THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 43 Number 11 SATURDAY, AUGUST 31, 1963 6d Fortnightly.

The Futility of Elections

The politician's business, not the people's—a better plan.

Here we are once again in an election campaign. A federal election less than a year after the last. What have the people gained from the last election? Nothing. What had they gained from elections before the last one? Nothing. What will they gain from the present election? Nothing; nothing, no matter how the parliamentary seats are shared between the different parties contesting them.

The politician—the people.

Elections are designed for politicians. Those among them who are elected gain something. They are pleased; even if they declare smugly that they are taking on a great responsibility (burden), not a single one of them gives up this burden the day after the election. They have their basic salary of $10,000 a year; they may tell us that this is not equal to the incomes they are giving up by leaving their office of business for Ottawa but not a single one of them gives up the $10,000 for a bigger turn-over at his office. It is because the two incomes add up rather well, and their post as deputy has not in the least the effect of driving away their clients.

So, for the politician, for the politician's personal advantage, the electoral struggle can mean something. It is certainly for that reason that he makes such a special effort during the weeks preceding polling day.

But what about the people? The people whom politicians strive to rouse into following them; the people to whom they sing their best songs; the people whom they woo to the point of satiety with speeches from platforms or on the radio and on television, and with advertisements in newspapers—the people, what do they get out of these elections? What taxes do they see reduced the day after? Do their wallets bulge with even the least fraction of $10,000 a year? Are they less in debt to the shopkeeper or the finance companies? Do the schools cost them less? Is the land or property tax any lower? Is the cost of living less high, even if there is a change of government?

Why twice in 10 months?

What then is the true reason for this new election on 8th April? Was it the people who asked for it?

Politicians can amuse the people but they are as completely indifferent to them after the election, as to a snowplough in the heat of July. The people are merely the machinery for getting themselves elected. Once the business is over, success for some, failure for others, the people are simply shoved back into the shed until the next time.

But this next time, which has come less than ten months after the last—what reason are the politicians giving for it? They say it is because we had a minority government in Ottawa. Diefenbaker's government was certainly not comfortable, with a minority that had to woo another minority in order to keep its seat on a very shaky chair. And facing the government, the liberal opposition, also in the minority, has been yapping at every opportunity, trying to force the government to call another election *so that the liberals might try to take over the government in their turn.*

And here are these gentlemen of every political hue, wanting to make excuses for this new upheaval by saying: It was not a stable government. But where is the party that thinks of sacrificing itself in order to bring about the coming-to-power of a stable government on 8th April?

The electoral game is the same this year as it was last year. Why begin all over again?

To attain a desired stability.

Insofar as stability is concerned, what the people would really like, my dear politicians, is something that you do not give them: the stability of an adequate income; the certainty of being able to keep what little they have—a salary if one has one, a house if one has one; the certainty of daily bread so long as there is wheat in our country; the certainty of being allowed to plan one's own life without the interference of bureaucrats coming along to impose their plans; the assurance of peace, without being disturbed so often by elections which foster the split between families, who, deep down, all want the same thing. Government stability? There's no need for elections to get it. Just let the government introduce legislation that will really meet the common needs of individuals and families—and not a single deputy will dare to oppose it.

Who was in opposition on 4th August 1960 when the government put to the vote in Parliament the Canadian Bill on the rights of man? It concerned political rights in accord with the hopes of every citizen, and the members of every party supported these rights.

Let the government do the same thing for economic rights, for the right of every member of society to share in the production of the country—and not a single M.P., not a single party will oppose it.

If Diefenbaker had proposed legislation guaranteeing that no-one should suffer hardship so long as the country is capable of maintaining the flow of products needed for its population, who could have objected to that?

And without going as far as this, if he had at least brought forward a measure to increase family allowances, to double the rate in face of a cost of living that has doubled since 1945, can one believe that a single party would have opposed it?

Questions that cause disunity.

But, instead of beginning with things that answer the desires

(continued on page 3)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas. The Social Credit Secretariat 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: 9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. *Telephone*: *Stratford-on-Aven* 3976.

Editorial: PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON N.W.1. *Telephone*: *BUSton* 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business—Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Editorial—Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones. Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36 Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSton 3893). Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O. Sydney, N.S.W.

"Not In The Public Interest"

While everything possible is being done (or so it appears) to disguise the fact that recent happenings in Great Britain and America which have been widely publicised in the orthodox newspapers and magazines of those and other countries are, whatever may appear, actually reflections of a single historical struggle, it is by no means impossible to reduce the point at issue to a single point, and thus to bring it to a focus. Its significance for us all is daily becoming more apparent and this is widely recognised. That is to say, almost everyone can now see 'the spots' and that they are 'angry', repellent 'spots', and a lot of them. But civilisation (the patient) isn't suffering from 'spots', but from some disorder which produces spots as a sideline. It narrows the field of enquiry to call that disorder *a crisis in government*. To trace the matter further still is within the capacity of this journal; but, for the moment, let us take one step at a time.

THE CRISIS IN GOVERNMENT: Sidelights are cast now almost daily upon various manifestations of this. Without singling out any instance for special treatment (and to treat some instances might invite unwelcome attention), the Law reports of *The Times* afford opportunity for study by anyone who wishes to reach sound conclusions concerning both the crisis itself and (possibly) the rôle of the judiciary in regard to it. We may illustrate the point by citing *The Times*' report of a case before Mr. Justice Cross in the Chancery Division of the High Court on July 31st. In this case an interlocutory application by Gordon Hotels Ltd. in their action against the British Railways Board, for leave to cross-examine Mr. Ernest Marples, the Minister of Transport, was refused. Mr. Marples had claimed Crown privilege for letters and other documents which passed between the Ministry, the British Railways Board, and the Treasury Solicitor in connection with an application by Gordon Hotels Ltd. for a new lease of the Grosvenor Hotel at Victoria Station, London, S.W.

Mr. S. E. Brodie appeared for the plaintiffs; Mr. A. C. Goodall for the British Railways Board; Mr. Bryan Clauson for the Ministry of Transport.

The newspaper's report of the Judgment is as follows:—

"His Lordship said that the plaintiffs wished to cross-examine the Minister on two defects in his affidavit claiming privilege which, they said, made it inadequate.

"First, it was apparent from the wording that the Minister had not himself considered the documents in question before an objection to their production had been made.

"The documents had been considered by the Minister's Permanent Secretary, and, on the assumption that the Permanent Secretary had not been authorized to act as the Minister's deputy, the plaintiffs submitted that his direction to object had been improper.

"It was also said that the affidavit gave no means of judging how far—if at all—the Minister had been influenced by the views already expressed by his Ministry, and that it was a 'common form' affidavit to rubber stamp a decision already taken by his subordinates.

"The Minister's answer to that was that the objection to production had not been made until the Minister swore his affidavit.

"His Lordship did not accept this.

"The plaintiffs then submitted that the Minister had not said that it would be contrary to the public interest that the contents of the particular documents should be revealed but that they were documents of a class which the proper functioning of the public service required should be kept secret.

"Counsel for the Minister had merely submitted that the Minister need not reveal the nature of the class of documents which he had in his mind.

"His Lordship thought that there were two reasons why it was in the public interest that the Minister should be explicit on these points. First, unless the class was specified the Court could not know whether the documents were in that class.

"Secondly, and a more important reason was, that unless the Minister stated the class of documents which he had in mind Parliament and the public could not see whether they agreed with him in his view of what measure of secrecy was necessary for the proper functioning of the public service.

"It was of great importance that the public should know the principle upon which Ministers acted in these cases.

"His Lordship thought that the objection to production had not yet been properly taken in this case. If his Lordship thought that the Minister had displayed any lack of candour or a tendency to prevaricate his Lordship would not hesitate to order him to submit to cross-examination. But there was no question of anything of that sort in this case and for his Lordship to force the Minister to submit to cross-examination at this stage would be wrong and might well create a totally false impression of the position.

"If the Minister wished to object to the production of the documents he would have to swear a further affidavit specifying the class of documents which he had in mind."

Indivisible Truth

Perhaps the least pleasant feature of the current (Profumo) scandal is the surprise and injured innocence expressed on nearly every side. We hear in fact a great deal about "morality" but very little about Power. Yet the late Lord Acton's dictum about the tendency of power to corrupt must be familiar to all the public figures who have spoken, as well as to the newspapers.

These more serious, though less sensational, issues found expression in the *Daily Telegraph* of June 14th, where D. Q. Baker said in the correspondence columns, ". . . it is the clear duty of the Commons to decide whether the drift of power into the hands of the Government of the day is to be approved or stopped or reviewed. The late Lord Hewart, perhaps the greatest Lord Chief Justice of all time, foresaw the danger of this power drift at least 30 years ago.

"I suggest that a remedy lies simply in a strict application of the Constitution; its provisions, though unwritten, are quite clear on the respective functions of the Sovereign, the Government, Parliament and people."

Elsewhere he remarks that, "We are moving rapidly into the position of a Republic with an authoritarian Prime Minister."

Nor is this writer surprised that in this atmosphere the "virtue of integrity does not always luxuriate."

I do not see how integrity or truthfulness can be expected from a set-up which is based on a financial confidence trick. In fact, memories must be very short that forget Sir Stafford Cripps' assertion about devaluation and his dead body. The real question is not so much whether private and public "morality" are divisible, but whether truth is divisible.

And the truth of course is that we are moving in all departments towards centralisation—even rural deaneries are amalgamated whether they need it or not—and that this inevitably breeds corruption and fraud. The party system itself may function in a court of law, where both sides of a case are underlined, but in a court an impartial judge and jury have the last word, whereas in Parliament the issue is decided by one of the parties concerned.

I do not think that truth is divisible as regards the purpose of production, which is consumption: yet we are told in one breath that labour-saving devices are of great benefit and in the next that employment is the great political object. And it is assumed in peace-time that finance is the master and not the servant of production and consumption.

No wonder that the puppets in exalted positions occasionally do not respond to the string and perhaps there is little wonder that indignation follows in case the show is spoiled. We have heard, too, a squeak of alarm from those who have been teaching that there is no moral law, and who are now blamed for the lack of moral standards; they have stated that there is no truth, and are indignant when they are accused of undermining honesty.

—H.S.

THE FUTILITY OF ELECTIONS (continued from page 1)

of the great bulk of the electors, the government busies itself above all things with things about which minds are divided. This is the means of maintaining the division, and as a consequence the parties that uphold these divisions as if they were something sacred.

As if they were in love, the electors, lined up in parties, forgive their own party everything and see nothing but evil in the other parties. And if there are four parties in the House, there may be four different views on the same question.

Should there be nuclear weapons in Canada at the disposition of Canadian troops stationed in Germany—is that a question to be decided by men who are not qualified for this task?

Moreover, the M.Ps. are just as little qualified as the electors they represent. Certainly it is possible to appeal to the emotions; this question lends itself to such an approach. Enemies are skilful in exploiting to their own advantage such emotions, which are, indeed, humane and very justifiable. This is why communists are to be seen in the front rank of marchers for nuclear disarmament, for total disarmament, and universal peace. But these demonstrations certainly do not take place in Russia. And can one, for emotional reasons, strip oneself of all weapons while the enemy remains armed to the teeth?

We are not making these observations because of a belief in the virtue of armed force to stop the expansion of communism. There are other weapons, that we are the first to recommend. But our aim is to stress that questions of technique cannot be settled merely by numbers. And that neither the people nor their representatives are competent to decide such matters.

Other questions are more pertinent, and yet it is these very questions which M.Ps. take great care not to ask. These, for example:

Bread or no bread?
The power to buy, or empty wallets?
Taxes or dividends?

The party called Social Credit.

But, the supporters of the group that has taken the name of Social Credit will say, does this party of ours not correspond with what you have just been saying about politics? Was it not indeed founded to demand things that everyone wants?

The Social Credit *movement* was founded for that reason. But as soon as some supporters of a Social Credit economy have organised themselves into a political party, they have become exactly like all the other politicians. First and foremost, they want power. Their Social Credit doctrine goes all to pieces.

Those who were elected last year on 18th June went into coalitions in Ottawa. Then they allowed themselves to become involved in the question of nuclear weapons.

Elected, as they said, to demand money for the service of man, a dividend for all, the right of everyone to a share in the country's products, their chief pre-occupation was to prepare for their re-election, by talking about the flag, the language, the promotion of French Canadians to positions in the federal government offices, etc. Good questions indeed, but not needing a new party to bring them forward, especially a party which has introduced itself for another specified aim. But even for this other specific aim, why a new party?

If a special party were needed for every question that arises, even if the question is important, there would be a ridiculous multiplicity of parties and one could never speak of stable government. And if one divides up the nation on various questions, upheld by so many different parties, how will this divid-

ed people get what they want?

Moreover, the Thompson-Caouette party is nothing more than a conglomeration of politicians who no longer even agree on the meaning of the two words "Social Credit", which they have taken as the label of their party.

Speaking in Montreal, at the opening of the present electoral campaign, Réal Caouette tried, drawing on the picturesque as he usually does, to show that he and his chief, Thompson, agree very well on the essential theme of their party. He said: "We may not have exactly the same tastes, nor the same type of character, but that changes nothing in our alliance. If, for example, Thompson orders a steak for lunch, and I order an omelette that means only that he prefers a steak and I prefer an omelette, but that in no way prevents us from being in complete agreement about Social Credit."

Simpletons will applaud this reply. But there is more than one steak and more than one omelette in the differing views that both of them express about Social Credit. Thompson openly rejects the national dividend; we dare not believe that Caouette has reached this point. Thompson gives no thought at all to the just price—a price adjusted and subsidised for the benefit of the consumers of the nation. Can it be that Caouette has followed this apostasy? For the dividend and just price are two essential points of Social Credit. When these points have disappeared, there may remain a plan for monetary reform, doomed to failure moreover, but certainly no Social Credit.

The solution: to enlighten and unite.

Where then is the solution to the present political and economic chaos, if it is not in an electoral success, so that power may be seized and appropriate reforms, which the nation is vainly awaiting, may be brought about?

If it is a question of reforms which would really answer the common needs of all we must certainly not expect them from electoral action, since this divides the people.

We must, on the contrary, unite the people on things about which all are fundamentally in agreement. The right to the necessities of life is certainly one of these things. Also the right of everyone to freedom of choice, so long as it respects the exercise of this same freedom in others. This freedom, moreover, can only really begin once a man is in possession of the necessities of life.

But thus to unite the citizens, who have been for generations so divided in politics by parties, we must first of all make them realise that they have the same fundamental unsatisfied aspirations to be attained, desires that have not been satisfied. We must therefore inform the people about this unity of objective, instead of blowing on the flames of the political alliances which divide them.

Then, the citizens, once they are aware of their common needs, must learn to express them to their representatives, whoever they may be and at all times: much more between elections, when laws are made, than during electoral campaigns, when candidates are facing competitors in their attempts to seize power.

To enlighten the people: to teach them to express their desires; to supply them with a journal as much for their information as to act as a voice for them; such is the work that *Vers Demain* has been pursuing for twenty-four years—with increasing success, even if the task, which is immense, is not finished.

On an election, the nation is not united and does not express its needs. What the elector does on polling day is to show, by his cross against a name, his preference for such and such a candidate amongst those who are on the list in his constituency. He chooses this politician rather than some other: that is all. He does not say what he wants, he says which politician has been most successful in winning his favours. That is why we say that the election is in the interest of politicians and not of the people.

Who is most in the people's service?

At the time of the federal elections last year, *Vers Demain* told its electors, brought up on Social Credit teaching, that it was useless to expect Social Credit to be brought about by the election of candidates bearing its title.

In fact, the 26 elected candidates of this party in Quebec, the 30 in Canada, have not achieved the slightest thing to better the lot of Canadian families. They have obtained for themselves the parliamentary salary of $10,000 for less than five months' attendance in Ottawa. But for the country's families, nothing.

One of those elected managed to become a delegate at the meetings of the United Nations, in New York, whence he returned saying that Communist China ought to be admitted to the United Nations. Another went, also at the expense of the taxpayers, as one of a parliamentary delegation to Paris, with Pigalle nights as part of the programme of that delegation. Another went off to have a good time in Japan and Formosa in the company of the leader Thompson. All 30 have had the privilege of free travel on the country's railways throughout the whole of Canada. Thompson's assistant, Caouette, was able to spend his holidays in Jamaica, before returning to woo the electorate once again for his party.

But what family in the country, except those of the elected candidates, has benefited in the slightest from that election?

In contrast to this, without a parliamentary salary, without free travel, without the prestige of M.Ps., active Social Crediters of *Vers Demain* have succeeded in demanding and obtaining justice and relief for many families struggling with real poverty. *Vers Demain* has mentioned a few of these cases to provide examples for others. But there are hundreds of these acts of charity brought about by people who have learned to love their fellow men, and especially by those who have been put to the proof, who have learned to give themselves, like Apostles, and not to take, as politicians do.

Social Credit, a more loving world, a more humane economy, a political system more concerned with persons and families—cannot be expected from elections. But we are getting it gradually, through the devoted efforts of men and women, like those who form *Vers Demain*, who are developing in themselves and in others by their example and by the light they spread, the sense of personal responsibility.

The better world desired by all, the propagandists of *Vers Demain*, Pilgrims of Saint Michael, are working to bring it into being, not only by the circulation of their newspaper and their pamphlets, not only by their door-to-door campaigning and by their meetings with families, not only by their broadcast messages—but also by their readiness to respond to the message of Fatima. The instructions of the Queen of the Universe are of infinitely higher importance than the self-interested appeals of the political parties, new or old.

LOUIS EVEN.

(Translated from *Vers Demain*, April 1, 1963)

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co. (T.U.), Wootton, Liverpool 25.