

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 19.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

According to the *Wall Street Journal*, the U. S. Government has paid nearly nine million dollars to Californian raisin producers to keep their crop off the market.

This appears to be contemporaneous with the statement of Mr. Strachey that "the Australian raisin crop has failed and there will be no raisins for Christmas."

Lenin defined democracy (as he observed the working of it) as "a state which recognises the subordination of the minority to the majority; that is, an organisation for the systematic use of violence by one class against another, by one section of the population against another." (Collected Works).

We have heard less accurate definitions. Notice the omission of any conception corresponding to "quality."

In uttering "a note of warning" to the Planners, by which the context indicates that the more or less honest dupes of the Plotters are indicated, Sir Frank Mears shows the first signs of awareness in public life of the technical fallacy involved in "Large Scale Planning" (we use the phrase beloved of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff and P.E.P.).

Premising once again that the fundamental object of Planning is Monopoly, a political not a technical aim, we must recognise that the second-rate technocrat is easily persuaded that exactly the opposite is the case. Very few technicians in these days have the opportunity to gain a wide outlook (in the golden days of the development of the Empire, the specialist was not nearly so prevalent), and the man or woman who "succeeds" in the current world has reasonable excuse for believing that the talents he daily applies to "planning" a collar stud, a tablecloth, or a valve-gear, are so indispensable to a satisfactory outcome of "social engineering" that only a half-wit could think otherwise.

The fallacy is diabolically subtle, but it is absolute, and perhaps the quickest way to grasp this truth is to realise that a Plan is the graveyard of an Idea. Everything begins in the imagination, *not in reason*; and when the rational processes legitimately begin, creative processes, in the real sense, cease. "Large Scale Planning" assumes that we have come to the end of the story.

Much the same principle is exemplified in the profound remark that "*Le mieux est l'ennemi du bien.*" But not merely is the best plan the enemy of a good plan: *any plan is the enemy of any subsequent plan.*

Now if the Plan merely comprehends collar-studs, it will probably retard the arrival of the best collar-stud, but will not, *per se*, prevent the use of buttons. But if it is a really "large scale Planning" ("viewing the problem as a whole, you know, my dear fellow") and you don't approve of the nationalised, or Monopoly, collar-stud, that will be just too bad.

"... and you may also notice that we seek approval, not for our acts, but for our words uttered in regard to one or another question. We always announce publicly that we are guided in all our measures by the hope and conviction that we are serving the public good."—*Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. No. XIII.

We don't know what our trade competitors think about our economists but they terrify us. When we read in a review of the standing and integrity of *Blackfriars* that "it was in order to sell more abroad and pay for essential imports that the pound was devalued," we are driven to speculate on the reasons which can have induced the writer of the article in which the sentence appears to adopt a subject for which he is so obviously unfitted.

Whether the information will do him any good we do not know; but we can assure him that the pound was devalued for the purpose of maintaining, at any cost, "full employment," which is a political, not an economic objective; that there is no possible sane objective in selling at a loss; that if we were not selling and at a colossal profit to the dollar with the pound at \$4.02 we must be selling at a heavy loss with the pound at \$2.80. But only Lewis Carroll could do justice to the subject.

Practically the whole of the so-called economic problem is involved in the disregard of the Hindi saying "The best way to chop down a tree is to chop it down."

Even yet—even yet, but perhaps for not much longer—the British Empire is much more than self supporting. If instead of making motor cars to export to the American market, which makes more motor cars than any other area of the world's surface, in order to obtain a diminishing return in dollars with the aid of which we can buy the raw materials to make more cars for still less dollars, we grew two or three times as much food in the Empire as we do now (or have we agreed with Pine Street not to do it?), we should have cars for ourselves and American cars at give-away prices for our food growers. We strongly suspect that the ground-nuts scandal is being staged to frighten the British public off the development of controlled territories, by demonstrating the incompetence of their Controllers.

Whether or no this is so, it is clear enough that we have not the faintest chance of retaining even the remnants of our economic or political independence under our present guidance.

The preceding notes had been written prior to the appearance in *The Scotsman* of two articles entitled "The Method of Democracy." The articles themselves are uneven in quality; what they do is to bear witness to the vicious nonsense masquerading as "science" which permeates our political thinking. As the writer observes "few economists have ever managed anything more complicated than a one-roomed flat, with the result that most of their preaching is futile, unreal, and more often than not, utterly wrong."

If the national newspapers of large circulation, instead of parroting cries for greater haste down wrong roads, would shock their readers into some kind of realisation of the self-evident failure of our policies, they would render a service unique in its urgency.

We notice from a sober and obviously well informed article in *The New York Herald-Tribune* of December 20 on "anti-Semitism" in Germany, that the number of Jews massacred by Hitler has been quietly reduced from six millions to 540,000.

"Anti-Semitism" is said to be practically universal, but severely repressed.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 8, 1949.

Grammar School Vacancies

Mr. Corlett asked the Minister of Education having regard to variations which occur from year to year in a particular area, how far it is in accordance with his policy that some places in a secondary school may properly remain unfilled.

Mr. Tomlinson: This is a matter on which two views are possible but where, as in the area which I assume my hon. Friend has in mind, the grammar school provision is above the average for the country as a whole, the arrangements for admission provide equal opportunities for all children, and the filling of every vacancy for the sake of filling it would mean lowering the standard of admission, I would not take exception to the Authority's action in leaving a relatively few vacancies unfilled.

Mr. Corlett: Is my right hon. Friend aware that his reply, for which I thank him, will give very great satisfaction indeed to all local education authorities in the country?

Mrs. Leah Manning: As the examination at 11 plus can never be a just criterion of a child's future development, is it not a very great waste to have empty places in this type of secondary school when there are children who are willing to enter and parents who are anxious that their children should enter?

Mr. Tomlinson: That depends on the number of children and the number of parents who are anxious. If a standard is assumed it is difficult to determine which of the children whose parents are anxious that they should enter should fill the vacancies. In the old days vacancies were filled by paying for the child irrespective of its ability.

Mrs. Manning: Has my right hon. Friend looked at the results of children who did not pass the school entrance examination for these very schools over the past few years?

Mr. Tomlinson: I have not those over the past few years. What I do know is that all those which are being brought to my attention are of children who failed at 11 and have subsequently passed, leaving out of account the thousands who were turned down at 11 and did not have another opportunity.

Mr. Dryden Brook: Will my right hon. Friend see that if exceptions are made and the standard is lowered, it is done over a whole area rather than in particular cases?

Mr. Tomlinson: That is done.

Sulphuric Acid (Government Purchases)

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter asked the President of the Board of Trade why, by S.I., 1949, No. 1934, he has exempted from price control sales of sulphuric acid to Government Departments.

Mr. H. Wilson: The intention of the exemption is to provide for purchases of sulphuric acid by Government Departments in cases where the maximum price cannot be assessed under Section 2 (b) of the Order by reference to the maximum price already paid by comparable industrial undertakings in the area where the acid is to be consumed.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: But why should Government departments be permitted to pay a price which, if paid by private firms, would amount to a black market transaction, and what justification is there for giving Government Departments a privilege to evade price restrictions imposed on everybody else?

Mr. Wilson: There is no question of black market transactions in this. What we have in mind is that there are certain Ministry of Supply atomic and other research establishments situated in areas where there are no other consumers on the basis of which it would be possible to fix a fair price, and therefore they are exempted for this reason.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: But is this concession given to any privately owned firm placed in the same position?

Mr. Wilson: If there were a privately owned firm in an area where there were no other comparable consumers naturally special arrangements would have to be made.

Mr. Shepherd: Is it not a fact that variations in price are caused only by the variation of the cost of delivery, and surely the reason advanced by the right hon. Gentleman is quite improper?

Parish Council Elections (Cost)

Mr. Gooch asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department what steps he is taking to assist rural parishes financially in cases where the cost of parish council elections absorbs most of the parish's total yearly income.

Brigadier Medlicott asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that many parish councils have found it difficult to meet the increased cost of the parish council elections under the new procedure; and if he will take steps to provide financial or other assistance in this matter, especially to rural parish councils to whom this new expense is an appreciable burden.

Mr. Ede: I would refer to my answer to a Question by the hon. and gallant Member for the Eastern Division of Norfolk (Brigadier Medlicott) on 1st December, to which I can only add that I have no power to assist parish councils financially in this matter.

Mr. Gooch: Does my right hon. Friend appreciate that it is rather disturbing to parish councils to discover that they have spent the whole of their yearly income on an election, and will he consider the possibility of passing on some suggestion to parish councils who desire to continue this democratic form of election to reduce the cost of the election?

Mr. Ede: The various fees which may be charged in connection with an election are fixed by the county council for the area concerned. I believe there is some occasion in some areas for that scale of fees to be considered.

Brigadier Medlicott: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware

that the old arrangements worked perfectly well and the new arrangements are expensive, unnecessary and unpopular?

Mr. Ede: The organisation speaking for parish councils in the country had for a long time asked that the old method should be abandoned.

House of Commons: December 12, 1949.

FOOD SUPPLIES

Fruit

Professor Savory asked the Minister of Food whether he is aware that there are in South Antrim and in County Armagh orchards lying thick with apples, including tons of Bramleys, for which there is no market owing to foreign competition, and that there are also eating pears, superior to any obtained abroad, which are rotting in the orchards owing to the quantities coming in from Italy and the Netherlands; and what steps he proposes to take to prevent the Northern Ireland fruit grower from being completely deprived of his market owing to foreign competition.

Dr. Summerskill: The apple crop in Northern Ireland is almost entirely composed of cookers and I cannot agree that their marketing has suffered in any way from the distribution last October of about half a pound per head of imported eating apples. And as for pears, under one-tenth of a pound per head are grown in Northern Ireland, and it is only those of poor quality that have failed to find a market.

Professor Savory: May I ask the right hon. Lady whether, before importing these foreign apples and pears, she consulted the Minister of Agriculture for Northern Ireland, who would have given her very accurate information?

Dr. Summerskill: If the hon. Gentleman consults that Department, he will find that they agree with everything I have said. Surely the hon. Gentleman would not deny his constituents half a pound of eating apples?

Professor Savory: As this country is so delighted to receive millions of our eggs, as the Home Secretary stated on 1st December, will not the right hon. Lady give kind consideration to our apples and pears?

Sweets (Overseas Visitors)

Sir Hugh Lucas-Tooth asked the Minister of Food under what regulation visitors from overseas are permitted to apply for coupons for an extra 2 lb. of sweets over and above the normal ration; how many such coupons were issued during the year ending on the latest convenient date; and whether all persons of other than British nationality may obtain such coupons notwithstanding that they may be permanently resident in this country.

Dr. Summerskill: This is an administrative arrangement which was introduced on 14th August, 1949, and I am afraid that no figures are available to show the number of coupons issued. The extra sweets are available only to overseas visitors staying temporarily in this country.

Sir H. Lucas-Tooth: Will the right hon. Lady say how long "temporary" means for this purpose, and how the scheme is brought to the notice of visitors?

Dr. Summerskill: The length of time depends on how long they keep their temporary ration books.

Commonwealth Sugar Production

Mr. De la Bère asked the Minister of Food what steps he is taking to encourage the Empire sugar producers to increase production, with special regard to the small sugar ration at present in force in this country, the impracticability of increasing supplies from dollar sources and the talks being held in London during December, 1949, between this country and sugar producers throughout the world.

Dr. Summerskill: The greatest incentive for Commonwealth sugar producers to expand their production was provided in 1948, when for a period of five years we undertook to find a market within the Commonwealth for all the sugar which they could produce for export. The main object of the discussions now being held in London is to make arrangements for a term of years beginning in 1953.

Mr. De la Bère: May I ask whether the West Indian delegates have really had a square deal? Cannot we have an assurance that we shall have not only the sugar they produce today but their increased production, so as to make sure that people in this country get their proper ration? Why not do something for the Empire? I want something done for the Empire.

Mr. Driberg: Quite seriously, can my right hon. Friend say whether the keen apprehensions expressed by the Jamaican representatives were justified? Is it the case that we are drastically cutting down our guarantee to the West Indies in order to take half a million tons of sugar from the dollar area, and if so, why?

Dr. Summerskill: I think my hon. Friend knows that negotiations are still proceeding, and it would not be proper for me to make any comment on them at this stage.

Mr. Oliver Stanley: During the course of those negotiations, which at the present moment appear to be in danger, will the right hon. Lady have particular regard to what was said by the Secretary of State for the Colonies during the Colonial Debate in July; a statement which was taken as representing the view of the Government and which gave great satisfaction to the West Indies?

Dr. Summerskill: Yes, Sir. We always consider the view of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. F. Noel-Baker: Can my right hon. Friend say what steps she is taking to ensure that when this sugar reaches the consumer in this country he gets sugar for his money and not political propaganda?

Mr. Driberg: Since the Jamaican representatives thought that the conference had reached such a crisis that they almost had to walk out of it and had to issue these statements, cannot my right hon. Friend say anything in reply to the very full statements which they have made?

Dr. Summerskill: No, Sir, not at this stage.

Germany (Synthetic Rubber Plants)

Mr. Walter Fletcher asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs why, in view of his negotiations with the United States of America for the reduction of their synthetic rubber production, he agreed to the starting up of synthetic rubber plants in Germany; and at what annual rate of production from 1950 onwards.

The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Mayhew): The manufacture in Germany of synthetic rubber

(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. 23. No. 19. Saturday, January 7, 1950.

Pegasus?

As the year begins, *The Times Literary Supplement* introduces a White Horse instead of a Light Horse, the Hon. Arnold Keppel, in the *Daily Telegraph*, only a little muted, diagnoses treason, *The Tablet* returns to the topic of the under-development of Catholic constitutionalism, and—Englishmen may say how they are defeated but, not on any account, who defeats them.

Passages in each of the contributions above mentioned deserve repetition in the ears of Social Crediters:

(1) "... in Britain the dangers are of a demagogic parliamentary party-majority, broadly based on mere class-interest, facing so weak an Opposition that a process as familiar as that in the *Republic* begins to operate. First the more extreme demagogues in the majority wag the dog, secondly the Long Parliament becomes a Rump, thirdly the extremists throw up a Man on a White Horse, and lastly the majority under his 'leadership' proceed to deprive the Opposition—and all who disagree with the mass—of their human and civil rights. Not one of these things is possible in the United States without a real revolution, a tearing-up of the sovereign Constitution, a suppression of the Courts, and an equal subversion of the written constitutions of forty-eight semi-sovereign states. All of them are possible—indeed, legally possible—in Britain, by a mere majority vote in the Commons; and, ere long perhaps even party control of the Courts in Britain can easily, and legally, be accomplished by a single vote in the Commons alone. Fortunately it still takes a vote of both Houses to remove a High Court Judge." Yes, but not to make one. The writer calls his description "scaremongering," but adds that "It is laying bare our constitution with a chill scalpel."

(2) "... The Socialists are like the philosopher Thales, who fell down a well while looking at the stars. The Lords are there to prevent 'Little Johnny Head-in-Air' from falling down a well. Unfortunately, it is not the Well of Loneliness, where Socialists might dwell apart; they are all too likely to involve the whole nation in their facile descent. Hence the Lords must be saved.

"The Lords are not a second House of Commons (as Socialists seem to imagine) but a Second Chamber, with a function entirely different from that of the Commons. That makes all the difference. The Lords stand over-against the Commons much as the Judges stand over-against the Executive. With the abolition of the Lords the Commons would be sole judge in its own cause, thus violating the most elementary of legal and constitutional principles.

"The Constitution is a complex of checks. Without check and counter-check the liberty of the subject cannot be maintained. Hence, again, the Lords must be saved.

"Surely it is wise, therefore, to make this a paramount issue now. Conservatives and Liberals should realise that

they go to the poll in defence of the Constitution, and perhaps on the understanding that the next Prime Minister shall be a member of the House of Lords. The proper place to defend the Lords is in the House of Lords, not leaving the fight to the Opposition in the Commons. . . ."

(3) "... what may be called the constitutional achievements of Catholicism have been under-appreciated, because they were still under-developed when the bad political developments of the sixteenth century not only submerged them but then created, in every country, a new vested interest, to make sure they were underestimated in the universities and wherever learned men looked to the royal favour for advancement."

And we might, from our letter-bag, quote ubiquitous instances of the (freemasonic) ban on exposure of the agents if not the authors of subversion; but this evil does not need the assistance of advertisement.

The Light Horse seems closely to resemble Minerva's Owl, which, so Hegel said, "Does not start upon her flight until the shades of evening fall."

The Awkward Elector!

From Belfast, says the *Daily Telegraph*, comes a report that a patient has "sacked" his doctor because the doctor gave evidence in a court involving another patient. Whether this is an instance of "failure to co-operate" with the doctor is not stated. The B.M.A. is said to be discussing an amending bill to the N.H.S.A. providing for penalties on "awkward" patients. "The secretary of one executive committee," says the *Daily Telegraph*, "said last night: 'There is no doubt that the existence of disciplinary provisions had a very salutary effect on patients who were inclined to play the fool.'"

We understand that the scale of fines to be imposed upon awkward electors who do or do not change their M.P.'s without adequate reason are not yet ready for publication, though it is no secret that the yield will aggregate several times the national income, and will be collected with complete disregard for any such formality as conviction.

Mongrelisation in the New Jerusalem

Abner I. Weisman, M.D., New York, writes to the *Journal of the American Medical Association* for December 10, 1949, giving some account of regulations "enacted by the Board of Health of the City of New York" and effective since July 1, 1947, "following an incident where non-medical persons revealed that they were in process of organizing a 'semen bank' for purposes of providing semen for human artificial insemination."

One of the provisions is that persons authorised to inspect records "shall not divulge any part of such records so as to disclose the identity of the persons to whom they relate except as provided by law."

Law?

Overseas Subscribers to T.S.C.

Printed papers may now be sent as second class mail by air to the whole of the British Commonwealth and most foreign countries outside Europe, at reduced rates, e.g., Australia 5d. per half-ounce; Canada 4d. per half-ounce.

The present Letter Air Mail rates will be maintained for subscribers, unless instructions to the contrary are received; but the lower rates shown above will be used in the case of new subscribers and renewals.

Notes on the Fabian Socialist Society and its Associations

By ERIC D. BUTLER

(continued)

The commencement of this article appeared in *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* last week introduced by the following comment:—

IT IS PROBABLE THAT THE DEFEAT OF THE LABOUR PARTY, THE MAIN TOOL OF THE FINANCE SOCIALIST PLOT IN AUSTRALIA, IS LARGELY DUE TO SOCIAL CREDIT ACTIVITIES AND, IN PARTICULAR, THE ENERGY OF MR. ERIC D. BUTLER. IN A COMPARATIVELY SMALL POPULATION SUCH AS THAT OF AUSTRALIA, THE CATALYSING EFFECT OF AN EXPLANATION SUCH AS THAT WE PRINT BELOW IS OUT OF ALL PROPORTION TO THE APPARENT INFLUENCE OF THE BODY FROM WHICH IT PROCEEDS.

London School of Economics' Evil Influence

The influence of the London School of Economics has been world-wide. Its teachings have permeated the universities, while the "key" members of the bureaucracies in all English-speaking countries have been trained at this institution.

During the Great Depression, Professor D. B. Copland took the "advice" of Professor Guggenheim Gregory. The principal economic adviser to the Federal Government is Dr. H. C. Coombs, a product of the London School of Economics. He is a declared totalitarian. Another member of the Australian bureaucracy who is a product of the London School of Economics is Professor Mills. The senior lecturer in Economics at the Sydney University, Professor Arndt, is also from the London School, as is Professor McMahon Ball, of the Melbourne University, who studied under Professor Laski.

In the preface to his book, *The King and His Dominion Governors* (1936), Dr. H. V. Evatt wrote: "I am also under obligation to Professor Laski, of the London School of Economics . . . for much encouragement and advice." Laski's philosophy has been summed up in the following extract from *Faith, Reason and Civilisation*: "Christianity has failed, and the Russian ideal is taking its place as the inspiration of mankind, and as the standard of public morality."

Various Social "Security" Schemes, like the National Health Scheme in Australia, have been inspired by the London School of Economics. Sir William Beveridge's Report on Social Security, produced during the war years, has influenced the policies of Governments in all parts of the English-speaking world, including the U.S.A. Sir William Beveridge, the advocate of a "half-way to Moscow policy," has been a leading figure at the London School of Economics for many years.

In Canada the principal economic "advisers" to the Federal Government are Dr. Cyril James, of the McGill University, Dr. Marsh, and Louis Raminsky, of the Bank of Canada—all products of the London School of Economics. Professor Laski has been a lecturer at the McGill University, which was mentioned unfavourably during the Canadian spy-trials in 1946. A number of those found guilty of espionage had been connected with this University. One of those found guilty had been also educated at the London School of Economics.

The Roosevelt Socialist New Deal was directly influenced by the Fabians and the London School of Economics. Roosevelt knew Laski. Dr. Burns, of the London School of Economics, is, or was, a leading economic "adviser" to the American Federal Government.

It has been stated that 67 members of the present British Socialist Government were educated at the London School of Economics. Sir Stafford Cripps, Mr. Attlee and Dr. Dalton were prominently associated with the institution.

Fabians' Control of British Labour Party

After leaving the Fabian Socialist Society and the British Socialist Party in 1946, Mr. Thorburn Muirhead, M.P., said: "Of the 300 Socialist M.P.'s, 230 (including 41 members of the Government) belong to the Fabian Society . . . The Society is organising a programme for the second five years of office that they hope the present Government will enjoy . . . The Fabian Society have a large leavening of foreign refugees, decrying most things British, and arbitrarily prescribing for Britain's conduct in the world arena. Meanwhile, they sing the Internationale and worship Russia, and try to tear down every sound institution."

Back in 1930, the Ramsay MacDonald Labour Government was also dominated by the Fabians. The following report is from the *Evening Standard*, November 1, 1930: "Many Labour members are talking about the dominance in the Government of that very academic body, the Fabian Society . . . every recent appointment, either to high or low office, in the Labour administration has been made from the membership of the Society, the latest examples of which are the new Air Minister, Lord Ambree, and the new Solicitor-General, Sir Stafford Cripps. I am told that at least 90 per cent. of the members of the Government are in the rolls of the Society, and that, contrary to regulations, so are a good many highly placed Civil Servants." Note carefully the reference to "highly placed Civil Servants"!

Writing of the influence the London School of Economics had on the development of the British Labour Party, Professor Laski has written: "Nor will anyone know until its archives are searched by a competent historian how immense were their services (the Webbs) in bringing the Labour Party to birth."

P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning) Offshoot

Early in the Great Depression, the Fabians developed their conspiratorial technique still further by the creation of another special organisation, Political and Economic Planning (P.E.P.) Associated with this semi-secret Socialist organisation was Lord Melchett, (Mond, the German-Jew, who hated the British landowners), of the Imperial Chemical Industries, a leading advocate of "rationalisation," which Trade Union leaders accepted as a step towards complete nationalisation. The Fabians and other Socialists are keen advocates of economic centralisation and the crushing of large numbers of small and medium-sized businesses. Writing in the English *Sunday Express*, on November 28, 1920, H. G. Wells said: "Big business is by no means antipathetic to Communism. The larger big business grows the more it approximates to Collectivism. It is the upper road of the few instead of the lower road of the masses to Collectivism."

Apparently leading figures in P.E.P. agreed with Mr. Wells. In recent years the most prominent figure in P.E.P. has been Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, of Marks & Spencer, the

big chain store combine in Great Britain. The first Chairman of P.E.P. was a Sir Basil Blackett, Director of the Bank of England, although this man later repudiated many P.E.P. ideas.

P.E.P.'s conspiratorial methods—typical Fabianism—can be judged by the following instructions issued on April 25, 1933, in conjunction with a broadsheet outlining the policy of Sovietisation by stealth: "You may use without acknowledgment anything which appears in this broadsheet on the understanding that the broadsheet and the group are not publicly mentioned, either in writing or otherwise. This strict condition of anonymity . . . is essential in order that the group may prove effective . . ." The broadsheet mentioned outlined how farmers and manufacturers should be controlled by "duly constituted authority." Small traders should be eliminated: "The wastes involved in . . . retail shops, one shop for every twenty households, cannot be allowed . . ."

Several further extracts will indicate beyond all doubt the totalitarian policy advocated by P.E.P.: Politically "big consequent changes will follow in the machinery of government." The following should be of interest to farmers and manufacturers: "Whether we like it or not—and many will dislike it intensely—the individualistic manufacturer and farmer will be forced by events to submit to far-reaching changes in outlook and methods."

"What is required, if with only a view to equitable treatment of individuals, is transfer of ownership of large blocks of land—not necessarily of all the land in the country, but certainly a large proportion of it—into the hands of the proposed statutory corporations and public utility bodies and of land trusts."

In view of the programme of gradual Sovietisation supported by P.E.P., it is not surprising that Mr. Sieff made the claim that "The only rival world political and economic system which puts forward a comparable claim is that of the Union of Soviet Republics."

Although its policy of infiltration was comparatively successful, *Planning*, the journal of P.E.P., made the following significant statement on October 4, 1938: "We have started from the position that it is only in war, or under the threat of war that a British Government will embark on large-scale planning." It was also stated that ". . . emergency measures should as far as possible be framed in accord with the long-term needs of social and economic reconstruction." Like their fellow-conspirators, the Fabians welcomed war conditions to further their ideas. Dr. Evatt attempted to use the war crisis to have the 1944 Referendum carried in Australia. Professor Laski publicly lamented Dr. Evatt's failure.

P.E.P. infiltrated and influenced the policies of the Baldwin "Conservative" Government. It was directly responsible for the establishment of food boards to enable greater Government control of farmers and primary producers. The mania to create food boards was transmitted to all other English-speaking countries. The Roosevelt regime in America was particularly keen on P.E.P. ideas.

Mr. Louis T. McFadden, an American Congressman and recognised authority on banking matters, exposed the connection between the New Dealers in America and the English Fabians. In 1934 he said: "Many serious people in England feel that this Fabian organisation (P.E.P.) practically controls the British Government and that this Government will soon be known as 'His Majesty's Soviet Govern-

ment' . . . About three months after the National Recovery Act (the first of the New Deal Socialist measures) of the United States, when Israel Moses Sieff was urged by members of his committee to show more activity, he said: 'Let us go slowly for a while, and wait and see how our plan carries out in America.'"

On March 15, 1934, in an address criticising the New Deal Socialist legislation for controlling cotton acreage in the U.S.A., Mr. McFadden said: "Their action (the New Deal planners) in this matter is also assisted and aided through the agency of the Foreign Policy Association of the United States, which is directly connected with the Fabian Society, or a branch of it, in England, which at the present time is attempting to take over the control of agriculture and its operation in England . . . I call your especial attention to the recent article, *America Must Choose*, by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, a syndicated article put out under the auspices of the Foreign Policy Association of New York and copyrighted by them. This article is quite in keeping with the plan of the British offspring of the Fabian group."

Other Financial Backing

It is significant that the Foreign Policy Association was sponsored by Paul M. Warburg, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and by Bernard Baruch, the "unofficial President" of the U.S.A. Another of the Warburg family, Mr. James Warburg, has openly expressed himself in favour of some nationalisation. Here again is further evidence of the fact that Socialist policies have the active support of wealthy and influential men.

In his book, *Looking Backwards and Forwards* (1935) the famous English Socialist leader, Mr. George Lansbury, provided further evidence of the fact that it is not true that all the "wealthy capitalists" have opposed Socialism. Lansbury relates his association with the international financier, Sir Samuel Montagu, whom he alleges gave him financial support to keep strikes going: "In this and other ways Montagu and I seemed likely to be in for a long partnership. We parted politically however, when I became a definite Socialist. When Sir Samuel heard of this he asked me to see him at the House of Commons. Sir Samuel was kindness itself, and reminded me of what he said at King's College; which was that he would get me a seat in the House of Commons at the earliest opportunity. Meantime, why not (he said) think of my wife and family, and the good I could do by remaining with the Liberal Party and preaching my Socialism inside it."

It is also appropriate to recall here that Joseph Fels, wealthy soap manufacturer, financed Lenin and Trotsky when they were in England in 1907. Fels also lavishly entertained Lansbury, Keir Hardie, and other Socialist leaders.

Sovietisation and Compulsory Labour

The following is further evidence of the close connection between Fabian Socialism and Sovietisation:

In 1931 George Bernard Shaw said: "Lenin owed a great deal of his eminence to the fact that in his younger days he studied the works of Sidney Webb . . . The success of the Russian experiment means that old words like Fabianism and Socialism are all out of date. There is nothing now but Communism."

The following item appeared in the *Evening Herald* (Dublin), of February 3, 1948, under the heading "Shaw Says He's a Communist":—"Replying to Mr. Kirschenbaum's

question whether he is a member of the British-Soviet Friendship Society, G.B.S. was quoted as saying: 'I subscribe to many such agencies, pro- or anti-Russian. I am a Communist, but not a member of the Communist Party. Stalin is a first-rate Fabian. I am one of the founders of Fabianism, and as such very friendly to Russia.'

One of the basic features of the Soviet economy is economic conscription. Irrespective of how it is introduced, Socialism in practice inevitably leads to manpower control. Shaw was very frank about this matter when he said: "Compulsory labour, with death as the final penalty . . . is the keystone of Socialism" (October issue, 1921, of *English Labour Monthly*).

Dr. H. C. Coombs, of the Fabian London School of Economics, has expressed himself in favour of economic conscription. Speaking at the Melbourne University on June 11, 1944, he said: "People could not expect complete freedom after the war . . . It would be necessary for some individual to be given the right to say what was best for the community."

Dr. H. V. Evatt, Professor Laski's friend, said at the Canberra Political Summer School in 1944: "What are Manpower Regulations but a system which . . . attempts to ensure that everybody in this country shall be usefully employed . . . There has been a nearer approach to a well-ordered society in respect of employment during this war and the last than in any of the years between the wars" Speaking in the Federal Parliament on February 11, 1944, Dr. Evatt said: ". . . full employment cannot possibly be achieved unless some authority is empowered to determine how employment is to be expanded." This is pure Fabianism.

Socialist Slavery via The Ballot Box

If the totalitarian menace is to be defeated, it is essential that it be clearly understood that the Socialists are just as revolutionary as the Communists. By the perversion of the Parliamentary system they pursue policies which must inevitably lead to the destruction of responsible Government and constitutional safeguards. The Socialists may claim that they oppose the Communists, but the opposition is only concerned with the best methods of reaching the Socialist objective of the Monopoly State. In his *Appreciation of the Communist Manifesto for the Labour Party*, issued in 1948, Professor Laski asked, "who, remembering that these (policies of high taxation and centralisation of credit) were the demands of the Manifesto, can doubt our common inspiration."

Fabian Tract No. 127 states that the use of taxation is the chief means of reaching the Socialist State. This Tract also says that "to the Socialist, the best of Governments is that which spends most." Slavery can be introduced via the ballot box and the Parliamentary system just as effectively as it can be introduced by direct violence. An individual can have his property taken from him at the point of a bayonet, or a political party with a temporary majority in Parliament can achieve the same objective by nationalising all property. What is the difference?

It will, of course, be argued that the "democratic" methods of the Socialists ensure that all individuals are compensated financially for any property taken from them by legislation. But Professor Laski and his fellow-Fabians have made it clear that once an individual is deprived of his property by "democratic" methods, he can then be also

deprived of any financial compensation paid to him by the imposition of crippling taxation. *The Scotsman*, of January 7, 1946, reported Professor Laski as follows: "Professor Laski said he had never been worried about compensation so long as there was a Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer who could fix the levels of taxation, especially Death Duties, Estate Duties and Legacy Duties. Compensation was a book-keeping transaction."

In his book, *The New Despotism*, Lord Hewart wrote: "The whole scheme of self-government is being undermined . . . in a way in which no self-respecting people, if they were aware of the facts, would for a moment tolerate." If the Fabian Socialist technique is continued, it will only be a matter of time before every aspect of the community's affairs must be governed by regulations passed by the bureaucratic officials to suit their own requirements. Parliament would then become a hindrance to the operating of the centrally Planned State and could be abolished. This eventuality was mentioned by the famous English Socialist, Mr. G. D. H. Cole, in an address to the Oxford Fabian Society in 1944: "I do not like the Parliamentary system, and the sooner it is overthrown the better I shall be pleased."

Those responsible for having the Socialisation objective included in the Australian Labour Party's platform at the 1921 All-Australian Trade Union Conference also advocated the Fabian technique for destroying the responsible Parliamentary system of Government. The following extracts are from the Official Report of the 1921 Conference:

Mr. J. H. Scullin, future Labour Prime Minister, and a trusted adviser of the Curtin and Chifley Governments: "From those industries nationalised shall be chosen a General Economic Council which will really take the place of our Parliaments today . . ."

Mr. A. C. Willis, later President of the Australian Labour Party, also Chairman of the Central Coal Commission: "The Russians have a Soviet form of Government . . . But they are building up what will be the real Government of Russia, a Supreme Economic Council . . . So far as we are concerned there is nothing to prevent us in this country from forming this special machinery save the indifference of the people. If you can build up that complete system of machinery for the whole thing, then our political government will not count that much." (Mr. Willis held up his pencil.)

Mr. John Baddeley, now Deputy Premier of New South Wales: "If our friend [*i.e.*, another speaker] has the idea that we are going to function [in the socialisation period] under the Parliamentary methods that exist today, I am against it."

There may never be a Communist Revolution in English-speaking countries, but the Fabian programme of Sovietisation by stealth will, unless exposed and opposed, lead to the same type of Monopoly State which the Communists advocate. Now is the time for all liberty-loving Australians to unite in defence of the rights and liberties which their forefathers won at so much cost in the past.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

is forbidden under Article V of the Prohibited and Limited Industries Agreement of April, 1949; this prohibition was not modified by the recent Agreement with the German Federal Chancellor.

Mr. Fletcher: Are we to take it from the fact that this dismantling has been stopped in these factories that there will be any change of policy in regard to the manufacture

of synthetic rubber?

Mr. Mayhew: Synthetic rubber will not be manufactured even though the factories have not been dismantled.

House of Commons: December 13, 1949.

Overseas Food Corporation (Air Contracts)

Mr. Gage (Belfast, South): The matter which I desire to raise tonight—namely, the question of preferential treatment of the British Overseas Airways Corporation by the Overseas Food Corporation—is one of some gravity, and I think the House will agree when they hear the facts that it is one on which an urgent explanation is required from the Parliamentary Secretary. The facts are these. From its inception the Overseas Food Corporation have had to find air transport for many of their personnel between London and Dar-es-Salaam. At first, the arrangements that they came to were on an individual basis, whereby various members of the Corporation should be carried, as to about 50 or 75 per cent., by B.O.A.C. at £146 per seat, and as to the remainder by individual private charter companies at £120 per seat. I do not think that any great criticism can be made of that arrangement at that stage, bearing in mind that the Corporation was, as it were, in its infancy, and that it of course takes a little time for corporations to find their feet in these matters.

However, the discrepancy between the prices charged by B.O.A.C. and the individual private charter companies of £26 per passenger was very soon noted. I understand that officials of the Overseas Food Corporation went to B.O.A.C., pointed this out, and suggested that as most of the personnel being transported from East Africa to London and vice versa were Overseas Food Corporation officials B.O.A.C. might do something about reducing their charges. The answer of B.O.A.C. to that was a flat refusal. So, quite properly—and I do not think any criticism can be made at this stage—the officials of the Overseas Food Corporation proceeded to approach the reputable charter companies in London. As a result of that, a charter company, which I understand is of very good standing, called Hunting Air Travel Limited was selected.

Negotiations commenced with a view to a long-term contract—which of course was more sensible than buying individual seats—which was to last at any rate a year, or to be renewed each year. It was negotiated, and the price per seat—and this, I think, is very significant in a contract of this nature—was £63 6s. 8d. The price that they had been paying to B.O.A.C. on an individual basis was £146-odd. Of course, that price of £63 6s. 8d. was to be on the basis of 100 per cent. load factor. That meant a saving to the Overseas Food Corporation of about £100,000 a year.

Not unnaturally, this woke B.O.A.C. up, and instead of the flat refusal which had been given earlier they came along to see the officials of the Overseas Food Corporation. In October, 1948, there was a meeting—and it is of some significance—between Lord Pakenham, Sir Miles Thomas and Sir Charles Lockhart. Now I think that is an unfortunate way of doing business. Private charter companies cannot approach such high personages, holders of such important offices in our country, and I think it should be left to the officials themselves, whose business it is, to do this. However, there was a meeting, and I am happy to say that the Minister of Civil Aviation appears to have rejected the view of B.O.A.C. that simply because they were a Govern-

ment Corporation they were entitled, as it were, to be assisted, and to some extent subsidised, by another Corporation. He rejected that view, and as a result Huntings got the contract.

I understand that the contract was carried out perfectly satisfactorily and properly for the period of one year. It was due either to expire or to be renewed—I understand it could expire by notice—on 1st November of this year. . . .

B.O.A.C. started negotiations to submit a tender so as to obtain the contract themselves, and on 27th July, 1949, a highly important and significant meeting took place between representatives of B.O.A.C. and representatives of the Overseas Food Corporation. The first thing B.O.A.C. representatives said at that meeting was this: that there had been a luncheon between Sir Miles Thomas and Sir Leslie Plummer at which it had been agreed that B.O.A.C. were to get the contract. Now, of course, at that time the representatives of B.O.A.C. did not know the amount for which Huntings were tendering, and they were asked what they proposed to tender. They made a tentative approach of £80 a seat, and were told that that was quite unacceptable.

At that point there took place a very significant thing. Mr. Ormerod, who was one of the Overseas Food Corporation officials present, left the conference; he visited Mr. McFadyen, who is Vice-Chairman of the Overseas Food Corporation; he returned to the conference and said that his instructions were that B.O.A.C. were to have the contract, provided they could quote within 10 per cent of the Huntings contract. At that point, of course, all that the B.O.A.C. officials needed to know in order to make things quite simple for them was the amount of the new Huntings tender. There again matters were made easy for them, because a Mr. Somerville and Mr. Ormerod left the meeting, went to Mr. Somerville's office and there worked out Huntings figures for an 85 per cent. load factor—because Huntings had tendered at a 100 per cent. load factor increasing to 90 per cent. load factor, which was some £66 per seat. They then added 10 per cent, and found that the answer came to £72 10s. a seat.

They returned to the conference, and the B.O.A.C. officials were informed that if they quoted that amount they could have the contract. . . . It is not surprising that as a result of this, on 28th July, B.O.A.C. put in a tender for £72 10s. a seat, which was accepted on 29th July. Notice to terminate the Hunting agreement was given the same day to expire on 1st November. On 1st October this year, a new contract embodying these terms was signed between B.O.A.C. and the Overseas Food Corporation. The result of all this is, that in order that these two great Government corporations should help each other, the taxpayer has to bear the burden of an additional 10 per cent, per seat over the amount which could have been negotiated with Huntings. When I say that the Overseas Food Corporation are now carrying about 2,500 personnel per year, that is not a small matter and no small loss to the taxpayer.

That is not all, because if one wants to buy a ticket to Dar-es-Salaam B.O.A.C. charge £146, and their operational figures on the cost of such a flight work out at £122 10s., so by tendering at £72 10s. they are losing £50 for every person carried, and that is a burden which the taxpayer must also shoulder. So in order that these two corporations shall assist each other, the taxpayer takes on a really heavy burden.

(To be continued)