

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 5.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

### Full Employment

*A further Essay in analysis of the psychological background of what is known as The Export Drive.*

By NORMAN F. WEBB

#### (I)

In the earlier sections of this essay an attempt was made to outline a credible picture of the build-up of modern internationalism, coincident with that of the Mercantile period and the rapid rise to world power of England under the Whigs culminating in the sudden flare-up in the 19th Century which we call the Industrial Revolution. It emphasised the growing and oppressive interference of the export-import industry—the nucleus of present day Internationalism—in all national governments, as obviously not a matter for publicity; rather the reverse, and depending for its continuance largely on the fact of its existence being kept hidden from the public, since it constituted, potentially if not actually, a threat to all those national and local loyalties which hold an average group of individuals together.

It was evident how, behind this curtain of secrecy, and unknown to the general public, one single social function—this same profession of export trading—had contrived to grow to such power and size, under the excessive stimulus of world-development (or industrialisation) promoted from London, as to threaten completely to destroy the balance whereby national integrity, and consequently authority are maintained. This internal aspect of the matter being inevitably and exactly reflected in the international field. And then I suggested the inevitability of this mechanism of international trading, including in the very first place, its control over the sources of public information, as having been appropriated by a group of international politicians, or Global Planners, as a perfect means to their own end; that of clamping down on society in general a centralised World-dictatorship in the form of a functional work-state.

Now, as far as one can see, examining the workings of Nature, and particularly human nature, in as open and humble a spirit as possible, human beings and societies progress and are maintained by a series of by no means unhealthy reactions; healthy, that is, as long as they are left sufficiently uninterfered with. That there are still no unmistakable signs of public reaction to the persistence of the present exaggerated inclination of society towards centralisation, suggests hidden interference of an unprecedented and particularly effective kind. After two World Wars of a size and violence beyond anything previously known, both of which were precipitated in the last resort by excessive concentration of power in too few hands, it is not in the nature of things that a strong reaction to the present trend could have failed to set in long ago had not the apparatus by which the authentic climate of public opinion is created, been secretly confiscated. And it seems certain that, occultly controlled, it is being employed by means of clever publicity propaganda and the suppression of essential facts and contrary views, in

an attempt to perpetuate long past the danger point what was in the beginning, no doubt, a necessary reaction. To such lengths has the interference been carried, that human society today, and in particular that national group known as Great Britain, resembles nothing so much as a ship in a hurricane, with her cargo shifted and listing dangerously struck by two great waves in close succession, and a third looming up out of the darkness and confusion to complete the job. That is not an exaggerated picture of contemporary affairs as they appear to most thinking individuals, when they dare look at them. What they are unable to realise, because they are under hidden pressure to ignore it, is the natural tendency of the ship to right herself with a minimum of enlightened assistance.

The real danger today, it appears, is not, as is popularly supposed, that society is in the hands of a violently reactionary movement; on the contrary, what we are suffering from is the artificial and unnatural arrest of a long-overdue reaction of a normal and healthy kind; a deliberate paralysis of society's recuperative faculties, brought about through the agency of the self-styled Progressives—unconscious "stooges," many of them—at whose disposal all the organs of propaganda and information are placed by those who control them. In short, the practical problem with which we have first to deal today, is this satanic attempt to interfere with the natural tides of human thought on the part of a comparatively few individuals, placed, either by design or accident, in a position of unique and almost supreme strategic importance. These are the International Planners, fundamentally rootless and mobile, who besides moving easily from one national group to another, as the tides of social inspiration ebb and flow, have gravitated instinctively to the biggest and most overpowering functional department of society operating the exchange of commodities, or real wealth, between nation and nation, and individual and individual. There, by a process of elimination, we found them located in the great international discount and acceptance houses at its apex, most of which today have their headquarters in New York.

#### (II)

It was seen how the cult of Exports for their own sake, the secret promotion of which had been the original impulse with the international exchange experts in their acquisition of control over the sources of public information, had been adopted and developed in the hands of the International Politician when he took over, as the pattern of the projected international Work State. At the start it is unlikely he found statesmen and politicians always acquiescent in the idea; 19th century Tariff Reform stands as a proof of that. It may be that the American War of Independence represents an early protest. But with the rapid increase of general mechanisation and of output per human unit during the 19th Century, came the bogey of unemployment, and it began to be noticed in other quarters, besides the high-financial, that exports were, in themselves, worth encouraging, this time as a provider of *pure employment, i.e., work with-*

out any return in increased real wealth, from the point of view of the community as a whole. And as the incipient threat of unemployment not only remained, but increased, this aspect of the matter, elaborated by the internationalists for their own purposes in propaganda up and down the country, grew to be an obsession with harassed Cabinet ministers, in this country particularly, mystified by the self-defeating characteristics displayed by so-called Economic Progress; as well as with the politician concerned for his position in Parliament, and dependent largely for votes on his ability to promise and provide jobs for the wage-earning section of his constituents. While those same constituents, of every class, were met in the Press, in the Pulpit, everywhere with the contemporary equivalent to the slogan "Export or Die."

Thus it is evident an immense weight of confused but unanimous "opinion" was fraudulently detached from national interests and ranged behind Internationalism and the Export Drive, posing as national self-preservation. The impression is one of an almost irresistible pressure in the direction of increased centralisation of power, leading to a further build-up of the already excessive and overpowering weight of the Faculty of International Exchange, and the strengthening of the position of the "international politician" entrenched at the summit of this enormous functional structure. It would be difficult, I think, to over-emphasise the importance of this situation, whereby the unpublicised objective of the Internationalists could be lent an appearance of immense national urgency in the eyes of almost every section of the community—politicians, industrialists, workers—for the entirely irrelevant, and *nationally* disastrous purpose of providing jobs, without a tangible increase in the products coming on to the Home Market to threaten a fall in prices.

If one stops for a moment to think of the matter in the light of experience and common sense, nothing could be more likely to produce ultimate turmoil and discord and world-wide bitterness than this rivetting together, in apparent and supposed identity of interest, of the supporters of two utterly divergent policies, the one national and the other international; the one open, the other hidden. And it is primarily with this artificially stimulated and maintained belief on the part of the public in the identity of these two utterly incompatible ideas, that any truly realistic economic proposal has to do battle today. Entirely on this false connection in the public mind depends the continuance—so essential to the Internationalist objective—of the mesmeric influence of the evil and un-Christian philosophy of Work for the sake of work—industry, industrialisation, as an end in itself. The Work-Statist calls it Full Employment, but whatever it is called, it is still universally acclaimed; the common and fraternally-shared bond between Communist, Socialist, Fabian, Liberal, Conservative, and all the other ideological and political Uncle Tom Cobleys. In short—and more particularly as applied to our neighbour,—it is believed in, *i.e.*, worshipped, by almost all of us comprising the well-meaning, credulous, newspaper-reading Western public, quite irrespective of creed or politics, or—it might be well to add,—common sense. This must be the mesmeric curse of Adam, that has to be broken.

Difficult and over-simple to grasp as it may seem, the fact remains that the severing of that false connection would break the spell under which, particularly, Western society lies paralysed today. And the first, and possibly the only move needed, is to let the public realize that they have been, and are being, misled and misinformed, not only as to the

facts, but as to the real identity of their misleaders. For until these particular individuals, who are bent on perpetuating the present centralising trend for their own purposes, are actually prevented, they will persist in their suicidal folly. We have to bring ourselves to recognise—and not shrink from the hard truth—that when individuals are steeped in deception, and in proportion to their degree of their saturation, they cannot be counted on to stop short of anything to preserve their secret. That is, or used to be, common knowledge—our simple forefathers deemed it unwise to give Satan credit for anything but evil—and when the victims of one's deception (I speak in the spirit of the observation "There, but for the grace of God, go I") are almost the entire human race, apparently placed in the hollow of one's hand, the depth of one's involvement, and the consequent lengths to which one will be tempted to go, are literally without limit. That, bluntly, is the position today. And that, implicitly, was the position in 1914, when the first World War broke out; and becoming explicit after 1921, when deflation was inaugurated.

### (III)

Into this sick and confused world of post-War One there came a discovery, illuminating in the first case a mathematical flaw common to all accounting systems as the cause of the prevalent stultification evidenced in unemployment and general lack of purchasing-power. Along with it, and based on a statement of impeccable Christian philosophy, to the effect that, while the true end of man is unknown, it is most likely to be achieved in the greatest possible degree of individual freedom, were proposals of comparative simplicity for achieving what is unquestionably the intended objective of the existing, or any, Money System:—an equitable—not equal—distribution of everything which the community as a whole is willing and able to produce. We recognise all this, and a lot more besides, under the title of Social Credit, originally termed, when it was first made public in 1920, "Economic Democracy."

In the fewest words, the initial history of that idea was as follows:—that up to about 1923, (say, for two years) under the impact of the great post-war deflation, it appeared to be gaining a wide, if, as it subsequently proved, a somewhat shallow acceptance among men of influence, in Great Britain at least. Then, like the sudden descent of a fog on the landscape, came a complete ban upon all public canvassing of the idea. It was somehow "understood," simultaneously in the Press and in business and in politics, that there were "grave objections" to the whole proposal—that is to say that it was not "favoured" in the influential regions to which the eyes of those who wished to better themselves materially were raised. This state of affairs lasted for over eight years; although, besides others, the book *Social Credit*, had been published in 1924, and run to a second edition in 1926, and was being widely read and studied in both hemispheres. Then, in the economic depression of the thirties, following the Wall Street collapse of 1929, the sheer weight of physical argument produced by the crude conjunction of semi-starvation and so-called glut, pierced the defensive embargo, and it came again to the surface.

All that seems arbitrary and mysterious enough to suggest pure accident, without any connecting thread of conscious cause—either that, or the suggestion that there was really nothing *in* the idea of Social Credit or it would have impressed itself, opposition notwithstanding, on public men of able intellect, of whom there were presumed to be

plenty. But, assuming for the moment the correctness of the Social Credit diagnosis and proposed remedy, if one looks at the facts in the light I have endeavoured to shed on them here, the argument for accident seems extremely unlikely, even if one believes in accident as an explanation of anything. At the time, statesmen in all countries, and in England in particular,—and by the term statesmen one means public men with the good of their country at heart—genuinely distressed at the failure to materialise of the Lloyd George-Liberal's rashly-promised "land fit for heroes," were casting about them anxiously in the mounting unemployment figures of 1921/23, and still in post-war mood for an experiment in realism. No doubt those who had immediately reacted to the realistic and revolutionary ideas contained in Social Credit, were examining them with a caution natural to their positions of responsibility; realising also, as they must have, the necessity for sanction to any radical move on their part from the agent of the United States Federal Reserve Bank actually established in the Bank of England at that time on behalf of the American War Loan to Europe. It is also fairly certain that before the idea had had time to develop any but the lightest roots, the more cautious would have sought for a directive from Threadneedle Street, from which oracle the lines of communication lead directly to Wall and Pine Streets where, as we have seen, the World Politicians were, and are, ensconced at the head of the International Discount Banks that crown the structure of International Exchange.

Here the full implications of Social Credit and its proposals would be examined, not only by the professional exchange manipulators and economists in their short-term, immediate effects, but without doubt in their long-term, politico-philosophical aspects, at an even higher and more confidential level, the nature of which we can only guess. The verdict returned would be arrived at with a single eye for its effects on the policy of World Dictatorship held by the scrutineers, and without any regard whatsoever either for the interests of this country, or, indeed, of human individuals, as such, anywhere. To imagine anything else is simply to refuse to accept human nature as it manifestly is, not in Wall Street only, but everywhere.

How long, must one suppose, would it take for such a finely-sifted panel of fanatical experts and world-planners, at either of these levels, to sense the fundamental opposition to their own objective implicit in the Social Credit idea, as something quite apart from its technical feasibility, which was the point presumed to be referred to them? Or how long for them to come to the absolute conclusion that no imaginable proposals could be more antagonistic to their own policy of centrally directed world-government from one geographical and material centre? A week? A month? Not more.

Here was a by no means over-recondite mathematical proof and explanation of the cause of the mysterious stultification to which modern industry was periodically subject in every industrialised country alike; that silly, but tragic dilemma which prevented society everywhere, except under the most primitive conditions, from enjoyment of the full substance of its own productive efforts, for lack of the shadow or abstract exchange medium; an explanation of the control, and therefore effective ownership to which, they, the politico-economic experts, had found themselves heirs as the successors of the purely functional economic exchange broker.

Whether this mathematical explanation came to them  
(continued on page 8)

## James Albert Crothers

The Social Credit Movement in Northern Ireland suffered a grievous blow by the sudden death on September 14 of J. A. Crothers.

Bertie Crothers was a staunch twig on the lusty sapling which was the Social Credit Movement thirty years ago. The efflux of time, which has brought that sapling to maturity, has now removed one of the strongest branches.

To those of us who had the privilege of his friendship for a quarter of a century his passing is as incredible as it is unbearable.

He was in his early sixties, of vigorous habit and keen mind. A musician of no mean order, a cultured speaker deeply informed of Social Credit and a man of wide interests, his efficiency, as honorary secretary of the Belfast Group, was a bye word. Nothing was ever too much trouble to him and he had the kindest and sunniest nature imaginable.

It can safely be said that to him and his chairman, Mr. N. F. Webb, can be ascribed the perdurability of the Belfast Group through the vicissitudes of the last fifteen years.

His devoted wife—they had no children—will be desolated as they were such a happily married couple. Our deepest sympathy goes out to her in her great distress. She assisted him for many years in the sale of Social Credit literature and indeed, in his general secretarial work.

Farewell, Crothers, we shall not soon forget you.

J.S.-K.

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy .....	6/6
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea .....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England .....	8d.
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 .....	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

### ALSO

#### Secret Societies and Subversive Movements

by Nesta H. Webster .....	20/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....(Cloth Edition)	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage 7/-	
Odlum v. Stratton	
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion .....	2/-
Communism in Action	

U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....2/-  
(Please allow for posting when remitting).

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

## 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. 23. No. 5.

Saturday, October 1, 1949.

### From Week to Week

"The economic life of the citizen is less under his own control than in the days of the Tudors. Even Tudor officialdom is not recorded to have ordered the ploughing-in of a crop ready for harvest, because its sowing had not been sanctioned, nor made it an offence to give a neighbour a pitcher of milk, nor forbidden him to repair his own house with his own hands. No guild tyranny was tighter than that of the officially encouraged closed shop, no sumptuary laws more explicit than many prohibitions of non-utility, and no official debasement of coinage more effective, as a barrier against the winning of independence through personal savings, than the fiscal policies of to-day."—Honor Croome in *Lloyds Bank Review*.

And we couldn't care less. Did you hear they're thinking of broadcasting murder trials? And say, boy, last Sunday's bathing b—— ch!

While it is certain that the tobacco-billionaire Jew, Juan March, was a dominant factor on the side of General Franco in the defeat of the Spanish Communists, it has never been very clear just exactly what was his objective. It is unnecessary to observe that it was not consideration either for Franco or the Spanish people and, lacking a better explanation, it appeared that it was the usual application of Sombart's dictum that "Wars are the Jews' harvests."

At the moment, however, the Spanish scene is assuming the familiar aspect of a battle between two groups of Jews for control of public utilities, notably the Barcelona Light and Power Co.. The Tennessee Valley Authority, the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board, The British Electricity Commission, are all evidence that one path to World Dominion is recognised, and the Jewish control of the Atomic Energy Commission in U.S.A. through David Lilienthal of the T.V.A. suggests that the inner ring is fairly small.

It is grimly humourous that Dr. Arnold Toynbee of "Chatham House" having been professionally employed for the last twenty years in "working feverishly and with all our might to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations" now feels that no political remedy is of any avail for the ills of the world, and that only a turning to God can save us in our dire extremity—a prescription which, however sound in itself, has, as coming from Dr. Toynbee, a slight flavour of Ninon de l'Enclos, who gave to the Creator the remaining years of a life for which she was unable to find futher employment.

To anyone who is not professionally committed to the service of anti-Christ, the direct connection between centralisation and its policies, Socialism, Communism, and the Finance-Capitalism of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, its World Banks, Global Food Controls and "Joint

Chiefs of Staff" can hardly escape notice. Nor does the key pronouncement of P.E.P.: "We have proceeded on the assumption that only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large scale planning" lose interest from the success with which "large-scale planning" has eliminated any particular significance from the "British Government" except as a bedraggled stalking-horse for Wall Street. The objective so far as it concerns ourselves is obviously that which was denounced thousands of years ago: *Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant*—"they make a desert, and call it peace." And the "war, or threat of war," is now transferred to that comic-tragic farce the United Nations, to force centralisation on the rest of the world.

It is increasingly clear that argument (such as we put forward ourselves, for instance) has no more bearing on the course of events at this time than the Chorus had on the plot of a Greek Tragedy. If it had, it would be incontrovertible that the maxim, profoundly true, that the Devil is the inversion of God can nearly be equated with an antithesis of quality with quantity. We use the word *fine* both to indicate quality and smallness; and *course*, to designate both vulgar and large; but our politics are hell-bent on size. Expansion, inflation, boom, bust. Common, majority, monstrous, massacre.

We trust that our readers do not feel that in reverting persistently to such periods as, for instance, that of the Cromwellian Revolution, we are pursuing some pet theory or alternatively flogging a dead horse. Clearly, we may be mistaken; but it is our firm conviction that these islands and the society which inhabits them, are gravely, if not fatally, corrupt; and that their dominant and tragic policies proceed from a corrupt philosophy of long standing. There is no other explanation visible to us of the events which have, at the moment, culminated in the devaluation of the pound—an incident, to understate its nature, which almost epitomises corruption.

To emphasise that this is not an isolated opinion we quote again from the historical novel by the American, Mr. Kenneth Roberts, *Oliver Wiswell*, the theme of which is the apparent determination of the English, and Lord Howe in particular, that the Colonists should be forced into independence:

"You'll never understand Howe's behaviour until you understand British politics . . . The Whigs are doing everything on earth to stay in power. They're attacking the Tory in every possible way, and stopping at nothing . . . The rebels in America are against the Tories; therefore the Whigs support the rebels . . . the English don't like to admit it, but you can corroborate it in a thousand ways—if you work hard enough. The Whigs, in their determination to retain power are not even hesitating to wreck the British Empire . . .

"Never in any nation has anything been seen like the malignant and daringly outspoken treason of the English Whigs."

In the above quotation we have substituted the words "stay in" for "get back," in order to make the sense self-contained. The present Government in this country, and any probable prospective Government, is a Whig Government, as it has been for at least forty years. There is no Tory Party. British policy is the policy of a Whig philosophy. Manufacturers have always, as a class, been Whigs and the Federation of British Industries, which now controls the banks, is a predominantly Whig concern. Hence the smug approval of devaluation of the pound.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Manning's paper, the so-called *Canadian Social Crediter* touches lightly on almost every aspect of Social Credit and quotes from genuine Social Credit papers everywhere (so far as we are concerned, without permission and usually without full acknowledgement) *except* where the subject matter involves the world attack on British credit by the Jewish monopoly in U.S.A., which is the determining factor of the whole technical problem, and the political domination of the Federal Government of Canada by Freemasonry.

A well-known lower-middle class circulating library wrote to the publishers recently, for a copy of *The Brief for the Prosecution*, doubtless under the impression that it was an orthodox murder story. It returned the copy "after inspection", with the comment "We now find that this work is unsuitable for our Library."

We can only agree.

## Planning the Earth

By C. G. DOBBS

(VII)

(continued)

Democracy, then, (brand Lilienthal) consists in the "DECENTRALISED ADMINISTRATION OF CENTRAL POLICIES" which in turn are decided upon by "the institution of politics," *i.e.* by those who succeed in securing majority figures at an election. Let us pursue this idea a little further.

Let us suppose (if the idea is not too far fetched) that the central policy, supported by an over 90 *per cent.* vote of The People, involves the expropriation (for the Common Good, as defined by the Government) of all Jews, and the imprisonment and gassing of some of them. 'Democracy' will then consist in getting everybody to participate with a will, to feel Big and important, and use their brains and initiative in carrying it out. But perhaps my example is tactless. Let us suppose then that the central policy, supported by a 99.9 *per cent.* vote of The People, with brass bands, banners, cheers, songs and slogans, involves the expropriation of some other category of persons, say all farmers or peasants living in a certain area (according to the progress of the Plan for farm collectivisation) who employ labour or have more than one cow or five chickens. Then of course Democracy (on the March) will consist in getting people to develop their individuality and initiative in carrying this out with zest and gusto. But doubtless this is unthinkable! So let us suppose (if the imagination does not boggle) that the central policy involves, among other things, a Plan for the dis-possession and eviction from their homes and lands of, say, 56,000 people who live in certain valleys needed for flooding (for the Common Good, of course, and in case they might get flooded out, and to save the soil, and just incidentally, to get power for bombers and atomic bombs). Then of course Democracy (at the Grass Roots) consists in adopting the 'devices of management' which will 'bring the people in, and make them co-operate cheerfully.' And that, as it happens, is precisely what Mr. Lilienthal says it is.

As for the accountability for results, which is represented as one of the chief 'democratic' features of the autonomous (and totalitarian) Corporation, it is of a type with which we are now bitterly familiar in Great Britain, where redress for an injustice (*e.g.* overcharging on one's electricity bill) can be obtained only by organising a majority in Parliament,

instead of, as formerly, by ringing up the local Company. The power companies which the T.V.A. is putting out of business with its unlimited tax funds are full of complaints that its accountancy is of an unprecedented, and privileged, type. To begin with it has complete freedom from federal taxation, and as regards local taxation is in the happy position of being able to assess its own payments "far short of the original claims of the local tax bodies," and above all it can 'allocate' whatever sums it thinks fit to various purposes such as flood control, navigation, education, and so forth. Its general 'accountability' consists in the submitting of lengthy reports and accounts to Congress, and being made the subject of debate, and investigation by Congressional Committees. One Committee sat for a year, and published a report of 7,500 printed pages, which few people can possibly have read—but let that pass. When it comes to legal liability we have already noted the P.E.P. remark that "The large funds known to be behind the T.V.A. . . . give it, however, an immensely strong bargaining position." There are also the 'real' results, such as the fact that in the drought year of 1942 the power companies had to come to the aid of T.V.A. with power from their steam plant; and there are the 'results' in the matter of flooding and dispossession, and 'atom' bombs and so forth which have been sufficiently noticed, and the poor results in respect of farm income and farm electrification, as compared with the other Southern States; but there is no accountability for this sort of result. What Lilienthal substitutes for genuine judgment by results, as exercised by responsible individuals, normally through the economic vote, is merely the success or otherwise of his Public Relations Department in inducing people to like what they are given.

It would seem that the people have had very little choice in the matter; what with the 3,500 different books, pamphlets and articles, the special mobile library service, often supplying the only reading, the broadcasts, the schools, the adult education, and the special valley-wide, and nation-wide educational programmes to stimulate demand for whatever the T.V.A. has to sell; and above all the hope of jobs and a share in the seemingly inexhaustible flow of money. This is indeed management: management and control not so much at the grass roots as at the very roots of human will and intelligence.

Since it was the main fulcrum of the T.V.A.'s land programme, the methods used to create a demand for phosphatic fertilizer provide a critical example. It is well known that phosphate deficiency, in relation to the crops which have to be grown on agricultural soils, is so widespread as to be almost universal, and that this is notoriously acute and limiting on pasture lands which have to bear a heavy drain of phosphates in animal form. It is also apparent that this problem is too great to be solved, except locally and temporarily, by digging up the relatively few deposits of phosphate which are known to exist, and spreading them over the earth's surface.

The phosphate, and other minerals, are lost in two ways; as human food, and by leaching into the subsoil. They could be restored, together, by such methods as suitable treatment of city sewage to provide an organic manure, by the introduction of deep-rooted forest into the agricultural rotation, and perhaps under suitable conditions by subsoiling. Such methods offer some hope of restoring the lost equilibrium; the supplying of one deficient mineral on a big scale in pure concentrated soluble form gives quick and spectacular results, and a virtual certainty of further disequilibrium.

The position in Tennessee, before the T.V.A., is described from the viewpoint of 'the fertilizer industry' in these terms: (p. 98): "In the past we have tried to get them to buy 'high-analysis' (*i.e.* concentrated) fertilizer, but they don't want it; what they want is the *mixed* [my emphasis] and low-analysis fertilizer. And what the customer wants we must supply." Not so however, the T.V.A., which concluded that "farmers could be persuaded to use concentrates." To do this it had to inaugurate its valley-wide and nation-wide educational programme, and to *demonstrate* by supplying superphosphate *free* to 'demonstration farms' the quick returns which can be obtained in this way. In return the farmer had to submit a new management plan for his farm, in writing, and to allow it to be used as a 'schoolroom' for his neighbours. As a result the sales of concentrated phosphate reached astonishing heights, which is regarded as a great achievement in unified Planning of resources; although on p. 98 we read that "the raw material—is exhaustible, and when exhausted is irreplaceable."

Now you cannot 'demonstrate' anything but quick returns, lightening results, 'magic' cures; you cannot 'demonstrate' the results of long experience, or of real wisdom; because a demonstration is necessarily a set piece narrowly limited in time. Some quick returns are a valid indication of long-term results, but not many; and every wise father tries to educate his son not to judge by them, but to look further, and deeper. *So here we have the process of education in reverse; the farmer who prefers the more balanced and slower-acting fertilizer being conditioned to accept the quick-acting 'concentrate' which is cheaper to transport, and conveniently uses electric power to produce. This is the process of learning by object lessons to which Mr. Lilienthal refers, in a less appropriate context, on page 179. We are not surprised at his familiarity with it.*

Meanwhile, whatever may happen in another ten years' time, it is true that the soil needs, and responds to, phosphate, and in this, and in other ways relating to soil conservation, the people have been permitted, under T.V.A., to do a certain amount towards arresting the decay of their uplands, which they were prevented from doing before by one thing only, the manipulation of finance. This point is more or less conceded by Lilienthal. He writes (pp. 73-74):

They knew, almost all of them, what they wanted. They knew that what was needed was to increase the productivity of their lands, to heal the gullies, to keep water on the land, and to prevent the soil from washing away. . . .

The farm experts . . . had known most of the technical answers to the *separate* problems of soils, of fertilizer, of terracing, and had known them for a good many years. They were competent in their special fields, and devoted to their work. Nevertheless farm income in the valley as in the whole Southeast continued at a low ebb: in some counties the average cash income for a farm family was less than 150 dollars a year. Soil losses were appalling.

It is even claimed (p. 62) that these 'new' methods of farming have shown displaced people "how a better living could be made from the uplands than older methods had provided on the river-bottom farms from which they had moved."

The extraordinary thing is that this should be adduced *in favour* of what the T.V.A. has done; it shows the immense influence of false emphasis, repeated until it has a hypnotic effect, and ordinary common sense is swamped. If this can be done to the uplands, with a small proportion of the funds found for T.V.A., what then could have been done for the valleys? It is so typical that under Planning the more fertile valley lands should be given to the fishes, and the

less fertile uplands to the men displaced from them, and that we should then be invited to applaud "a thriving industry that in 1943 produced six million pounds of edible fish," (p. 23). "It all goes to show" as some wit remarked, "what God could do if He had money!"

## (VIII)

In the end, as it was in the beginning, it comes to be a matter of credit, that is, confidence, or, to use a shorter word, faith; the credit that was not given to the people of the Tennessee Valley, but was given to the Tennessee Valley *Authority*; and the faith that did not, and did, underlie that credit. Only the very dimmest-witted comrades, the sort that actually think in terms of slogans put into their mouths by cleverer people, imagine that they believe in the materialist interpretation of history—that is, that the *initiative* in human affairs lies with the inorganic forces—and if they did with more than the surface of their rather shallow minds believe any such thing, they would at once stop trying to influence the course of events by shouting slogans, which are, after all, spiritual and non-material things.

Mr. Lilienthal's book, at any rate, is bursting with confidence; confidence in the Big Job of the Century, and in the people—all the people—from the Chairman downwards, who are carrying it out. People who visit Tennessee tend to come away sharing the same sort of confidence, and slightly dazed by the immense gleaming dams, the vast lakes, the wooded slopes, the new throbbing industries, the great 'Atomic City' (with the shadow of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and Bikini in the background); in short, immensely impressed by the great demonstration of Power. But whose Power? Not the people's Power (democracy). They can *participate* in producing it, but they have no *control* over it; that is the prerogative of their Managers, and among them, not the least, of Mr. Lilienthal in his new guise, and of his Bankers' Committee. For what he means by 'decentralisation' is that the central policy, the policy of himself and his fellow-Planners, shall be carried right down, by psychological and propagandist measures and 'devices of management', until it is firmly embedded in every heart and mind; only then will it be safe from the challenge of unpredictable initiative. That, in fact, is *centralisation* carried to its logical and absolute limit.

There are two sorts of faith, and two sorts of confidence: the sort which is based on reality; and the sort which is merely a 'device of management' intended to inspire a like confidence—the confidence of the confidence trickster, the 'smart' salesman, and the 'successful' politician. This latter sort forms a cover for a contempt for its victims, and a pessimism as deep as Hell. A glance at the photograph of the author which, rather rashly perhaps, forms the front-piece of *T.V.A.—Democracy on the March*, taken in conjunction with the contents of the book, and his history and affiliations and present position, may assist the reader in coming to a judgment in the matter.

What, then, are we to make of the specific denials, at the end of the book, of any belief in the inherent wickedness of ordinary people, or the superiority of the managerial *élite*? The 'managerial' attitude declares itself from every page, verbal statements to the contrary notwithstanding; the belief in the inherent wickedness, or at least suicidal lunacy, of Man (other than Planners) is implicit in the imposition, by whatever means, of a centralised Plan, which is claimed to have a *moral* purpose (pp. 17, 189); for otherwise, why not give the billion dollars to the people of the Valley and leave them to do the planning each in his own proper sphere and

property? Because that would never do! Any Planner, any socialist, any liberal, any conservative, any Progressive-minded person, almost any person of 'education' nowadays will tell you that that would mean chaos, anarchy, *laissez-faire*, selfish interests would run riot, the law of the jungle would prevail and result in misery, devastation, destruction and catastrophe. The clichés mount up, but they all mean the same thing, that all natural, private, individual, or even 'sectional' or 'parochial' interests and policies are 'selfish' and, in their aggregate results, fatal to the human race. At the time of writing, Sir Alexander Gray has been telling the Economics Section of the British Association at Newcastle that "If the new world into which we are moving is to work it will demand . . . in particular the suppression of self." . . . "And it is not I but Lenin who says so." And such statements from prominent people could be repeated a thousand-fold.

Now it is nonsense to pretend that an attitude which demands the *suppression of self* (quite a different thing from 'losing' the self, *i.e.* forgetting it in its use) can deny the inherent wickedness of the self, that is, if the concepts of 'good' and 'bad' are allowed to have any real relation to results. For if the belief were only in the *corruption* of a self inherently good though tainted with original sin, the course of action demanded would not be directed against the self, already sufficiently hard pressed, but against its Adversary, and the sources of its corruption, which, in the modern world are becoming more and more obviously powerful and centralised. To pursue this far would take me beyond the scope of the subject; but it is interesting to remind ourselves that the very word 'selfish' was, according to Archbishop Trench<sup>1</sup>, new minted by the Puritan writers of the seventeenth century. Up to that time Christians had got along on the injunction to love their neighbours as themselves. This becomes a little awkward to carry out when the self is 'suppressed', but I suppose that when the self has reached the stage of being a statistical unit or an entry in various card indices, without 'private' or 'vested' interests of its own, the injunction may be fulfilled by showing an equally impersonal willingness to sacrifice oneself or one's neighbour to The Common Good.

On the other hand it is quite clear that this assumed wickedness of the self cannot apply to the Planners, or else their Plans might be condemned as 'selfish' and the whole idea of central Planning would fall to the ground. The idea that the managerial *élite* is of superior morality, as well as intelligence, to the selfish common man is undeniably implicit in the whole mentality of central Planning; for to

deny it would lead the Planners to the position of openly imposing their own 'selfish' plans upon the world, a stage which is acknowledged only when power has become so habitually centralised that the opinions of the multitude become a matter of indifference to the rulers.

At present we have the obvious fact that, as always, any young man 'with an eye to the main chance, (*i.e.* a suist, or 'selfish' person) will be well advised to throw himself wholeheartedly on the side on which power, money and influence are to be obtained; and that side, it can scarcely be denied, is the side of the Planners and the Managers. On that side he can wield the word 'selfish' against all who oppose him and his ideas, and if he does so with sufficient zeal and ability he may obtain a position of relative wealth, comfort and privilege in the community. Only in the unlikely event of his turning against central Planning, and giving up his chances of promotion, if nothing more, to pursue some deeper satisfaction, such as adherence to the truth may give, will he himself be accused of pursuing his 'selfish' aims to the detriment of The Common Good. It is just one more case of inversion.

Another is implicit in the use of the word 'Planning' itself. If by 'planning' we mean the application of the mind to transforming the will into action—a process fundamental to the development of the human character, and to be found in simple form even in animals—then 'Planning,' in the modern sense, is the usurpation of this function by a few people by the use of power, and more especially, and most dangerously, the use of psychological power on minds in the mass, thus interfering with the development of character at its core. 'Planning' therefore necessarily involves a disbelief in planning, and a reduction to a minimum of the application of the human will and intelligence to the world in which we live.

That it is able to masquerade as the opposite of this is due to the substitution of a widely diffused 'pseudo-will,' in fact the will of a few centrally placed persons, and the application of a widely diffused intelligence to it, for the genuine integrated action of mind and will in the individual. (Attempts to confuse this with the legitimate action of mind on mind and the diffusion of ideas by their own power, and without the use of extraneous force, must be resisted). The result, however, is not merely an immense reduction in the amount of human will in operation (a sort of de-humanising of humanity) but a similar and devastating reduction in the amount and quality of intelligence. It is a matter of common experience that the agent of central policy is not in possession of his full powers, either of will or intelligence; indeed they are reduced in operation to a pitiful fraction of what he possesses as an individual, and often further diluted by diffusion within a collectivity, such as a committee. Consequently he will find himself acting in a way which is mentally deficient, and often sub-human, scarcely up to the standard of foresight and intelligence exhibited by the higher mammals, let alone the morality, which is the produce of integrated will and intelligence acting cumulatively over a long period.

Awareness of this leads to grave disturbance and discontent of mind in the persons concerned, a fact of which the Planners are well aware, and which they attempt to overcome by stimulating the pseudo-will to an inflated enthusiasm—so characteristic of totalitarian regimes in their early stages—which for a time effectively seals off the intelligence from the part affected, and enables the individual to co-operate,

<sup>1</sup>*English Past and Present*, Lecture II, Everyman Edition, 1936; p. 68. In a long footnote we read: "A passage from Hackett's *Life of Archbishop Williams*, Part II, p. 144, marks the first rise of the word, and the quarter from whence it arose: 'When they [the Presbyterians] saw that he was not *selfish* (it is a word of their own new mint), etc.' In Whitlock's *Zootomia* (1654) there is another indication of it as a novelty, p. 364: 'If constancy may be tainted with this *selfishness* (to use our *new wordings* of old and general actings).—It is he who in his striking essay, *The Grand Schismatic, or Suist Anatomised*, puts forward his own words, 'suist,' and 'suicism,' in lieu of those which have ultimately been adopted."

We cannot help wondering how the course of history might have been affected if the Planners of the seventeenth century had not been allowed to provide their successors with this weapon of perversion in the word 'selfish,' and if Whitlock's far juster alternatives, with their suggestion acquired since from the still later word 'suicide,' of losing one's life through loving or saving it, had instead dominated the thinking on the subject.

with an appearance of innocent approval, in the most vicious and insane behaviour: e.g. taxing, dispossessing, evicting, restricting and frustrating the will and action of other people through the application of compulsion, or threats of compulsion, in every possible way. But the division of mind is only driven deeper to the unconscious level, where it can produce a neurosis tending towards schizophrenia. The hope that this division of mind can be eliminated by the complete absorption of the individual will permanently and for the majority of mankind, into the central policy of a few men thus restoring peace, and an end to the necessity for compulsion, except against a minute 'anti-social' minority, is an insane and wicked hope, impossible of fulfilment, but capable of the attainment of sufficient verisimilitude to lure us onwards into ever-increasing conflict and misery. However far we have gone, the only possible escape lies in the opposite direction, in the liberation and re-establishment of the policy and powers of the total individual.

(To be continued)

#### FULL EMPLOYMENT (continued from page 3).

—or to most of them—as a revelation or not, we have no certain means of knowing. In any case it is beside the point, because it is inconceivable that those at least at the very top had not long before recognised that they held their position of power, on which depended their whole chance of achieving World government under their personal control, solely by virtue of the mysterious and hitherto inexplicable inability of the individual members of society to exchange more than a fraction of what they were willing and able to produce, without coming to them—the exchange controllers—for sanctions in the shape of loans to which could be attached whatever conditions suited their policy of centralisation of control. And if that realisation on their part had up till then been more instinctive and unformulated than dialectically expressed, as may have been the case, it most certainly would only require a minimum of reflection on their part to envisage the practical results of the impact of the simple revelation contained in Social Credit on national governments all over the world, to grasp its full impact for them. And especially when they realised, as they must have done, the impatient and smouldering resentment on the part of those national governments against international restraint and interference everywhere, and in particular in London, it must have been borne in on them how precarious, and giddy, and tenuous was the occult source of their vast powers, wholly dependent on continued public ignorance of the true facts.

#### (IV)

Would they have hesitated for a moment to condemn the whole idea out of hand? Or failed to take the most immediate and effective steps to dispose of what threatened to reduce the whole immense, confused issue, from the mysterious intractability of which their own tremendous power immediately derived, to the dimensions of a mathematical equation? It seems unlikely; more especially when it presented itself accompanied by this simple and apparently quite feasible formula for applying to national accountancy, whereby, (and this is the real core of the matter) the members of a society, individually and/or collectively, were to be made free of the entire available material product of their exertions without externally-controlled or arbitrarily-regulated sanctions of any kind, or only such as they themselves should decide to apply.

To a political philosophy of compulsion, which is the root from which the idea of a material and secretly-controlled

World Dictatorship springs, the prospect invoked by such a suggestion is quite literally appalling. The idea of a system acting so comparatively directly and so openly, as to allow even the least educated to connect effort (or absence of effort, or indifferently-applied effort, or even deliberately-deflected effort) with result, presents itself to such a mentality not only as socially dangerous in the highest degree, but, personally, as the most undesirable that could be imagined. And when it is seen against a background of the actual productive potentiality of modern technological progress—with its obvious cumulative capacity of paying immense dividends in the material sense—which, it was suggested, should be released of all *personal* control, except that of each active individual concerned, the picture is altogether too terrifying. Especially unwelcome, too, to those in whose personal grasp the control levers actually are today.

That, I think, is a not unfair summing-up of the inevitable personal reactions, and minds, of those individuals to whom perplexed political statesmanship in England between 1921-23, applied for *economic* guidance in the interest of their war-disrupted national economy. That they got the answer they did get, seems on the face of it, inevitable. That they really imagined that light could be shed from that quarter, confirms the impression that they simply did not understand their real opponents, or the dynamic nature of what they were handling. How many do today, for that matter? For the reactions then invoked, and still active, come from very deep down indeed, where the comparatively common personal power-complex merges in the group-obsession.

Fully to grasp the position, what has to be kept in mind is the fact that the technical proposals of Social Credit, which are what we are assuming were submitted by the administrators for approval, represent in spite of their somewhat misleadingly simple mathematical appearance, something essentially ethical and profoundly challenging. And this is because their claim to feasibility is based on an assumption which, to the dialectical materialist, is entirely unsubstantiated and unjustifiable; and that is the claim that there exists a Natural Law, operating quite independent of human personality, and not amenable to it. That is something which the materialistic, dictator, mentality cannot, dare not, acknowledge, or even conceive; because it undermines all his plans, his planning, to believe in something greater even than his vision of himself ranged at the head of an overwhelmingly organised concentration of material energy. He is completely wrong, of course, in his satanic and ridiculous claim to personal omnipotence, which, since it includes the well-known academical assumption "What I don't know isn't knowledge," brands itself as fictitious nonsense. The practical point, however, is that this *negative fiction*, has become an *active cult*, or *culture*, embodied (incarnate) in those individuals holding and promoting it. The proposals referred to the world's financial masters in 1921-23 contained for them, the most positive and direct challenge that any one culture could give to another. If this challenge was not immediately met and countered, it constituted in fact, a death sentence. The counter-move, while the power to do so still remained, was obviously to be the first to pronounce sentence, and this was accordingly done, and has been since enforced by every available means, which, unhappily, are considerable and varied.