

The Fountainhead

of the

Socialist Conspiracy

Notes on the Fabian Socialist Society and Its Associations

Prepared by

ERIC D. BUTLER

Campaign Director Victorian League of Rights

LTP
320.5312
B 97 F

The Fountainhead

of the

Socialist Conspiracy



Notes on the Fabian Socialist Society and Its Associations



Prepared by

ERIC D. BUTLER

Campaign Director, Victorian League of Rights

THE SECRET REVOLUTION

The fountainhead of Socialist ideas in English-speaking countries is the English Fabian Society and its associated organisations.

One of the most notorious Fabian Socialist theoreticians is Professor Harold J. Laski, whose influence has dominated Socialist Movements in all parts of the world. Late in 1946 Laski paid a visit to Soviet Russia and had discussions with Stalin. After these discussions Laski made the public declaration that English Socialists and Russian Socialists were approaching the same objective by different roads. This was a very important statement.

Late last century Karl Marx said that the British would never make their own revolution and that foreigners would have to make it for them. (This statement was made in 1870 in a secret message sent by Marx from London to the Internationale in Geneva.) But a violent revolution such as the Communists envisage, is not the only type of revolution. There is such a thing as a silent revolution, the undermining of a nation's institutions from within. This is what the Fabian Socialists set out to accomplish. Their policy was one of influencing all other political groups by permeation and infiltration: Sovietisation by stealth.

The Fabian Society, which took its name from Fabius Cunctator, the Roman dictator who eventually defeated Hannibal as a result of a policy of gradualness, was launched in the winter of 1883-84 under the leadership of Professor Thomas Davidson, "an ethical Anarchist Communist." He was soon superseded by the Webbs and George Bernard Shaw.

The policy of permeation soon started to bear fruit. Politicians of all parties were influenced. George Bernard Shaw has frankly described this policy: "Our propaganda is one of permeating—we urged our members to join the Liberal and Radical Associations in their district, or, if they preferred it, the Conservative Associations—we permeated the party organisations and pulled all the strings we could lay our hands on with the utmost adroitness and energy, and we succeeded so well that in 1888 we gained the solid advantage of a Progressive majority full of ideas that would never have come into their heads had not the Fabians put them there."

Shaw has also revealed how the Fabians used English Liberal Party members for their own purposes: "I being then a permeative Fabian on the St. Pancras Liberal and

Radical Association (I had coolly walked in and demanded to be elected to the Association and Executive, which was done on the spot by the astonished Association, ten strong or thereabouts), took them down to a meeting in Percy Hall, Percy Street, Tottenham Court Road, where the late Mr. Beale, then Liberal candidate . . . was to address as many of the ten as might turn up under the impression he was addressing a public meeting. There were certainly not twenty present, perhaps not ten. I asked him to move the resolutions. He said they looked complicated, and that if I would move them he would second them. I moved them, turning over Webb's pages by batches, and not reading most of them. Mr. Beale seconded. Passed unanimously.

"That night we went down to the 'Star' with a report of an admirable speech Mr. Beale was supposed to have delivered. Next day he found the National Liberal Club in an uproar at the revolutionary break-away. But he played up . . . said we lived in progressive times and must move with them."

On page 310 of his *Reminiscences*, the Socialist leader, Hyndman, wrote about "the bureaucratic Fabian Society which so assiduously promulgated the doctrine of middle-class permeation and high-toned intrigue."

After his failure to get control of the Fabian Society early this century, the Socialist writer, H. G. Wells, spoke of the Fabian technique of "permeation," and described its leaders as "a very small group of pedants who believe that fair ends may be reached by foul means." Wells also referred to Sidney Webb as an "incessant little intriguer." In view of the Fabian technique for destroying responsible Government and constitutional safeguards, which we will examine later, it is appropriate here to refer to Wells's description of Webb at work. After he had written his book, *The New Machiavelli*, Wells was asked whether the Baileys in this book were the Webbs. According to the *English Sunday Express*, of December 11, 1927, Wells said that the Baileys were not the Webbs, "but only Webby people." In *The New Machiavelli*, Wells describes Bailey—i.e., Webb—as follows: "I can still recall little Bailey, glib and winking, explaining that Democracy was really just a dodge for getting assent to the ordinances of the expert by means of the polling booth."

Elie Halévy, the noted historian, has confirmed what Wells had to say. Writing of the Webbs, Halévy states: "I can still hear Sidney Webb explaining to me that the future belonged to the great administrative nations, where the officials govern and the police keep order." Halévy has also

recalled Shaw arguing that "the world is to the big and powerful States by necessity; and the little ones must come within their border or be crushed out of existence."

One of the most dishonest pieces of writing issued by the Webbs was their lengthy work, *Soviet Communism: A New Civilisation* (1935), in which they used all their Fabian trickery to try and whitewash bolshevism. The following is a typical example of their dishonest methods:

"No one can compute the sum of human suffering caused by this triple revolution over so vast an area, in so brief a time, amid the most embittered civil war, supported by half a dozen foreign armies actually invading Soviet territory . . . But equally no one can compute the sum of human suffering even unto the death, caused in England by the Protestant Reformation, the Industrial Revolution, and the triumph of democratic parliamentarianism, the whole drawn out over four centuries, with only the mildest of civil wars, and with next to no foreign wars."

Needless to say, when the Webbs visited Soviet Russia, they were treated as favoured guests. Even so, the Webbs could not but help hear of the mass liquidations. They did not deny the human suffering that had taken place, but attempted to justify it as above.

Karl Marx's great collaborator, Engels, wrote of the Fabians as follows in 1893: "Their tactics are to fight the Liberals not as decided opponents, but to drive them on to Socialistic consequences; therefore to trick them, to permeate Liberalism with Socialism, and not to oppose Socialistic candidates to Liberal ones, but to palm them off, to thrust them on, under some pretext . . . all is rotten."

Mr. Ellis Barker wrote: "The Fabian Society is the least open and least straightforward Socialist organisation . . . it habitually sails under a false flag, wishing not to arouse suspicions as to its objects . . ." Dr. Beattie Crozier has written: "This process of secret and gradual insinuation was, in effect, a real conspiracy."

In her admiring biography of Mrs. Sidney Webb, Margaret Cole, herself a Socialist and friend of Mrs. Webb, writes: "Fabian tactics in general have been described as 'permeation'; and until their retirement from English politics, most of the Webbs's political work might fairly have been described as permeation of one sort or another. But the period around the turn of the century was really, as far as they were concerned, the time of 'permeation' in the stricter sense—the time when they had hopes of so working upon the capitalist parties from within as to make them Socialist unawares."

TECHNIQUE OF CENTRALISING POWER AND UNDERMINING BRITISH DEMOCRACY

The Fabians shrewdly assessed the weakness of most politicians, irrespective of their label: the tendency to centralise political power. The Webbs and other Fabians set about influencing all politicians to support legislation which would so centralise power that a process of delegation of power to a growing bureaucracy became inevitable. Once the bureaucracy was empowered to make regulations and decrees having the force of law, responsible Government was undermined. In other words, the Fabians deliberately set out to pervert the Parliamentary system and to use it to reach the same objective which the Communists wanted to reach by force.

In his book, *Democracy in Crisis*, Professor Laski said that the first task of a Socialist Government would be "to take vast powers and legislate under them by ordinance and decree." Professor Laski has dealt further with the Fabian technique as follows: "The necessity and value of delegated legislation and its extension is inevitable if the process of socialisation is not to be wrecked by the normal methods of obstruction which existing parliamentary procedure sanctions" (from the Fabian journal, *New Statesman*, September 10, 1932).

Sir Stafford Cripps, Mrs. Sidney Webb's nephew, and an important Fabian, wrote in his booklet, *Can Socialism Come by Constitutional 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."

The Fabian technique of perverting the Parliamentary system to destroy responsible Government was dealt with in some detail by the famous former Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart, in his great classic, *The New Despotism* (1929). Lord Hewart made the following serious charge: "A mass of evidence establishes the fact that there is in existence a persistent and well-contrived system, intending to produce, and in practice producing, a despotic power which at one and the same time places Government departments beyond the sovereignty of Parliament and beyond the jurisdiction of the Courts."

The "persistent and well-contrived system" has been considerably advanced since Lord Hewart wrote his book. Government bureaucracies have been rapidly extended in all parts of the world, and the "key" members of these bureaucracies, the economic "advisers," have virtually become the framers of Government policies.

There was nothing new about the Fabian Socialists' ideas; they had all been applied in Germany last century under Bismarck, who worked together with the German Socialists to centralise power. Lord Haldane, close friend of the Webbs, said on one occasion that Germany was his "spiritual home." As Hitler merely built upon the centralised Germany created by Bismarck and the German Socialists, it is instructive to note the following statement by the chief speaker at the Fabian International Bureau's Conference on 15th March, 1942: ". . . There is not much difference between the basic economic techniques of Socialism and Nazism."

If Governments were to be controlled and "advised" by permanent officials, the Fabians realised the necessity of ensuring that the "key" officials were suitably indoctrinated with Fabian ideas. The London School of Economics was started in 1894 for this purpose. The London School of Economics is now attached to the University of London and receives a Government grant.

Professor Laski has been one of the principal instructors at the London School of Economics. In his book, *The Alien Menace* (1933), Lieut.-Colonel A. H. Lane pointed out that about a third of its teachers bore names of a highly foreign flavour. In *From Smoke to Smother* (1948), Douglas Reed, the famous English publicist, writes: "I found it (the London School of Economics) to be well known to Communists in Berlin, Vienna and Prague before the second war, and some of these young men did not disguise from me their belief that it could be used by Communists who wished to pursue their political activities in England under the respectable mantle of 'economics' and studentship."

When Sir Otto Niemeyer, at present a Director of the Nationalised Bank of England, visited Australia and other countries during the early part of the Great Depression, he was "advised" by Professor Theodor Emmanuel Guggenheim Gregory, who was detached from the London School of Economics in order that he might accompany Sir Otto Niemeyer.

BACKED BY POWERFUL FINANCIAL GROUPS

As it is often claimed that Socialism is opposed by all the "wealthy capitalists," it is necessary to emphasise that the Fabian Socialists were supported by some of the wealthiest financial groups in the world. Mrs. Webb herself inherited a small fortune from her father. George Bernard Shaw had no objections to marrying wealth. He married Miss Charlotte Payne-Townsend, Irish millionairess. It is also well to recall that Karl Marx was practically dependent upon his friend, Friedrich Engels, the wealthy Manchester "capitalist," for financial support.

In her autobiography, *Our Partnership*, Mrs. Webb reveals how she and her husband were helped finance the London School of Economics by the Rothschilds, Sir Julius Wernher, and similar financial magnates. The present Lord Rothschild is the leader of the British Socialist Party in the House of Lords.

Sir Ernest Cassel, German-Jewish financier, and associated with one of the most powerful international financial groups in the world, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of Wall Street, New York, was the biggest financial contributor to the London School of Economics. In 1920 he saved the School from serious financial difficulties by a donation of £472,000. In *The Quarterly Review* for January, 1929 (pp. 187-8), Professor J. H. Morgan, K.C., wrote: "When I once asked Lord Haldane why he persuaded his friend, Sir Ernest Cassel, to settle by his will large sums on . . . the London School of Economics, he replied, 'Our object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State'." It is worth recording here that Sir Ernest Cassel's favourite granddaughter is Lady Mountbatten, whose Leftist views are reported to have had a big influence on her husband.

The British Socialist Government introduced special legislation to enable Lady Mountbatten to anticipate her income under the will of Sir Ernest Cassel. Commenting upon this matter, the conservative English journal, *The Tablet*, said in its issue of 21st May, 1949, that "the suspicion will remain that this exceptional treatment commends itself to Mr. Attlee and his colleagues because the advanced views of the beneficiaries also commend themselves."

Professor Laski was reported in the February, 1948, issue of the American *National Home Monthly* as having praised the Mountbattens, particularly Lady Mountbatten, who has a "social conscience." This is another way of saying she sympathizes with Professor Laski's socialist policies.

LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS' EVIL INFLUENCE

The influence of the London School of Economics has been world-wide. Its teachings have permeated the universities, while the "key" members of the bureaucracies in all English-speaking countries have been trained at this institution.

During the Great Depression, Professor D. B. Copland took the "advice" of Professor Guggenheim Gregory. The principal economic adviser to the Federal Government is Dr. H. C. Coombs, a product of the London School of Economics. He is a declared totalitarian. Another member of the Australian bureaucracy who is a product of the London School of Economics is Professor Mills. The senior lecturer in Economics at the Sydney University, Professor Arndt, is also from the London School, as is Professor McMahon Ball, of the Melbourne University, who studied under Professor Laski.

In the preface to his book, *The King and His Dominion Governors* (1936), Dr. H. V. Evatt wrote: "I am also under obligation to Professor Laski, of the London School of Economics . . . for much encouragement and advice." Laski's philosophy has been summed up in the following extract from *Faith, Reason and Civilisation*: "Christianity has failed, and the Russian ideal is taking its place as the inspiration of mankind, and as the standard of public morality."

Various Social "Security" Schemes, like the National Health Scheme in Australia, have been inspired by the London School of Economics. Sir William Beveridge's Report on Social Security, produced during the war years, has influenced the policies of Governments in all parts of the English-speaking world, including the U.S.A. Sir William Beveridge, the advocate of a "half-way to Moscow policy," has been a leading figure at the London School of Economics for many years.

In Canada the principal economic "advisers" to the Federal Government are Dr. Cyril James, of the McGill University, Dr. Marsh, and Louis Raminsky, of the Bank of Canada—all products of the London School of Economics. Professor Laski has been a lecturer at the McGill University, which was mentioned unfavourably during the Canadian spy-trials in 1946. A number of those found guilty of espionage had been connected with this University. One of those found guilty had been also educated at the London School of Economics.

The Roosevelt Socialist New Deal was directly influenced by the Fabians and the London School of Economics. Roosevelt knew Laski. Dr. Burns, of the London School of Economics, is, or was, a leading economic "adviser" to the American Federal Government.

It has been stated that 67 members of the present British Socialist Government were educated at the London School of Economics. Sir Stafford Cripps, Mr. Attlee and Dr. Dalton were prominently associated with the institution.

FABIANS' CONTROL OF BRITISH LABOUR PARTY

After leaving the Fabian Socialist Society and the British Socialist Party in 1946, Mr. Thorburn Muirhead, M.P., said: "Of the 300 Socialist M.P.'s, 230 (including 41 members of the Government) belong to the Fabian Society . . . The Society is organising a programme for the second five years of office that they hope the present Government will enjoy . . . The Fabian Society have a large leavening of foreign refugees, decrying most things British, and arbitrarily prescribing for Britain's conduct in the world arena. Meanwhile, they sing the Internationale and worship Russia, and try to tear down every sound institution."

Back in 1930, the Ramsay McDonald Labour Government was also dominated by the Fabians. The following report is from the *Evening Standard*, 1st November, 1930: "Many Labour members are talking about the dominance in the Government of that very academic body, the Fabian Society . . . every recent appointment, either to high or low office, in the Labour administration has been made from the membership of the Society, the latest examples of which are the new Air Minister, Lord Ambree, and the new Solicitor-General, Sir Stafford Cripps. I am told that at least 90 per cent. of the members of the Government are in the rolls of the Society, and that, contrary to regulations, so are a good many highly placed Civil Servants." Note carefully the reference to "highly placed Civil Servants!"

Writing of the influence the London School of Economics had on the development of the British Labour Party, Professor Laski has written: "Nor will anyone know until its archives are searched by a competent historian how immense were their services (the Webbs's) in bringing the Labour Party to birth."

P.E.P. (POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PLANNING) OFFSHOOT

Early in the Great Depression, the Fabians developed their conspiratorial technique still further by the creation of another special organisation, Political and Economic Planning (P.E.P.). Associated with this semi-secret Socialist organisation was Lord Melchett, (Mond, the German-Jew, who hated the British landowners), of the Imperial Chemical Industries, a leading advocate of "rationalisation," which Trade Union leaders accepted as a step towards complete nationalisation. The Fabians and other Socialists are keen advocates of economic centralisation and the crushing of large numbers of small and medium-sized businesses. Writing in the English *Sunday Express*, on 28th November, 1920, H. G. Wells said: "Big business is by no means antipathetic to Communism. The larger big business grows the more it approximates to Collectivism. It is the upper road of the few instead of the lower road of the masses to Collectivism."

Apparently leading figures in P.E.P. agreed with Mr. Wells. In recent years the most prominent figure in P.E.P. has been Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, of Marks & Spencer, the big chain store combine in Great Britain. The first Chairman of P.E.P. was a Sir Basil Blackett, Director of the Bank of England, although this man later repudiated many P.E.P. ideas.

P.E.P.'s conspiratorial methods—typical Fabianism—can be judged by the following instructions issued on 25th April, 1933, in conjunction with a broadsheet outlining the policy of Sovietisation by stealth: "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. This strict condition of anonymity . . . is essential in order that the group may prove effective . . ." The broadsheet mentioned outlined how farmers and manufacturers should be controlled by "duly constituted authority." Small traders should be eliminated: "The wastes involved in . . . retail shops, one shop for every twenty households, cannot be allowed . . ."

Several further extracts will indicate beyond all doubt the totalitarian policy advocated by P.E.P.: Politically "big consequent changes will follow in the machinery of government." The following should be of interest to farmers and manufacturers: "Whether we like it or not—and many will

dislike it intensely—the individualistic manufacturer and farmer will be forced by events to submit to far-reaching changes in outlook and methods.”

“What is required, if with only a view to equitable treatment of individuals, is transfer of ownership of large blocks of land—not necessarily of all the land in the country, but certainly a large proportion of it—into the hands of the proposed statutory corporations and public utility bodies and of land trusts.”

In view of the programme of gradual Sovietisation supported by P.E.P., it is not surprising that Mr. Sieff made the claim that “The only rival world political and economic system which puts forward a comparable claim is that of the Union of Soviet Republics.”

Although its policy of infiltration was comparatively successful, *Planning*, the journal of P.E.P., made the following significant statement on 4th October, 1938: “We have started from the position that it is only in war, or under the threat of war that a British Government will embark on large-scale planning.” It was also stated that “. . . emergency measures should as far as possible be framed in accord with the long-term needs of social and economic reconstruction.” Like their fellow-conspirators, the Fabians welcomed war conditions to further their ideas. Dr. Evatt attempted to use the war crisis to have the 1944 Referendum carried in Australia. Professor Laski publicly lamented Dr. Evatt’s failure.

P.E.P. infiltrated and influenced the policies of the Baldwin “Conservative” Government. It was directly responsible for the establishment of food boards to enable greater Government control of farmers and primary producers. The mania to create food boards was transmitted to all other English-speaking countries. The Roosevelt regime in America was particularly keen on P.E.P. ideas.

Mr. Louis T. McFadden, an American Congressman and recognised authority on banking matters, exposed the connection between the New Dealers in America and the English Fabians. In 1934 he said: “Many serious people in England feel that this Fabian organisation (P.E.P.) practically controls the British Government and that this Government will soon be known as ‘His Majesty’s Soviet Government’ . . . About three months after the National Recovery Act (the first of the New Deal Socialist measures) of the United States, when Israel Moses Sieff was urged by members of his committee to show more activity, he said: ‘Let us go slowly for a while, and wait and see how our plan carries out in America.’”

On 15th March, 1934, in an address criticising the New Deal Socialist legislation for controlling cotton acreage in the U.S.A., Mr. McFadden said: "Their action (the New Deal planners') in this matter is also assisted and aided through the agency of the Foreign Policy Association of the United States, which is directly connected with the Fabian Society, or a branch of it, in England, which at the present time is attempting to take over the control of agriculture and its operation in England . . . I call your especial attention to the recent article, *America Must Choose*, by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, a syndicated article put out under the auspices of the Foreign Policy Association of New York and copyrighted by them. This article is quite in keeping with the plan of the British offspring of the Fabian group."

OTHER FINANCIAL BACKING

It is significant that the Foreign Policy Association was sponsored by Paul M. Warburg, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and by Bernard Baruch, the "unofficial President" of the U.S.A. Another of the Warburg family, Mr. James Warburg, has openly expressed himself in favour of some nationalisation. Here again is further evidence of the fact that Socialist policies have the active support of wealthy and influential men.

In his book, *Looking Backwards and Forwards* (1935) the famous English Socialist leader, Mr. George Lansbury, provided further evidence of the fact that it is not true that all the "wealthy capitalists" have opposed Socialism. Lansbury relates his association with the international financier, Sir Samuel Montagu, whom he alleges gave him financial support to keep strikes going: "In this and other ways Montagu and I seemed likely to be in for a long partnership. We parted politically, however, when I became a definite Socialist. When Sir Samuel heard of this he asked me to see him at the House of Commons. Sir Samuel was kindness itself, and reminded me of what he said at King's College; which was that he would get me a seat in the House of Commons at the earliest opportunity. Meantime, why not (he said) think of my wife and family, and the good I could do by remaining with the Liberal Party and preaching my Socialism inside it."

It is also appropriate to recall here that Joseph Fels, wealthy soap manufacturer, financed Lenin and Trotsky when they were in England in 1907. Fels also lavishly entertained Lansbury, Keir Hardie, and other Socialist leaders.

SOVIETISATION AND COMPULSORY LABOUR

The following is further evidence of the close connection between Fabian Socialism and Sovietisation:

In 1931 George Bernard Shaw said: "Lenin owed a great deal of his eminence to the fact that in his younger days he studied the works of Sidney Webb . . . The success of the Russian experiment means that old words like Fabianism and Socialism are all out of date. There is nothing now but Communism."

The following item appeared in the *Evening Herald* (Dublin), of 3rd February, 1948, under the heading, "Shaw Says He's a Communist": "Replying to Mr. Kirschenbaum's question whether he is a member of the British-Soviet Friendship Society, G.B.S. was quoted as saying: 'I subscribe to many such agencies, pro- or anti-Russian. I am a Communist, but not a member of the Communist Party. Stalin is a first-rate Fabian. I am one of the founders of Fabianism, and as such very friendly to Russia'."

One of the basic features of the Soviet economy is economic conscription. Irrespective of how it is introduced, Socialism in practice inevitably leads to manpower control. Shaw was very frank about this matter when he said: "Compulsory labour, with death as the final penalty . . . is the keystone of Socialism" (October issue, 1921, of *English Labour Monthly*).

Dr. H. C. Coombs, of the Fabian London School of Economics, has expressed himself in favour of economic conscription. Speaking at the Melbourne University on 11th June, 1944, he said: "People could not expect complete freedom after the war . . . It would be necessary for some individual to be given the right to say what was best for the community."

Dr. H. V. Evatt, Professor Laski's friend, said at the Canberra Political Summer School in 1944: "What are Manpower Regulations but a system which . . . attempts to ensure that everybody in this country shall be usefully employed . . . There has been a nearer approach to a well-ordered society in respect of employment during this war and the last than in any of the years between the wars." Speaking in the Federal Parliament on 11th February, 1944, Dr. Evatt said: ". . . full employment cannot possibly be achieved unless some authority is empowered to determine how employment is to be expanded." This is pure Fabianism.

SOCIALIST SLAVERY VIA THE BALLOT BOX

If the totalitarian menace is to be defeated, it is essential that it be clearly understood that the Socialists are just as revolutionary as the Communists. By the perversion of the Parliamentary system they pursue policies which must inevitably lead to the destruction of responsible Government and constitutional safeguards. The Socialists may claim that they oppose the Communists, but the opposition is only concerned with the best methods of reaching the Socialist objective of the Monopoly State. In his *Appreciation of the Communist Manifesto for the Labour Party*, issued in 1948, Professor Laski asked, "who, remembering that these (policies of high taxation and centralisation of credit) were the demands of the Manifesto, can doubt our common inspiration."

Fabian Tract No. 127 states that the use of taxation is the chief means of reaching the Socialist State. This Tract also says that "to the Socialist, the best of Governments is that which spends most." Slavery can be introduced via the ballot box and the Parliamentary system just as effectively as it can be introduced by direct violence. An individual can have his property taken from him at the point of a bayonet, or a political party with a temporary majority in Parliament can achieve the same objective by nationalising all property. What is the difference?

It will, of course, be argued that the "democratic" methods of the Socialists ensure that all individuals are compensated financially for any property taken from them by legislation. But Professor Laski and his fellow-Fabians have made it clear that once an individual is deprived of his property by "democratic" methods, he can then be also deprived of any financial compensation paid to him by the imposition of crippling taxation. *The Scotsman*, of 7th January, 1946, reported Professor Laski as follows: "Professor Laski said he had never been worried about compensation so long as there was a Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer who could fix the levels of taxation, especially Death Duties, Estate Duties and Legacy Duties. Compensation was a book-keeping transaction."

In his book, *The New Despotism*, Lord Hewart wrote: "The whole scheme of self-government is being undermined . . . in a way in which no self-respecting people, if they were aware of the facts, would for a moment tolerate." If the Fabian Socialist technique is continued, it will only be a matter of time before every aspect of the community's



30328500394191

affairs must be governed by regulations passed by the bureaucratic officials to suit their own requirements. Parliament would then become a hindrance to the operating of the centrally Planned State and could be abolished. This eventuality was mentioned by the famous English Socialist, Mr. G. D. H. Cole, in an address to the Oxford Fabian Society in 1944: "I do not like the Parliamentary system, and the sooner it is overthrown the better I shall be pleased."

Those responsible for having the Socialisation objective included in the Australian Labor Party's platform at the 1921 All-Australian Trade Union Conference also advocated the Fabian technique for destroying the responsible Parliamentary system of Government. The following extracts are from the Official Report of the 1921 Conference:

Mr. J. H. Scullin, future Labor Prime Minister, and a trusted adviser of the Curtin and Chifley Governments: "From those industries nationalised shall be chosen a General Economic Council which will really take the place of our Parliaments today . . ."

Mr. A. C. Willis, later President of the Australian Labor Party, also Chairman of the Central Coal Commission: "The Russians have a Soviet form of Government . . . But they are building up what will be the real Government of Russia, a Supreme Economic Council . . . So far as we are concerned there is nothing to prevent us in this country from forming this special machinery save the indifference of the people. If you can build up that complete system of machinery for the whole thing, then our political government will not count that much." (Mr. Willis held up his pencil.)

Mr. John Baddeley, now Deputy Premier of New South Wales: "If our friend (i.e., another speaker) has the idea that we are going to function (in the socialisation period) under the Parliamentary methods that exist today, I am against it."

There may never be a Communist Revolution in English-speaking countries, but the Fabian programme of Sovietisation by stealth will, unless exposed and opposed, lead to the same type of Monopoly State which the Communists advocate. Now is the time for all liberty-loving Australians to unite in defence of the rights and liberties which their forefathers won at so much cost in the past.