



CONSERVATISM IN CONTEMPORARY

CANADA

Robert Thompson is a world traveller, personally acquainted with the problems of nations and the needs of their peoples. In 1943 at the request of Emperor Haile Selassie Mr. Thompson went to Ethiopia and spent the next fifteen years establishing the nation's educational system and as special advisor to the Emperor. Assignments have taken him throughout the Middle East, India, Pakistan and Europe where he became familiar with the ever-changing character of world events.

Basically, however, he is a Canadian with a vision not only for the tremendous development potential of this vast and rich land of Canada but also a Canadian with a conviction that Canada has a vital role in world affairs as a helper of the less privileged nations and as a example for world peace and progress.

Mr. Thompson's outstanding work as educator and advisor to the emerging peoples of Africa, his extensive administrative experience and his non-partisan convictions about the dynamic potential of Canada's economy have made him highly respected across Canada and throughout much of the free world.

As an able and proven executive and as a wise and dedicated parliamentarian Mr. Thompson has attracted the attention of men of conservative sentiment throughout this land. The Edmonton Journal said, 'Mr. Thompson's address made several profound points that will bear wide reflection and discussion.' It is becoming increasingly apparent that as conservative thought is being revitalized in Canada more and more Canadians are looking to Robert Thompson.

by

Robert N. Thompson, M. P.

Address by
Robert N. Thompson, M.P.,

National Leader
Social Credit Party

to
The National Young
Social Credit Convention

WINNIPEG

August 8th, 1964

My remarks are directed to all small 'c' conservative Canadians. A few of these are still to be found in the Conservative benches of Parliament - more still are within the Progressive Conservative Party. In Alberta and B.C. most of these have taken refuge in the Social Credit ranks, as have many in the other provinces. With the disappearance of protectionist policies relating to trade, many small 'l' Liberals believe there isn't any significant difference with their small 'c' neighbours, and thus conservatives are found even within the Liberal parties. In fact one can find small 'c' conservatives in the most unexpected places today as the drift to the left in both major parties causes distress and confusion. As a result, the greatest strength of conservatism in contemporary Canada is with the growing numbers of politically uncommitted. Thus my remarks to this national gathering of Young Social Credits are directed to all who believe in the importance of the individual in a free society, who are concerned with the inordinate growth of centralized, paternalistic, governmental power and who are willing to rise up and do something about it.

This returning 'to proven ways, not because they are old but because they are true' will prove that conservatism is still a living force and that all essential reform will be brought about in the realism of the conservative approach.

The Contemporary Canadian Scene.

Canadians have watched the Goldwater victory at the Republican Convention in San Francisco almost in wonderment and awe. The Canadian press has given more space to this event than to any other American nominating Convention in history, and 95% of this coverage has been passionately critical. Practically all news coverage has harshly editorialized, to paint a picture of incredulity if not shock and horror, as if most Republican Americans had lost their minds. Many Canadians accepted and shared these reactions and attitudes, although if the facts were known, a greater number are hoping that the pollsters and the experts are wrong as they have been with Goldwater many times.

One of the few rational editorials written about the Goldwater nomination appeared in the Hamilton Spectator on July 16th. It said in part, 'What many Canadians who view the American political situation with alarm fail to realize is that essentially Senator Goldwater is no more a conservative than our own Arthur Meighen, R.B. Bennett and John A. Macdonald. His main drawback is his apparent impetuosity, but to his admirers that is a virtue, only they call it candidness and courageous forthrightness. Otherwise he is merely the figure-head for a philosophy that has been treading water for a long time.'

It is a philosophy, incidentally, which is certainly not dead in Canada either, even though no major party practices it except in nostalgic speeches. There is in fact a real residue of conservatism in this country and the day may soon come when enough articulate men and women will rise up against creeping socialism and federal paternalism to build a bandwagon. Unfortunately, at present, true conservative thought in Canada is either inarticulate or passively dormant - perhaps both.

In May of this year Canadian socialist demonstrated the necessity and importance of political ideas. Going on the offensive to maintain an intellectual initiative and to keep socialistic reform and thinking before the people, they met in Toronto to found EPIC, the 'Exchange for Political Ideas in Canada'. This new left-leaning organization is to 'research, study, discern and propagate change and reform'. The Edmonton Journal timely remarked (May 29 / 64):

'So the left is organizing intellectually. What is the right doing?...Political conservatives . that is, people opposed to the unnecessary growth of Big Government and the Welfare State - are weak and on the defensive in Canada, and have been for years, because they have failed to mobilize their men of ideas.

'The time is now more than ripe for such a mobilization...

'The right is doing little, if anything. There is no widely-accepted conservative alternative to socialism, whether of the creeping or galloping variety.

'The conclusion is therefore incapable; if conservatism is ever to become a meaningful force in Canadian politics; if the leftward trend of the past thirty years is ever to be slowed, halted or reversed, a mobilization of conservative intellectual resources is urgently called for. If conservatives hope ever to gain effective influence, they will have to become the men of ideas in Canadian politics - not the socialists... All modern Canadian 'conservatives' seem to be able to offer as an alternative to leftism is diluted socialism. That is not sufficient. Diluted socialism is an inadequate remedy for conservative intellectual impotence. What is needed is independent thinking, from the standpoint of the individual.

'With these remarks I am firmly in agreement.

Political Realignment Essential

There are many today who mourn the fact that there is so little real expression of conservative philosophy on the national scene in Canada. The liberal credo manifested in the premises of Marx has almost totally embraced the trend of Canadian politics for the last thirty years.

In fact during the past two decades, as in the U.S.A., party labels, in so far as the two traditional parties are concerned, have come to be meaningless. To define the difference between Progressive Conservatism and Liberalism is baffling. With a curious combination of progressiveism and rationalizing indecision along with a harping back to the days of the horse and buggy from the Conservative side led by John Diefenbaker, and the general embracing of the Socialist Left, typified in the Welfare Statism of Mack-

to snowball their principles over a conservative opposition which is reinforced not with ideas but rather with forlorn sentiment.

In other words, the true conservatives have not opposed liberal ideas with conservative ideas; liberal premises with conservative premises in any intelligible way on a national basis. We have fought only on the basis of reactionary Liberalism and stand-patism on one hand, or in Social Credit economic reform on the other, which, except in Alberta and B.C., has never found an atmosphere or attitude of acceptance, and then in these provinces only because of complete economic or political collapse of the old approach.

If the conservative movement is to pick itself up and mobilize its forces so that it can positively contribute to the Canadian political scene, then it must bring forth men of ideas. We cannot fight gunpowder with sticks and stones. The first one to acknowledge the need of a true conservative revival is the liberal who feels no challenge to his intellect as long as his opponent rests in the apparent comfort of listless sentiment. The true gladiator is insulted when asked to fight a sick and tired old man.

CANADA - A Difficult Environment

Canadian conservatism is failing to reach into the warp and woof of Canadian fibre. The seeds planted have been few, and the ground, at the best, difficult during the pioneering and developing years. There was in Canada no background of tradition, no generations of gradual development, no aristocracy, no peasantry, no established social structure, and likewise no revolutionary mobs or totalitarian Jacobin democratic

philosophy in opposition to which European conservatism came into being in the days of Burke. Canada, fractured by geographical, religious and cultural divisions, was hardly a favourable setting for a conservative philosophy to grow. The roots which have taken hold have each claimed a difference parentage: the ultra montanism of the Roman Catholic Church; the monarchical love of the British and the 'nouveau riche' industrialism of the Americans. As a result, that conservative thought and practice which did develop was regional - even as it remains today, which like most other Canadian institutions has been very difficult to reconcile on the federal level. No better example of this can be had than the Social Credit administration of Alberta, now more firmly entrenched than ever after nearly thirty years.

In spite of its lack of a cohesive force of tradition or a logical growth environment and all its contemporary inadequacies, conservatism in Canada does portray widespread common inclinations and attitudes. This latent force finds its champions amongst some who occupy the front benches of the present Liberal Government. It includes a sizable group of front and back benchers of Progressive Conservatives, in spite of the fact that some who wear that label do not have much of an idea what basic conservatism means or stands for. It finds a hard core of practical and committed strength within the Social Credit Party; yes, and it also includes a frustrated, divided support in the Province of Quebec, found within the Union Nationale provincially, the national Social Credit and Progressive Conservative Parties. Should these forces come together, it is my opinion that Canada would soon produce a truly national conservative government, capable of quickly setting sail and

rudder so that the nation could right herself out of her present confused economic situation and the leftward drift.

A Brief Historical Survey on Conservation

The history of modern conservatism dates back to Edmund Burke in the 18th century. While there have always been conservatives, it was Burke who so clearly enunciated those principles which form the basis of present conservative thought - reverence, contentment, prudence, patriotism, self-discipline, the performance of duty - the marks of the good man. Order, unity, equity, stability, continuity, security, harmony in progress, and the confinement of change as the marks of the good society, and dignity, authority, legitimacy, the just rule of law, constitutionalism, the recognition of limits as the mark of good government.

Burke was a liberal in that he fought for the American colonists and against the abuses of a tyrannical monarchy - yet the French Revolution horrified him for he saw it as a danger to those very liberal principles for which he had struggled. In seeking to conserve those liberal convictions of liberty and justice, Burke fought the radical liberalism of his day, that destructive force of innovation born in the sewers of Paris. Burke said that one must conserve that which is good from the past and adopt that which is good from the proposed to the framework of custom and habit. Those who follow in the path of Burke include John Adams, Tocqueville, Disraeli, Churchill and Kirk. There have been others in their turn who in contrast were not happy just to conserve and change rationally in light of the inevitable. These

include Bonald, Veuillot, Nietzsche, Hitler, and Mussolini. They wanted to go back in the other direction. Each had a different idea as to the society to which he would return but all were united in the call for restoration. It is this basic view of society that forever separates the reactionary from the conservative...actually in the end the reactionary and the liberal have much in common even as we can see in Canada today.

Change is an indubitable part of life. One who doesn't recognize this fact is either a fool or a dreamer. But there is a great difference between change and innovation. Innovation is that which uproots and completely replaces. Change is evolutionary, the difference taking place within the framework. This is one of the basic points of difference between the liberal and the conservative. The liberal wants to cast out the existing order; for him it is replaceable much like a broken machine. Radical liberalism has no respect for existing values and established institutions. For them change must be thorough and complete, not half-hearted. You don't remedy the situation by altering just one part of it, says the liberal - you cast the whole thing aside and replace it with a new one.

This is innovation, which is the radical liberal. He was known in Athens as a Hellenist, in France as a Jacobin, in Russia as a Bolshevik.

Naturally, this obsession with radical change prompted fear and suspicion among those who felt secure in the existing order. The more radical the threat of disruption, the more anxious was their fear. These people often became hysterical at the thought of

flinging aside everything they knew and, consequently, were forced back into the corner of 'stand-patism' and more often than not, reaction. For them all change was wicked because some had demanded too much. Excess of change produced excess of the preservationist spirit. Those who refused to recognize the inevitability of change believed they could 'go back to the good old days' or at the very least 'hold time still.' Such were the Sullas, Stuarts, Bonapartes and Mussolinis.

What is Conservatism?

These are extremes and true conservatism lies between these fields of incensed emotions. It is true that most conservatives view change with suspicion and caution. They are more inclined to hold on to what they have than to risk the gamble of overhaul. Yet, despite this sentiment, the true conservative recognizes that change does exist and will always exist, even as does growth in the normal living body. More than anything he is a realist moved neither by the pictures of a universal Utopia to come nor by the wishful fantasies of a return to the glories of the past. The conservative says both are unrealistic and impractical. Both would disrupt the existing framework to replace it only with a fantasy.

Freedom - Essential to Growth

Society then is an organ which grows from within itself gradually and slowly like a giant tree. The true conservative wishes to preserve this organ and its values so that change and not disruption might occur. He is repelled by both the liberal and the reactionary who would use violence, if neces-

sary, to cast aside that precious framework in order to replace it with their ideal state, whether it be of the future or of the past. He takes into account the whole man, spiritual and physical, not just the material side of man's nature as does the liberal. A conservative is a man who conserves the most valuable thing in past, present and future - the free spirit of man. He holds that man, and not the state, is the central figure in the drama of history.

For several generations it has not been considered necessary to discuss such foundation ideas that underlie our political beliefs. It was assumed that all held certain concepts in common. Nowadays, thanks mainly to the sons of Lenin, we again have to examine our foundations. This is a very good thing. 'Man is an animal' said Lavrenti Beria, 'with civilized veneer. A collective animal grouped together before the threat of his environment. Those who would control him must have specialized techniques to direct the animal to greater efficiency of the state.' The state is therefore a technical elite who struggles for control over the herd. Political power is the prize, and death ends all human meaning. Lenin stated 'Our revolution can never succeed until the myth of God is removed from the mind of man.' The question of God fascinates his descendants like Khrushchev because they realize that on the Yes or No of that question hangs all their thought structure. That is why the astronaut Titov boasted in America 'I have been out in space but I did not meet God.' A US astronaut retorted 'If you had got out of your capsule you would have.' Childish perhaps, but it illustrates this fascination with the topic and we should not presume that these sincerely revolutionary men who seek the fundamental answers may

not find them quicker than some of us in the West who do not seek.

The Supporting Pillars

The foundation for conservatism rests on several positive supporting pillars. The first and most important of these as far as the individual is concerned is that the religious basis of society is recognized. The individual is a divinely created being with spiritual, mental and physical needs and potentialities, and as such is the most important factor in organized society. The recognition of destiny in the affairs of men serves to remind the conservative of his own limitations, and is the controlling force to keep him from wandering into the ideals of possible human perfection and the Utopia of heaven on earth. This religious awareness, usually scoffed at by the liberal intellectual, is the basis of a realistic appreciation of human nature and all its potential for good and for evil, for peace and for violence. It is the basis also for the belief that the government must serve the individual and that the major task of democratic government in organization is to bring about the desired results from the management of their public efforts in so far as they are morally right and physically possible.

Secondly, the conservative realistically understands the difficulty of an egalitarian society except from a moral standpoint. This means that from earthly and material standards equality of man can never be established. It does recognize, however, that the individual is entitled to a claim for equality of rights and opportunity for material security necessary as a means of attaining freedom - but not as an end to be retained by restricting

it. This concept leads the conservative to believe that the rights of men are something to be earned rather than given, and that the justification of private property is vital for 'liberty, order and progress.' (Clinton Rossiter). It is for this reason that we claim all men are equal before the law. The law is conceived as being based on the moral law, it must be based on the will of the governing group. Then anyone who opposes the governing group is an outlaw, and the whole fabric of democratic government collapses.

Progress - Survival or Destruction

This is the age of progress and rapid change. We live in a world that is marked by its everyday miracles. A simple mechanism like television would have alarmed the generation of our parents' youth. One need look no further than the phenomena, advances in health; the wonders of a whole new world in nuclear physics; the rush of man to those long-awaited stars. There are more scientists living today than have lived in man's entire history. While this age of discovery and enlightenment is marvellous to behold, yet it holds within itself the seeds of its own destruction.

Two completely new factors before unknown to man have now appeared on the world scene, and these are rapidly forcing mankind to change its entire approach to current economic and political problems. These factors are: First, nuclear power by which the entire planet can be transformed into charred cinders, and secondly, advanced automation and technology which can now eliminate the greater part of the entire labour force from gainful employment - that is, if

these two forces are owned, directed and controlled by those who are indifferent to the survival and well-being of man. Nuclear power need not be used for hydrogen bombs - it can be used to provide unlimited energy, harnessed for man's benefit. Technology does not have to mercilessly throw men out of work. It can be used to eliminate hunger, disease and illiteracy from the entire surface of the earth. It is a matter of whether or not we have the common sense and principle to employ these tools constructively for the good and the benefit of the human race, and every individual within it. Failure to do so will mean inevitable disaster and unbelievable suffering. The choice has become mandatory. Economic greed and war have run their course in the affairs of nations and of men. There is no place for the inherent evils of reactionary politics, communism or capitalism.

Utopian Liberalism

It is imperative that we retain a sense of balance, an appreciation for order and stability so that the inventions of our gifted minds may be put to the task of achievement and not destruction. In this tremendous sweep and advance into realms heretofore unknown, man has become hypnotized by the liberal ethic of change for change's sake. The new goal for the liberal is Utopia. It is that ideal state of affairs where man is free from the bondage of custom and habit and where he will flourish in the perfect nature that is true to him. It is the ideal state of Plato, Rousseau and Marx. It is the perfect circumstance where man will live in bliss. It is the establishment of world government with universal peace. It is an abstraction - a rational real only to the author's mind. It is, and always has been, an idea which, when attempt-

ing to be real, collapses under the harsh winds of actuality.

Man, says the liberal, is perfectible. 'Evil and sin are not natural to him. Man is conditioned by his environment. Put him in the right surroundings and he will act according to the virtuous creature he is. 'It might be agreed that improved circumstances will lessen social evils, but complete eradication is pure fantasy. Man is a weak creature, born in original sin, and he is not going to be made perfect by the implementation of an ideal state. Indeed, the very fact that so many liberals disagree as to what the ideal state should constitute is worthy proof of its impracticality. What the liberals should have learned from history is the fact that human nature does not change and man released from the disciplines of experience and tradition becomes a worse creature than before. To overthrow all that man has known and to replace it with nothing but an ideal has always proven to bring untold disaster and tragedy. Need we look further than the French Revolution? Even the American liberal, Tom Paine, who had fought so hard for the cause of the revolutionaries, was imprisoned by those he thought would bring the New Jerusalem to Paris. Was Robespierre, or Danton any less evil than King Louis before them? Did cleaning house help to bring out their true and reverent nature? Indeed not.

Conservative Realism

Conservatives then do not believe that every generation should start from scratch, abandoning all the wisdom of the past, scrapping every achievement of former generations. Not at all. Conservatives believe that men

should begin where their fathers left off - working to grow in that framework of custom, that womb of tradition into which they were born.

What then does the conservative offer his generation? It is true he rejects the many Utopias offered and laments the emotional appeal they produce. Truly he can propose only that which is modestly better than the present. For he knows only too well the limitations of the human character. He cannot promise a new paradise for he knows man would be little different and one must change man, not his society. The hunger for power and the lust for self-satisfaction would still remain. The present class of the Russian Revolution is just such an example.

This materialist concept of life and government is very ancient and has been basic to all dictatorial regimes. But the concept that man, because of his spiritual nature, can rise to the disciplined, unselfish stature needed for voluntary self-government is a new and daring concept. Men have only been struggling towards it for a few centuries and nowhere yet has it been given a complete 100% try-out. It is the newest government concept in circulation today.

This explains the apparent contradiction of why all real conservatives are also realistic reformers. This is the basis of Social Credit economic reform. The determination to conserve man's free nature forces them to take up a permanent evolution of change and development. The death of one man or many men does not put an end to the meaning of life which continues generation after generation building and improving character. This is each generation's heritage from the past. Its aim is to

fulfil the most ambitious policy ever put forward for mankind - 'Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.'

Some people may be disturbed and say, 'This is the realm of religion.' It certainly is the realm of faith as any political arrangement has to be based on faith in something, either money, planning, the state, force or on the character of man. Let us define 'Heaven on earth' as a state of affairs where everything is done right, everyone is cared for and everyone cares for others. The vision of some such state has motivated nearly all philosophers, including Karl Marx. When he wrote, 'From each according to his ability: to each according to his need' he was calling for the Kingdom of Heaven on earth - but without God.

Individualism in Perspective

Perhaps one of the greatest inadequacies of conservative thought today is its weak emphasis on individualism. While the freedom of the individual is cherished and upheld by all conservatives, they should be the first to recognize that unleashed individualism is as destructive as unleashed collectivism. While collectivism seeks to level and compel the different resources of man to be lost in a sea of mediocrity called 'the average man', a situation contrary to his nature, so does a mistaken concept of individualism seek to destroy those institutions and sentiments which hold the social organ together. Both are atomistic. While one does not allow for man's natural differences, the other does not allow for man's natural and mutual needs. The theory of 'the survival of the fittest' is repugnant to all conservative thought for it is as materialistic in its embodiment as is the collectivist who sees

little more to man's needs than a full stomach and a roof under which to lie. This concept, then, of a ruthless jungle, where each man struggles for his own survival, caring little for his unfortunate brother, is devoid of both spiritual and cultural persuasion and is, therefore, offensive to the true conservative. Likewise does he object to the collectivist idea embodied in the Welfare State. Indeed today he should recognize extreme collectivism and not extreme individualism as the major threat to our society. In any event, the conservative objects to extremes of any kind.

It is perhaps easier to understand the conservative mind by looking at the men who embodied it most in the past. One knows a man by his heroes. To whom do men of conservative mind turn for inspiration? What is it in these men they admire? Maybe the most popular names would be Washington, Burke, Pitt, Wilberforce, Shaftsbury, Lincoln, Macdonald, Laurier, Churchill. 'AHA' will cry the surface critic, 'Burke was a Whig, Laurier a Liberal and Macdonald drank too much whiskey.' But we are talking of the men who inspire the conservative mind and about the things in those men that are admired. These men had different Party labels and some had none at all. They are not admired for all they did but they are admired for certain qualities. Draw together the qualities and aims that they pre-eminently represent and you will have a picture of the faith of the conservative. They had in common a faith that nations can and should be governed by men who are themselves governed by their conscience, by that spiritual wisdom of right and wrong which goes so much deeper than mere book knowledge.

It is at this point that the conservative mind comes into sharp conflict with the materialist idea of government by an elite intel-

ligensia. Many who regard themselves a liberal intellectuals come to grief at this hurdle. They have come to believe that the human brain can discover for itself all the issues of right and wrong which guide a man's choices. If a man were just a thinking animal, perhaps his brain would be his sole means of guidance, inadequate though it be. A man's conscience guides his will as his brain guides his hand, and it is the will that guides the brain, not vice versa. If a man wills to do what his conscience shows him is right, his brain will show him the best way to do it. The wise intellectual recognized this basic fact.

Leadership Essential

Nowadays the idea is that, if you set up enough committees of enquiry, take enough Gallup polls, amass and analyze all the facts, somehow out of the net sum will arise the correct action. This is not so. It is important to know all the facts but, when all is known, the fundamental choice that confronts us is still one of conscience. In 1940, when all the facts were known and all the factors of power and opinion weighed, they added up to one inescapable conclusion: Britain should be reasonable, save what she could from the wreck and surrender. Now it is convenient to forget that Churchill was called by many a dangerous and irresponsible man for refusing to negotiate. Churchill's decision that it was better to be dead than a brown-shirt, though he didn't intend to be either, was an act of moral courage. It was conservatism at its highest.

As freedom requires good sense and responsibility, so does privilege require obligation and duty. The leaders of a society should not be envied for the superficial privi-

leges they hold because the weight of their responsibility is the cost of their status. It is when the leaders of the people abandon their responsibility that one is justified in his complaint. The leaders of this 26th Parliament seem to have forgotten the Aristotelian principle of duty and obligation as they pass their time in political expediency, selfish conduct and childish bickering.

What then is the purpose of the state? Is it the good life as Aristotle claimed? For conservatives it must be so. The conservative looks not to the political as an end in itself, but rather he seeks it only as a means to the good life. For him the family, the church, property, music, art, books, unions, enterprise, manners, morals and country are the pillars of an organic society that must be retained in the face of the atomistic claims of the liberal. Today, in this age of phenomenal change, we see the family unit being split by the pressures of divorce, delinquency, and total self interest; we see the arts being subjected to a feverish commercial barbarism; we see how men care so little for enterprise, property, church and morals. Consideration for the other fellow is becoming a lost term in English phraseology. Even self respect is a dying ethic.

In Canada the pride for one's country and the love for one's nation have taken second place to the selfish demands of regional loyalties which would dissolve this land and render the years of building and struggle meaningless.

Destructive Negativism

There are pitfalls in this regard for the conservative minded. As with the left-leaning, they face the danger of being trapped by reactionary prejudice. The passion of many radical liberals comes from reaction to what was wrong in the past and they try to take revenge on those they consider responsible. As such they are captives of the past, unable to concentrate on what needs to be done in the present. But the same sort of aberration takes hold of anyone who reacts to what is wrong in the present by clinging blindly to the past. Such are the fearful and self-righteous folk who embrace extremes of anti-communism and anti-anti-communism. Listening to the past they try to go the same way in opposite directions.

Man is my Neighbor

For a true conservative there can never be room in his heart for the arid prejudices of anti-communism, anti-Americanism, anti-British, anti-Labour, anti-Jewish, anti-Russian, anti-Negro, anti-German, anti-white, brown or yellow or any holier-than-thou attitude of being anti-someone else. If man is to govern himself in the dignity of free conscience, there is an equally honourable role for every background. He needs you and you need him, whatever his culture, colour, class or creed. Canadians and Americans need to remember this just now. How else can we remake the world? Unless we do remake the world as a community of free men freely doing what is right, we must inevitably splinter into hostile camps armed with nuclear weapons. There can only be one end to that.

Light Disperses Darkness

In fear of that holocaust men of weak faith and courage cry 'Better red than dead.' It is a wholly false alternative, since there is no need for mankind to be either. The Red concept is as dark and wretched a one as man has ever been offered. Think of the bankruptcy of men who can seriously consider liquidating 300,000,000 people as a prelude to a better world. Nevertheless, when darkness invades your house, you do not try to brush it out with an anti-darkness broom, or denounce it or shoot it. You light a light. The people who sit in darkness are not as we are. Let free men, therefore, work to illumine human affairs in the same exciting way that Thomas Edison illuminated the material affairs of men.

A Practical Conservative Policy -

Summing up the conservative approach in the light of practical application, one might ask what a small "c" conservative policy for Canada would be like. Such is outlined in ten brief points. Small "c" conservatism:

1. Believes in individual responsibility, initiative and enterprise, and the right to individual property ownership. It condemns irresponsible individualism as well as irresponsible collectivism in the false premise "for the public good".
2. Recognises that the state is the servant and not the master of its people. As such it recognizes the power of public opinion to stimulate governments to maintain law and order on the basis that government exists for the benefit of the people and not just for the benefit of those who happen to hold government positions and power.
3. Accepts social responsibility - not only for the individual but also for the state, acting on behalf of all individuals in those matters wherein collective action can alone be effective in attaining desirable results. This applies to economic policies as well as to health, welfare and education. The conservative really believes he is his brother's keeper as a moral concept - not a legislative one - that he cannot be indifferent to the needs of his neighbour, whether that neighbour is next door or in some distant land.
4. Respects the rights of the working man to fair wages and good working conditions, and also the right to bargain for improvement in both. However, it also recognises trade unionism as the servant of the worker and not his master. Herein is involved the preservation of the fruits of labour or the savings of labour particularly in light of technical progress and automation, which would hold the machine as the means to an easier and better living in the inevitable age of leisure which awaits on the threshold.
5. Maintains that freedom of economic opportunity and security are equally important as the freedoms of speech, of the press, of worship and of assembly, irrespective of colour, race or creed.

6. Leads in international co-operation but in respect of local and national sovereignty. It sees governmental aid not as a crutch for permanent support but as a temporary help to assist nations, as with individuals, in being better able to help themselves. It shares responsibility for the peaceful development of the world but recognizes a positive role in achieving that end.

7. Regards freer trade as essential in the modern world and in the progressive elimination of artificial trade barriers which hinder the exchange of goods. The survival of developing and developed nations together depends on mutually advantageous trade agreements with financial arrangements geared to this objective.

8. Demands that governmental operations and expenditure be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis with the elimination of all discriminatory and inequitable taxes. Allowing for contingent essential public capital development, deficit budgets, ever-increasing tax loads and pyramiding government debt must cease. Discrimination or restrictive financial policies must be eliminated, allowing for the effective incentives and awards to private enterprise. (Likewise the natural resources of Canada must be efficiently conserved and effectively developed for the benefit of all Canadians.)

9. Assures Canadians that constitutional rights and autonomy, not especially delegated to federal authority, will at all times be respected and preserved for provincial and local governments. This involves a guarantee that the federal government ceases to follow a policy of power usurpation but at all times limits its own rights to

the proper constitutional process.

10. Believes that Canada "cannot be truly great or permanently strong unless its peoples respect the eternal God and His right to man's worship and allegiance. The voluntary acceptance of this individual and collective responsibility is basic to enduring progress and the dignity of man" and as such will always be safeguarded and preserved.

Such policies demand dedicated people in government, not extremists as such, but those who are firm in their conviction that the forces which are driving us into the waiting arms of collectivism can only be met by a committed and determined counter force. Smug, self-styled moderates never accomplish much — Wilberforce was hardly an extremist — but certainly not a moderate either. Neither was Ghandi. Men with the same selfless passion of these men will lead the world towards progress and peace. We may yet live to see Russia and China become patterns of free democracy, and Canada as well, governed by God-led men dedicated to the conservative approach.

Copyright 1964 by
Aavangen Press
Box 19
Ottawa, Ontario