

THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

VOL 24, No. 16

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY

AUGUST 29, 1958

EDITORIAL

The World Revolution Gathers Momentum

Nothing has demonstrated so graphically the disease destroying Western Christendom than the spectacle of the major Western Powers voting unanimously with their declared enemies in the United Nations, in support of a policy of further retreat in the Middle East. The British and American Governments have accepted this retreat so meekly, and the consequent further decline in Western prestige throughout the Arab world, that it would almost appear they had been deliberately encouraged to intervene militarily in Lebanon and Jordan only for the purpose of inflicting this defeat upon them.

The record of the United Nations since its creation leaves no doubt that it is one of the main instruments being used to destroy Western civilisation. We warned from the inception of this international organisation and its associated bodies that the propaganda wave of idealism was designed to mask the real objective: the destruction of national sovereignties and the creation of the World Police State. One of the first major policies of the organisation, which was allegedly going to outlaw aggression, was to endorse the Zionist aggression, which deprived one million Arabs of their homes and their country. General McArthur found in Korea, as did his successors, that United Nations policy helped prevent a decisive defeat being inflicted upon the Red Chinese at a time when this was easily possible.

Although the United Nations could do no better than piously condemn the brutal Communist attack upon the Hungarians when these people courageously put the desire for freedom ahead of life itself, it lost no time in ensuring that the British did not regain military control of the Suez Canal. It is not without significance that, although the American Government was prepared on this occasion to play a vital role in helping to force the British retreat, today the same Government is also behaving just as abjectly as the British Government. This surely indicates that the real power behind international politics is supra national and attempts to use all Governments as its pawns.

If the British and American Governments were the masters of their own policies, they would surely not be now preparing to turn their backs upon the problem, which they allegedly introduced their troops to deal with. All the talk in the United Nations and the resolution agreed to unanimously has not solved the basic problem in

any way. Nasser knows this, as do the Communists. The fundamental cause of the Middle East crisis, the State of Israel and the Arab refugees still remain. Subversion will continue and Nasser and his Communist supporters will continue to exploit the fundamental cause. As for the proposed United Nations force, it will be as ineffective in preventing subversion as it was discovering evidence of subversion in Lebanon. Apparently the young King of Jordan realises this and has displayed no great enthusiasm for the establishment of a United Nations force in his kingdom.

We do not pretend to be able to predict in detail future developments in the Middle East. But we have no hesitation in stating that the retreat of the British and the Americans will result in a further increase in the rapidly growing prestige of Nasser. Even the most pro-Western of the Arabs must waver in their opposition to Nasser and Communist tactics as they see the major Western Powers apparently unable or unwilling to take a resolute and independent stand to protect their own vital interests. Clearly the tide of revolution is now running stronger than ever in the Middle East, with the Communists eagerly anticipating the situation where Western oil supplies can be cut off and a revolutionary situation produced in Western Europe as industry closes and unemployment grows.

We have persistently pointed out over the post-war years that the threat of military war was being used to obscure the fact that the real threat to Western Christendom is revolution. This revolution, manifesting itself in numerous spheres, has gradually undermined the Western will to resist, with the result that we stand on the very

(Continued on page 4)

NEWS SECTION

Western Secrets Lost in Iraq: As a number of private individuals and groups were warning for some time of the possibility of a violent overthrow of the previous Iraqi Government, it is surely logical that the Western Governments' intelligence services also knew of the danger. If they did know of the danger, and warned their Governments, why was no action taken to ensure that military documents and other intelligence information was not jeopardised? The loss of the material to the revolutionary Government is being described in the U.S.A. "as one of the West's greatest security disasters." Whatever the truth of the matter, events have again demonstrated that the intelligence system of the West is failing to help prevent the defeat of the West. Or can it be that the information supplied by the intelligence systems is not being acted upon by Western politicians?

It would be revealing to know what Government intelligence officers have to say concerning the possibility of the young King of Jordan surviving for very long after the British forces leave. And what action do they think Israel will take if there should be a revolutionary coup in Jordan similar to that which took place in Iraq?

American Support For Indonesia: If the policy-makers in the U.S.A. were as interested in the future independence of this country as some Australians would like us to believe, they would not be allowing American military equipment to be supplied to the Sukarno Government. Supply of the equipment is justified on the basis of an assurance by the Sukarno Government that it will be used for internal security only, and not for external aggression. If it were true that the machine-guns and other small arms are required only for internal security, this means American assistance for Sukarno and his Communist supporters against those Indonesians resisting the Sukarno version of a "guided democracy." But as Sukarno claims that West New Guinea is part of Indonesia and that the natives living there are now Indonesian citizens, he could also use the American arms in a campaign against the Dutch, claiming that such a campaign was not external aggression. The American claim that there is no need for concern because they are only supplying light equipment can provide Australians with little satisfaction when they realise that Soviet Russia has supplied Indonesia with large numbers of jet planes and other major military support.

If West New Guinea is eventually taken over by Indonesia, Sukarno and his backers will probably achieve their objective through the United Nations after causing a crisis by threatening military action. It is to be hoped that, before this happens, sufficient Australians and Dutch reject the perilous proposition that matters concerning their vital interests should be decided by their enemies in an international organisation, which by its very nature must be the instrument of world tyranny.

Dishonest Editorial in Church Paper: The editorial in *The Anglican* of August 15 is one of the most dishonest examples of journalism we have seen for a long time. The purpose of the article is to encourage support for the policy of recognising the Communist Government of China. The writer completely ignores the fundamental fact that the devotees of Marxism-Leninism are, in the famous words of Mr. Khrushchev, attempting to "bury" the non-Communist world. Mr. Mao Tse-tung, Mr. Khrushchev's fellow murderer has explained in his book, *Problems of War and Strategy*, just how it is proposed to conduct the burial programme.

It may be, of course, that the editorial writer of *The Anglican* is aware of the Communists' objectives but feels that it is of small importance if non-Communist countries pass under the domination of Marxist-Leninist criminals. He informs his readers that "it has yet to be demonstrated" that Communist control of Formosa would mean "an absolutism more burdensome" than that which the Formosans "at present enjoy." It is blatantly dishonest to attempt to equate the Governments of Formosa, Colombia and Spain with that of Communist Governments. Whatever may be said about the Governments of Formosa, Colombia and Spain (these last two are mentioned for sectarian purposes) there is no suggestion that they are engaged in a worldwide campaign designed to "bury" other peoples. Any person recommending that diplomatic recognition be extended to those who boast about their murderous intentions towards the peoples of the non-Communist world is either a traitor or a fool. We suspect that the editorial writer for *The Anglican* is one of those self-opinionated fools who can always be relied upon to give aid and comfort to the enemies of Christendom. It is not without significance that *The Anglican* invariably displays a pro-Evatt bias when discussing politics.

Behind the Middle East Murders: There could not be stronger evidence of a secret and malign force at work in the world than the reactions to the recent events in Iraq. An entire dynasty, with whom Great Britain had been in alliance since the days of Lawrence of Arabia, was wiped out by murderous insurrectionary thugs, yet the bodies of the assassinated King and Crown Prince, together with those of the murdered womenfolk and Ministers, had scarcely been disposed of than the British Ambassador was reported to have been "highly satisfied" with his talks with the upstarts responsible for the massacre. News of the bloody business was fed to the British people piecemeal and without emphasis, and although the new regime promptly declared its adherence to Nasser, Britain's declared enemy and Moscow's palpable stooge, the British nations joined in the headlong stampede to afford it official recognition. Why?

Such things simply could not happen except by decree of supranational forces working behind the scenes. The strict control of public response to the butchering of the dynasty of Iraq and its chief public servants, being instantaneously applied, cannot be explained on the basis of any assumption other than that what was done was not only known in advance but approved—and, indeed contrived—by the secret masters of the world. While the insurrectionaries received the encouragement of Moscow and Cairo, if all were known it might well transpire that the actual plot, like that which overthrew the Czar, was incubated in New York.

—A. K. Chesterton in *Candour*, August 15.

Cleric Warns on Basic Cause of Middle East Crisis: The plight of a million Palestinian refugees is at the root of the unrest in the Middle East, declared Mgr. Peter P. Tuohy, president of the Pontifical Relief Mission for Palestinian Refugees, on his return recently from a month's tour of refugee areas in the Middle East.

Mgr. Tuohy said "Soviet Russia has profited tremendously by the tensions in the Middle East between the Arabs and the Israelis."

There will be no peace in the Middle East, Mgr. Tuohy said, unless the following conditions prevail:

- (1) The Palestinian refugees are given the choice between repatriation to their former homes or compensation, as provided in a United Nations resolution of December 1948.
- (2) The "fantastic artificial borders" between the Arab States and Israel are revised.
- (3) The Holy City of Jerusalem is internationalised according to the plan laid down by the

U.N. General Assembly in November 1947. Mgr. Tuohy said that Soviet Russia "will make further progress unless the United Nations, which gave birth to the State of Israel, tackles this bitter problem (of Palestinian refugees) with foresight, courage and justice."

He added that by justice he meant "especially justice for the one million Palestine Arab refugees who do not wish a daily dole of bread." Mgr. Tuohy stated that during his visits to refugee areas in the Middle East he was consoled to see what progress has been made by the U.N. Relief and Work Agency, the Pontifical Relief Mission for Palestine Refugees, and other voluntary agencies, in caring for the refugees.

"However, I am more than ever convinced," he asserted, "that all these wonderful humanitarian efforts on behalf of the Palestine refugees are simply stop-gap measures on a day-to-day programme, and there will be no peace in the Middle East until the Arab-Israeli conflict is settled equitably and justly."

Asian Students and Communism: Professor O'Connell, Dean of the Faculty of Law in the University of Adelaide, writes in an article in the U.S. Jesuit journal, *America* (June 28) of his views concerning Asian students studying in Australia under the Colombo Plan. These views, based upon first hand experience, confirm what we have consistently pointed out: That the training of Asian students in Western Universities is producing an increasing number of future Asian leaders whose pro-Socialist outlook will be of tremendous value to the Communists.

Professor O'Connell makes the following comments: "Socialism in some form or another is an inevitable concomitant of Asian and African nationalism. And at this point there is a split on methods, the Communists offering one blueprint, those who wish to salvage the democratic process another. There is a tendency, however, for all to unite in opposition to imperialist capitalism and to the perpetuation of colonial evils All this means that the uncommitted African or Asian, because he is a nationalist, is in danger of 'fellow-travelling' on issues which serve to establish the platforms of ultimate Soviet success."

The growing anti-Western campaign in Asian and African countries is in fact being subsidised by the peoples of the Western countries. This anti-Western campaign is a vital part of the world revolution now so close to achieving the objectives sought by its promoters. Universities everywhere have increasingly become hotbeds for the production of students prepared to help the revolution advance.

SPECIAL CAMPAIGN IS HAVING IMPACT

The special campaign to bring to the attention of responsible people the realities underlying the Middle East situation is demonstrating once again what a small number of dedicated individuals can do in a crisis. There has been a most encouraging response to the League of Rights brochure, *The Basic Cause of the Middle East Crisis* that has already had a big impact.

We have seen several newspaper editorials obviously influenced by the brochure. At least one well-known radio commentator has used the material, while a number of clergymen have requested further supplies of the brochure for distribution. During the debate at Canberra on the Middle East, the contribution of Mr. D. J. Killen, Liberal M.H.R. from Brisbane, was widely commented upon. Immediately following this courageous address, which dealt with the Zionist cause of the Middle East troubles, the A.B.C. switchboards in Sydney and Melbourne were jammed by calls from electors asking for the name of the last speaker.

Favourable reactions to Mr. Eric Butler's recent Melbourne address on the Middle East continue to come in. Already the tape recording of this address is being used. It is an excellent tape and further copies can be supplied to those who can obtain the use of a tape recording machine. Here is a chance for all to hear one of Mr. Butler's most important addresses.

Accompanied by the Treasurer of the League of Rights, Mr. Butler visited Geelong and spoke to a group of leading businessmen last week. A representative of another Geelong organisation immediately made arrangements for Mr. Butler to address members of this organisation at an early date. On last Sunday week Mr. Dyason addressed a Church organisation on the Middle East situation in relationship to the world plot against Christendom. Again there was intense interest and a desire to distribute the facts. Another League of Rights representative, Mr. W. J. Carruthers, has addressed the Box Hill Business Men's Club on the issue. He was also well received and found that he had answered satisfactorily many of the questions which his listeners had been asking about the Middle East.

The first edition of *The Basic Cause of the Middle East Crisis* is now exhausted and a further edition is being published to meet the con-

tinuing demand. Further funds are also urgently required to ensure that there is no financial holdup to the intense mailing campaign still being conducted from League of Rights headquarters. We again urge all *New Times* supporters who have not already done so to obtain a supply of the brochure and to post to selected people in their district. Make certain that the clergy, schoolteachers, police, doctors, local councillors, and similar people receive copies. And do not overlook any contacts in the armed services. Keep the campaign moving. There is not a moment to be lost. The League of Rights will shortly issue another brochure, exposing the United Nations Organisation as a major instrument of the international power groups working for world domination. But it is essential that there first be an effective coverage with the first brochure.

Book For Dinner And Seminar

We request all those supporters intending to attend this year's Annual Dinner, to be held on Friday, September 19, to let us know immediately in order that organisational arrangements can be made. We would also appreciate it if those attending the dinner would also indicate if they are attending the Seminar on the Saturday. This information is necessary for the arranging of afternoon tea at the afternoon session of the Seminar. The donation to this year's dinner will be 35/- per person. Seminar costs will be covered by a collection at the door.

WORLD REVOLUTION GATHERS MOMENTUM

(Continued from page 1)

edge of the abyss. The situation has now probably deteriorated to the stage where we must be prepared for further disasters. But determined and correct action by genuine patriots everywhere can still prove decisive in rallying support for policies of salvation and an ultimate rebirth of Christian Civilisation. The promoters of world revolution, the international Money Power, must be fearlessly exposed and their policies opposed. There is clearly not a moment to be lost if we are to survive the storm which it appears that now only a miracle can avert. Victory can still come out of disaster if we display both the will and courage to turn the tide before it completely engulfs us.

ARTICLE SECTION

THE POLICY OF A PHILOSOPHY

By C. H. Douglas

I don't know that anything that I am going to say to you is of any transcendent importance. It is very largely a question of emphasising things which, in one way or another, you know probably fairly well at the present time, but which, like so many other things connected with this subject in which we are all interested, have certain very subtle emphases. I have come to the conclusion, and others in the Social Credit movement, so-called, have come to the conclusion with me I think, about these very slight differences of understanding—the very slight differences of emphasis one may place upon certain things, which are quite familiar in one form but which if you put a slightly different emphasis on them, appear in a different light—that it is indeed, in this different emphasis that the most important thing which we have to contribute may be said to reside: and to begin with, I am going to define two words which will be used a good deal in what I have to say and a good deal in what you all have to do, and the first of them is "policy."

We have had a certain amount of correspondence in regard to the use of this word "policy", and it is not a bad thing. I think, to go back to the etymological roots of a word: it may not lead to anything, but sometimes it does. Policy is allied to "police" and has, I think, much the same meaning. The just, original meaning was that it was Civil Government applied to a recognised objective. There is a meaning of objective, a strong essence of objective, in the word "policy". It is not merely administration. It is actually, if you like, governmental action, but it is action taken towards a recognised and conscious objective, and it is in that sense that we use the word "policy"; it is a little more, but it comprehends and comprises the word objective. That is the first word.

The second word that I am going to define, for my own purpose if you like, is the word "religion".

Now the word "religion", again going back to its etymological derivations, derives from a word meaning to bind back; it is related to the word ligament, and so forth, and sometimes it is defined as meaning to bind. Well, it obviously would have a slightly unpleasant flavour if you define it as being to bind, but I think that the agreed definition, its original meaning, was to bind back. In the sense that I am going to use it, and I think I will be using it correctly, the word religion has to do with a conception of reality. It is the binding back either of action, or of policy—particularly of policy in the sense that I was using the word policy—to reality. In so far

as it means to bind back, to bring into close relation again, and in that sense I am going to use it, religion is any sort of doctrine which is based on an attempt to relate action to some conception of reality. It does not necessarily mean, for instance, that your conception of reality is a correct one, but it does mean that you are postulating that there is something which we refer to as real, and you are basing your policy upon that reality.

Not very long ago, a very competent member of the Social Credit Movement, in whose opinion I place great faith, said he thought the Secretariat and, on the whole, the Movement which was closely associated with it, was extraordinarily good, but that he thought the morale of the Social Credit Movement as a whole was bad, and he wanted ultimately to consider that state of affairs, from what it arose, and what could be done about it. Well now, first as to the facts. A little later, I shall come to one more definition of what we mean by Social Credit—but first as to the facts.

In a great many people's minds, Social Credit is a scheme of monetary reform, and the explanation of why any scheme of monetary reform at the present time is having rather heavy going, of course, is because we are all suffering under a wave of so-called "prosperity" and obviously, if your conception of Social Credit is that it is merely a scheme of monetary reform you will follow the curve of monetary reform. When things are bad monetary reform is always on the upgrade, and on the downgrade, at any rate temporarily, when things are a little bit better, and although I think we should all agree, those of us who really know anything about what is the position of this country, that there is a great deal more hot air than prosperity at the present time, the fact is indubitable that through rearmament, and things of that kind, there is more money being distributed and people are better off. I think it is very patchy, but at the same time, there is such a state of affairs; so that in the narrow sense of a scheme of monetary reform, it is perfectly easy to see why, just at the moment, we should not be especially progressive or making the headway perhaps, that people think we ought to make. But, in my opinion, it is a very superficial definition of Social Credit that it is merely a scheme of monetary reform; and this is where the definitions I insisted on come in to some extent.

Social Credit is the policy of a philosophy. It is something, based on what you profoundly believe—what at any rate, I profoundly believe, and hope you will—to be a portion of reality. It is probably a very small portion, but we have glimpsed a portion of reality, and that conception of reality is a philosophy, and the action that we take based upon that conception is a policy, and that

*This important address was given to a Conference of Social Crediters in London on June 26, 1937.

policy is Social Credit. It is in fact a policy based upon a philosophy, which is, incidentally, why, in many cases, it is no use arguing with many people about the technics of Social Credit, because they don't agree with your philosophy; often they don't even understand it, and, therefore, what you say in regard to policy and technics sounds like a loud noise to them, chiefly without any sense; and the best thing to do in the circumstances is, of course, to agree to differ.

About the middle of the 17th Century we had a Civil War in this country between the Stuarts who were the protagonists of a theory of the Divine Right of Kings, and the Roundheads—the Whigs and the Puritans. It is a very unfortunate thing that very often the best causes have the worst protagonists, for there could probably not have been worse protagonists of what in one particular sense was a very sound thesis, than the Stuarts. I am not going to suggest that there is any reality about the Divine Right of Kings, because whatever there may have been in ante-diluvian ages, no one would be foolish enough to suggest that now. But the point I want to make is this: It was a perfectly logical proposition to have a civil war about the Divine Right of Kings, and the State Church—the particular sort of church—and even to have an idea that the King could impress a religion upon the country, and at the same time have a particular policy. If there is one thing, which seems to me beyond dispute, it is that you cannot have a policy (here I use the word again in the way in which I have defined it), the policy of a country, policy of a race, or of a nation, without having a philosophy behind it. You cannot have a bridge without a model and drawing behind it, or without having had a desire to have a bridge. You might as well say the Sydney Bridge just grew although nobody had ever said they wanted a bridge. I am absolutely convinced myself that there must be somewhere behind the policy a philosophy, or you cannot have a policy. Now, if you remember, the religious aspect of the Civil War was freedom of conscience, so-called; in other words, you were to be allowed, and you very rapidly did have, under the Protectorate, 57 religions, all different, and the only reason that you did not have 570 religions was that people could not think quickly enough. I am not saying that any of them was either right or wrong. I am not interested. The rather subtle point I am trying to make is this—that the philosophies in the mind of the people in the country became completely chaotic, and that left the way open to the dominance of a philosophy, which was not any one of them. I am not suggesting that the philosophy before the rise of the Protectorate was a right philosophy. What I am saying is that the attempt of the Stuarts was to have a unified principle behind their policy, and that it was completely offset under the plea of freedom of conscience, out of which there could not possibly come a coherent policy, nor did there.

The rise of the Protectorate, as, of course, we know, was financed by Manesseh ben Israel; and the first Act of the Protectorate was to readmit the Jews into England,

possibly a good and sound thing§, but it had the undoubted effect of elevating Whiggism, which with one very short interval, that of the Restoration, has been dominant in this country ever since; and Whiggism is abstractionism. I am not here as a protagonist of Christianity (in fact I am eventually going to talk about "Local Objectives", and I am getting there, though you may not think so!), but Whiggism is abstractionism, and this country, which is allegedly a Christian country, is probably the greatest exponent of abstractionism as a national policy in the world today. The whole of our protestations as to the way in which we govern our actions allege it to be Christian—as I say. I am not here as a protagonist of Christianity, I am looking at this from a very different point of view—but our actions in this country—our penal system, our industrial system, our methods of dealing with criminals and our methods of dealing with business—actually have no relationship whatever to Christianity or anything which could be remotely related to it at all.

Our policy, so far as it can be defined, and the policy of this country, by common consent of all other countries, is the most difficult to disentangle, is related philosophically to the adulation of money. Money is an abstraction. Money is a thing of no value whatever. Money is nothing but an accounting system. Money is nothing worthy of any attention at all, but we base the whole of our actions, the whole of our policy, on the pursuit of money; and the consequence, of course, is that we become the prey of mere abstractions like the necessity for providing employment. That is where Whiggism is so successful in that it puts forward in a moral form something, which it is extraordinarily difficult to disentangle from its slyness, something that, in fact, it is not really aiming at at all. What is being aimed at so far as you can put it in a few words is a pyramidal slavery system by which people are kept in their places, and it is done by elevating things into rewards, and giving them values, which don't exist. For instance, take the Honours system in this country. Anybody of common sense knows that these "Honours" often are brought with a cheque. Well, there is nothing honourable about buying honour with a cheque. That is abstractionism—pure Whiggism—giving to a thing quality, which it does not possess.

You may remember, of course, that after a short interim while the Stuarts came back again, there was the orgy of the Restoration when James II finally disappeared; William and Mary came to the throne as nominees of the Whigs. Well their first action, practically, to which you can attach any importance at all was the foundation of the Bank of England in 1694, and from that time, of course, we have been happier and happier every year; And that is where we are at the present time.

Now just as I said to you at Buxton that you had to have a mechanism by which you could bring the desires of people to impinge upon the organisation through which

§It is possible that this is to carry broadmindedness to excess in the light of subsequent events. —C.H.D.

things are done and the organisation through which things are allegedly done, or could be done, in this country, is the Parliamentary system—just so you have to recognise (and this is nothing fresh to the people I have been inflicting my ideas more closely on for the past few years) that you have to build up in some way or other something which will prevent a state of affairs coming into existence such that, when you have, by the efforts of a few devoted people, shall we say, got together all the signatures which are necessary to place pressure upon the House of Commons to make them do what you want, you can be frustrated by a change in the rules. The danger, which I have always foreseen, and which under certain circumstances would be inevitable, and even mathematically certain, would be for them to say: "All right! you have got to the position where you can get what you want, so now we'll abolish the Parliamentary system."

Behind any mechanism, you always have to have a sanction. It is the sanction, which is the important thing. If you have the sanction, the mechanism can always be devised. You have, in the Electoral Campaign, the mechanism which will deal with the Parliamentary system, but you have no sanction to prevent the Parliamentary system being abolished, and a dictatorship, say, set up. We should be lacking in judgment if we were to go forward without doing certain things along parallel lines, and this does not in the slightest degree detract from my inflexible opinion that we have got to push the Electoral Campaign right through, but we have to make sure that when we have won the game under the rules of the game as they are at present, the rules are not changed.

In one of those dreadful books, which are always being quoted against me—"Credit Power and Democracy or some other—I think I said that the essential nature of a Social Credit state was a democracy of consumers accrediting, and being served by an aristocracy of producers. Now that is the materialistic aspect of certain relationships to which we think we have claims in reality and I don't want you to take my word for it, but to consider it for yourselves whether, in fact, in the world that is working today, there is anything working successfully which does not really work along these lines. Nobody knows of a successful democratic producing concern. There is no such thing—or at least, I have never heard of it. It certainly does not exist in the Co-operative Movement, or in the Labor Movement. On the other hand, we have working today, to a certain extent, with powerful reservations, a democracy of consumers. The democracy of consumers is not properly financed, but it is a fact that no producing concern can go on producing against the inflexible dislike of all its consumers; to put it plainly, it cannot sell its goods, so it goes out of business.

Examine that statement for yourselves. Does it appear to be and is it in fact, in the nature of things that all producers must be hierarchical, that you must have

a grade of precedence in all people employed in producing, so that you can always get a decision, so that there is always the possibility of a decision? Anybody who has any experience of very large undertakings will probably know as well as I do, and I have some experience of large undertakings that the whole problem of making these undertakings successful is to devise a method by which you get quick decisions. That is where the big undertakings in this country, such as the railways, are unquestionably failing at the present time. The distance between where things happen and the man who has the power to say, "Do this about it", is too big.

There is too great a length of time before decisions come through; that is the great problem, and in order to solve it you have got to have hierarchy combined with the power to make decisions quickly. Now it goes without saying that if you are going to devote a very considerable proportion of the lifetime of people to the economic process, as we do at the present time, though I hope we shall not continue to do so, you must have agreement on policy. We have all been over this before and know, therefore, that it is in the region of policy that democracy has its proper function, not in that of method, or, as you might say, production. Now we are getting a little nearer to the Social Credit Movement and our various objectives.

Whilst what I have been saying has received, at large, a certain amount of lip service, when it actually comes to doing something about the Social Credit Movement—and you must remember that actually doing something about Social Credit falls quite naturally into the relationship of producer and consumer, just exactly as everything else does, because when you have got to do something everybody cannot take executive positions—you have got to have this fundamental relationship which is one of the primary conceptions of the policy of Social Credit. That you must have policy democratic and execution hierarchical is one of our fundamental conceptions in Social Credit; yet when we actually come to the point in which we are doing things, quite a large proportion of the Social Credit Movement falls into the misconception of producer and consumer exemplified by an American baseball crowd. "A good time is had by all," telling people second by second exactly what those on the field are doing and should do, and how much better those sitting in the stalls could do it than those who are playing. I don't complain, because, as a matter of fact, I have nothing to complain of—far from it; but I am simply pointing out that in my opinion, to get a thoroughly sound morale right through the whole of the Social Credit Movement, this conception—which is one of the first and most elementary conceptions of how things can possibly be done, how it is in the nature of reality of things to be done—has to be grasped first of all. If anybody can show me a single exception, in industry or even in games, in which that conception does not stand, then I shall be very pleased to reconsider my views, if I consider what they see as just. I don't know of any example myself.

Now we are getting still nearer to what we call Local Objectives. The object of the Local Objective idea is at least threefold, but if I had to place emphasis on one aspect of it more than others, it is that it is a discipline, or an exercise. You will remember when I seemed a long way from the subject of Local Objectives that I said you could not have a policy without a philosophy: You could not have a country which was pursuing a consistent policy unless somewhere at the back of it there was a consistent philosophy. Now the first part of this policy based upon a philosophy that I should like to see driven home is the reality of this relationship between the people who are doing things and the people who are empowering them to do them, and I myself cannot see any better way than trying if it works. It is a well-known proposition amongst engineers in particular, that when you are trying something, which is in some of its aspects novel, you want to try it on the smallest scale you can to begin with; make a model of it and see how that works. First make a drawing, then a plan, and if it does not work well on the model, alter the model, until it does work, and in doing that, you will not only find out that you can do certain things, but you will get into the minds of the people who do things in that way the absolute certainty that they will always succeed if they proceed along these lines.

The Local Objective proposal, then, is in no sense something to replace the Electoral Campaign. It is something, which has, as I say, several aspects. In the first place, it gets something useful done. You pick out a local objective which wants achievement, and then you definitely train yourselves to achieve that objective in a particular way by the tools which on a small scale are those which could achieve the results you desire from the Electoral Campaign; and when you have got a sufficient number of people to believe in the only way that belief is useful, that is to say, belief founded on successful experiment and knowledge—they will not tolerate a change in the rules of the game on the larger scale of the Electoral Campaign to which ultimately you will have to address yourselves. It is only by getting this knowledge, the knowledge which is gained by discipline, and thus only by accepting this discipline, that you will become strong enough to carry out a successful objective on a large scale—only by a knowledge which first of all imposes upon yourself the grasp of the fact that you must succeed if you will first of all be democratic about your objective, let us say, to have a lamp post moved from one side of the road to the other, and get people together to say: "We will have this done, and will resolve ourselves into a firm body and give orders for getting that lamp post moved from the left to the right", and thereafter leave the technician to do the job in his own way. You will succeed, I am absolutely convinced, and having succeeded, you will say: "This is the goods—if we can do it in this little thing, we can do it in a bigger thing and when we do it in a bigger thing, we will not have the rules of the game changed."

That really is all I have of great importance to say to you. There is nothing new about it. What I feel is that we have got to the stage in which we must get out of a great many people's minds the idea that Social Credit is an unlimited license for what the Americans call a "free for all", that in some extraordinary sort of way, by uttering the word "Social Credit" or saying "I am a Social Creditor" or saying "finance is rotten" and so forth, you can achieve the millennium. You cannot achieve the millennium any more than anything else, which has been achieved, except by taking action along lines, which will achieve it. All that you can say about Social Credit, either in its monetary aspects, or in these aspects I am discussing tonight, is that we see—and I profoundly believe that we do see—just a little bit of the way in which the universe does in fact act. We see, through the adulation, what the nature of money is, and knowing the nature of money, we know what we can make it do, and what we cannot. Our power is largely in this fact that we know a little, or believe we know a little—and the sort of belief, which made people fight for religious conviction in the Civil War is an important thing. The important thing then was not that the religious conviction was right but that they believed in it. The trouble now is the people don't know where they are going, or how to get there.

We have something we want to achieve so we have to get into our minds a conception of the mechanism of the universe in order to use it; whereas, of course, the average man in the street, including the average politician, the average statesman, and the average person, does not even know where he is going, much less how to get there. That is one of the chief explanations of the chaos now, and it leaves the way clear to those who have a conception of the world they want. So long as they have a clear-cut conception, together with the use of the organisation which alone can achieve success, and which is actually working in the world, they will continue to be the force, which imposes present policy on the world. That is why the system stays, that is why it achieves the results it does in the relationship between the democracy of policy, and the aristocracy of the producer. That is why our present financial and monetary system holds together. If the consumers struck, if it were possible for every consumer in this country to buy nothing for nine months, the whole economic system, of course, would collapse, and you could make any new one that you wanted. It is the relationship, which keeps it together, and you have got to recognise that relationship.

Our new philosophy will change the run of the universe at once. It will enable you to have a new conception. So if you can do that, and in my opinion you can do it systematically, you will, in an incredibly short time, become the most formidable force that the world holds, because you will have, in my opinion, the sounder philosophy, and you would have, in that philosophy, a better policy.