

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 18. No. 22.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 2, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

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 it is symptomatic. For the agencies of power nowadays care little for the contents of our consciousness provided they can control our 'subconscious'. 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 'subconscious.'

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

*A book has just been published describing in detail (261p.p.) the psycho-analysis of a young man: "All that the patient was aware of was that 'things were not right, life was not satisfactory.'" It is claimed that the analysis of this patient gives information on "the fundamental structure of normality"†

†*Science Illustrated* of February, 1947, lists among "Hollywood 'converts'" to the methods of Audience Research Inc.: Goldwyn, Selznich, Disney, Columbia, R.K.O., Universal, and in England, J. Arthur Rank.

old chief, Herbert Morrison... It has been persistently 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.

Stevenage New Town Order

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.

†SERGE CHAKOTIN: *The Rape of the Masses*, p. 273.

SCIENCE, LIBERTY AND PEACE

By ALDOUS HUXLEY.

PRICE 3/6. POSTAGE 2d.

Obtainable from:

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: July 15, 1947.

PRIVILEGES

Members of Parliament (Contractual Agreements)

Report [17th June] from the Committee of Privileges considered.

The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Arthur Greenwood):

I beg to move,

"That this House agrees with the Report of the Committee of Privileges and in particular declares that it is inconsistent with the dignity of the House, with the duty of a Member to his constituents, and with the maintenance of the privilege of freedom of speech, for any Member of this House to enter into any contractual agreement with an outside body, controlling or limiting the Member's complete independence and freedom of action in Parliament or stipulating that he shall act in any way as the representative of such outside body in regard to any matters to be transacted in Parliament; the duty of a Member being to his constituents and to the country as a whole, rather than to any particular section thereof."

I do not propose to embark upon a discussion of the whole proceedings of the Committee of Privileges...

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby): ... I could have wished that the matter of the Motion had come before the House tonight in a rather different form from that in which it is brought to us. For there are two issues covered by the Motion. One issue is whether we agree or disagree with the majority report of the Committee of Privileges—and about that there may be, and probably will be, conflicting views, cutting right across the party line. The second issue is whether the House thinks it desirable to lay down, in the form of a Motion, some kind of guidance relating to contractual obligations between Members of the House and outside bodies. I can conceive that there will be Members who would like to vote against the first part of the Motion, but would desire to vote for the second... I would wish to say something about both halves of the Motion. The first half accepts the majority report of the Committee, which takes the view that, in the transactions between the honorary officers of my union and myself, what transpired did not constitute a breach of Privilege; I invoke the machinery of the Committee of Privileges; I appealed to that tribunal; I made my complaint to them; they have investigated the case and have pronounced judgment upon it. In those circumstances, it would ill become me either to criticise or to question the report of the Committee. The House has, in the volume before it, all the documents that were put in; it has the minutes of evidence; it has some knowledge of me, and, in short, it possesses all the raw materials for judgment. In that respect all that I can do is humbly to submit this issue to the judgment of my fellow Members of Parliament, and that I do...

... When I first came to this House, in 1929, I entered it as a member of the Labour Party, and I sat as a Labour Member. I was also a trade union man, receiving financial aid from my union. In that respect, my position was analogous to that occupied by many Members of this House today, as those on all sides of the House will readily agree. In that Parliament I had no contractual arrangements with my union specifically related to my work in Parliament, either governing or related to my work in Parliament. But the circumstance that there was no contractual arrangement at all did not prevent the strongest pressure being brought to bear upon me during that Parliament. In 1931 I left the

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 to be 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, pith, 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 re-affiliation 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 secretaryship."

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

(Continued on page 7).

PRIVILEGE AND MR. BROWN

The Report from the Committee of Privileges concerning the affairs of Mr. W. J. Brown, M.P. for Rugby—adjacently we publish extracts from the Debate on it in Parliament—touches, without illumination, on the proper relation between an M.P. and his electorate. The whole subject requires closer examination, which the Committee did not find it their business to make. In this connection *The Social Crediter* hopes to return to the contents of the Report at a later time.

There is another notable aspect of the Report, however. As Mr. Pickthorn pointed out in the debate, Privilege, which inheres in any one Member of the House only as a part of the House and is a part of the rights of the House, is thus primarily a part of the rights of constituents.

It is surely a part of the rights of constituents and electors generally, then, to remark on the Attorney-General's extraordinary display of dramatics in his examination of Mr. Brown in the Committee; on the way he pressed questions apparently more for their psychological effect on his hearers and readers than for their relevance; and on his occasional use of the prejudicial phrase ("While you were to be free to air your own views on political matters..."). No doubt such tactics are usual in a Court of Law. But even to use 'tactics' assumes conflict, and electors of this country are concerned to have a complicated matter laid bare for their assessment (and further action if need be), not to be confused with muffled emotion.

We trust it is not breach of Privilege to criticise a Report on Privilege, but the implications of these things are grave. We must beware of the incidence of the technique of the 'Demonstration Trial.'

The Right to Contract Out

Many Members have been helped into Parliament by Trade Union Funds. Mr. Brown has always, in and out of Parliament, opposed the monopoly of labour known as 'the closed shop' exercised by the leaders of some of the Trade Unions, and his views must be an embarrassment to the Trades Union Congress in its pursuit of what is logically the next objective—the complete monopoly of manpower, a 'corner' in manpower. What will they do with it when they have it? Mr. Deakin of the Transport and General Workers' Union already recommends compulsory peace-time direction of labour. Would it not be well for 'labour' to take a last look at the end-point of this process? It is to be seen in Soviet Russia where the Unions have become instruments of the employers (the Government, but still the power that imposes conditions of work) for enforcing Government decisions and for pressing more and more from the workers. And it must not be forgotten that there the 'closed shop' is worked together with a system of 'closed feeding,' if we may so call a discriminatory rationing system. The sanction against the worker is near-starvation.

Shall we, too, reach this end? It depends, once more, on the worker: his safeguard is to hang on like grim death to the right to contract out, without extraneous penalty, from trades unions and employment alike. If not, the grim death will be on his own doorstep.

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. 18. No. 22.

Saturday, August 2, 1947.

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 in these days, which are the culmination of nearly two hundred years of wrong teaching in political economy, ought to be in any doubt about that. But it has been difficult to assess the evolving result, and therefore its fallacies have not been rectified. 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 free-masons 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 apposite 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 "phoney 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 surmised, 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 "kidnapped," 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 "phoney 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 spurs' 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

*Danger and risk may appeal to the adolescent for the sake of the excitement or the kudos to be gained by them; but the adult person sees them as obstructions standing in the way of his real objective, and to be avoided as far as possible.

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

facts and laws and is legitimate. It is also precisely by observation of, and obedience to these facts and laws that man has been able to transcend the dictum and reach a condition in which he can enjoy both security *and* leisure. Unfortunately, man has a weakness for making a virtue of a necessity. In this case the dictum was given a moral status, and, as its practical applicability declined, has been raised to the rank of a moral imperative, till now it has attained the strength of a moral fetish, subscribed to by practically everyone. It can easily be seen how important this is to the planners' intention of making security dependent on employment. Also as one of the results of industrial development is to dispense with man's labour, 'work' has come inevitably to mean more and more a matter of a job—employment—for the sake of an earned income—the pay packet and less and less a matter of the wealth produced or the services rendered, neither of which may be required. Full Employment, therefore, can only be undertaken by government, which is in a position to make and invent jobs by a variety of ways and means impossible to private enterprise. Thus, Full Employment and absolute government, *i.e.* dictatorship, are essential to each other—are, in fact, one.

It is a lamentable, pathetic and ironic fact that those people who believe, or sincerely think they believe, in freedom are, by their besotted and baneful adherence to the creed of Full Employment giving their fullest assistance to the very powers they fondly imagine they are opposing.† They are, indeed, actually assisting in the change over from the present financial system which does at least leave open a way of escape for some by way of the dividend, to a rationing system from which none will be allowed to escape. That the change is already taking place only the wilfully blind or the hopelessly innocent can fail to see.

The failure of the present system to equate purchasing power with goods, which industry itself was powerless to remedy, can be overcome by a rationing system. Under the control of a Government which can decide what shall be produced, exported and imported, goods can be related to the points, coupons, docketts and so forth assigned to each individual. The innumerable rules and regulations that such a complex system entails are useful to a government committed to find full employment, since their administration necessitates an ever increasing number of officials appointed to see they are carried out. Thus, fears of the 'natural spurs' of "danger, risk, poverty, hunger, bankruptcy," inseparable from the present system will be replaced by fears

†An instance of what can only be called a break-down of the intellectual faculty resulting from this adherence occurs in the commentary in the June number of *The New English Review*. There we read that: "Full Employment is a consequence of full production and can be ensured by no other means." What, it must be asked here, is meant by 'full production'? Is the aim and purpose of it to supply the needs and wants of the community? If so, owing to modern industrial methods, *unemployment* may be a consequence of 'full production.' Or is 'full employment' the object of 'full production?' Then if so the statement is a truism. Of course, you can go on making things *ad infinitum* and make full employment a consequence of full production. If full employment is your object, if all you want is to give employment, what you do with the things when produced is irrelevant to your purpose. But only the brush or pen of a super-surrealist artist could depict the ultimate nightmare horror of the logical outcome of such a process in a power-production age. The fact that by a variety of means a state of affairs has been brought about which gives plausible support to the government's 'Work or Want' and labour shortage propaganda should not be allowed to obscure the fundamental realities of the situation.

of the "Gestapo"—"Ogpu", 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 dissociation 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

‡There are people who are unable to believe in the existence of a plot; but to suppose that what is taking place is merely the result of a fortuitous course of events places an even greater strain on one's credulity.

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? [Interruption.] 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... 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, or 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...

NOW AVAILABLE THROUGH K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS

I Chose Freedom

by Victor Kravchenko

PRICE: 15s. (Postage extra).

The Personal and Political Life of a Soviet Official.

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	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Money and the Price System	7d.
The Use of Money	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.

ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart...	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
The French Revolution by Nesta H. Webster	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster	7/6
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster	5/-
Communism in Action U.S.A. House Document No. 754	2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
Protocols of Zion	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.	1/-
Aberhart: Manning	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards ..	8d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick	6d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	4d.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson	4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson	6d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson	4d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne	3d.
This Freedom	9d.
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
Social Credit: An Explanation for New Readers 1½d. each, or 50 copies for 5/-.	

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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