

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 15. No. 4.

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Owing to the rising flood of murder, rape, looting, robbery with violence, and vandalism in Berlin as the result of the Russian occupation, it is understood that the Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Hewlett Johnson) is delaying the appearance of his new best-seller, *The Charm and Practical Christianity of the Socialist Sixth of the World*, in order still further to amplify the evidence.

According to information published in our esteemed contemporary *The New Times* of Melbourne, the two opposing groups of Jews who are using world-war for their own purposes are the Rothschilds, on the one hand, and Mendelssohn-Bleichroeder (with whom are associated the German Four Big D. banks, Messrs. Schroeders of London, and Kuhn Loeb of New York) on the other.

In the Armistice years, this latter group let loose Bolshevism in Spain, and manipulated South America and Australia so as to give the United States, their main base, an opportunity to interfere.

"The Rothschilds withdrew into France, Belgium, Switzerland and Holland (in the 1930's) the gold which they had in the countries which revolted against them—England and the United States. Mendelssohn-Bleichroeder, etc., have used these two countries to bring about the fall of the Rothschilds who have ruled Europe since Waterloo... And when the victory over the non-Jews is complete, an understanding between the two groups can be arrived at."

Well, Clarence, you see how you've been lending to defend the right to be free.

The Professorial Bean-Spiller, Mr. Laski, in the course of his tour of showing the British Flag in distress, is alleged to have said, "England has been conquered twice, once by William the Norman in 1066, and again by Montagu the Norman in 1931." Now this is interesting. We know 1931 to have been a key year. "England" went off the Gold Standard, and the MacDonald-Snowden gang were painlessly liquidated. If our Australian informants are correct, this would suggest (a) That Laski belongs to the Rothschilds' faction. (b) That Montagu Norman belonged to the Mendelssohn-Bleichroeder-Kuhn Loeb-Schroeder contingent. Hence, presumably, the close relations with Dr. Schacht. If there is anything in all this, then we shall hear an inspiring appeal for Bretton Woods, from the "Labour" Party, before long. But it seems to be one over the eight.

The superior persons who dominated the Age of Reason, roughly the nineteenth century, used to marvel

delicately at the simple credulity of the Scots of the sixteenth century who were split in twain by arguments regarding salvation by Faith and Grace, and salvation by Works. But to anyone who can grasp the fact that the Age of Reason, and its mental processes, embodied one of the worst aberrations of the human intellect with which mankind has been cursed—an aberration which is the direct and immediate parent of the condition in which we find ourselves—it is easy to see that the Scots made no mistake in their estimate of the issue, though they chose the wrong answer. Professor Laski, who says that Christianity has failed (to meet his requirements), and that the "Old Testament" embodies the Gospel of Work, is everlastingly right, and the Slave State is the inescapable consequence of his rightness. He recognises, as his progenitors who used the salons of the Encyclopaedists to propagate their incredible plot recognised, that you have only to deify work, to instal automatically a priesthood which will define what is work and what is not work.

"Salvation," on this earth, being bed, board and clothes, anyone who, by definition, does not work, is a "parasite," batten on the Elect, now installed in the seat of Him who knoweth ye have need of these things. Anything which savours of criticism of this doctrine clearly constitutes blasphemy, and deserves forfeiture of bed, board, and clothes. To avoid the risk, and to satisfy the doctrine, all unearned incomes must be expropriated, and luxury reserved for those whose Obeisance to Anti-Christ is most profound and whose efforts conduce to the enlargement of Sacrifice and the veneration of the Priesthood. This is the issue which underlies every other issue, including monetary reform. "Salvation by Works" is not primarily a justification of work, which needs no justification, but a condemnation of the Creator. He didn't know enough to make the lovely vales of Cheshire and South Lancashire properly; So Jehovah, the God of the "Old Testament," took them over, and made them into Warrington, Widnes and Wigan.

The Scottish Highlands are next on the list; perhaps as a reward for the doctrinal choice of the sixteenth century.

If we had the faintest hope that they would understand what we are talking about, we should commend these considerations to the Conservative Party, as a substitute for "catching the Whigs bathing, and stealing their clothes."

According to Beelzebub's Brethren Calling, the Germans had marked down certain "B."B.C. officials, and the Fabian Society, for "liquidation."

We have always felt that there must be some good in the Germans, if only you could find it.

The Julius Elias (Odham's Press) publication *News Review*, an organ of our new culture, states that the Trades

Union Congress "heartily endorsed" as 'Basic Budget principles' that "Taxation should not be regarded *merely* [our emphasis] as a way of raising money for necessary Government outlays, but as a *weapon* [our emphasis] for the *ordering* [our emphasis] of the nation's whole economic life, a vital part of the general social plan."

"Gross inequality of incomes should be *deliberately* [our emphasis] corrected."

Lord Southwood (Julius Elias) is a very rich man, largely through the agency of newspaper attacks on "property."

"'Ours' they will not touch, because the moment of attack will be known to us, and we shall take measures to protect our own."—*Protocols of Zion*, III, 12.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: August 24, 1945.

PROCEDURE

Mr. Hopkin Morris (Carmarthen): ... If one examines, for instance, the volume of legislation and change in the nature of legislation in recent years, particularly due to the last two wars, it will be found that there has been a great increase. The right hon. Gentleman the Lord President of the Council quoted Gladstone and 1886, when Statutory Rules and Regulations had not begun to be published. In 1889 they had begun to be published, and it is interesting to compare their volume. From 1901 to 1914 the annual output of Statutory Rules was something in the neighbourhood of 1,000. In 1920-21 the number had more than doubled annually. It is argued that this is rather a convenience and that detailed matters of administration should be left to the experts; and that the House, in some mysterious way, is not competent to deal with them. I should like to challenge that view.

Squadron Leader Donner (Basingstoke): ... We all know that the Civil Service is conscientious and hard working, but it cannot get the same daily contact with the people of this country which hon. Members of this House have got, and it cannot, therefore, be aware what the people of this country will willingly accept and what they will bitterly resent.

We had an example of that in the last Parliament over the Requisitioned Land and War Works Bill. It was plain that that Bill as drafted contained many things abhorrent to large numbers of people. Representations were made to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Amendments were moved on the Floor of the House, and, on the whole, many satisfactory compromises were reached. I hope, therefore, that this House will never deprive itself of the opportunity of adequate discussion of legislation on the Committee stage of any Bill or leave our people at the mercy of the machinations of anonymous permanent officials, who, though they do their very best to frame and administer the law, must nevertheless abide by the regulations and rules which are laid down and cannot make allowances for those individual cases of hardship with which we are all so familiar. That is why apparent discourtesy and lack of consideration are an inherent part of any system of bureaucratic control, and that is why to-day I am asking that the legislation of this Government shall be fully debated on the Floor of this House.

If it were otherwise, the hardship and injustices may prove to be innumerable, and those injustices will bring bitterness and discontent.

The first paragraph of the Motion which we are now discussing says:

"That a Select Committee be appointed... to report what alterations, if any, are desirable for the more efficient despatch of such business."

The word "efficient" seems to me to require some elucidation. Some people think that "efficient" means producing the maximum production of something. We should do more harm than good if we were to approach procedural reform with any kind of assumption, conscious or unconscious, that whatever tends towards greater efficiency in that sense is a constitutional improvement...

I submit this fact, which it may well be in the interest of His Majesty's Government to consider, that innumerable authorities on statecraft and political philosophers of many nationalities have long reached the conclusion that the fewer laws a Government passes the better is that Government. That view was shared by Plato and by many eminent humanists such as Saint Thomas More, one of the greatest of Englishmen, Erasmus, Vives, that great Lord Chancellor Francis Bacon, that great Dutch thinker Hugo Grotius, Thomas Hobbes, Winstanley, James Harrington, and that American idealist, Bellamy and many more. Now we are assured by the Lord President of the Council in his speech this morning that so great is the bulk of Government Business, that we must speed up the passage of legislation in this House...

Sir William Darling (Edinburgh, South): ... Mr. Gladstone has been quoted. There have been other Prime Ministers whose sayings and achievements linger in the memories of some of us. One of the great Prime Ministers of this country was Lord Melbourne. He was Queen Victoria's Prime Minister and he was a successful Prime Minister. There was a great deal of peace and happiness, pleasure and human enjoyment in the days of Queen Victoria—[An HON. MEMBER: "And starvation wages."] I look back with a certain nostalgia to the days of the starvation wages, compared with the proposals of the present Minister of Food. Lord Melbourne was a practical politician. It is reported that he met his Cabinet four times a year. On one occasion he met them at a quarter to twelve o'clock and said that he was to have a glass of sherry at twelve and consequently would not retain them very long with the agenda. He said on another occasion: "Must we really do anything?" While I do not agree with such an extreme policy of inaction I shall not be surprised if we are converted to a policy of inaction before this Parliament comes to an end. Why this passion to do things? [An HON. MEMBER: "We are sent here to do things."] The great world moves on irrespective of the gyrations and eloquence of people in this House...

I will conclude that if this Committee has as its object—as doubtless it will have its instructions—the curtailment of the rights of Members of this House, the consequence will be plain. A year or so from now these benches will be empty. The public will cease to have an interest in this Chamber and hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite will have served their purpose because a stage will have been achieved—not a stage created and designed as the creature of the imagination of reactionary Tories—but of the totali-

tarian State, to which Socialism as well as National Socialism has inevitably moved.

POLAND

Sir Ernest Graham-Little (London University): ... I have it on good authority that the way in which elections have been conducted in Poland is as follows. There is a great army of Commissars distributed in proportion of one to 18 voters, and the Commissars are very eager and efficient in making the voters vote as they would wish them to do. If a voter does not vote, he is liquidated or otherwise disposed of, and the result of the arrangement is that it is usual to report that the candidates have been elected by 100 per cent. of the votes. The treatment of the delegation that went to Poland is surely a very salient and incontestable obstacle. It is an instance of a breach of international law and order. When a delegation has received a safe conduct and is imprisoned on arrival in the country, it is something of which to take notice...

Comment has been made on the fact that the defendants, if you can call them such in the trials of Moscow, if you can call them trials, admitted their guilt. Hon. Members must remember the series of State trials which took place in Moscow from 1931 to 1936. They all followed a similar pattern. They are obviously not trials in the sense in which we have trials, but State functions carefully arranged; and the fact that every accused person admits the crimes of which he is accused, and invents some for himself, surely shows up the travesty of justice which these trials really are. With regard to the reality of the opposition to the return to Poland of the Polish communities outside that country, I have details here of a Congress of Polish emigrants. Something like 600,000 members were concerned in the matter in France, composed of factory workers and the general middle and working classes. They passed a unanimous resolution that they would have nothing whatever to do with the Lublin Government, that they would never be ruled by the Lublin Government, and expressing their complete loyalty to the Polish Government in London...

Mr. Zilliacus (Gateshead): ... What has happened in Poland is something which is absolutely different from a general election in this country and from the conduct of a war in this country. There has been a revolution in Poland and the Poles who do not desire to return to Poland—I am very glad to know that they have been offered the chance of British citizenship, or will be helped in some other way—happen to be adherents of the old régime, the régime of the landowners and big business. They do not want to go back because there is no room for them in the Poland of the revolution.

Professor Sawory (Queen's University, Belfast): ... During the last war I was sent out by His Majesty's Government to become the Secretary to His Majesty's Minister in Stockholm and it was through Stockholm that passed all the negotiations with regard to the independence of these countries. As the physician who presided at the birth of these three Baltic States I may perhaps be allowed to take an interest in the growth of these children and I have followed them up to manhood. I want to know, Are you going to allow those three independent States to be absorbed in Russia?

Let me remind the House of the history of this question. During the whole of the early months of 1939 the question

of these three independent States was being constantly raised in the negotiations between this country and Russia. You had given a guarantee to Poland. The Prime Minister came to this House on March 31 and suddenly announced that a guarantee had been granted to Poland. No attempt had been made apparently up to that time to find whether that guarantee would also be ratified by Russia. A whole series of contentious negotiations were entered into and it is quite certain historically that we could have had a Russian alliance at any time if we had been prepared to hand over to Russia those three independent Balkan States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. But be it said to the honour of the Government of Mr. Neville Chamberlain that he refused to be a party to such a dishonourable bargain, with the result that Stalin negotiated with Ribbentrop and found Ribbentrop a good deal more complacent. While conducting negotiations with us, he was also secretly conducting negotiations with Germany which led to the famous Treaty of Alliance of August, 1939...

It was only in San Francisco that finally M. Molotov confessed to the right hon. Gentleman the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that they had been arrested, in spite of the safe conduct, in spite of the assurance that had been given by the Russian Government to the British Government here and which had been conveyed to the Poles in London.

I admire the courage of our former Foreign Secretary who refused, backed up by Mr. Stettinius, to carry on any further negotiations. Then we had the trial in Moscow and we have been told by hon. Gentlemen opposite that these men confessed. We know how these confessions are brought about; we have not forgotten the trial of the British engineers for sabotage. They were forced to confess by methods on which I shall not dwell, but, as our White Paper shows, immediately after having made these confessions, when they were released, they went to the British Legation in Moscow and retracted the whole of their statements, which they said had been extorted from them by methods which had worn them out, and which had compelled them to confess...

I challenge the hon. Gentleman to deny the facts which I give him on this question. Can you expect to find confidence in the existing administration? On July 24 Reuter's despatch, published in this country, reported that 300 people were condemned by a special court in Warsaw for "treason against the Polish nation," and that 6,000 more cases were pending. On August 18 Warsaw radio gave another item which developed this information by saying that

"1,692 new cases of treason against the Polish nation were opened before a special tribunal in Warsaw last month."

If the hon. Gentleman will look up the archives, he will find that there are full copies of these despatches. The British Government are extremely well informed of these facts, because British prisoners were in Poland—men who had to make forced landings from aeroplanes—and others, who have been repatriated and have come back to this country. Their dispositions have been made; what they have witnessed has been recorded. At the same time, most stringent orders have been given to these men that they should not say anything about their stay in Poland. It has not been thought desirable that they should reveal facts of which they are cognisant. But some of them have a most

(Continued on page 7)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 15. No. 4.

Saturday, September 29, 1945.

Sick Unto Death

BRITAIN SPENT THE BIGGEST PROPORTION OF INCOME*

Britain spent a greater percentage of her national income to pay for the war than Russia, the United States, or any of the Dominions from 1940 to 1944. The following table shows the percentages for each year:

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Britain	15	39	49	53	54	54
Russia	22	27	35	45	48	44
Canada	2	10	19	40	54	52
New Zealand	2	9	23	50	54	49
Australia	2	12	25	43	48	44
United States	2	3	11	35	46	46

These figures are taken from a chart attached to President Truman's 20th Lend-Lease report.

The mistake which has tintured the foreign policy of this country for a hundred years—we pass over its origin—is the fallacy that the United States of America is an Anglo-Saxon nation fundamentally friendly to the British. Whatever may have originally been the case, it is not true now.

Not only is the United States predominantly foreign; but its population is either hereditarily anti-English, or originally indifferent, and anti-British by education. And it has a Press which is dominated by interests which are not even European.

During the nineteenth century, it served the purpose of the "City," and notably the Rothschilds, Cassels, and other German Jews, who were aggrandising themselves by lending British credit to build up, with cheap immigrant labour, a successor to the country they were emasculating, to secure the vogue of the "hands across the sea" nonsense—a purpose which was the easier of achievement by the colourable imitation of Americanese spoken in Whitechapel, and the fact that a minority of the inhabitants of the British Isles, and a majority of the inhabitants of Ireland had relatives settled overseas. Outside a minority, the population of the United States suffers from an inferiority complex,

*In the pained accents which the "B."B.C. adopts in reporting anything favourable to Great Britain, we heard on September 22 of a "premature" leakage of figures, alleged to have been prepared by Lord Keynes, reflecting facts already known, and publicised in *The Social Crediter* over a long period, concerning Great Britain's share in fighting (and winning) the war. The case for Great Britain is not 'new'; and the presentation of it (if it has been presented, which there is grave reason to doubt) is the opposite of "premature." The article above was written before the "B."B.C.'s announcement, for which Lord Halifax's broadcast was substituted in Sunday newspapers. — Editor, T.S.C.

the usual penalty of getting rich too quickly; and Anglo-phobia is a not unnatural consequence.

The dangerous factor in this situation is that we appeal to American common interest for assistance. Since, on the only two occasions on which, very leisurely, it has been given, that interest has reduced us to a condition of inferiority far greater than was imposed on Germany by the loss of the 1914-18 phase of the War, it ought to begin to dawn on us that the situation envisaged for "Briain" is that of a stormy bastion for a comfortable America. That is neither an attractive nor an inevitable destiny; and it is to be hoped that Lord Halifax will intimate the fact without undue delicacy.

In the main, the explanations to which United States citizens attribute their special situation in tool-power politics (without usually recognising the nature of that position) are wide of the mark. It was an authentic Yankee, Artemus Ward, a type which seems to have disappeared with the late-lamented Will Rogers, who remarked, "There's nothing that makes men so ridiculous as the knowing so many things that ain't so." Nevertheless, they make no mistake in claiming certain virtues for some of their earlier immigrants (mainly from these islands) *in the situation in which they found themselves*. They were self-reliant; they did not allow themselves to be hampered by rules; and they were ready to try anything once. What their successors have failed to grasp is that this situation was bound to be transient; it was merely a recapitulation of conditions met more successfully and with less assistance thousands of years before in Europe; and that mere preponderance in gadget production offers no promise of the transfer of those qualities to the far more difficult frontiers which now bar mankind from the promised land.

The world is sick unto death; many of the origins of the possibly fatal disease are comprised in the mysterious word, *organisation*, whose very etymology ought to make it suspect—the treatment of *things* as though they were *organisms*, and the treatment of *persons* as though they were *things*.—If we are to escape the coming judgment, we have not much time in which to recognise the nature of the standards we are asked to accept in place of those from which *grew* the derided *English* conception of life. There is a minority in America which knows this as well as we do; to that minority, not to the United States, we call.

Portrait

Let this at least be said of Stafford Cripps:
 His hand endorsed the utterance of his lips.
 Did ever theory fail to fit a fact,
 Cripps, undeterred, proceeded still to act.
 Fearless and funless, formidably fair,
 The perfect pattern of a doctrinaire.

EXCALIBUR.

The De-Lubricators

"As things are at present, we are perilously near a tripartite 'go-slow' movement—of workers, because of the E.W.O. and P.A.Y.E.; of capital, because of future commercial uncertainties; and, in some engineering industries, of customers, because of lack of relief from war-time artificialities, such as Purchase Tax." — *The Sunday Times*.

"Full Employment" and Freedom in America

By Dr. VIRGIL JORDAN

PRESIDENT: NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD OF THE U.S.A.

[WE ARE INDEBTED TO THE AUTHOR FOR PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE IN *The Social Crediter* THIS IMPORTANT ADDRESS BEFORE THE ST. LOUIS CONTROL OF THE CONTROLLERS INSTITUTE OF AMERICA, SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI, MAY 11, 1945.]

I think I had better say to you at the outset that I am not among those who believe that—to quote a recent Potomac charter—"the end of this war will bring the unfolding of a new era based upon a vastly expanding economy and unlimited opportunities for every American," merely by everybody uniting to ignore or evade the economic facts that face us, by agreeing upon verbal flower arrangements that divert attention from them, or by cooperating to compromise with error and evil in public or private policies for the sake of political expediency or "peace in our time," either at home or abroad.

It seems to me that this war is not the kind of thing that any candid or decent mind can grin off for the newsreels or erase by mumbling economic charms or political incantations over its consequences. Quite apart from its devastating physical effects, which have no parallel in the human record, we are dealing here with a spiritual and moral catastrophe so profound and comprehensive that anyone sensitive to truth must be overwhelmed by the confusion, chaos and conflict and the bitterness, hatred and delusion left behind in every country by the colossal struggle for power within and among governments out of which this war arose. To imagine or pretend that the vast harvest of waste, destruction, corruption and demoralisation sowed in this thirty years' war can simply be plowed under with pious platitudes, that you can write off either its economic or spiritual costs with a few well-chosen words and begin again as though nothing had happened to men and their world, is merely childish or dishonest.

The plain truth is that whatever the phrases and formulas out of which the laurel wreaths of victory may be woven, among conquerors and conquered alike the idea of unlimited government has won this war everywhere in the world, not only on land and sea, but in the minds of men; and the individual citizen who was the unknown soldier who fought it is also the universal victim. In every country, victorious or vanquished, his ideas and aspirations are to-day occupied territory in which by his courage, fortitude and credulity he has helped to plant firmly and perhaps permanently the emblem of the absolute State. After a bare two centuries of revolt from it, in which men in most countries succeeded in building some kind of defenses against it, behind which they could carry on their life and work in tolerable freedom and independence, the ancient dogma of supreme government has everywhere returned to the throne, armed with the sceptre of new instruments of power which the absolute monarchs of yesteryear could not even imagine, and arrayed in regal robes woven of glittering phrases like full employment, national income, consumer purchasing power, social security and international stabilisation, which disguise age-old ambitions of personal and imperial power.

You know as well as I do that to-day most governments

and their millions of dependents, camp followers and courtiers, are concerned mainly with the task of maintaining, consolidating and indefinitely expanding the power over the life and work of the community which they won as a result of this war. They may talk of dismantling war industries and demobilising armies—though if you read the news from Russia in recent days you may doubt even that—but nobody mentions or could even imagine the demobilisation of government. Instead of beating their swords into plowshares they are forging them into political action committees and pressure groups and other weapons to preserve the unlimited power and special privileges they won through the war. In the past, war was only a partial and occasional activity of the community, and so the State at worst touched only part of men's lives in wartime; but through this war omnipotent government has dug itself in so deeply and spread itself so widely through the whole pattern of their ideas, aspirations and conduct that its withdrawal or liquidation is now unthinkable for most of them. It is not merely that every civilian economy has become permanently an instrument of military and political policy henceforth. Total war has brought with it total government everywhere, and most of men's thought about peace and their planning for the postwar world is now shaped in terms of unlimited expansion of the wartime pattern of omnipotent government, in which vast structures of State machinery, domestic and international, are piled one upon another on a planetary scale, burying the great mass of individual citizens beneath an immense pyramid of bureaucratic authority within which all independent effort and responsibility become impossible and the very capacity for them must be crippled and may ultimately disappear.

In men's minds all over the world peace looms up as a peril menacing the omnipotence and providence of the unlimited governments by, off and for which their peoples live. As the war draws to its close, in almost every act of government—its persistent pressure for peacetime military conscription legislation; its postwar lend-lease, rehabilitation and world policing and slave labour proposals; its reconversion, rationing and price control measures; its "job-budget" bills, its Bretton Woods and other international economic agreements—one may see plainly the political purpose or hope of keeping the American community and the world in a kind of permanent war-economy in the name of peace and full employment as the most plausible and appealing means of maintaining the power of supreme government at home and abroad.

So I for one do not expect this war, in the sense that I have been speaking of it, to end suddenly or definitely during this decade; and when it finally subsides—to use Mr. Stalin's charming phrase—the political temptations to maintain or resume it will be so strong that beneath the uncertain and shifting shadows of Dumbarton Oaks most of the world will be as peaceful as a bomb shelter and as quiet as a subterranean tank factory. War has become too important to the world's politicians to permit them to take peace very seriously. It has solved too many insoluble problems for too many of them; and when we talk of the

end of the war to-day, we should remember always that our word-changers who have occupied the political temples have become so skillful in the past decade that they should have no difficulty in making the transition from war to peace with only a slight change of phraseology, or semantic scenery, leaving all the economic and political realities essentially the same. If you doubt this, ask yourselves whether anyone in the business community, or in organised labour, or in public office, really looks forward with enthusiasm or confidence to the speedy and drastic demobilisation of government and of the powers which it has got hold of in this war, or sincerely expects that its end will bring "the unfolding of an era" based upon anything but the continuation and expansion of those powers. And when you have answered that question honestly, I think you come face to face with another—not one of fact, but one of will.

The course of events abroad and the global fish fry in San Francisco bring us closer day by day to a decision far more difficult and terrible than the one that took us into this war. As it subsides, we are coming to the time when we will have to decide whether we are willing and able to fight for the liberation of America from unlimited government at home, or want to make unconditional surrender to the system of ideas about the State which we presumably set out to destroy in Europe and Asia in this war, and which have invaded and conquered us here while we were doing it abroad. To make any sort of armistice with unlimited government will not save us from the choice, for we cannot merely drop anchor in the swift stream of Statism on which we are riding, and we shall finally have to get ashore to the firm ground of freedom or go over the falls of dictatorship and serfdom.

This is a decision which is perhaps of less concern to business management than to labour and the rest of the American community because for more than a decade now, business has been occupied territory, operated largely with captive labour and management hostages; but everybody in this country who still wants any sort of freedom for its own sake has a stake in that decision. To-day the question of liberty in America is no longer merely an economic issue, a matter of the market place. It goes far beyond and much deeper than the problems of business or labour organisation. It reaches into every part of the life of the individual and touches everything that makes it worth anything to himself or anyone else.

Nor is it merely a domestic decision, a matter of individual liberty and independence we are talking about, for it will determine where we stand in the One World of totalitarian states in which this war will end, and may finally decide our independence and freedom as a nation, and perhaps whether or not or how soon we must be prepared to fight again for it. In that sense, there is no doubt that the fundamental issues of domestic and foreign policy are inseparable, or indeed identical. They come down to the decision whether or not this country is to remain within the international system of compulsory collectivism, and be kept permanently in the iron circle of socialist states which this war has created throughout the world. Every event in the field of foreign affairs from Hot Springs and Bretton Woods to Yalta and San Francisco makes it evident that this is the underlying aim of all international policy towards the United States, until lately, under the exigencies of war, our government has shown little sign of successful

resistance to it, or indeed of any disposition to oppose it. Instead, we have been trying to buy international peace, by bargaining away our birthright of freedom bit by bit here at home. I think it is one of the greatest paradoxes of history that having beaten Germany we have adopted, or are about to adopt, all her basic economic and political ideas—Bismarck's social security plan, Hitler's full employment plan, and Schacht's schemes for controlling foreign trade, which is "Bretton Woods."

We must realise by now that whatever the military or diplomatic outcome of the war in the West, the essential economic and political ideas of National Socialism have conquered Europe even more completely than the Nazi armies did. It is not merely that the Soviet legions have overrun the Balkans and the Baltic countries and already turned out the lights of an entire continent from Kiel to Korea, but that in most of the rest of Europe, in Italy, France, and England, no Red armies were needed to destroy economic freedom and civil liberty. It had been done long before by the politicians, business men and labour unions of these countries. Our armies abroad have been fighting for ideas—for a philosophy of life and a conception of government—which, in fact, were dead nearly everywhere in the Old World long before the war began.

What is more important is that all of the ideas for the postwar world which are accepted to-day in Europe, especially in England and Russia, assume it as an imperative condition for their success that this country be brought within the same system permanently after the war, and every device for shaping American thought and feeling to this end is being used to-day, as they have been during the past decade. The European and Asiatic statesmen who are planning and building their postwar world on the foundation ideas of National Socialism with a façade of new names, having destroyed the Nazi military power with our aid, know better or sooner than the Nazis did that the world cannot live for long half under socialist serfdom and half under economic freedom. This recognition is no less urgent in the long run for Uncle Joe's totalitarian autarchy than it is for a nation under parliamentary government like England, who must live by trade or starve, and who knows that her postwar planned economy, however complete, cannot compete in any free markets of the world with the productive power of a free America.

So I say to you that the character of American political institutions and her economic system after this war have become as much a crucial concern of the rest of the world as those of Germany were at its beginning, or as those of Russia were after the last war, but this time in reverse fashion, because in a postwar world of socialist states the idea of economic freedom will remain a subversive revolutionary force internationally as well as internally, just as Bolshevism was after the last war. But I think that this fact will furnish the key to most of the postwar problems of international relations as well as those of domestic policy for another decade or two. Whether America can be kept within this global structure of national socialism which has been erected around her political institutions and economic organisation during this decade, or whether she is to resume life within the traditional framework of economic freedom and competitive effort where she left off—this is the central issue for the postwar world. It underlies not only the larger problems of international reconstruction, but

also the practical domestic problems of reconversion for us.

I know that few of us in America are yet aware of these things, and hardly anybody has been quite willing to believe that the question would come to that, partly because we are used to thinking that freedom is free, and can't imagine having to buy and pay for it again, but mostly because in the current debates about it, the real issue is disguised in very shifty economic terms like "full employment," "social security," "expanding economy," "compensatory fiscal policies," and "international planning," until hardly anyone knows what anybody is talking about in these matters any more. You know as well as I do that in this country we have been living for a decade or more in a new Tower of Babel deliberately designed for us by our bureaucracies, under a carefully planned confusion of tongues, in which the meaning of all words and ideas is made relative to the political purposes of the moment, and the end of every sentence cancels out the beginning, until even the most absolute tyranny may commit murder and pillage, condone or encourage slave labour, and maintain concentration camps, in the name of freedom, democracy, free enterprise, or international peace. There is no chance that we in America may make any wise or courageous or honest decisions upon the fundamental issue that faces us in our domestic situation or our foreign relations—if we want to—unless somebody begins soon to nail down in candid and definite terms some of the ideas and words we are dealing with in discussion of these matters to-day, and tells us plainly where they lead. There are many of them, and their meaning shifts from day to day amid the semantic shadow dances of the official word-changers, so all I shall try to do here is to spell out the plain implications of one of these ideas—that of unlimited government guarantee of income or purchasing power, which has been successively marketed under the changing labels of national planning, the planned economy, social security, full employment, guaranteed annual wages and international stabilisation, and has finally become the keystone of the international structure of compulsory collectivism, embodied simultaneously in the full-employment bill in America and the Beveridge plan for Britain.

(To be continued.)

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

intimate knowledge of the circumstances in Poland to-day. Some were sheltered and taken care of by noble and gallant Poles, and from them learned the Polish language. They were thus in a position to talk to the Polish people, and they have related what they have seen of the way the Polish population was treated when the Russian troops arrived. All this was taken down when they arrived in this country. It is all on record, and I hope the War Office will now withdraw the ban and allow these men to give evidence, so that the people of this country can know what is the truth, what are the circumstances at present existing in Poland...

The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket

By C. H. DOUGLAS
Price 2s. (Postage extra).

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2.

"Majority Rule" in Australia

By JAMES GUTHRIE

For the House of Representatives every man and woman of 21 years of age and over has a vote, and this is called a democratic vote. Since this democratic vote has been in existence in Australia and in England for a good many years now, and since the result of this vote has been increasingly distressing and unfortunate for the poor taxpayer, it may be that this thing they describe as democratic may be like many of our other modern institutions—exactly the opposite to what it pretends to be.

It might prove profitable, therefore, to examine more closely what is called the "Majority Vote" and "Majority Rule." In Trades Union circles and kindred organisations, men have been taught to believe that by putting a question to the vote and obtaining a majority ruling they are doing something very democratic; that they are settling a problem in the only possible way, and that they have obtained the right answer. But I would put this one question to those of you who have had some experience in the affairs of life:

How often have you, when amongst friends, put a vital question to the vote? I should say seldom, if ever.

In small compact groups, a vote is only used to register a practically unanimous opinion of people who are prepared to shoulder the responsibilities of their decision. But when a large organisation takes a vote of its members, either the question does not affect the members vitally—and then the question usually could be left to executives to decide—or, if it concerns the members vitally, and the voting is not unanimous, then the minority must be severely hurt.

In a free democratic community, the minority can withdraw from the organisation and start a fresh one where there is unanimity of opinion and policy; but where the minority is not free to withdraw and is compelled to submit to a policy of which it heartily disapproves, then the majority vote is merely a thin disguise, or a cloak, to hide the policeman's baton.

This should never be forgotten, and the various reformers in our midst who wish to compel you and me by law to do what we have no intention of doing, are merely attempting to use brute force on us.

The majority vote, therefore, is only democratic when the minority have some means of escape from victimisation. Where this is not the case, then the majority vote can be by no stretch of the imagination be called democratic.

I have been in an organisation where members, by contributing 2/6 a year, but giving no time or thought to the work, could, and did, out-vote those who worked solidly practically every day throughout the year. You can understand, therefore, that as an organisation becomes very large and the members have various interests, a vote usually becomes a weapon used by unscrupulous men to give legal sanction to their own actions and purposes. This is particularly the case in political elections and in large trades unions. A snap vote is the device of the devil which the dictator uses as a "democratic" screen, thus escaping responsibility.

It should be remembered, too, that when the general vote was given to the people of England it was introduced by the great industrialists and financial interests long before

the Labour Party was pushed into office. It was probably realised then that the popular majority vote could easily be manipulated to out-vote and to destroy by taxation the few independent men who make the life of tyrants so uncomfortable.

How many voters know the man they vote for? How many know how those men are picked, and for what reasons? Those of us who do not like either party, how do we vote? Many people who vote Labour like that party probably less than I do, but they won't vote for the Opposition. The Labour leaders know this—that is why they do not require to do anything for their supporters—except, of course, for the picked few. The same applies to the Opposition.

At election times the voters are caught in a cleft stick; the voters are given the same choice as Henry Ford gave his customers when he made his first car; he said: "You can have any colour you like as long as it is black."

In a democratic election, the voters are supposed to have a free choice of candidates; what you are actually given is the privilege of deciding for yourself whether you will be boiled in oil or hanged by the neck.

And after the great "democracy" has spoken, and the "will of the people" has prevailed, then the permanent army of bureaucrats, officered by permanent Commissars, carries out a permanent policy uninterrupted by which way the people have voted. If you do not consider this a reasonable analysis of the political set-up in Australia, ask yourself these questions: When in the history of Australia did the people ever give permission for the increasing of their taxes? When have they ever been given permission to decide this question so vital to their existence?

When Labour was the Opposition in Canberra they violently attacked Professor Copland and Mr. Essington Lewis and others. Labour is now in office—why are these two men still in power? When the Opposition was in office, Labour violently attacked the Man-power Regulations and Industrial Conscription; now Labour is in office and they want to continue industrial conscription after the war!

Or, to go further afield, why did the so-called Conservative Party in England bring in more socialistic legislation than Labour Parties did, and tax the landowner practically out of existence?

These questions have got to be answered, and they can only be answered by stating that the party system is a fake, that the political fights are mostly sham fights hiding the real issue; that the policy of both party bosses is the same, and is imposed upon them by a permanent government not elected by the people. And this is all made possible by the "Majority Vote."

The permanency of key permanent officials and their advisers, and the source of their power, can be seen from the fact that they have nearly all been trained at the London School of Economics—a school endowed for that purpose by a millionaire; and the disruptive nature of their work can be seen clearly in Otto Niemeyer, of Depression fame, and in Professor Copland, the Price Commissar.

What the members of the present Federal Government think of the Majority Vote can be seen in their attitude to the Referendum.

The Majority Vote in Australia and in the majority of States went against the Government's proposals, but that didn't make the slightest difference; the Government still goes ahead with the policy which the majority refused to sanction. So that those who shout loudest about Democracy and the sanctity of the Majority Vote are the very people who treat it with the utmost contempt. This should be a warning to you, if any is needed.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction.....	6d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
Why You Are Short of Coal by Aims of Industry.....	6d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
The Representative's Job.....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.