A report from Ohio accredits to Mr. Bertrand Russell a brief series of connected statements of profound importance for the world.

They are that war will break out this year; that Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy will thereby be reduced to ruins; that the United States of America will emerge Dictator of the World; and that such a conflict would be preventable only if America announced her intention to fight any aggressor in the interest of world peace. “But that announcement,” in Mr. Russell’s opinion “will never be made.” Nor will it.

In its broad outline, this pessimistic forecast of the direction and result of a catastrophe which seems to thousands of us almost within earshot differs in one respect alone from the conclusions reached by Major Douglas and published at intervals in this paper since last September.

The difference is one of attitude. Mr. Russell’s summary identifies what are called the United States of America as the enemy of Europe and of the world. The annihilation of the great European Powers which he foresees is merely the clear verbalisation of what every statesman and every citizen of sound mind knows to be the inevitable outcome of a conflict waged with the stupendous destructive forces available. It is a result assiduously prepared for and designedly catastrophic. To minimise it is merely to shrink from the imaginative reconstruction of what intelligence forces upon us.

There is a major and a minor conclusion: the major, the inevitability of the impact; the minor, the real identity of the masses opposed. Europe against America!

Then why is Europe divided?

If, in the first place, social crediters will realise that there is in this phenomenon of arrest a unification of the will of the people and of their government and that this unification is in itself the establishment of the sovereignity of the people. Once gained it can never be lost.

If that order which Douglas has made attainable is ever to be attained it must be before the destruction of freedom not afterwards. Afterwards, whatever there may be, there will not be freedom. Freedom in security is attainable if freedom is secured first. Freedom is attainable if the Governments of Europe are held to their trust.

There is no time to lose. Let anyone who has access or any means of approach to those in office in Britain, in France, in Germany, in Italy, force upon their attention the prediction of Mr. Russell. There is no need to argue it. There is no Treasury in Europe but is saturated with its truth.
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WHAT IS EFFICIENCY FOR?

The Minister of Transport has informed the Ruthin Rural District Council that he is satisfied that economy and efficiency in highway administration throughout Denbighshire will be promoted by the transfer to the County Council of the unclassified roads in the district. The Rural Council's appeal against this decision has been disallowed.

Mr. J. H. Jones, Llanarmon, expressed surprise at this decision, and feared that the new arrangement would have an adverse effect in the remote parts of the district.

"We talk about Hitler and Communism. If we don't mind it all will be in the hands of officials, and we shall then be worse off than under Hitler," he said, criticising the tendency towards centralisation of local government.

Mr. J. E. Foulkes, Llanwrnog, said "Centralisation is a backward step. It means that everything is done by officials, and we might as well be in Germany."

* * * *

The country people in central Wales are dealing with practical problems all the time. When they think of a road it is in terms of its surface. They have to get their animals and farm carts along it. When you ask the way in a remote district haven't you ever noticed how, at the end of the pains-taking explanation you will be told, "It's a good road all the way," or the "road's bad in parts."

The officials at the Ministry of Transport think of monetary cost first, and surface second. It is obvious that in this case, the local people are afraid that the unclassified roads in the district, used chiefly by themselves, will be neglected in favour of the major system of trunk roads, which for some time now have been under the direct control of the minister.

In this simple example you have the elements of the problem which our movement is facing.

When the councillors complain that under centralisation "everything is done by officials" they mean that officials make decisions on policy, while local councils tend to become mere ciphers, concerning the results desired by their electors.

About 1921 an enormous exhibition was held at Olympia. It was known as the Efficiency Exhibition. It was designed to show how very efficient was every department of national life. A large section was devoted to office furniture, and equipment, burglar-proof safes, and so forth. Then there was the building and manufacturing section, and even a section for the home (why wasn't this the biggest of all?)

It was all very exciting and tiring, as all such exhibitions are; but the curious thing was, that though they demonstrated efficiency hard for several weeks, none of the exhibitors knew what they were being efficient about. If they had known we probably should not be in the terrible state of uncertainty in which we live to-day.

In exactly the same way you are told that centralisation is necessary for efficiency, but you are not told what the efficiency is for.

The concise Oxford dictionary defines "efficient" as productive of effect; unless you are satisfied with any sort of effect, it is necessary to decide definitely upon the effect you require.

Mr. Jones and Mr. Foulkes desire an efficient high-way administration, so that they may have good roads even in the remote parts of the country; the Minister of Transport cannot separate "efficiency" from "economy" by which he understands the saving of money.

So it comes to this. The rural councillors want suitable roads. The Minister of Transport wants to save money, at the expense of the social services.

Now the Minister of Transport, like every other government department works within the framework of the existing money system. The result of this system is to accumulate financial capital into fewer and fewer groups, and at the same time to emphasise the will-to-power of the men who control these groups. Looked at only from the financial aspect, the fewer these groups the better the book-keeping system can be made to work. Costs can be saved, prices can be fixed, it is easier to raise big loans. Thus it comes about that every undertaking which has dealings with the money system tends towards centralisation. The one-man business becomes the chain store, a dozen railways become four, and threaten to become one, the mines tend towards nationalisation. But from the point of view of you and me, this efficiency exists only on paper. Do we find the railways cheaper and more comfortable, or our coal less expensive?

Here I must make a slight detour. Many women love the sixpenny stores, and are inclined to think they are more efficient than the one-man business. They are efficient from one point of view, they help us to save some of our hard-earned pennies, and get more goods for our money, a very important consideration with most of us under present wretched conditions. But there is something else which we tend to lose sight of. The chain store, in concert with centralised finance, really decides what we shall buy. They say, in effect, "You can have these biscuits, jam, tinned fruit, or lipstick, because we have arranged to
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sell it to you at a lower price. If you want another make, you'll have to go elsewhere and pay more for it." Thus we are at the mercy of mass-production, and have to take what we are offered. This will continue to be so while the first item on every housewife's shopping list has to be "Save money."

If we have decided that the only thing we want is for the financial system to look well on paper (which is the only place where it does look well) we shall have to consent to more and more centralisation, and more and more bigness, until the individual and his desires are entirely ignored.

But suppose we have decided that the Ruthin councillors are right, and that we should have the power in association of getting what we want. Then forget all about the money system for the moment, and think only of the organisation which has charge of the making and upkeep of the roads. Far from adopting centralisation as an end in itself, which means making everything as big as possible, it is obvious that there must be a certain degree of size at which every machine works best. Douglas has said that the most suitable size for a unit is just about the size in which you can get agreement on general principle.

As to the road problem, there is no doubt that centralisation applied to the major trunk roads is desirable. All classes of the community use them. It is not likely that a different type of road surface, varying from one village to the next, would conduce to the comfort of the travelling public. But with regard to the local unclassified roads the sort of surface and general upkeep should depend only upon local traffic needs and desires. To apply the method of centralisation to a small problem like this, means that you are making it too big to get agreement on general principal; the result is that local electors lose all control over the machine.

Centralisation is only one of the methods of getting what we want, and one that must be employed with the utmost caution. You have your group wanting a certain result. It is possible that neighbouring units may desire an exactly similar result. Centralisation as a method of helping these units towards what they desire is permissible, but the moment there is the slightest disagreement on policy, the process of uniting must stop.

If these points are not kept clear, and centralisation is regarded as a desirable end in itself, we shall find we are giving the money power one of the most dangerous weapons it could wield. We did in fact do so when we allowed the formation of the League of Nations and the Bank of International Settlements. Mercifully, the power of this has been broken, but everything will be done to set up something else to take its place. If this happens, we shall once again have a centralised power coercing unwilling units, with a result which every reader of this paper can anticipate only too clearly.

B. M. PALMER.

FOR SALE

Private Hotel at Ventnor

Mr. C. A. Redfern, who lives in Amsterdam and supports the New Economic Group over there, wishes to dispose of a substantial 10—bedroom stone-and-brick Private Hotel at Ventnor.

The house stands in its own grounds, overlooking the park, is close to Ventnor West Station and within easy distance of the shopping centre and sea front. Electric light. Gas. Town water. Main drainage. Recently redecorated. Recently redecorated. 

P. Hlinold £2,350.

OR—a half section of the house may be had to let unfurnished at £60 a year exclusive, or furnished for holiday parties from 2 to 4 guineas per week according to season.

OR—the same half-section can be let in two flats, furnished or unfurnished.

Mr. Redfern has kindly offered full Agency terms to social credit funds in the event of a sale being effected through the movement. Full details may be had from—W. Wilson, 34, Newcombe Park, Mill Hill, London, N.W.7.

Just Price Mechanism in U.S.A.

Mr. Wallace, Minister of Agriculture for the United States, has devised an interesting plan for dealing with "surplus" food in that country.

The intention is to experiment with it in 10 or 12 cities, so as to find out if it can be universally adopted.

It is based upon "charity begins at home," and is a scheme whereby the unemployed may buy additional food at cheap prices, instead of this food being exported at cut prices.

Two sets of coloured tickets will be distributed to families in receipt of relief by the local authorities. One set of tickets will be orange in colour, the other blue.

The orange tickets will permit their owner to purchase twice as much American farm produce as their face value. The unemployed family would be able to buy £1 worth of these orange tickets and obtain £2 worth of food for them.

The blue tickets would be issued free, and the Government would reimburse the food merchants for the food supplied in exchange for them, as well as making good the margin on the half-price orange tickets.

At first the only commodities to which this will apply will be oranges, grape fruit and dairy products, but meat may be included later.

If the subsidy to the food merchant is to be paid from taxes, the scheme will increase taxation on the earning population in direct proportion to its success. Apart from this, the plan employs the formal mechanism of the just price.

In a similar way, the mechanism for a national dividend is used in 'dole' payments and old-age pensions.

For THE TRUTH IN ALBERTA

Read "Today and Tomorrow"

Send your sub. to TODAY AND TOMORROW 1018-118th Street, Edmonton, Alberta

Subscriptions $1.50 a year

(at the present rate of exchange about 6s.)

You can subscribe by International Money Order, obtainable at any Post Office.
CONTROL OF THE PRESS

The advertiser-supported newspapers, whose revenue can be halved almost over-night do not comply with the wishes of the money-power by accident.

Transference of initiative from the governmental executive to “the public” which “wants to know” is, obviously, a dangerously large bite of that transference of initiative which is the main defensive objective of the money power to prevent.

Telling the public exactly how it is that news fails to reach it is the same as telling the public that news does fail to reach it but not by any means the same thing as telling it what news fails to reach it.

If the public were told exactly how news was intercepted, the public would be able to make shrewd inferences concerning the nature of the news. It doesn’t. All it knows is that it is not told everything, and at the same time it is told that that is a good thing for the public—which the public more than half believes.

Social crediters are in a position to draw ‘their own conclusions’ because they are in possession of the key to the puzzle centred upon the failure of modern society to function satisfactorily.

No one else can draw their own conclusions; they can only draw the conclusions they are desired to draw or none at all. Human vanity is broadly against the drawing of no conclusions.

If this train of reasoning is correct, the outburst at the National Union of Journalists’ meeting about censorship, even if sincere, as there is every reason to believe it to have been, merely has the effect of showing the public what fine fellows the journalists are in defence of the ‘rights’ of the public in regard to freedom of speech—this (like the withholding of news) being ‘in the public interest.’

The “D” notices to which attention was drawn during the debate in Parliament on the Stanhope affair concerned matter withheld ‘in the national [not the public] interest.’

Ask anyone you can find who was in the Press Bureau during the war, and he will tell you that precious little that was important ever got anything like near enough to a Censor to be censored! A great deal was censored, of course. What did the taxpayer pay Censors for?

At the journalists’ meeting Mr. E. S. Bardsley, of Rotherham, president, said there were people in high places in this and other countries who would be pleased to see British journalists in a position in which they could be controlled in their work by officialdom. “Bureaucracy in all countries suffers continually from an itch for power, and some bureaucrats in this country would be delighted to be able to muzzle the newspaper press whenever they desire to do so.”

“In the great changes that have taken place in non-democratic countries during the past few years,” he said, “we have seen journalists, some of whom formerly did great work for freedom and democracy, either crushed out of the profession or brought down to the status of Government scribes, not allowed to express opinions of their own, nor print news of benefit to the people. The totalitarian Governments have destroyed many newspapers and journals that failed to submit to official surveillance. The Governments tolerate only those newspapers that do their bidding, with the main object of keeping the people misinformed as to what is going on. What we in the National Union of Journalists must watch is the possibility of that system’s becoming regarded with favour in our own country. The menace may seem remote but it is moving towards us. Let us see that it is faced with a vigorous and righteous opposition.”

The people have been more persistently misinformed for the past twenty years than ever before. But seemingly even Mr. Bardsley has not been informed about it.
Councillor Funks Personal Responsibility
Mr. W. A. Barratt's Report

The following is a report of an interview with a councillor who has proved much less amenable to the ratepayers' demand than many interviewed.

The attitude of this councillor towards his personal responsibility to face up to the FACTS and instructions of his electors will be corrected by action on the part of the lower rates association which will result in the councillor experiencing the effects of failing to discharge his personal responsibility.

Councillor started by saying that there was no one who wanted lower rates more than himself. What did we want to say to him?

Reply: We were pleased to hear that he was so much in sympathy with the Demand and we were sure he would be delighted at this (pulling out a programme for Council meetings). You have no idea what an enormous amount of work we do night after night. Meetings—look at this (pulling out a programme for Council meetings). You people have no idea what it costs a man who is a Councillor. As for having lower rates the Councillors who allow it make? We should present the Demand; your Party would retire to consult about it. They would return and inform us that unfortunately there was a large majority against it and that they were therefore so sorry they could do nothing further. We should then be obliged to do exactly what we are doing now, and that is to see each individual Councillor.

Councillor then said: “I see, you have got it all worked out beforehand. It is not fair, it is not fair at all putting me into this position. You people have no idea what an enormous amount of work we do. Before you expect to get rid of this huge debt in Newcastle without putting up a fight for it, you are very much mistaken. You have got to make a start and you could do this by putting forward a resolution similar to this one (Ballymena) which has already been passed by one Council. (Resolution read out to him). There is a form here which you could sign showing your willingness to fight for what all your electors want.”

Councillor: “I'm not signing anything. See my Party.”

Reply: “Very well then, we shall have no other alternative than to inform your electors about your attitude. The rates cannot be put up without each individual Councillor giving his own sanction and therefore if the rates go up this month we shall let the 40,000 people who have signed know the names of the Councillors who are responsible.”

Councillor: “The rates cannot be put up without my sanction? How do you mean?”

Reply: “We mean this, that when the estimates are presented to the Council for sanction, if these estimates entail a rise in the rates the Councillors who allow them (vote for their acceptance) will be responsible for a rise in rates.”

Interview then terminated.

Space reserved by the United Ratepayers' Association

JACOB POPP

Last week a small shopkeeper named Jacob Popp of High Wycombe died. Jacob Popp kept a sweet and tobacco shop, and he pioneered for the present Sunday trading act. Every Sunday since 1901 he opened his shop contrary to regulations, and sold sweets. He received 403 summonses in eight years and paid more than £200 in fines. He found that the alternative punishment to a fine was a day in the stocks (the offence against the Sunday Trading Act of 1677) so he demanded to be put in the stocks.

High Wycombe had no stocks, so Popp insisted that a fine was illegal. The summonses were stopped—and he still opened his shop on Sundays.

That is more than the spirit of freedom.

Detailed plans for the moving of school children from London in time of war have been issued by the L.C.C.
TO ANY EDITOR

Dear Sir,

A Last Bid for Peace

Of the 120 million people living in Germany and Great Britain it would be difficult to find 120 who want war, or could possibly benefit from it.

If the peoples were able to express their will, war would be impossible. Let us remember, even at this late hour, that we in Britain still possess a democratic constitution.

This is not a time for peace petitions or conscientious objection. Whether we want it or not, we must expect a fight. But let us make quite sure, before offering up our lives, that we are fighting our real enemy.

Who constitutes the real enemy? Clearly, the handful of people who want war. Make no mistake, these people are not all in Germany. They are distributed in twos and threes in every country from America downward. England has its quota and the first step for English democracy is to rout them out.

Seek and ye shall find. Surely it should not be impossible for a community of 40 millions to seek out half a hundred inciters, especially if it is borne in mind that the media of incitement are the press, the radio, the public speech and (not least important) ’expert’ advice to those in high places.

We cannot foresee Hitler’s next move, and for that reason we must keep our powder dry. But, in the meantime, let us face up to the undeniable fact that the worst menace comes from those in this country who are deliberately goading him to an act of war.

If we want to save our country, ourselves, our wives and our children, we must join together in exposing and attacking these Warmongers. It is up to us to make them conscious of the fact that the people are watching them, and that the people intend to judge them according to their fruits. Confrontation with the certainty that they would suffer one thousandth part of the misery they are willing and eager to inflict on millions of their dupes would ensure action to make war impossible.

This is the only fight worth fighting. Let us all enter into it while there is still time.

Yours etc.

‘King-Maker’ Goes to Canada

Those who have ever been so inquisitive as to try to find out just how the Great Panjandrum got invited to deliver the ‘right’ message at the ‘right’ place at the ‘right’ time know that it is easier to become a social crediter.

Lord Baldwin has gone to Canada.

He has been asked to ‘lecture’ there— at ever so many places, and not only there but in the United States as well.

According to the gossip writer of the Daily Telegraph, he and Lady Baldwin won’t be gone more than a month; they won’t even see the King and Queen in Canada, and will only be able to see Lord Tweeds-muir by going all the way from Toronto to Ottawa for a day or two. Lord Tweeds-muir is “a very old friend” of Lord Baldwin’s.

Lord Baldwin spent most of the mornings during his recent Riviera holiday working on three lectures to inaugurate the Sir Robert Falconer Lectureship in the University of Toronto.

The only thing he hasn’t done yet is to find a title; but what the lectures are about is DEMOCRACY.

Now isn’t that nice of Lord Baldwin—to choose a topic about which he has as much to learn as most undergraduates instead of talking above the heads of his audiences about some art, like King-making, of which he is a master!

U.S.A. and Japan

According to a Times telegram, Mr. Cordell Hull admitted before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the increase in American exports to Manchukuo—from $3,542,000 in 1936, to $17,000,000 in 1938—represented purchases by Japan of war material.
Present day politics are of an overwhelming complexity. They present a façade which is imposing, magnificent, impressive. The Pomp of Parliament, The Circumstance of State, Conferences, Treaties, Ambassadorial Affairs, Politicians absorbed in industrious debate, Lawyers never ceasing in their drafting of Act after Act; and the Civil Service, swelling like a balloon in its endeavours to put these into operation.

What is the essential effect of all these doings? They must have some result. We are becoming accustomed to marvels of efficiency: aeroplanes at 450 miles an hour: colossal telescopes in which men sit and observe occurrences which took place thousands of millions of miles from this earth: power stations which continuously develop more power than could six million people. We are used to thinking on this scale, and so should be able to recognise the "goods" which the political machine turns out; and it is important that we should, for its workings affect each action of our lives. Whether we like it or not, the conditions in which we live are the product of politics. No one can escape that.

Electoral results contain interesting indications. The votes cast at General Elections average about 71 per cent. of the electorate; and it is the usual thing for about 64 to 7 million electors to refuse the opportunity to vote. Can it be that this large number of men and women do not care whether they have good times or bad? It seems more probable that in their opinion the use of their votes has no appreciable effect. This distrust is significant.

In considering the results produced by our political machinery it will be well to recall afresh the reason why we play this game—or endure this grim struggle—of politics. It is certain that no one wants to be governed for the sake of being governed; there is no sense whatever in democratic politics unless they are the means which each has to get the conditions of life which, in common with others, he desires. Probably it is the great teachers, poets and philosophers who have best expressed the aspirations which are common to mankind. But it is the politicians whose job it is to bring these forward into practical effect. Burke, Fox, Disraeli, Gladstone, Kier Hardy, Bonar Law, Chamberlain,—to each, surely, must be given the credit of having seen however intermittently, some aspect of the interests which British people have at heart. Conservatives have, perhaps, specialised on stability; Liberals on expansion, and Labour politicians on the betterment of the working classes. They have schemed, they have planned and worked, no one can doubt it. There is ceaseless movement of the water at Westminster Bridge: the tide races up, the river rushes down; and the movement of paper through the Parliamentary and political presses is almost as ceaseless. But where do all these labours "come out" in our own personal lives?

During the last few generations politicians have had unexampled opportunities of proving themselves and the political machine—that is to say, in providing people with the conditions they want. They have had none of the problems of stark starvation and scarcity which until recent times, were the constant preoccupation of mankind. The development of science as applied to industry has completely swept all such problems aside. Overboard with all such worries and anxieties; that is where we should be. The plain fact is that no single individual need lack any reasonable requirement whatsoever. Give that full weight; it is substantiated by overwhelming evidence, and is denied by no one who understands the actual physical power which is now available.

The essential aim of every politician should surely be to bring about an expansion, proportionate to this inheritance, in the facilities and in the freedom of each individual life.

The Parties

The connection between electors and their political representatives is the vote; and in practice this can only be used in support of some Party. The Party System dominates politics; and this is true for either a Party Government, or a "National" Government, which is entirely dependent on the support of Parties and whose members are selected by party manoeuvres. This is the accepted political machine—but has it proved itself the right machine? It will not be argued that our affairs are in such fine fettle as to forbid the question—does it work?

Has the Party System given us the results which Democratic Politics should give us?

The principal parties present a formidable front. In the report on the thirty-seventh annual conference of the Labour Party it is stated that the total affiliated membership is 2,013,663 individuals. The funds received and expended by the Central organisation are over £50,000 a year, and a modest estimate of the local expenditure of the 736 localised unions and branches points to a total for Labour Party politics of not less than £100,000 a year. Similar figures have not been obtained, but it would seem unlikely that the membership and expenditure of the Conservative Party is less than this. It is enough for this purpose, to realise that many millions of electors entrust their political interests to the various parties, and together subscribe amounts which run to a good many hundred thousand pounds each year. The Parties have not wanted for funds, and neither has time for their efforts been lacking, for their existence has extended over generations.

Each has a nation-wide organisation with branches in every considerable town, and an imposing Headquarters with large numbers of paid officials,
whose whole time is devoted to Party affairs. Each is able to conduct extensive publicity campaigns, having access to the Press, and in touch with a web of intrigue inside and outside Parliament which is used to the utmost to obtain this or that advantage.

Present Conditions are RESULTS

The setting of our lives is the outcome of the activities of these Parties. Laws which restrict freedom: taxation which empties our pockets: any action put in train by the Government is the result of this Party System. An incalculable amount of labour and of money has been expended—the continuous work of these vast organisations, General Elections, the concentrated efforts of Parliament, Government and Civil Service to make and administer laws which alter the conditions of our existence.

To What Effect?

Words by the million: Debates and Enquiries by the thousands: Acts of Parliament by the hundred—put them out of mind. The real question is how much nearer are you and I as individuals, to the conditions we want? How much nearer is the Conservative to the stability at which he aims? How much nearer is Labour to contented wage earners? How much nearer are we all to the state of freedom in conjunction with security which we all want?

Argument and instance are scarcely required. The people of this country, all of them, are less secure than they have been for generations—quite apart from possibilities of war. No one who honestly considers what he sees can doubt it. Great family estates broken up, and often enough, those who should be upholding a constantly revitalised tradition are peddling shares or selling hats. And at societies’ other end, millions of pale faced street corner men; devitalised, without hope, without means to use and enjoy the leisure thrust upon them. The outlook of our society is not that of confident advance towards a future of limitless possibilities. It is curtailment of liberty which we expect; and the keynote of our lives is limitation—personal frustration.

In this respect the contemplation of history and politics is not enlivening. The violent contrast, between rare flashes of genius and the tough deeds which mould the actual world, shadows the mind. Few have that sense of certainty and hope which makes for resolution in these times. We cast enormous cannon and lay down Leviathans, but that is not enough. We are losing grip of life and hardly dare to consider the end to which we are drifting. Something more than re-armament in terms of tanks and guns is needed. And underneath the surface troubles which encourage this weakening of the national temper there is a deeper apprehension that nowhere is there substantial ground for hope. Debates and speeches—these should be mighty headlamps in black night, but are as candles in the wind. We are dizzy with the ceaseless round of Conferences and Crises, which lead to no substantial end; to nothing likely to put our problems straight for good and from roots up. And so, hesitating, we are inclined to ask if Democracy has failed.

Never believe it. It is not Democracy, but the way we use it which is at fault.

The Purpose of Politics

The results of this failure of our political machinery form the atmosphere in which we live. It affects each daily detail and yet, as a whole, escapes attention.

How do you like paying ever-increasing Rates and Taxes? How do you like going before the Public Assistance Board? How do you like selling your estate to pay Death Duties? What are you going to do with your son when he leaves Eton—or the Secondary School? . . . Send him to the Air Force? Do you like all this?

There are forty-eight million people in Great Britain, and there are forty-eight million people who do not like this sort of thing at all. That is to say, they have a desire, a Will, towards better conditions.

The purpose of politics is to put that desire into effect.

What is it which we all want from the community? It is increasing security for ourselves and for our children, and increasing freedom. Such a security as will give us continuous freedom from anything approaching poverty or diminution of our standard of living. Anything within the control of man which decreases that security is against us—it is something which we do not want. Higher rates, higher taxes, higher prices and lower incomes diminish our security; they are against the wishes of the people. Lower rates, lower taxes, lower prices and higher incomes are what we require, for they will bring increasing security. Science has made these possible and it is only by getting them that we can enjoy the real benefits of science. This is the sort of practical result which everyone wants and may reasonably expect to get; and if our political machinery were competent, these wishes would be accomplished facts.

The Party Political Machine has shown itself to be completely incapable of putting these wishes into effect.

The Essential Link

It is certain that Democracy desires such results—they can be provided—and Democracy is Sovereign. Then how is it that we do not gain this end? Where is the fault?

The fact is that this Will is ineffective because it never gets home, with the right emphasis and punch, to the practical expert men who know how to fulfil it. Then what political machinery is needed to ensure the Results democracy requires?

The first and vital essential is that it must provide the closest and most real connection between the People and the Agents (Members of Parliament and Councillors) whom they appoint to see that their Will is carried out into practical effect. This Will is the driving force of Democracy and without its
adequate mobilisation Democracy will die. Because of its inadequate mobilisation Democracy is dying.

The problem of successful democratic government is focussed on this point. It is necessary to understand and see the true centre of gravity of the desire which people have in common. That is a task for a new type of Civil Service; commissioned not to impose; not to instruct; not to propagandize; but to use every device and experiment which ingenuity can suggest to find the objective, the result, which people want next. To gather this prevailing desire into a steady flow sustaining and supporting the elected Agents in their task of seeing that the results demanded are provided. This is veritable democracy: such a genuine demand, backed by the Armed Forces which are its own ultimate sanction, will outweigh any conceivable opposition.

Democracy depends upon this full and adequate connection between the people and their representatives. This established, the rest will follow. With this support—or under this pressure—Parliament (or the Local Authority) will know very clearly what it is that they must get done. And in those conditions they certainly will get it done, not with their own hands, but by instructing practical men who know their jobs, whatever they may be. Experts will work to any aim. They will not balk at producing universal war; they would think nothing of constructing a channel tunnel; nor other experts at providing each individual with an endowment of freedom and "plenty" which corresponds with what is possible.

These experts: our industrialists, engineers, financiers, and business men that is, are now working—and are now producing results. These results include such items as bankruptcies and suicides; absurd advertisements to "eat more bread" while semi-starvation is the rule in half a million homes; restriction of crops; bitter competition, insecurity and the prospect of war. It does not matter in the least whether or not these results are intended; they are produced and are what we endure.

What we have to do is to get Our aim—Democracy's aim—transmitted by democracy's representatives direct to those who know how to reach it. When they know what is wanted, experts will work to that aim just as easily, and more successfully than they now attempt impossibilities such as selling "too much bread" to those who have not the money to buy it.

The Alternative

Few will be found to contest that this is how democracy should work. Criticism is more likely to be directed towards difficulties in the way of putting it into practice; but it is useless to be dismayed, the alternatives are clear enough. There may be some who are willing to slide by scarcely perceptible stages further and further from democracy. Towards what? Quite clearly towards the European fashion, some variety of Dictatorship, or, if you prefer, some form of Communism; it matters not which, for they are quite indistinguishable in their results in human lives. And there is no refuge in any combination of Parties, indeed it is noticeable that the more "National" a government becomes the more it verges on dictatorial ways. There may be some who wish for an increase in regimentation, a loss of personal freedom, a multiplication of rules and regulation for every detail of our daily lives, a deluge of propaganda in the endeavour to make these palatable. There may be some, but only a few. They would not fill a continental ferry boat and that is the best place for them. British people do not want to lose their freedom. They want to regain it, to increase it. But do not imagine that freedom will be gained or Dictatorship averted by our present system of Party Politics. That is flatly impossible.

At this point it is natural to think of National Conferences for the Reform of Democracy: of the formation of vast Associations with pretentious names: of the preparation of elaborate Schemes and Agendas, References Back, Amendments, and the sedulous Exploration of Avenues. Such means are useless, hopeless and indeed fatal. These are the methods of the Party System, and all that they do is to make words and still more words—and never effective action. There is no need to emphasise this, because everyone knows it.

The essential pivot of this business turns on the collection and making effective of the Will which individuals have towards a common end. Then that is where to start; to see whether in fact this can be done.

Experiments in Democracy

A series of experiments to this effect has been carried out during the last two or three years, at first on the smallest scale possible. Attempts were made to find out what small local matters ratepayers required amending; such as street lighting, the repaving of roads, traffic lights, improvements to schools, the abolition of various nuisances. Invariably they were successfully carried through.

In 1937 a further series of more considerable endeavours to interpret the ratepayers' will was made. This was in connection with Rates. At Belfast, Newcastle, Parkestone, Northampton and Gateshead, ratepayers numbering many hundred thousands joined in expressing their desire that there should be no increase of rates, or some similar objective. The pressure was adequate and in every case they gained the point at issue. This involved the control in the ratepayers' interest of a total of several hundred thousand pounds.

During the winter of 1937/8 much indignation was aroused by the proposals, regarding Rating Assessments. In about fifty different centres this was focussed along certain definite lines to the effect of bringing pressure to bear on the appropriate quarter that the assessments should not be altered. This too was successful, for in February, 1938, the Government decided to postpone action in this matter.

The latest success is in connection with the proposal to billet civilians on householders during war or crisis. This was taken up at an early stage and is remarkable for the widespread support to the
suggestion that proper camps be provided for such occasions. On the 13th February, 1939, it was announced that a million pounds is to be expended on such camps.

Several other lines of action are now in progress the most important of which is the Demand for Lower Rates without any corresponding decrease being made in Social Services. This has disclosed a definite opposition; that of “finance” which by long custom claims the ownership of the monies created on the security of the public services. It is the loan charges arising from this claim which makes rates high, indeed they account for more than 50 per cent. of rates collected. This is an anomalous position which needs correction; and opposition puts those opposing this aim in an invidious position, which should not be necessary. Pressure towards the lower rates which will be secured by this amendment is already considerable, and signs are not lacking that this is being felt.

Credit is not claimed by these experimentalists for the origination of any of these requirements. Their work has been wholly directed towards making effective some desire which already existed. The public objected to the alteration of assessments; to the arrangements for billeting, etc., and what has been done is to add unity and put point and direction to desires which otherwise were incoherent and disunited. Along these lines it is possible for a small number of individuals to make the public Will effective; but it should be noticed that this correct use of democratic principles does not permit of dictation. Such objectives as “Pay off the National Debt in Five Years”; “Forbid the sale of All Intoxicants”; “Two Children and an Adult in Every Bedroom” could not be gained by the use of real democracy unless, as seems improbable, they really were wanted by most people.

Who is it wants War?

These matters have no very obvious connection with re-armament, international politics, war and the like; but the connection exists. There is one way, and only one way, to make war as out of date as the dinosaur, and that is to make the Will of Democracy effective. No normal individual wants war—each wants something quite different—security, with the freedom and resources to live his life in his own way. That is quite possible, and the problem therefore centres on the mobilisation and connection of this Will to an adequate political machine.

That is the root of the matter. Meantime it is clear that the populations which may be involved in war have nothing to gain by it and all to lose. It is still possible that this sheer common sense may get through, and there is no such service to peace as to make this plain, as between the individuals of this and other countries. Appeals to dictators are useless—they can only be stopped by their own populations.

If it comes to it we must defend ourselves; and in preparing for this we must safeguard what we defend—our own personal freedom. Conscription is alien to our ideas and will never be entertained in any sense of permanency; but if that is the only way whereby we may successfully resist aggression we may have to agree to it. But only for a time. This is dangerous ground, for in agreeing to conscription we shall give to some men (The Government) power of life and death over most men (The Public). That power might be used to extend or perpetuate restrictions: it might be used against us. Therefore the need for guarantees becomes evident; guarantees to be undertaken by each Member of Parliament in respect of his constituents, to the effect of enabling the electorate to recover surrendered liberties as and when that is their wish. It is for Parliament to satisfy the electorate as to this; and for the electorate to be satisfied before they agree to conscription.

The Ruling Factor

The experimentalists before mentioned have shown that it is possible to mobilise the demand for such a requirement and get it put into effect. From the results already obtained it is clear that the successful accomplishment of any aim which is widely felt and needed is a matter of the persistent application of simple means of unifying such a desire and bringing it to bear as support (or if necessary as pressure) on the representative concerned.

As this reconstituted democracy continues to prove itself by producing results in peoples’ lives, so it will grow in purpose and in power. Fully developed it will become the ruling factor, or reference datum to which all subsidiary systems will—and must—adjust themselves. The Industrial system will very soon adapt its organisation to produce whatever is wanted. The function of the money system is to distribute these products; and upon the application of some small part of the power which is latent in veritable democracy, financiers will find a way to do that.

The keynote throughout is constructive action rather than destructive criticism. Such action will expose any attempts to oppose or delay; and in these politics exposure is merely a step towards the removal of the obstacle. To give the tree an occasional shake is salutary, but positive growth is the essence; where action is based on an understanding of authentic democracy, outworn systems will be displaced as buds push off dead leaves.

Parliament Obeyes People

Efficiency consists in producing the desired results with the greatest economy of effort; and the efficiency of these experiments has been remarkable. Hundreds of thousands of people, shown the action needed to secure the objective they required, have acted; but they have been moved to this by a handful of experimentalists co-ordinated by a single organiser with a staff of two people. There is no façade about this but there are sound results; in fact you can hardly escape the results which already have accrued. Your assessment, for example, remains unchanged. If you live in a “danger” area you have some prospect of a real retreat in emergency, and if you are a country man, more chance to keep your home free from reckless townspeople. If you live in certain
cities your rates remain unchanged instead of “going up”; or if in a score of other places some useful amenity has been added.

These are definite and practical results. They have been secured without the help of Party orators; without help or even publicity in the National Press; without note or comment by the B.B.C., and without advertisement or Party Labels.

Contrast this with the effort required to move a Party to adopt such demands from the public, and put them into effect. These are requirements involving the control, in expenditure or saving, of something over 1½ millions. The effort which has produced these results in solid reality, had it been expended on Party lines, would not yet have got beyond the stage of discussion in local centres as to “whether it was a fit subject to bring before the Committee to consider whether it should be put on the Agenda for the consideration of, etc., etc—” And how much nearer to this factual result should we be if, by some miracle, the election of an independent Member of Parliament, pledged to these objectives had been secured?

For effective Parliamentary action the concurrence of 350 members is needed. And, without waste of time, energy and money, this concurrence has been secured, otherwise, how were these items rendered into law—as has happened?

**Freedom or Suppression**

There can be small doubt that this generation is fast moving towards some drastic alteration in the structure of society. The essential cause is the application of science to human affairs; in particular the industrial revolution, culminating in the very astonishing increase during the last thirty years in power to alter the environment and provide for the requirements of mankind.

We may use this power for the enlargement and freedom of the individual. We may allow it to be used towards his suppression. Or if we choose, for his destruction.

“Unemployment”, “overproduction”, the fight for export markets, war, revolutions, dictatorships—these are phases in the decision as to what is going to be done about it. We in Great Britain find our islands becoming ever more closely involved. We are a part of humanity and no single person, whether he likes it or not, can avoid taking his part in this. Change is coming, nothing can be more certain than that; and in this country it rests with us, its people, what that change will be. If what we all want, what Democracy wants—could be translated into action there would be no misgiving as to the outcome.

Why should we feel impotent? It is because we have lost faith in politics. It is because the machine of Party Politics is incapable of making our desires effective.

The use of real democracy provides a different perspective; for with the success it brings comes the conviction that these desires can be fulfilled. If a sufficiency of people pursue this line of action the result, no matter what may intervene, will be the substantiation in reality of what science can mean to mankind in terms of security, freedom and life. If not, that change, with equal certainty, will bring the realisation in actual events of what science can mean in terms of oppression, destruction and death.

The decision, this way or that, is not a matter of assent or verbal choice, but will grow out of what is done or not done, by each one. It is a decision which it is impossible for any to escape, and the outcome will be the experience of one of these alternatives by yourself, your friends and your family—as well as all humanity.

**Action**

This is the fundamental basis of democracy: that the People are Sovereign; that it is their Will which must be put into effect. Members of Parliament and Councillors are elected for no other purpose than to see that that is done.

Then this is the action required:

Firstly, for the People to tell these Representatives what their Will is—what is wanted next.

Secondly, for that Will to be made so clear, so united, so determined as to ensure that nothing can stand against it; resting content with nothing less than the Results demanded.

This granted, there is no doubt as to the issue. It is common sense action on these lines which is needed. The purpose of politics is to secure results desired by the people—and most of the results experienced are not wanted. In that lies the opportunity for the right sort of action. Local matters may suggest themselves for treatment, and most Ratepayers will join in the wider demand for lower rates, when they understand that these can be obtained without any decrease in social services. (Advice regarding organisation is obtainable from U.R.A.A. See * footnote).

This is a realisation in action of what democracy really is. It means no violent dislocation of society; there is nothing “subversive” about it—but it makes democracy real. And it works: enough has been done to show that this correct use of democracy provides the required results, and that is what politics are for.

Democracy has not failed. It is not necessary to cast especial reflexions on this or any other of our governments. The failure of present day politics is the failure of the Party System.

Dictators, whether Fascist or Communist, cannot solve these problems: nor great Parliamentarians, though we allow them equal powers. Nothing can avert these dangers, nothing can secure to each that personal freedom and security which he desires, except action which will make democracy a reality. And it is through the solid success and by the spread of such action that we shall regain our grip and so recapture hope, resolution and high certainty, which are the spirit of the essential re-armament of Morale.

* Note: The Experimentalists to whom reference is made in the text have acted in line with advice given by The United Ratepayers' Advisory Association, Sentinel House, Southampton Row, London, W.C.I. Secretary John Mitchell.
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday’s issue.


BIRMINGHAM and District. Social Crediters will find friends over tea and light refreshments at Prince’s Café, Temple Street, on Friday evenings, from 6 p.m., in the King’s Room.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Study Group meets each Tuesday at 8 p.m., in the Y.M.C.A., Limbrick. All welcome. Enquiries to Hon. Sec., 47, Whalley New Road, Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats. All enquiries welcome; also helpers wanted. Apply R. J. Northin, 7, Centre Street, Bradford.

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER will be obtainable outside the Central Bus Station on Saturday mornings from 7-15 a.m. to 8-45 a.m., until further notice.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Next open meeting in the Primrose Café, 15, Cases Street, off Ranelagh Street, at 8 p.m., on Friday, 21st April. Speaker: W. L. Bain, subject “The People’s Weapon in Politics.” Enquiries to Hon. Sec., Green Gates, Hillside Drive, Woolton.

LONDONERS! Please note that THE SOCIAL CREDITER can be obtained from Captain T. H. Story, Room 437, Sentinel House, Southampton Row, London, W.C.1.

NEWCASTLE D.S.C. Group. Literature, The Social Crediter, or any other information required will be supplied by the Hon. Secretary, Social Credit Group, 10, Warrington Road, Newcastle, 3.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group. Weekly meetings every Thursday at 8 p.m., 16, Ursula Grove, Elm Grove, Southsea.

SOUTHAMPTON GROUP—Annual General Meeting takes place at 8, Cranbury Place, Southamton, on Friday, April 14th, at 7-45 p.m. Members please note.

SUTTON COLDFIELD Lower Rates Association. A complete canvass of every house is being undertaken. Any assistance welcomed. Campaign Manager: Whitworth Taylor, Glenwood, Little Sutton Lane, Sutton Coldfield.

TYNESIDE Social Credit Society invite co-operation to establish a local centre for Social Credit action in all its aspects. Apply W. L. Page, 74-6, High West Street, Gateshead.

WALLASEY Social Credit Association. Enquiries welcomed by Hon. Sec., 2, Empress Road, Wallasey.

Miscellaneous Notices.
Rate 1s., a line. Support our Advertisers.

DERBY & DISTRICT Lower Rates Demand Association. Meetings are held fortnightly (Tuesdays) in Room 14, Unity Hall.

TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE, THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT, 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Chairmanship of Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute £ , per week, per month, per year towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Name
Address

---

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

The NORTH DURHAM Ratepayers’ Advisory Association would welcome support, physical or financial from sympathisers in Gateshead and District to carry on their campaign for Lower Rates and no Decrease in Social Services. Campaign Manager, N.D.R.A.A., 74-76 High West Street, Gateshead.

UNITED RATEPAYERS’ ADVISORY ASSOCIATION. District Agent for Newcastle-on-Tyne area, W. A. Barratt, 10, Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 3, will be pleased to assist anyone on new Lower Rates Associations.

UNITED Ratepayers’ Advisory Association. District Agent for S. Wales and Monmouthshire, Mr. P. Langmaid, 199, Heathwood Road, Cardiff.

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer, Social Credit Expansion Fund, c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

I enclose the sum of £ : as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the sole discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name ..................................................
Address .............................................

---

The Social Crediter

If you are not a subscriber to THE SOCIAL CREDITER, send this order without delay.

The Social Credit Secretariat,
12, Lord Street,
Liverpool, 2.

Please send THE SOCIAL CREDITER to me

Name ..................................................
Address .............................................

For Twelve Months—I enclose 15/- “Six” 7/6
“Three” 3/9 (Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to “The Social Crediter.”)

Published by Tudor Jones and Elizabeth Edwards for the Social Credit Secretariat, Offices: 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co, Woolton, Liverpool.