

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 17. No. 1.

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

The Alberta "Bill of Rights"

A Warning to Albertans

By Dr. C. G. DOBBS.

INTRODUCTION. "Mind your own business" is the first rule in Social Credit, and the Alberta "Bill of Rights" is primarily the business of Albertans; but it is with no intention of minding the business of Albertans that I venture, because no one else seems to have done so, to give expression to the following thoughts on the Bill. It is my own business, or rather my own freedom, as well as that of many others in this country who have been fighting the Beveridge Plot which I am concerned about. We have done our best over here, but two wars at once have been too much for us, and the enemy in the rear, for the time being, has won. All the same, the fight goes on, and we look to Alberta, as many people in Europe looked to Great Britain a few years ago, as the sole remaining bastion of sanity and freedom, which alone can save the world by her example. One thing you can credit us with is knowledge and experience of the Enemy; we really do know his tricks and camouflage methods, and when we see them being tried on Alberta, it is difficult indeed not to utter a word of warning. So I ask you to take this as a message from Occupied Territory, a piece of intelligence from behind the enemy's lines, and not just a criticism from a busybody. The thing is too serious for that.

Here, perhaps, a word of personal explanation would be in place. For the last thirteen years I have been teaching University of London students at King's College, just across the way from the London School of Economics, and I have every reason to know the ideas which emanate from that remarkable institution, particularly as to some extent I have made a speciality of studying this 'social security' business.* About a year ago I was reliably informed that something was being hatched which would bring Alberta permanently into line with the General Plan, and the Alberta "Bill of Rights" shows every sign of being that 'something'. I should add also that I have long been a loyal follower of Major Douglas and the Social Credit Secretariat, but claim no right at all to speak for either. What I have to say is said on my own responsibility, and it is this:

In God's name, Albertans, be warned in time! The Alberta "Bill of Rights" is nothing less than a special variation of the Beveridge Plan, deliberately concocted by experts in this country to deceive 'the masses' in the only part of the world where social crediters are in a majority. It

therefore has, of course, the necessary ingredient of monetary reform in the *method* by which the social security payments are proposed to be made, but the *policy* is the policy of the enemy—cradle to grave control of the individual by the State, and the divorce between power and responsibility. I know nothing about Albertan politics, and how such a Bill became the declared policy of the only Social Credit Government I have no idea, but I can guess at the subtle means used, and the constant strain and pressure to which members of your Government must have been subjected. All that is your business; mine is to put the facts as I see them from my vantage point so near Enemy Headquarters, and to leave the rest to you.

WHY "BILL OF RIGHTS"? First of all the title: why is it called the Bill of Rights? True, it declares that various essential rights of the citizen shall be preserved, *within the limitations of the laws in force in the Province**; but what is it which interferes with the rights of citizens everywhere in the world today? Is it not the laws in force, and nothing else? And who makes and administers the laws but Governments—provincial, federal, and world, the larger always over-riding the smaller? So the Bill will protect you from all oppression except from the oppressors! You can do just what you like provided it is exactly what you are told! What on earth does it mean? Nothing! And when you get a form of words which looks like freedom for the ordinary citizen, but on closer examination does not mean a thing, you know who is behind it. The Old Enemy; it is one of his most characteristic tricks; you can recognise him by it. The only way to deal with it is of course to find out precisely who was responsible for putting those meaningless clauses into the Bill, and see that he never again holds a position from which he can exert any influence on legislation.

No Bill of Rights is worth the paper it is written on which does not safeguard the rights of the citizens from the interference of the Executive Power, which in the modern world consists of Governments, working through legislative chambers and bureaucracy. That is the sole object of a Bill of Rights. If the Provincial Parliament of Alberta were to declare that NO law, imposed by ANY Government, shall be valid within the Province if it annuls or interferes with the agreed and specified rights of the people, that indeed

*See publications: 'The Beveridge Plot', 'You and the State Doctor', 'National Insurance—The Right to Contract Out' (K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, England).

**"Freedom is the right to do as the law allows" is the definition of 'freedom' given in Protocol 12. No one, whatever their view of the origin of 'The Protocols' has ever denied that they represent the policy of evil.

would be a Bill of Rights, and would rally good men and true to the side of Alberta throughout the world. But a Bill which specifically declares that the rights of the citizens shall be limited by the laws, and does not declare that the laws shall be limited in any way by the rights of the citizens, is the very reverse of a Bill of Rights; it could quite accurately be described as a Bill for the legalising of Wrongs!

THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROPOSALS. Now for the Social Security part of the Bill. I should like to remind you that, ever since the Beveridge Plot was hatched, Social Crediters in England have formed the core of the opposition to it. It was Social Crediters who, by exposing the Plot, turned Beveridge out of Parliament, and who formed the spearhead in the fight against the so-called 'Health' (or Human Veterinary) Service. It was Social Crediters who launched the Petition to the King for the right to contract out of National Insurance, which has so far been signed by 7,000 people. In all cases there were two reasons for this opposition; the vicious burden of the compulsory levies for financing these schemes, and even more, the power given to the Government to make *conditions* for the payment of 'benefits', conditions which interfere with the freedom of the individual at precisely the time when, being sick or unemployed, or otherwise in need, he is in the weakest position for standing up for his own rights.

The first reason for objection does not, of course, apply to the Alberta Bill, under which it is proposed to finance the scheme out of the unused credit of the citizens of Alberta; but the *method* of financing is of small importance compared to the *purpose* for which the money, whether tax or credit, is to be used. A realistic method of financing is no proof of a good purpose, as the example of Japan could have taught us. At the London School of Economics they have been making a careful study of Social Credit methods, and are quite prepared to use them (as in the compensated price for food) whenever it suits their purpose. In this connection the following sentence from a pamphlet (The Beveridge Plot) written in 1943, is relevant:

If people of the mentality displayed in the above extracts from the Beveridge Report obtain control of the national credit they will use their new power in the same way as they are using the money from levies on income—to secure absolute control over life and labour.

Now if we examine the Alberta Bill of Rights we see that it departs in one vital particular from the policy on which the Aberhart Government was elected, the policy expressed in the disallowed Credit of Alberta Regulation Act, and the policy pursued by Social Crediters throughout the World, in that it substitutes a variety of conditional 'social security' payments to some people for the one unconditional basic dividend for all. Before going any further, let us stop and consider the effect of this. If one person offers another a money payment upon conditions, he is bringing pressure to bear upon the other, a pressure proportional to his need for the money, to comply with those conditions.

The conditions which the Alberta Government propose should qualify for the 'social security' payments are broadly the same as those proposed by Beveridge, and they all amount to the same thing; that the recipient, through whatever cause, youth, old age, sickness, or unemployment, *must not be gainfully employed*. Notice also that this automatically selects the neediest, upon whom the pressure will be strongest

to comply with the condition.

There are two main questions about this aspect of the Bill to which Premier Manning invited answers: (1) Is it proper, just and reasonable, *i.e.*, *right*, in the Christian sense? and (2) Will it work? These are, of course, merely two ways of putting the same question, but it is convenient to take them separately.

(1) IS IT RIGHT? It is quite clear from their enthusiasm for the Bill that many members of the Government and ordinary citizens are honestly convinced that it is. I can imagine their saying that they have done their best to introduce the genuine Dividend, but as that has been persistently frustrated by the Dominion Government, the next best thing is to bring it in by stages; and the first stage should be to see that the old and young, the sick and unemployed, the neediest and least able to help themselves shall be given security out of the ample resources of the Province; and furthermore that that, they are persuaded, would be so obviously a good and Christian act that they are not going to let any theoretical objections from 'doctrinaire' social crediters stand in their way.

This view, convincing as it may seem, necessarily carries with it a conclusion which is false, namely, that the Bismarck-Beveridge Social Security Plan, now being imposed all over the world in various forms adapted to the local feeling, is also a good and Christian thing, except for the burdensome and obsolete way in which it is financed. If that is what you believe I beg you most earnestly to reconsider it in the light of the experience of those who have been fighting this Thing very close to its centre. The main objective of the Plan is a thoroughly evil one, to destroy the independence and initiative of the people beginning with the poorest, and to bring them under the control of State officials; and to this objective the method of financing by compulsory contributions and taxes, though most helpful to the enemy, is by no means essential, and could easily be dispensed with in Alberta, where it has been exposed to an extent which may make it dangerous.

It is obvious that Alberta is much too important not to be the object of special tactics on the part of the enemy, and that the only camouflage under which he could hope to slip the Plan over would be one which would represent it as 'Christian' and a step towards Social Credit. Unfortunately, in doing this he has an easy task, because of the dreadful confusion of thought on this subject of helping the needy, especially among good, kind-hearted Christian people, many of whom have not thought very deeply about it.

Let us get it straight: To give freely, something which is yours to give, is an expression of Christian charity (that much-perverted word). It makes no conditions; to make conditions is not giving, but buying power. It aims at increasing the independence of the recipient, not the power of the donor. Nevertheless, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," which clearly implies that there is some blessedness in both. That is one thing! To give what is not yours but somebody else's; more especially for a Government to take from some and give to others, making all sorts of conditions about the giving, is something quite else. There is no virtue in the 'giving', nor gratitude in the receiving, but resentment in both. It divides Society into two classes, whether it be rich and poor, strong and weak, or

workers and non-workers, thus creating class war and strengthening the central power according to the old maxim "divide and rule." It is a way of buying popularity and votes for politicians, and of making the needy entirely dependent on the State, as well as teaching them to exploit politically, as their sole claim to receive wealth, their incapacity to produce any. Far from being Christian in any sense, this is the very basis of the 'Welfare' State, the policy of which was expressed by Lenin in the words: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs"—More words which look good to the ordinary man if he does not see that they mean nothing at all, unless they mean: "From each according to his ability (as decided by the Government); to each according to his needs (as decided by the Government)" which, in a word, is slavery; a state in which, as in Stalin's Russia, 'needs' are very soon replaced once more by 'work'.

At this point I think some readers will be telling themselves that the social security dividends proposed in Bill 76 are not to be taken from anyone, but are to be financed out of new credits which would not otherwise be created; and that therefore this does not apply to them. But what is the true situation? If there is a real basis for additional credits in Alberta there is a real basis for a dividend; something 'meet to be divided' equally and unconditionally among its inheritors, who are the citizens—all the citizens, not some of the citizens. The Government is in the position of trustee of this inheritance, and it has no more right to withhold payment for some, on the ground that they are earning wages, or to make payment to others, on condition that they retire from work, or get a doctor's certificate, or prove that they cannot find work, etc., than the executors of a will have a right to make similar conditions about paying the legacies. To take a man's inheritance, especially without making it clear that you are doing so, and to apply it to the relief of other people, however needy, and even though they are inheritors too, is just as wrong as to take the money from him in taxation and use it for the same purpose; and if you are a Social Crediter, i.e., one who believes in, or rather knows about, the existence of this inheritance, then I do not see that there can be any argument about it.

Social Credit, like every other Christian thing, is a true, precise, and living balance between unbalanced, and therefore disastrous, alternatives; in this case between the work-or-die, scramble-for-jobs-and-the-Devil-take-the-hindmost attitude of pre-socialist economics, and the subsidizing of everyone except those who are actively creating the wealth of the community, which is characteristic of the second stage towards the servile socialist state, which in turn leads very soon to planned scarcity and chaos, and that to totalitarian dictatorship. We have now, however, come to the consideration of our second question:

(2) WILL IT WORK? This depends upon whether the main condition, the right to *work or maintenance* (the cry of the socialists for a century) is a *real* alternative. The answer is "Certainly not!" Work and maintenance are not alternatives; the one depends upon the other. Not, of course, in the often misunderstood sense of "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat," but very definitely in the sense that, without the work of some, there is no maintenance for anybody! The increment of association is not a sort of magic which produces goods without human agency; and any

move which interferes with the willingness of men to work is a blow against the security of all.

For a very long time Social Crediters have had to contend with the jeers of people who say that the National Dividend would be "paying people to be idle," and would necessarily be inflationary because it would destroy the incentive to work. This is completely untrue of the National Dividend in so far as it leaves completely untouched the *inducement* to work provided by a money wage, although it removes the *compulsion* of unnecessary poverty by means of the dividend income, which in itself provides an additional inducement to *all* to increase the wealth of the community up to the level of satisfaction. But this criticism is quite literally true of the proposed 'social security dividends' limited to non-workers, which constitute an interference with the springs of human action which must necessarily be disastrous. The higher the dividends, and the nearer they approach to a decent and generous livelihood, the more they destroy the inducement to work, and since there are but two incentives in human society, inducement and compulsion, it is obvious that, if the whole society is not to break down in chaos and scarcity, for every loss of inducement there must be a corresponding increase in compulsion; and that is exactly what always happens in practice.

The way it happens is all too familiar! It means Government officials to see that you take work when offered, to decide what is suitable work for you, and what you may, and may not, refuse, and to make sure you are 'genuinely seeking work'; to decide whether you are sick enough to be away from work, or whether you are malingering (which turns your doctor into a medical policeman); if you are young, to decide what education you must have, if necessary overruling your parents, and to see that you attend school and to fine or imprison them if you don't; if you are old to make sure you have genuinely retired, and are not wickedly earning a bit on the sly, and so forth and so on. All backed by forms to be filled in prying into your private affairs, and with fines and prisons held over your head continually if you make a slip, or dare to disobey in any single particular.

There is a great deal about FREEDOM in the "Bill of Rights", but not a word about this sort of thing, which is quite certainly unavoidable if the conditions for the payment of the social security dividends are to be enforced.

As for the 'security' of those who get the 'social security dividends', the effect upon that should be fairly obvious. Since they are all people who cannot, or must not, help themselves by 'gainful employment', they have been provided with incomes of, say, \$50 a month, in order to *induce* other people to work for them. If any of them do work they must give up these incomes, so that the inducement to work of a wage of \$50 a month is *nil*, and the inducement of all wages above that is reduced by that amount; whereas with a National Dividend every dollar of every wage would pull its weight, being additional to the dividend. Where, then, is the 'security' provided by a basic income for the non-worker which, whatever the amount, will mark the bottom limit of inducement to work? A more effective way of sabotaging the economy of a naturally wealthy country than by offering a 'generous' dividend exclusively to non-workers it would be difficult to imagine. Do you think it is all an accident?

It has always been one of the aims of Social Credit to

(continued on page 8)

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. 17. No. 1.

Saturday, September 7, 1946.

From Week to Week

Within a few hours of the collision of the *S.S. American Farmer* and her hasty desertion by her American crew at the entrance to the (once) English Channel, a U.S. destroyer came alongside her. Subsequently, the British *Elisabet* was ordered away. When the Dutch steamer *Nigerstroom* was damaged in the Channel on August 24, the U.S. cruiser *Houston* arrived some time after the *Isle of Sark*, the Channel Islands mail boat. The *Isle of Sark* left the U.S.N. *Houston* standing by. It is not stated whether the *Isle of Sark* was ordered out of the Channel by the *Houston*, or why there are so many American warships round our coasts. No, Clarence, we do not think any considerable portion of the British Navy is cruising in Long Island Sound.

There are not many things for which we have the Americans to thank; but one of them is certainly the impression American soldiers have produced in Australia, not to mention anywhere else. A wave of pro-British sentiment of a warmth unequalled for many years is sweeping the Commonwealth. Doubtless our present Internationalist Administration will succeed in administering a series of rebuffs to it, but in the meantime a good deal of the sedulously cultivated friction has been blown away by the recognition of a common and valued culture and heritage. And the Australians are kinsmen worth having.

The Searle Grain Company (Canada) estimated the wheat yield for the three Western Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, alone, at 502,000,000 bushels, or about 14 million tons.

We await with interest the arrival of some new use for wheat. Plastic toys, perhaps, to go with the umbrella handles made out of the milk we aren't allowed to drink. But we feel sure dear Mr. Strachey, that inverted Providence, which knoweth what we want, and takes it away, will find a solution.

Not infrequently, we have a real difficulty in deciding whether this Administration is possessed of a subtle sub-acid sense of humour, or whether it is just plain "dumb".

One of these occasions is in regard to the statement, which appears at intervals in the press "from a special correspondent," with that ham-fisted aspect which characterises attempts at propaganda by bureaucrats, that large quantities of American tourists are expected shortly to swarm

over the British Isles, but particularly Scotland, bringing and spending bags of dollars in our luxury hotels. It is, of course, by no means inconceivable that special hotels, quite civilised and comfortable, are to be provided for visitors, and that the native is to be rigorously warned or couponed off, as is done in Russia. But at the moment, having sampled meals which, at exorbitant prices, are thrown in front of travellers not provided with a nasal accent, we can only say that one such meal at any of our best hotels in the beauty-spots of these islands would make a self-respecting American trek for the next boat home.

Meanwhile, Mr. Thomas Johnston, ex-Secretary for Scotland, whose rise to fame was accomplished in the wooded dells of central Glasgow, has combined touristy with forestry. A short time ago, he was also a hydro-electric expert, while exultant over the imposition of the ten-pound limit on building without license. It has to be admitted that the valour of the ignorant is finding a market beyond its wildest dreams.

Evidence is accumulating that Mr. Emanuel (God with us) Shinwell, whom Heaven preserve, is to his surprise and disgust, finding himself nursing the baby—a position so unusual to the members of his tribe that it merits close attention.

We have always been convinced that the cleverness of the Jew, while real in its way, is primarily of a nature common to the East. Fundamentally it is based on simple principles (a) Appropriating other people's property either in materials or ideas, (b) inducing the party of the second part to exploit them for his benefit, (c) paying the party of the second part at its own expense, coupled with that of the party of the third part. Given the control of the credit system, this system can be reduced to a routine.

The key property of this country is coal, and Mr. Shinwell's advisers have been working for fifty years to appropriate it. On paper, they have succeeded completely, and are in process of dealing with the parties of the second and third parts—the miners and the coal consumer. But it seems to have been overlooked that the miners have not been coached for fifty years for nothing. They are showing just the same mentality to Mr. Shinwell and his shadowy friends as to the original owners and developers of coal-mining.

The present attempt to throw the squalling infant to the consumer by loud accusations of wastefulness and inefficient use, seems rather crude, and was quite effectively challenged by Sir Michael Naim at Kircaldy. Because, of course, all that Mr. Shinwell knows about coal is that it is the raw material of politics.

"The British are now hauling down their export target for 1946 to put up a bigger one. British exports may be 3½ to 4 billion dollars this year; the target set last year was 3 billion . . . With imports still towering over exports, the British are 600 million dollars in the red thus far this year . . . Loan dollars will have to be thrown into the breach immediately to pay for essential imports."—*World Report*, Washington, July 11.

There, Clarence, you just see what Planning can do. Now run away and work twice as hard for export, and by the end of the year we shall be over a billion dollars in the red. And nearly all the exports are war material.

The History of World Revolution

BY THE LATE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND, K.G.

(From the National Review of July, 1931, by courtesy of the Proprietor.*)

(continued)

Throughout the nineteenth century we see these theories put into practice in one country after another with equally futile results, but side by side with these revolutionary attempts has gone the so-called liberal and constitutional movement. This movement has resulted in the adoption in all countries of the principles of popular or representative government. Now these principles are very old; they were common to all European countries in the early Middle Ages, but in a great many cases they had not survived the vicissitudes of those times and had been obliterated. The division of the population into grades or estates, each with its own rights, each capable of making its wishes known, each acting as a check on the others, in fact that constitutional system which reached its highest form in England, was equally the original heritage of other States. In so far as these principles were revived, they constituted a return to the old rather than the adoption of new reforms. Representative government is not a new but a very old institution, but there is a fundamental difference between the old and new conceptions of its working. The modern idea of democracy takes no account of orders, grades or estates among the people; it regards them as a whole, rich and poor, educated and uneducated; employer and labourer are all equally entitled to a voice in government. The majority of the people, without any distinction of class, calling or trade, should decide the national destiny. And, moreover, that majority is paramount; it is really the Sovereign, all forms of authority are subject to it and originate from it. Such was in general the conception of the highest form of government in Europe during the opening years of the twentieth century. And in order to carry it to its logical conclusion the franchise was constantly extended in all countries, for obviously, if *vox populi* is *vox Dei*, the electorate should include the whole population. This theory of government has now reached its logical conclusion. England practically has universal franchise and most other countries have either reached or are approaching that condition.

But there has been a steadily growing opposition to these ideas, not from the reactionary or Tory element, for although they would no doubt like to go more cautiously than the Liberal or Radical element, they yet admit the truth of this theory of government, but from those elements which have been gathering headway in Europe ever since the Reformation, those who are enemies of the whole existing world order. Christian civilisation has, of course, always had its enemies, as Professor Gilbert Murray points out in a very interesting pamphlet entitled "Satanism and the World Order," in which he says that Bolshevism is merely a modern manifestation of that strange medieval cult of Satanism. If Emperors, Kings and Popes, so this theory ran, are equally the vicereagents and representatives of God, He must be a demon, for no other agency could inspire and employ such means or produce such disastrous results; and therefore the real champion of mankind is he whom men have regarded as the supreme enemy of God. And, accordingly, devil-worship became at one time quite a fashionable creed. There is much truth in

the analogy. In a civilisation based on Christianity, hostility to it was naturally based on anti-Christianity. In a civilisation based on certain political conceptions, the opposition to it is based on the negation of those principles. The constitutional reformers of the last 130 years have put their whole faith in Parliament as the agency through which the people must govern. Liberty, reform, progress are only attainable through Parliament. But at the same time ever stronger and stronger grows the disillusionment of the irreconcilable element in all countries with Parliamentaryism. The Socialist favours either a vast bureaucracy, which in practice, if not in theory, is incompatible with any independence, or, indeed, the existence of Parliament, or he advocates a government for industry based on guild organisation existing side by side with and independent of Parliament, a theory equally destructive of the latter. The Communist would replace Parliamentary institutions by Soviets, and direct representation by a system which is the very converse of direct. Now it is curious to observe that these ideas are gaining most adherents and have, in fact, been put into practice in one of the greatest empires in the world at the very time when, as stated above, the principles of democracy, as hitherto understood, have been carried to their logical conclusion. The goal of which the Radical and the Socialist of the Victorian epoch dreamt has been reached, every man has a vote, and yet no sooner have we reached it than the tempting prospect proves to be only an illusory mirage, and the would-be reformers set forth again in quest of another and even more visionary objective.

There is no use disguising the fact that, however vain the dreams of this revolutionary element may be, however disastrous the result of their experiments, however futile on the constructive side, yet on the destructive their criticism of Parliamentary government is based upon a truth, and their plea for its supersession upon logic. The supremacy of the caucus, the chicanery of the political machine, of election programmes, the sale of honours, the unscrupulous use made of party funds, above all the patently absurd system by which representation is made to depend upon the mere counting of noses, all this has resulted in the control of government not by the people, but by the capitalists, the monied classes, by the bourgeoisie; it is an organised deception of the people. The Labour or Moderate Socialist parties in all countries are equally blameworthy because, instead of sweeping away this system, they aim at capturing it and using it for their own purposes. To the Russian Bolshevik and his counterpart in other countries there can be no compromise with a system which is essentially false and exploits the people in the name of democracy. Moreover, in their reading of history, Parliamentary institutions belong to a stage in the development of democracy which is passing away; they have no doubt served a useful purpose, they represent a step on the road to freedom, but they are merely a necessary feature of that revolutionary phase the aim of which was to rid the world of absolute monarchies and privileged nobilities. These have given place to the dominion of the bourgeoisie who are now the enemy, and the bourgeoisie is synonymous with Parliament. To get rid of one you must get rid of the other. In all this the Bolshevik thinks clearly; with the grant of universal franchise there can be no further development of the Parliamentary system in a Liberal direction, no further extension of democratic control.

*The commencement of this significant article appeared in our issues of August 24 and 31, 1946.

Does not the whole course of recent history bear out this

contention? Liberalism, as understood since the Reform Bill, is dead. There is no longer any essential difference between Liberal and Conservative, both are united in defence of their last line of fortification, Parliament and the Constitution, after surrendering successive lines in the vain hope that the enemy will rest contented with the empty glory of their capture. Liberalism has depended for support on throwing sops to the wolves, on holding out hopes of something for nothing, on its appeal to the cupidity of the multitude. And the multitude is as voracious and as restless as ever, but Liberalism has nothing more to offer, it has "had its day and ceased to be," and the fight is no longer between the old political parties, but between the champions of law and order and the forces of red revolution.

Such is the conception of the enemies of the existing world order, and it is a logical conception. It takes a long view of history. For countless ages the proletariat has been struggling to obtain its rights; it has succeeded in making its will respected, the great ones of the earth tremble before it; but there remains one more step. Kings, nobles, priests have been shorn of power, in order to give it to the bourgeoisie. They are the last enemy which stands in the way of the victory of the proletariat, of the real sovereignty of the people to whom the so-called democratic nations pay lip-service while obstructing its attainment.

Just as the French Revolution proclaimed to all the world the sovereignty of the people, so the message of the Russian Revolution is the Dictatorship of the people; sovereignty through Parliament is a sham, the only real sovereignty is through the iron tyranny of Communism. The Russian Revolution is the complement and fulfilment of the French Revolution. It carries the world revolutionary movement a step further. And as the first freed men's souls from the control of priests, so the last frees them from the control of Christianity altogether. Freedom of conscience was the principle of the one; freedom from a religion which was the opiate of capitalism was the principle of the other.

Can it be doubted that these conclusions are the inevitable result of the doctrine of popular sovereignty? They embrace a view of progress which is logical and consistent. What is the answer to them? Now for the past 150 years or more mankind in general has been firmly convinced of the fact of progress. The world is becoming gradually more civilised, so we have said mankind is more enlightened, more humane, more free, more thoughtful of others, there is a larger sense of community, there is a general moral and material improvement. These ideas were especially fashionable in the Liberal school of thought, but they were shared by the public at large, and the increasing prosperity of all classes lent weight to the view. The war gave the world a rude shock; civilisation was for a time face to face with an abyss of ruin, and even now, when the danger is past, there are many who view the future with the gravest apprehensions. Civilisation is confronted with two great perils, war and Bolshevism, either of which will be fatal. And the antidotes to both appear highly unsatisfactory. To the danger of war we oppose an ideal of international unity, achieved by means of a League of Nations; this is to replace the aggressive nationalism which has produced wars in the past by fostering an international sense, an ideal of universal fellowship which is to unite Christendom again and to start it on the path to higher aspirations than that of national

advantage. But this conception embraces two contradictory ideas, for while it preaches internationalism on the one hand, it expressly postulates on the other hand, the continued existence of free, independent, sovereign nations with their armies and navies. The Bolshevik is at least logical; if internationalism is really to succeed, if the interests of all nations are the same, let us no longer cling to nationality, but supersede it by the universal Dictatorship of the proletariat; let us end the era of national wars by a final victory over capitalism. Similarly, the antidote to Bolshevism leaves much to be desired. It is merely a clinging to Parliamentary institutions, to Constitutional forms. But as we have already seen, no further development is possible on these lines. We may or may not improve these institutions and render them more efficient by devolution, or we may relieve some of the grievances of labour by better industrial organisations and increased production, and thus avert for a time the danger of revolution, but is it possible to believe that there is sufficient scope in such a programme to satisfy the expectations of the growing number who clamour for political, social and industrial regeneration? The issues in the future will not be between the choice of constitutional and industrial reforms, as opposed to social and revolutionary changes, but between a party which strives to maintain existing institutions as against a party which desires to sweep them away. Already we have this situation in England: the party in power is actuated by the sole desire to avoid revolution; in place of a constructive policy it has exalted opportunism into a fine art, and in order to placate Labour is compelled to undertake legislation contrary to its professed principles, and by State control of industries to inaugurate a Socialist régime. Parliament is being gradually superseded by the growing power of the Executive and of the Bureaucracy, and the economic foundations upon which industry and society rest are being undermined.

In home politics, as in foreign politics, there is no clear principle, no definite programme. While abroad we stake everything on an international League, we dare not forego the great safeguard of national sentiment or the appeal to local patriotism, though by our action we weaken both; while at home we stake everything on reforms, political and social, we dare not forego the safeguards upon which government and society rest, though all the time we weaken them by our legislation.

It is surely evident that we are approaching a great crisis in world affairs. The hopes of ordered and continuous progress, cherished hitherto, rest on no solid foundation; the hopes of universal peace are a dream, for the method of attaining them offers no chance of success; the hopes of continued development of political and social institutions are equally unattainable because those institutions are bankrupt. Those who still pin their faith to them are falling into exactly the same error as that with which they have previously charged the reactionary element in all countries, lack of imagination and failure to realise the spirit of the age. The Liberal mind has always had a genius for deceiving itself. To them past history means the gradual emergence of mankind from a condition of slavery, both of mind and body, into a citizenship of the highest and fullest character; it is the gradual evolution of the race to a better state of existence, and this idea has been tacitly accepted by the world at large. But history is a record of the rise and fall of successive civilisations, and what if it be true that the very

progress of which they boast has produced the malady of decay? There is another view of the history of the last 2,000 years which may contain more truth. The course of progress has also been the course of disintegration and decay. In the last hundred years men have felt this dimly and the romantic movement of the last century was an endeavour to express it, a vain effort to return to the conceptions of the Middle Ages. The idea received a mere fracture of exemplification in the attempt of Alexander I of Russia to unite Europe in the Holy Alliance against the forces of revolution. It was a last effort to restore in the international sphere what had so often been attempted without success in the national sphere, the unity of political and religious powers and aims to obtain a common policy which both might pursue. Democracy was in effect anti-Christian and all Christendom should unite against it. The effort, of course, failed because it was an attempt to build without a foundation, without a universal Church as the expression of Christianity, and, moreover, it was a violation of the principles of freedom and the independence of nations. This effort at unity was made under the overwhelming impression of the disasters of the Napoleonic Wars, and now after the last great war a similar effort is being made in the League of Nations which we are told is based upon the principles of Christianity. But Christianity a hundred years ago was conceived of as expressing itself through an organisation, and the most powerful organisation of Christians being the Church of Rome, it was through the Pope that the appeal to Christianity was to be made. Now Christianity is no longer regarded as an organisation, but as a set of moral and ethical ideas which are to influence the nations, and no more striking proof of the progress of European disintegration during the past century could be desired.

Just as the world in earlier ages groaned under the tyranny of the world monarch and the world priest, so it is now groaning under the tyranny of the world proletariat. And every form of rule or dominion must have a religion, and the religion of the triumphant proletariat cannot be Christian. The logical denouement of democracy, of the sovereignty of the people, is Bolshevism, which would stamp out Christianity if it could, and the mere fact that every institution and idea handed down by traditional Christianity through its representatives is expressly repudiated by those who urge the sovereignty of the people, is a sufficient proof that it cannot be Christian. There is every indication to show that it will be humanism, or the worship of man. This is indeed the natural result of the principles of democracy. Man is the arbiter of his own fate, he owes no allegiance to any authority, he is the source of power. Nothing is more remarkable than the kind of mysticism which surrounds the conceptions of Labour agitators. When the people rule, all sordid motives, all corrupt aims, will vanish away. It is only when the masses make their power felt that evil will disappear, wars will cease, *etc., etc.* These ideas are fostered by mystical books, like those of Mr. Edward Carpenter, consisting of rhapsodies about democracy in language betokening nothing less than a new revelation. Then, again, there are various forms of Modernism which, by representing man as being by nature not a fallen creature, but a being endowed with every virtue, capable of rising by his own unaided efforts to any height, and being indeed literally divine, encourages this strange new cult.

It has been customary to consider the history of Europe

as the history of the development of free institutions, of education, of science, in a word the history of progress, but it is admitted that progress is a word impossible to define and that in some respects there has certainly been retrogression instead of advance, as, for instance, in art. But it has never yet been considered as the history of the disintegration of a certain form of society, the decay of a certain form of civilisation. The obvious benefits secured by the Reformation, and in a sense by subsequent revolutions, has so dazzled mankind that they do, or will, not attach due weight to the evidences of disruption and decay. But the progress and the decay are both true, both must be followed to their logical conclusion. The one has brought immense benefits, the other has brought corresponding evils. Neither will cease to exercise their effects. Progress has been exhaustively examined; it is time that decay was as exhaustively considered.

We have seen that the original strength of European society lay in religion; during the last four centuries it has lain in the sentiment of nationality. Whenever a nation has developed revolutionary tendencies it has been customary to appeal to this sentiment as the only binding force. This sentiment is being undermined by the internationalism of the League of Nations, by the inevitable reaction following on the war, and by the internationalist Labour Movement. We have also seen that at the same time the political institutions of all countries seem to be approaching a condition of stagnation because there is little room for their further development in a democratic direction, and they no longer earn the respect formerly accorded to them.

The forces of destruction and disruption are gaining strength, but they are only strong because they are destructive. The various schemes for a new world order do not really attract the masses, there is no constructive force in them. But it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the element of decay which we have observed in recent European history must eventually destroy the remaining institutions upon which our society is based, because the foundations of those institutions, religion and nationality, have lost or are losing their force.

But if these foundations disappear, others must be provided. The decay of national sentiment will probably render the next attempt at world domination successful. The lack of unity in Europe, due to the disintegrating influence of the Reformation, has led to successive attempts to achieve European hegemony, by Spain in the sixteenth century, by Louis XIV in the eighteenth century, by Napoleon in the nineteenth century, and by Wilhelm II in the twentieth century. All these were attempts to unite Europe, and the probability is that a federation of Europe can only be achieved in this way.

The history of the world moves in cycles through successive stages from absolutism to democracy and back to absolutism again. The internationalism of the present day is the final stage of the decay wrought by democracy, and the next stage will be a return to absolutism, brought about by the domination of Europe by some great Power of the future. Similarly, Socialism or Communism is the last stage of the decay wrought by democracy in the political constitutions of European States, and the next stage will be a return to some form of absolutism in those States.

Such would seem to be the world order of the future,

judging by the history of the past.

And just as the history of the old world order is the history of the decay of Christianity regarded as an organised force, so the new world order will be based on some new conception of religion. The nature of this new religion may be guessed from the working of democracy on Christianity. Democracy has exalted the people into the position of the ruler; the supreme authority in the State is the people. In religion a similar process seems to be taking place in the exaltation of man into the position of a divinity. One of the most popular theories of the present day is the divinity of man. The first stage in the evolution of this religion is to disprove the old idea of the fall of man. Having never fallen, he is as a "god knowing good and evil." All evil tendencies in mankind are due to environment and not to any deep-seated defect in his nature.

The above sketch of the history of world revolution may seem to some pessimistic, but the question is, "Is it or is it not the logical result of past history and present tendencies?" Amidst the complexity of current events it is difficult to take a detached view of history, to judge the comparative value of the various factors which go to make up history, but it is essential that we should make up our minds exactly as to where we are going. We are not the blind sport of fortune; our fate is in our own hands; it is never too late to recognise a truth or to avoid a danger. And there is this encouragement for us; the truth is being dimly perceived by multitudes. It is but too evident that Democracy is the parent of Bolshevism, and that the sovereignty of the people is not synonymous with liberty, good government or a higher morality. And so throughout Europe a steady movement is taking place "towards the right." But if this movement relies for success merely on paying lip-service to Parliamentary institutions while giving way to the Socialistic tendencies of present legislation, it will fail. In this crisis salvation can only be achieved by a return to convictions and principles which may be dubbed "reactionary," but which will nevertheless earn respect and support, because they have logic and truth upon their side, and will be seen to be the only bulwark of authority amid the crumbling of altars and thrones.

(Concluded).

Alberta Bill of Rights—(continued from page 3)

make the financial system reflect accurately the real situation as regards the wealth available to the community. Under Bill 76 the more illness and unemployment, the more dividends will be distributed, the less illness and unemployment, *i.e.*, the more people are producing, the fewer people will get their dividends. What a travesty of Social Credit! So also with power and responsibility: those who are currently responsible for producing the dividend are thereby disqualified from receiving it, which, of course, is the most certain way of ensuring that there shall be no dividend at all.

THE RETIREMENT CONDITION. Who has been at work here? Just in case anyone is still in doubt, let me take as an example one single point in the Alberta Bill 76 which shows its origin as clearly as if it were stamped "*Made in the London School of Economics*"—the retirement condition which is proposed for the Old Age Pension. This is about the meanest bit of regimentation in the Beveridge Plot, designed to deprive the elderly of the right to work as they

like, or to earn any money to supplement their pension, beyond such petty sums as the Planners may 'allow' them.

Its history is as follows: about 1935 the idea was put forward by P.E.P. (the 'British' branch of the World Planning Network) in their broadsheet *Planning* No. 50, in these words:

"The State should intervene to see that superannuation is provided in the greatest possible number of cases on the strict understanding that the new augmented pension is payable only to those who retire from ordinary gainful employment."

In November, 1942, in the toughest part of the war, the Beveridge Report came out with the same 'retirement' condition in it, which was accepted by the mainly Conservative Coalition Government, and later incorporated in the Socialists' National Insurance Act. I should perhaps explain that in Great Britain, for nearly twenty years, we have had unconditional, though inadequate, Old Age Pensions, which have provided a useful supplement to the small earnings and other incomes of old people. These now are to be abolished, for the openly stated purpose of making old people work at full pressure for as long as possible, and preventing any easing off or partial retirement. This, of course, amounts to a death sentence for many of them.

Coincident with the Beveridge Report was published a bulky Appendix containing the Memoranda submitted to Sir William Beveridge by various organisations which he saw fit to consult in drawing up his Report. Interestingly enough, the P.E.P. Memorandum contained no reference to the retirement condition, which by then had been so well spread by its well-known methods of permeation that it appeared as a recommendation in no less than five of the Memoranda of other organisations, namely: The Fabian Society, The Trades Union Congress, The Co-operative Congress, The National Labour Organisation, and the Liberal Parliamentary Party.

Three months after the Beveridge Report, the retirement condition appeared in the Marsh Report, in Canada, and in the various literature circulated to the Canadian Forces about it. Not long after, it appeared, very unobtrusively in small print, on page 65 of the Alberta Reconstruction Pamphlet "Prepare Now"; and now, in 1946, we have it emerging as one of the 'rights' of the people in the Alberta 'Bill of Rights', where it is expressed in the following terms:

"It is hereby declared that every citizen of Alberta who has reached the age of sixty years is entitled as a right of citizenship to retire from gainful employment and upon retirement to receive— (a) a pension; (b) medical benefits."

Just above it there is another declaration which says:

"It is hereby declared that every citizen of Alberta shall be free to engage in work of his own choice which may be available to him within the Province."

So a restriction is described as a 'right', and you are perfectly 'free' to work, provided you do not mind being fined the whole amount of your dividend. If ever there was a blatant example of the technique of the Enemy, this is it; but it is clear that such things are a great deal easier to see in London than in Alberta. Hence this warning! If it is quite unnecessary, I hope you will forgive me; it seemed the least I could do! If I have given you something to think about and to discuss, please, if you value your liberty do not stop at thinking and discussing. The Bill, I was glad to see, is by no means rigid, or in its final form. Albertans, the next move is with you.