decision in the individual case is firmly placed upon the Home Secretary and not on Parliament. It is not placed on the newspaper Press. The great bulk of the provincial Press, as far as I can see, has been very level-headed and sensible, and so has a high proportion of the London Press. But there are certain newspapers which have rather lost their heads. There is a Sunday paper called *Reynolds* which mystifies me. It seems to take its policy from the Communist party and to get its money from the Co-ops., of which I am a humble member. *Reynolds* newspaper does not like the Labour party and does not like me, and it is entitled to its view, but it has been rather hysterical. The *Spectator*, which is, I understand, a Conservative weekly review—[HON MEMBERS: "Liberal."]—attacked me about the brutality of 18B, and the *News Chronicle* is amazing. It pursued me about 18B and was in alliance with the hon. Members for Gravesend (Sir I. Albery), Epsom (Sir A. Southby), and Cleveland (Commander Bower) and supported them. It almost accused me of having abandoned every Liberal principle, and now it switches right round and joins the mob, and even the *Star*, which used to be called "the naughty little betting sister of the *Daily News*," has done the same thing. It may be the case that Liberalism is dead in Bouverie Street. By Liberalism I mean Liberalism in its highest sense. It appears to be dead in Bouverie Street, but I am proud to say it still survives in the British Home Office. . . . A lot of people have walked round the clock on this. This Regulation was denounced by the Communist party earlier on.

Mr. Gallacher: No.

Mr. Morrison: Yes. I wish I had time to go into it. It was denounced by the National Council of Civil Liberties. That is an amazing organisation. They switched right round and so did a lot of other people. I had to make this decision and I have made it, right or wrong—I believe rightly. . . .

THE FOLLOWING PUBLICATIONS are available in limited supply from K.R.P. Publications, Limited:—

<i>The Nature of Social Credit</i> , by L. D. BYRNE.....	3d.
<i>Battle for Freedom</i> by L. D. BYRNE .....	2d.
<i>Prepare Now!</i> (A suggested Programme of Post-War Reconstruction, issued by the Bureau of Information, Legislative Building, Edmonton, Alberta) .....	5d.
<i>The Father of Lies</i> , by WARREN WESTON .....	3/6
<i>Why Colleges Breed Communists</i> , by A. N. FIELD .....	2/6
<i>The Press Ban on Parliament</i> (compiled by JOHN MITCHELL) with <i>What Capital Levy Means to You</i> , by C. H. DOUGLAS .....	1/6
<i>Lower Rates and Lower Assessments</i> .....	3d.
<i>The Social Order</i> (The Encyclical <i>Quadragesimo Anno</i> ) by His Holiness POPE PIUS XI.....	2d.

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

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

### ALSO

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

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.