The Assault on our Minds

Who controls the force of anonymous ‘public opinion’, and how? Plainly the ‘public’ does not itself control it, because the results are now suicidal to most, not merely some, members of the public. For the same reason it seems that members of ‘the public’ cannot be aware that their ‘mass-mind’ is being controlled—or they would do something about it. What does not seem to be realised is that power not used by those who have a right to it never lies idle: there are others who pick it up and use it and are pleased if they are not noticed. Nothing but someone’s purpose could so consistently and intelligently frustrate every real aim by fitting to it methods that can only produce diametrically opposite, and undesired, ends. Yet just there in people’s consciousness there is a blank spot. They are incapable of relating the dog’s body to the dog’s tail: they do not for instance, see the connection between the excessive electric power demands and the talk of more production, and the austerity and high taxation they experience.

Now this peculiar inability to relate one part of their experience to another has grown much worse in the last twenty years, concurrently with the rise and application in advertising and politics of the theories of mechanistic behaviourism and Freudian psychology. That people are unconscious of what is symptomatic. For the agencies of power nowadays care little for the contents of our consciousness provided they can control our ‘subconsciouses’. It does not matter to them whether you do not know that you are being ‘worked’, or whether you are so deeply convinced that your complexes, reactions, inhibitions and other psychological jargon-entities are an automatic result of material stimuli and are reactions over which you have no personal control. Hence the boom in behaviourist and psychological ‘systems’. Hence the boom in propaganda, and particularly propaganda cunningly directed, both above and below the line of consciousness, to equip us with false and unrealistic standards.

Take for example the grotesque operations of Audience Research Inc., an organisation run in the United States by the indefatigable Dr. Gallup. It sets out to ensure the box-office appeal of cinema films by moulding them in the course of production to satisfy the average appetite of the average nineteen-year-old United States citizen. From the beginning of production to the end, the averaged anonymous mass opinion is invoked to shape the film. Subject, possible actors, possible titles are each in turn submitted to a poll: the returns of the poll determine the next action. “Would you buy a ticket to see a movie based on the life of Al Jolson?” “In a film on the life of Al Jolson would you buy a ticket to see Miss So and So, Mr. Such and Such or Mr. What’s-it?”

When the film has been made within this general framework it is sent for a pre-view before an audience picked by trained ‘samplers’. It is a young audience; for on the average there are in the United States more young than old cinema-goers. For the preview of The Jolson Story the average age of the audience was 19. Each spectator registers his reaction to each scene by moving the indicator on a tele-voting meter with a dial marked ‘Like very much,’ ‘Like,’ ‘Dislike,’ and ‘Dislike very much.’ The separate reactions are transmitted to a central machine which averages them. The result is a graph which shows editors which scenes to edit.

On the whole there is much simple fun to be got from the thought of a set of gum-chewing American adolescents gawping at the screen and duly registering the hot bits that they may be averaged off and forcibly fed to half the inhabitants of the world. But the matter is serious, for all that; films form tastes as well as satisfying them, and are the basis on which many millions of people judge what is and what is not possible. And what connection have the sugary, salacious or sadistic appetites of an (average) nineteen-year-old with what is possible and true?

The corollary of A.R.I. (another obnoxious set of initials) is centralised control of the mass-mind. The only serious scare Great Britain has given the United States recently is the threat to cut down on the import of films, which no doubt the Government is more willing to do since it has entered the contest for the control of our ‘subconsciouses’.

Consider this biographical note {about Mr. S. C. Leslie until 1925 he was Mr. S. C. Lazarus} from an article in the Sydney Morning Herald, July 3, 1947, now Chief Economic Information Officer in this country, earning £3,750 a year with the Central Planning Organisation:

“He studied American publicity ideas, and twisted them to meet British contemporary opinion...”

“In club and pub he was inclined to hold forth to his cronies on the necessity for the creation of a ‘Ministry of Public Enlightenment’...”

He delighted to develop the Freudian theory as applied to mass psychology that people en masse could be swayed and persuaded not only by political eloquence but by publicity based on the assumption that most people suffered from boredom, insecurity, ignorance, loneliness and frustration, all of which could be played upon by a publicity virtuoso...

“In his new job Leslie is once again working with his...
old chief, Herbert Morrison... It has been... whispered that Leslie wrote Mr. Morrison's outstanding patriotic speeches in 1941 and 1942..."

Will it not be jolly to watch the unfolding of the Freudian theory in terms of Economic Information?

Now Mr. Serge Chakotin once analysed in detail the tactics, methods and efficiency of this battle fought by agencies of power for the possession of our subconscious. He showed how Hitler and the National Socialists produced such inhibitions as they found useful in the German people, and manipulated mass opinion as they desired, by the methodical application of the results of e.g. Pavlov’s famous experiments on the production of inhibitions in dogs.

Mr. Chakotin used a violent emotive phrase for it. He called it ‘psychical-rape.’ He makes it as vivid and convincing as a nightmare. Then in conclusion he says of his own socialist ideas:

“The propaganda of these ideas, hammered into men’s minds until they become a real obsession, can be effected by the same method of ‘psychical rape’; but this method, employed by Hitler and Mussolini for negative and anti-human aims of national isolation and war, would have the excuse, if adopted by Socialism, of being indispensable for the saving of humanity from the danger it is running. In order rapidly to build up Socialism and true democracy, it will be needful to employ the same method of procured obsession, acting in this case no longer on fear but on enthusiasm, joy, and love. A violent propaganda of non-violence!”  

This is like saying that the cure for a child half-killed by a blow on the right ear, is an equally violent—or more violent—blow on the left ear! Nevertheless, these are the methods used by Mr. Attlee’s Government.

These are not the tactics of applied Christianity, nor can they help us. The Enemy’s own methods are no use to us. We must choose our own ground and invent our own tactics. They will be quite other than the Enemy’s in kind. They will not steal other people’s minds, but awake them to life. The invention and operation of such tactics is the task of every Social Crediter within his own sphere, but we hope to deal with the matter, within our own limitations, later.

E.S.D.
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OBJECTORS’ APPEAL DISMISSED

On July 24, the House of Lords dismissed the appeal by Mr. W. V. Franklin, Mr. G. L. Hearn and Mr. M. R. Tetley, of Stevenage, from the decision of the Court of Appeal reversing the judgment of Mr. Justice Henn Collins, whereby he quashed the Stevenage New Town (Designation) Order, 1946, made by the Minister of Town and Country Planning.
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Labour Party. I did that with great reluctance and after a good deal of mental struggle, because I thought that it was right for me to do so...

...When I decided to leave the Labour Party in 1931, there then ensued on the part of the Executive Committee of that association, an attempt to prevent me from standing for Parliament again. That was defeated overwhelmingly by the annual conference of the union. It was laid down that I was free to stand if I wanted to and that the union was not concerned with my political line. That was not of very great consequence then, because in 1931 I lost my seat, and it was not until 1942 that I returned to this House. When I returned, I did so with a very vivid recollection of what had happened in 1931. Then, although there had been no agreement about my Parliamentary work, pressure had been exerted. This time I was determined that there should be an agreement, and that it should be an agreement which made it utterly plain that I was free in my political life. Therefore, in the agreement which was drawn up between me and my union, paragraph 3 stipulated:

"Mr. W. J. Brown was to engage in his political activities with complete freedom in accordance with the decisions of the Annual Conference."

I want to stress that, if I may, because, if the House is to judge the position, it is essential that this point should be understood. The whole point, pit, and purpose of that agreement, from my point of view, was to establish my political freedom. I meant to establish it because of my experience in an earlier Parliament when there had been no agreement at all. It is not the least irony of my life—a life which has not been wholly free from ironical circumstances—that an agreement designed to establish freedom should have been by implication cited as an agreement to limit it!

There was another thing that both my union and I were concerned to do in 1942, and that was to make it plain that neither of us accepted responsibility for the politics of the other...and so paragraph 6 of the document laid it down that nothing in the agreement should entitle me to purport to represent the political views of the Association. I was only to represent them in relation to Civil Service matters...

While no differences arose between me and my union on Civil Service matters—no differences arose in that field—there were wide differences in politics, and after the reaffiliation of my union to the Trade Union Congress, that gap became very wide. They represented that my independent and sometimes critical attitude was an embarrassment to them. Finally, they presented me with an ultimatum:

"Either you agree not to speak or vote except in accordance with Trade Union Congress and Labour Party policy, or we will take whatever steps we can to make it impossible for you to retain the Parliamentary secretariatsy."

In the words of the minority report, the nature of the approach to me was:

"Either cease your political activities, or go."

I need hardly say what my reaction was to that. I said bluntly and categorically that I would give no assurance of any kind to them, or to anyone else, that would limit my political freedom in any degree whatever.

There then followed an attempt to buy me out. A very large sum of the members' money—and the members had not been consulted about this—was proposed as a condition of bringing the agreement between us to an end. I
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From Week to Week
The level of political intelligence in this country, with which we include the sayings of the Archbishop of Canterbury, appears to be approaching that of our dear old nurse: "Think of the poor blind beggar, and eat your nice porridge."

Many of our readers, and a much larger body of intelligent people who do not yet add to our circulation, must be perplexed by the perverse socialistic trend of the Opposition in the House of Commons, not to mention the egregious Industrial Charter formally attributed to Mr. R. A. Butler but more probably the result of major influence through Mr. Harold Macmillan. The effect of this is, of course, to suggest that "everyone agrees with Planning". There are, of course, really sinister explanations of this phenomenon, but they are, in fact, hardly necessary. The situation is nearly—not quite—summed up in the well known aphorism "Them as can, does; them as can't, teaches."

The primary difference between teaching and doing is the wide distinction in the time lag between cause and effect. In the majority of cases, doing something involves a process which discloses faults and shows up the difference between a nice, neat plan, which looks effective, and the nearly unrecognisable end-product which will work, unlike the original plan. Teaching has an end-product; no one living at all. Teaching looks irresponsible, but doing quickly demonstrates that it demands rightness, and throws out the incompetent. And for the most part, the House of Commons is composed, and certainly controlled, by teachers who, in the very nature of things, prefer planning and teaching to doing. That a greater reckoning awaits irresponsible teaching than incompetent doing probably troubles them not at all.

There is something queer about the replies given by Dr. Summerskill (Mrs. Samuel) to Parliamentary questions about food. To take one instance only, in a list of home produced foods expressed as "a percentage of a main item of rationed food which is home-produced," cheese is stated to be only 12 per cent—presumably 88 per cent is imported.

Anyone whose memory goes back to the nineteenth century will remember the lavish supplies of incomparably better cheese at about 6d. per pound available everywhere in England. Practically the only foreign cheese sold in noticeable quantity was Gorgonzola, the mainstay of the music-hall joke. Just why has British cheese disappeared and how much milk in this country is wasted? (Odd, isn't it, that we supply just 100 per cent of our milk requirements?). Why must we eat the processed rubbish Dr. Summerskill appears to prefer to the honest Cheshire, Stilton, Wensleydale or genuine Cheddar? Is it because most of the processed cheese comes from factories abroad, lessens the self-sufficiency of this country, uses electric power and requires ship and railway transportation—tending to "full employment" in an international world ruled by Dr. Summerskill's friends?

"The 'terrible power of the purse' of which world freemasons boast, is much used to buy buyable puppet politicians, and to exclude the un-buyable from politics... That master control of all controls, currency control over foreign trade, is the basis of dictatorship. This master control is being used against us to force us to sell cheap and buy dear, in order to subdue us." (Our emphasis—Editor, The Social Crediter)—Commander Geoffrey Bowles, R.N., in Free or Mason in The Patriot.

According to the "B".B.C., the President of the American Automobile Association, speaking in London on July 21, said that he would tell his members on his return that they could have every confidence in touring in "Britain"—some of the hotels were better than U.S. hotels.

It seems probable that the Government, in imitation of Moscow, is arranging a few tourist hotels in which the prices will be prohibitive in sterling but normal in dollars, and the standard will be high. Apart from that, broadly speaking, even luxury hotels outside London provide poor cooking, worse food and unattractive service. We can think of no more certain way still further to advertise the decline of these islands than to bring tourists here under the present regime. Travel facilities to the Continent are quite inadequate to accommodate the native yearning for a decent meal and an atmosphere of comfort.

It is quite possible to obtain occasional items of interest and importance from the bulletins of the "B".B.C. if patience is exercised and slight skill in estimating deviations from established propaganda is available. One such example is contained in the conjunction of the quarterly birth rate statistics with a survey, or snoop, of the health of a cross section of the population. The birth rate for the last quarter is the highest for twenty-five years (how much of this is "alien" is not stated) and four-fifths of the house-wives who were snooped confessed to some kind of illness or accident in the same period. Whether the "B".B.C. was aware of it we do not know; but there is an appropriate case on record.

During the 1914-1918 war, the famous Chillingham herd of white ancient British cattle, which has lived inside the walled park of Chillingham Castle for nearly a thousand years and will not leave it, was under-fed. The birth-rate rose perceptibly; but all the calves were inferior.

A politico-monetary reform body which, while we do
not necessarily endorse its views, we credit with complete honesty of purpose, makes the following statement in its June-July Members' Bulletin.

"During the whole of this eight months [the "phony war" 1939-1940] lengthy negotiations were conducted by the British Foreign Office and Mr. Chamberlain, and the German Foreign Office and Hitler, by which from our side, we offered to stop the war if Germany would again agree to a Gold Standard and International Usury, while Germany offered to stop the war if we would agree to allow her to develop her barter-trade system, and give her back some of her colonies... Then followed the Atlantic Charter meeting of Roosevelt and Churchill, attended by Mr. Montagu Norman, when, as stated above, Churchill pledged this country to support America's plan to get the world back again on to a Gold and Usury standard when Hitler was defeated."

Before commenting on these statements, we think that the positive form in which they are put deserves attention. Whether the writer had sources of authoritative information such as to justify them, we have no means of judging.

Now the first point is that almost everyone surprised, and many people, including ourselves, knew, that some kind of supreme effort was being made to stop the war. It may be recalled that a "party of British Officers"' dining conveniently near the German border of Holland was "kid-napped," and disappeared into obscurity. And the second point is that "America" was furious, and poured out a stream of venomous and filthy abuse both on this country and, in particular, on Mr. Chamberlain. Further, Mr. Churchill, not Mr. Chamberlain, was the advocate of the Gold Standard, and it was Mr. Chamberlain, who as Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1931, reversed the policy inaugurated by Mr. Churchill in 1925 and enthusiastically endorsed by the "Labour" Chancellor, Phillip (Viscount) Snowden. These are obvious discrepancies, and obscure the probability that Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Churchill were far from being at one on policy.

We hold no brief for Mr. Chamberlain except that of preference for common decency, admittedly an old-fashioned idea. And the usual confusion regarding "usury" and credit-control which seems to be an obsession with monetary reformers weakens the probability that the terms of negotiation were as stated. But the main fact is unchallenged. There were negotiations; they broke down; they were followed by the substitution of a "National" (save the mark) Government of Planners and passive Conservatives, headed by the half-American Mr. Churchill with his record of Jewish support; and Mr. Chamberlain died. And with him, the British Empire, and Great Britain.

We are more convinced than ever, if possible, that the falsification and obliteration of history is a major contributory to deepening world calamity. And we think that the publishers of the statement we have quoted could hardly do a greater service, not merely to this country, but to the whole world, than to press in every possible way for the public examination of all the facts and personalities connected with the period of the "phony war"—a period which quite probably marks a fatal crisis in human history. During that period the whole of Europe, including the British Isles, was condemned to six years hell by the group which is the sole beneficiary of the war; and the same group is hard at work to repeat the sentence.

"Spurs"
by BEATRICE C. BEST

In an article entitled The Spur of Security which appeared in Truth (April 18, 1947), Sir Ernest Benn quotes Shakespeare as declaring that security is "mortal's chiefest enemy." Sir Ernest evidently does not question the dictum for he goes on to say: "Danger, risk, poverty, hunger, bankruptcy, are the natural spurs to endeavour; security is a dangerous form of dope."

The circumstances in which this declaration of Shakespeare was made, however, throw a light both on the nature of a spur and the nature of security, or more precisely, perhaps, on what one may call their functions. They also reveal a fundamental contradiction or inconsistency between Sir Ernest Benn's philosophy of the freedom of the individual and the policy he approves for its realisation. It may, therefore, be worth examination.

First, then, it should be noted that it was an agent of evil—the witch Hecate—who pronounced the dictum, and, since the devil is a liar and the father of lies, that fact alone should make it suspect. Secondly, the security promised to Macbeth was a bogus security, in the nature of a trick played on him, designed to encourage him, and give him the necessary confidence to continue the fatal course the witches knew would lead to his doom and his death. In Macbeth's case it was this false sense of security that proved to be his enemy; as a commentary on real security, then, Hecate's dictum is worthless. What does transpire, however, is that the witches found it necessary to give Macbeth a sense of security to get him to act. But the real spur to his actions, that which inspired or provoked them was his ambition: his desire to get rid of his enemies and consolidate his position.

If this be allowed, then it follows that the fallacy of Sir Ernest Benn's argument lies in his misconception of the nature and meaning of a spur. His 'natural spur's of 'danger, risk, poverty, hunger, bankruptcy,' are in reality goads, driving man to seek security—the very condition Sir Ernest so distrusts—and if driven far enough to seek it by any means. But the real nature of a spur, as already suggested, is the inspiration of the goal, the desired end, the wish, the ambition. It is the desire to escape from the goads enumerated by Sir Ernest Benn that turns security into an end in itself—the goal it never should be. Only in this sense can 'the spur of security' be regarded as a danger. Man desires security of course, but as a stable condition necessary for dynamic action—not as an end, but as a means whereby his actions may, with confidence, be directed to his chosen and individual ends. If one takes the well-worn example of the person driven or goaded by poverty to write pot-boilers, instead of the work which is his real aim, one sees that his immediate spur is his desire, indeed his need for security; but by the time he has gained it—if he is lucky enough to do so—his true ambition may have waned, or his talent become dissipated. In this way, security, acting as a spur, may lead to decline.

It is, of course, undeniable that fear, when it does not paralyse, galvanises, goads into action; but not into making...
the best endeavour, for fear—anxiety—clouds the intellect.

An interesting confirmation of this can be found in a review of works by Swiss authors published in *Horizon* for February of this year. In the course of his review the author has occasion to refer to certain experiments on Köhler's apes which are cited in a work by Gustav Bally. These showed that the animals did not use the best of their intelligence when engaged in a struggle to get hold of food; but they "found intellectual solutions for difficult situations only when their greed was diminished." The reviewer goes on to say: "What Bally described in the behaviour of these animals is the background against which the typical human attitude of intellectual freedom can be explained.

This freedom can exist only... when certain essential conditions of human dignity are fulfilled. A man must be protected from danger and want before he can play with intellectual tasks and function in a cultured and dignified way. Only... when he need not be afraid of starvation or new wars, will he use his cortical brain and go on living in a cultured way neither as a savage nor as a barbarian."

From all this one feels justified in maintaining one's contention that Sir Ernest Benn's belief in the right of the individual to exercise freedom and initiative, and the policy he favours for its implementation are at variance. "Danger, risk, poverty, hunger, bankruptcy," are not favourable to the exercise of freedom. A philosophy of freedom and a policy of fear do not belong. Also such a policy suggests a debased view of human nature, and is inconsistent with a belief in the worth and dignity of the individual, and in his right to be considered. A creature who can only be impelled to endeavour by fear can hardly be thought fit to exercise choice and initiative; in any case the compulsion of fear rules out the possibility of freedom of choice.

It should be clear that the system of finance operated by those who have a monopoly in the ownership and control of credit, otherwise the money power, is a most efficient instrument for disseminating the aforesaid fears of "danger, risk, poverty, hunger, bankruptcy." These fears have served the purpose, useful to this power, of giving to security the false value of causing it to be regarded as an end in itself, and as fears are made to extend, the only end. In this way the ground has been well prepared for governments to introduce schemes of 'planned social security' designed to culminate eventually in the grand slam of International Security. The fact that the promised security is bogus, that it will deprive man of the independence essential to freedom, will, it is confidently expected, be lost sight of. A starving man does not stop to examine the food offered him to see if it is poisoned; his whole attention is focussed on getting hold of it.

A weakness of the present system, however, as an instrument of absolute control, is the fact that within its framework it is possible for some to become independent by means of the device or mechanism of the dividend. But a planned economy offering security as a bait would enable governments to eliminate the dividend and bind security to a policy of Full Employment; thus the wage or earned income could be made progressively to replace the dividend.

"If a man will not work neither shall he eat" is a dictum practically and logically applicable to a primitive community in which every man's individual labour is required to produce sufficient real wealth for the community's consumption. Obedience to it, therefore, is a matter of obedience to natural

---

Additional text not translated from the image.
of the “Gestapo”—“Ogpy”, or whatever the name or initials the agents selected by the Government to see that you obey the rules are known by.

Money and even the dividend may still be retained as a kind of interim façade to disguise what is really taking place, and as a basis for punitive taxation; but the modus operandi is not important; the powers that be are not wedded to any particular method, only to one that will give them complete control and enable them to rule by fear. 

Social Credit has been defined as: “Belief inherent in society of its members that in association they can get what they want.” It is founded therefore, on faith (belief) and friendship (association). The security it offers is embodied in the National Dividend, based on the cultural inheritance, which itself is the fruit of that belief and that association. As the inheritance grows the dividend must increasingly replace the wage. The security obtained in this way is not an end in itself, but the condition necessary for man to enjoy that freedom and independence resulting from his inheritance, and thus to be able to exercise his personal sovereignty and pursue ends other than the sole end of material security.

Social Credit is therefore in direct opposition to the rule of fear which, because of the suspicions and conflicts engendered by fear, results in disassociation and enmity. The security promised by this rule is embodied in the policy of Full Employment in which, as previously shown, the wage will increasingly supplant the dividend, and which places man at the mercy of the State, and thus deprives him of freedom and independence and destroys his personal sovereignty. It can be seen then that no compromise is possible between the two rules; the one—the rule of faith, and the other—the rule of fear. The choice they present today is simple and clear cut; but it is crucial and momentous. For man must decide whether he will yield obedience to the State—in reality, the State being an abstraction, to the will of men corrupted and transformed into devils by their insatiable lust for, and implacable will to power; or whether he will obey the will of God. It is a choice between entering into bondage, or into that service which is perfect freedom.

Parliament

(Continued from page 3)

declined to be bought out, as I had declined to be bullied in. Then the decision was taken to initiate steps to bring the Parliamentary secretaryship to an end. That decision, it seems to me, raises two issues: One touching the House; one a matter between me and my Union. The matter between me and my Union was whether that contract should be brought to an end. I was perfectly prepared to do battle on that issue before the annual conference of my association, and I think I know pretty well what the result would have been. The other issue, it seems to me, concerned the House. I think that this combination of circumstances—the attempt to stop me speaking my mind, the attempt to buy me out, and the attempt to drive me out, collectively, constituted improper pressure on a Member. If that were so—and it is my understanding of the term—that constitutes a breach of the liberties of this House, and whatever view the House may take of the majority or minority report, I hope that it will not think that I was wrong in bringing that second issue to the notice of the House, and giving to the Committee of Privileges the opportunity of investigating and pronouncing on this matter. It is suggested that I could have avoided the occasion of privilege by resigning the Parliamentary Secretaryship. I certainly could. But why should I, who, by common consent, has carried out his part of the agreement faithfully, resign at the behest of the executive which had broken their part and which I regarded and still regard, as being wholly unrepresentative of the membership of the organisation? I repeat that—an executive which I regarded, and still regard, as wholly unrepresentative of the membership. The test of that will come at the next conference, and although I am not overgiven to betting, I am prepared to have a wager if anyone is inclined to indulge in a little gamble on this subject.

What happened within my union—and I would ask trade union men opposite to take this point seriously because they know how serious this thing is—was to a large extent the result of penetration of the union by the Communists.

Mr. Gallacher (Fife, West): That is a good line to take.

Mr. Brown: Many trade union leaders in this country know just how serious is that problem. If they do not, they should look at the landscape in France, which ought to teach them, because there the Communists control the trade union movement, and they are making life impossible for a democratic Government with which everyone in this House ought to be in sympathy. It is my view that we should resist the Communist penetration—what I was trying to make the point—and I think it was a fair one—that I hold certain views about the present position, and I do not think we can arrest Communist penetration by running away from it and arguing. I regret that the position arose. I did my best and the General Secretary did his best to prevent it coming to a head. It was painful to me, as it must be to any trade union man to be in public conflict with the executive committee of his union. But I was satisfied that no other course would have met the requirements of the situation, and it is for this House to determine whether the evidence tendered by me, and endorsed by the Secretary of the association, is the evidence tendered on behalf of the honorary officers, bears the stamp of truth, and if it is so, what is the proper construction to place upon that evidence.

I turn now to the last half of the Motion which deprecates the entering into of any contractual agreement with an outside body controlling or limiting the Member's complete independence and freedom of action in Parliament.

... I should be less than honest if I expressed the view that this Motion really goes to the heart of our problem. There are a very large number of Members of the House who have relations with outside bodies, from which they receive financial aid of one kind or another. In some cases as in mine, the relation is the subject of a written agreement, in other cases not. In some cases, as in mine, it is proclaimed to the world; in others, the world knows nothing about it. I hazard the guess that in only a minority of cases—and probably a small minority at that—do written contractual documents exist which govern the relations of Members and outside bodies.

It follows from that that if we are to deal only with
contractual relations—unless a very wide term is given to that—then we shall be dealing with the smaller and, perhaps, the less important part of the problem. Indeed, we may find ourselves doing an injustice as between one side of the House and another. The rise of the modern Labour Party would have been difficult if not impossible but for the help given by trade unions, of which mine was one, to candidates and Members of Parliament...

The second point is that, in my opinion, the most dangerous and insidious arrangements are not the public arrangements proclaimed to the world, but the secret arrangements of which the House and the world know nothing. I would make it obligatory upon Members to disclose the nature of any such financial arrangements both to their constituents and to this House. [HON. MEMBERS: “Hear, hear.”] At last I have united both sides of the House...

Mr. Harold Roberts (Birmingham, Handsworth): I do not think I represent the right hon. and learned Gentleman [the Attorney-General] unfairly when I say to him, that he told us that, although the Committee would have been glad, had they been asked to do so, to embark on the whole question of Privilege, the terms of their remit were confined to investigating the particular complaints made about the conduct of this trade union. Upon that I looked at the report, and I found words to which I must trouble hon. Members to turn at the very beginning:

"Complaint being made by Mr. Byers, Member for the County of Dorset (North Division), of certain actions by the Executive Committee of the Civil Service Clerical Association, which he submitted were calculated improperly to influence Mr. William Brown, Member for the County of Warwick (Rugby Division), in the exercise of his Parliamentary duties, and constituted a breach of the Privileges of this House."

Ordered, "That the matter of the Complaint be referred to the Committee of Privileges."

How could the Committee of Privileges, with any conception of their duty, consider that complaint if they had not a clear idea of what was and what was not a breach of Privilege?

If they embarked upon their duties under the misapprehension under which the Attorney-General apparently laboured as to the terms and ambit of their remit, one cannot be surprised that they came to the conclusion which, I am bound to say on reading the evidence, appears to me to be entirely contrary to the weight of evidence given. This is an attempt to exonerate the trade union and maintain some appearance of generality, and they have to set out a series of what I can only call conflicting duties of people having contact with Members of this House.

I wish to speak with great moderation but, as we have been reminded by one hon. Member, the ultimate decision upon this grave matter rests with the Members of the House. The Committee do their work, and it is for us to pronounce upon it. I am very sorry to say that, when I perused the report in full, I discovered that at every stage the great forensic abilities of the Attorney-General appeared to me to be directed to a cross-examination calculated to discredit the complainant and to exonerate the respondents. I am free to admit that my judgment may be wrong. I would only ask hon. Members who are eager to criticise me thoroughly to re-peruse the whole report, and to devote themselves particularly to those items which are the cross-examination by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. For that reason I find myself unable to agree with the report, and I am further of the opinion that it does not hang together with the last portion of the Motion...