

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 25.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

• Electors in South Lewisham, says the *Daily Graphic*, are wondering why a five-pointed red star appears on hand-bills advertising Mr. Herbert Morrison's meeting.

And, of course, with characteristic candour, Mr. Morrison tells the wonderers that it signifies the continuing determination of the "Labour" Party to subordinate itself and them to the Learned Elders of Zion.

• • •

The latest parliamentarian to rattle the dice box of "Secret Ballot" is Miss Florence Horsbrugh, Conservative candidate for Midlothian and Peebles and Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health, 1939-1945. If Miss Horsbrugh knows anything (and she knows a great many things) she knows of the many thousands of women in this country who have been regularly once a week for years (and sometimes twice) to remind their "representative" that they want a house to live in—and, of course, are still wanting. Does Miss Horsbrugh think that these or the successful habitans who proudly disclosed their party allegiance (if any) are the more concerned about the secrecy of the ballot?

We, however, cannot but heartily endorse her opinion that "the way people voted could have no effect whatever on their position and livelihood." (*The Times*). Perhaps here, as so often, the neat paraphrase of *The Times* respects interests nearer and dearer than the speaker's reputation for intelligence.

• • •

What would happen if candidates of all parties should get some cards printed: THE WAY YOU VOTE WILL HAVE NO EFFECT WHATEVER ON YOUR POSITION OR LIVELIHOOD? Are the politicians joining the electors in revolt? That, of course, will come, and it may have come already in some cases. "Under plebiscitary democracy the people soon become aware that their choice is fictitious. They soon learn that what they have been taught to regard as a solemn exercise of sovereignty is an ink-strain on a slip of officially provided paper, and as a result they rebel, not against their leaders but against politics itself. It is for the Conservative Party, which has not travelled as far as Labour along the road to plebiscitary democracy, to see that the present election does not degenerate into a plebiscite. It can do this by using the election first as a means of informing public opinion, and secondly to elicit a decision, not between policies which are and ought to be transient and unpredictable, but between the principles on which those policies must be formed." It is only slightly unfortunate that, in these wise words, both 'plebiscitary' and 'policy' mask the underlying meaning of the unwarranted and unwarrantable reference-back of *methods*, as the contrast with 'principles' shows. It is not only *The Tablet*, from whose columns the words are taken, that is bursting with ideas which vitally concern the coming struggle to re-establish and develop a veridical Constitution.

We have not done this? Frankly, we don't care a brass button who has done it. It has been done.

• • •

"There are those who hold, indeed, that under the present electoral system results are entirely fortuitous, and that the act of voting is about as significant an exercise of personal freedom as buying a ticket in a lottery or trying your hand at four aways with an imperfect knowledge of the game." Yes, albeit there is *one* (sometimes more than one) winning ticket; whereas in a conspiracy to write up the total material production of the collective effort of the whole community as a "debt" against it, no winning ticket is distributed.

• • •

It has been said that the Englishman is prone to the weakness of mistaking intelligence, instead of character, for his long suit—and, of course, going "no trumps" in the wrong suit. We shall know later whether the criticism overfavours him. Character *was* his long suit before corruption seized him.

### Australian General Elections

The following is an extract from a leaflet recommending the "informal" vote as a protest against the centralising policy of all Parties:—

"It would appear to be obvious that all SOCIAL POWER arises in the individual—for there IS NO OTHER SOURCE. This power is the greatest known force in the world. It is greater than atomic energy, for in the absence of organised society (CONTROLLED SOCIAL POWER) atomic energy would never be released under the control of man. When this power is accumulated in great masses we have organised society, organised research, organised political power and organised military power. All these enormous powers are accumulations of the trickle which flows from the individual. Like all power, in itself it is neither good nor bad; but it can be directed more and more to the DESTRUCTION OF SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS which have consumed centuries in building. As a consequence the liberties of mankind are fast evaporating. In its simplest expression social power takes the form of 'CONSENT,' and those individuals who 'CONSENT' are finally responsible for ALL THE CONSEQUENCES that ensue. In the political field that Party which on polling day can muster the greatest volume of 'CONSENT' takes over the whole DIRECTION OF OUR AFFAIRS. Originally the Party system had its roots in REALITY—for each Party represented a DIFFERENT POLICY. But today there is no fundamental difference in policy which each Party presents for OUR ACCEPTANCE."

The result was that thousands of informal votes were cast, with no possibility of mistaking them as ignorant votes, as many were signed with name and address.

## "Conservative" Party Policy

*Two Individual Assessments of the Election Manifesto*

By NORMAN F. WEBB

### (1) Change of Direction?

The parallel is that of a hen scratching through the contents of a bag of chaff, if one looks through the Conservative election manifesto for any real grain, and yet withal there is a ring of decency, if not honesty, about it, and even humility, which is more than can be said for the Socialist election broadcasts so far. If indeed the Labour and the Tory parties are, at bottom, equally partisan and sectional and division-minded, then at the very lowest level the Tories are far the better dissemblers of the two.

Listening to the Party broadcasts, uninfluenced by the speaker's actual physical radiation, and for the first time in one's experience sensing a quality of virtue and real use in that horrid innovation, the radio, one can allow the speakers to make their impression on the sub-conscious mind almost without listening to the tenor of the words. The loss is negligible, because at least nine tenths is no more than political cliché on either side. In these circumstances it seems not unlikely that in the minds of the genuinely and seriously concerned section of the electorate, which feels the unwelcome necessity of a decision one way or another, commonsense may reassert itself, and in the choosing of the lesser of two evils, which unhappily in this relative and imperfect world is always the immediate necessity, they will follow the heart rather than the head. For there can be little doubt that the rather woolly and perplexed Tory understatement holds out more hope of a national survival and reassertion of nationality in Great Britain, which is what the present world needs more than anything else at this time, than the somewhat cocksure Socialist assertiveness, so palpably alien, so un-English in inspiration, at once self-righteous and vindictive. It would be a sad reflection on the conditions of the national character of this country, if one thought that the British elector, collared and collarless, had so irretrievably lost his native *nous* as to be unable to make the distinction, small as it may seem to readers of this paper, who know the fatal political commitments of the Tories and all the implications of their blind adherence to the Judaic doctrines of Full Employment and Taxation.

Of the odd grains among the Tory chaff, there are, of course, the definite pledges to repeal the Iron and Steel Act; to de-nationalise Road Transport, and to reconsider Gas and Electricity, and the Air Corporations. This section, (3) of the Manifesto closes on the assurance: "We shall stop State bulk buying. The Liverpool Cotton Market will be reopened, as well as other commodity markets as conditions permit." Further on it is stated: "We shall call an Imperial Economic Conference at the earliest opportunity . . . and call an all-party conference with the aim of reforming the House of Lords." That is all; crumbs, but genuine ones. The rest is hot air—not, unfortunately, the silence of Elsinore;—pious promises as to retrenchments, and reforms, and betterments as to housing and agriculture and the rest, on exactly similar lines to the Socialist pledges, and all equally Utopian since they are made within the utterly prohibitive framework of the prevailing economy of Debt Finance.

Nevertheless, it is something not to be overlooked that, within that framework, which as yet awaits the discovery of a directly effective political challenge, the bull points enumerated are all directed backwards towards more realistic conditions in which enquiry and discovery and enlightenment

regarding fundamentals would be at least more probable than they are today. If there are still some flames of national feeling left in the heart of Toryism, surely five years of International government must have blown them into some semblance of heat!

It is real heat that is wanted, such as was displayed in the courageous outspokenness of Viscount Bruce at the Mansion House rally of the Savings Campaign last October. His words deserved to be recorded. He said: "No conscientious person can get up and appeal to his fellow citizens to subscribe their savings, if he knows perfectly well in his heart that when the hour of need comes for the people to draw them out, the pounds they get will not buy anything like so much as when they put them in." Viscount Bruce may not know, but probably does, that he is not the only one influential in politics outside the ranks of the Social Credit Movement who is attempting to think realistically about money.

One looks again at this Conservative Manifesto and reads in section (1), under the heading, Honest Money, Promoting Savings, the following: "To promote savings, the true value of money must be honestly maintained. We cannot allow a continuation of the fall in the purchasing power of every pound, which since 1945 has amounted to 3d. and 9d. . . ." Excellent, but how is the fall to be stopped? Apparently the manifesto has nothing to say on this point. Nevertheless, if there should be hidden in the ranks of the Conservative Party among the industrialists—not so likely with the legal and accountant, and economist professionals who, unfortunately, tend to swamp all other sections in politics, today—a realism and courage equal to that of Lord Bruce, the Social Credit idea of a true National Balance Sheet instead of the Budget would be within sight of realisation. An acceptable short-term reason for such a move would have to be forthcoming; but it must be remembered that, with the financial system visibly disintegrating about them, and their native land along with it, the professional men of Finance, as distinct from the International politicians and their shock-troops, the Labour Party, cannot possibly be in quite the same frame of mind as they were in the thirties. With the increasing rumblings of discontent regarding Sterling Balances and Unrequited Exports and British War Debts generally—the *Daily Telegraph* had a leading article on this subject not long ago,—and the incipient and natural Tory dislike of economic dependence on the United States, and their inherited inclination towards the promotion of Imperial self-sufficiency—with all this, could not a case be made out for a realistic statement of Great Britain's economic position within the Empire, that would necessitate, as a beginning, the production of a national balance sheet? As a reversal in direction of the Socialist policy of Imperial liquidation pursued since 1945, such a move would be in tune with the pledges regarding the reform of the House of Lords and the repeal of the Iron and Steel Act, and the release of Road Transport.

The issue of such a Balance Sheet drawn up as to the credit side along the lines indicated by Douglas, would immediately raise a host of searching questions, as Social Crediters well know. For the mere statement in balance sheet form of the National Debt, calling as it would, even if its official title were not correctly designated as Paid-up Capital, for an equivalent asset to balance it on the other side, at once begs the question of the ownership of the assets, and consequently of who is entitled to the dividend, if any. For if a nation owes twenty-seven thousand million, or whatever the figure is, it stands to reason it must be owed to someone. And even more pertinently; if there is no asset, then the

debt is unrepayable.

It is amusing to speculate on the situation that might arise if, on the objection of the effective power to a drawing-up of that asset statement and the divulgence of the names of the claimants to the National Debt or share capital, a realistically-minded House of Commons from its constitutional position as the controller of the nation's purse, and on the implication that since the asset could not be assumed, there was none, were to declare the nation bankrupt—nothing in the pound—and write off the whole transaction. They might then reconstruct the country as a going concern—Great Britain (1950) Ltd.—on a nominal capital, crediting the asset, which palpably exists, to the whole community, of over seven years' residence, in equal shares. They would, of course, need to compensate accredited holders of Government stocks; but this, if it was thought fit, could be done on a steeply sliding scale, modelled on Death Duties. And that part of the present interest and sinking fund saved in the operation might be returned to the community in the form familiar to all Social Crediters, as a percentage reduction on all retail prices, thus avoiding the risk of inflation.

## (2) "Conserving" Socialism

by ELIZABETH S. DOBBS

If the Labour Party offer the complete Welfare State with everything laid on and no responsibility to disturb the sluggish torpor of the Planned Life, then the Conservatives offer all this and heaven too. They are all for the Welfare State. Mr. Churchill started it. They promise freedom as well; without explicitly doing away with compulsion.

This is according to the account given in the *Manchester Guardian* of January 25, 1950. *This is the Road*, like the Labour theme *Let us Win through Together*, was still in trackless retirement (at least in the provinces) at the beginning of February, though we notice that it was already circulating in New York. How it must puzzle the Americans! For, as the Bishop of London remarked on his return from America recently, "They have an idea that the Welfare State is tied up somehow or other with the Labour Party. They don't look on it as the ideal condition which all parties in Britain are trying to attain. The Americans confuse the idea of the Welfare State with a narrow-going regimentation, control, and restrictions."

May be the programmes are skilled and crafty work for export only, but their absence hereabouts certainly means that the vast majority of electors will vote not on the authorised agenda but on the garbled versions of them appearing in the newspapers.

The Conservative Party programme for the general election says that a Conservative and Unionist Government will:

"(1) REDUCE TAXATION: There will be substantial reductions in both direct and indirect taxation. Income tax will be revised so that people are less penalised when they produce more through working on piece rates or putting in overtime. Businesses will be encouraged by taxation changes to adopt schemes to improve efficiency.

"To make cuts in taxation possible and to check inflation, Government spending must be pruned . . .

"(2) LIMIT CONTROLS: We shall keep controls down to the minimum and reduce them as the situation improves . . . when we have secured enough of the necessities for every

family and every individual we shall end food rationing . . .

"(3) STOP NATIONALISATION: We shall repeal the Iron and Steel Act, leaving the industry under free enterprise with public supervision of its prices and development.

"Buses, trams and lorries already nationalised will be restored to their former owners wherever possible. . . .

"The air corporations will be reviewed so as to restore a measure of free enterprise in civil aviation.

"The Coal Board and railways will be reorganised and decentralised. We hold ourselves free to decide the future of the gas and electricity boards when we have had more experience of their operation. . . .

"We shall stop State bulk buying. The Liverpool Cotton Market will be reopened, as well as other commodity markets as conditions permit.

"(4) GROW MORE FOOD: We shall rely on British farms to produce at least half as much food again as they did before the war, and to concentrate more than at present on live stock. Housewives will get the first chance of extra supplies.

"Guaranteed prices will be continued. Our own producers will have first place in the home market, and horticulture will be protected against destructive imports. . . ."

The countryside will be given priority in house building, local schemes for water and sewerage, educational facilities, electrical equipment and better bus services. Small holdings will be provided, with the opportunity for the holders to buy them. Land nationalisation and State farming will be strenuously opposed.

"THE SOCIAL SERVICES: . . . Suggestions that we wish to cut the social services are a lie.

" . . . In any approach to the problem of food subsidies made necessary by the urgent need to improve the purchasing power of the pound there will be no reduction affecting food prices without compensating increase in family allowances, pensions, and other social benefits and without reductions of direct and indirect taxes to increase incentives."

The Health Service is to be improved; increases in war pensions are to be considered and an optional pension of 10s. weekly without retirement offered to old age pensioners; more teachers are to have higher pay; more technical schools and colleges; equal pay for men and women in government services is to be considered.

Omitting the paragraphs on the Empire, which I shall not examine now, we note that pay and conditions in the Regular Armed Forces are to be improved and their numbers increased. "The principle of national service must be maintained in these dangerous times, but voluntary recruiting must be stimulated."

And finally, the Conservatives intend to (a) restore our democratic institutions to their rightful place; (b) call an all-party conference with the aim of reforming the House of Lords; (c) restore confidence and responsibility to local government; (d) restore the university constituencies.

The Labour Party manifesto was highly consistent within its own axioms, and once these were laid bare it was simple to tell whether or not one agreed with them; although many of the clauses were artfully thrown into a form of words with which it was very difficult to disagree without appearing brutal oppressors of Humanity. It is the propagandist's profession to fabricate cages and patterns of powerful and

(continued on page 8)

## 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. 24. Saturday, February 18, 1950.

?

If no one else had done so, we have remarked not infrequently upon the quality of the New Testament, and particularly of the Gospels, as a guide to the practical conduct of life. If it had not this quality, we should be less sure than we are of its unique place in the literature of the world. We refrain from quotation in support of this claim in order that those who may consider that an exception must surely be made in the case of voting in general elections, if only on the ground that they have nothing to do with the practical conduct of life, but exemplify the impractical conduct of life, may have the satisfaction of discovering their error for themselves, and of finding how great a satisfaction it is.

Since, to judge from the frequent introduction of his name into bus and tram conversations between the army of (£500-£800 per annum) pink geraniums from the more predatory Ministries canvassing for the Labour Party and their less omniscient dupes trying to vote them down, Lord Woolton seems to have become the "Conservative" Party's worst and most dangerous asset, we will begin with Lord Woolton.

If you believe that rationing and the departmental store mentality go together, how soon after the 23rd do they do it, and how do you vote to secure that result?

If you believe that "the rest" will follow if you seek the Real in the first place, what do you think will follow your search for a candidate? Is he real, in any sense?

What do you think "the rest" will be if, intending to participate in the choice of a policy, you make an ink-mark on an officially provided slip of paper instead?

Does it appear to you that apple-trees, if they bear at all, bear apples? Then what do you consider to be the natural yield of 34,000,000 actions which are not realistically related to any concrete result at all; and why should you contribute your thirty-four millionth to the confusion?

### The Common Law

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

Dear Sir,

I read Mr. Hewlett Edwards's article dealing with the Common Law. Sir William Blackstone traced the common law back to King Alfred (died 901) and said that it was restored by Edgar and Edward the Confessor. The check on absolute power had been inherited from the Germans, whose council is noted by Tacitus. It was Bracton who described the King's duty at that of "ruling according to law."

Blackstone described our mixed constitution, and had the highest admiration for its system of checks and balances,

The founding fathers of America studied Blackstone, and so produced their constitution.

But Blackstone's description has been attacked by modern historians. He "seemed to know nothing of the prime minister or the Cabinet or the party system or parliamentary sovereignty . . . It would be difficult to conceive a picture more remote from reality," wrote F. J. C. Hearnshaw.

The answer to this criticism is given on the final page of the first volume of the Commentaries. Blackstone has described how a corporation may be dissolved. The fourth way is "By forfeiture of its charter, through negligence or abuse of its franchises . . . And the regular course is to bring an information in the nature of a writ of *quo warranto* . . . The exertion of this act of law, for the purposes of state in the reigns of King Charles and King James the Second, particularly by seizing the charter of the city of London, gave great and just offence . . ." King Charles lost his head and James II his throne for daring to challenge the City! King Charles II, according to Christopher Hollis, had nearly shaken himself free of the moneylenders by issuing his own notes. This line of kings, descended both from William the Conqueror and from the old West Saxon line, knew their trade too well. A king who could not speak a word of English was the City's ideal.

In this way the element of personal rule was eliminated. As Blackstone warned, "the constitutional government of this island is so admirably tempered and compounded that nothing can endanger or hurt it but destroying the equilibrium of power between one branch of the legislature and the rest." While "In all tyrannical governments the supreme magistracy, or the right of both *making* and *enforcing* the laws, is vested in one and the same man or body of men; and wherever these two powers are united together, there can be no public liberty . . . in England, this supreme power is divided into two branches; the one legislative, to wit the Parliament consisting of king, lords and commons; the other executive, consisting of the king alone." Yet, in the excellent "Christian Philosophy and the Common Law" which Mr. Edwards mentioned, Mr. O'Sullivan has a note in which Lloyd George writes, "Parliament has really no control over the Executive, it is pure fiction." Lloyd George was claiming to be the Executive! If this is not usurpation, the word has no meaning. An American President would not like to be told that he was no longer the Executive! So, in England, "reality" is represented by the whole panjandrum of prime minister, cabinet, party system, etc. Or if it does not represent reality, what does it represent?

On the subject of the common law, Blackstone remarks that "The husband might give his wife moderate correction . . . in the politer reign of Charles II, this power of correction began to be doubted . . . the lower rank of people, who were always fond of the old common law, still claim and exert this ancient privilege."—HENRY SWABEY.

Lindsell Vicarage, Chelmsford, February 6.

### REALISTIC CONSTITUTIONALISM

(Notes for an Address to the Constitutional Research Association at Brown's Hotel, Mayfair, May 8, 1947)

by C. H. DOUGLAS

K.R.P. Publications

SIXPENCE (Postage 1d.)

## The Planners and Bureaucracy\*

By ELIZABETH EDWARDS

Working discreetly but busily in this country to-day are several organisations which, under a pretence of assuring the individual his freedom "after the war," are treacherously depriving him of his personal sovereignty, political and economic, and ensuring so far as they can that he shall never be in a position to regain it.

Probably the two most influential of these organisations are the Fabian Society and P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning), which are closely interconnected in effective policy and in personnel. Both make for the complete control of the individual directly by the petty bureaucrat, and ultimately by a small ring of persons who are protected from being held responsible for the results of their actions by the complexities and ramifications of an immensely augmented bureaucracy.

The Fabian Society makes a direct appeal for nationalisation of land and industry, and the vesting of power (nominally) in "the State," which is an abstraction. Actually power devolves upon executive officials, and thus on those on the anticipation of whose wishes depends the officials' promotion. Safely screened from public recognition behind the lesser bureaucracy, these use the authority of the State as the cloak for their own will.

P.E.P. derives directly from the Fabian Society, of which, as a revolutionary organisation, it is a more subtle and insidious form, designed to allow the open use of the methods of Socialism by big business men and others, who, for various reasons, dissociate themselves from "nationalisation" and "Socialism." It advocates the formation of Public Trusts, Commissions, Bodies and Corporations, which centralise power conveniently to the hand of the administrator in the same way as "nationalisation" does, but are less easily influenced in their activities by the ordinary individual, and leave a pretext for the grinding taxation which public "ownership" would have no excuse to preserve.

Both societies are eager to convince people that the programmes put forward will bring them the freedom and security for which they crave. By immense pressure of propaganda, and almost mesmeric advertisement, they have come near to doing this.

### The Fabian Society

The Fabian Society first emerged as an independent organisation in 1888, when it dissociated itself from the Fellowship of New Life and launched its own programme, thus formulated in one of its publications:—

"The Fabian Society consists of Socialists. It therefore aims at the reorganisation of Society by the emancipation of the land and industrial capital from individual ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit . . . the Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land . . . for the transfer to the community by constitutional methods of all such industries as can be

\*Written in 1943, we have chosen to republish this material in *The Social Crediter* rather than in pamphlet form, in order that it may be correctly related to the comprehensive body of opinion which this journal dispenses. The convenience incidental to pamphlet publication, although well-known to us, has corresponding disadvantages, which, in our opinion, should be diminished as far as possible.

conducted socially."

The fundamental *slogan* of the Fabians, as distinct from these aims, was the righting of the wrongs of the working classes, with whom the society, however, had no very direct contact, as far as can be seen.

In fact they confined their early efforts to drawing-room meetings, where gathered many people, who were later to gain great distinction and fame: Lord Passfield (formerly Sidney Webb), the late Lord Olivier (then Sidney Olivier), Mrs. Annie Besant, the late President of the Theosophical Society, Ramsay Macdonald, George Lansbury, H. G. Wells, Margaret Bondfield, and many others.

Out of the drawing-room meetings there emerged the characteristic Fabian tactics of permeating existing societies and parties with their idea. According to a Fabian tract:—

"The Society takes part freely in all constitutional movements, social, economic and political, which can be guided towards its own objects."

Bernard Shaw described the methods of Fabianism as follows:

"Our propaganda is chiefly one of permeating . . . we urged our members to join the Liberal and Radical associations of their districts, or if they preferred it, the Conservative associations. We told them to become members of the nearest Radical Club or Co-operative store and to get delegated to the Metropolitan Radical Federation, and the Liberal and Radical Union, if possible. On these bodies we made speeches . . . and moved resolutions, or better still, got the parliamentary candidate for the constituency to move them and secured reports and encouraging little articles for him in the *Star*. We permeated the party organisations and pulled all the wires we could lay our hands on with our utmost adroitness and energy, and we succeeded so well that in 1888 we gained the solid advantage of a Progressive majority, full of ideas, that would never have come into their heads had not the Fabians put them there, on the first London County Council. The generalship of this movement was undertaken chiefly by Sidney Webb, who played such bewildering tricks with the Liberal thimbles and the Fabian peas that to this day both the Liberals and the sectarian Socialists stand aghast at him. It was exciting while it lasted all this permeation of the Liberal party, as it was called; and no person with the smallest political intelligence is likely to deny that it made a foothold for us in the press, and pushed forward Socialism in municipal politics."

In 1893 the society entered openly into the political field, and the Independent Labour Party was formed by the grouping of Fabian societies then in existence. These groups, under the leadership of Keir Hardie, Friedrich Engels (Marx's partner), and E. Aveling (Marx's daughter), had accepted Marxism, thus summarised: "To establish a Socialist state where land and capital will be held by the community."

The ideological connection between parent and offspring, is close: a Fabian tract says, "The Society is a constituent of the Labour Party and the International Socialist Congress."

The measures backed by the Fabians in those days (schemes for National Insurance, Pensions, Tariff Reform, Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation, etc.), while purporting to solve the individual's difficulties, did not touch the real causes of his troubles, and instead began to take away what freedom remained to him.

They were the seed which is now fruiting in the sub-

jection of the individual to anonymous irresponsible bureaucrats who, in the four years before 1943, made under the Emergency Powers Act, 318 Defence (General) Regulations, 43 codes of Defence Regulations dealing with special subjects such as finance, administration of justice, *etc.*; about 2,100 Statutory Rules and Orders under the Defence Regulations; and other directions in individual cases, of which the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee (once of the Fabian Society) said, "it would be impracticable to give a statistical statement."

Discontent, still acute among the working class, continues to form a pretext for more and bigger interference with the liberty of the individual, both employer and employee.

In 1903 the Labour Party was formed, but the Fabians still pursued their old tactics of permeation, and applied them to new spheres.

In agricultural circles the so-called "Progressive Policy" was pushed, which aimed at the nationalisation of the land.

An important step in the broadcasting of their propaganda among the younger generation was the inauguration in the universities of "University Socialist Societies," which in 1912 were grouped into "The Universities Socialist Federation" by the late Lord Allen of Hurtwood (then Mr. Clifford Allen), who became Chairman of the Federation. Lord Allen of Hurtwood was still a member of the Executive of the Fabian Society, and was associated with P.E.P., until his death in 1939.

In 1921 Fabian activities in the educational field culminated in the launching of the London School of Economics, of which Professor J. H. Morgan, K.C., wrote in *The Quarterly Review* of January, 1939: "When I once asked Lord Haldane why he persuaded his friend, Sir Ernest Cassel, to settle by his will large sums on . . . the London School of Economics, he replied, 'Our object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State.'"

Among the chief lecturers of the London School of Economics has been Harold Laski, for many years a member of the Executive Committee of the Fabian Society and Chairman of its publishing committee, whom Mr. Roosevelt is said frequently to have consulted.

It is the members of this institution who have been mainly responsible, either directly or indirectly, for the concoction of the grinding and punitive taxation which has caused the disastrous state of British land.

In active politics members of the Fabian Society have retained the leadership of the Labour Party. A Fabian report stated, in 1929, when a Labour Government came to power: "Eight Fabians are members of the Cabinet, and fourteen others hold offices in the Government without seats in the Cabinet."

And on November 1, 1930, the *Evening Standard* published the following:

#### GOVERNMENT BY FABIANS

"Many Labour members are talking about the dominance in the Government of that very academic body, the Fabian Society. I find that many people believed that this organisation, through which many intellectuals entered the Socialist movement, had ceased to exist. But it goes on with a membership, small, but influential, of some 5,000.

"Yet practically every 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 Amulree, and the new Solicitor-General Sir Stafford Cripps. I am told that at least 90 *per cent.* of the members of the Government are on the rolls of the Society, and that, contrary to regulations, so are a good many highly placed civil servants. The civil servants would probably defend themselves by saying that the society is more intellectual than political. This ascendancy is, of course, due to the all-powerful influence of Lord Passfield and Mrs. Sidney Webb, with whom the Fabian Society has been the ruling passion of their lives."

The New Fabian Research Bureau was set up in 1931, with Mr. Attlee as Chairman, and Mr. G. D. H. Cole as Secretary.

It was in the same year that Mr. Bernard Shaw is reported by the papers as having said: "Lenin owes a great deal of his eminence to the fact that in his younger days he studied the works of Sidney Webb . . ." (The result was that syndicalism, anarchism and class war, which had been the basis of Russian Communism, were squeezed out under the pressure of economic necessity and the residue is Fabianism).

"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."

To-day, in 1943, the Fabian Society backs centralisation of power in all fields: internationalism against nationalism, regional government against local government, bureaucracy (called the State) against the little man, standardisation against diversity. It still proceeds by much the same methods.

Alderman Albert Emil Davies, the Jewish alderman, and Past-Chairman of the London County Council and Honorary Treasurer of the Fabian Society, said recently, "We Fabians, you know, *do* influence legislation out of all proportion to our numbers. I may as well tell you that when any new legislation is proposed the Government Departments concerned usually send for the latest Fabian literature on the subject, and often adopt many of the proposals, though not, of course, all."

Possibly for reasons implicit in this remark, the membership of the Society has been augmented by numbers of aliens. *The Daily Telegraph* of March 16, 1942, reported:

"Comrades' was the way Mr. Noel-Baker addressed the Fabians yesterday at their conference on post-war German problems. There was quite a number of aliens in his audience. They are responsible, I understand, for the increase in membership of this body since the war.

"Mr. Noel-Baker can speak of Germany and the Germans with authority . . .

"His speech to the Fabians was broadcast in Germany last night."

The new Organising Secretary of the Society is Mr. Oliver Gollancz, nephew of the Communist Victor Gollancz.

#### Planning versus Freedom

Just as the aim of the Fabians is nationalisation of industry and the land, while its slogan is to right the wrongs of the working class, the aim of P.E.P. is planning as "the only means of escape from the intolerable restrictions upon individual liberty and freedom of choice." (*Planning*, No. 200).

But P.E.P. planning gives the planners control of policy

as well as powers to force the planned-for to take part in their schemes. Its four chief characteristics are:

- (1) The wresting from the individual of the power to form his own policy, and its centralisation, with dictatorial force, in industrial and public trusts, corporations, commissions, *etc.*
- (2) The increase of regimentation of the individual by compulsorily organising him in accordance with plans, schemes and controls such as those we have become familiar with in war-time, extending to the maximum the regulation of the first-class expert by the second-class expert.
- (3) The use of police and military powers, including a huge corps of OGPU-Gestapo "snoopers," officially known as "inspectors," to enforce such a régime.
- (4) The endeavour to cozen the public that such a condition would embody "liberty" and "democracy," and that the unpleasant results which they object to in to-day's approximation to the slave state would vanish with larger doses of the same medicine.

The idea that such planning has any connection with freedom of choice, other than its negation, is ludicrous: P.E.P. planning makes for freedom no more than Hitler's planning, with which it is identical. Both schemes deny the first test of freedom: the power to contract out of an association without penalty for contracting out.

That planning as a policy has not been, and is not being "freely chosen" is admitted when *Planning* (No. 200) says: "Evolutionary planning depends for its success on the *education of public opinion* . . . Almost the only alternative to a serious curtailment of freedom is an intensive effort to *convert public opinion*. But changes in public opinion can be speeded up . . ." (Our emphasis). Alternatively (presumably an argument for use if public distaste proves more difficult to overcome than is estimated), the matter is not subject to freedom of choice at all: "We have appealed to those who are genuinely concerned over the outlook for liberty to set to work thinking and discussing how planning can be made the vehicle instead of the enemy of liberty, for *planning is inevitable*." (Our emphasis).

There is no doubt that those behind the propaganda in favour of a Planned and Planning State wish its coming to be thought "inevitable" as it is only by the inculcation of this notion that they will get such a state accepted. In practice planning of *this sort* is entirely alien to the temperament of the people of this country, however much they may seem to respond to verbal reiteration of the ideas concerned. *Planning* No. 200, goes on to speak of the "startling effectiveness" of the planning approach, elaborating its meaning by examples:

"Soviet Russia is proving it [the 'startling effectiveness of the planning approach'] on a massive scale. So, with a later start, are the war machines of Britain and the United States. On the other hand, the menace of Nazi Germany and of Japan is almost entirely due to their exploitation of planning for wrong ends."

### "Freedom and Planning"

*Freedom and Planning* was the title of a document first circulated in 1931 to a few who were asked to use its contents but not reveal its source. It set forth a plan visualising National Councils for Agriculture, Industry, Coal Mining, Transport, and so on, all statutory bodies "with considerable powers and self-government, including powers of

compulsion within the province with which they are concerned."

"It is possible to envisage a considerable extension of this form of organisation of the Nation's business. A new picture begins to emerge in the outline of industry, agriculture, transport, *etc.*, enjoying if not Dominion status, at any rate wide powers of local self-government, with the Cabinet, Parliament and the Local Authorities liberated from the duties to which they are not ideally suited and free to perform their essential functions on behalf of the community."

The following extracts show the proposed application of these theories to the various organs of the economic body:

THE FARMER: "The development of an organised system will lead to a profound modification of the traditional individualism of outlook of the dairy farmer."

"Whether we like it or not, the individual farmer will be forced by events [our italics] to submit to far-reaching changes of outlook and methods. He will receive instructions as to quantity and quality of his production."

THE MANUFACTURER: "He will be less free to make arbitrary decisions as to his own business . . . in resisting them [the plans], because he regards them as encroachments on what he calls his freedom, he will make things much worse for himself and the community."

THE RETAILER: "Reorganisation of retail methods is necessary. The multiple shop and the chain store are already bringing about notable modifications. The waste involved in the 500,000 or more retail shops cannot be allowed to continue to block the flow of goods from producer to consumer."

For all the fable of the "efficiency" of big stores, largely based on "statistics" relating to paper abstractions and the supply to customers of irrelevancies, it needed a major world war to induce the consumer to transfer his custom to them, and then he did so only in so far as conditions forced the local shops to close down. It is significant that Mr. Moses Israel Sieff, ex-Chairman of P.E.P., is Assistant Managing Director of Marks and Spencer, the chain stores; and that Mr. Lawrence Neal, in 1942, made Deputy Secretary in the Planning Department of the polyonymous Ministry of Works and Buildings, is a founder member and member of the council of P.E.P. and also Chairman and Director of Daniel Neal and Sons. Sir George Schuster, another member of P.E.P., is a director of Home and Colonial Stores, Limited, and of Maypole Dairy Company, Limited.

THE LANDOWNER: "Planned economy . . . must clearly involve drastic inroads upon the *rights* [our italics] of *individual ownership of land*." "This is not to say that land nationalisation *in the ordinary sense of the term* [our italics] is either necessary or desirable. Far from it. Nothing would be gained [by whom?] by substituting the State as landlord. What is required . . . is transfer of *ownership* of large blocks of land, not necessarily of all the land in the country, but certainly a large part of it, into the hands of the proposed Statutory Bodies and Public Utility Bodies and of the Land Trusts.

"It would be possible further, in a number of cases [the Chosen People] to leave management undisturbed, together with the enjoyment of the amenities which at present go with ownership, subject to the transfer of title to the Corporations or Trusts."

Major Douglas comments on these proposals in *The*

*"Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket:*

"The full beauty of these proposals only becomes revealed as they are carefully examined and thoroughly understood.

"The first point to notice is that the *rights of ownership* are expressly mentioned and are not abrogated, they are transferred. To anyone who has taken the small amount of trouble necessary to penetrate the conjuring trick of 'Public' ownership, it is obvious that the powers will be transferred to anonymous bondholders, who will exercise them through bureaucrats, whose advancement will depend on their alacrity in anticipating the wishes of their masters.

"But 'nationalisation' is recognised as an awkward threat to grinding taxation, so that 'Public Bodies' and 'Land Trusts' (Forestry Commissions, National Trusts and out-and-out Land Companies) are to be interposed."

(To be continued)

**"CONSERVING" SOCIALISM** (continued from page 3)

accepted taboos such that the floundering mind can only escape through one small hole, which bears the party label. This is a trick quite apart from truth and there are some well-blown examples in the Conservative programme too. But the main trouble with the Conservative programme, which makes the reader instinctively distrustful even if he does not recognise why, is that it falls into two mutually excluding parts, and this in two ways: the first financial, the other conflicting in policy.

Firstly, within the confines of its own conventions the programme falls apart financially. Lord Beveridge pointed out on February 9: "... this time they have made far more promises than can be kept by anybody. They are going simultaneously to raise the standard of life and lower taxation; they are pledged quite simply to get a quart out of a pint pot." Within the conventional limits this is undoubtedly true. There is nothing to show that the Conservatives intend to transcend those limits so we must leave this astonishing flaw with an interested query.

The second cleavage in the programme is more fundamental. Controls would be kept down to a minimum: but the compulsory national insurance and health services, which are a welter of controls tied to bribes, are not, at least explicitly, to be made voluntary. Iron and Steel, buses, trams and lorries are to be un-nationalised; but not coal, nor railways and probably not gas and electricity and aviation. Bulk buying is to be stopped: but bulk selling, in the form of marketing boards which though theoretically 'voluntary' are generally too large to be so in effect, are to be encouraged. The consumer is left with the scant protection of a Monopolies Commission and a special committee of investigation—fantastically unwieldy substitutes for the alternative independent sources of supply. Direction of Labour is to be abolished: but not conscription, nor the unilateral contract of national insurance, or the State's assumption of over-riding rights in the children.

Thus the Conservative Party, while it is anxious to gain credit for 'fighting socialism' is patently reluctant to disperse the power collected by the Labour Government. Yet it is precisely this centralisation of power which characterises socialism, and to exactly the extent that it decentralises power and then secures that decentralisation constitutionally will the conservative party oppose socialism.

The reader is bound to ask himself, at this point, how

much socialism will the Tories Conserve?

It is clear that in making their manifesto the conservatives realised the weakness of an appeal to a return to a freedom that supplied abundance beyond measure which was yet denied to many consumers by their poverty. Sir Hartley Shawcross seized on this point in answering Mr. Churchill's first broadcast speech: and the truth is that the Conservatives have no answer to it—except socialism and the Welfare State.

That is not an alternative. The viable alternative lies in the decentralisation of the social credit to empower the individual unconditionally, to release the flood of energy and initiative frustrated in the 1930's by money, and in the 1940's by the Planned State.

Thus the core of this election turns on social credit. And only if this is recognised can we make any way into the tangle confronting us. Yet this alternative is suppressed by all three parties.

There remains the question of expediency; how can we best use our vote? When asked whether he will hasten quickly or hasten slowly, how should the elector vote who wants to go the other way? Mr. Churchill and Mr. Morrison are both equally open about trying to catch this vote—it is of course behind their Porpoise Dance with the intervening Liberals. Indeed the Conservatives will probably take fewer votes on their manifesto than on their formal position as opposing socialism. They would take more if they would arrange for the register of an open vote for those who believe in taking the responsibility for their actions.

## 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 Realistic Position of the Church of England.....	8d.
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	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

Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster.....	20/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....(Cloth Edition)	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage Odlum v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	7/- 2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion.....	2/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.