

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 2.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 16, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

Perhaps the simplest method by which the fundamentals of the world crisis can be indicated—a method which is involved in the "Light Horse" exploration—is to decide whether or not there is, in the realm of metaphysics, a system of law analogous to, but not necessarily identical or even parallel with, the conception we call the scientific conception of the physical world. On this decision, we can build a framework of human rights, or the absence of them. If human rights are "real" they carry their own penalty. If there is a metaphysical law, as Christianity has always contended, then the idea that, e.g., the House of Commons can pass any law of the realm without reference to metaphysical law, is simply a claim that the House of Commons has no relation to reality, and its actions must plunge its constituents into one disaster after another. The Russian thesis is that there is no boundary to the acts of the State, and therefore, no metaphysical law. As has so often been stated, although with an altogether different intention, Russia is a Great Experiment. We await confidently the great Explosion.

• • •

It is quite beyond dispute that, whether we prefer to use the vocabulary of the Church, and to call the present struggle the War between Christ and Anti-Christ, or to pander to that curious vogue of depersonalisation which pretends that policies can exist without politicians, and so talk of "the trend to centralisation," "the Common Good" or other abstractionist phrases, the Thing in Itself is there for anyone to see. And, as seems always to be the case, "perversion" is the key word to an understanding of it. Unless we are to adopt the Manichaeic Heresy, and believe that matter, material, is in itself essentially evil, then it is tool-power politics, and not tool-power, which is threatening us with destruction. To say that this matter is of primary importance is banal. We have to make up our minds, and act upon our decisions, as to whether the world can produce tool-users whose politics are fitted to justify the possession of their tools: or whether our only hope is to break up the tools. It is along the lines of the first idea that the arguments of centralisation lie: and, like a gigantic question mark, we see in this direction the well-known words of Lord Acton: "All power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

• • •

Now that our local Kommissars can board the American-built transatlantic plane and spend a comfortable week-end conferring with their superior officers in Washington, it is pleasant, as we contemplate the two square inches of indurated cocoa-nut matting which our butcher playfully calls the meat ration, to compose the kind of lunch available in Washing-

ton's many excellent restaurants, as well as in its palatial hotels. Of course, if you want an elaborate lunch, you can have it but we might begin with a Manhattan cocktail, for which whisky supplies are plentiful. Fricasee oysters à la Créole, followed by canvas-back duck, with cranberry sauce and brown sweet potatoes, or, if preferred, a grilled steak of Virginia peach-fed ham, and a good Roquefort cheese, all washed down with a sound imported burgundy (if it is felt that it will not jar with the Manhattan) would induce that mellow feeling which will enable us, after a suitable interval, to negotiate the diversion of food cargoes consigned to "Britain" to the under-fed Indonesians of Balikpapan, who will reciprocate with raw rubber for the new Russian armoured-car-tyres. We can understand that Sir Ben Smith feels that International Socialism, with its headquarters accessible for the week-end, and a really adequate cuisine for the Politbureau and its friends, is a good deal better than driving a taxi-cab.

How long it will take the general public to grasp the fact that Socialism is little more than a clever scheme to maintain selected Socialists and their Masters in luxury at disproportionate expense, we do not know. But there is no lack of evidence.

• • •

As an individual, Miss Ellen Wilkinson, who understudies the Duke of Norfolk, is probably of small and transient importance. But as Minister of Education she is both interesting and significant, serving to bring into prominence a factor which is little recognised, but may easily be responsible for the final eclipse of "Britain." In parenthesis, it may be noted that Miss Wilkinson was "educated" in Manchester.

To what extent the ancestral strains which are present in the population of these islands can be made responsible for the phenomenon to which we are about to refer, we should hesitate to dogmatise. We are inclined to believe that subtle influences entirely ignored by contemporary eugenics make heredity a much less haphazard affair than, at first sight, it might appear to be. Whatever may be the truth of this (and we are now writing primarily of the English), it is a fact that two main types of English stock, both in their way thoroughbred, the "gentleman" and the "cottager," have built up the prestige of England abroad; and a third, of which Miss Wilkinson is an example, and which is predominantly urban in extraction, and related to the Gentile ghetto, the factory system, has wrecked it. And if, in the contemporary fashion, it be contended that English prestige was false, or of no consequence anyway, the answer is that without exception the inhabitants of every country to which the English have penetrated make precisely the same distinction. In India, it is not the *sahib* who has

9

brought about the dislike of the English (if it exists widely, which we doubt), although a skilful propaganda to that effect has been in progress for many years, linked with Colonel Blimp. It is the European shopkeeper and the mill mechanic. It was to Miss Wilkinson's type that such strong exception was taken in the United States that "No English need apply" was not an uncommon addition to a factory notice of "Help wanted."

It is not easy to epitomise the factors which go to evoke this widespread dislike; but one of them is undoubtedly an unctuous self-satisfaction based on not very obvious premises. How much of this is "inferiority complex" is difficult to say. We think that this explanation is considerably overworked. But it is a characteristic which makes its unfortunate possessor a most useful tool for those influences which have been dominant in "Manchester" for so long, and it is clearly a matter of grave concern that our educational system should have come (perhaps only openly instead of covertly) under such disruptive management.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Lords: February 18, 1946.*

### THE WORK OF THE CIVIL SERVICE

*Lord Hawke:* ... The only real remedy is one put forward by the noble Marquess, to cease the spate of legislation founded on this highly speculative interpretation of the wishes of the electorate, and which is disliked just as much in the Civil Service as by the general public. I can imagine that the prospective functions of the Treasury meddling in banking and finance are little liked by the Treasury officials, while the prospect of their owning the mines I am perfectly certain fills them with the utmost horror. I think I have dealt not ungenerously with the Civil Service in their problems.

Before I sit down I should like, however, to make one small criticism which, coming at a time when many new entrants are in prospect, may be of some slight assistance to those in whose hands lies the keeping of the traditions of the Service. I think your Lordships will agree with me that the standards of our foremost houses of commerce and industry are second to none, and that any idea to the contrary in the public service should be severely discouraged. In my six years of working among them I found the Civil Service to be most industrious, clever, not lacking in decision, and of course of unquestioned integrity. I only pray noble Lords opposite and their colleagues in another place, that even though they seem bent on Bedlam, they do not drag with them the noble body of servants of the State.

*February 27, 1946.*

### ADMINISTRATION OF COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*Lord Tweedsmuir:* ... I had the great honour of serving in the Infantry of the Canadian Corps... I found that by far the majority held the opinion that we were unwilling to go further in our dealings with India on account of the supposedly great flow of gold which flowed from that country into the coffers of England. I am not surprised that they thought that. Three people out of five in this country know no better...

I will quote... from the *Spectator* of an issue of January. In his article he says:

"Outside official agencies, a few organisations exist which are concerned with the Imperial tie, but most of these are of Victorian origin and form, are primarily social in character, and are content with an occasional banquet. They are in no way comparable to such influential organisations as the Australian-American Co-operative Movement, supported by a number of powerful business houses, and Australian-Soviet House, with a large Left-Wing and Liberal support, and even to smaller organisations concerned with China and India. Likewise, while the cause of a small nation such as Chile is being vigorously put to Australians by its representative, the residence of the United Kingdom High Commissioner remains empty. Nor, for the most part, have those private individuals sent, or permitted to travel, to Australia by the British Government during the war years, impressed Australians as wholly suitable representatives of an heroic and embattled country. Representatives and partisans of almost every country concerned with Australia are busily engaged in telling Australia of the virtues of those countries—with the exception, save hitherto in a limited degree, of Britain. This is a matter both for Australian and United Kingdom concern. These things can no longer be taken for granted. The United Kingdom should have the most virile representatives, and the best information and film libraries in Australia, not only as good as anything the Americans can provide, but better. A reticent diplomatic obscurity in a limited official or social circle is not enough for a British High Commissioner to-day."

There is nothing in the past or present of this Empire of which we need be ashamed, but we have a dangerous weakness in this country, wrongly accounted by some as strength; we consider the justice of our cause to be self-evident...

The foulest slanders have been laid upon this Empire and allowed to pass without contradiction. Great strides have been made in the dissemination of news, by wireless, by papers and by films, so much so that it has to some extent atrophied the reasoning power of the individual. The man in the street is mesmerised by a barrage of slogans, catch-words, half-truths. In this smoky atmosphere, propaganda flourishes. Malicious propaganda is not buried in the grave of the dictators. Anyone who considers it is, deludes himself. The antidote to it is truth and understanding. That is no passive thing, but a positive force. Any attack that goes unanswered, goes by default, to the attacker. If you do not present a case in these days, it is assumed you have no case to present...

*Viscount Bennett:* ... I apologise for trespassing upon your Lordships' time so long, but the fact is I am so accustomed to hearing this country blamed when I know that blame does not attach to it, and I have been so amazed at your modesty, that if I may say so, I have come to believe in this country tolerance is a disease. I mean that. As a stranger, looking it over, I cannot but think that long centuries have bred a type of tolerance that is nothing better than a very bad disease. We are so tolerant in our attitude towards every problem that affects our country that even so strong an imperialist as Sir John McDonald had to send a letter of protest to this country. When he and Sir Stafford Northcot were going together as Commissioners to Washington it was felt you were almost contemplating giving the whole of Canada to the United States, only the difficulty was you couldn't deliver the goods. That is an instance of this attitude of tolerance...

*Lord Fairfax of Cameron:* ... Certain European types of film and American films manufactured in America and South Africa are being circulated in East and West Africa. These films were never intended for a simple Colonial audience; they were made for European audiences. They are misleading and a bad influence; they give a wrong impres-

sion of what white people are like and they should certainly not be circulated amongst people who are being educated and brought up on the right lines. These films have paid their way already—or a large number of them have at any rate—and they can be circulated at practically no cost. Therefore it will be readily seen that it is hard to compete with them. These films should certainly be checked because of the evil they are doing. However, competition is a very poor method of stopping them. . . .

*Lord Altrincham:* . . . First and foremost I cannot deny myself the pleasure of congratulating Lord Tweedsmuir, the son of my old friend, on the speech with which he opened this debate this afternoon. . . His father was an old friend of mine from the days when we were undergraduates together, and it is really a great happiness to know that he is now represented in this House by so worthy a son. . . .

After the first war, we said: "Thank goodness, our unity has enabled us to win. We have now set up a League of Nations, and if we work for, and take a practical interest in the League of Nations, it will do all that was done by Commonwealth unity, and we can rely upon it to prevent war." That sort of talk was widespread after the last war. It expressed a way of thought. I claim no prescience for this, but I ventured more than once, in the years between the wars to assert that it was not the Commonwealth which would be found to depend upon the League, but that the ideal of the League would be found to depend, in the long run, on the unity of the Commonwealth. I think you will all agree that we should not be talking now of a United Nations Organisation to replace the League if it had not been for the unity of the British Commonwealth. That is a fact we must keep in mind. Do not let us imagine for one moment that loyalty to the United Nations Organisation, deep and sincere and profound as that should be, can replace loyalty to the conception of the Commonwealth and to that great British family to which we belong. I think that the unwisdom of the way which sentiment went in this country and throughout the Dominions after the last war, after all, proved by the event. Let us beware of falling into that same danger now.

That is why I do not feel disposed to agree with the present Prime Minister of Canada when he talks about the danger of setting up *blocs*. After all, it was a *bloc* which saved the world and it was very fortunate for the world that there was such a *bloc*. . . .

Certainly the need for decentralisation is greater now than it has ever been and therefore I most strongly support, and I hope the noble Viscount will endorse, the argument which Lord Tweedsmuir made for building up the High Commissioners. The position of the Dominion High Commissioners is very high here. I think that the British High Commissioners in the Dominions should certainly be built up and that they should be equipped with greater facilities, more power of entertainment and a larger staff than they possess at the present time. . . .

*House of Commons: February 21, 1946.*

### ALIENS: PERSONAL CASES

*Mr. S. Silverman* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, why Siegfried Gembicki, a Jewish refugee from Germany who escaped from a German concentration camp where all his relatives were murdered, was interned in this country for over six years and then sent

back to Germany against his will and by force without means, friends or home; and what crimes this man had committed to deserve this penalty.

*Mr. Ede:* There is no evidence that this man was a refugee from Nazi oppression, but he has nine convictions in Germany and France (from which country he was twice expelled) for fraud, embezzlement and similar offences. He entered this country by impersonating a Danish subject. He was convicted here of making false statements to a registration officer and other offences under the Aliens Order, and was recommended by the Court for deportation. This could not be done before the war and, in view of his former service in the German Air Force and of his criminal record, he was interned during the war as an alien of enemy nationality. When circumstances permitted, he was repatriated as an undesirable alien.

### PALESTINE

*Mr. Thomas Reid (Swindon):* . . . To conclude, I ask is the British taxpayer going to keep on paying money to keep this policy going? Since 1920, the British taxpayer has provided over £13,000,000 to keep Palestine out of bankruptcy. He has contributed tens of millions also on military expenditure owing to this unfortunate policy. The policy of establishing a Jewish State can only be maintained by force. Are the American or the British Government to send their boys to fight in Palestine to establish a Jewish State by force? The thing is untenable and impossible. I ask that this question should not be decided on grounds of expediency, but on grounds of decency. The following words, those of Burke, which I quoted in Palestine in 1938, are applicable:

"It is with the greatest difficulty that I am able to separate policy from justice. Justice is itself the great standing policy of civil society; and any eminent departure from it, under any circumstances, lies under the suspicion of being no policy at all."

*Squadron-Leader Segal (Preston):* . . . Britain has been in Palestine these last 25 years merely as the instrument of a great purpose, and I believe that only as we assist that great purpose to unfold itself, can we hope as a nation to survive. Well may we pray in the words of our great poet, Milton:

"What in me is dark  
Illumine, what is low raise and support;  
That to the height of this great argument  
I may assert eternal Providence,  
And justify the ways of God to Men."

Let us this evening seek to justify our high hopes of this Labour Government to uphold our great Labour movement, in its oft-declared conference resolutions on the subject of Palestine, to vindicate our nation in the pages of history, and to salvage the conscience of mankind.

*Mr. Oliver Stanley (Bristol, West):* . . . I am not denying for a moment the great material advantages which Jewry in the last 20 years has brought to Palestine and to the Arabs, too. But not all peoples in the world—and certainly not the Arabs, I think—measure everything by material standards. You may be offered considerably increased prosperity by Western standards, but it may be at the cost of something that you value very much more. Your own mode of life, we may think, is lazy, inefficient and backward, but it may be the mode of life that you like, believe in and want to continue. In the Arab race there is undoubtedly a fear

(Continued on page 8)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*  
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.  
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 16. No. 2. Saturday, March 16, 1946.

### A Light Horse. Part III.

To contributors to Parts I and II.

Please criticise, amplify or modify the following skeleton proposal:

- (a) The secret ballot to be abolished and replaced by an open, recorded, and published vote.
- (b) The Party system to be retained.
- (c) Prior to an election, each Party to put forward an outline of any legislative proposals together with both the cost to the taxpayer and a designation of the interests and specific individuals affected.
- (d) The cost of Legislation by the successful Party, together with the proved loss to any individual not having voted for the successful Party, to be borne solely by those having recorded votes for the successful Party, and any reduction of taxation directly attributable to specific legislation to be shared as to 25 per cent. by recorded supporters of the unsuccessful Parties, and 75 per cent. by the supporters of the successful Party so long as it may remain in power, after which the gains shall be equalised.
- (e) Consider and if desirable suggest means to make these provisions retroactive over fifty years.

### "The Sky's the Limit"

It is not without significance that Mr. Churchill, in his speech at Fulton, Missouri, made after a conference with Mr. Bernard Baruch, should have emphasised "free, unfettered elections and a secret ballot." The whole speech reeks of Jewish Freemasonry—the insistence on "the sky's the limit" in legislation; the World Police, like the World Bank, above all law; and the use of "Russia," exactly as "Germany" was used, so that "in war, or under threat of war" the Big Idea may be advanced one step further.

If anyone is still innocent enough to suppose that the speech was made without an understanding that our State Socialist Government is whole-heartedly in accordance with Mr. Churchill's thesis, then they are no doubt saved some unpleasant anticipations. But most of the readers of this review left the political kindergarten some time ago, and they will readily apprehend that Mr. Churchill is gambling on futures, as he always has done, and for this reason is not much interested in the immediate reaction to his speech. It is quite possible that Mr. Randolph Churchill may cash in on the "futures."

One lesson stands out from the speech crystal clear for anyone to see. It is little less than insanity to waste time in trying to substitute a "Conservative" for a "Labour" Government. For ten years a so-called Conservative majority

was in power at Westminster. It passed more P.E.P.-Socialist legislation than has the present Administration, and it served no interest but internationalism and Kartels. Anyone who is foolish enough to suppose that it would do any better under, say, Mr. Harold Macmillan deserves what he would undoubtedly get. The present dog will do just as well as its blood brother—if it is given a thorough good hiding for bad habits.

### "The Vital Principle"

"...in the inextricable confusion in which the world is tossing, the State finds itself compelled to take over an immense weight of duties and offices. But does not this abnormal state of affairs threaten greatly to compromise its essential course and the efficacy of its authority?"

"...The Church cannot cut herself off, inert, in the privacy of her churches, and thus desert her divinely providential mission. . . .

"Under this aspect, Venerable Brethren, the faithful, and, more precisely, the laity, are in the front line of the Church's life. For them the Church is the vital principle of human society. Accordingly they, especially they, must have an ever clearer sense, not only of *belonging* to the Church, but of *being* the Church—that is the community of the faithful on earth under the guidance of the common Head, the Pope, and of the Bishops in communion with him. They *are* the Church, and hence, from its earliest days, the faithful, with the consent of their Bishops, have united in particular associations relating to the most diverse spheres of life; and the Holy See has never ceased to approve of and to praise these organisations.

"Thus the principle meaning of the supra-national character of the Church is to give lasting shape and form to the foundations of human society, above all differences and beyond the limits of space and time. Such a task is arduous, especially in our days, in which life in society seems to have become an enigma for men, an inextricable tangle. Erroneous doctrines are current in the world, which declare a man culpable and responsible merely because he is a member or part of a determined community, without taking the trouble to seek or examine whether on his part there has been any personal sin of deed or omission. This means arrogating to oneself the rights of God, the Creator and Redeemer, Who alone, in the mysterious design of His ever-loving Providence, is Absolute Lord of events, and, as such, if He so deems, in His infinite wisdom, unites the fate of guilty and innocent, of those responsible and those who are not responsible.

"We may add that especially the complication of the economic and military order have made of society a huge machine of which man is no longer master; of which, indeed, he is afraid. Continuity in time had always appeared essential to life in society, and it seemed that this could not be conceived if men were isolated from the past, present and future. Now this is precisely the disturbing phenomenon of which we are to-day witnesses. Too often scarcely anything is any longer known of the past, or, at most, only what is sufficient to guess at its hazy outline in the accumulation of its ruins. The present is for many only the disordered rush of a torrent which carries men, like foam on its headlong course, to the dark night of the future, in which they will lose themselves with the stream that bears them on."

— Pope Pius XII. February 20, 1946.



## A POLITICAL SYSTEM

In presenting an example of the first fruits of the interrogation which has been continuing in "The Social Crediter," under the title "A Light Horse," we have to thank a large number of readers for their participation in the unobtrusive launching of a political vessel of, at present, unascertained "displacement." The answers to the questions which appeared in our issue for January 19 have all been thoughtful and valuable. The paper which appears below, the joint work of Dr. and Mrs. C. Geoffrey Dobbs, is published as an exhibit, preceded by the original questions, to facilitate reference. New readers who may be puzzled by the heading under which the questions appeared may understand that this arose from a sporting notion that a light horse might after all move faster and more surely to the end which the tired multitudes of this world desire than the Heavy Brigade whose movements occasion increasing apprehension wherever we turn.

### A Light Horse Part I

The assistance of our readers is requested in order to obtain sound and considered answers to the following (preliminary) enquiries:

- (a) To what extent, and in what connection, if any, do you consider the adult universal vote constitutes a mechanism, with or without modification, corresponding with, and tending to, a satisfactory political system.

In this connection assess, quite objectively and with reference to any observed evidence, the incompatibility or otherwise of the two statements:

- (1) "The voice of the People is the voice of God."
  - (2) "For Thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory."
- (b) If, within the limits you consider desirable and specify, or without limit, the vote is a competent mechanism, how would you confine its use to those limits if imposed, and how would you ensure that results of the same positive and concrete nature, on the political plane are obtained, as in the case, when placing an order with your grocer in say 1896 (*i.e.*, before the South African War), you offered him a gold sovereign in payment?

### The Validity of the Political Vote

**DEFINITION: VOTE:** (fr. Lat. *volunt*, 'wish, vow; to wish for') 1. Formal expression, by ballot or show of hands, *etc.*, of one's wish, choice, opinion, esp. in regard (i) to the election of a candidate for a post, or as a member of Parliament or other legislative or administrative body; or (ii) to the passing of a resolution, law, measure, sanctioning or prohibiting some specific form of action.

— *Wyld's Dictionary*.

- (a) DISCUSSION OF QUESTION (a).

(Question taken with current meanings and within the framework of present day political systems.)

Surveying the evidence:

(i) Great Britain, U.S.A., U.S.S.R. (all vote over 18), all have adult universal vote; in none of them does it constitute a satisfactory political system, serving merely to camouflage tyranny. At its most prosperous period in the 19th century Great Britain had certain qualifications, real but not political, on the right to vote.

(ii) On the other hand the reluctance shown *e.g.*, by powerful forces in Belgium to have a universal vote on the proposed abdication of King Leopold, and in Greece to a vote on the form of government desired by people

there, point to the conclusion that there is some field in which an adult universal vote is valid and could muster the power to thwart the Dark Forces. The elaborate measures taken in *e.g.*, Jugoslavia to preserve some of the trappings of a universal vote also point in this direction; but in fact the vote there is no longer universal, the disqualifications for voting being political (*i.e.*, 'fascist,' *etc.*) not real.

We therefore conclude that it is not so much the vote that should be considered but the whole vote-operation, including as well as the vote the policies and people voted for, and the way of summing up the results, and the limiting factor of propaganda and information available to voters.

Wherever there is an adult universal vote at present we find complete control and corruption of the other factors composing the operation, so that the vote is useless for ends not approved by the controllers, while giving an illusory air of free choice.

We consider the following factors important in this connection:

I. That no satisfactory political system is workable unless those concerned with it hold broadly the same religious or philosophical views: in practice this was so when Christianity was the dominant religion. This is the only safeguard to the social credit (the faith of people that in association they will get what they want) of a system without which any political system will disintegrate.

II. So-called democracies have always emphasised exclusively the numerical aspect of the vote. The development of the party system has caused each political vote to be set off against another different one (thus playing off different groups of the community against each other and creating class warfare) and account is taken only of the difference in numbers between supporters of the competing parties. In consequence (a) many votes are rendered ineffective, and (b) the resulting Government may not even represent the majority of voters. (In the recent elections here and in Canada the exclusively numerical character of the vote was actually used as an argument for voting for big parties.)

The political vote is thus transformed into an instrument to restrict the freedom of the voter by selecting one policy only and imposing it on everybody. Possibly because it can be used to frustrate people's wishes in this way, and so control them, the political vote has increasingly been invading the sphere proper to the economic vote, *i.e.*, the provision of services—post, transport, health, education, *etc.*, and now even goods, *e.g.*, coal, milk in prospect and the intention to nationalise industries.

In fact, any vote, to be effective for its function of choosing, should in itself be a title to the achievement of

the choice it makes, always provided that the voter's demands are not occult, nor imposed on anyone unwilling to take part in them, and that the field presented for choice is amenable to the exercise of preference (*i.e.*, is not concerned with technique the consequence of which is occult to most people).

Next the two statements quoted in the question:

Taken in the normally understood sense, the terms of "The voice of the people is the voice of God" are both untrue and self-contradictory (but after all it was first said ironically!). The Voice of God is understood plainly; but what is taken for the Voice of the People, where it is one and unitary, is a voice imposed on nearly all of them by an unorganised minority; *cf.*, French Revolution, Russian Revolution, abuse against criticism of Jews, *etc.* Let us call this unanimous voice the Pseudo-voice: it is incompatible with the voice of the creator of the Universe of various, diverse and differing creatures not only because it is unitary but also because it is observed to lead often to frightful results and in all cases to results not intended by the separate people who compose the mob, except for the few who are behind it, in whose interests the results appear to work. The Pseudo-voice gathers its power because it is based on and offers a perverted solution of real problems; *cf.* the Pseudo-voice, which in order to remedy the housing situation advocates the hanging of landlords from lamp-posts and the liquidation of the Royal Family; also, the General Election which voiced a true dissatisfaction with the services of the previous Government, which did not automatically mean approval of a socialist government, however.

If for God is read *Deus Inversus*, the statement is seen to be true and compatible within this reference with the second statement, "Thine is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory." As there can be no incarnation of the Devil (because there are no bad things, but only bad uses of them), the nearest approach to it is the greatest perversion of what was intended for the best uses. To keep a thing perverted continuous coercion is necessary, so that extreme centralisation is the characteristic of systems of politics based on the glorification of *Deus Inversus*. On those holding the final power, as nearest to the abstract evil intention which is behind the perversion, will devolve the infernal Kingdom, the power of ruling by fear and the resulting un-glory. A thing perverted too far, however, no longer serves its natural ends, and dies. Some material things, with capacities for good and possibilities of perversion, live on.

In the sense that the voice[s] of the individual people themselves, insofar as they express themselves and not the imposed opinion of the controlling minority (whether or not the words are provided by another), express the Kingdom of God which is within them, then the first is compatible with the second statement also taken in a real sense. And the diligent reader will note that the Voice of the Creator thus expressing itself is not simple nor unitary, but extremely rich, varied and multifarious, each creature fulfilling itself in its own fashion. (Deeds and actions of course are a better means of expression than words of the Voice of God for most people). The two statements are linked by the idea of the incarnation of the Kingdom which is within. In such a Kingdom, the Power and the Glory would belong to God, *as well in His immanent as in His transcendent expression*. To the extent that God is immanent in each

of us, the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory would belong to each of us.

#### CONCLUSIONS.

Considering these remarks in relation to the opening discussion we see that:

1. The consciously formulated political vote is both ineffective to obtain diverse wishes, and at the same time open to so many forms of perversion that as many choices as possible should be (a) taken by means of the more flexible economic vote and (b) short-circuited by decentralisation of power so that people could do what they wanted without having to ask first.

2. When a political system involves the presentation for vote of a unitary plan or policy the only validity of the vote lies in the possibility of rejection. Some negative votes are valid, because all can reject in unison—a negative is abstract. It is this the central authorities fear. Hence the delay of plebiscites on the monarchy question in *e.g.*, Greece and Belgium, at a time when for different reasons elections could not be so completely rigged as in Jugoslavia, say, and people know directly the meaning of what they are voting about.

3. The positive vote cannot be unitary, because all want different and multifarious things, and these are not abstract. Experience has shown that they can be supplied most effectively by the economic vote. Any approach to a unitary positive vote is necessarily abstract (like the negative) to be expressed in such terms as "Freedom." The nearest approach to a united positive objective is in fact the National Dividend, *i.e.*, the mathematical expression of the freedom progressively possible to exercise the available choice. But here again, a valid positive majority vote based on *understanding* of this proposal is scarcely a possibility. The very considerable number of votes cast for a National Dividend both in this country (in the Electoral Campaign) and in Canada expressed in fact a protest against deprivation of access to a plenty the existence of which was a matter of experience; *i.e.*, it was a form of negative vote.

A similar protest against that deprivation of rights which is a common experience of everyone to-day might well take the form of a demand for a Bill of Rights. The very nature of a Bill of Rights is to *prevent* interference; interference being the encroachment most truly realised by people to-day.

#### DISCUSSION.

We have concluded that the supply of concrete results, goods and services can only be satisfactorily obtained by the economic vote. The function of an effective political vote, therefore, is to maintain a political situation such that the economic vote continues to operate and people can associate as they please (even in planned economies, such as monasteries) subject, of course, to the elementary criminal law. That is, political voting has to do with relationships of power where power has to be delegated by *everyone*—*e.g.*, in preserving that fundamental framework.

The following notes outline the sort of framework within which a political vote might properly be used and be useful for the ends of its users:

1. A BILL OF RIGHTS, OR MAGNA CARTA securing to himself absolutely the rights of the individual. This should include the right of property, including right of access to

the social dividend (which social creditors realise involves the application of the proposals of Major Douglas in the economic field). There would be right of appeal to an independent legal system by any individual or group against:

(a) Actual infringement by individuals or groups.

(b) Any legislation considered to infringe the rights of the individuals or groups as laid down in the Bill of Rights. Where such infringement is found the offending law must be repealed, and the person responsible for introducing it, who must always be named at the introduction of laws, subjected to severe penalties.

The aim of this would be to ensure the maintenance of an effective financial system and the removal from the political field of all matters amenable to the money vote, or to individual choice by other means.

## 2. PARLIAMENT:

Those things left outside the Bill of Rights are susceptible to change by a process of legislation. It should be open to any citizen to propose a new law subject to extremely severe penalties if a law, after having been passed and put into operation, should prove to have evil results (*cf.* Description of the Athenian law to this end, appended). In Athens every such law had first to be brought before an assembly of the whole voting electorate (or a quorum of it). Modern States are too large for this, hence the need for a Jury or Parliament representative of the ordinary people (as well as an upper house, which provides a further check). There is no reason to suppose that a vote is the best way of choosing: any process of voting for the individual representative involves prior selection of candidates and presentation of the grounds of selection in any but the smallest community. Selection by lot on a geographical or constituency basis would be preferable, from a panel comprising all nationals by birth who fulfil certain qualifications of residence and responsibility ("Good men and True").

Qualifications for the upper house may well vary in different countries and under different conditions, whether hereditary or by service (*e.g.*, an aristocracy of producers), but membership should be on a different basis from the commons, and inalienable within the qualifications.

All laws have to be passed by both Houses, and those introducing them are held responsible.

The responsibility of the representative is now to reject by vote any new law which is unworthy of trial—which he understands will bring results which he does not want. It is the responsibility of appropriate functionaries of Parliament to ensure that the vote of the representatives is limited to this: *e.g.*, there should be persons whose function it is to present the law to the assembly and to interpret it expertly in terms of expected results, and also a Speaker whose function is to put the matter to the vote only when it has been fully explained, debated and in his judgment its implications have been fully understood. These men must be of a dignity, integrity and intelligence comparable to that of the best of H.M. Judges, and must be highly rewarded, and irremovable *except* when found guilty of perversion of their function by a special independent tribunal of proved men. All these people must have a full understanding of the nature of policy.

After passing the preliminary vote in the two Houses the Act is put into effect for a limited period. The people then having experienced its results are given an opportunity of rejection by vote, (provided it has not first been found

to infringe the Bill of Rights, when it would be automatically repealed on those grounds). A negative vote by a large (*e.g.*, one third) minority would blackball the law, and automatically repeal it, setting in train serious consequences for those responsible for its introduction and presentation.

Here again it is essential that an impartial expert assessment of the results and their relationship to the Act should receive publicity comparable in extent to that given to any other presentation of the case. This would be one of the functions of the Civil Service of Policy, which must be entirely independent of the Government.

## 3. THE KING AND THE EXECUTIVE.

The establishment of the sovereignty of the individual implies also the sovereignty of the State supported by the necessary sanctions: in the case of the State military; in the case of the individual the Law administered by independent judges (backed by force where necessary) whose primary function it is to ensure that the rights of individuals are not infringed. In this there will be need also for the essential help of two other classes of *public servants* of fully comparable independence and integrity, namely, the Public Accountant, who ensures the preservation of the right of economic access, or monetary vote—*i.e.*, the National Dividend—and the "Civil Servant of Policy" (or politician) whose responsibility, again, is to the public as individuals and not to the Government, who provides correct advice on political matters to individuals and to agents of publicity and ensures that the political system is correctly administered (in particular that no 'improper' vote is ever taken).

Special Tribunals would in the last resort impeach those accused of errors or bad faith in the administration of Law, Accountancy or Politics.

Administration of the military and legal sanctions would be in the authority of the King, who should normally obtain and act on the best available advice in making appointments.

## 4. NOTES.

At different times in our history King and Parliament have held roles not dissimilar to these, and a re-emphasis of these functions would not violate too far our tradition (a relevant point since tradition enshrines the votes and experienced choices of our forefathers, adding considerably to the franchise!).

The Bill of Rights would be independent of other law, and would take absolute priority. It must only be alterable with extreme difficulty—in case some other provision might need to be added to it.

We must re-iterate, however, that we do not consider any political system can work properly unless those taking part hold a philosophy or religion in common, which is a source of good faith, and (especially where a Bill of Rights

### DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT: BELFAST GROUP

#### A PUBLIC ADDRESS

in Grand Central Hotel

Tuesday, March 19 at 7-30 p.m.

Subject: The Export Policy—Will it Work?

Questions and Discussion.

is concerned) the only effective religion would be a realistic form of Christianity.

#### 5. SANCTIONS FOR OBTAINING A BILL OF RIGHTS.

Magna Carta was renewed no less than 30 times: when things got bad Parliament made its reaffirmation a *condition of voting funds*. But when Parliament itself obtained the power, the re-affirmations ceased.

#### "THE GOVERNMENT OF ATHENS"

Extract from "The Government of Athens," an appendix to Lord Brougham's "The British Constitution" (p. 449):

But another important restraint was imposed by positive law, and it operated at all times, and actively, though it was perverted, like everything else in that turbulent commonwealth, to the purposes of faction. It was criminal to bring forward any decree or any legislative measure which was contrary to the existing law: the first step to be taken was propounding a direct repeal. This of itself was a great security; inasmuch as men will often be averse openly and at once to abrogate an old law, or destroy an ancient institution, who would have little scruple about suffering it to be undermined or indirectly assailed... by piecemeal. But suppose a person propounded a total repeal of the old law, he was compelled to substitute another in its place; and if this was not beneficial to the nation, he was liable to be prosecuted at any time within a year, although the people and the senate should have sanctioned his proposition and passed the law—nay, although the same should have been acted upon. If his proposition, being adopted, had proved ever so beneficial, he was liable to prosecution unless he had brought it forward and carried it according to the strict forms of legislative procedure, having regard, among others, to the important rule which required direct repeal, and prohibited any indirect breaking in upon the existing law... Every person, be he ever so insignificant, was entitled, on this condition, to make what proposals he pleased; and no person, how powerful soever, was exempt from prosecution for his attempts to change the law, or to obtain decrees inconsistent with its principles. Nor was the concurrence of the state itself any guarantee of his safety. The same body which to-day joined in carrying his measure, might some months hence, nay some years hence... join in working his ruin, and that without an original fault on his part or on theirs; because all might have been formally done, and the event might still prove the change to be hurtful. It is no wonder that the orators and party chiefs at Athens stood in great dread of such a proceeding, and regarded with the most serious apprehension the responsibility which they thus incurred in the discharge of their public duty, if you will, but certainly in the pursuit of their own ambitions.

#### PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

of the domination by a race which is alien in character, in religion and in economic concept. . . .

February 25, 1946.

#### AGRICULTURE (GOVERNMENT POLICY)

Earl Winterton: . . . I end with this aphorism, which I commend to hon. Gentlemen opposite, as well as to my own hon. Friends. Primitive man, when he first entered upon the settlement stage, scraped the ground to sow his crop; then he harvested the crop and protected it because he did not trust his neighbours and knew that his life and that of his family depended upon the food he grew. So it was for countless generations, if we follow the history of mankind. In the nineteenth century, however, under the influence of Mr. Cobden, the belief sprang up that one could always get food somewhere and therefore that one could neglect one's own land as much as one liked, and in any case the idea of universal war was unintelligent. The 1914 war shook that idea rather badly, but under the influence of the League of Nations, and especially under the influence of the

invincible and unjustified optimism of the League of Nations Union and its advocates, the old delusions were brought back between the wars. But I would like to say this: deplorable as it may seem to all of us on both sides of the House, primitive man, with his flint hoe and his club to protect his crop, may more accurately have judged world human nature than either Mr. Cobden or Lord Cecil of Chelwood. So it would appear looking round the world to-day. What I mean is that it would not appear that humanity, in essence, had changed very much from the days of the man with his flint hoe and his little store of grain. At any rate the lesson which the two wars have taught this country is that we can never, at any time, but especially during a war, depend on another country to send us all the food which we want at the price we can afford to pay for it, and that once and for all the people of this country and this House had better wake up to this. . . .

#### SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY LIST

The Librarian asks that members of the Library should add the following to the list circulated to them:—

- C63 *Confessions of a Capitalist* by Sir E. J. P. Benn.
- A77 *The Passing of the European Age* by Eric Fischer.
- A78 *America's Role in Asia* by Harry Paxton Howard.
- A79 *Solution in Asia* by Owen Lattimore.

## THE BRIEF for the PROSECUTION

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

8/6 net.

"... Major Douglas possesses one of the most penetrating intellects of our time; he has a profound knowledge of the 'set-up' behind governments—and he is fearless—a combination of gifts most rare in a time-serving world."

"Major Douglas at his best."

— Truth.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
7, Victoria Street, LIVERPOOL, 2.