

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 12, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

The Brief for the Prosecution

By C. H. DOUGLAS

PART II. CHAPTER III*

"A mass of evidence establishes the fact that there is in existence a persistent and well contrived system intended to produce and in practice producing a despotic power which at one and the same time places Government Departments above the sovereignty of Parliament and beyond the jurisdiction of the Courts."—Lord Hewart, *The New Despotism*.

Since a considerable portion of the earlier portion of this book is devoted to an examination of the process and the origins of the situation to which Lord Hewart refers, further emphasis on the fact is unnecessary. But the statement just quoted, great as its value is as coming from a Lord Chief Justice of England, only deals with half the indictment. The system to which he refers does not merely place the anonymous bureaucrat above the law. It places the law, and the sanctions of the law, at the unchecked disposal of the bureaucrat.

It should be realised that the situation of an anonymous lawmaker has become at least temporarily impregnable, and is a violation—admittedly only open rather than covert—of the principles of Parliamentary government without those principles having been renounced. For some time, much too long a time, no Bill has been presented to the House of Commons which has not been drawn up by the Treasury, whoever ostensibly sponsored it. But someone *did* sponsor it, and a facade of responsibility has been maintained until recently. This has now gone. "The State" makes laws *tout court*. "The State," in fact, is quite probably some little naturalised alien full of bright ideas from the ghettos of Mid-Europe, looking for preferment to any quarter rather than that affected by his law-making. To employ a colloquialism, lawmaking has become altogether too easy.

Law is taking on a new aspect. For centuries concerned to maintain every man in his rights, it is mainly now employed to take them away. Interference in small matters, to have any rationality, apart from desirability, must postulate an over-riding policy, and if unlimited latitude is allowed, even in regulation-making, control of policy goes with it. To illustrate this, we may consider the proposed large projects for the "utilisation" of Scottish water-power.

The Report on which the proposals are based remarks "No vested interests will be permitted to interfere" with them. That is to say, the proposals represent an over-riding policy which will be empowered by the sanctions of the law to sweep *existing* vested interests out of its path. At the same time it is admitted that the objective is more power for factory industry, and notably for electro-chemical industry. Who committed the nation to that policy? When was it submitted to the judgment of the House of Commons?

It is symptomatic of the paralysis which has overtaken British thinking in the past fifty years that this phrase "vested interest" which merely means stability of tenure, can appear in the Report of a Royal Commission, without amplification, as though it described a public evil. There is probably not an individual in the country whose waking hours are not largely devoted to acquiring a vested interest in something or other, even if it be only a tooth-brush. In fact, it is precisely those predatory aggressors on vested interests concerned with the monopolisation of Scottish water-power, and the industries for the use of which it is intended, which transform concentrated vested interests into a public danger. The widespread distribution of vested interests would be the greatest guarantee of social stability conceivable.

This sweeping away of minor vested interests by a major vested interest is policy in action. But the policy is not defined and is carefully kept from Parliamentary discussion unless a nebulous connection with "full employment" can be regarded as a definition.

Large-scale utilisation of water-power for the generation of electricity has been feasible for at least fifty years and the benefits arising from the general use of electricity have been widely recognised if not realised. It is curious that, while the prime mover, the water turbine, has not been radically improved during that period, and the prime mover used in the generation of electricity from the use of coal, the steam turbine, has been improved out of all recognition, the sudden decision to transform Scotland into a water-power factory has awaited the "nationalisation" of coal. From an orthodox economics point of view, the case for hydro-electric development *on a large scale* is weaker than it was in 1900. In 1938 the generated units of electricity in Great Britain were approximately 26,000,000,000. Excluding war production, which was already considerable, it is doubtful whether industrial demand was 50 per cent. of that figure. At the present time, *i.e.*, before any of the proposed water-power has been developed, (war-time electricity-production-figures cannot be given) it is very greatly in excess of the pre-war figure. There is no possibility of utilising power from extensive hydraulic development for many years after any normally contemplated termination of hostilities, and

*The extracts now being published in *The Social Crediter* from Major Douglas's forthcoming *The Brief for the Prosecution*, of which the first appeared on May 13, 1944, are published with a view to the existing situation, and not in the sequence or detail in which they will appear later.

such termination must cause an almost immediate drop in the demand for electrical power. By the time the immense works contemplated are complete, industrial demand, in the absence of war, will have fallen far below present electrical supply capacity, and will not be replaced by equivalent domestic use. To the extent that this capacity displaces manpower (the objective of using electrical power) the unemployment situation, looked at from an orthodox point of view, will be worsened.

The proposal to increase greatly the generating capacity of electric power-stations, therefore, requires far more justification than has publicly been offered for it, by whatever means the power is generated. The idea that there can be no limit to the generating capacity required is not merely absurd on the face of it, but is contradicted by experience, *except in war*. If it has been decided to adopt the philosophy of the Great German General Staff, that the primary objective of a nation is war, that is another matter. Even so, it is far from certain that these large power-stations do not constitute the gravest possible military risk. There is a considerable mystery surrounding their comparative immunity from attack.

We must therefore link up the development of water-power with the "nationalisation" of coal. A considerable proportion of the coal mined in Great Britain goes to provide the energy which is distributed as electrical power. A good deal of careful propaganda has been devoted to the "wastefulness" of burning coal, but in fact the subject is far from being susceptible to unqualified judgment. What is obvious is that coal is the principle raw material of the chemical industry: that every ton released strengthens the chemical industry: and that the chemical industry with its collateral, electro-metallurgy, is making preparations to take delivery of a high percentage of the electrical energy generated by Scottish water power: and that the propaganda for increased export may easily result in the export of our capital resources on an even larger scale than in the past.

On the other hand, the minor vested interests which are adversely affected are numerous. Perhaps the first in importance, although apparently the last to be considered, is the antipathy of the resident population. The Scottish highlander has never taken kindly to the industrial system. He is entirely unconvinced that "the development" of the highland areas would be to his advantage, and in fact the arguments which have been adduced to convince him, are both perfunctory and disingenuous. The natural highland water power is almost ideal for the utilisation of small, high-fall installations taking water from small streams at a high altitude, and returning it to its original bed several hundred feet lower down, without interfering in any way with the watershed or the local amenities. Such plants, rarely exceeding two or three hundred horsepower, under local control and possible in nearly every village, offer advantages to the local population obtainable in no other way, and are almost specifically excluded from the project.

The Commission proposals are radically different. Whole catchment areas are to be monopolised, glens are to be flooded, villages submerged, immense dams and pipelines built, with secondary effects on climate and vegetation which are unknown but certainly considerable. No one can say with certainty to what extent American soil erosion is affected by large power schemes.

The electrical energy generated is transmitted at so high a voltage that its utilisation locally or *en route* is impracticable, and is in fact disclaimed.

After rendering lip-service to the need to arrest the depopulation of the country, the country's chief assets are to be at least damaged, and at most destroyed, and its power transmitted almost intact to selected industrial areas further South. The Severn Barrage Scheme which is free from many of the objections to Highland industrialisation appears to have been shelved to the detriment of our only unspoilt area.

While the project, brought forward under cover of war, when probably 75 per cent. of the individuals whose lives will be affected are prevented by absence or other causes due to war, from expressing their opinions on it, affords a compact instance of the working of the Supreme State, it does not differ, save perhaps in magnitude, from hundreds of similar cases. The technique is always the parade of "the common good." As Madame Ayn Rand so truly remarked in *The Moral Basis of Individualism*, "no tyrant ever rose to power save on the plea of the common good."

To anyone who will take the trouble to penetrate through the veneer with which written British history has been overlaid, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the political instinct of the people has deteriorated, rather than progressed. The situation with which we are confronted is one with which our history ought to make us familiar, and to which we have previously reacted correctly by such measures as Magna Carta and the Petition of Right. The native instinct has intuitively recognised in the past that it was not so much the question of who held certain powers which was important, as that those powers should not be concentrated. The derided phrase, "That is not done," embodies a sound, if now perverted, national conclusion. One of the more ominous symptoms of this political degeneration is often to be found in those quarters which in many ways represent the flower of our culture. It takes the form of a lament that "the unity of purpose which we find in war cannot be carried over into peace." The short answer is that it can be and is, in Germany and Russia, and that if that is all that is required, why not surrender to one or the other?

This attitude arises more than from any one other cause out of an almost perverse determination *not to recognise the persistency of a policy of centralisation*, and in consequence, *the absolute necessity for the equivalent of a Bill of Rights ultra vires of Parliament together with a permanent professional body, trained to attach not only an existing law, but armed with permanent power to bring out into the open for cross-examination at any time the originators of any law which encroaches on those rights*. It is essential to exalt the man above the machine. It is nothing less than suicidal to allow the idea of abstract and unquestioned omnipotence to the products of a law-making system of the chain-store variety such as we tolerate to-day, and such "laws" as Regulation 18B, which sweep away the hard-won safeguards of a thousand years, are the logical outcome of this mental attitude.

It is perhaps hardly necessary to observe that such a body would be appointed and dismissible by individuals, not by the administrative Civil Service. One of the first results

of such an arrangement would be an arrest in the flow of law-making. If the world is regarded as a factory run by officials on would-be mass-production lines, continuous works-orders camouflaged as laws are inevitable, though quite rapidly fatal. But, in a world in which it is realised that the more action is spontaneous within the limits of personal sovereignty the less the friction and the higher the general satisfaction, they are both redundant and objectionable.

There are several unofficial bodies in existence whose intentions in regard to this problem are excellent, but it is no detraction from their public spirit to say that they are wholly inadequate. We have to deal with the usurpation of powers which derive from a completely different conception of the nature of the state, and these powers require to be brought into proper relation to the world of to-day by measures as carefully designed and powerfully supported as those with which they have to deal.

It is often said, and with justice, that we hear too much in these days of "rights," and far too little of duties. It does not appear to occur to such critics that when rights were more stable, duties were more recognised.

(Copyright)

(All rights reserved)

CHECK TO WILLINK

"Door-to-door 'Snoopers' ask 'How is your health?'" "They question 2,000 people a month." "Should a Patient Tell Snoopers?" "B.M.A. protest sent to Willink." These and other headlines suggesting the Gestapo drew attention to matter in the *Daily Express* for July 27 and 28, concerning the background to a letter written by Dr. A. Henry Price, secretary of the Reading division of the B.M.A., to the Minister of Health protesting at "women 'snoopers' going round his district quizzing people about their ailments."

Dr. Price, says the *Daily Express*, wrote to the Minister and five Berkshire and Oxfordshire M.P.s:—

"I beg that full consideration be given to the attached copies of statements. I retain the originals.

"The matter was discussed by my executive last week, and I was instructed to call attention to:—

"1. The Gestapo-like method by which private information with regard to the health of free persons was extracted.

"2. The expression of opinion as to the alleged differential treatment of patients.

"3. The fact that the local doctor was not even visited or even informed that his patients were to be questioned.

"My executive feels that this is the type of behaviour that will occur if the profession does not repel the proposed attempt to bring the doctors under the heel of Whitehall."

The "snoopers" were field-workers of the War-time Social Survey Department of the Ministry of Information conducting an investigation into the public health for the Ministry of Health.

The complaining patients say that throughout extensive and intimate questioning they were allowed to retain the impression that they were obliged to give information regardless of their own wishes in the matter.

THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT

1. "THE AWAKENING."

By N. F. W.

"He that plots to be the only figure among cyphers is the decay of the whole age." — FRANCIS BACON.

With the threat of "Technical Peace," along with all its tremendous problems, assuming visible proportions on the international horizon, I think we should attempt to get some general idea at least of one of the most, if not *the* most vital issue that will be presented to us; and that is, the question of political Judaism, the effective spearhead of which is wrapped up in what is known as the Zionist Movement.

We are likely to make most headway in dealing with anything connected with the Jewish race, if we face certain facts concerning it as our starting-point, and accept them without rancour. The Jew, notwithstanding the inhuman treatment his behaviour has evoked all down the centuries, is a human being, and the problem he presents, no matter how exaggerated and acute it is in his case, is only an accentuation of something common to humanity. To Nature, the Great Physician, and from the standpoint of perfect balance, we are all of us more or less "pathological cases." Where the Jew differs from the rest of us is in presenting a case of collective racial neurasthenia. It should not be necessary to elaborate this point. We are all familiar with individual cases of neurasthenia; we have noted its exaggerated touchiness and egotism, the rapid reaction from one extreme to the other, and above all the persecution mania which makes every event appear like a threat to existence. We all know what a tragedy it is, and how upsetting, not only for the individual concerned but for the whole household, when one member gets, so to speak, on the wrong foot in the Dance of Life. It is obvious, when the same thing happens to a race, and that race is dispersed as the Jews are, throughout all the civilised nationalities of the world, that the tragedy and the upset will be exactly the same, only swelled to international proportions.

That I think is the chief conditioning fact as to what is popularly known as "the international situation." And when settlements and adjustments come to be made after the present military phase of world affairs is over, all signs indicate that there will be a tremendous resurgence of the "problem of Palestine," and that it will dominate, and colour, and distort the situation out of all geographical and national proportions, as it did during, and at the end of the 1914-18 phase.

All the more reason, then, to have some general idea of what constitutes Zionism—its background and history and if possible its implications. Has the British House of Commons, one wonders, any clearer attitude to the matter than it had in 1918, or does it still oscillate between a gentlemanly Anti-semitism, and sentimentality of the type represented by the late Lord Wedgwood? Has British statesmanship learned anything in the intervening years, or are Churchill and Eden still where Lloyd George and Balfour were then? Lloyd George imagining he could intrigue, and ally himself and his country, with the International Jew and come out unscathed; and Balfour, the sentimentalist,

(Continued on page 7)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 12. No. 23.

Saturday, August 12, 1944.

GERMAN INTERNAL POLITICS

The internal politics of Germany demand the most careful attention from our readers because it is increasingly evident that they involve nearly, if not quite, the same elements with which we have to deal at home. In both countries, "under war or threat of war," the dominant force is Mond-Turnerism, which perhaps more exactly describes P.E.P. National Socialism, the New Deal, and Lenin-Trotsky Bolshevism. (At the moment, Stalinism seems to defy analysis.) One description of Mond-Turnerism is playing both ends against the middle.

The attempt (if there was an attempt) on Hitler's life has been followed by a "purge" of professional soldiers, an hysterical attack on "blue blood," and the abolition of the traditional military salute, in favour of something which can be modified into the Communist gesture with hardly perceptible difference. Robert Ley, who resembles our own Mr. Ernest Bevin in so many characteristics of person and office that they could be interchanged without much comment, has been foaming with abuse of aristocracy in the best manner of Limehouse up-to-date. Mr. Stimson, sounding off for the United States, is at pains to make it clear that this is a private quarrel, and gentlemen are requested to keep out.

We most certainly hold no brief for the Junkers, who have been the spearhead of the policy of the Puritan idol, Frederick "the Great." But certain facts demand consideration. Against all the evidence, it has been steadily propounded that the Junkers made the 1914-1918 War.

That war was hatched by the German heavy industrialists, with the German Banks behind them. They were loathed by the Junkers, and co-operated with the German Socialists, and Bismark, to impress upon the Kaiser that "German Industry must control the World."

The Junkers played straight into their hands by demanding armed forces commensurate with the Kaiser's pretensions.

During the short reign of Bolshevism in Bavaria, as has been pointed out by Mr. Douglas Reed, Hitler remained in the service of the Bolshevised Government.

It is necessary to bear in mind the fact that the so-called Peace Treaty was dominated by Mond-Turnerism on every side, and was admittedly the most disastrous Treaty ever negotiated.

From Week to Week

In the recent sweeping victory of the Socialist C.C.F. Party over the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan (no Social Credit candidates stood for election, for reasons which will eventually become apparent) only about half the electorate voted, and only 52 per cent. of this 50 per cent. voted for the C.C.F.—in itself, a fantastic demonstration of the workings of ballot-box politics.

"The insatiable appetite to control other men's affairs is often evinced by those whose capacity to manage their own is in inverse proportion to their desires."—MR. JUSTICE EVE.

Mr. Christopher Hollis, much of whose writing we respect, has been reviewing a book on the Bank "of England," in *The Tablet*. In the course of his review, he remarks, "Nobody can seriously deny that in William III's reign, bankers were more rascally than other people—which is saying a great deal. . . The accusation in modern times is not against their wickedness but against their stupidity."

Mr. Hollis would add to our indebtedness if he would indicate precisely the process, and the chronology, of the change from rascality to stupidity. Does he really ask us to believe that the dominant characteristic of the Central Banks since 1917 is stupidity?

Is stupidity behind the foundation of twenty-eight new central banks with extra-territorial rights? Is stupidity behind the activities of Dr. Schacht, or Mr. Morgenthau, or the Bretton Woods Conference, or the Bank of International Settlements? At what date did the banking rascals who became rich and powerful by banking rascality, become fools who became richer and more powerful by banking stupidity? We pause for an answer.

As quoted in *Charter for the Soil* by Mr. John Drummond, Marshall Stalin has discovered "an enormous balance against State farms." So the cold-blooded and cruel murder of six million inoffensive Russians, who only wanted to be allowed to mind their own business on their own farms, is just one of those regrettable errors of judgment which have been the outstanding characteristic of Socialism from its vestigial origins in Cromwell's wreckers, through the murderous French Revolution, and the abortive risings of 1848, to the long agony of the Bolshevik regime and the short but terrible reign of Bela Kun.

We stand in Great Britain in a greater danger than in 1940. Not one of the upheavals mentioned took its rise from the underworld. Each of them was engineered by powerful forces in control of money and influence. Those forces are working with all their might, and it is considerable, to pervert the sanity of the British people by the inculcation of theories which have proved fatal wherever tried.

As things have gone in the past forty years, the unearned increment of association, like all powerful forces misused, has become the greatest threat to the human race with which it has ever been faced in normally recorded history. It is in the nature of the universe that the benefits of association either benefit the individual or wreck society. The idea that individuals must be sacrificed to the "common

(Continued on page 8)

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION

By Dr. BRYAN W. MONAHAN

III. THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY. The individual grows, as we have seen, physically by the absorption and organisation of matter, and mentally by the absorption and organisation of elements of the cultural tradition. Into these materials, purpose builds what we recognise as personality.

Now, the individual extends both materially and mentally beyond what we perceive at first sight as his limits. On the material plane, his boundaries are quite indefinite to perception. With every breath he acquires fresh atoms and gives up others. People breathing the same air are exchanging their substance in part one with another. The food a person has eaten passes only gradually into his essential being, and, as slowly, molecule by molecule, leaves. The roots of his hairs are "alive," the remainder "dead," but the root and the shaft are continuous, and all are "part" of him. Thus matter simply flows through him; it is obvious in the case of fluid, yet the fluid for a time enters into his essential being. Thus in all material aspects, he is related to the surface of the earth as is a cloud of dust, and materially is not discontinuous with other creatures. How then are we to conceive his boundary? That boundary is where his purpose ceases to be effective, the locus of becoming, the boundary where atoms and molecules are accepted and rejected.

In the mental sphere, personality extends outwards into Society; this fact is the basis of Sociology. But the nature of this extension is commonly misunderstood. Society, for each individual, is nothing but the extension of his own personality. The situation is analogous to the physical situation as revealed by the Relativity Theory of Physics. The space-time continuum has no practical reality for the individual (possibly because of his special relation to the time dimension); he is a unique observer, with his own unique frame of reference. The space-time continuum is independent of the observer; otherwise there are as many physical worlds of relations as there are individuals. In the same way, there are as many societies in the concept Society as there are individuals. That is to say, each individual sees society as a set of relations of which he is the centre, and into which his personality extends. His *perception* is of *his own* society, in this sense; he can only *conceive* Society. On the other hand, he *can* perceive other Societies, of which he is not a member; the Englishman thus perceives the Society of the French, the Americans, *etc.*

The fundamental attitude of the individual to his own society is, therefore, of its subservience to his personal purpose. One has only to watch children to realise that; the development of the child consists largely in discovering modifications of that fundamental attitude. And it might easily be that unsatisfactory experiences in this modification lead to that pathological desire to change Society by force, through identification of Society with a personal perception of society.

What really exists for each individual is a unique set of relations, of organic connections *centred within himself*, between himself and other individuals and groups. The connections are organic, because they are vitalised in a perfectly real sense, from the centre—that is, from the individual—"Social power proceeds from within," to answer Douglas's

question (*The Big Idea*, p. 60). Of course, the connections are reciprocal, to varying degrees, individually; but as a set they are unique, and dependent on the existence of the individual. Now Society, in the relativity sense, is the aggregate of these relations, and thus can never be identical with any one set. That it can be, is the Collectivist fallacy.

From the point of view of the individual, then, society is a further mechanism serving his purpose. Particular functional organisations of this society are as regards his personality what habits are as regards his mind: they set him free "for his own proper work."

If a man is asked: "What would you do if you were in a position to put Society right?" the almost invariable first response is to conceive himself as a dictator, and from this position to imagine Society organised outwards from himself, so that his percept and concept would be identical. Any change is, in fact, conceived from the position of "What I would do if I were in such and such a position." Now the actual results of such a reorganisation of Society are not only a matter of theory; we are all too familiar with them, so that there is no need to analyse them here. What we want to find is the *Why* that the *How* expresses. In the first place, the structure of such Society must be unicentric, hierarchical, and must be based on power of one sort or another. The vertical relations between individuals are transitive non-symmetrical (more... than). But at the bottom of the pyramid, the transitive relation ceases to hold, a fact which leads to instability—and a fact that no doubt leads the Germans to postulate a slave race, since this permits the transitive relation to be carried right through their own race, the slave race being held by naked power. Where it is not a case of two races, the bottom layer consists of what we may distinguish as serfs (as against slaves). In this case the criterion would presumably be "intelligence" quotients as against "racial purity."

Totalitarian Society is the most complete extension of personality into Society, and as such it involves the permanent organisation of other partial personalities into the extended structure of the Leader's personality, through the transitive relation, which in its psychological aspect is the Will to Power, with its components assertion and submission. Will to Power holds in an organised manner all through the structure except at the bottom layer, where the assertive component must be suppressed. The whole Society is, therefore, an organic unity organised by the purpose of the Leader. Such a group is as a result an actual living unity.

The individual in whom this personality is centred must be, as a result, a super-normal individual. Hitler's statements give us a glimpse of the subjective aspect of this, and the objective evidence is before us. But the personality is necessarily limited and rigid, in much the same way as on the material plane the Crustaceans are limited. Too great a part of the personality is beyond the control of purpose, and even more beyond the control of conscious purpose. Purpose is limited in the same way, in principle, by the laws of matter and the laws of mind. Purpose makes decisions, which pass into structure, and there remain effective; purpose has passed on, but the decisions are limitations, whether right or wrong, because becoming is the integration of a series of them.

The same considerations hold, only in lesser degree, for

subordinate functionaries, and this is, I think, the explanation of their distorted personalities—"In their function, possessed of devils." Here there is the extension of personality far beyond conscious control; but the case is worse, in that the structure has been built not by the individual exercising the function in question, but transitively. The functionary enters into a structure he did not build, so that structure never did pass through his consciousness.

That organisation of individuals into a group does occur is a fact of observation, and that some individuals are inherently leaders is a similar fact. It appears to me indubitable that personality is a force of some kind, extending in some sense beyond the material boundary of the individual, and that this force acts on other individuals in such a way as to orientate them by virtue of their assertive-submissive polarity. That is the primary phenomenon. But it is confused with and overlaid by other phenomena, of which the most important in this connection is the use of external force to carry further the effects of the orientation produced by personality—external force in the sense of being outside the personal polarising phenomenon, and acting on such other psychological attributes as fear, hunger, *etc.* This use of external force to secure and maintain permanent organisation as an extension of the individual's own personality is clearly something to be distinguished from the organisation which is the pure expression of a powerful personality.

There can be no question here of saying what personality is, except that it is what one actually perceives it to be, in exactly the same sense that sight and sound are what one perceives them to be, and that it is the external aspect of Self. There is no reason why personality should resemble anything else with which we are familiar, any more than that sight should resemble sound or electricity. The effect of personality is a matter of individual experience: the word "personality" is the one I attach to that experience in its transcendent aspect. Now personality has its own laws, not the laws of matter, and consequently the concepts of physics are inapplicable, and should be forgotten when we use the words "force" and "power," as we have to do in the absence of others more appropriate.

The power of a personality is evidently related to the degree of organisation and integration of the components, both material and mental, achieved by purpose, and this in the first place is within the boundary of the individual as previously defined—power comes from within. Conversely, and perhaps more obviously, a disintegrated personality lacks power. Hence, no doubt, Douglas's insistence on integrity. Besides the integration, however, there is the question of orientation. What this means can be appreciated, again, from personal experience: it is a matter of the polarisation of assertion-submission. There is a *natural*, easy orientation, experienced as a feeling of superiority (in the sense "superior to adverse circumstances," not in the unpleasant sense of domineering) which is the subjective aspect of assertion, when one is master of a situation—"nothing develops a man like achievement." I do not think that either integrity or orientation have anything to do with the inherent, inborn, abilities and endowments; they are found in the lowly and in the genius. But they are related to purpose, and they are influenced by environment. They are independent variables, but can be correlated by purpose, and out of their development and correlation arises the power of personality.

One of the properties of personality to be noted is that the transitive relation does not go far by itself; that is, while a given personality can and does act through one individual on another, adjuvants, in the way of external power, or else secondary personalities, are required to carry the relation through an extended series. Even a great General requires good subordinates and discipline to weld an army. This has nothing to do with the numbers that can be affected directly, which is a matter of reciprocity. It was noted previously that the relations which lead to this extension of personality are to varying degrees reciprocal, depending on the polarising effect, which is not necessarily, and not always, passive: polarity is subject to purpose. On the other hand, it is also subject to suggestion—the extreme example is hypnotism. Suggestion, however, is of the greatest importance, because a knowledge of the technique of suggestion is an adjuvant of extreme potency. Propaganda is simply the scientific technique of suggestion, and "organised"—centralised—education is simply propaganda.

Theoretically, reciprocity may mean anything from a symmetrical relation to the complete absorption of one personality by another, though in practice the extreme of absorption is inconceivable, and the extreme of symmetry rare. In fact, in Society each individual centres a unique set of relations, limited, and variable; ideally, subject to his purpose. This is the antithesis of the totalitarian ideal. Thus we return to the statement that Society is the aggregate of individual societies, which are unique sets of relations, and as such, simply mechanisms serving individual purpose. Particular functional organisations of this society are as regards the individual's personality what habits are as regards his mind: they set him free "for his own proper work." And equally the right to contract-out is in this sphere what liability is in evolution. With the development of machine production, never before in history did man have such an opportunity. We are being thwarted at the threshold of what amounts to a new evolutionary development in the setting-free of purpose.

(To be continued)

THE "SOMEWHERE" SCHOOL

"The nearer we get to this next climax," [of the war], "the nearer we come to the complete downfall of some hitherto all-powerful strategic school somewhere."

— *Review of World Affairs*, July 28, 1944.

P.E.P. AND THE B.M.A.

A correspondent draws attention to an admission which doctors and patients may find useful in self-defence against the planners. It occurs in the course of a controversial letter in the *B.M.J.* for July 29 by the Acting Secretary of P.E.P.:—"We regret [the presumed attitude of the B.M.A.] all the more since it is a departure from the co-operative and objective relationship which existed between the B.M.A. and ourselves in 1937, when the PEP report on the British health services was produced with much help from the B.M.A."

THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT (continued from page 3)
with, as he imagined, detached, experimental sympathetic interest in the Jewish problem. Has England learned anything during this last unhappy quarter of a century? It is profoundly to be hoped so.

What is Zionism and the Zionist Movement? Ostensibly it is the organized desire and need of the Jewish race for a National and Territorial Home. Were that all, there could be no justifiable opposition to it, except that its realisation in the specific manner demanded by the Jews involves the territorial rights of another nation—the Arabs. It is hardly possible, however, in view of its history, that the Movement represents no more than that. So leaving the matter there, let us glance at the origin of Zionism in its present form. It is of comparatively recent growth. Officially it dates only from the First Zionist Congress held in Basle in 1897 when Theodore Herzl was elected first president. That event, however, according to L. Fry,* was the co-ordination of a number of more or less similar movements in different countries under the same impulse. She cites five founded between 1864 and 1869, beginning with *the Brotherhood for the Awakening of Slumbering Jews*, in Moscow, and including the Alliance Israelite Universelle, at Paris. The common object was to warn Jewry of the danger of racial extinction, through the natural process of assimilation by the Gentile nations. Nineteenth Century humanitarianism and enlightenment, it appeared, “threatened” to solve the abstract Jewish Problem by absorption into the Gentile body politic—the only reasonable way of escape it would almost seem open to those who, for whatever reason, elect to have no body politic of their own. That it would be the only happy solution for the individual Jew, there can be little doubt; though how the Gentile economies would stand the meal is, of course, another question.

However, with those who control any considerable association of individuals, and in proportion as they are not its openly declared (democratically elected) heads, the inevitable tendency is for the interests of the individuals composing the association to come second—and often a very bad second—to the preservation of the association, the Kollektivismus, to give it its ugly continental name. This is one of the innate weaknesses of dictatorship or centralised control, and when it is allied, as it is in the case of the Jewish race, with Occultism; where the national organisation is on the lines of a Secret Society, in which the policy of the high-ups is completely hidden (occult) from the low-downs and even the middles, the weakness is fatal,—to individual happiness, that is. What we are dealing with here is of course just human nature, and it constitutes the comprehensive and imperative reason for keeping Collectivism—all excessive centralisation really, and “Socialist” theory—strictly in its place. The safety of democracy, on the other hand, lies in its comparative unsecretiveness. If there is corruption, as there must be, it is more or less open and winked at. That is deplorable, of course, from the point of view of the doctrinaire, the puritan, but it does allow the decomposing gases to get away and serious explosions are thus avoided. Continentals never can understand Anglo-Saxon cynicism because they are incapable of appreciating the above natural fact.

This urge towards self, and racial preservation among

the members of the Jewish Kahal, or Council, during the latter half of the 19th century, which was signalled by the sudden appearance of these widely dispersed but politically similar organisations, such as the Brotherhood for Awakening the Slumbering Jews mentioned, was closely followed by “events” calculated to remind the rank and file, should they be liable to forget it, of their racial distinction. Whether one regards the suggestion as far-fetched or not, one must admit that the most effective means to that end were undoubtedly Gentile “anti-semitism” and persecution. However it arose—and the assassination of the Tsar Alexander II in 1881 was one immediate cause,—a wave of pogroms and persecution swept Eastern Europe at this time, and in Russia in particular the plight of the individual Jew was desperate. To quote from a book by an ardent Zionist,† referring to this Russian situation: “Hints were given from high places that the Western frontier was open . . . and seized by a mass psychosis, and impressed by the ominous utterances of their national poets,” (my emphasis) “the Jews began the greatest migration in their history. Between 1880 and 1913, 2,359,476 Jews arrived in the United States. . . In 1880 there were in America about a quarter of a million Jews, mostly of Sephardic and German origin. Today there are almost 5,000,000. The rise of the Russian Jew in America in such a short period is one of the most amazing phenomena in history. . . The same story repeats itself, though on a smaller scale. . . in England, Canada, South Africa.”

In this period of tension and turmoil arose Theodore Herzl. As a foreign correspondent of the Jewish-owned Viennese paper, *Die Neue Freie Presse*, in Paris, he reported the Dreyfus case, which it is said, “made a Jew of Herzl.” His book, *The Jewish State*, was published in 1896, and the next year saw the First Zionist Congress. Between that date and the first phase of the World War, the battle of Zionism raged, not against the Gentile, however, but among the Jews themselves. The Western, mainly Sephardic Jews, whose theory and inclination regarding the problem of their race was termed Assimilationism—Gentile absorption,—being not so badly off, particularly in England and France, were naturally enough for letting well alone. But the size and squalor and acuteness of the “problem” in Eastern Europe, and the streaming westward exodus from Russia and Poland, proved too much for the theory of Assimilation. In the end the Zionist won out, with the help of Kaiser Wilhelm’s battalions, and Zionism as an active political organisation, with a usefully appealing exterior—a National Home for the outcast and the homeless—was established.

There can be no doubt, I think, as to the astuteness of the move, of the Movement. It holds, of course, no real solution of the Jewish problem in the Gentile sense, which is the assumption that some decent compromises must be found; some mutual reconciliation of the respective position of individual Jews and Gentiles living together on this globe, such as the theory of Assimilation propounds—whether we agree with it or not. There is no compromise in Zionism; its success, from the point of view of its instigators, is the absolute supersession of Gentile policy *everywhere* by Jewish policy. Here is a useful definition of Zionism aims from the pen of Professor Brodetsky of Leeds University, and a member of the original British Committee of the Movement,

**Waters Flowing Eastward*, by L. Fry, British American Press.

†*The Jewish Struggle*, by Ben Jacob. Geo. Allen and Unwin, 1942.

which appears in a very useful symposium,† contributed to by the majority of present-day leaders of Zionism in Britain. "Reduced to its uttermost limits of simplicity," says the Professor, "our policy contains two principles: civic equality in all lands and free national life in Palestine." There is more than a hint there of the Atlantic Charter, or of its origin. It will be seen, however, that the Zionist demands, like those of all abstractionists, are for two incompatibles. For the Jews, being internationalists—"civic equality in all lands"—are committed to regard the entire world as their "home," actual and potential, a fact which automatically debars them from the geographical and physical reality of a National Home. Palestine, therefore, to the real instigators of Zionism, is intended to be no more than a window-show,—no real home in the sense that no doubt a number of sincere and enthusiastic Jews regard it,—but a H.Q. from which to conduct the International Campaign. It would look as though there were every reason for the Awakening of the Slumbering Jews, but not quite in the sense intended by the promoters of the original Brotherhood.

(To be continued)

FROM WEEK TO WEEK (continued from page 4)

good" is, as Madame Ayn Rand emphasised, the basis of every tyranny which has ever existed, and is pure Satanism.

Anonymous letters are beginning to appear in the Scottish newspapers, which rather surprisingly tolerate the practice, attributing the opposition to the spoliation of the Highland glens to "the landlords." In point of fact, looked at from the materialistic point of view, Highland landowners would benefit by the large water-power schemes so dear to the Mond-Turnerists. Landowners are scarcely a factor in the opposition, which is growing and formidable, and comes overwhelmingly from "the bourgeoisie" and the growing body of Scottish Nationalist sentiment.

It is significant, and far from reassuring, that the Communist Party in every country has been instructed to support the views of the United States Government in cases in which there is divergence of opinion from that of Great Britain. Communism has dropped all pretence of being a people's movement, and is openly working for the Empire of Big Business-Mond-Turnerism.

It would appear that there are nearly a million Russians fighting against the Soviets, some of them, under General Vlasov, as a distinctively national army, and others as Russian units under German command. In itself the fact is intriguing, but it acquires greater importance when it is remembered that the outside world is as unknown, strange, and misrepresented to the average Soviet citizen as though situated upon a distant planet.

We have little doubt that one of the serious preoccupations of the Russian Bureaucracy is the effect which will be produced on Soviet troops, if and when they invade "capitalist" Europe, and that the rapid swing to Big Capitalism is a psychological preparation.

Mr. Hore-Belisha is understandably jittery lest we should negotiate with German Generals to bring the war to

an end and dethrone Hitler, and the fiction that we are fighting National Socialism is thrown overboard without ceremony. We are fighting the Great German General Staff, but we musn't make peace with it—peace must be made by Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, marked out "for the highest political office" (*Jewish Chronicle*), M. Litvinoff and Mr. Bernard Baruch, with the "German" Jews who will miraculously be found living in the safest and most comfortable parts of Germany.

Well, it may be so. It's been done before in our lifetime.

The mysterious depths to which the present world crisis ramifies are well indicated by the efforts made to present Darwin's theory of the Descent of Man as a fact of scientific knowledge, instead of being, as it is, a pure and unsupported hypothesis, not original to Darwin, and now discredited by the more competent authorities. Its usefulness to contemporary Marxian and neo-Marxian propaganda, in whose service it is incidentally used by the "B."B.C. amongst others, is to bolster-up the equalitarian theory of society.

The facts of the case are presented, in part, in an interesting article in the *Nineteenth Century and After* for July, which we recommend to our readers.

FOOD FOR MOLOCH

"One of the curious developments in recent years has been the amount of tub-thumping that has gone on about the need for using wheat for everything else except eating it... That we should take all these ludicrous suggestions seriously, is surely an indication that we in the West are becoming just a little soft in the head."

— J. H. GRAY in *The Edmonton Bulletin*.

There has reached us from Australia a slip of paper, three inches by four-and-a-half, on which is boldly printed:—

"We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except a politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges. — CHURCHILL."

Recent Publications

Programme for the Third World War

by C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 2/-

Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: the Grid

by W. A. BARRATT

Price 3d.

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

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

†*The Jewish Home*, edited by Paul Goodman: Dent.