

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 19.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 15, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

The Brief for the Prosecution

By C. H. DOUGLAS

PART II: CHAPTER II*

At the present time, we use words for political purposes which either have no meaning, or, if correctly defined, describe something which does not exist. We do this at our peril. Democracy is such a word.

The etymological description of democracy is "popular government, rule by the people" (Skeat). Out of six words comprising this double definition, four require definition in themselves—"popular," "government," "rule" and "people."

But even so vague and inexact a definition as that of Skeat would probably not be advanced by most people, who would say that democracy is rule by the majority, or universal suffrage. And if asked to name the democracies, they might reply, Great Britain, the British Dominions and the United States. Great Britain is a limited monarchy, and the United States is a republic. Neither is, even by definition, a democracy.

When a man says he has something of which some kind of a definition or description exists, it is a sound principle, before forming any opinion of the thing, to make sure that he really has it. It is certain, for instance, that the state of affairs in any of the titular democracies cannot be made to agree with even Dr. Skeat. It is almost equally certain that it would be a major catastrophe if it did so correspond. Clearly, there can be two explanations of this. Either "the people" are prevented from "ruling" by the machinations of wicked men, or "rule by the people" is an impossibility.

The second explanation has an important consequence—that democracy, being impossible but attractive as an idea, would form the best possible cloak for the condition indicated by the alternative explanation. This is the criticism strenuously propagandised by the admirers of totalitarian rulers such as Herr Hitler and Mr. Stalin (although Communists amusingly describe Russia as a democracy). It can be demonstrated that real democracy is possible; but it must be conceded that a visible dictatorship is preferable to an anonymous tyranny or a manipulated electorate.

Mr. Asquith, when concerned to pass the Parliament Act, which abolished the very real safeguard of an effective Second Chamber, said "The will of the people must and

shall prevail." With this in mind, an examination of the working of "majority rule" may be helpful. Almost any concrete case would serve, but we may take motor-car taxation as an example. The facts are fairly simple. The tax in Great Britain is the highest motor tax in the world, it is inequitable and irrational, and it is detrimental to motor-car design and economical production. It is highly popular with everyone who does not pay it. It was imposed under a strict undertaking that it would be devoted to road costs (Car Licences are still called Road Fund Licences) which undertaking was almost immediately abandoned with complete cynicism. Yet this is an outstanding instance of majority rule. The explanation is that fewer people have motor cars than are without them. An election on whether motor car taxation should be abolished and the same sum added to the taxation of beer would not be in doubt for five minutes. In the United States or Canada, where a large majority own cars, British car taxation would not be tolerated.

Or take the price of wine. A bottle of good red or white wine in France or Italy ten years ago cost about 2d. The same, or a worse, because adulterated, wine in England cost probably 3/6, since wine drinkers in England are in a minority, and can be safely penalised.

The successful attack on landowning has the same explanation. Just as taxation on wine is made respectable by "temperance" crusades, and motor taxation, until well established, was justified by a mythical deterioration of the roads by motor traffic, so land taxation, the real basis of which is minority ownership, is made virtuous by "Land Songs" and other incendiary propaganda. The instances could be multiplied indefinitely.

So-called democracy, therefore, is a ballot-box device for despoiling minorities, not, it should be carefully noted, for the benefit of majorities, but for the benefit of third parties. Motor taxes do not distribute motor cars, wine taxes do not distribute wine, and expropriated estates do not go to the landless.

It has been remarked in many quarters, and the argument is receiving more attention daily, that the present political chaos is directly and consciously connected with the doctrine and popularisation of the unproved theory of the origin of species, and its corollary, the survival of the "fittest."

There is also much evidence to connect the ideas which Darwin expounded with Malthus and Rousseau and so with the French Revolution. "Progress" as an automatic feature of nature is inherent in this doctrine, which has been termed a theological, rather than a scientific dogma. The present vogue of geopolitics, relating wars to a specialised form of

*The extracts now being published in *The Social Crediter* from Major Douglas's forthcoming *The Brief for the Prosecution*, of which the first appeared on May 13, 1944, are published with a view to the existing situation, and not in the sequence or detail in which they will appear later.

dialectical materialism, clearly belongs to the evolutionary blind-force school of thought.

It is a curious fact, which may or may not be coincidental, that the type of society which is induced or produced by this type of thinking, bears marks resembling the workings of the thermo-dynamic principle of entropy—the tendency of energy to deteriorate from a potential to a latent and unavailable state—to “run down.” That is to say, so far from this systematic penalising of minorities under the entirely unproved theory that the equalitarian state is a desirable objective and corresponds to anything we can describe as “progress,” or the survival of the fittest in any cultural sense, it appears to correspond to the exact reverse. Perhaps the most complete embodiment of dialectical materialism is contemporary Russia, and it will be noticed that the rulers of Russia are living in the monuments of a different era, the Kremlin and the architectural achievements of the period of Catherine the Great, and appear to be unable to produce anything but industrial monstrosities. It would be difficult to find a clearer exposition of the principle at work, and its effect, than that of the Balt, Paul von Sokolowski. He refers directly to the agricultural aspect of land, which can be overstressed, although perhaps not at this time, but it is, *mutatis mutandis*, true in regard to all real property.

“There are two processes which weaken man’s hold over Nature and diminish his courage in his fight with her: they are MOBILISATION of the soil and its SOCIALISATION. Neither war with its ravages nor any Act of God fundamentally endangers civilisation, so long as men pursue agriculture *for its own sake*. But directly the land is mobilised, that is to say, when it becomes mere property, capable of transference and financial-capitalisation, directly it comes to possess only a commercial interest, it loses the inviolable permanence and security without which its care and culture are impossible. To the man whose home is on his own land, the idea that either he or his successors could ever desert the fields of their labour for the sake of any economic advantage whatsoever, should be unthinkable. Nothing in the world should be able to make them willing to sacrifice or exchange their inherited home.”

“Socialisation of the soil is even more ruinous in its effect, for it is likely to take control and care of the land out of the most competent hands; since, regardless of the true needs of the community, it is a temporary satisfaction of the cravings or ambitions of destitute sections of the population by the distribution of landed property (*e.g.* parcellation of estates). Only one agrarian reform can increase the efficiency of the land: it is the commitment of its care to those best qualified for the trust. A change in agrarian tenure which is made at the expense of the land’s welfare—in the interest of no matter what group—should properly be termed destruction of the soil. Socialising land laws undermines confidence in the permanence and inviolability of property, without which proper husbandry is unthinkable; for who is to give even those directly privileged by such reforms the assurance that yet further reforms will not expropriate them from the fields they have just acquired? The faintest recollection of such changes must pass from the memory of the people before confidence, thus broken, is restored.”

However this may be, the observed working of political

systems does make it essential to examine the properties of a political majority, and the first characteristic requiring attention is that of homogeneity. What are the boundaries within which we can say that a uniform vote reflects a uniform opinion? To what extent and in what connection, does an opinion represent a presentation of a fact? Because it must be indisputable that to base the actions of an organisation on a mass of votes which do not reflect a rational conception, is difficult to justify by the name of a system.

Most people of necessity, and especially in these days of mass propaganda, form their opinions at second hand, and a great deal of opinion formed in this way is purely passive. Little or no critical faculty is applied to it, but on occasion, it is regurgitated as though it had been formed as a result of personal experience. This is always true, but when the opinion refers to a complex or subtle problem, it is a mathematical certainty that what is registered is either a minority opinion popularised, or has no intrinsic value. Legislative action based on *proposals* submitted to a large electorate must, from the very nature of the case, place the population at the mercy of a trained bureaucracy, and if as in the case of the British Civil Service, this is irremovable and, to the public, irresponsible, the result is indistinguishable from a dictatorship of a most undesirable character.

To take an example from comparatively recent history, of what value is the opinion of the average voter on Tariffs? We may further notice, at this point the contemporary emphasis on the virtues of the “common man”—not on his uniqueness as an individual, but precisely the opposite; on his “common”-ness, his resemblance to a mass-produced article. John Buchan (Lord Tweedsmuir) refers to “that degeneration of the democratic theory which imagines that there is a peculiar inspiration in the opinions of the ignorant” (*Augustus*, p. 340). It would be equally legitimate to doubt the permanent virtue of a considerable body of “instructed” opinion. But we cannot have it both ways. Either minorities have obtained privileges by natural selection, or they have not.

If they have, it is a gross interference with the process to penalise it. If they have not, then natural selection is inoperative in human beings, just as it is fashionable to decide heredity in human beings while being extremely careful not to bet on a horse which has not a satisfactory race-winning pedigree. The argument that the breeding of race horses is controlled while that of human beings is not ignores factors which are probably decisive.

The further the subject is analysed, the more evident it becomes that the primary perversion of the democratic theory is to identify it with unrestricted majority government. When Mr. Asquith announced that the will of “the people” must prevail, he probably meant that he would present a bribe to the electorate in such a way that he would get a majority. It is that situation which has to be altered. It is easy to demonstrate that minorities (not to be confused with any particular *economic* class) are invariably in the forefront of improvement, and that while a minority opinion is not certainly right, a right opinion on a novel problem is inevitably a minority opinion—beginning with a minority of one.

Nevertheless the democratic idea has real validity if it is separated from the idea of a collectivity. It is a legitimate

corollary of the highest conception of the human individual that to the greatest extent possible, the will of all individuals shall prevail over their own affairs.

There are two essential provisions to a genuine democracy of this nature. The first is the provision of an absolute check on majority bribery of the description to which reference has been made. And the second is the provision of something which may be called a Civil Service of Policy, as distinct from Administration.

(Copyright)

(All rights reserved)

"A SMUTS-WEIZMANN MOVE"

The issue for 17 December, 1943, of *Aufbau*, a journal published by German refugees in the U.S.A. which describes itself as "An Independent Weekly Journal (in German and English) to Serve the Americanisation and the Interests of all Immigrants," bears on its front page the headline (in German): "A Smuts-Weizmann Move: Palestine Solution or a 'Free Europe,'" writes S.E.F. in *The Patriot* of June 15. According to the article, Dr. Weizmann, the Zionist leader, has invited the principal Zionists in Palestine, U.S.A., and South Africa to important meetings in London:—

"Secrecy is being maintained about the motive and subject of these conferences. One can only presume that events have taken place that have led to them, which will bring Zionist politics from the long period of ebb to a state of movement and flood. One learns that Weizmann has at last had a meeting with Prime Minister Churchill before his journey to the historic conferences at Cairo and Teheran, for which he had waited several months in vain, and which General Smuts, the South African Premier, had arranged and attended. General Smuts had represented Churchill in the Cabinet during his absence. Later, Smuts, on his way back to Pretoria, met President Roosevelt at Cairo. There is reason to believe that he also seized this opportunity to break a lance for a Palestine solution of the Jewish question, as he had sent cheering cables from Cairo to his Zionist friends in South Africa. That is an encouraging sign."

After discussing the Jewish question as it has existed since 1917, the writer in *Aufbau* again refers to the Smuts-Weizmann negotiations, adding:—

"What solution should they seek? Influential Jewish individuals and circles in America and England, together with their powerful non-Jewish friends, have worked with increased effort towards the Jewish question being considered at the end of the war, both publicly and in the Cabinets, and a solution will be sought in the direction of a renewal of the era of emancipation. The solution of a 'Free Europe' will be put forward instead of that of a 'Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine.' High State officials, diplomats, and statesmen are charmed with the idea."

A study of the names of the members of the Advisory Board of *Aufbau* shows that they are largely Jewish.

The *Evening Standard* for September 21, 1942, recalled that when Rabbi Herz was expelled from the Transvaal Republic by President Kruger he was escorted to the frontier by Smuts, who was then a young State Attorney. "There have been a number of changes since those days," concludes S.E.F.

Recent Publications

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS.....2/-

THE PROBLEM OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

By B. W. M.....1/-

BRITISH MEDICINE AND ALIEN PLANS

By ANDREW RUGG-GUNN, M.B., F.R.C.S.....1/-

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
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
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
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards..	8d.
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.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
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.

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. 12. No. 19.

Saturday, July 15, 1944.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"Among the great figures of our time, Lloyd George will be remembered as one of the most changeable. On almost every subject, he has professed almost every opinion."

— *World in Trance* by L. SWARTZSCHILD, p. 69.

"Those who ascribe a mystic clarity of vision to 'the people' are becoming increasingly rare. More than ever before have we reason to think that democracy is relatively the most desirable form of social organisation. But less than ever before have we reason to think that democracy is desirable because it is an automatic expression of collective wisdom.

"Democracy is desirable for entirely different reasons. . ."

— *Ibid.*

Our esteemed French-language contemporary *Vers Demain*, whose paid circulation appears to have reached nearly forty thousand copies per issue, has christened the Socialist C.C.F. propaganda, "ceeceefisme." No, Clarence, not si-Sieff-ism.

Our American Allies have "said it very loud and clear, they even shouted in our ear," that they will not tolerate interference in American politics from "Britain."

The penultimate plank in the Republican platform "calls for the opening of Palestine to their [Jews] free and unrestricted immigration and land ownership" and goes on "We condemn the failure of the President to insist" [our emphasis] "that the Mandatory of Palestine ["Britain"] carry out the provisions of the Balfour Declaration."

Now let's see where it turns up in the Democratic Platform.

The Palestine Economic Corporation entirely directed by New York Jews, is the Chemical Cartel organ for Palestinian exploitation. It is protected by British soldiers.

If we do not comment at any length on the Government's Land Proposals, it is not by reason of the unimportance of the subject, which is basic.

Considered *in vacuo*, the proposals are an improvement on their unlawful begetter, the Uthwatt Report. But, in common with nearly all current adumbrations of coming legislation the White Paper merely reflects the undisclosed

bargain between the so-called Conservative majority and the Socialists "in war, or under threat of war." The Chosen People do not, for the moment (or perhaps ever, openly) take possession of these islands in fee simple. Eighty per cent. of all improvement value is the blackmail, leaving the individual to take the risk and the trouble.

It is the considered policy of this paper and the Secretariat not to be drawn into a detailed criticism of schemes, either monetary or agrarian, which proceed from, or are conditioned by, the forces of international finance and World Monopoly. The exaction of a tribute for "betterment" is simply an inversion (*demon est deus inversus*) of the principle of the unearned increment of association. A man who builds a beautiful house and makes a lovely garden at his own expense, confers a benefit upon his neighbours as well as upon himself. To fine him for his action and to pretend that his neighbours get the money taken off him in fines is of course the backbone of the Chosen People racket. Of two things, one is certain about this racket—either its days are numbered, or this country has no future. In either case, schemes based on it are not worth lengthy discussion.

The intellectual laziness of the English, to be as charitable about the characteristic as circumstances will permit, makes them peculiarly susceptible to the inversion of the Oriental trick of selling you glass beads at ten times their value by asking a hundred times their worth, or as Sir William Beveridge would phrase it, of taking you half way to Moscow by frightening you with the prospect of going all the way to Moscow. It is being sedulously propagandised that any suggestion that there is an immensely powerful organisation, of which the dupes call themselves Socialists and the controllers are careful not to call themselves anything at all, renders you liable to be called a "fascist," and of course, no-one ever explains that a "fascist" is a socialist and fascism is socialism, and that the groups who installed Fascism in Italy are the same groups who are behind P.E.P. and the New Order and Socialism in this country and elsewhere. The same propaganda insists that, although you must on no account suggest that there is an organised plot and a body of plotters, it is desirable that all proposals should be discussed "objectively." In military terms, you are to be allowed a certain use of tactics, because tactics never won a war, and provide a good deal of valuable information to the enemy. But you mustn't have a strategy. If you have, you're a fascist, and Regulation 18B is a very valuable institution for dealing with fascists.

Sir Herbert Williams, M.P., described by Mr. Quintin Hogg as resembling a pilotless aircraft, or doodle-bug, in that he has a harassing effect and makes a terrific noise, is evidently one of those people common in war-time, having special and amazing knowledge on unexpected subjects. We should imagine that he saw the Russians going through Croydon in 1914. In the course of an apparently pointless and certainly worthless attack on Major Douglas's book *Credit Power and Democracy* in a speech in the House of Commons on June 25, he remarked that the Labour Party condemned it, and its circulation went down. Then Sir Oswald Mosley "was elected Labour M.P. for Smethwick, in 1928. Apparently he bought the surplus copies of this book." . . . "As a second stage from Major Douglas, there

was a gentleman called Aberhardt." (spelling in original) "He said it was a splendid idea to rob everybody of half the interest to which they were entitled. . . . They got a lot of people to sign an undertaking that they would take half their interest in full satisfaction. That was social credit. . . ." (*Hansard*, June 25, 1944).

Mother of Parliaments, these be thine ornaments!

"Before the last war, one of the greatest explosives factories in Germany was at Wolfgang, near Hanau, and after the war there appeared before the Allies a deputation which urged that that great explosives factory should be left untouched for fear of causing unemployment. That deputation was composed, not of militarists, not of Junkers, not even of German heavy industrialists, it was composed of German Socialists and Trade Unionists. . . .

"In a very short while that factory was back in military production, and it went into full military production long before Hitler's time."

— LORD VANSITTART, House of Lords Debate, April 18, 1944.

The International Trades Union and Labour Movement is a cartel of exactly the same nature as the Chemical Cartel, and having the same anti-social objects. It requires breaking up, and its members liberating, no less than the *I. G. Farben*.

DIVIDED COUNSELS

In the House of Lords, "Lord Woolton . . . indicated that the Government would institute an enquiry into cartels and restrictive practices" (*The Times*, p. 4, July 7).

In the House of Commons, Mr. Ellis Smith asked if the Prime Minister would institute a Royal Commission . . . ramifications . . . cartels—"Mr. Attlee.—No, Sir" (*The Times*, p. 8, July 7).

(Note: What do they want to enquire about? The War Office, The Foreign Office and The Home Office has each, independently, all the information necessary for immediate action in the national interest).

JOSTLING

"Two things seem to have been determined, apart from the election value of Mr. Churchill, as the planks of the Conservative platform. One is the ceaseless fight against almost all forms of public control, guidance or planning, which is reflected in that naive sheet, *The Recorder*, now exposed for sale in some quantity on the London streets. . . . That the strident recriminations of the Left, . . . are . . . becoming . . . distasteful . . . is no reason at all for diverting the energies of the Conservative Party . . . unless it is that the Right does not wish, by having a policy, to embarrass the Left, which has none." — *The Economist*.

THE WORLD'S PROBLEM

" . . . the world's problem now is not an economic one of achieving quantity, but a political one of achieving freedom." — *The Tablet*, June 17, 1944.

Radio Monopoly Broken

S. C. MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT INAUGURATES "COMMUNITY" BROADCASTS

The following was broadcast by MR. NORMAN JAQUES, M.P., from the House of Commons, Ottawa, on May 22:—

This broadcast is sponsored by the Community Radio Stations of Canada. It marks the birth of a new idea—the idea that members of parliament should be given some free time on the radio in order to discuss public affairs.

I believe this idea to be of fundamental importance because, if democratic government is to continue, close personal contact must be maintained between the people and their parliament.

In the past the public depended almost entirely on their members for political information. But these days, with a radio in every home, people listen to commentators who do not represent the listeners, and who are in no way responsible to them. In other words, the paid salesmen and agents of unknown interests enter every home, while responsible members of parliament remain outside the door.

The fact is, radio has revolutionised the means of propaganda—and is being exploited to the full by commentators who broadcast for unknown, but organised minorities. And, until now, members of parliament—the responsible agents of the unorganised majority of people—have been barred from the air, if only for reasons of expense. So that, if you want to hear your member give an account of his actions in parliament, you must attend a public meeting at some hall, perhaps miles away. I am not saying we can do away with public meetings, but I do suggest that an annual local meeting is not enough these days—too much is happening in the world. And, naturally, you prefer to stay at home, to turn on the radio, and listen in comfort, rather than travel to a meeting in order to hear an account of public business. That, of course, is your privilege, but you can be sure of this, if you do not look after your business, other people will take advantage of your lack of interest. It's all very well to talk about the duties of members of parliament and to criticise their shortcomings, but did you ever put yourself in their places? Did you ever ask yourself how long you would continue to worry yourself about public business if the public showed little interest, either in you, or in your handling of their affairs. Well, before you criticise parliament and its members let me ask—do you not owe a duty to yourself as a free citizen? Surely, you should at least let your members know what you think, and what you want. You owe that much to yourself, as well as to your member, who has a right to be heard—if he is to be of real service to you.

I therefore welcome, and want to thank the sponsors for this opportunity of speaking to the people whom I represent. This broadcast is merely the first of a series in which every member of parliament will be given an opportunity to speak to his constituents at least once a month. It is hoped that it will be possible to build up a radio audience big enough to justify the extension of the plan to weekly broadcasts. But that depends on you as well as on me. If you are interested—and I hope you will be—tell your friends, write to this station, and don't forget to let me have your opinions and suggestions.

As I have said, this broadcast has nothing to do with the C.B.C.—it is sponsored by private concerns in the public interest. And this is a good time to tell you something about Radio Broadcasting, which is being discussed in a committee of parliament.

As you know, radio in Canada is *controlled* by a public utility,—the C.B.C. This control is supposed to be impartial in the interests of truth, free speech, and the free exchange of ideas. *But*, there are increasing complaints that the services of the C.B.C. are being more and more used for "leftist," that is, for Socialist and Communist propaganda. It is charged that the chief adviser to the C.B.C. on "Talks," and the like, is a Communist. It is stated that the C.B.C. is honeycombed by "Communism." That the chief adviser on talks is the new chairman of the Writers', Broadcasters' and Artists' War Council. That five of the seven branches of *that* Council were personally organised by a member of Tim Buck's national executive.

If this be true, and it has yet to be proved untrue, it is a most serious, even alarming state of affairs. For this is exactly the way that democracy has been undermined, and destroyed in other countries—by its enemies obtaining hidden control of propaganda. Now, of course I believe in free speech, and I would defend the Communist rights to their freedom of speech. But these C.B.C. Communist talks are not advertised, or sponsored, as such. This propaganda is disguised as education for democracy in the New Order, or the "Shape of Things to Come" and the like.

The same is true of the motion pictures. No doubt many of you saw a film called *Mission to Moscow*, which was advertised as the truth. About a year ago two prominent Americans wrote a letter about this picture to the *New York Times*. E. J. Dewey, and Suzanne LaFollette had been in Russia as chairman and secretary of the international mission of inquiry into the Moscow trials. Let me quote from their letter:—

"The film *Mission to Moscow* is the first instance in our country of totalitarian propaganda for mass consumption—a propaganda which falsifies history through distortion, omission or pure invention of facts, and whose effect can only be to confuse the public in its thoughts and loyalties.

"The film is anti-British, anti-Congress, anti-democratic and anti-truth. It deepens that crisis in morals which is the fundamental issue in the modern world. *Mission to Moscow* is a major defeat for the democratic cause. It assails the very foundations of freedom. For truth and freedom are indivisible, as Hitler knew when he expounded his method of confusing public opinion through propaganda. The picture *Mission to Moscow* makes skilful use of the Hitler technique. This kind of 'truth' is on the march, and God help us if nothing can stop it."

I did not see the film. But let me ask you this: How is it proposed to build the four freedoms on a foundation of falsehoods, when truth and freedom are indivisible? Is it not written: "*And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.*" I would advise you to examine all propaganda, all proposals for a new order—for a new world—from the point of view that truth and freedom are indivisible.

Ask yourself two questions. Is it the truth? If not, then it will destroy liberty. Does it propose to bring about

a better world by curtailing liberty? If so, it is not the truth. But instead of the truth we have "Propaganda to confuse the public in its thoughts and loyalties. Totalitarian propaganda for mass consumption. This kind of truth is on the march and God help us if nothing can stop it."

In a letter to the chairman of the radio committee of parliament, a loyal Canadian citizen states:—

"In the name of the vast multitude of Canadians who are alarmed at the present abuses of the radio system for which they pay, I wish to protest. This system, in the guise of education, is being used to destroy our hopes of freedom. In particular I wish to protest against such programmes as *Of Things to Come*. Certain commentators always colour their remarks to reflect the glory of Stalin and slyly to belittle British institutions. They appear to be concerned mainly with the future security of Stalin and the spread of world communism."

Now, please understand, I do not quote this against Russians. What they do in Russia is *not* the concern of Canadians, but of the Russian people. *You* do not need *me* to remind you of Russia's epic struggle against Germany, but is that any reason why we should be asked to believe that Russia is more efficient and more democratic than we are when, in point of fact, Russia is a totalitarian dictatorship—whatever it may become in the future. *That* is the TRUTH, and it is time people realised that subversive elements in Canada, and elsewhere, are using the Russian army as a means of propaganda to undermine confidence in Canadian ideals and institutions. And such is the gall of these subversive elements, they label anyone who opposes this communist propaganda as a Fascist, anti-Semite, or some such name. Last year, in the House of Commons, while criticising proposals for such an international bank and a world currency based on gold, I named some of the chief international financiers, and quoted from a certain book containing these very same proposals which undoubtedly would destroy the sovereign freedoms of the Canadian people.

At once I was denounced as an anti-Semite by the Vancouver Labour Council in a statement carried by the Canadian Press. This "Labour" Council demanded that my speech be stricken from *Hansard* and that I be forbidden ever to repeat it. And who control this Vancouver Council? Well, I have the written authority of the Minister of Justice to say:—

"These persons mentioned are, according to information I have, and believe to be reliable, prominent communists."

So, here is a communist organisation, under the guise of a Labour Council libelling, trying to intimidate a member of parliament and demanding that he be silenced in the House of Commons itself. And for what reason? Because in criticising a scheme of international control by the gold standard, I named the chief international financiers as follows:—the Rothschilds, Sassoons, Kuhns, Loeb, Montefiores, Warburgs, Sieffs, Neimeyers, Sieppmans, Fruhlings, Cassells, Strakosches, Schroeders, Baruchs, Schusters, Cohens, Bleichroders, Kleinworths, Kahns, etc.

Well, there they are, or at least some of them, all well known names, and I put it to you—Are you willing to place the control of the world, including Canada, in the hands of these financiers, not one of whom is a Canadian? And now

perhaps, you will understand why the Socialists introduced Bill 37, whose purpose is:—

“to prevent public utterances, or dissemination of material calculated, or likely to cause discrimination or disharmony on account of race or religion. The intention of the Bill is to make such action unlawful in the interests of unity and harmony.”

If it becomes law Communists and other subversive elements could hide behind the Bill, defy opposition, and prosecute any critic for causing disharmony on account of race or religion.

The introduction of this Socialist Bill has stirred up general opposition and members of parliament have received hundreds of petitions protesting the Bill, and denouncing it as a threat to our freedom of speech.

Now, why should communism resent criticism of international financiers and their gold standard? Is there a bond between international finance and international communism? You think that is absurd? Well, don't forget what Bismarck said to Karl Marx—“We march separately, but we conquer together.”

But that is a story for another day. The Bank Act is now before the committee of Banking and Commerce and, as one of its members, I shall deal with Finance, the gold standard and international dictatorship in my next broadcast.

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: July 4, 1944.

PUBLIC EDUCATION, SCOTLAND

Sir John Graham Kerr (Scottish Universities): I am sure that the whole Committee listened with extraordinary appreciation to the great speech of my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State. I do not propose to criticise it, nor do I propose to criticise the machinery of education in Scotland. I would only say that I have great admiration for those who have to carry it out, for those hard-worked and not too well-remunerated officials, whether they be teaching or administrative. I would rather offer a few remarks on education itself, and on what my right hon. Friend called the system of education in Scotland. I think I have some qualifications for expressing opinions about it. There is an old English proverb:

“The proof of the pudding is in the eating.”

So it is with education; the proof of education is in the results that it produces. For a long part of my professional life I happened to be head of a great teaching department in one of our great Scottish universities. Through that department passed a continuous stream of students, numbering not hundreds but thousands, and my contact with those students, who came from all kinds of schools, was not the mere contact of a lecturer from his rostrum but the far more intimate relations of a teacher in the laboratory. Watching these people at their practical work, guiding and discussing, one had an extraordinarily favourable opportunity for judging how Scottish education does its work.

There were various things which impressed me in my experience. One was the extraordinary training in the process of absorption of information. There was the most

avid appetite for any sort of information; they got down, bolted, as much as was laid before them. But with this extraordinary power of absorption there was not joined anything in the way of discrimination. I remember how some of my students seemed quite mystified when they first came to the department and I told them that, whenever they had the chance, they must test the accuracy of what had been put to them by their teachers. It seemed quite a new idea to them, that they should ever have to check what had been told to them. They had been trained to accept what had been told to them. If you showed them a specimen, you would find that they simply accepted what they got out of a text-book or a lecture. There seemed to be a lack of flexibility; they were unable to switch over to new sets of ideas which came to them. But, as I said before, one has to remember that they had been taught the power of absorbing information and that they were really industrious. When I took up my post in Glasgow I used to be sceptical that students would ever kill themselves with overwork. I soon changed that idea. I found that there was a real danger in students working too hard. They were tremendously keen and interested in their work.

Of course, we all know how important observation is in life, and important it is in a trade or business of any kind, or in handicrafts or in a profession like medicine. The power to observe and interpret your observations is of the most tremendous importance. We also know that most of our adult fellow citizens are not so devoid of that power to observe or thinking about what they have observed. Where have they got that training? They got it, in the first place, in what was the greatest of all educational periods when, as small children, they were taught by their parents, where they experimented and observed, often with painful results to themselves. They pursued the scientific method of learning and later, when they became craftsmen or business men, or anything else, they trained themselves to observe a number of things concerned with their trade or profession. But in the intervening period when they were at school, in an ordinary day school, that process of training and observation practically ceased.

We teach the children to memorise and to absorb, but we never train it to observe and think. It was not always so. In the far back ages, when our ancestors pursued the primitive mode of life, it was not so, as I observed for myself when living among primitive people in a remote corner of the world. I watched their system of education. The whole education of the boy was what it is fashionable to call nowadays, “citizenship,” that is to say, training to play his part well in the community in which he lives. The small boy was given his bow and arrow. With that he pursued birds and small game. He learnt to use that weapon, but he learnt something far more than that. He learnt to observe. His sense of sight and hearing were worked up to the highest. He was trained in perceiving the slightest abnormal thing that happened. He learned far more than that, too. He learned to interpret what these things were and to react to them in the proper way. He learned more than that still. He learned to keep his mind absolutely flexible, to keep his wits about him the whole time and to be prepared for any emergency that might come his way.

I wish we could do something to get back these old factors in education, observation and mental flexibility. How

is it that they have disappeared? It is a paradoxical thing. They have disappeared through one of the most beneficent inventions ever made by mankind, the invention of the printed book, that invention by which we can gain access to the stored up knowledge of the rest of the world; that invention which has given us a new kind of heredity, by which we of one generation can pass on our knowledge to the next and in that way safeguard our civilisation from falling away and disappearing as has been the case with many civilisations in the past; that invention which enables us to flit away from the sordid world of workaday affairs into other worlds. That invention it was which made mass education possible and which has squeezed observation, training and thinking into an imperceptibly small bulk as compared with the mere accumulation of information, good or bad. In this new world our minds are bombarded by books, magazines and newspapers, cinemas and wireless—bombarded with all sorts of ideas, true and false. Surely, if there was ever a time, the time is now when we should learn, not to absorb unthinkingly, but to be critical and to ponder well before we accept anything at all.

I should like to go on for an hour. I must not do that, but there are just one or two things more that I might say. I wonder if my right hon. Friend ever notices the tremendous mental expansion that comes to a small boy when he is allowed to play about with tools in a workshop. It is quite phenomenal. It is a thing we ought to remember. While I am on that, may I allude to this other point. I wonder when we, the great British people, will realise not to talk as we do of work with the hand and work with the brain as if they were totally different things. Of course, it is the brain that works every little movement. The skilled artificer when he is making some beautiful piece of work, the artist in the painting of pictures—whatever it is that he is doing with his muscles, he is working his brain. A man who produces some beautiful piece of handiwork is not doing less but more real brainwork than a philosopher sitting in his study writing a book on philosophy or a poem and yet—what nonsense it is—we think of a literary man as a man who is well educated. I often think of a talk that I had many years ago with an old friend in Glasgow who was a great authority on the Clyde steamships. I happened to mention the old "Iona." He remarked darkly, "She is held together by the paint." I sometimes wonder whether we are not apt to think of our civilisation as being held together by the paint and to forget the great steel fabric that lies underneath.

House of Commons: July 5, 1944.

BRITISH ARMY (CITIZENSHIP CLASSES)

Mr. Sorensen asked the Secretary of State for War whether the same kind of pictorial propaganda posters used to encourage subscription to War Loan will also be employed to emphasise the civil responsibility of men and women in the Forces; and whether he will have posters of this character issued for display in camps, aerodromes, naval stations and elsewhere.

Mr. A. Henderson: I assume my hon. Friend is referring to the instruction in citizenship which is given in most units of the Army for one hour a week during working or training time. A number of pictorial aids has been issued for use

in connection with this instruction and the further display of such aids will be considered. I understand that the practice in the other Services is broadly similar.

Mr. Sorensen: Yes, but might I ask my right hon. Friend whether this method of drawing the attention of the men to their civic responsibility could not equally be used to emphasise the need to sign their election cards? Why cannot the same kind of publicity be employed in that direction as in regard to War Bonds?

Mr. Henderson: That is an entirely different Question. . . What I said in reply to my hon. Friend's supplementary question was that his reference to difficulties arising in connection with the registration of soldiers for the purpose of voting was an entirely different question from whether we were using pictorial aids in order to foster the interest of soldiers in their civic responsibility.

Mr. Sorensen: Surely the best civic responsibility is focused on this question of registration. Would the hon. and learned Gentleman take steps, therefore, to consider this matter sympathetically?

Mr. Henderson: I am always prepared to examine any suggestions made by an hon. Member of this House.

House of Commons: July 6, 1944.

EDUCATION

Citizenship (instruction)

Sir William Davison asked the President of the Board of Education whether he will give an assurance that as soon as the Education Bill has become an Act of Parliament, he will issue a Regulation under the authority conferred upon him, providing that the curriculum in all county and auxiliary schools throughout the country shall make provision for the teaching of the primary duty of all citizens to defend their native land.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Ede): It is the intention of my right hon. Friend when the Education Bill becomes law to apprise local education authorities and teachers of the need for instruction in the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. Such particular aspects of those duties and responsibilities as are referred to by my hon. Friend cannot adequately be dealt with in regulations which prescribe the minimum conditions for the payment of grant. The precise manner in which the subject can most effectively be imparted to pupils of differing ages and abilities is at present engaging the attention of my right hon. Friend.

Sir W. Davison: Is my right hon. Friend aware that a definite assurance has been given by the Government that some such words as those indicated in my Question would be included? Is he also aware that a general statement as to the teaching of citizenship is very different from what is suggested in my Question as to the duty of all people to defend their native land; and will the House of Commons receive a similar assurance to that given by the Government elsewhere?

Mr. Ede: I would advise my hon. Friend to put that question to my right hon. Friend when the Bill comes back to this House. . .