

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 7. No. 20.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 17, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

## THE BIG IDEA (II)

It should be observed that the Archbishop did not specify a war against Germany. Another great war would do. Clearly, it was something proceeding from war in itself which, to him, seemed an indispensable ingredient of the sort of New World he contemplated.

Now, I do not suppose that the Archbishop of Canterbury, in spite of his obvious Calvinism, and its consequent Old Testament philosophy, has achieved such an Olympian detachment from the sufferings of humanity during his numerous holidays as the guest of Mr. Pierpont Morgan that he really contemplated as desirable the scenes from *Inferno* typified by Rotterdam, London, and Coventry. But I cannot see that he could mean anything but the idea covered by the remark of *Planning*, the journal of P.E.P. (Chairman Israel Moses Sieff), that "only in war, or under the threat of war, would the British Government consent to large-scale 'Planning.'" And I think that it is important to consider how this relationship between the Planned Economy of Russia, Germany and the Costa Rican New Deal, and the contemplation of a World War on the one hand, and the reluctance of the British Government to adopt this policy, while making, with certain important reservations, genuine efforts to avoid war, on the other hand, affects the real, though not specified, Peace Aims.

I am going to suggest, and I believe that it is quite easy to prove, that Britain was the only great power which wanted peace and the only factor which prevented Britain from remaining at peace, and still further, maintaining peace in Europe, was the domination of the Government by international Finance and its tools, notably the "Labour" or Socialist Party. And that it was exactly this domination of Britain which, by wrecking individual initiative, provided a spurious justification for "Nationalisation," now called "Planning." The objective was, of course, as in Russia and Germany, monopoly, miscalled Socialism. Once we accept the proposition that Britain is an obstacle to world monopoly, we can understand why the "Labour" Party first pressed for disarmament and then for war.

I do not think that it is a coincidence that both in Socialistic Germany and Socialistic Russia there were, and are, two features in common. One is steady and continuous preparation for war. And the other is scorn of Christianity, two at any rate of whose principles are that individuals are more important than institutions, and that the end never justifies the means.

Men make no mistake when they say that this is an ideological war. It is the war of the Old Testament against the New Testament, of Anti-Christ against Christ. This is not apocalyptic raving—it is not even, in the ordinary sense, religion. It will not be featured prominently in the calls to prayer of the "B".B.C. It is merely a statement of

the trinity of philosophy, policy, and mechanism, brought into the present tense—that two philosophies and two policies, those of world domination and the materialistic Messiah, on the one hand, and individual freedom on the other, are now at death grips. Anyone who cannot see that Judaism and Christianity have come out of the Synagogues and the Churches into the Banks, the Masonic Lodges, the Cabinets and the workshops, has little to contribute to the direction of victory and still less likelihood of recognising it when it arrives. He will not be greatly assisted by the pronouncements of the Archbishops.

To say that the stark issue is abstractions versus realities would of course leave much unsaid. But the Satanic use which has been made of such meaningless phrases as "public ownership and control" is an important feature in the struggle. How can a bloodless abstraction called "the public," having neither position or dimension in time or space, own, still less control, anything? Yet the second largest political party in once-great Britain, the chosen tool of international Finance and intrigue, has largely been built up on blah of this description.

The simple fact is, of course, that the word "ownership" is itself largely meaningless. Except as a legal fiction, you do not "own" anything you do not control, and the object of the drive for "public ownership" is, as in Russia and Germany, to take away individual control and freedom and to centralise power in the hands of a new Ruling Caste. Old Testament moralistic abstractions are perhaps the most powerful agency to this end because they appeal to the lowest mob instincts, and they are not less identifiable when they masquerade under such vestures as "*Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*." Consider the state of France.

Although the fact is a little obscured at the moment, the human individual is the highest manifestation of divine attributes with which we are in day-to-day contact. What differentiates him from the lower orders, when he is different, is his initiative—the fact that he manoeuvres under his own steam. I am confident that there is an organised attempt to drive him down the scale of existence, so that he become primarily a number on a card index, by taking away as far as possible any recognisable initiative, his potentially divine attribute. The present war, and the obliteration of nationalities, the talk of Federal Unions and United States of Europe, a purely Masonic conception, are all directed to that end. That is to say, war provides the opportunity, perhaps the necessity, for conditions of existence in which the individual is wholly at the mercy of institutions, and those institutions are ultimately controlled by an international junta.

To say that the present crisis is adventitious—that it "just happened" and that everyone did their best to avoid it, seems to me to be merely perverse.

The part of Germany has been sufficiently publicised.

Everyone knows that the strenuous efforts (with reservations), of Mr. Chamberlain, who went to lengths never before approached by a British Prime Minister in "appeasement," were greeted with howls of fury not only by the British Socialist Party but by the Costa Rican press urging us to commit suicide, and were finally and irrevocably defeated by the treaty of non-aggression between Mr. Stalin, who had said that he wanted war, and Germany. (Please note that I do not say "between Germany and Russia"—I do not believe that, politically, there is such a place, though there may be later on.)

The major strategy was simple, if grandiose. You bring about a state of affairs in which International Finance controls trade, industry, and distribution and would have no check on its extortions but for private enterprise. You bring about, as in 1928, major depressions and crises, and when you have intolerable conditions, as in Germany and the Distressed (Pardon me, Special) Areas, you say nothing can be done about it because there's no money.

When these conditions inevitably bring about war, you say War is the major evil of the world and comes from "private enterprise"; you spend eleven million pounds a day in pure destruction when you were unable to spend eleven million pounds a month for constructive purposes; and you set every available type of propaganda to work to advocate that the affairs of the whole world shall be finally and irrevocably handed over to a monopoly of the powers operating through finance and subterranean intrigue, so that effective revolt becomes for ever impossible.

It is, of course, the convenient fashion to say, "Yes, yes, but that is all past history—we must forget all about that, and work for the future." There is no such thing as past history. Only by being quite certain what has happened, not merely what we are told, happened, can we understand what *can* happen. Or to put it another way, only by knowing and understanding what and who caused the war, can we understand how to win the war.

(To be continued).  
(All rights reserved).

*C.S. Douglas*

## THE 'REAL' AMERICA.

### To Beat the Enemy

A passage from an article by FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT, *the American Architect*, in "The Progressive."

To beat the enemy these crimes must cease: *Crime*  
1. Chronic artificial-scarcity; *Crime* 2. Real poverty; *Crime*  
3. The general frustration of the people.

On account of these three crimes this nation has now utterly unrepayable money-debt, thousands of billions of hours of perfectly good man-power steadily unemployed year in and year out, lottery-conscripts by the million and countless billions wasted on exploited fright, again betrayed into a war with neither top, bottom nor sides.

No matter who wins this war, we, the people, will eventually have to resolve this clash between two despotisms: the visible despotism of the Axis powers and the invisible despotism of the Democratic powers. Why not resolve it now? If not, all must accept this rising tide of despotism. Democratic despotism is losing visibility rapidly as we sneak toward total war.

The ancient fable of David and Goliath might come in for a little national attention. The nation able to buy the most planes and guns the fastest, and rank-and-file the most conscripts is Goliath! Where is David? He with the pebble in his sling is the people. It is time for David to find the weak spot in the Goliath armour. Essential factors of victory for the people never did lie in this foolish trust in Goliath, the murder-machine. Outrageous bluff has already gone too far. We, the people, must get into effect a few ideas square with the form of government we profess. Victory for us lies in that direction.

What would the essential factors of our victory be? As always in a democracy: Popular initiative! Buy back these United States of America for the people. Call back this one and elect a Congress that will capitalise this nation as planned by the Constitution and at whatever sum is the essential need of the whole people—a fair appraisal made of the share due its present owners—issuing stock to them, making them co-partners in a genuine capitalism of the people, by the people, and for the people, instead of going on with this unconstitutional futile money-gamble now staked on gold.

Then our subservience to foreign influence would end. Call back the vassals of the present order for cause. Send others more capable and loyal. And if the Supreme Court proves to be disloyal to the Constitution—well—there is a name and a remedy for that.

This is counter-revolution by popular initiative! A counter-revolution that is now our only salvation. Only democratic dynamics can put an end to this out-moded international control by the out-of-date, abstract, big-money-industry of London and New York, busy now easing us into bigger and better wars whichever side wins this one.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### The "Future" of Music

Sir,

As an erstwhile executive artist, I should like to endorse (in so far as it covers my own period) every word of Mr. Kaikhosru Sorabji's brilliant article on the "future" of music. Having been placed on half-pay for health reasons shortly after the last war, I studied music abroad, and having attained some success there was first engaged on my return to this country for the international opera season at Covent Garden in 1927, subsequently appearing at the Three Choirs Festival, Albert Hall, and as guest-artist with the gallant Carl Rosa Opera Company, etc. Amongst a number of broadcasts, I was the original *Marcello* in the B.B.C.'s *La Bohème*, but declined the last contract offered me by the Corporation. I played a final *Toreador* in *Carmen* in 1936—and since then have not sung a note either in public or private.

Mr. Sorabji's graphic word-picture of "organised gangs, cliques, rings and institutions of music" is literal truth. Singers are proverbially difficult to silence and my pristine enthusiasm died hard. But such is the effect of that "cess-pool of corruption," the English commercial musical racket, that he who has the good fortune to be independent must extricate himself in order to preserve his self-respect.

Yours faithfully,

CUTHBERT REAVELY, (Capt.)

Sutton, Surrey; January 17, 1942.

## PRESERVING BRITAIN (II)

By N. F. W.

"...the real line of demarcation in the world is cultural, not economic..." — C. H. DOUGLAS.

If the above statement is correct it follows that a world war of such dimensions as the present, must be fundamentally a war of cultures. Properly to assess the chances, then, we must leave theory alone and come down to practice, to biology and experience.

Following this line of thought in the previous article under this title, comfort was found in Britain's fumbling attempts at centralisation—in fact, in her failure to accommodate herself to totalitarian organisation. It may be a somewhat humbling form of comfort, but surely it must be obvious that if anything positive is to emerge from the howling blunders of the present conflict, it will be a humbling of intellectual pretensions of some kind, or nothing.

The hope of the English-speaking people, or rather, the hope of the individual, which embraces the whole of civilisation, lies in the genius of the Anglo-Saxon stock. That is not a racial boast, but simply the logical outcome of the fact that, for good or ill, Anglo-Saxon culture is based on the individual, and not on either race or state, and that ethnologically there is only one true universal unit, the human individual, and a culture to be in the least susceptible of universality must be on that basis. Totalitarian, or state culture is of its nature exclusive and not inclusive. Its comprehensiveness is the same kind as that of the young cuckoo in the sparrow's nest. Such is its habit.

Our hope, then,—and if we are modest enough to be able to perceive it, a very considerable one—is to be derived from the spectacle of Britain, in spite of strenuous and prolonged efforts to convert her to totalitarianism, remaining substantially true to her own genius and her own culture; since it is a biological fact that an organism survives a crisis in its own way, or not at all.

But what guarantee is that of ultimate victory, it might be asked—of preservation? May the Axis Powers not also remain true to their genius? Undoubtedly. But in a war of culture the issue is finally a question of realism in its truest sense. Are we—is British culture—more realistic than the Germans? That is the question. Has decentralisation of initiative and control any practical advantages over centralisation? In short, is Anglo-Saxon culture, comprehending, as it does, the individual point of view not as a secondary, but as a primary element, something closer to Reality and what we call God, than that of the Axis Powers; and therefore, and for that reason alone, containing superior survival value?

It is not really far-fetched, in view of the developing scope of World War No. 2, to suggest that the issue is in fact between Christianity and—it must be 'Paganism,' whatever interpretation we give that term. They stand for two opposed conceptions of the universe and its Government, civil and mental.

The ancient world conceived of only one power, and only one form of Government, that of physical force,—threat and punishment. In fact there was no practical alternative, until the advent of Christianity. This advent took the form of the discovery and demonstration of a new force, not physical as physics had been understood up to then—but what the Greeks, for want of a better word,

called metaphysical. Christianity was an assertion and demonstration of the supremacy of this force, and of its indestructibility.

It is more than nineteen hundred years since this discovery impinged on human consciousness, and most, if not all, of Western history has consisted in the reactions it produced in the ancient Graeco-Roman civilisation of Southern Europe and the Germanic and Scandinavian races. In one sense they impressed themselves on Christianity almost as much as it impressed them; the resulting amalgam being typified in that territorial abstraction known as the Holy Roman Empire.

In one country, however, from which the Roman influence had receded, a social structure grew up and matured under influences predominately Christian, and that was in the British Isles, and pre-eminently in Anglo-Saxon England. So that culturally, in the true biological sense, the British stock came to be the outstanding, and most complete racial embodiment of Christianity, functioning in practical and organic harmony under their own typical constitution.

Whether by accident or design the English-speaking people came to tame and populate the waste spaces of the earth, till that small race of stalwart Christians grew into the most widely scattered and prosperous nation ever known, engendering in the process, as such achievements always do, envy, and malice, and fear in the minds of less favoured nations.

Now, with the last, and this war, comes the testing time, not so much of the British Empire, which is really a political abstraction, as of Christianity itself, embodied in Anglo-Saxon culture. Men are to have proof whether, as it asserts, Christianity is not merely a form of religious worship, but the Truth—natural realism, against which, and without which, organised physical force, either in the form of the centralised military power of the totalitarian states, and upon the Home Front, now and subsequently, under the name of Socialism (which is governmental centralisation) is relatively impotent.

British culture constitutes a genuine biological advance. It is not the case of just another Babylonian, or Roman, or Spanish Empire; a national uprising, and growth and decay on the well-trying and self-destructive principle of centralising control of administration—the Trade Cycle in terms of society; but a break-away in a wholly new direction. No repetition, but an entirely new experiment in life and politics, under the influence of a wholly untried force, or principle.

It would seem that in the face of the magnitude of the crisis which confronts all society, no less a conception of the issue is adequate; nor of the potential position and responsibility of Britain towards it. Although under the increasing pressure of misapplied and manipulated financial credit, particularly in the last twenty or so years, the last vestiges of any condition in which Christian practice might be supposed possible, appeared to be fast fading, yet the hopeful and acute eye may discern under the stress of World War No. 2 what looks like a true Christian core in British nature in process of being exposed. If this is so, then it all depends on whether Christianity itself is realistic. As a practical motive force behind men's actions, is it nearer to Reality in every sense, than the limited Pagan conception of physical force? Upon that point, and our ability to be true to our own national genius, rests the issue for us, and for the whole world.

## 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: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15; Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 7. No. 20. Saturday, January 24, 1942.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

#### Committee on New Electoral Register

Mr. Bower, M.P. asked the Home Secretary in the House of Commons on January 8 whether he could make a statement on the constitution and terms of reference of the committee which is to consider certain administrative and technical problems that will arise in connection with the preparation of a new register of electors and possible redistribution of seats?

Mr. Herbert Morrison: I will, with permission, circulate in the OFFICIAL REPORT a statement giving the constitution and terms of reference of the Committee.

Mr. Keeling: Would the right hon. Gentleman consider whether any future announcement in the Press can be made in plain English instead of Civil Service jargon?

Mr. Morrison: The difficulty was between clarity and accuracy. There was some conflict. We did our best to state the purposes of the Committee. I am sure that the Committee will understand their terms of reference.

Following is the statement:

Constitution of Committee:

Sir Sylvanus Percival Vivian, C.B. (Chairman), Mr. Charles Craik Cunningham, C.V.O., Sir Rowland Evans, Mr. Charles Lee des Forges, C.B.E., Mr. Morgan Garro Jones, M.P., Mr. William Glenvil Hall, M.P., Mr. Sidney West Harris, C.B., C.V.O., Mr. Herbert Holdsworth, M.P., Mr. Raymond Jones, Mr. Charles Henry Lockhart, Mr. Cecil Oakes, C.B.E., The Right Hon. Sir Robert William Hugh O'Neill, Bart, M.P., Major Goronwy Owen, D.S.O., M.P., Mr. George Robert Shepherd, Sir Robert Topping, Lieutenant-Commander Charles Williams, M.P.

Terms of Reference:

To consider whether for effecting the purposes of the present system of electoral registration improved methods and machinery can be devised, having regard especially to the circumstances likely to obtain in the period following the termination of hostilities;

and to examine the technical problems involved in any scheme of redistribution of Parliamentary seats by way of preparation for consideration of the principles on which any scheme should be based;

and to report on both these matters.

The Joint Secretaries of the Committee are:—  
Mr. V. P. A. Detrick of the General Register Office (England and Wales), and Mr. K. Macassey, of the Home Office.

#### Points from the Debate on the War Situation

Commander Sir Archibald Southby (Epsom): "General Auchinleck's fine campaign in North Africa does not offset the loss of Guam and Wake and the over-running by the

Japanese of the Philippines. How much better it would have been if the Government had encouraged the United States to augment the defences of those vitally important places rather than encourage them to expend time and material in the creation of the new bases which we have leased to them in the West Indies, Bermuda and Newfoundland."

"We are in difficulty in Singapore because we have not got aeroplanes, and we have not got aeroplanes because they have been sent to Russia. We could hit at the Japanese who are trying to get Singapore by bombing them in Tokyo, and the easiest place from which we can do that is Vladivostock, but we cannot do that because our Russian Ally is not fighting the Japanese. Neither the United States nor ourselves can stem the tide of Japanese victory in the Far East unless we hold Singapore."

Mr. Stokes (Ipswich): "We find ourselves in the position of having the Prime Minister in the United States with most of the Chiefs of Staff, and that does seem to me to illustrate the disadvantage of having a Prime Minister who is also a Minister of Defence. I leave it at that with these two observations. I, myself, hate to think of the military centre of control shifting to Washington for reasons into which I need not go. Secondly, it strengthens a nasty feeling, which I have had for many months, indeed I might almost say for many years, that we may find ourselves reduced to occupying what I term the position of America's Heligoland off the Coast of Europe."

A Stafford corn-merchant complained in court that he could not keep pace with the circulars he received from the Food Ministry. The Ministry had sent him 600 circulars. In one there were 19 pages of reading matter. Another of 10 pages told him how to sell a sack of bran, and it was so full of "whereas" and "wherefore" that when he had read it he did not know what it was all about.

Mr. J. Henderson Stuart, M.P. has already noticed signs in the Government of "an unholy alliance of big business and big unions that augered ill for the future of freedom and prosperity."

Or of free and proper men?

Sir Ernest Benn does not like monopoly. He says, "select sections of the front to attack. I have chosen the B.B.C. monopoly."

In the World's Fair, the Aunt Sallys would seem poor sport, if the managing director became at all conspicuous.

"Parenthetically, does the British public know the Army's principal pleasantry at the newspapers' expense? British units believe, or feign belief, in a newspaper conspiracy to impress the world that the British Army consists principally of overseas legions, includes some Scottish units, but not a single Englishman.

"When I was telling friends of the 4th Tank Battalion that I proposed that the unit's name should be submitted for publication I got a derisive comment 'That will never do; we are English to a man!'"

— Daily Telegraph.

## Democratic Victory or the Slave State?

By L. D. BYRNE

*The conclusion of the address given at the Winnipeg Monetary Reform Convention of October, 1941, by the Technical Adviser to the Alberta Government.*

The primary consideration in all organisation is the objective—because the purpose of organisation is to gain a pre-determined objective by the most efficient means—that is, by the *right* means, using the term in the sense that 'that is right which works best.'

The objective of organised community life has never changed. It is to enable individuals to gain the maximum personal security and freedom from their association. Or in other words to obtain the results they want as the outcome of their organised efforts.

The form of organisation which will achieve this is one in which the members of a community, collectively, constitute the supreme authority. It entails the sovereignty of the people in determining the results they get—and this is the basis of what we call democracy.

The means by which those results can be attained depend upon the application of specialised knowledge. While some of the people will have this knowledge on one branch of activity, the majority are invariably ignorant about that particular subject. While each might be a specialist in something, they cannot be experts on every subject. So that while there may be general agreement on the results wanted by those comprising a community, when it comes to a question of methods for obtaining those results the majority is invariably wrong. Besides even those who have the specialised knowledge are unlikely to agree on the *best* method.

The branch of organisation dealing with devising and applying methods to produce certain results is termed "administration." And the principle involved is for the people to appoint those who are prepared to accept responsibilities to get them the results they want in various branches of activity, and to give them a free hand to adopt the methods they consider best and to judge them by results.

### Responsibility United with Authority

Responsibility must carry with it authority to perform the duties entailed. And just as responsibility without authority simply will not work, neither will authority without responsibility. The mess in which the world flounders to-day is evidence of this fact—for the authority exercised by our financial rulers and governmental bureaucrats is devoid of all responsibility to the people.

What do we mean by authority? It is the right to impose one's will on others. In the world as it is constituted, authority must be backed by sanctions—or, if you prefer, the means to enforce one's will.

Now in a functioning democracy, ultimate power resides with the people and all other authority is delegated by them. This supreme authority—or sovereignty—is backed, in the final analysis, by force; for example, the armed forces, the police and so forth.

So much for the broader considerations of social or-

ganisation. Without going into specific details it is necessary for us to consider two other questions of major importance—the means by which the people can assert their will (a) in the sphere of government or politics, and (b) in the economic sphere.

We can, perhaps, obtain a clearer concept of these questions by comparing them, in their relation to society, with the organisation of, say, an industrial concern.

In an industry the shareholders and the board of directors elected by them are concerned with policy—and policy only. All questions of technical methods are left to the management—and if the desired results are not forthcoming the management is changed by the directors, or if the latter do not remedy an undesirable state of affairs, the shareholders can change their directors.

In the same way a properly organised democracy would have two distinct branches—that which has to do with deciding policy and the administrative branch dealing with methods.

The people, or the shareholders in the commonwealth, must have the means for making known their wishes in regard to the results they want and the means for enforcing their will.

### The Money System is a Voting System

The most effective means which have been devised for ascertaining the wishes of individuals, and getting at "the will of the people" are the various systems of voting. Those which will be most familiar to you all are the political voting system and the plebiscite. However, there is another voting system we all use much more extensively, but the fact that it is a voting system has been very carefully hidden from the people. This is the monetary system.

Now money is one of the chief organising agencies which has been devised by the human mind. In fact it is primarily an aid to economic organisation. By distributing recognised claims to goods and services in the form of money, we ensure that individuals can go into stores where the goods are displayed and obtain what they want. By so doing they are getting the results they want from the economic system.

It will be plain that, under our modern complex economy, to the extent an individual has money, he possesses economic voting power. To the extent an individual lacks money, he is without economic voting power. And finally to the extent he can obtain money only on conditions over which he has no control, his effective economic voting power is restricted.

If, in the necessarily cursory review of these matters which I have given you, I have succeeded in presenting a clear idea of, firstly, the most important features of the situation we have been facing, and, secondly, the basic factors involved in the organisation of society to conform to the requirements of a natural social order—then you will readily agree with the following summary of the points which emerge:

(1) In a democracy the State and all its institutions exist to serve the sovereign people, and the people will obtain the results they want from the management of their affairs.

(2) In point of fact this has not been happening in the democratic countries. The people have been forced to

accept conditions which have been imposed upon them—conditions diametrically opposed to those they wanted.

(3) This has been achieved by means of the monetary systems under the control of a centralised power.

(4) This money power has used the financial system to render ineffectual the people's economic voting power. And because the control of money carries with it control of the things money will buy, centralised control of financial policy means centralised power over every aspect of economic activity. Thus effective government has been transferred from parliaments and legislatures to bank parlours and the small group of international money manipulators in whom resides the ultimate control.

(5) The result has been to render ineffective the sovereignty of the people and the instruments of democratic government.

Now it will be plain that the broad policy behind the attempt to enslave humanity, is to continue the process of centralisation of power until the people do not possess even their present democratic rights.

### The Essential Task

I submit that the essential task which confronts us is to defeat that policy and establish the opposite policy of a progressive decentralisation of power.

How are we going to achieve that objective? Clearly the crux of the question is to transfer power from the control by a small group of men to the people as a whole. But how?

To decide this we must, I submit, get back to first principles in the organisation of democracy. The people must become the supreme authority, so that the State and its institutions operate in obedience to their will.

Unless we remain blind to reason it is certain that we cannot hope to achieve this by using the means which have resulted in the present mess. For example it is useless for the people to expect that they can go out and vote for this or that party candidate every three or four years, and then go home and leave their affairs to party management. The professional party politician has a vested interest in his party and is subject to control by those who control his party. And those who control his party are those who, in the final analysis, supply the party funds.

Is it any wonder then that representative government has ceased to represent the will of the people, and that it functions in obedience to financial domination? And that state of affairs will continue until the representatives of the people are forced to represent their constituents.

To achieve this the people, as the sovereign authority, must be organised. Unorganised they are nothing more than a helpless mob which can be stampeded hither and thither. Properly organised they become an invincible force whose authority is supreme.

The task which confronts us is to enable the people of this country to organise themselves as an effective democracy. And provided we remain true to the basic principles involved, we can do it.

Now the strategy of all tyranny is to divide and confuse. To counteract that any effective organisation of the people must unite and eliminate confusion.

That unity can be achieved on the basis of agreement

as to the results desired. So the people's organisation must be able to enforce "the will of the people" at all times on all questions of policy, and be proof against the dangers of disintegration resulting from differences over methods.

Without going into the matter in any detail, I will give you my views, for what they are worth, on the kind of organisation which will meet these requirements.

The unit of organisation would be a group of ten under a leader elected by the members. In any district the leaders of ten groups would form a district council under a leader of their own choosing. These district leaders in a suitable area, e.g., a constituency, would constitute the divisional council, likewise under an elected leader. And in the same way the provincial council would consist of the divisional leaders, who would choose a provincial leader after consultation with their divisional councils. The provincial leaders together with the elected national leader would constitute the national executive.

The basis of the entire structure would be the free association of individuals in groups, and the elected leaders all along the line would hold office at the pleasure of those upon whom they are dependent for election. All questions of policy would be decided by the general membership. All questions of administration would be left to the respective executives.

At first sight there may seem nothing very remarkable in that form of organisation, but I assure you that, given the necessary incentives, it would prove invincible.

Suppose, for example, such an organisation existed in this province, and a majority of the people belonged to it. No elected member of the legislature, no newspaper, in fact no other organisation could refuse to obey "the will of the people" as expressed through its membership. Consider its control over newspapers' circulation, over elections, over payment of taxes and so forth, and you will get some idea of the sanctions it could invoke to enforce its authority.

Again, because the members of the various elected councils—district, divisional, provincial and national—could remain in office only so long as they had the support of those who elect them, they would be responsive to the wishes of the members all the way along the line.

I have merely touched upon a couple of the features of this type of organisation. Details of its constitution and its possibilities would, necessarily, be a subject for special consideration. For the present I am concerned only with raising this question in a general way.

Finally let me make it plain that the adoption of this form of organisation does not necessarily mean scrapping any existing organisation. It can proceed as a parallel mechanism which will ultimately, by a natural process, replace others as it unites people at present divided by loyalties to a multitude of ineffective organised bodies.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the situation as I see it. It is your privilege to agree or disagree with the views I have placed before you.

The stark fact is that we are face to face with a desperately urgent situation—a situation in which everything we hold dear is being threatened by ruthless forces.

It is of little use merely recognising the peril which confronts humanity. It is worse than useless hoping that

conditions will right themselves, while the forces of destruction carry us with increasing momentum toward certain and large scale disaster. It is criminal folly to refuse to recognize the gravity of our plight.

There is one and only one hope of averting the tragedy towards which we are being hurried—and that is action along effective lines and over a sufficiently wide area.

It is within your power to give the leadership and the inspiration which will invoke such action.

*Reprinted from "Today and Tomorrow."*

*(Reprints of this article will be available shortly. A further announcement will be made when they are ready.)*

## POOR JOHN

By B. M. PALMER

The power to defeat German National Socialism, both in the field and in essence, can only be drawn from the organic development of British genius. But this would not be favourable to the vast organised political powers which are making a last attempt to establish complete world control. This is a simple explanation of the intensive propaganda now being run by the controlled press and the B.B.C.; of which the burden is that the *means* employed for the military defeat of the Nazis are of no moment, at the same time suggesting that there is only *one* means—that like the Russians we should allow ourselves to be totally "governmentalised." (This frightful word, with its partner "democratisation," is symbolic of the 'new' philosophy. Compare them with "free," "good," or "God," which these hybrids mean to destroy if they can).

We had been told that we must expect great things from Russia. But few here, not even the most ardent communists, really believed that the Russians could long withstand Nazi centralised military control. Yet within eight months the tide seems already to have turned, and the Russians have performed that most difficult of all military operations, according to the B.B.C., the change-over from defensive to offensive warfare.

It is well for us that they have done so much. But they were capable of the same heroic resistance under the Czars. General Marian Kirkiel, at present G.O.C. the Polish troops in Scotland, wrote in 1937:—

"The Russian army retreated . . . without demoralisation or decomposition. 'Its body was stricken, not its spirit,' wrote Saint-Cyr. Reduced numerically, it did not cease to be an effective instrument of war. The incredible moral staying power and stoicism of the Russian army of 1812 introduced an unknown factor into all calculations based on material forces. . . . In the night after the battle Napoleon entertained the hope—and many shared it—that the end had been reached through the annihilation of the Russian forces. He was wrong."

By all the rules of probability Napoleon should have taken Moscow in 1812, and Hitler's troops have made it their winter quarters in 1941. Each was defeated, not by a system of government, but by what N. F. W. has defined as "biological nature, individual and national," in which climate and geographical conditions play a secondary part, and systems of government least part of all. For a people are what they are in spite of, not because of their governments. "Governments have to be mastered."

If this were not so, the White King would have been one of the greatest of military leaders:

"The next moment soldiers came running through the wood, at first in twos and threes, ten or twenty together, and at last in such crowds that they seemed to fill the whole forest. Alice got behind a tree, for fear of being run over, and watched them go by.

"She thought that in all her life she had never seen soldiers so uncertain on their feet: they were always tripping over something or other, and whenever one went down, several more always fell over him, so that the ground was soon covered with little heaps of men. . . . The confusion got worse every moment, and Alice was very glad to get out of the wood into an open place where she found the White King seated on the ground, busily writing in his memorandum book.

"'I've sent them all!' the King cried in a tone of delight."

As N. F. W. puts it, it is quite certain that if we have nothing to oppose to the Axis but centralised despotism employing organised physical force we may count ourselves defeated already. For the Germans, by reason of their nature, are able to do these things far better than we can, better even than the Russians. But victory does not depend on centralisation alone, as is now quite clear. What progress have the Japanese made in the China war during the last five years, and at what cost?

It is vital to the enemies of democracy that these things shall not be formulated in the national consciousness. Therefore we are subjected to an organised campaign urging us to depart from our true nature, the only thing that will give us the strength to win, or make victory worth while when we have it.

The disastrously divided state of mind produced by this devil's propaganda is reflected in a letter to *The Times* of January 12:—

"Sir,—The articles in *The Times* of January 2 and 3 are interesting reading, giving many and various reasons why we have not produced and are not producing all the munitions possible. They do not, however, strike at the root of all the trouble. This trouble is so deep-seated and its cure so distasteful to the whole up-bringing, spirit, and sentiment of our people—and to those of the writer—that it is only the extreme urgency of the case which has prompted this letter. As a people and as a Government we do not love—more, we actually distrust—complete and thorough Government control of industries, services, supplies, and labour. Up to the present, we have toyed with half-and-half measures. Our productive effort is torn in two—one half is under Government control, the other half still private enterprise.

"We do not like Government control, but the day has now come when we must consider, not our preferences, but what must be done if the war is to be won. One thing is clear. We 'cannot serve God and Mammon'—Government control and private enterprise. Government control has now gone so far and is so badly operated—because of our dislike of it—that it is strangling and retarding the efforts of private enterprise to which in the past we have always trusted, and which, it must be remembered, has made England great. It is no good trying to 'produce' satisfactorily while one is being strangled, and therefore the only thing now to be done is to give up the struggle and the strangling,

and for the war-time at least resort to total and complete Government control of all industry, all public services, all material, all transport, and all labour.

"We cannot be worse off than we are now, with a total productive output far below the total productive capacity of the machines and labour we have available. Russia has demonstrated what a totally governmentalised country can do, and we had better follow her example, hoping that we may come somewhere near what she has achieved. Our hotch-potch methods have only produced muddles, delays, disappointments, apathy, discontent—with oneself as well as with the powers-that-be:

"All along a muddle, all along a mess,  
"All along of doing things 'rather more or less.'"  
"Yours, &c., JOHN A. PURVES."

John A. Purves is not alone in his reluctant willingness to sell his inheritance for a mess of pottage.

He is not even clear as to the identity of "God and Mammon"; judging from the order of his words he sees Government control as God, although he believes that in the past it was private enterprise that made England great. For "God and Mammon" read "Immanent and Non-Immanent sovereignty," or "free men and banksters" (a good old Social Credit word which we might at this juncture revive), and it becomes clear that poor John in his confusion is advocating the old lie that the end justifies the means.

We shall and will defeat the Germans, but not by defeating ourselves in the process. There is only one way: by ensuring that the means employed *envisages* the end. Have it in poetry if you like:—

"Come the three corners of the world in arms,  
And we shall shock them; nought shall make us rue,  
If England to itself do rest but true."

#### SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND

#### SOCIAL CREDIT CIRCULATING REFERENCE LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* is in course of formation. It will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a considerable number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon the subject, as well as standard works on banking, currency, and social science. No charge will be made to registered annual subscribers for this service but a deposit of 15/- will be required for the cost price of postage, which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion. A packing box, which must be returned with the books borrowed, will be supplied free. For further particulars, apply Librarian, 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

Preliminary list of books to be acquired:—

*The Tyranny of Words* by STUART CHASE.  
*Waters Flowing Eastward* by L. FRY.  
*Secret Societies and Subversive Movements* by NESTA WEBSTER.  
*World Revolution* by NESTA WEBSTER.  
*Grey Eminence* by ALDOUS HUXLEY.  
*Rural Rides* by COBBETT.  
*Comingsby* by DISRAELI.

160

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Use of Money .....	6d.
"This 'American' Business" .....	3d. each 12 for 2/-

Also

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold .....	4/6
Lower Rates (pamphlet) .....	3d.
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson .....	6d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce Report .....	6d.
Is Britain Betrayed? by John Mitchell .....	2d. each 12 for 1/6
How Alberta is Fighting Finance .....	2d. each 12 for 1/6

(All the above postage extra).

#### Leaflets

Bomb the German People .....	100 for 1/9
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell .....	9d. doz. 50 for 2/6
Taxation is Robbery .....	100 for 3/- 50 for 1/9

(The above are post free).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED  
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

## REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

Information about Social Credit activities in different regions may be had by writing to the following addresses:

- BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.  
BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.  
BLACKBURN S.C. Association: 168 Shear Brow, Blackburn.  
BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.  
DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.  
LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.  
LONDON Liaison Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.  
Lunch hour re-unions on the first and third Thursdays of the month at 12-30 p.m., at The Plane Tree Restaurant, Great Russell Street, W. C. 1. Next Meeting February 5.  
MIDLAND D.S.C. Group: see Birmingham.  
NEWCASTLE-on-Tyne Douglas Credit Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.  
PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group: 115 Essex Road, Milton, or 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor.  
SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

## MISCELLANEOUS

WANTED: Social Credit, volumes III-X complete. Write to E. Bruley, "Plymstock," Dukes Avenue, Theydon Bois, Essex.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.