

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 24. No. 6.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

"The cure is easy, if we have the will. We must take back from the Administration its power over our money, which is our work.

"Money is only a receipt for work done. Credit is an I.O.U. for work not yet done. Any nation which lets its government operate on credit in peacetime is a nation of indentured servants. It is on its way to becoming a nation of serfs. If we let the State use deficit financing in peacetime, we are agreeing to let it conscript our labour in peacetime.

"The point at which to attack the evil is in the budget of the Federal Government. For it is there that clever men are fighting to enslave a people, who by their own indifference, are already half enslaved."—Edna Lonigan in *Human Events*, U.S.A.

We don't think that it is quite as easy as all that, Miss Lonigan. There is a long distance between knowing what to do, and being able to get it done. But you have the right idea, by the tail.

"If one adds up the American and Canadian 'loans' (neither of which is ever likely to be repaid) and the sums which Britain has received under the Marshall Plan, the figure is over \$7 billion. This far exceeds the income lost in the same period from the attrition of foreign investments. Yet even with these lavish subsidies the Socialist Welfare State has not been paying its way."—William Henry Chamberlin.

So another Socialist alibi goes West. But after all, you must be prepared to pay for the privilege of the New Statesmanship, complete with its God-with-us Shinwells and its squalid nuisance Bevans.

Mr. Louis Johnson, U.S. Secretary of Defence, is getting tough with Uncle Joe. One hour after the Russians drop a firework, he will throw in the heroic British to the last man, and turn America into the Arsenal of D'markrazi, so there.

The death, suddenly of Prof. Harold Laski, late of the London School of Economics, was announced on the "B".B.C. on March 25. Waal, waal, waal.

The sharp revolt of the Lord Mayor of York, the Mayor of Scarborough, and others, against the assumption of the Lord Mayor of London that he is authorised to thank our overseas friends and kinsmen for their never-to-be-forgotten kindnesses in mitigating the drabness which the financiers of the City of London have done so much to foster, is a matter for sound satisfaction. The proposal is meretricious in itself, apart from the flippancy with which

it is advanced; it is on a level with the masonically inspired Post Office post-mark which was equally resented: and it is a subtle attempt to establish the idea that the individual is irresponsible, his gifts can be (as they were) withheld at the whim of the bureaucracy, and the bureaucracy will take over from him his genuine gratitude, substituting a racket from which their friends will do nicely.

Not the least valuable aspect of Mr. C. M. Mannock's Notes on World Population, which appeared in our issue of March 25, is that it brings into focus the situation with which we are confronted in a world which is supposed to be governed by opinion, and opinion is the outcome of false statements, false statistics, and false philosophies.

Anyone having the smallest acquaintance with India or China will recognise at once that Mr. Mannock must be right in his scepticism of population figures. But the rot goes much deeper. For instance, we do not believe that the total number of Jews in the world is about fifteen million. We do not believe Hitler's men murdered six million of them—we doubt very much if they murdered six hundred thousand. We do not believe any considerable proportion of the statistics which were issued by U.N.R.R.A. We don't believe the food statistics issued by Lord Boyd-Orr's Food Organisation and we don't think they form any basis whatever for rationing in these islands. We could extend the list to much greater length.

This mass of lies is organically related to Communism in which truth is defined as being whatever serves the purpose of the omnipotent State; *i.e.* the Sanhedrin and its nominees. At bottom, the important issue is whether or no truth has any real sanctions. Does it matter that everyone thinketh a lie, and will anything happen because of it? We think it does, and something will happen; but the Devil evidently has a long rope.

### Missing N.Z. State Documents

"New Zealand Prime Minister Sidney Holland said in Wellington yesterday that many top secret documents were missing from Government files when his party took over from the Socialists in December.

"In a letter to Opposition leader, Peter Fraser, Mr. Holland said members of the previous Cabinet had taken with them much more than private and personal papers.

"The letter was made public yesterday by Mr. Fraser, along with his reply.

"Mr. Fraser's letter said that, when the Socialists took over in 1935 they found the Ministers' offices denuded of papers, all documents relating to external affairs in particular having been destroyed on the orders of the previous administration.

"He invited Mr. Holland to name the missing documents, and he would endeavour to clarify the situation."

—*Dundee Courier and Advertiser*, March, 21.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: March 22, 1950.*

### Letter and Postcard Rates

*Mr. Rodgers* asked the Postmaster-General when he expects to be able to make a reduction in the present letter rate of 2½d.

*Mr. Ness Edwards*: As a reduction of even ½d. in the letter and postcard rate is estimated to involve an annual loss of revenue of rather more than £8½ million, which would practically eliminate the prospective postal surplus, I cannot say when such a reduction will be made.

### Petrol Rationing

*Brigadier Rayner* asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether he will consider abolishing rationing of petrol in this country for a trial period of three months.

*Mr. P. Noel-Baker*: I am afraid that the abolition of petrol rationing in the United Kingdom would result in a substantial increase in consumption, which would add considerably to dollar expenditure. I regret therefore that I am unable to adopt the suggestion made by the hon. and gallant Member.

### Power Stations (Coal Consumption)

*Mr. J. Grimston* asked the Minister of Fuel and Power what was the average weight of coal needed to produce one Kilovolt-ampere by the British European Airways Corporation during any convenient recent period.

*Mr. P. Noel-Baker*: During 1948-49 the power stations of the British Electricity Authority, to which I must presume the hon. Member refers, consumed on the average 1.478 lbs. of coal per unit (Kilowatt hour) sent out.

*House of Commons: March 23, 1950.*

## NATIONAL FINANCE

### Pound Sterling (Purchasing Power)

*Sir W. Smithers* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will give the purchasing power of the pound sterling reckoned over the whole field of personal expenditure taking the year 1900 as 100 for 1910, 1920, 1930, 1945 and the latest available date; and the figure at the latest available date taking 1945 as 100.

*Mr. Gaitskell*: Reckoned over the whole field of personal expenditure by the public, the purchasing power of the pound sterling in the years in question was approximately as follows: 1900, 100; 1910, 95; 1920, 37; 1930, 58; 1945, 38; February, 1950, 31. Taking the year 1945 as 100, the figure for February, 1950, was 81.

### Aliens (Naturalisation)

*Wing-Commander Bullus* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department what is the number of foreigners who have been granted British nationality in the past 12 months.

*Mr. Ede*: Nine thousand six hundred and eighty-nine persons were naturalised in the period from 1st March, 1949, to 28th February, 1950.

*House of Commons: March 24, 1950.*

## SUMMER TIME

*The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede)*: I beg to move,

"That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty in pursuance of the provisions of Section 2 of the Summer Time Act, 1947, praying that the Summer Time Order, 1950, be made in the form of the draft laid before this House on 6th March."

It may be as well if I say a few words in explanation of this Order and the history of this matter. The Summer Time Acts, 1922 and 1925, enact that the period of Summer Time runs from the Sunday after the third Saturday in April, or a week earlier if this conflicts with Easter Day, until the Sunday after the first Saturday in October. If that had been followed this year, it would have meant that Summer Time would have extended from 16th April to 8th October. Under the Summer Time Act, 1947, the statutory period may be varied by Order in Council.

The draft Order in Council now before the House gives effect to a proposal which I announced on 15th December last, that Summer Time this year should run from 16th April to 22nd October. . . .

This year the draft Order prescribes a period which begins on the statutory date but continues for a fortnight later. In deciding to recommend these periods to the House, I consulted the interests affected by Summer Time, which are mainly agriculture, industry, and fuel and power concerns. All of them accept this year's commencing date on 16th April, which gets us back to what I might call the established statutory date. It gives agriculture, which wants to start as late as possible, particularly in Scotland, nearly a fortnight later start than last year. I admit that farmers would prefer the concluding date for Summer Time to be earlier than 22nd October, the date proposed, because an earlier date would give more light in the morning for harvesting the root crops.

On the other hand, fuel and power interests prefer, mainly because of reducing electricity generating difficulties, that Summer Time should continue to the end of October, for in that way the peak call for domestic use does not occur while the electricity requirements of industry are also heavy. I have had to balance these two interests. . . .

*Mr. James Stuart (Moray and Nairn)*: I do not wish to take up a lot of time in discussing this Order. I realise, as the Home Secretary has said, that we are getting nearer to the pre-war state of affairs, and for that we are naturally grateful. I have nothing to say, therefore, about the opening date, which is in accordance with the 1925 Act. I must point out to the right hon. Gentleman, and to the Government, that the closing date is something that is causing concern in the northern parts of the country; in fact, the further northward one goes the more concern it causes. I hope, therefore, that the Government will see their way next year to revert to the old state of affairs under the 1925 Act.

It is, after all, nearly five years since the end of the war. These hours were departed from only as a war measure. I realise that there are conflicting interests to consider, such as the fuel and power position, but I would remind the Home Secretary that the continuation of Summer Time into the late autumn, or at least towards the end of October, is a heavy additional cost on the farmers in those parts of the country where there is a late harvest. The farmer cannot do his harvesting until late in the day, with the result that he runs into overtime earlier than would normally be the case. The sun still performs its usual

functions in getting the dew off the grass at the normal time.

I always think it is rather foolish that the human race should have invented these clever devices for time-keeping, and then, having worked them effectively for so many years, should now resort to these new devices, fooling ourselves, by legislation, that the time is not what it ought to be. As we all know, neither the animals nor the sun descend to these devices. I often think that if the cow could speak to us, she would tell us how stupid we appear to be, looked at from her tranquil point of view. . . .

*Mr. Snadden* (Kinross and West Perthshire): I wish to say a few words in support of what has been said by my right hon. Friend the Member for Moray and Nairn (Mr. J. Stuart). It is difficult to exaggerate the importance agricultural attaches to this business of Summer Time.

. . . In my part of the country, because of the imposition of Summer Time, practically nothing can be done before the dinner hour. That means that overtime has to be paid in the evenings, which adds to the costs of production and lowers our efficiency, for which, in the end, the consumer has to pay through the price reviews. We look upon this matter, therefore, as being a serious one from the point of view of efficiency and maximum food production.

We welcome the slight concession that has been made by the right hon. Gentleman this year. But I cannot understand why we have not reached the stage when we can return to the dates laid down in the 1925 Act. If the argument is that each year must be judged on its merits, which, I understand, was the argument put forward last year by the right hon. Gentleman, then surely, today, when every ounce of food is needed to feed our people and to save dollars, there is a very strong case, not only for the return to the old dates, but for the complete abolition of Summer Time.

Industrialists have told me that its effect upon industry is doubtful, and all agriculturists will tell us that its effect on food production is adverse. I cannot help thinking that if the right hon. Gentleman got down to the problem and weighed up the balance of what is in the best interests of the nation, he would come down on the side of a return to the 1925 Act dates. We, in Scotland, feel that we are moving too slowly in this matter. I hope that if it falls to the right hon. Gentleman to bring in a similar Order next year, we shall be able to return to the old dates.

*Mr. Hollis* (Devizes): I should be very grateful if the Home Secretary could enlighten me on one point on which I am far from clear. There is much to be said for the powerful case of my hon. Friends and that of cows against having Summer Time at all, but without entirely associating myself with them, what I do not understand is what is the case for varying Summer Time year by year? If we are to have Summer Time—I admit there is a balance of interest here—I cannot see why it has to be varied and why it is different from year to year. . . .

For correct information concerning the Constitution of **THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT**, Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for the Statement published in July, 1949, (*postage 1d.*)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

## Diplomatic Privileges (Extension) Bill

Considered in Committee.

[SIR CHARLES MACANDREW in the Chair]

Clause 1.—(AMENDMENTS OF 7 & 8 GEO. 6. C. 44.)

*Mr. Manningham-Buller* (Northants, South): I beg to move, in page 1. line 22, to leave out from "representatives," to the end of line 24, and to insert:

"to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe and their substitutes."

I hope that the Government will look favourably upon this Amendment, which does nothing more than carry out the intention that they expressed upon the Second Reading. The Under-Secretary of State then said that the object of the Bill was to protect the rights and privileges of those who attend the Council of Europe as members of the Consultative Assembly. He said that at the beginning of his speech. If the Amendment is accepted, it will give effect to what he said. As the Bill now stands it goes far beyond the Council of Europe and the agreement which is set out in the general agreement of privileges and immunities of the Council of Europe.

When one looks at that agreement, one sees that the privileges and the immunities are in two categories. The first is the category of representatives of the Consultative Assembly and their substitutes, and the second is of officials of the Council. There is no reference to staffs or officials of the representatives. Therefore, there is no need for the Bill to go beyond that point, if it is the intention, as the hon. Gentleman said, to protect the rights and privileges of those attending the Council. As the Bill now stands it extends the earlier Act to cover representatives, whether of the Governments concerned or not, or "on any organ of such an organisation."

What does that mean? If our Amendment is accepted it is clear that representatives from this country, whether they are representatives of the Government or not, will be entitled to the protection given under the Bill. I ask the hon. Gentleman whether he will now give me the answer to the question that I put to him on the Second Reading: If the Bill is intended to apply to any other organisation than the Council of Europe and the Consultative Assembly, what organisations have the Government in mind? If they have none in mind, then the extension of the Bill beyond what is necessary is wrong. If they have any in mind we should at least be told what they are, and why, in the Government's view, they are not covered by existing legislation. . . .

*Mr. Gage* (Belfast, South): There is one point which the hon. and learned Member for Gloucester (Mr. Turner-Samuels) said with which we can all agree. That is that when we grant diplomatic privileges it is no light thing. It is, therefore, important that we should all know precisely to what bodies or persons we are granting those privileges. That was underlined by my hon. Friend the Member for Buckinghamshire, South (Mr. Bell). When one looks at the wording of this Clause it is quite impossible to understand how far we are empowering Orders in Council to be made in respect of different bodies. If I may say so with respect to the hon. and learned Member for Gloucester, when he had finished clearing up the matter I found myself in complete confusion as to what the Clause meant. So I now turn to another lawyer, the Minister of State and I am happy to do so when I recall that he and I became

(continued on page 7).

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 24. No. 6.

Saturday, April 8, 1950.

### The Menace\*

In September 1918, M. Oudendyk, the Netherlands Minister at Petrograd, wrote to the British Minister at Christiana from personal observation of the Communist Revolution in Russia. He said, *inter alia*, "... unless ... Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread in one form or another over the whole world, as it is organised and worked by Jews who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things."

This communication was passed on to the British Government, who seven months later incorporated it in a White Paper. This, however, was withdrawn almost immediately on publication, and replaced by an abridged version which omitted M. Oudendyk's warning.

The emphasis in the passage quoted is ours. It *must* be realised that so-called Communism is only one adaptation of a policy which is being relentlessly pursued in practically every country in the world. The policy is centralisation, MONOPOLY, leading to One World Government; and it is being "organised and worked by the Jews for their own ends."

*The Social Crediter* draws attention to the importance of questioning the axioms as well as the propositions of the enemy. Now contemporary official economic doctrines are based on axioms many of which are deliberately false, and deliberately destructive. But if they are accepted, and policies are based on them, then *any* Government, no matter how "anti-Communist," will further the Communist—*i.e.*, Judaic—policy. Conversely, a challenge to these axioms will very quickly reveal the human forces whose ends they serve, just as happened in Alberta.

It is "Communism" as concealed in current economic and political axioms which constitutes our great danger; but the real menace lies in the purpose of those who benefit by the destruction they cause. There is nothing for it but a challenge to them and their purpose.

#### William Morris

"Yet in some ways the English Socialist State today is still further from Morris's requirements of a good society than that in which he lived."

— *The Times Literary Supplement.*

### University Principal and Lord Vansittart

*The Times* (in England) seems to have been the newspaper most fully to reflect the repercussions of Lord Vansittart's speech in the House of Lords on March 29

\*From *The Australian Social Crediter* of February 11.

(Communists in the Public Service), although the whole matter (*The Times*, March 31) occupies less than one third of a column. Observing that "Lord Vansittart had referred to a number of individuals by name, as well as several organizations and Government Departments," the newspaper quotes Sir Raymond Priestley (geologist), Principal and Vice-Chancellor of Birmingham University, as follows:—

"There are Communists in the university. It would be difficult to find any shade of political opinion not represented. I am not aware that the Communist Party has been out-lawed by the Government.

"We do not normally inquire into political convictions and, in my opinion, we should be wrong to do so. Mr. Cope [in his speech Lord Vansittart referred to a Canon Gilbert Cope at Birmingham] is an honours graduate in science and theology, which is an unusual and attractive combination. He was strongly recommended by people who count in the academic world, and he appeared to the committee a satisfactory man to act as resident tutor. There is no evidence in my opinion which suggests that the committee was wrong."

*The Times* proceeds to quote the REV. GILBERT COPE, a tutor at Birmingham University, as saying that he was not a Communist and had never been a member of the Communist Party. The only party he had belonged to was the Labour Party, of which he was a member in Stourbridge before moving to Birmingham last October. The attack on him was a "dreadful misrepresentation" of the facts [Lord Vansittart had referred to the Rev. Gilbert Cope as "a particularly murderous priest"].

Mr. Cope said . . . : Lord Vansittart had attacked him in ignorance of his real convictions. "I am not the blood-thirsty tyrant his imagination has contrived."

Commenting on Wednesday night on Lord Vansittart's speech, the BISHOP of BRADFORD (Dr. Blunt) said: "My connexion with the Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership ended three or four years ago. It was partly because of what Mr. Cope said in his pamphlet that I severed my connexion with it."

DR. LESLIE WEATHERHEAD said that he did not know the organization which Lord Vansittart had mentioned. "So far from being a Communist, I have frequently stated that, in my opinion, Communism and Christianity are quite irreconcilable."

*The Daily Mail* on April 1, said villagers wanted the Rev. Gilbert Cope banned from preaching at Holy Trinity Church, Belbroughton, Worcestershire, and were sending a petition to local church authorities.

On Monday, April 3, an argument developed impugning Lord Vansittart's accuracy, he withdrawing as misinformation the statement in the House of Lords that the Bureau of Current Affairs had received a grant from the Pilgrim Trust, while pressing the point that a writer (Mr. Syers), disowned by the Director of the Bureau as "not on our staff", was nevertheless approved as "first-class". In the same column (*The Times*, April 3.), Lord Vansittart is confronted with a fresh charge of misrepresentation by the Director-General of the Festival of Britain Office.

It will be apparent that the progress of such encounters will throw light on both sides participating in the argument, though to what purpose cannot be foreseen. At the time of going to press, no reply to Mr. Gerald Barry, the Director-General of the Festival of Britain Office, is available. His letter ends:—

"If Lord Vansittart is in possession of facts to support his statement that the Festival of Britain Office has been or is being used in the way he alleges [*i.e.*, for the dissemination of Communist propaganda written by a Czech, Mr. Jiri Hronek, *alias* Langstein], I shall be grateful to him for supplying us with them, so that we may take suitable action. Alternatively, I should appreciate his public withdrawal of his imputation."

## Communism in Canada and Elsewhere

By FREDERIC DAVIDSON\*

It is foolish to attempt to deal with Communism as of any one country, because it is a world-wide movement. On the other hand, its methods and effects in any one country go to prove what it is trying to accomplish elsewhere. It forms a topic, therefore, vast and voluminous, yet, after all, essentially simple, for its aims and methods are the same wherever it appears.

I begin by stating what Communism is not. It is certainly not Communism in the original sense of the word: vesting of property in the community, each member working according to his capabilities and receiving according to his wants. This is the definition in the *Oxford Dictionary*. There are many other definitions, but all stress the abolition of private property.

I doubt if there has ever been an example of perfect Communism in the original sense. The nearest approach is the communal life of monasteries and convents and perhaps I should add that of certain savages, notably those of Tierra Del Fuego, who share all things, even their wives, and occasional castaways in the cooking pot. There have been attempts through the ages to set up this sort of Communism and all, without exception, from Sparta and the Essenes, to the 41 Christian Socialist Experiments of the 19th Century have proved lamentable failures.

Robert Owen, of England, 1771 to 1858, founded 12 Communist settlements, the average duration of which was less than three years. But this is not the meaning of Communism as the word is used to-day. To-day it is synonymous with Bolshevism and both mean the regimentation and enslavement of peoples under a handful of bureaucrats, a dictatorship of bureaucracy over, not of or by, the proletariat and such remnants of other classes as may survive. It is based on the writings of Karl Marx, a German Jew, whose real name was Mordecai, an apostate Jew, apostate not to Christianity but to atheism, and especially on his Communist Manifesto published in 1848 and republished in 1888 by his friend, the Prussian Friedrich Engels. In this he demanded the abolition of Law, Family, Morality, Property and Religion, and this is the basis of all that has happened in Russia and wherever Communism has gained a foothold. The official definition of Communism as given by Report No. 2290 of the American Congress, January 17, 1931, generally known as the Fish Report on Communist Activities in the United States, is as follows: "A world-wide political organisation advocating:

1. Hatred of God and all forms of religion;
2. Destruction of private property and inheritance;
3. Absolute social and racial equality, promotion of class hatred;
4. Revolutionary propaganda through the Communist International, stirring up Communist activities in all countries in order to cause strikes, riots, sabotage, bloodshed and civil war;
5. Destruction of all representative or democratic governments, including civil liberties, such as free speech, freedom of the press, of assembly and trial by jury;

\*Published in Toronto in 1937, we have received this material from the widow of the author, and warmly thank her for this courtesy. Noting the date, readers will observe the appositeness to present conditions.

6. The ultimate and final objective is by means of world revolution to establish the dictatorship of the so-called proletariat in one world union of Soviet Socialistic Republics, with the capital in Moscow, Russia."

Now by what means is this negative creed to be introduced? The first is the class war, as recommended by Marx, a war in which the manual labouring class is encouraged to rise and suppress the aristocracy, the clergy, intellectuals, business men and farmers, by the promise of the seizure of the property of these and its handing over to the "proletariat." But this is never done. After arrival at power by fooling the people, the successful bureaucrat takes over all property, even the possessions of the poorest, and uses it to maintain himself in power. Lenin did give land to the peasants, but shortly proceeded to take it back, while Stalin's policy of collectivisation has cost the lives of millions. The first famine of 1921-22 cost six million lives. The famines of 1933-35, this time purely artificial, man-made, are said to have cost as many lives as the Great War. See *Human Life in Russia*, by Dr. Ammende, 1936, page 97.

Thus Communism is not, as some people believe, a system of sharing among all of the people, but only a pretence of sharing with one class, the so-called worker, using him in a warfare to "liquidate" all others and then enslaving him. To illustrate this, I quote from a speech by Stalin as published by the Comintern Press in Leningrad: "I think that the moment is not far off when a revolutionary crisis will be unleashed in America, and when that revolutionary crisis comes in the United States, the Communist Party of the United States must be armed to be able to meet this historical moment and to head the forthcoming class war."

Another means of fostering Communism lies in confusion of terms among people who would resent the appellation of Communist, but have no hesitation in declaring themselves Socialists. But most would have difficulty in stating clearly what they mean by this term. Daniel Griffiths, in his book entitled *What is Socialism?* published in London in 1924, lists no fewer than 263 definitions of Socialism. As a matter of fact, there is not even the thickness of a sheet of paper or of a hair between official Socialism of to-day and Communism as already defined.

Of course, the word, like Communism, has borne different meanings in the past, but the root meaning is comradeship. We had, in the last century, a school of Utopian Socialism, of which Mr. H. G. Wells is almost the last representative, and who has said of Karl Marx: "The world would be a better place if he had never been born." The only difference to-day between Socialism and Communism, if it could be thought a difference, lies in the method of approach. What this shadow difference is has been well expressed by Prof. Hearnshaw in his *Survey of Socialism*: "This Socialist method is the method of sapping rather than assault, of craft rather than force, of subtlety rather than violence." And Mr. Woodsworth, for the C.C.F., says that the aims of his party and the Communists are the same; the only difference is in tactics, but of course this, too, is only camouflage; various members of his party have suggested violence, and supported violence, as in our strikes at Vancouver, Regina, Crowland and Stratford, and Prof. Hearnshaw agrees with Mr. Austin, who says in his "Hope of the Workers" that "Socialism, once the dream of kindly but foolish men, has become a monstrous tyrant, spreading abroad envy, greed and hatred, holding mankind from the

path of true progress, and even striving to drag the human race back to the beasts from which it sprang."

The Soviets' official title is Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Socialists appear on platforms with Communists; they join in movements, associations, on directorates of Red sheets, as in *Action*, the organ here of the so-called League Against War and Fascism, in demonstrations and in popular fronts. Apropos of this, the word has recently gone out from Moscow to disuse the term "Communist" and replace it by "Anti-Fascist." Dust in the eyes and red wool pulled over them!

The other terms of which we hear so much just now in Spain, anarchism and syndicalism, are just aspects or masks of Socialism and Communism. Anarchism certainly means abolition of law, family, property, morality and religion. Syndicalism's speciality is that the workers should seize the factories in which they work. Personally, I prefer your honest Communist who says openly he is out to cut your throat and take your property. As Ewart Humphries said recently to Premier Hepburn: "We intend to liquidate your class." Karl Marx says to the doomed middle class in his Communist Manifesto: "You reproach us because we would abolish your property. Precisely so, that is our intention." And Bernard Shaw, that arch-traitor, says in one of his Fabian tracts: "Compulsory labour, with death as the final punishment, is the keystone of Socialism."

Well, all this is very social, is it not? And remember, Socialism is supposed to be only for one class—the "worker."

I have already given an inkling of the means by which the Marxian paradise is to be attained; but I should like to state the methods briefly with greater clearness; methods of bringing on the class war.

Pending the zero-hour of violence, of course the chief methods are organisation and propaganda. As to the former, I would refer to the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Quarterly*, July and October, 1935, and January, 1936, which show Canada organised into districts by the Communists and into the various societies, such as the Workers' Unity League (now dissolved), the Farmers' Unity League, Friends of the Soviet Union, the Maxim Gorky Clubs, the Workers' Ex-Servicemen's League, by which an attempt is made by the party to bring ex-soldiers within its control. A new development is the Progressive Veterans, organised by an alien from the States, said to have some sixty thousand names of men ready to go to Ottawa with demands to be settled by Parliament. I am told there is an oath to this effect. It is from such organisations that it is hoped to gain militant leadership for street demonstrations and other conflicts.

There are a number of other organisations, such as the Young Communist League (with a branch in the University of Toronto), the Women's Labour League, the Workers' International Relief, the Canadian Labour Defence League, the National Unemployed Councils, the Women's International Peace Movement, the League Against War and Fascism, not to speak of the C.C.F. and the Communist Party itself and a dozen others, sliding in and out from and under various names, all branches of the upas-tree, which has its roots in the Third Bolshevik International at Moscow.

They control many newspapers. *The R.C.M.P. Quarterly* lists 26 of such, besides a large number of mimeographed sheets, pamphlets and shop papers. 13 of these newspapers are in foreign languages.

But perhaps the most dangerous branch of organisation

is their attack upon the children for the training of young Communists. For this purpose many schools are being conducted:

- (a) By the Young Communist League;
- (b) By the Ukrainian Labour Temple Association;
- (c) By the Finnish Organisation of Canada;
- (d) By the Jewish Workman's Circle;
- (e) By the Russian Labour Clubs and other Communist foreign language associations.

The children are being taught that there are only two classes, the haves and the have-nots, and that the have-nots should take what others have, by force. In other words, that capital should change hands. They are also taught that religion, according to the Marxian theory, is a stupefying drug, "the opium of the people." Over one hundred of these schools are listed, with thousands of children passing through their hands every year.

You will note that the majority of these associations, papers and schools are carried on by foreigners. They intend to take Canada as a reward for our hospitality. Are we going to let them?

When I come to speak of propaganda, I find the field so vast in Canada alone, that I can do no more than dig into the edge of it. First of all, we find some of our own newspapers, which ought to know better, opening their columns to garbled news, dictated by Jew-owned press agencies, to special articles and interviews extolling the virtues of Communism, and even producing editorials damning National and Empire interests with faint praise or blame. A certain newspaper stands out supreme in this regard, and plays up every subversivist who comes to town or who burrows in our midst, thus doing, in my opinion, more harm to civilisation in Canada than any other influence; and, of course, a patriot finds it very difficult to obtain in the columns of the press a full expression of facts or views. These are often blue-pencilled or waste-basketed by the editor, who may be a neighbour who borrows your lawn mower and at least no more qualified than you to give an opinion on national or world affairs. But, of course, we must remember that the press is largely owned, controlled or influenced by those behind the scenes who are interested in world revolution, hence the great conspiracy of silence over the truth.

I refer now to *The Fortnightly Review*, which as long ago as May, 1904, (p. 757), published an article on Russia, which says, in part: "The visible mastery of the finance of the world achieved by the nimble Jewish intellect is accompanied by a phenomenon which hitherto has attracted but little attention. I refer to the extent to which the press and news agencies of the world are now in the hands of capitalists, writers and managers of Jewish extraction."

Another branch of propaganda is, of course, the publication of broadsheets, pamphlets and notably books. Not to speak of the difficulties met by an author of a truth-revealing book in the matter of publication, while hundreds of more or less subtly Communist publications see the light every year, you will scarcely believe the difficulties besetting even the would-be purchaser of an honest and loyal book; it just isn't there; you are told it is out of print—and this is sometimes true, for it is bought up by the enemy—or that it can be had on order; you order, and nothing happens.

I have had occasion to test this in London, Paris and Toronto, but books aplenty praising Russia are always there.

One more method of propaganda must be mentioned, and that is the infernal gospel spread by speakers, whether over the radio or from the platform, or even the pulpit. Day by day, in every way, they arise from our midst or arrive from foreign parts, to preach the downfall of our civilisation, or Up! Russia; whether it be Strachey, Gallacher, Norman Thomas, Schevenels, Cripps, A. A. McLeod, Sarah Gold, Margaret Crang, Spivak, Forster, Gunther or Tim Buck, they always have the floor and no reply is admitted. Free speech for Reds only is the order of the day, just as Socialism-Communism admits of no opposition.

The most recent example of this is the entry to Canada and to Toronto of three Spanish Communists, one of them an unfrocked priest, to plead the cause of the so-called Spanish Government, which tortured and murdered the leader of the opposition, Calvo Sotelo, and set up the disinterred skeletons of nuns one hundred years buried about the entrance to a Barcelona church as a defiance to religion.

They falsely described the nationalist army—the true loyalists, loyal to Spain, not to Moscow—as composed of Moors and Foreign Legionaries, and ascribed all the atrocities to the Moors, while the truth is that the Spanish Foreign legion is 90 per cent. Spanish; Moors are legitimate subjects and soldiers of Spain, as were the Indian soldiers of Britain in the Great War. They believe in God, as the Reds do not, and they are disciplined, sober and respectful of women, as Mr. C. B. Pyper, correspondent of the *Telegram* on the spot, tells us.

Of course, also there is the Communist cell, in factories, in labour unions; the boring from within, personal contacts, exhibitions of art which is the negation of art, such as the recent Bolshevik show at the Toronto Gallery, which looked like the work of insane children, but all this is well known, so I pass to the origin of Communism.

(To be continued)

## PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3).

members of our circuit at the same time. Now, for the first time, I am able to ask his legal opinion without paying anything for it.

What he must tell us is what precisely these words means. How far are we extending the provisions of the Act of 1944, which we are extending, "to representatives (whether of governments or not) on any organ of such an organisation and members of any committee of such an organisation or of an organ thereof and their official staffs."? Cannot that mean, taken with the 1944 Act, that Orders in Council can be made to cover such non-Parliamentary matters as an international organisation of bee-keepers, or poultry keepers, who happen to come together as members of different countries and meet either in this country, France, or other places?

I appreciate that Orders in Council need not be made to cover such bodies, but in fact we are given power for such Orders in Council to be made and for the Executive to make them, if they are so minded. I am not suggesting that they would do so, but it is an important power which we ought to regard most jealously. It might well be that a gentleman would be meeting an English gentleman here at an unofficial conference to discuss international affairs and would ask for exemption from taxation, or something of that nature. Cannot that be done under this provision? The wording is completely obscure; I cannot tell whether it can be done, or not.

I would like to know from the hon. Gentleman whether, in his view, it might extend to such completely non-governmental bodies. I have mentioned two such bodies and hon. Members can mention many others. I see the hon. Member for Norwich, North (Mr. Paton) present. He might suggest a conference of hairdressers. Might it not extend to them? If the hon. Gentleman thinks it will not extend to them, will he tell us why not, so as to make it quite clear. Unless he can make it, the subsection, quite clear I shall press that it be clarified, as I think it will be, by the introduction of the Amendment.

*The Minister of State (Mr. Younger):* . . . If this Amendment were accepted, we should be tied not merely to the granting of facilities to the representatives on the Consultative Assembly, but we should also be tied precisely to the nomenclature used at present. Any change of name in any of these organisations which are, after all, in their very early stages of development, would not be covered by this Bill. Some of the organisations have their constitutions under review at the moment. Indeed, that is the case with the Council of Europe. If there was even the smallest change—in the name of the Consultative Assembly, for instance—we should be compelled to have a new Act of Parliament before we could cover the position.

If there were to be any change suggested in the agreement for immunities and privileges upon which we would propose to base the Order in Council, a new Bill would be required. If, for instance, it was decided to cover the point raised by the hon. Member for Windsor (Mr. Mott-Radclyffe) that the present Agreement does not touch committees sitting between the sessions of the Consultative Assembly, and it was suggested that the International Agreement should be modified to cover the committees, I do not think that many hon. Members would think it unreasonable to agree. Once again, we would have to have a complete Act of Parliament.

I very much doubt whether any hon. Member, however keen he may be to ensure that, on each occasion, these matters come before us, really thinks that we should have a Bill passing through all its stages in both Houses. I should have thought that from that point of view the position was amply covered by the present procedure whereby an Order in Council is laid and is subject to the negative Resolution procedure. I was asked whether in fact we contemplated any other body in addition to the Council of Europe. I cannot say that we are aware of any new Parliamentary body of precisely the nature of the Council of Europe to which we might in any early future wish to extend these immunities and privileges. But I would point out that there is at present, particularly in Western Europe, a proliferation of new organisations with various functions, some of them if not overlapping, at any rate very close to one another.

It is far from certain that there might not be developments in the sphere of organisation in Western Europe which might certainly alter titles and might possibly transfer certain functions from one to another. I think that it would really be an exaggeration on our part to insist every time one of these adjustments occurs that, in order to cover new organisations, or newly named organisations, we should have to have a new Act of Parliament.

I would remind hon. Members that even as regards these Orders in Council made in the interval since 1946, there have been a number of instances where then existing organisations have gone out of existence but their functions

have not. Other functions have been carried on, having been transferred to another body, and it had been necessary to have a new Order in Council not really in order to extend the matter at all, but simply to cover the new body which is doing the same work which was done by the earlier body. An example of that is much of the refugee work which was originally done by U.N.R.R.A. and, when U.N.R.R.A. wound up, it was transferred to the International Refugee Organisation. An Order in Council was made in respect of that organisation.

*Sir H. Williams:* Does that mean that if somebody comes to relieve refugees here he ought to be labelled "C.D." so that he can go into night clubs without further trouble?

*Mr. Younger:* That intervention indicates that the hon. Gentleman has not entirely followed all the details of this admittedly complicated Bill.

*Sir H. Williams:* I agree. Nobody can.

*Mr. Younger:* It was put to me that perhaps the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Postal Union, or indeed some bee-keepers' association in which the hon. Member for Belfast, South (Mr. Gage) is interested, might qualify for immunities and privileges under the legislation as we propose to amend it. This would not apply to bee-keepers or the trade union organisation, but it would apply to the International Postal Union which is already a specialised agency within the orbit of the United Nations. It is a specialised agency brought into relationship with the United Nations, and it could be covered—I do not think that in fact it has been covered—as a matter of law under the 1946 legislation. It is quite unaffected by that Bill.

*Mr. Manningham-Buller:* The hon. Gentleman realises that that organisation was set up under the Treaty of 1874, long before the United Nations was thought of?

*Mr. Younger:* The hon. and learned Member has not appreciated the point. There are many organisations of that kind, including the International Labour Organisation, all of which ante-date the United Nations but have now been brought into relation with United Nations. I think that in all or nearly all cases the United Nations have co-ordinated many of the provisions referring to them such as the Convention on Immunities. In any case, that has nothing to do with this Bill, because the International Postal Union could perfectly well be covered under the older Acts. It was precisely that type of organisation which was envisaged at the time of the 1946 Act.

I think I have convinced the Committee that, for all these reasons, there is a very strong case for maintaining flexibility, because of the uncertainty of the precise structure of international organisations which are coming into being very frequently and which are being constantly modified, and because of the need to preserve as far as possible a measure of reciprocity, so that if there is an alteration in one of these agreements we can play our part in conjunction with other nations who will be playing theirs. For these reasons, the Government feel they cannot accept any Amendment which would simply retain some old and out-of-date formula, and they ask the Committee not to accept this Amendment, but to agree with the proposals of the Government.

*Mr. Manningham-Buller:* The hon. Gentleman has indeed changed the ground from that which was adopted by the Under-Secretary in moving the Second Reading of this Bill. . . .

. . . That being so, it is not without interest that we are today, for the first time, being told that the real intention behind this Measure is to go much further than the Council of Europe. Today is the first time that we have heard and reference to the needs of the I.L.O. It has not been made clear to me, although I was listening very carefully, that this Bill seeks to give statutory protection to legal interpretations in respect of the I.L.O. I think it quite clearly emerges from what the hon. Gentleman has just said that this Bill goes a good deal further than codifying the existing law and a good deal further than extending it to the Council of Europe. I think it is clear, from what the hon. Gentleman and myself have both said, that we are in agreement that, if this Bill passes in its present form, it will mean that any Government of the day will have the power by Order in Council to extend diplomatic privileges and immunities to any kind of organisation to which this country is a party.

That, quite clearly is going far beyond the 1946 Act, because that Act was limited to organisations of which the Government of the United Kingdom were members. It is also going far beyond the 1946 Act in the respect that, under this Bill as now drafted, international organisations of which this country is a member need not have upon them any representatives of His Majesty's Government at all, because the Bill in terms is extended to every organisation of which this country is a member, and to persons, whether representative of this country's Government or not. Therefore, it follows that under this Bill in its present form, we could have protection for any organisation of which this country is a member, and also protection for all the representatives of this country on that organisation, without one of them being a representative of the Government.

I am sure that the hon. Gentleman will agree that that is going a great deal beyond the 1946 Act, and that it is also going a great deal beyond what is required for the Council of Europe. Why is it that we are asked to take that great step forward along the path of progress in giving more privileges to different people? . . .

*" . . . Major Douglas possesses one of the most penetrating intellects of our time; he has a profound knowledge of the 'set-up' behind governments—and he is fearless—a combination of gifts most rare in a time-serving world."*

—*Truth.*

## THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

by C. H. DOUGLAS

8/6 NET.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 7, VICTORIA STREET,  
LIVERPOOL, 2.

## 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.)