

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 34. No. 21.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1956.

6d. Fortnightly.

The Nature of the Threat to Freedom

THE MEDICAL POLICY ASSOCIATION (N.S.W.) ABOUT TEN YEARS AGO, PUBLISHED A NUMBER OF BULLETINS AND MEMORANDA. ALTHOUGH ADDRESSED PRIMARILY TO THE MEDICAL PROFESSION, THE PRINCIPLES DISCUSSED CONCERNED EVERYONE. THE MATERIAL DESERVES A WIDER PUBLICITY THAN ORIGINALLY GIVEN BY THE M.P.A. THE RE-PUBLICATION OF BULLETIN 2 IS CONTINUED FROM OUR LAST ISSUE:

The London School of Economics is an extraordinary institution. It is avowedly Socialist, and was endowed by Sir Ernest Cassel, one of the world's richest financiers, and of German-Jewish origin, "in order to train the bureaucracy which will run our future Socialist state." (K. H. Morgan, *Quarterly Review*, January, 1929.) But the school is one of the official training schools for economists, who obtain positions as advisers to governments (of any complexion) and banks. Thus there is clearly no conflict of aim between socialism, and orthodox financial practice, a highly significant fact. The enormous power of finance, and particularly of international finance, is obvious; yet socialist-trained economists not only do not attack the power of finance, but defend it. This is because financial power is the great instrument of centralisation.

London School of Economics graduates are convinced Socialists—that is, they believe in State ownership and control, which includes State ownership and control of the individual. But the "State" is actually an oligarchy of "experts" who "advise" the nominal Governments—the higher bureaucrats. Dr. Coombs, Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction[*], and Professor Mills, Chairman of the Universities Commission, are graduates of the London School of Economics and are members of the key "advisory" body to the nominal Government—the Advisory Committee on Financial and Economic Policy to the Treasury. A member of this Committee, Professor Melville, is Economic Adviser to the Commonwealth Bank. But it should be particularly noted that these higher bureaucrats, who mould all Government policy, are, with minor reshufflings, permanent, despite changes of "Government." But they favour "Labour" governments, because these are more easily moulded. The over-riding policy they pursue is the concentration of power and authority in the Federal "Government."

A further off-shoot of the Fabian Society was an organisation, launched secretly in 1931, but subsequently appearing as a semi-public organisation—Political and Economic Planning (P.E.P.). It is difficult to appreciate the significance of this body in Australia, because it is not very widely

known. But in England it has received considerable publicity.

P.E.P. forms a peculiar bridge between outside influence and the Civil Service. The Civil Service is in any case now heavily infiltrated by Fabians, and products of the London School of Economics; but in addition to this, P.E.P. constructed a new link. The apparent aim of P.E.P. was "fact finding" in connection with a projected planned economy, and in pursuit of this objective it issued a series of "Broadsheets" dealing with various aspects of the economy, including the medical. In the preparation of these documents, the group had the "assistance" of a number of officials from the Civil Service, who contributed "valuable information," but, of course, had to remain anonymous.

The broadsheets, under the title of *Planning*, were issued from April, 1933, and have appeared ever since. The first few issues bore a notice which included the following: "You may use without acknowledgment anything which appears in this broadsheet, on the understanding that the broadsheet and the group are not publicly mentioned, either in writing or otherwise." The effect of this, naturally enough, was to encourage a spate of articles advocating a planned economy, and supported by superficially impressive facts and figures, which appeared apparently spontaneously in the Press.

Space does not permit an adequate treatment of this organisation here, and we refer our readers to a valuable booklet, *Our Peace Crisis*, by Arthur Rogers, which treats of P.E.P. and its allied or permeated organisations in some detail. But it would be difficult to over-emphasise the importance of this key organisation as a link in the "vast chain of interlocked organisations."

The first chairman of P.E.P. was Sir Basil Blackett, of the Bank of England, and on his death he was succeeded by Israel Moses Sieff, deputy chairman of the chain stores, Marks & Spencers Ltd., Grand Commander of the Ancient Order of Maccabees, and vice-president of the English Zionist Federation. "Mr. Kenneth Lindsay, M.P., was secretary of P.E.P. before he became, in turn, Civil Lord of the Admiralty and Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education. He was followed as secretary of P.E.P. first

(Continued on page 2.)

[*] Now Governor of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia—Ed. T.S.C.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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 and Editorial:* 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.
Telephone: Belfast 27810.

*Note: The above rates cover subscription to *Voice*, appearing fortnightly in alternate weeks with *The Social Crediter*.

From Week to Week

From time to time we come across expressions of opinion and anecdotes concerning famous men of the past which seem to bear upon the *ethics* of ourselves as Social Crediters and the *ethics* of others as Social Crediters. It would be improper to attach such sentiments to Social Credit or to call them a part of Social Credit ethics. Unquestionably there is a Social Credit ethics, which does not especially call for elaboration: it is implicit, like much else, in Social Credit.

To give an instance: In the first of "Satyrane's Letters" (S. T. Coleridge) "Satyrane" recounts an encounter with an inebriated Dane on the Hamburg packet, who "mistaking me for *un philosophe* in the continental sense of the word, [. . . .] talked of Deity in a declamatory style, very much resembling the devotional rants of that rude blunderer, Mr. Thomas Paine." "Satyrane" resorts to *persiflage*, a vice, he says, he commonly takes pride in avoiding, and, in defence of his dereliction says, of Pericles, that he "Answered one of his dearest friends, who had solicited him on a case of life and death to take an equivocal oath for his preservation: *Debeo amicis opitulari, sed usque ad Deos* (It behoves me to side with my friends, but only as far as the Gods). Friendship herself must place her last and boldest step on this side the altar. What Pericles would not do to save a friend's life, you may be assured I would not hazard merely to mill the chocolate-pot of a drunken fool's vanity till it frothed over."

"Only as far as the Gods." We remember this ambiguous plural in many connections. The gods of the theatre gallery are not intended in the passage quoted; nor the gods of the ballot box. Nor, we are quite sure, are Mr. Menzies, Mr. Eden and Mr. Dulles, whether jointly or severally. No, not even the hands which manipulate these puppets, though they approximate more closely to the conception—that is to the inverted conception.

It was Douglas, in whose hearing tact was extolled, who said: "Tact? That is an insult to the intelligence of your man in any case." More ethics where not perhaps expected!

• • •

"Preserving a fitness in the parts, and a harmony in the whole, they form a nature of their own, though a false

nature." (Coleridge, of French Tragedy: "Satyrane's Letters: Letter II.")

Compare the description with any just description of (a) 'orthodox' economics (b) modern science (c) 'abstract' art (d) modern society.

THE NATURE OF THE THREAT TO FREEDOM—

(continued from page 1.)

by Mr. Max Nicholson and then by Mr. David Owen, who became private secretary to Sir Stafford Cripps, and who is also the author of *Social Survey* handbooks issued to the lecturers of the Army Bureau of Current Affairs, which is responsible for discussion meetings for troops, at which attendance is compulsory." (*Our Peace Crisis*.)

Subsidiary organisations, linked with P.E.P., exist in connection with education, manufacturing, retailing, religion, *etc.*, and each puts forward proposals for a planned economy from its own point of view, but deriving the basic ideas from P.E.P. And, of course, the medical profession received adequate attention, of which more later.

So far as has been discovered, the original document associated with P.E.P., a secretly circulated anonymous paper entitled *Freedom and Planning*, was issued in 1931. In 1938, immediately after Munich, *Planning* carried an article stating: "We have started from the position that only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large-scale planning." The entry of Great Britain into war in 1939 witnessed the immediate introduction of Orders in Council, authorised under the Emergency Powers (Defence) Act and conforming to the plans of P.E.P. At the same time, an immense propaganda, conducted through the B.B.C., the Press, an amazing volume of "Left" books, the cinema, and the Army Bureau of Current Affairs, assured the public that planning was "inevitable," that there could not possibly be any return to the "old" order of things, and which suggested that any opposition to the uprooting of tradition, the absorption of small and independent businesses into larger units, and their linking to "Big business" was not only opposed to the war effort, but was "Fascist." Socialist members of Parliament, in particular, made every effort to have those with enough courage to call attention to such facts as are disclosed here interned under Regulation 18 B, which authorised arrest and detention without charge and without trial.

Orders in Council are government by regulation, a subject which was discussed in M.P.A. Bulletin 1. During the war, the process was excused by its advocates chiefly as being justified by war necessities. Nevertheless, many of these orders went far beyond anything necessary for the conduct of the war, and were clearly intended to be permanent. That the war was used, exactly as *Planning* had designed, has been confirmed by subsequent developments. Since the Socialist Government came into office, the Supplies and Services (Transitional Powers) Bill has been passed. It gives the Government power to continue to govern by Regulation for *five years*; those powers were exercised by the War Government only for one year at a time. To see this in proper perspective, it is necessary to consider the statement, published in 1932, and made by Sir Stafford Cripps in a booklet entitled *Can Socialism Come by Con-*

stitutional Means?: "The Government's first step will be to call Parliament together and place before it an Emergency Powers Bill, to be passed through all its stages on the first day. This bill will be wide enough in its terms to allow all that will be immediately necessary to be done by Ministerial orders. These orders must be incapable of challenge in the courts or in any way except in the House of Commons." This represents a marked advance of the menace to which Lord Hewart directed attention. (See Bulletin 1.)

This brief selection from the facts available may serve to demonstrate that Governments are only an element of a much larger system, and that the policy carried out by Governments does not originate with them, but that they are used by outsiders to advance that policy. The next clue is to be found in the fact that an identical policy is promoted in all the important countries of the world, though the order and manner of its implementation varies with circumstances from one country to another.

The nature of this policy first became apparent in Germany. Professor Hayek, in *The Road to Serfdom*, to which reference was made in M.P.A. Memoranda I, and II, analyses this policy in very great detail, and shows that "democratic" socialism leads inevitably to the subordination of the individual to the State; that it leads rapidly to a condition of "pre-totalitarianism," which is a condition of increasing centralisation of controls; and that it is quite logically succeeded by complete totalitarianism, when these centralised controls are seized by a small group. It may be added that if these centralised controls were not first created, it would be impossible for a small group to seize dictatorial control, because they represent the essential administrative apparatus by which its power is maintained. A modern industrialised community is much too complex for such controls to be instituted following a *coup d'etat*; they are its essential preliminary. The activities of Communism (which is only one string to the bow) and the centralisation of administrative apparatus are co-ordinated from a focus further back.

The planned economy of National Socialist Russia and that of Nationalist Socialist Germany; the New Deal in the United States of America; and the Fabian-Socialist-P.E.P. planned economy of National Socialist Great Britain, are all in their principles, and to a great extent in their details, *precisely the same policy in operation*. Yet that policy is represented, as far as possible, as proceeding from the "under-dog," whereas, in fact, it is sponsored by "Big" Business of the international cartel variety. In essence, it is the policy of International Finance, imposed through the control of national finance by international. That is to say, "national" socialism—totalitarianism—is promoted under appropriate disguises in every country, as an essential step to the final interlocking of the component parts in an overriding system of International Authorities, the outlines of which are rapidly emerging. International Finance, the keystone of the arch, is predominantly controlled by Zionist Jews, whose power is openly displayed by their ability to use the United States as a whole, and Socialist movements elsewhere, to coerce Great Britain to upset the Palestinian policy.

The practical effect of the policy of centralisation of power and authority is to convert the free man into a slave. He might be, probably would be, a well-kept slave. But

he would have lost his power of self-determination. His "education"—better described as "conditioning"—would follow from infancy the rigid pattern designed to fit him for the employment assessed as most suitable by means of intelligence and aptitude tests; youth-centres and movements, and organised physical training, would be employed to mould him to the unquestioning obedience of the soldier; his expenditure would be equated to his income, to rob him of any chance of accumulating savings and so of becoming independent of the machine; instead of savings, he has "contributions" to social "security" schemes, the benefits of which are to be absolutely conditional on conformity to the governing regulations. And because, as in the Army, the great means of escape from the soulless tyranny of the machine is illness, doctors too must be controlled so that they may act as a sort of medical Gestapo.

Earlier, we pointed out that the material basis of freedom of the individual has broadened tremendously. It requires some effort of the understanding to comprehend all that this implies. It is a fact that the necessary amount of human work required to maintain an industrialised community at a high standard of living is of the order of an hour per head per day (or less; in America, certainly less). But this fact is obscured, and deliberately obscured, by the intense and pervasive propaganda which identifies the right to live with the arbitrary necessity to be "employed."

Now this is the central fact of the plot against the individual. The only way that a ruler can control others is by directing how their time shall be occupied, that is to say, by employing them in some sense—either in what is commonly called "work," or in fighting forces, or, in exceptional cases, by "permitting" "approved" self-employment. That is to say, the right to live is subject to permission, the permission taking the form of a dole of wages issued in return for fulfilling the conditions, which are "full employment" with all its concomitants.

It is only the collective hypnotism resulting from the continuous subtle propaganda concerning these matters that prevents the absurdity of contemporary economic and political doctrines being self-evident. Employment, for example, is a means to an end; it is the curse of Adam. But it is set up everywhere as *the end*, and politics are chiefly devoted to finding means to secure that end. This is quite as absurd as searching for means to ensure that all motor-cars should be drawn by horses. The purpose of machinery is not to provide employment for man, but to release him from the necessity for it. The forces behind Socialism, planning, "full employment," "Big" Business, and their subsidiary organisations and institutions and agencies are completely and genuinely reactionary, and are the most frightful danger civilisation has ever faced—because the means available to achieve their schemes for world domination, and to maintain it once secured, are on such a colossal scale—the atom bomb, for example, which they will not hesitate to use unless public opinion awakes to the danger in time.

3. THE ATTACK ON THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

As stated previously, it is essential to the collectivist plan that the medical profession should be organised to fit

in with general governmental control over the life of the community. Propaganda directed against the profession dates back more than fifty years. The individual patient likes the individual doctor; between them there is a greater intimacy, even friendliness, than obtains in practically all other similar relationships. The sum of these individual relationships would normally be a friendly relationship between the community as such, and the medical profession as a corporate body. But in fact, there is a curious dichotomy. Apparently, the medical *profession* is highly unpopular; and this results because the individual has been taught by subtle propaganda to regard the corporate profession unfavourably.

This, however, provides only the background for the real attack. It is designed to create a suitable psychological atmosphere, or "climate of opinion." The real attack is two-pronged. The first prong is designed to take the profession from within, and it consists in the technique of converting leading members of the profession to the outlook of the planners. In England, a Medical Planning Commission was set up, which, of course, immediately and inevitably developed a vested interest in planning. If you invite a man to produce a plan, it is completely natural that he should develop a strong pride and interest in seeing his plan adopted. In due course of time, a plan emerged that the medical profession should be organised on the lines of a self-governing corporation, responsible for supplying medical "services," like delivering bread, all over the country. Sir William Beveridge, of the London School of Economics, is stated to have assisted the Commission. Those concerned in this "planning" then became interested in having their plan adopted by the profession as a whole. They became easy victims of the Planners; they wanted to believe that there was something wrong with the medical profession; they made grateful use of the argument that "organisation" was "inevitable" (see Memorandum II, section 1). They argued in perfect good faith that the profession would be well advised to adopt their plan, to avert a worse plan from the "Government."

As events have shown, all this had the effect only of weakening and confusing the profession. It could be foreseen, and was foreseen by the Medical Policy Association (London), that the "Government" would not agree to anything that did not give control of the "organised" profession into its hands. Opposition to control by the "Government" was dissipated by internal wrangling over a variety of schemes, exactly as was intended; "a house divided against itself. . ."

The "Government" White Paper for a National Health Service (prepared, of course, by the P.E.P.-Fabian bureaucrats) was the second prong of the attack.

Nevertheless, it is known that the persistent exposure of the situation by the Medical Policy Association (London) created a formidable body of informed opinion which delayed the implementation of the "Government" plan, which was to be in operation before the war ended, but which is still delayed; and a point has now been reached where the intentions of the "Government" expose themselves, and strong-man efforts, which create strong opposition, have to be employed.

The situation in Australia differs in two important respects. In the first place, the Constitution stands as a

barrier between the ambitions of the Federal Government (actually, the London School of Economics-trained bureaucrats, who are the real sponsors of the centralising schemes for Australia) and the freedom of the people. And in the second place, there is no effective central organisation of the medical profession whose leaders can be converted and made use of in the service of the planners' intentions. The real political power of the B.M.A. in Australia is in the hands of the State Branches, and it is an immensely more difficult task to secure agreement by all the branches with the planners' plan, just as so far it has usually proved impossible to get all the State Governments to agree at the same time to commit political suicide.

The High Court decision in regard to the Pharmaceutical Benefits Act has, in all probability, put an end to the line of attack discussed in M.P.A. Memorandum I; but further—and doubtless, more formidable—attacks will be forthcoming. It appears most likely that the next attempt will be another to overthrow the Constitution, which, if it succeeded, would open the way to a direct attack on the freedom of the profession.

(To be concluded.)

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom".....	5/-
The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
Social Credit	3/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of The Church of England.....	8d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	8d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.

(*Terms for quantities to bona fide
Social Crediters on application.)

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST, N. IRELAND.

(Please allow for postage when remitting.)

" . . NEITHER DO THEY SPIN . . "

by

BRYAN W. MONAHAN

World Copyright Reserved

Published by

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

LINCOLN CHAMBERS,

11, GARFIELD STREET,

BELFAST, N. IRELAND.

ONE SHILLING

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.