

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 26.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 28, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

## Social Credit in Alberta (1948)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

The fourth consecutive victory of a Party bearing a completely novel political label at the time it was first elected in 1935, that of Social Credit, is in itself a notable event. While its significance is considerable, and should not be underrated, it is quite easy to misunderstand its nature and in so doing, to minimise its usefulness.

The first point on which to be quite clear is that the Social Credit Government, now headed by Mr. E. C. Manning, is where it is because some of the most powerful Forces in the world have failed in previous attempts to put it out. In other words, the Social Credit *idea* can not only win elections, but it can go on winning elections against tremendous opposition, *so long as it is clear to the electorate that the opposition is being fought*. That is to say, there is definitely a Social Credit electorate in Alberta.

And it may be remarked that there is a growing Social Credit electorate over the whole of Canada, practically unsupported by financial resources, and led by inexperienced but brilliantly zealous pioneers. Quebec may quite easily prove more impressive, because of its special characteristics and greater homogeneity, than was Alberta in 1935.

Now it is quite clear that the opposition met by the first three Social Credit administrations, both during their elections and their term of office, was quite different in character to that now existing. And it is also clear that the change results from a recognition of the fact that the Alberta electorate is Social Credit, but the Administration is not. Anyone who has followed with reasonable attention the strategy which unites such apparently divergent interests as Zionism, Communism, Socialism, and International Cartelism, will have no difficulty in recognising that these labels, taken in reverse order, represent the military theory of the Limited Objective, and the major *tactic* for their attainment is infiltration. Nothing could be more puerile than to suppose that every believer in Big Business, Socialism, Communism, and the Chosen Race is a rogue, or even a fool. Each and every one of these matters is subtle and complex; and all of them are the subject of subtle propaganda. Consider the Canadian Russian Spy Report.

The Manning Administration is no more a Social Credit Administration than the British Government is Labour.

It is fairly obvious that the Opposition to Social Credit which comprises all of these interests, does not care much what the Alberta Electorate thinks; it is what the Alberta Legislature *does* which interests them.

While it is a wise child who knows its own father, it is generally conceded that a father prefers his own son, as well as being likely to suspect the paternity of an imposter. Since the pedigree of a policy is derived from a philosophy, it may be helpful to recall two propositions which, if not comprehensive, are essential to any Social Credit philo-

sophy:—

The first is that it is essential that the group shall have no conscriptive power over the individual; *i.e.*, the individual must have the power to contract-out of any group.

The second is that maximum decentralisation of initiative is in the interests of human welfare.

It is grimly amusing that the Leader of the Socialist (C.C.F.) Party of two in the Alberta Legislature has, rather shrilly, accused Mr. Manning of appropriating C.C.F. measures and calling them Social Credit. I am a little doubtful whether he would appreciate my support, but, unsolicited, he has it, if only on this occasion. Much of the Legislation of the Third Social Credit Administration, and the programme for the new legislature, the Fourth, to an examination of which we shall come almost at once, is State Socialism and Collectivism and contravenes every principle, and particularly the two just stated, of Social Credit. That may not be important; but its consequences are very important.

There is much in Mr. Manning's general attitude to recall Lewis Carroll's well-known contribution to the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy; that in his opinion *Hamlet* was not written by Shakespeare, but by another man of the same name. Whilst it would involve a slight *non sequitur*, Mr. Manning, so thinking, may feel that it does not matter very much if the libretto is written by the London School of Economics. And it is clear the title may be retained, and a good time be had by all—for a time.

(To be continued)

## Hyderabad

The Editor,  
*The Social Crediter*,

Sir—There is far more than meets the eye in the dispute between Hyderabad and India. In *The Times of India*, December 15, 1947, it was announced that a "No Tax Campaign" had been decided upon by Hyderabad State Congress. Swami Ramananda Tirth, President of the Hyderabad State, stated in the Hyderabad State Congress that complete freedom had been given to the people of Hyderabad to defend themselves in all ways. 'The first phase of the struggle will take the shape of a no-tax campaign throughout the State.' (*Times of India*).

But it becomes a very different matter when the people of Hyderabad commence 'to defend themselves' against the ramifications of the tax-gatherer!

J. CREAGH-SCOTT.

Moretonhampstead,  
August 13, 1948.

## The Social Structure

THE FOLLOWING IS TAKEN FROM A LETTER FROM THE SECRETARIAT TO A CORRESPONDENT ABROAD:—

“... The appearance of ‘The Light Horse’ was ‘the unobtrusive launching of a political vessel of . . . unascertained displacement’ (*T.S.C.*, p. 5., March 16, 1946). It began with a major question to our readers and two consequential questions. Taken together, these questions were an invitation to assess the value of our political system and, from the starting point of the answer to that question, to analyse it. A correct analysis could only reveal (a) the nature of the political structure familiar to us in relation to (b) the nature of a satisfactory political structure. Parts II and III, therefore, short circuited the discussion by assuming, in part, that someone had answered Part I correctly (according to our interpretation of the matter).

“What was our interpretation of the matter? That, hidden in every Constitution, implicit or explicit, was a *structure*, which Major Douglas designated ‘tripodal’ or ‘trinitarian’. If this was, at least pragmatically, understood, the society which possessed that constitution worked satisfactorily; if it was not understood, or, if understood theoretically but not made effective in practice, the association did not work satisfactorily. If there should be anything in this, what we must do first is to understand a Constitution, actual or inherent, accordingly; and therefore we must go to the roots of the ‘tripod’ idea, and, having mastered it, see how it applies to human society.

“At each stage in the development of Major Douglas’s ideas, he and to the extent that they are aware of it, his followers, have been obstructed by the same difficulty, which may be stated broadly to be the pronounced disinclination generally to give credence to the proposition that the value of any individual judgment depends very largely from a realistic appreciation of the matters judged—by the judge. *The Social Crediter* speaks often in almost the same breath about elections, ballot boxes, majorities, Members of Parliament, Officials—matters of which everyone has some direct knowledge—and the structure of society, policy, the ‘price-structure’, which are matters which are understood, if at all, by very few. We by no means assent to the proposition that anyone may join these few unconditionally. We should agree that anyone may join these few providing that certain essential conditions are fulfilled. Broadly, the conditions are definable; but that, in its turn, is by no means to say that definition of them automatically secures understanding of their nature. In this particular matter of the proposition that the structure of human society is ‘tripodal,’ anyone who handles the idea successfully must, we should say, have some familiarity with available mechanisms for abstract thinking, be or become reasonably skilful in their use, and apply them honestly and intelligently to the matters which are in dispute.

“The idea that human society has a ‘structure’ at all is, of course, an abstract idea. An engineer’s notion of a building structure is, probably, quite a different thing from a photographer’s. The engineer sees something in a building what is, strictly, invisible: he sees lines of force which would not be present if the building were absent, but which, nevertheless, are not the building, which is a material thing, while they are not, yet they cannot be present without it. This notion of structure, as a complex of forces, is only by analogy made applicable to the state of society, the Nation, the Kingdom, etc.

“It is at this point that the difficulty of following what Major Douglas has been saying lately enters—that is to say, at the very start. The difficulty arises from confusion of the engineer’s notion and the photographer’s: the ‘pattern’ for the photographer is one of red and green paint, or of vertical and horizontal lines of great clearness or pleasantly moulded shading, or patches of sunlight filtering through the leaves of trees; while for the engineer they are not these things at all, nor are they even the hidden rods of steel or the cement encrusting them, nor the bricks, or stone, or girders, or carved woodwork. But common to both conceptions, there is, somehow or other, something that materially isn’t there, but is, nevertheless, IT—the structure. Without this essential ‘structure,’ no photograph, no rooms, no life within the rooms would be possible. Yet it is a purely abstract conception. Now the question arises, how far does this notion itself apply to human society?

“To go far, except on purely experimental lines, with this conception necessarily entails self-discipline and patient individual effort to master first the elements and then the whole of the idea. The ‘feet’ of the tripod are nothing familiar to popular understanding—they are not truly King, Lords or Commons; Policy, Administration, Power; Politics, Economics, Culture: they are and are only ‘feet’.

“How is the ‘switch-over’ from mechanical to the social aspect effected: by intuition, or by experience?

“Probably both. Experiment (experience) is the test universally on this plane of the sufficiency of ideas. ‘Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.’ It is Douglas’s constant claim that, by some special good fortune rather than by conscious design, the English (not, in this connection, the Scots or the Welsh), hit upon or developed by a process of growth, a rational, consistent and workable Constitution, that Constitution which is now the object of such ferocious attack. But what was it that they had hit upon? They don’t seem to know. Possibly this is related to their special qualities, which are inseparable from their special defects: such of the English as have contributed anything considerable to metaphysics have had a strong mechanistic bias: they are ‘practical,’ and their accomplishment is a practical accomplishment; but the *nature* of the structure they built up belongs to the sphere of metaphysics. They don’t understand what they did, nor, evidently, how to prevent its being undone.

“It would doubtless be unfair to say that, for the English, when the Word becomes flesh it ceases to be the Word; but the general tendency is to fall short of the full idea of the Incarnation. We have no experience of principles operating *in vacuo*: mechanisms are needed to express them. But not all mechanisms are molecular; and social mechanisms are an outstanding exception.

“Now, in the mechanical case of a camera tripod, or the metallic construction to hold a lamp or brazier, the identification with the rods which support the object with the ‘structure’ is so apparently complete or close as to lead to confusion. In the social analogy this is not so, and when Douglas says that we have discerned an essentially trinitarian principle running through the whole universe (as, less explicitly, has the Christian Church), it should be clear that identification of the elements of experience with the elements of the abstract structure is less self-evident. But let us start with the simple, mechanical tripod. In the first place, it is fairly easy to see that we can replace one of the ‘feet’ by a ‘foot’ of another shape or material without affecting in

the slightest degree the structure at all. This in itself proves that it is not the material 'foot' but something real invisibly associated with it that is the 'foot' of the structure, the real foot. To do this in practice is very instructive. For example, suppose we replace a straight ash rod by a curved or a spiral rod of steel, the total length remaining the same. In the first case the 'foot' does not even lie where the rod lies, though it passes through both ends, and in the second it passes through each turn of the spiral and again cuts both ends. There are secondary consequences of this substitution, it is true: the new 'foot' is more 'springy' than the old, which could only be shortened by great pressure diminishing its total length by compression along it. But even this familiar tripod is not the only kind in experience. We might replace one or two of the 'feet' by a point of suspension instead of one of support, in which case there is no *physical* point of application of one or two of the 'feet'; but the whole earth supports the 'point of support' by means of some accessory structure, without in the least affecting either the stability or indeed the actuality of the tripod. This illustration should prepare us for hidden features of those tripod structures of a less material nature which we are suggesting as existent realities, as real and possibly more fundamental than a mere prop for a camera or anything mechanical of the sort.

"It would take too long here to substantiate the argument that the analogy between the mechanical system we have been considering and its social or moral counterparts holds. The chief point for us is: does the notion work, and can it be employed with advantage? We say 'yes'.

"But there is at least one other point arising from our consideration of the camera-stand: we can do other things with the 'feet' besides place them in their correct positions on the ground; we can tie two of them together so that they behave as one, or introduce worm into the wood so as to destroy the stability of this 'foot' in its material 'incarnation.' In either case the camera will come tumbling to the ground sooner or later, proving that the 'structure' is stable only so long as it adequately reflects the tripod principle. Further, we might mount our camera on a large granite rock, which might or might not be as stable a foundation for it as the tripod; but, in that case, we have disguised our tripod by, as it were, filling in the spaces between any three 'feet' you like to imagine with unnecessary masses of useless granite. This has an important application to our problem, for it shows that we are not aiming at the construction of something new, but are only trying to gain a mastery over what is old and, indeed, universal, through a correct understanding of what it is. It is not a case of the Christian conception being something desirable to realise in nature, or the Judaic, monotheistic, conception being something it is desirable to destroy: the real structure is the same; but the Christian understanding, we allege, is a correct understanding of its essence and the Judaic a false understanding of its essence. If you act as though the Judaic, monotheistic, conception were true, and tie the 'feet' together, the camera will fall; if you use the tripod principle correctly it won't.

"But now we come to a difference between the mechanical structure and the cosmic structure: in the material case, each 'foot' is in some respects like each other 'foot': it is (1) elongated, (2) rigid, (3) convergent geometrically with the rest, and so on. In our higher Trinity, this is not so, and the 'feet' are different in all respects but that which happens to be its tripod essence. So the 'Confession of our Christian Faith'—the *Quicumque vult* (whosoever wishes) of

St. Athanasius—says: 'Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold . . . ' this faith, *i.e.*, the faith that things stand in stability in the universe in this way: there must be understood to be underlying everything an indivisible substance, not three Gods but one God, of three persons, and the Persons must not be confounded, nor the substance divided. But this, so far as Athanasius could, carries us to the highest level of understanding of the creation and of its nature and structure. Between this level and the purely mechanical level is an infinity of other levels, and, important to us, the level of social structure. At all levels the same principle is exemplified—or so it is our contention; and at each level 'the persons must not be confounded nor the substance divided.' A writer who has very interestingly and powerfully supported this view is Miss Dorothy Sayers in her book, *The Mind of the Maker*, than which I cannot think of a better introduction to the whole subject. The 'Maker' she has in mind is the maker of things—at his best the artist. She shows how there are 'Persons' of widely different attributes universally associated with each artistic production—*e.g.*, the conception, the idea; the arduous execution and at last the realisation, the accomplishment, the whole which could not be but as itself the outcome of all three. Further she shows what happens when one of these elements is perverse or defective. We think you might start with Miss Sayers's book.

"The 'bricks and mortar' of the Constitutional tripod *were* in the pre-Cromwellian order in England, though doubtless imperfectly. We should retain such features as we still possess, restore others and doubtless improve some of them."

### "Peace in Industry"

(MOND-TURNERISM IN ACTION)

" . . . If the industrial worker was to be given to understand that tobacco supplies would fluctuate as the national industrial output fluctuated, then, I believe, we might see results."—A Letter to *The Times*, August 20.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK—continued from page 4.

reasonable hope, and they went about their task with such enthusiasm and effect, that in a surprisingly short period of time they had effectively re-orientated public opinion on the nature of money and its manipulators. Unfortunately, the answer to this tactic was too simple. It was only necessary, and it was done, to put the authority of Governments behind the monopoly of credit. The resulting Monopoly has such command of propaganda as almost to exclude competition; and this propaganda is directed to the manipulation of ballot-box majorities so as to secure a 'mandate' for any chosen villainy.

"In these circumstances, reform of the money system is out of the question. Nothing can be done until the alliance of political and economic power is broken; and that means the abolition of the secret ballot. . . .

"There seems to be only one argument in favour of the secret ballot, and that is to prevent intimidation. But intimidation is a criminal act, to be met by the open enforcement of law. The Communists perform one of their innumerable services to the Socialists by discrediting the open ballot; but that game is obvious enough and should be challenged for what it is. It is now more important to gain open, responsible, voting, than it was to secure the Just Price."—*The Australian Social Crediter*.

## 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. 20. No. 26.

Saturday, August 28, 1948.

### From Week to Week

"We have been told very often, that our grain markets operate under the law of supply and demand. Let us explore and see how much truth there is in that statement. Wheat was about \$3.30 per bushel on January 15, 1948, and thirty days later, it was about \$2.40.

"Was there a greater supply of wheat on February 15 than there was on January 15, and if so, where did the wheat come from? I am certain we farmers did not produce a new crop in the meantime."—A. H. Booth, in *The Farmers' Voice*, (U.S.A.).

"Those [historians] who omit it [the influence of the Money Power], omit the one thing salient, the one thing omission of which renders their judgement worthless."—Hilaire Belloc: *Monarchy: A Study of Louis XIV.*

The attack upon the British Empire exhibits a characteristic which seems to us to be highly significant—it appears to negative the Arab proverb that "My enemy's enemy is my friend." On the contrary, and at least superficially, scorn, contempt, and denigration appear in this case to be a unifying influence. It has been insisted that the Germans are the enemies of the Jews (didn't they massacre six million, neither more nor less?). But there is a group of Germans in the United States which issues well-documented, and up to a point reliable, books exposing the workings of international finance, and identifying this with the British Empire, which it treats as a synonym for "the City." Chicago is full of scurrilous little rags pumping the same bilge-water.

Yet the Jews, all of them who are left after the massacre of the six million, are at one with these Germans, if they are Germans, in undying hatred of the British who, *ex hypothesi*, they manipulated all through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, more particularly after the influx into these islands from the Continent after their abortive plots of 1848.

Now the phrase that 'England acquired an Empire in a fit of absence of mind' may not be—is not—comprehensive, but there is more truth in it than that she acquired it, as the United States acquired Louisiana and Alaska, by purchase. England and Scotland produced peoples who were colonising, pioneering, and adventurous, in excess of other races with the possible exception of the Norwegians, Danes, and Normans. In the natural exercise of their aptitudes, these hardy adventurers established squatters rights, without, it would appear, a clear policy. Prior to the American Civil War, North America was predominantly the venue of these same hardy, adventurous pioneers. That war, the direct outcome of financial intrigue, destroyed a high

percentage of this stock, and reduced much of the remainder to penury and impotence. The character of the post-Civil War U.S. citizen is wholly dissimilar and is what would be expected from a mongrelised flood of Mediterranean and Central European immigration.

The streets and subways of New York teem with faces expressive of a character quite alien to the ideas which justified British rule in India and elsewhere—a character as mass produced as spam, a spiritual and intellectual demonstration of entropy.

This post-Civil War population, illiterate and unprotected, was the ideal medium for Wall Street exploitation, and the interests of the temporarily dominant City of London did not fail to note it. The British had never been wholly satisfactory; they were too homogeneous and self-respecting; Karl Marx commented upon it, and, as Ludendorf observed in his impressive book *The Coming War*, published in 1931: "The majority of the English do not realise that, having done their duty by the inner Jewish circle, they have now got to disappear as a World Power." The "majority of the English," having lost their trust in, and respect for, an aristocracy which had largely vanished, were debauched and demoralised by alien propaganda. This, on the one hand was secretly financed by "the City," and, on the other, was provided with the suitable background of discontent by a fraudulent money-and-price system which was protected from amendment by such institutions as the London School of Economics, founded primarily for that purpose and staffed by aliens. "The majority of the English" were in no condition to interfere with the new instrument of Financial Hegemony—Wall and Pine Street."

The worst period of recorded history is contemporaneous with the removal of the World's Financial Centre from London to New York, and the substitution of the Cahmon Man for the Yeomen of England as its principal tool.

We place so much reliance on the accuracy, as well as the good sense of our contemporary *Truth*, that we are both surprised and a little puzzled by the paragraph headed "Mr. St. Laurent" in its issue of August 13. In addition to stating quite erroneously that the "C.C.F. holds office in three provinces—Saskatchewan, Columbia [*sic*] and Manitoba," the paragraph suggests, if it does not state, that the C.C.F. (Socialist) Party is growing in strength in Canada, and will be the next Canadian Federal Government.

All our information is to the contrary. In the only Canadian Province with a C.C.F. Government, Saskatchewan, it was returned with a much reduced majority, and the recent return of certain Federal C.C.F. candidates was primarily due to the Communists in the towns—a factor which limits further gains. While it is the third Party, in the House of Commons, it numbers less than half of either the Liberals or Conservatives.

We should be much interested to learn from what source our contemporary accepted this paragraph. Its tenour is exactly opposite to the policy of the paper in which it appears, and its appearance on the eve of the Alberta Elections is, shall we say, unfortunate.

"It is now many years since Social Crediters believed that they had only to propagate the truth about the financial system to secure its reform. It appeared to be a not un-

(continued on page 3.)

## The Ballot

A CONTEMPORARY VIEW OF ITS INTRODUCTION

Further extracts from *Selections from the Writings of Sydney Smith; London, 1854: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.*

If there be ballot there can be no scrutiny, the controlling power of Parliament is lost, and the members are entirely in the hands of returning officers.

An election is hard run—the returning officer lets in twenty votes which he ought to have excluded, and the opposite candidate is unjustly returned. I petition, and as the law now stands, the return would be amended, and I, who had the legitimate majority, should be seated in Parliament. But how could justice be done if the ballot obtained, and if the returning officer were careless or corrupt? Would you put all the electors upon their oath? Would it be advisable to accept any oath where detection was impossible? and could any approximation to truth be expected under such circumstances from such an inquisition? It is true, the present committees of the House of Commons are a very unfair tribunal, but that tribunal may and will be amended; and bad as that tribunal is, nobody can be insane enough to propose that we are to take refuge in the blunders or the corruptions of 600 returning officers, 100 of whom are Irish.

It is certainly in the power of a committee, when incapacity or villainy of the returning officer has produced an unfair return, to annul the whole election and to proceed again *de novo*; but how is this just? or what satisfaction is this to me, who have unquestionably a lawful majority, and who ask of the House of Commons to examine the votes, and to place in their house the man who has combined the greatest number of suffrages? The answer of the House of Commons is, "one of you is undoubtedly the rightful member, but we have so framed our laws of election, that it is impossible to find out which that man is; the loss and penalties ought only to fall upon one, but they must fall upon both; we put the well-doer and the evil-doer precisely in the same situation, there shall be no election;" and this may happen ten times running.

Purity of election, the fair choice of representatives must be guarded either by the coercing power of the House of Commons exercised upon petitions, or it must be guarded by the watchful jealousy of opposite parties at the registrations; but if (as the Radicals suppose) ballot gives a power of perfect concealment, whose interest is it to watch the registrations? If I despair of distinguishing my friends from my foes, why should I take any trouble about registrations? Why not leave every thing to that great *primum mobile* of all human affairs, the barrister of six years' standing?

The answer of the excellent Benthamites to all this is "What you say may be true enough in the present state of registrations, but we have another scheme of registration to which these objections will not apply." There is really no answering this Paulo-post legislation. I reason now upon registration and reform which are in existence, which I have seen at work for several years. What new improvements are in the womb of time, or (if time have no womb) in the more capacious pockets of the followers of Bentham, I know not: when I see them tried I will reason upon them. There is no end to these eternal changes? We have made an enormous revolution within the last ten years—let us stop a little and secure it, and prevent it from being turned into ruin; I do

not say the Reform Bill is final, but I want a little time for breathing; and if there are to be any more changes, let them be carried into execution hereafter by those little legislators who are now receiving every day after dinner a cake or plum, in happy ignorance of Mr. Grote and his ballot. I long for the quiet times of *Log*, when all the English common people are making calico, and all the English gentlemen are making long and short verses, with no other interruption of their happiness than when false quantities are discovered in one or the other.

What is to become of petitions if ballot is established? Are they to be open as they now are, or are they to be conducted by ballot? Are the radical shopkeepers and the radical tenant to be exposed (as they say) to all the fury of incensed wealth and power, and is that protection to be denied them in petitions, which is so loudly demanded in the choice of representatives? Are there to be two distinct methods of ascertaining the opinions of the people, and these completely opposed to each other? A member is chosen this week by a large majority of voters who vote in the dark, and the next week, when men vote in the light of day, some petition is carried totally; opposite to all those principles for which the member with invisible votes was returned to Parliament. How, under such a system, can Parliament ever ascertain what the wishes of the people really are? The representatives are Radicals, the petitioners eminently conservative; the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau.

And if the same protection be adopted for petitioners as is given in elections, and if both are conducted by ballot, how are the House of Commons to deal with petitions? When it is intended particularly that a petition should attract the attention of the House of Commons, some member bears witness to the respectability or the futility of the signatures and how is it possible, without some guides of this kind, that the House could form any idea of the value and importance of the petition?

These observations apply with equal force to the communications between the representative and the constituent. It is the Radical doctrine that a representative is to obey the instructions of his constituents. He has been elected under the ballot by a large majority; an open meeting is called and he receives instructions in direct opposition to all those principles upon which he has been elected. Is this the real opinion of his constituents? and if he receive instructions for a ballot meeting, who are his instructors? the lowest men in the town, or the wisest and the best?—But if ballot be established for elections only, and all communications between the constituents on one side, and Parliament and the representatives on the other, are carried on in open meetings, then are there two publics according to the Radical doctrines, essentially different from each other; the one acting under the influence of the rich and powerful, the other free; and if all political petitions are to be carried on by ballot, how are parliament to know who petitions, or the members to know who instructs?

I have hitherto spoken of ballot, as if it were, as the Radicals suppose it to be, a means of secrecy; their very cardinal position is that landlords, after the ballot is established, will give up in despair all hopes of commanding the votes of their tenants. I scarcely ever heard a more foolish and gratuitous assumption. Given up! Why should they be given up? I can give many reasons why landlords should never exercise this unreasonable power, but I can give no

possible reason why a man determined to do so should be baffled by the ballot. When two great parties in the empire are combating for the supreme power, does Mr. Grote imagine, that the man of woods, forests, and rivers—that they who have the strength of the hills—are to be baffled by bumpkins thrusting a little pin into a little card in a little box? that England is to be governed by political acupuncture?

A landlord who would otherwise be guilty of the oppression will not change his purpose, because you attempt to outwit him by the invention of the ballot; he will become, on the contrary, doubly vigilant, inquisitive, and severe . . . when once the ballot is established, mere gentle, quiet lying will not do to hide the tenant who secretly votes against his landlord. I consider a long concealment of political opinion from the landlord to be nearly impossible for the tenant; and if you conceal from the landlord the only proof he can have of his tenant's sincerity, you are taking from the tenant the only means he has of living quietly upon his farm. You are increasing the jealousy and irascibility of the tyrant, and multiplying instead of lessening the number of his victims.

Not only you do not protect the tenant who wishes to deceive his landlord, by promising one way and voting another, but you expose all the other tenants who have no intention of deceiving, to all the evils of mistake and misrepresentation. The steward hates a tenant, and a rival wants his farm; they begin to whisper him out of favour, and to propagate rumours of his disaffection to the blue or yellow cause; as matters now stand he can refer to the poll-book and show how he has voted. Under the ballot his security is gone, and he is exposed, in common with his deceitful neighbour, to that suspicion from which none can be exempt when all vote in secret. If ballot then answered the purpose for which it was intended, the number of honest tenants whom it exposed to danger would be as great as the number of deceitful tenants whom it screened.

. . . The noise and jollity of a ballot mob must be such as the very devils would look on with delight. A set of deceitful wretches wearing the wrong colours, abusing their friends, pelting the man for whom they voted, drinking their enemies' punch, knocking down persons with whom they entirely agreed, and roaring out eternal duration to principles they abhorred. A scene of wholesale bacchanalian fraud, a *posse comitatus* of liars, which would disgust any man with a free government, and make him sigh for the monarchy of Constantinople. . . .

A state of things may (to be sure) occur where the aristocratic part of the voters, may be desirous, by concealing their votes, of protecting themselves from the fury of the multitude; but precisely the same objection obtains against ballot, whoever may be the oppressor or the oppressed. It is no defence; the single falsehood at the hustings will not suffice. Hypocrisy for seven years is impossible; the multitude will be just as jealous of preserving the power of intimidation, as aristocrats are of preserving the power of property, and will in the same way redouble their vicious activity from the attempt at destroying their empire by ballot.

Ballot could not prevent the disfranchisement of a great number of voters. The shopkeeper, harassed by men of both parties, equally consuming the articles in which he dealt, would seek security in not voting at all, and, of course, the ballot could not screen the disobedient tenant whom the landlord requested to stay away from the poll. Mr. Grote

has no box for this; but a remedy for securing the freedom of election, which has no power to prevent the voter from losing the exercise of his franchise altogether, can scarcely be considered as a remedy at all. There is a method, indeed, by which this might be remedied, if the great soul of Mr. Grote will stoop to adopt it. Why are the acts of concealment to be confined to putting in a ball? Why not vote in a domino, taking off the vizor to the returning officer only? or as tenant Jenkins or tenant Hodge might be detected by their stature, why not poll in sedan chairs with the curtains closely drawn, choosing the chairman by ballot?

What a flood of deceit and villany comes in with ballot! I admit there are great moral faults under the present system. It is a serious violation of duty to vote for A. when you think B. the more worthy representative; but the open voter, acting under the influence of his landlord, commits only this one fault, great as it is: if he vote for his candidate, the landlord is satisfied, and asks no other sacrifice of truth and opinion; but if the tenant vote against his landlord under the ballot, he is practising every day some fraud to conceal his first deviation from truth. The present method may produce a vicious act, but the ballot establishes a vicious habit; and then it is of some consequence, that the law should not range itself on the side of vice. In the open voting, the law leaves you fairly to choose between the dangers of giving an honest, or the convenience of a dishonest, vote; but the ballot law opens a booth and asylum for fraud, calling upon all men to lie by beat of drum, forbidding open honesty, promising impunity for the most scandalous deceit, and encouraging men to take no other view of virtue than whatever it pays or does not pay; for it must always be remembered and often repeated, and said and sung to Mr. Grote, that it is to the degraded liar only that the box will be useful. The man who performs what he promises needs no box. The man who refuses to do what he is asked to do despises the box. The liar, who says he will do what he never means to do, is the only man to whom the box is useful, and for whom this leaf out of the puny Pandects is to be inserted in our statute book; the other vices will begin to look up, and to think themselves neglected, if falsehood obtains such flattering distinction, and is thus defended by the solemn enactments of law.

Old John Randolph, the American orator, was asked one day at a dinner party in London, whether the ballot prevailed in his state of Virginia—"I scarcely believe," he said, "we have such a fool in all Virginia, as to mention even the vote by ballot; and I do not hesitate to say that the adoption of the ballot *would make any nation a nation of scoundrels if it did not find them so.*" John Randolph was right; he felt it was not necessary that a people should be false in order to be free; universal hypocrisy would be the consequence of ballot: we should soon say on deliberation what David only asserted in his haste, *that all men were liars.*

The exclamation of old John Randolph applied to the method of popular elections, which I believe has always been by open voice in Virginia; but the Assemblies voted, and the Judges were chosen by ballot; and in the year 1830, upon a solemn review of their institutions, ballot was entirely abolished in every instance throughout the State, and open voting substituted in its place . . .

All objections to ballot which are important in England, apply with much greater force to Ireland, a country of intense agitation, fierce passions, and quick movements . . .

I observe Lord John Russell, and some important men as well as him, saying, "We hate ballot, but if these practices continue, we shall be compelled to vote for it." What! vote for it, if ballot be no remedy for these evils? Vote for it, if ballot produce still greater evils than it cures? That is (says the physician), if fevers increase in this alarming manner, I shall be compelled to make use of some medicine which will be of no use to fevers, and will at the same time bring on diseases of a much more serious nature. I shall be under the absolute necessity of putting out your eyes, because I cannot prevent you from being lame. In fact, this sort of language is utterly unworthy of the sense and courage of Lord John; he gives hopes where he *ought* to create absolute despair . . . There are two beautiful words in the English language—Yes and No; he must pronounce them boldly and emphatically; stick to Yes and No; to the death; for Yes and No lay his head down upon the scaffold, where his ancestors have laid their heads before, and cling to his Yes and No in spite of Robert Peel and John Wilson, and Joseph, and Daniel, and Fergus and Stevens himself. He must do as the Russells always have done, advance his firm foot on the field of honour, plant it on the line marked out by justice, and determine in that cause to perish or prevail.

In clubs, ballot preserves secrecy; but in clubs, after the barrister has blackballed the colonel, he most likely never hears of the colonel again; he does not live among people who are calling out for seven years *The colonel for ever*; nor is there any one who, thinking he has a right to the barrister's suffrage, exercises the most incessant vigilance to detect whether or not he has been defrauded of it. I do not say that ballot can never in instance be made a means of secrecy and safety, but that it cannot be so in popular elections. Even in elections, a consummate hypocrite who was unmarried, and drank water, might perhaps exercise his timid patriotism with impunity; but the instances would be so rare, as to render ballot utterly inefficient as a general protection against the abuses of power.

In America, ballot is nearly a dead letter; no protection is wanted: if the ballot protects any one it is the master, not the man. Some of the states have no ballot—some have exchanged the ballot for open voting.

Bribery carried on in any town now, would probably be carried on with equal success under the ballot. The attorney (if such a system prevailed) would say to the candidate, "There is my list of promises: if you come in I will have £5,000, and if you do not, you shall pay me nothing." To this list, to which I suppose all the venal rabble of the town to have put their names, there either is an opposition bribery list, or there is not: if there is not, the promisers, looking only to make money by their vote, have every inducement to keep their word. If there be an opposite list, the only trick which a promiser can play is to put down his name upon both lists: but this trick would be so easily detected, so much watched and suspected, and would, even in the vote market, render a man so infamous, that it never would be attempted to any great extent. At present, if a man promises his vote to A., and votes for B., because he can get more money by it, he does not become infamous among the bribed, because they lose no money by him; but where a list is found, and a certain sum of money is to be divided among that list, every inter-loper lessens the receipts of all the rest; it becomes their interest to guard against fraudulent intrusion; and a man who puts his name upon more lists than the votes he was entitled

to give, would soon be hunted down by those he had robbed. . . .

If ballot were established, it would be received by the upper classes with the greatest possible suspicion and every effort would be made to counteract it and to get rid of it. Against those attacks the inferior orders would naturally wish to strengthen themselves, and the obvious means would be by extending the number of voters; and so comes on universal suffrage. The ballot would fail: it would be found neither to prevent intimidation or bribery. Universal suffrage would cure both, as a teaspoonful of prussic acid is a certain cure for the most formidable diseases; but universal suffrage would in all probability be the next step. "The 200 richest voters of Bridport shall not beat the 400 poorest voters. Everybody who has a house shall vote, and then the people will be sure to have their way—we will blackball every member standing for Bridgewater who does not promise to vote for universal suffrage."

The ballot and universal suffrage are never mentioned by the Radicals without being coupled together. Nobody ever thinks of separating them. Any person who attempted to separate them at torchlight or sunlight meetings would be hooted down. It is professedly avowed that ballot is only wanted for ulterior purposes, and no one makes a secret of what those ulterior purposes are: not only would the gift of ballot, if universal suffrage were refused, not be received with gratitude, but it would be received with furious indignation and contempt, and universal suffrage be speedily extorted from you.

. . . Ballot is a mere illusion, but universal suffrage is not an illusion. The common people will get nothing by the one, but they will gain everything, and *ruin* everything, by the last.

Some members of Parliament who mean to vote for ballot, in the fear of losing their seats, and who are desirous of reconciling to their conscience such an act of disloyalty to mankind, are fond of saying that ballot is harmless; that it will neither do the good nor the evil that is expected from it; and that the people may fairly be indulged in such an innocent piece of legislation. Never was such folly and madness as this; ballot will be the cause of interminable hatred and jealousy among the different orders of mankind; it will familiarise the English people to a long tenour of deceit; it will not answer its purpose of protecting the independent voter, and the people, exasperated and disappointed by the failure, will indemnify themselves by insisting upon unlimited suffrage. And then it is talked of as an experiment, as if men were talking of acids and alkalies, and the galvanic pile; as if Lord John could get on the hustings and say, "Gentlemen, you see this ballot does not answer; do me the favour to give it up, and to allow yourselves to be replaced in the same situation as the ballot found you." Such, no doubt, is the history of nations and the march of human affairs; and, in this way, the error of a sudden and foolish largess of power to the people might, no doubt, be easily retrieved! The most unpleasant of all bodily feelings is a cold sweat; nothing brings it on so surely as perilous nonsense in politics. I lose all warmth from the bodily frame when I hear the ballot talked of as an *experiment*.

I cannot at all understand what is meant by this indolent opinion. Votes are coerced now, if votes are free, will the elected be the same? If not, will the difference of the elected be unimportant? Will not the ballot stimulate the upper

orders to fresh exertions? and is their increased jealousy and interference of no importance? If ballot, after all, be found to hold out a real protection to the voter, is universal lying of no importance? I can understand what is meant by calling ballot a great good, or a great evil; but, in the mighty contention for power which is raging in this country, to call it indifferent, appears to me extremely foolish in all those in whom it is not extremely dishonest.

If the ballot did succeed in enabling the lower order of voters to conquer their betters, so much the worse. In a town consisting of 700 voters, the 300 most opulent and powerful (and therefore probably the best instructed) would make a much better choice than the remaining 400; and the ballot would, in that case do more harm than good. In nineteen cases out of 20, the most numerous party would be in the wrong. If this be the case, why give the franchise to all? Why not confine it to the first division? *Because even with all the abuses which occur, and in spite of them, the great mass of the people are much more satisfied with having a vote occasionally controlled, than with having none.* Many agree with their superiors, and therefore feel no control. Many are persuaded by their superiors, and not controlled. Some are indifferent which way they exercise the power, though they would not like to be utterly deprived of it. Some guzzle away their vote, some sell it, some brave their superiors, if they are threatened and controlled. The election, in different ways, is affected by the superior influence of the upper orders; and the great mass (occasionally and justly complaining) are, beyond all doubt, better pleased than if they had no vote at all. The lower orders always have it in their power to rebel against their superiors? and occasionally they will do so, and have done so, and occasionally and justly carried elections against gold, and birth, and education. (Footnote—The 400 or 500 voting against the 200 are right about as often as juries are right in differing from judges, and that is very seldom). But it is madness to make laws of society which attempt to shake off the great laws of nature. As long as men love bread, and mutton, and broad cloth, wealth, in a long series of years, must have enormous effects upon human affairs, and the strong box will beat the ballot box. Mr. Grote has both, but he miscalculates their respective powers. Mr. Grote knows the relative values of gold and silver; but by what moral rate of exchange is he able to tell us the relative values of liberty and truth?

It is hardly necessary to say anything about universal suffrage, as there is no act of folly or madness which it may not in the beginning produce. There would be the greatest risk that the monarchy, as at present constituted, the funded debt, the established church, titles, and hereditary peerage, would give way before it. Many really honest men may wish for these changes; I know, or at least believe, that wheat and barley would grow if there were no Archbishop of Canterbury, and domestic fowls would breed if our Viscount Melbourne was again called Mr. Lamb; but they have stronger nerves than I have who would venture to bring these changes about. So few nations have been free, it is so difficult to guard freedom from kings, and mobs, and patriotic gentlemen, and we are in such a very tolerable state of happiness in England, that I think such changes would be very rash; and I have an utter mistrust in the sagacity and penetration of political reasoners who pretend to foresee all the consequences to which they would give birth. When I speak of the tolerable state of happiness in which we live in England, I do not speak merely of nobles, squires, and canons

of St. Paul's, but of drivers of coaches, clerks in offices, carpenters, blacksmiths, butchers, and most men who do not marry upon nothing, and become burdened with large families before they have arrived at years of maturity. The earth is not sufficiently fertile for this:

*Difficilem victum fundit durissima tellus.*

After all, the great art in politics and war is to choose a good position for making a stand. The Duke of Wellington examined and fortified the lines of Torres Vedras a year before he had any occasion to make use of them, and he had previously marked out Waterloo as the probable scene of some future exploit. The people seem to be hurrying on through all the well-known steps to anarchy; they must be stopped at some pass or another: the first is the best and the most easily defended. The people have a right to ballot or any thing else which will make them happy; and they have a right to *nothing which will make them unhappy*. They are the best judges of their immediate gratifications, and the worst judges of what would best conduce to their interests for a series of years. Most earnestly and conscientiously wishing their good, I say. **NO BALLOT.**

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy .....	( <i>edition exhausted</i> )
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	( <i>reprinting</i> )
Credit Power and Democracy .....	6/6
Warning Democracy .....	( <i>edition exhausted</i> )
The Big Idea .....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism .....	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles .....	13d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart...	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster.....	20/-
The French Revolution by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit.....	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage.....	7/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	5/-
Odlum v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Communism in Action U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
Protocols of Zion.....	1/6
The Smear Terror .....	1/3
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W.....	1/-

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.