

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 21. No. 11.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"... we should expect to find that in monarchical and aristocratic regimes the apparatus of coercion was at its zenith, because there was no other driving power, and that in modern democracies it was at its nadir, because the demands made by them on its citizens are all the decisions of the citizens themselves. Whereas what we find in fact is the very opposite, and that there goes with the movement away from monarchy to democracy an amazing development of the apparatus of coercion."—Bertrand de Jouvenel: *Power*, p. 30.

"We caught Congressman Taber for a few minutes during his brief visit to the Capital last week. 'I am hoping,' he said, 'while I am here to do something to halt the ridiculous dismantling of German industrial plants. Unless the German people are put to work, they will continue to be supported off the charity of the United States. Unless the German people are allowed to produce transformers and engines and steel products other than military, European recovery and self-support will be delayed indefinitely. The dismantling of these German plants will probably be followed up by taking new machinery and equipment out of the United States.' The Congressman told us that he had just made substantially these remarks to newspapermen. But search of the ticker-tape of four news agencies that day revealed that not one word of this interview was carried."—*Human Events*, (Washington, U.S.A.), September 29.

"The brutal fact is that Franklin D. Roosevelt is now rated a political liability."—*Times-Herald*, Washington, D. C., October 8th.

And his dear friend Winston S. Churchill?

The word "British" is no longer to qualify the word "Commonwealth." Now consider whether the course of events in the last fifteen years, with its appalling British sacrifices, its "victory," and its positively astounding decline in the significance of the Nation which fought Germany single-handed, suggests accident, or design. If the latter, whose design?

The maximum number of political prisoners in the time of the last Czar was thirteen thousand, and many of these were merely forbidden to leave a particular district; under the Socialist Republic the number is variously estimated at a minimum of five millions and an upper limit of eighteen millions, condemned to conditions of slavery which amount to a death sentence for all but the young and hardy.

The inescapable alternative to an attempt to grapple with the World Plan or Plot could scarcely be put more tersely than in the words of George Wyndham, perhaps the most brilliant political mind of the late nineteenth century. He

wrote: "Democracy is a disease for which there is no cure; or at best, a normal form of senile decay in States.

"Let us quit all this hopeless, helpless, dumb show of 'Hypnotised Democracy,' going to its appointed doom of Bureaucracy and Cæsarism—now, as everywhere *quod semper et ubique*."—*Letters*.

The Rt. Hon. George Wyndham married Sibell, Countess Grosvenor. Lady Grosvenor was highly sympathetic to the views of G. K. Chesterton and entirely in agreement with his opinions on British decadence, and its proximate cause. Whether her enlightenment was subsequent to the death of George Wyndham, we do not know.

Sir Stafford Cripps confirms his remarks of 1934, to the effect that the liquidation of the British Empire is an essential to the success of Socialism, and asks us to observe that, under his supervision, it is proceeding apace.

We are much more concerned to learn when the liquidation of the liquidators will begin. Or perhaps Wall Street will tell us that High Treason indictments are outside our competence.

Our Australian contemporary, *The Australian Social Crediter* in a wise little leading article dated September 18, observes that "The difficulty that many people have in grasping the nature of our troubles probably arises from the difficulty of conceiving a master plan in sufficient detail" and concludes "A centralised policy is being imposed on the world; and at the centre are the Plotters. *The Planners are only tools*." (Our emphasis).

It would be possible to expand this little leader into a large book without exhausting either the importance or the urgency of its implications. As our contemporary implies, much of the effectiveness of the Satanists is due to the employment of a simple self-perpetuating principle—let the fools hang themselves.

No serious student of history or affairs, contemplating the faces of Sir Stafford Cripps, Mr. Strachey, Mr. Aneurin Bevan, or Mr. Thomas Johnston would suppose seriously that out of them comes the directing force of British decline and fall. Not at all. The feature they possess in common is concealed irresponsibility. No misgivings as to their competence or of their obligation to be "right" affects the delight with which they occupy the desirable situations to which, no doubt they are assured that they have attained by outstanding merit.

In fact (and their case can be seen reflected in every country) *they are where they are because of their fundamental incompetence*. If any one of the "Socialists" we have mentioned really understood the inevitable consequences of the policies they advocate (and it must be held in mind that these policies are neither new, nor are the results in doubt) we find it impossible to believe that honest men would advocate them. It has been observed that Mr. Harry Hopkins,

the U.S. incompetent with a craze for centralisation, had an almost morbid enthusiasm to discover distress so that he could organise its alleviation. Needless to say, the organisation remained when the distress was alleviated.

That is the major strategy of the Plotters; don't allow evil to be rectified the right way; use it as an excuse to perpetrate a greater and more enduring injury.

We know nothing of astrology, and suspect many of its affiliations, but the confident prediction of Mr. Rupert Gleadow, M.A., that Mr. Truman would be elected (against every forecast) is curious, and is not disposed of easily. There can be more than one explanation.

The Canadian Social Crediter, the organ of the Manning Government carries in its issue of October 14 an editorial entitled "A Satisfactory Price Control" which is both technically unsound and politically undesirable. It should be discredited.

On the other hand, we feel that the touching little song which appears on the next page to the Editorial in question should not be lost, and we reprint it with acknowledgements.

Give me a grave on Alberta's soil,
When my days are over and ended my toil,
Where Social Credit continues regime,
Man's standard of living and rights are supreme.
Give me a grave where possessions live on,
And not in the Province of Saskatchewan,
Where the CCF might (possibly do)
Claim grave-clothes and coffin and the rough box
too.

PARLIAMENT

House of Lords: October 27, 1948.

Address in reply to His Majesty's Gracious Speech

Lord Elton: . . . I am not a member of any Party; I am a mere Independent in politics, and it may be, therefore, that I am prejudiced or mistaken. Or, on the other hand, it may be that the onlooker sees more of the game. But I must confess—and I hope that I shall not shock members on either side of the House too profoundly—that what strikes me about the contemporary political scene is not the width of the gulf between the Parties, but their extraordinary similarity. . . .

There are, of course, differences in pace and emphasis, in tone and temper, between this Government and any which might conceivably replace it. There are undoubtedly considerable contrasts in the relation of this Government to the world of labour, but, as one outside all the Parties, I must say that it would seem to me that all of them, willingly or unwillingly, are being borne by the intellectual currents of our time—the collectivist fashions which have reigned since at least 1890—towards the State as Leviathan and, maybe, beyond that towards the State as Frankenstein.

Viscount Samuel: Frankenstein's monster.

Lord Elton: I beg your pardon—the monster known to Frankenstein. Not merely, that is, towards what we see in

the immediate future, the State in which the individual is a mere cog, but towards that which looms behind it, the State which may yet devour its own creators. . . . Surely it may well be that very soon, if not already, the Government may feel that its Defence Programme—I am taking only one example—may demand the cessation of the expansion of the Social Services, and possibly even some reduction in them. It may well be that the Government may find itself, if it faces difficulties realistically, compelled to consider, not "Guns before butter," but at least "Guns before orange juice and free spectacles." And when that time comes, it may prove very much easier for Ministers to take the steps which they themselves judge to be necessary, not by way of conflict but by way of co-operation. I must earnestly ask—and I am sure that I am speaking on behalf of many who cannot or do not speak for themselves—that if and when that situation arises, His Majesty's Government should most seriously consider the possibility of some form of national co-operation.

There is one other matter—and a closely kindred matter—to which I wish to draw your Lordships' attention. I suppose that, as long ago as last July, by every standard which would have been familiar to any Foreign Secretary of the past, it must have appeared as more than possible that we were within a few days of the outbreak of a Third World War. . . .

Perhaps the shrewdest comment on the whole situation comes from that shrewdest of elder Statesmen, General Smuts, who remarked not long ago that maybe after all the day of the shooting war was virtually over; that henceforth perhaps, the open war of bombs and guns will be only the brief eventual climax of a long preliminary process of infiltration, sabotage and fifth column work—in short, of what the Americans call the 'cold war.' Now if that, or anything remotely like that, is true, if we have to look forward to months or maybe yours of cold war, I most earnestly suggest that the Government should accommodate their policy to the profound truth that although we are not at war we are most certainly not at peace.

After all, there are certain licences very rightly permitted in a democracy in peace time and very properly forbidden in war time. Now we are not at peace and not at war; we are living in a hybrid intermediate state, and some of those liberties must be near the border-line. It is for the Government to decide on which side they fall. If I may give an example, it is widely believed in Malaya that some considerable while ago the police authorities submitted a list of 100 names for banishment—and banishment in Malaya, of course, merely means sending back a foreign gunman to his country of origin. It is asserted there that of these 100 only two in fact were banished. Such leniency may be proper in peace time but not in war time; and it was surely not proper to the period of the cold war either. I believe that the leniency emanated from the Colonial Office; and it is undoubtedly thanks to that leniency—so welcome in peace time but so dangerous in the hybrid conditions in which we now live—that we have to face such an expenditure of blood and treasure as is being asked of us in Malaya at the present time.

And so it is with home affairs. Of course, standards are different here and it is for the Government to say whether any of the traditional liberties proper to peace time are being exploited improperly by the enemies of the State. Yet it is worth remembering, after all, that in every great factory,

in every university and at the head of some of the great unions are men and women devoted primarily to the interests of a foreign State and presumably prepared in some way or another to play the rôle of quisling, if required. I most earnestly suggest to His Majesty's advisers that they should consider the activities of some of these people, whose object seems to be to sabotage the Government's industrial policy. Without being unduly severe, they should at least once again remember that although we are not at war we are most certainly not at peace. . . .

House of Commons: October 27, 1948.

Debate on the Address

Mr. Peter Thornycroft (Monmouth): . . . I always study the Socialist Party's little pamphlets on policy, because I think it is useful to do so. I have here a lovely one called "Towards Tomorrow. Public Ownership the Next Step." This is what they say about this nationalisation problem, which shows how futile it is to argue about the matter.

"The choice of industry will depend upon the yardsticks, or criteria, used. Should the most profitable be nationalised? Or the least profitable? The declining or the expanding? The most efficient or the least efficient? Those industries with many small or those with few large units? It would clearly be folly to use only one of such possible yardsticks. We have to decide which are the right yardsticks to use, and then apply all the relevant ones. Which are they?"

Well! Under that they can have it anyway. . . . I am bound to say that so far I think hon. Members would find it extremely difficult to justify the action which they now propose in the case of steel. I want to take the tests which they themselves have laid down for whether a nationalised industry is a good thing or not. They ask in this pamphlet:

"Does it increase the people's power over their own economic destinies?"

They would find it extremely difficult to justify that. Today, as the hon. Member for Keighley has pointed out, increasingly the consumer can go to only one producer. Gone are the days when he could choose between them. The House of Commons is no safeguard of the people's economic destinies in this matter. None whatever. We cannot ask a question about a nationalised industry—or hardly any question. If we write to a board we do not get any further information on the subject. The shutters have been put up on all these things; they have closed themselves in. Even this Anglo-American Production Committee will not be allowed even to look at one of the nationalised industries. Nobody is to be allowed to have a look at them.

Next the Socialists ask:

"Does it lead to higher standards of life . . . ?"

What has happened? What has happened in the case of coal, of electricity, of transport, and all the others? The price to the consumer has gone steadily up, and up, and up. There is no higher standard of life at all. The housewives are trying to get along, and on not very high wages in many cases—

Mr. Shurmer: Tell us why.

Mr. Thornycroft: —while costs are increasing. Next they ask:

"Does it lead to a more equal standard of life?"

Well, does it, when everybody has to pay exactly the same

price for coal at three or four times its pre-war cost?

"Does it lead to a more stable standard of life, i.e., promote full employment?"

The Minister of Health has said that if it were not for American aid there would be over a million men more unemployed as a charge on this country. Finally:

"Does it open the way to extended industrial democracy?"

We read the other day of some miners who because of absenteeism had been thrown out of a pit. They may have been properly dismissed. But look what happens to them. They are not just thrown out of that pit. They are thrown out of the whole industry; they cannot work in the coal industry again. That is not my idea of industrial democracy.

. . . I think it is this Government's policy deliberately to make it utterly impossible for private industry to carry on effectively. After all, you cannot break all the rules of a capitalist society and still expect capitalism to work. It is no good going against all the elementary basic principles, if private enterprise is to function, and then to call the result a mixed economy. This is not a mixed economy, but is chaos; it is chaos that is being deliberately produced. Take one essential in a capitalist society, and that is that new people ought to be allowed to start in business. How on earth can anyone start a business today? A man cannot even keep chickens unless he had chickens in 1938, and if someone is allowed by one Department to set up a shop, he is not granted the licence for the goods he wants to sell by another Department. The first thing is to allow new entrants into industry, and that the Government do not propose to do.

Then, what about the rationing schemes upon which thousands of people are engaged, not only in the Government but in industry? How can the clothing trade hope to function under this monstrous machine, which was introduced to deal with shortage of clothing as compared with the amount of money in circulation? Pretty well the whole of the rationing of clothes could be swept away to-morrow without any injury to anyone, and everyone knows it. Producers, buyers and retailers all say that practically the whole of the scheme could be done away with. Why are the Government not doing it? The next question is how to get the houses we want. I think that the schemes of the Minister of Health are admirable, if he wants to reduce the number of houses that are built. What is the good of expecting private enterprise to put up houses with a 100 per cent. development charge, which obviously removes the whole incentive to build and makes it impossible for the private sector of the building trade to work?

Finally, there is savings. Industry has obviously got to be able to make savings in order that they can be ploughed back into industry. But everyone knows that if 30 per cent. of the national income is taken by way of taxation, it is impossible to expect another 20 per cent. to go into savings. The Governor of the Bank of England, who until recently was one of the Government's own servants, has told us in the plainest possible terms about that. What are the Government going to do about it? It is no good sitting back and saying we have a mixed economy. Either they have to produce conditions under which private enterprise can work, or they have to take over the lot and try to run it themselves, and judging by the look of them they will not be able to make much of a success of it. . . .

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby): . . . The one big Measure
(Continued on page 7.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 21. No. 11.

Saturday, November 13, 1948.

Functional Discipline

We reprint on the next page one of those inimitable short articles by Major Douglas which both re-emphasises the fact that the clarity and sufficiency of vision which characterises the direction of the Social Credit movement is not a recent acquisition and establishes the range of application of the writer's advice.

The article concludes with the observation that, so far as we are concerned, what matters is "only individual initiative submitting itself to functional discipline." If there isn't time to do what has to be done, there just isn't; but we do not and cannot know that there isn't, and any sensible person in such circumstances must presume the possibility of success (within, of course, reasonable limits). Those limits are not, certainly, the limits set by individual inertia and procrastination—we have not "plenty" of time, in the sense that anything we might do can be put off until some other, preferably distant, time, though we may have a sufficiency, *i.e.* plenty of time in a just and Social Credit sense. Our attitude should be that if we haven't only God will ever know about it, and it will matter to us only in Heaven, which, in such a case, "were a place wherein I could not dwell."

Individual initiative in conjunction with functional discipline is the just admixture advocated by Marshal Foch in his treatise on the Art of War. He calls it 'voluntary obedience.' The voluntary part is the individual's identification of his will with the objective; the obedience lies in his recognition that Law rules the universe, including the means employable for the gaining, in the real world, of his objective. So a great deal of the history of the Social Credit movement is the story, more or less plainly told, in deeds as much as in words, of the pertinacious training of a body of willing men in functional discipline. In many cases it has succeeded. In others, probably more numerous, it has failed. "My way" almost always means "not quite your policy either." (We adhere to the principle that choice of policy is within the right of every individual: this *is* his power, to which responsibility should be, and in fact is, indissolubly attached, the Christian rule of Forgiveness alone standing in qualification).

This functional discipline might be easier to bear, *submission* might be easier, if its decrees were not so much left to individual ascertainment.

"Tell me what to do" is a question which can be answered in varying degrees of detail. Foch emphasised that, in modern warfare, it was relatively useless, if not impossible, to give detailed instruction to higher officers. We have heard this principle called in question, its being asserted

that, on the contrary, modern warfare was a matter of the most finished and detailed planning. If so, that might be one reason why modern wars take so long to finish and end so unsatisfactorily, all things considered. Perhaps, after all, the 'right' side doesn't win, and isn't intended to win, and disregard of Foch's idea is contributory to this result. In any case, increasingly we *cannot* give detailed instructions to the troops the whole matter of functional discipline in our movement is inevitably a self-discipline, arising from instant and almost instantaneous perception of the grounds for action.

A contributor tells us that during the past week he has had two Constitutions constructed upon the now familiar decadent model of the disintegrating 'British' Constitution submitted to him for his assent, and two agendas of the 'framed' variety which he was expected to accept without demur. It would serve no useful purpose to disclose the occasion for so rich a harvest of opportunity. Some might say 'how far-reaching and important,' some might say 'how trivial and beneath my notice.' Nothing of this sort is trivial. Such opportunities and others widely different in character are wide open doors for the assertion of vitally important principles. Moreover, one alone will be found, in practice, to try the capacity of the most leisured and most resourceful. "Whether there is sufficient time, I do not know."

Communism

Communist progress in Britain was the subject of a short debate at the Conservative Party Conference at Llandudno. There was an excellent speech from Mr. Henry Strauss, M.P. who, at the time of Yalta, was the only minister to resign because of the agreements reached at that place of ill omen. The other speeches, his excepted, were proof to me that Communism was but little understood by those who spoke and heard.

"It is a view widely held throughout the English-speaking world that Communism is the child of poverty by frustration, and that its progress can be checked only if the workers receive a fair reward and are treated with proper respect. This reading of Communism is quite erroneous and leads its holders to underestimate their opponent dangerously.

"What lends it colour are the rapid gains made by Communism among the poorer classes in times of economic instability. But similar circumstances bring similar gains to Fascism, which has up to now proved quicker off the mark. The truth is merely that, in unstable conditions, any political movement gains adherents which makes Messianic promises of any sort. But the hard core of the Communist Party is not recruited from these economic victims. True Communism is not bred in despair or spite; rather it is rationality gone mad. Nor, as is so often said, is it a soulless doctrine. Were it the materialistic thing which both its friends and foes claim it to be, it could never have proved such a breeding-ground of fanatics."—Bertrand de Jouvenel in *Human Events*, October 20.

Sir Henry Slessor

The Tablet announces that Sir Henry Slessor has been received into the Roman Catholic Church.

"These Latter Hours"*

The nascent science of Social Dynamics presents many urgent problems for solution to its students, and perhaps one of the less understood is that of the distinction between Social Momentum and Applied Force.

There is an idea in the minds of many people, I think, that the world and the rulers of it are susceptible to some description of death-bed repentance, and that, in consequence, the penalty of their past policy can be averted. It is very doubtful indeed whether such an idea has any sound foundation. The prevention of a great war, for instance, in order to be effective, requires the removal or shutting off of forces which lead to a great war, 15 or 20 years before the war will otherwise take place. It has always seemed to me that 1923 was the critical year in regard to the situation in the world today, and approximately the latest date at which the disasters which threaten us could have been avoided, although that is by no means to say that they cannot be mitigated. In 1923 it became obvious that bankers had learnt nothing and forgotten nothing, and, as Mr. Otto Kahn said at Ottawa, "They had been a little anxious, but now had the situation in hand."

The traditional success of British Governments in dealing with various situations that may confront them (which from one point of view has provoked the criticism, so universal on the Continent, that we have no policy other than expediency) is due, I think, to our concentration upon problems of momentum, rather than upon problems of original forces. When such momentum is comparatively small—as is the case where communications are slow, agriculture and small industry are primitive, the dissemination of news and propaganda is comparatively restricted, and in general the conditions are those which existed up to the beginning of the present century—the brake is a more effective and simpler mechanism than are the engine controls. When it is necessary to affect the judgment of only a small number of comparatively well-educated people, constantly in touch with each other and familiar with the practice and technique of governmental action, a change of policy is easy and can be comparatively rapid. But such is not the case today. Political propaganda has reached dimensions previously unknown, by means of syndicated newspapers, broadcasting, motion pictures, and so forth, whilst the submission of large populations to a uniform economic system based upon finance, and producing parallel problems everywhere, has generated mass emotion on a scale which is reflected in the wars and revolutions contemporaneous with it.

If the situation is looked at in this light, it must evoke even some sympathy for the unfortunate statesmen who are supposedly responsible. If we regard them as free agents with the best intentions, which is in most cases much to assume, they are faced with the necessity for action along two distinct lines, both of them full of difficulty. In the first place there is the reduction of the momentum towards disaster which has assumed such formidable proportions; and the difficulties which surround effective action of this nature—even the dangers of a directly opposite result to that which is desired—are exemplified by the breakdown of efforts at disarmament. But with the magnitude of modern social forces, it is not much use applying the brake if the vehicle is still hell-bent to destruction on full throttle. The forces which make for destruction in the world today, which have produced the situation which is now so menacing, are

more powerful than they were 25 years ago, and there seems to be little more prospect that their direction will be diverted.

Without pressing material analogies too far, it may be observed that the stored energy of matter in motion is proportional to mv^2 . If we have a flywheel one ton in weight turning 100 revolutions per minute, it takes a great deal more to stop it if it is all in one piece, than if it is split up to 20 flywheels weighing 1 cwt, and of correspondingly less diameter. The analogy is crude, but it is suggestive of what I am convinced is the truth, that dictatorships representing the power of many millions of people must be disastrous if the dictators are in control of *policy*. It is quite possible to have all the power of a unified dictatorship and yet to have control over it in such a manner that its policy can be rapidly changed, if it is recognised that the dictatorship is merely functional, and not one of initiative. Freedom is a real thing. It is the most important thing which is at stake in the world today, and it is beyond all other things necessary that its nature should be understood. It is the power to choose or refuse one thing at a time. It is the power to choose whether you will play cricket or whether you will play golf, or whether you will play neither. Quite emphatically it is not the power on the part of the non-player to change the rules of cricket or golf; that is not freedom, it is oppression. As the freeman of Arbroath said to the Pope when he opposed the enthronement of Bruce: "It is not glory, it is not riches, neither is it honour, but it is liberty alone that we fight and contend for, which no honest man will lose but with his life."

The dictatorships of the world at the present time are slaveries, not because they dictate that their industries shall be carried on to certain programmes, but because they dictate that everyone shall take part in them under either economic or administrative pressure. And this is just as true of Fascism as it is of so-called Communism as practised in Russia today. The fact that such dictatorships may be for a time functionally efficient is quite irrelevant. The more efficient they are under conditions which remove the power of initiative from the individual, the more certain it is that they must come into conflict with each other and produce a world catastrophe.

How much time is required both to apply the brake and reverse the engine, and whether there is sufficient time, I do not know; but only individual initiative submitting itself to functional discipline for the purpose of reaching that objective can have any success. C. H. DOUGLAS.

Alleged Bribery of Ministers

A correspondent sends us a copy of a Sunday newspaper (*The People*) which bears on its front page an interview with one of the witnesses who will appear before the Tribunal of Inquiry instituted by the Government to enquire "Whether there is any justification for allegations that payments, rewards or other considerations have been sought, offered, promised, made or received by or to Ministers of the Crown. . . ."

A facsimile letter "to refresh Lord Woolton's memory" is printed in support of an allegation that the witness, an alien, was well-known to Lord Woolton. We are more interested in the witness's assertion that he was the originator of the plan, recently mentioned in *The Social Crediter*, to secure the distribution of highly rationed foods, of which there are stocks in this country, to the order of American friends who pay in dollars. Concerning the attempted in-

*The editorial article in *The Fig Tree* for September, 1936.

volvement of Lord Woolton, we would observe that an effective, if an unadmirable, method of reducing the scale of enquiry into present tendencies in the Administration would be to enlarge the field to cover more political interests than one. The lingering distaste for the washing of dirty linen in public is one which will further assist in distracting attention from essentials to such supremely inessential matters as partisan complicity. Unfortunately, the political laundries, if there are or ever were any of reasonable efficiency, have not been functioning for a long time. If they were still in existence and still serviceable, we should say, by all means get your washing done at the laundry. As things are, all we can say is that it is more important that dirty linen should be made clean (or thrown on the fire) than where it is washed.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

proposed in the Speech is the nationalisation of steel. On that I do not want to get involved in the clash between the two sides on whether steel would be more efficient publicly owned than it is privately owned. I will not embark upon the argument of whether steel production costs will go down or go up. I will not argue whether there is any analogy between this case and that of the coal mines, for the nationalisation of which I voted, or that of the Bank of England, for the nationalisation of which I also voted. We shall have the opportunity of discussing that when we have the Bill, and we have not got the Bill yet.

There is one observation of a general kind I would make. It is that when we come to discuss the Bill we should bear one aspect of the matter in mind. Such studies of history as I have been able to make have convinced me that it is only in the wide distribution of power within a community that the hope of freedom lies. That is to say that if we have all the power of a community concentrated in one institution, or one class, we shall find that there will be very little liberty left for other institutions and other classes. It does not matter a very great deal in the long run whether the class or the institution which possesses complete power be a monarchy, an aristocracy, a capitalist class, a collection of trade union leaders, or a Civil Service bureaucracy. It is not the nature of the concentration that matters. It is the fact of the concentration.

All the struggles in England over the centuries towards liberty have been struggles to wrest away from some institution or class in England part of the power which was regarded as excessive. The aristocrats under the barons fought the monarchy for a share of the power for themselves. At a later stage the rising commercial classes under Cromwell fought for a share of the power for the mercantile classes. In the 19th century, the Chartist movement and the development of the trade unions represented an attempt to win a share of the power for the humblest classes in the community. In our day, the women of England have asserted and made good their claim to a share of the power. It is in the sharing of the power that liberty lies. Wherever there is a concentration of power, liberty dies. All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Dr. Morgan: What about colonial policy?

Mr. Brown: Perhaps I may be allowed to make my speech in my own way. From the point of view I am taking, we have to ask ourselves one question. Political power in England is concentrated in the State. A very great deal of economic power has now become concentrated in the State. The State has the railways, the coal, the Bank of England,

electricity, gas and long-distance transport. I cannot reckon up while I am on my feet the number of men that that list represents who are in the direct employ of the State. Take all the miners, railwaymen, long-distance transport men, busmen, electricity men and gas men, and then take the two millions who are employed in municipal and national government, and in the Civil Service, and we shall find that we now have an immense proportion of our people directly dependent upon the State for their livelihood. I was taught as a young man in the Socialist movement that

"he who controls the means whereby I live controls my life."

It will not help us to have an England in which, not merely the direct functionaries of the State are employed by the Government, but a very large proportion of the people of England. I do not care to take this point any further now, but I ask that when we come to consider the Steel Bill we shall look not only at the narrow calculations of profit or loss, and whether output will be a bit higher or a bit lower, and other such arguments, but that we shall at least have some regard to the undesirability of carrying the concentration of power in State hands further than it has been carried in the present Parliament.

Mr. Scollan (Renfrew, Western): Is the hon. Member advancing the theory that the employee of the State is more insecure and has fewer facilities for promotion than the employee of a private capitalist company?

Mr. Brown: I have not mentioned that point at all. I was trying to put across an argument which I believe, rightly or wrongly, to be of considerable social importance. That argument is not concerned with the difference between the employment of a person by the State or by a Government board, public utility society, or by private enterprise and the rest of it. I would only add that if we get too much power in the hands of the State, there is security for neither public nor private employees. For an example of the lack of security in State employment when the State has too much power, let us look at what is happening in Czechoslovakia, and at what has happened in Poland and in every other country where the same conditions exist.

It is difficult for those who try to follow what is happening in the world to look at the King's Speech, drafted, I have no doubt, with the best of intentions, without a feeling of complete unreality. That is the feeling, the emotion, that arises in me when I read the King's Speech. The truth is that all our affairs at home and abroad are dominated and largely governed today by one central fundamental consideration. It is the Communist challenge, throughout the world and at home, to the survival of the free peoples. It is time we looked that challenge squarely in the face and tried to assess its significance to us, as Englishmen living in the 20th century. That challenge takes on a triple form. First, it is an imperialist challenge. Secondly, it is a social and political challenge. Thirdly, it is a moral challenge. If the House will bear with me, I would like to say a word on each of these three heads.

So far as the first heading is concerned, Stalin's Russia, compared with Czarist Russia, is merely "new presbyter is old priest writ large."

Exactly the same imperialist ends are sought by Russian foreign policy under the dictatorship of the Kremlin as were sought by the Czarism of Russia. If one goes back and picks up *The Times*, say for 1850, one can take from it whole

articles referring to Russia, and could re-publish them today, without the alteration of a comma, and with the substitution only of "Stalin" for "Czar."

... The Russian challenge is an imperialist challenge. It is an assertion of power politics at a time when other countries, and certainly our own, have been retreating from it. It is a challenge at a time when British imperialism—in inverted commas—is on the retreat, as it has been for the last three years in India, Egypt, Palestine, Ceylon and elsewhere, and even to a degree in the West Indies. At a time when British imperialism has been on the retreat, Russian imperialism was never more aggressive than it has been during the three years that have elapsed since the end of the war. To that challenge there is only one answer: we must defend ourselves against that kind of challenge when it comes from Russia, just as we would do if it came from anywhere else in the world.

The social and political challenge is a different one. In this country we draw our principal roots from two sources—from Ancient Greece, and from the Hebrew culture. Plato, with his definition of "the reasonable soul," and the Hebrew prophets, with their conception of man as an immortal spirit, gave rise to values which have steadily more and more saturated the civilisation of the West as time went by. The ideals of Plato and of the Old Testament prophets, and the New Testament prophets, too, certainly did not achieve success overnight, but they worked like a leaven in society. They undermined slavery in Rome. They modified some of the worst features of feudalism in Britain. They were responsible for the decision to abolish the slave trade in the British Empire.

Dr. Morgan: It was Christianity that did that, not paganism.

Mr. Brown: I beg the courtesy of the hon. Member for Rochdale (*Dr. Morgan*).

Dr. Morgan rose—

Mr. Brown: If the hon. Member is trying to make my speech for me, that is an impertinence. If he is merely interrupting, that is discourteous.

It is a condition of the Greco-Hebrew point of view—if you like, the Christian point of view—that because the soul is reasonable, and because man is more than what he seems, tolerance is the principal civic virtue of civilisation, because only in tolerance could ideas be allowed to work themselves out, and prove, in controversy and time, which idea was superior to the other. Tolerance became the mark of civilisation. In a modern community that means that, although a government may beat an opposition, it must not murder it. It means that, although any government, whichever side it belongs to, may reject the point of view of the opposition, they must not suppress it. That means not to imprison, mutilate and liquidate opponents, or destroy the freedom of the Press, or establish an over-riding tyranny throughout every phase of life. That is exactly what Communism does whenever it wins the day. A triumph for Communism is synonymous with the destruction of every liberty that marks off a tolerant democracy from an intolerant and harsh despotism.

There is a third challenge—the moral challenge. What I mean by this is that the worst thing that Communism has done in the modern world is to rot and erode all those accepted values and amenities which form the basis of good

intercourse between man and man. That is its worst crime. And if one looks at the doctrine one knows why. Marx, in almost the last sentence of the Manifesto, lays it down that the existing organs of society can only be destroyed by violence.

Mr. Gallacher: Which Manifesto?

Mr. Brown: The Communist Manifesto.

Mr. Gallacher rose—

Mr. Brown: I am not giving way.

Mr. Gallacher: It is not true.

Mr. Brown: The actual words used in the Manifesto are:

"The Communist disdains to conceal the fact that his ends can only be obtained by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

That is quoted verbatim from Marx' Manifesto, and if that does not mean that the Communist works for the violent overthrow of existing society, it does not mean anything at all. Because that is its method, it follows from the beginning that the Communist Party must be a conspiratorial body; it must work as an underground army until it is time for it to emerge into the open, and that means that it must train its members in lying, in deceit, in the tactics of the smear; it must try to undermine in its members all those qualities of elementary honesty between man and man upon which civilised intercourse depends.

What is the result? Our civilisation certainly has many imperfections, but by comparison with modern Russia this is a paradise. Men cannot be trained in lying, equivocation, betrayal and the rest of it for twenty or thirty years, and then, the day after the revolution, be expected to turn into high-souled trustees of the public good. It does not happen. What we find after the revolution is that we are governed by thugs, and from then on the thuggery increases in mathematical ratio within the State. And so fearful is it of the comparison between itself and freedom that it must do its utmost to destroy freedom everywhere else. Those are the three challenges of Communism, and they have got to be taken up.

I know something of the trade union movement. I have spent all my life in it since I was a boy of 15 or 16, and I have seen the union movement over the years steadily eroded by this evil thing. I have seen it reach a point where it is splitting unions from top to bottom—and it is bound to. Take the Horner dispute at the present time. I, personally, have a liking for Horner. I think he has got many good qualities, but do not make any mistake about it. Horner, in his capacity as the secretary of the miners' union, should carry out the policy of the miners' union. Horner, as a member of the Communist Party, is bound to apply the

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of *annual* subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, Croft House, Denmead, Portsmouth.

Communist policy, whether that agrees with union policy or not. That is the situation in every union.

The Communist does not think in terms of votes at an election. Communism has not been elected into power anywhere in the world, and never will be. The Communist thinks in terms, not of getting five hundred Members of Parliament, but in terms of capturing key positions inside the organisations of existing society, and then perverting and subverting those unions towards the overthrow of the social order, which is what he desires. We have got to defend ourselves.

I am glad the Trade Union Congress today has issued a manifesto to the trade union movement calling upon the executive committees of the unions to cleanse themselves from the kind of penetration which is happening. We have got to defend the public service from infiltration and contamination. My own solution probably would be a little less drastic than what the Government would do. What we ought to do in the public service is to find all Communists and to put them in one department—preferably the Board of Control—and there let them fight each other instead of being a nuisance to the rest of us.

Dr. Morgan: The Board of Control is not a department.

Mr. Brown: Puerile pedantry will now instruct me! It is a sub-department of a bigger department. I really knew that some time ago.

We must all the time distinguish between the Russian people and the dark and dreadful philosophy which inspires the activities of their Government today. I agree with what was said by the hon. Member who preceded me that wherever one goes in the world the common people do not want war. I was in Russia myself in 1927, and I found the Russians likeable, warm-hearted, friendly, kindly people with whom I got on extremely well. I found Americans warm-hearted, kindly people and got on extremely well with them too, even when I told them it was a pity they won the war of independence. The common people all over the world do not want war, but, make no mistake about it, in Russia the common people are in the grip of a tyranny where bayonets, not ballot boxes, govern. They have no rights whatever, and the secret police are omni-present. As for the rights of labour, workmen are utterly denied even the rights of individual and civil liberty. Common people under those conditions do not get much chance of saying whether they want peace or not. They can be and indeed are hurled into conflict with people elsewhere, and so people elsewhere have to be ready to defend themselves.

I cannot believe that there are not tens of millions of people in Russia who hate the regime under which they live. I cannot but believe there must be millions of Poles and Czechs who have not ceased to be Poles and Czechs merely because their free institutions have been overthrown and they have been compelled into the Communist order. I would like to see this country not merely defending itself against the wild extravagancies of Mr. Vishinsky. Mr. Vishinsky is a man who is used to having his opponents surrender and plead guilty, and because of that he has scored many notable victories in sending his fellow countrymen to the gallows. I would like to see this country not merely answering the Russians point by point, but asserting its own policy. I believe that though there is an attraction in tyranny the attraction of liberty is greater. Long after those men who have kept the world in disorder for the last three years have

gone, the Russian people will still be there, still a kindly, peaceful, honest and decent people, and it is with them that we ought to be concerned.

I have spoken longer than I meant to speak, and for that I apologise; I have said what it was in my heart to say, and for that I cannot apologise.

Reissued in Canada:

DICTATORSHIP BY TAXATION

By MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS.

(The text of the Belfast Address of November 24, 1936).

PRICE: THREEPENCE.

From:

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., Liverpool or Electoral Campaign Headquarters, 207/413, Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart...21/-	Secret Societies and Subversive Movements
by Nesta H. Webster.....	20/-
The French Revolution by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit.....	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...7/-	The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....
5/-	Odlum v. Stratton
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Communism in Action	U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....
2/-	Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....
2/-	The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp. 1/6
1/6	Protocols of Zion.....
1/6	The Smear Terror
1/3	The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W....1/-

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.