

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 9. No. 1.

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Further protests against proposals to centralise local government were made at Plymouth recently, when the Mayor of Totnes (Mr. G. C. Edgcumbe) presided at a meeting which he had convened of representatives of non-county boroughs of Devon and Cornwall of under 10,000 inhabitants to consider the suggestions relative to reorganisation of local authorities as contained in the report and memorandum of the Special Committee of the Association of Municipal Corporations. Almost the whole of the boroughs concerned in the two counties were represented.

"Our ancient rights and privileges which we and our forefathers have enjoyed, and which we as representatives of the various communities still continue to operate, are in danger," said Mr. Edgcumbe, "and it behoves us to be prepared to defend these rights and privileges and see that the people by whom we have been elected to the positions which we hold are not seriously prejudiced by the scheme of local government reorganisation which it seems that the Government intend to put before the Legislature."

The following resolution was moved by Mr. Edgcumbe:

"That this meeting of the Mayors and other representatives of the Municipal Corporations of Devon and Cornwall with a population of under 10,000 inhabitants disapproves the action taken at the recent special general meeting of the Association of Municipal Corporations, when a majority adopted the report of the Special Committee upon reorganisation of local government, together with the memorandum and explanatory statement attached thereto, being of the opinion that this is not the appropriate time to consider the reorganisation of local government, and that the energies of all concerned would be better devoted in concentration on winning the war. But if the Government is determined to proceed, we claim that when any scheme for reorganisation of local government is proposed the position of the county borough with an ancient charter must have special consideration, as all these provide amenities for areas much greater than their own and have within them machinery for wider service.

"We are convinced that it would be little short of a tragedy if in any reorganisation their position was not secured, or if they were divested of their charters, for it cannot be doubted that, as the country towns, they provide a focal point for local opinion and administration. And as the wishes of the general body of inhabitants who must be most affected by reorganisation of local government has not been given due consideration, and seem to us to have been entirely overlooked in the scramble by certain bodies to get in first, we appeal to H.M. Government to suspend con-

sideration of the matter until the termination of the present emergency.

"And that a copy of this resolution be sent to Sir William Jowitt, the Rt. Hon. Ernest Brown, Minister of Health, and to the Members of Parliament for Devon and Cornwall."

The resolution was seconded by the Mayor of Dartmouth (Alderman W. G. Row) and carried.

A committee to consider what proposals should be put before the Association of Municipal Corporations comprised the Mayors of Tiverton, Bideford, Totnes, Helston, Lostwithiel and Bodmin, and the Town Clerks of Penryn, St. Ives, Liskeard, Totnes, Okehampton, and Honiton.

The Times of September 3 gave an account of a recent stand by the borough of High Wycombe against "discourteous and high-handed" treatment by anyone, including the Lord Chancellor's Department, the Treasury Solicitor, and the Ministry of Works and Planning.

• • •

The county court has sat at the Guildhall in High Wycombe once a month ever since county courts were established. The Guildhall is an old building, and in many ways inconvenient for the business of the court, besides being noisy, draughty, difficult to warm, and badly ventilated. The Lord Chancellor, on being informed of these unsuitable conditions, gave instructions for other accommodation to be provided. Under the County Courts Act, 1934, the town council is obliged to provide accommodation for the court.

The Ministry of Works and Planning then came on the scene and interpreted the Act of 1934 as empowering it to demand that the council hand over certain rooms in the municipal offices for the sittings of the court. The council pointed out that it could not spare these rooms. The Ministry disagreed and ordered the rooms to be made ready for a sitting of the court on July 9.

The town clerk wrote asking that the matter be deferred until the council could discuss it at its meeting on July 21. But on July 6 the town clerk was informed that the Treasury Solicitor considered that his letter did not call for a reply, and that the county court had been called to take place at the municipal offices on July 9.

The mayor, on July 6, instructed the town clerk "in view of the discourteous and high-handed manner which had been adopted" to inform the Ministry that no facilities would be available, except in the Guildhall, for the court. The Ministry replied on July 9 that under the Act of 1934 the council was obliged to provide accommodation at the municipal offices.

The county court—judge, counsel, witnesses, registrar and all—arrived to hold a sitting in the municipal offices

and found doors locked, barred, and bolted against them.

Since then all cases have stood adjourned *sine die*. The county court is homeless in that it refuses to sit any longer in the Guildhall, and is refused accommodation in the municipal offices. The dispute between the Lord Chancellor's Department and the town council over providing accommodation continues.

The Board of Education has requested that school-children in Britain should be taught more about Soviet Russia. They will study text-books written by Lenin and Stalin.

A list of 40 books covering Russian history, biography, geography, education, the arts and literature has been sent to schools in London and the Home Counties, where the scheme is now operating.

The list of books recommended includes works by Lenin, Stalin and Dr. Hewlett Johnson, but no mention is made in the press whether the children are also to read books by observers less prejudiced and equally authoritative on the less acceptable results of the communist system for the individual—his complete loss of freedom.

The press report continues:—"The idea is to promote understanding between Great Britain and Russia."

Not to tell the children the truth?

"Probably a majority in Britain take the conventional view that the whole business of a second front should be left to experts: that it is far too risky for amateurs to interfere in so grave a matter. But a most powerful minority, with a tremendous propaganda organisation at its disposal, overrides the easy-going mass.

"Most of those who press for a second front claim the conviction that it would succeed. Others, taking a more offhand view of the whole business, merely remark that if it cannot be managed now, when a large part of the German army is bottled up in the East, when can it be done?"

"The main points and implications of the unadulterated 1942 thesis ought to be explained. They are:

- (1) Russia could beat Germany this year if we landed in Europe at once.
- (2) If we don't, organised large-scale Russian resistance may collapse.
- (3) If Russia takes a bad knock, the remaining allies have no hope of beating Germany.
- (4) The alternative "imperialist strategy" based on Anglo-American sea power, is unacceptable.

"Many of those who propagate this will tend to make its acceptance the condition of their further support of the

war. To these circles it is treachery to say that Britain could live even if the Soviets fell. The fact that the opposite opinion is extreme defeatism is ignored. So, too, is the fact that the survival of Britain after a major Soviet reverse would be the only imaginable chance of Russia's eventual restoration to anything approaching her pre-war position. The popular cry is that without Russian victory now—soon—the war cannot be won. This cheers up the Germans enormously. This is exactly the state of mind they want prepared, for, rightly or wrongly, they think they can beat Russia, and the one thing they would then need is this very reaction in Britain, whom they do not think they can defeat by military means. . . .

"It certainly cannot be denied that Russia, in her role as the first Communist state, has an immense psychological influence beyond the military scene. For many people in all parts of the world her victory or defeat is the only issue which interests them. We have described this on the British side, but it is equally true of the German. Many of Hitler's allies are only fighting in this war on the German side because they hate Soviet Russia. . . .

"On both sides, therefore, Russia has a powerful—perhaps a decisive—influence upon the war effort. This is one of the most interesting occurrences in history. When that issue has been decided one way or the other, the war for them will be over. Be this as it may, if out of fear governments allow politics to interfere with military strategy, the reactions which will follow will be much worse than anything threatening at present. In the present military position no government in Britain or America ought to allow itself to be forced into any action for purely political reasons. Military considerations must be allowed to influence strategy. . . .

"We have no reserves of territory, supplies, shipping, manpower, or prestige with which to gamble. We cannot afford more mistakes. When the full story of this war comes to be written it will be seen that political pressure has again and again destroyed wisely conceived plans. If this happens many more times, irretrievable disaster may come. It is time the British and American public were clearly warned."

— *Review of World Affairs*, September 1, 1942.

NEWS FROM CANADA

The Legal Proceedings Suspension Act

The Legal Proceedings Suspension Act, 1942, which was submitted to the Alberta court of appeal by the provincial government to determine whether or not it was *ultra vires* the provincial legislature, either in whole or in part, and if so, in what particular or particulars, or to what extent, has been declared *ultra vires* the provincial legislature, in a written judgment handed down by Chief Justice Hon. Horace Harvey, and concurred in by Mr. Justice H. W. Lunney, and Mr. Justice W. R. Howson.

In dissenting judgments written by Mr. Justice Frank Ford and Mr. Justice A. F. Ewing the act is held to be wholly within the legislative competence of the legislature.

The act was passed to stay proceedings in actions commenced, or to be commenced, in which there had been raised the validity or applicability of the Alberta Debt Adjustment Act until 60 days after the determination of an appeal now pending before the Privy Council on the validity

By C. H. Douglas

THE BIG IDEA

2/6

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

of the Debt Adjustment Act.

This act was declared *ultra vires* the provincial legislature in a judgment on a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada, by the Dominion government. That judgment was appealed by the province, and the hearing of the appeal is now pending.

The following counsel appeared at the argument on the reference: George H. Steer, K.C., representing the Canadian Bankers' Association, S. H. McCurig, K.C., representing the Alberta Mortgage Loans Association, and W. S. Gray, K.C., and H. J. Wilson, K.C., representing the attorney-general.

The Chief Justice's judgment that the Legal Proceedings Suspension Act was *ultra vires*, was largely based on the argument that, "For the period of the stay this is a complete setting at naught of the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada [which declared the Debt Adjustment Act *ultra vires*], and it is not without significance that the period of the stay is not limited to the time involved in obtaining the decision of the Judicial Committee, but is for a further period of 60 days, and the argument that this is simply to get definite information of that decision does not seem to call for serious consideration." He pointed out that if the appeal to the Judicial Committee was not prosecuted, this indefinite period would never end. He held that the matter resolved itself into a question of whether the legislative power could itself determine for a long or short period, a definite or indefinite time its own legislative authority, and on this point the majority judgment observes:—

"Though not expressly set out in the terms of the British North America Act it is of the essence of our constitution, which assigns definite and limited powers of legislation to the legislatures, that the courts should determine whether the legislature has exceeded those limits, and that the legislatures should recognise and observe that determination."

Mr. Justice Ewing, in his dissenting judgment that the Suspension Act was within the legislative powers of the legislature, held that the Suspension Act did not prevent the holder of a promissory note from suing, nor recovering judgment. "It does not impose any conditions upon suitors nor does it qualify their substantive rights in any way. But if the Act can be said in a certain sense and in a very limited way to do all of these things then clearly these things are not its pith and substance."

"The Act merely stays those actions to which the Debt Adjustment Act, if operative, applies, for a reasonable time and reasonable purpose. The real purpose of the act and the time of stay make up its pith and purpose." He saw no reason to believe that the appeal to the Privy Council would not be prosecuted.

Concurring with Mr. Justice Ewing's judgment, Mr. Justice Frank Ford said, "The fact that the executive council had immediately submitted the act for the court's opinion as to its validity shows that its object or purpose was not to defy the judgments of the court invalid, but rather by the exercise of its power over the administration of justice and procedure in the civil courts to give, without a multiplicity of proceeding, an opportunity to have the question of legislative power in the premises finally passed upon."

He held that the act did not take away from the court in any vital particular any essential characteristic of a superior court, and pointed out that none of the cases so far decided go as far as to say that a legislative stay of

proceedings is in itself *ultra vires*.

"As to the argument that the act is an interference with the right of the subject to seek access to the courts, the act, instead of infringing it, is seeking to maintain the right of a large body of debtors to have their rights finally determined by the tribunal of last resort, the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

"The pith and substance of the act is to give those litigants, though defendants, the opportunity in a simple and speedy way to have the matter of the validity of an act passed for their benefit finally determined."

Federal M.P.s and War Finance

In a recent letter to the "Edmonton Bulletin" Mr. Norman Jaques expresses the attitude of Canadian Social Credit (Federal) M.P.s to the financing of the war:—

"Social Credit has nothing to do with issuing currency, or with bureaucratic control. Social Credit is a peace-time solution of the problems of over-production, or 'under-consumption.' It is absolutely opposed to bureaucratic control, 'planning,' and other socialistic ideas for the control of the many by the few.

"On the contrary Social Credit would preserve free and individual enterprise and is pledged to the control of the few by the many.

"We expounded these principles in the House up to September 1939. Since then Canada has been at war and we have consistently advocated a 'pay as you go' policy, but have maintained from the very first that an 'all out' war effort cannot be financed merely by taxing the incomes and borrowing the real savings of the people. There is a gap between government total expenditure and government total revenue from taxes and borrowed genuine savings.

"We have, therefore, advocated taxation, to the limits of preserving the public health and morale, rather than 'borrowing,' which includes, and cannot be separated from bank purchases of bonds, and bank loans to the public for the same purposes, both of which are pure creations of money and must tend to defeat the very purpose of the taxing and borrowing—to prevent inflation. In addition such borrowing creates a post-war debt problem which will destroy the fruits of victory—as it did after the last war.

"Therefore we have advocated the issue of national credit to fill the gap between government revenue and expenditure.

"The government, backed by the other parties, always have cried 'inflation,' to which we have cried 'inflation' in war can be prevented by 'rationing' and price control, and that the government would have to adopt these measures, sooner or later, to offset the increase of money from bond purchases by and through the banks.

"Both rationing and price control now are in effect. . . .

"More than a year ago Mr. Ilesley confessed, in the House, why the government does not use the Bank of Canada to finance the war. The reason is because the chartered banks could use this money as a basis for creating and issuing 20 times as much bank money. As a result of 'borrowing' bank-created 'savings' we already have the results predicted for financing through the Bank of Canada—price control and rationing to meet the threat of inflation—but in addition we will be saddled with a crippling, but unnecessary debt—as a reward for having won the war."

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. 9. No. 1.

Saturday, September 12, 1942.

Public Opinion or Collective Will?

An enterprising American society recently asked 2,000 eminent American Economists whether there would be a 'post-armament depression,' and if so, how to avoid it.* The replies of the 480 who bothered to answer were neatly analysed, tabulated, published and duly selected by the pamphlet-of-the-month club, presumably for circulation to a voracious army of pamphlet readers in America.

Now even Immutable Economic Law, which has long been susceptible to the influence of a few carefully camouflaged individuals, is not yet amenable to guidance by the statistical mean, or even the sum, of 480 eminent economists' opinions. The theory that a composite opinion has any connection, because it is composite, with factual truth is one that could only be put forward by economists and credited by the very gullible.

As a guide to the mysterious workings of the economic mind, however, this Survey of Opinion has interest. It must be observed that not one of the 480 who strain desperately to invent Work for All after the armaments boom has had the realism to divorce the problem of production and distribution of goods and services from the so-called 'work problem.' "They have withdrawn too much from the contemplation of nature and the observations of experience," as Francis Bacon said of similar gentry, "and have tumbled up and down in their own reasons and conceits."

But apart from its innate value as a contribution to the natural history of the economist, this survey must be regarded as an instance,—an extreme one—of a growing and world-wide tendency.

In 1934 Major Douglas laid emphasis on the necessity, for the rehabilitation of democracy, of expressing and bringing to fulfilment people's *will*, individual and collective, and he suggested a practical mechanism suitable for that purpose at that time. Since then there has been a steady effort to pervert and discredit the mechanism suggested. To make people conscious of their will it was convenient for it to be expressed in words, and one phase of the perversion referred to is the endeavour to confuse *will* with *opinion*, stressing meanwhile the importance of freedom of opinion. The Atlantic Charter while eloquent about freedom of opinion is silent upon freedom of action (the fulfilment of will)—that is, on freedom.

The opinion that is meant here is the view on the technique of a problem of one who is not engaged in carrying it out.

What it is intended to emphasise is the increasing attempt to use this public opinion as a politico-economic

motive force in the same way that, in an effective democracy, collective will should be used.

Various instances of organisation using this technique come to mind as examples. There are institutions that collect statistics of the percentage of people who think this that or the other. (Before the United States entered the war the American public was asked to poll on who it thought would win the war. Here we confine ourselves to the popularity of Mr. Churchill). There are those that, before they start, carefully subject their public to lectures on the points they want to inquire about. The endeavour to make political capital out of these surveys is steadily growing. Meanwhile people go on thinking what they do think, and wanting what they do want, irrespective of statistics and frequently irrespective of any intellectual questions they may have answered to inquisitive journalists—or whatever enquirers call themselves.

The fact is that people's will, individual and collective, is an elusive and shy thing, and has for the most part found proper expression through the economic money vote which (when you had the money) was automatic and in spite of advertising, relatively more free from propaganda.

Conditions of war have destroyed this freedom, and it becomes correspondingly more important that organisations which misrepresent however "scientifically," the people's will by substituting for it the people's opinion, should be held responsible by the people concerned for what they do.

E. E.

BUSINESS MEN AND BUREAUCRACY

"This country is threatened by a second front from within—a second official fifth column," said Mr. J. Wentworth Day, when he addressed a meeting of business men and staffs at Liverpool recently.

Mr. Day said that, after the war, this country—because of the Government's control of industry and the suppression of private enterprise—would be a State similar to that of Germany, but called by another name. Individual tradesmen were trampled upon in war-time because the Government took over their industries. The only way for them to regain their rights was to fight.

A resolution was passed "deploring the present tendency towards excessive bureaucratic control of industry as being unnecessary, dictatorial, expensive and destructive of personal initiative and morale." It is to be sent to Mr. Churchill personally.

HAIRDRESSERS PROTEST

An article in *The Hairdresser and Beauty trade* points out that many small hairdressers object strongly to the proposals of the Retail Trade Committee for compensation in case of concentration. The journal adds:—

"Now let's get busy, all of us, in particular our Councils and Associations. Meanwhile, the individual hairdresser, whom I hope I have stirred to action, can tilt a valuable lance by protesting to his M.P. BUT do it NOW! If he simply can't find the time to write a letter, then let him snip these pages out, pin to his letterhead and post off at once to his local M.P., addressing it to the House of Commons, S.W.1."

*Can we Avoid a Post Armament Depression? National Association of Manufacturers.

For What are We Fighting?

The substance of a leaflet issued by the Democratic Monetary Reform Organisation of Canada.

This war is not like other wars. It is not just military conflict involving territorial disputes. It is basically a deep-rooted struggle between two opposite ideas of life, the outcome of which will decide the future of civilisation and the pattern of the world for centuries to come. . . .

The Nazis pillory democracy as the social system which, before the war, produced poverty amidst plenty, slums, economic despair, and all the social injustices of those bleak years. The Nazis ridiculed elected governments pointing out the continual party strife it causes, the abuses of graft and intrigue, and the futile results it has produced. They fling the jibe in our faces that democratic government has resulted in hunger, exploitation of the people, monopolies, unemployment and national ruin.

We have a case to answer. Are we prepared to meet those charges and give the lie to the propaganda with which they are poisoning the minds of the people in Europe?

Facing the Facts

Let us be honest with ourselves. Are we fighting to preserve the pre-war world? Did that social system which caused such widespread suffering and injustice represent real democracy?

We know in our hearts that we can answer "No, most emphatically NO," to both those questions. But then must we not be very clear in our minds on what we do mean by "democracy" and the kind of world we shall build after this war? Of course. Then let us see if we can get general agreement on these important questions.

Democracy is government in accordance with the will of the people. This means that under democracy the people as the "directors" of the country, should obtain the results they want from the management of their affairs.

How can this be done? In the first place the people must be able to state quite plainly what results they want. "That sounds easy," you may say, "but how can the people state their wishes? I know what results I want, in fact I am the greatest expert in the country on that question. And everybody else may know what he or she wants, but how are we going to get together on this matter?"

That, too, should not be difficult. There are certain results that all the people want from the management of their affairs. Adequate wages; adequate prices for farm products; a fair return for services in industry and commerce; security in the home; security from destitution through unemployment, sickness or old age; freedom from debt; freedom from crushing taxation; freedom from regimentation; and so forth. These are results which almost everybody wants. They would constitute the greatest common measure of agreement and would take priority as "the will of the people." That is surely quite evident.

Organisation Essential

"But how will the people ever get into accord on the results they want?" That, too, is simple. However, in order to do so, they must be organised *as the people*. It is not possible to achieve a social objective without organisation. And if electors are to voice their wishes they must be organised as a united body. Then it will be an

easy matter for them to vote on those results they want and the order in which they want them.

However, that is not enough. The people must be able to obtain obedience to their wishes, otherwise they will not be the "directors" of the country. There would be nothing difficult about this if they were *united and organised*, because the machinery for making their wishes law, already exists. The people would elect their representatives whose duty it would be to see that in parliament and in their legislatures laws were passed to obtain the results which they, the people, wanted. If they failed to get satisfactory results, the people would be able to force the government to resign and they would elect other representatives.

"Oh! ho!!", someone might interject, "it doesn't work like that now."

Of course it does not, because at present the people are neither organised nor united. Suppose, for example, the mine-workers of the country were not organised under a union. It would be easy for unscrupulous employers to impose inequitable wages and working conditions upon them. But as an organised and united body they can insist on getting a fair deal. It is exactly the same with all the people of a country.

Futility of Party System

At present we operate our political institution under the "party system." A political party is a vested interest for those who stand to gain from the party's organisation. Whatever ideals might have originally inspired the formation of the party, in time the main objective becomes the preservation of the party organisation as a means of conferring favours on its supporters.

Thus we get several vested interests existing as political parties all fighting each other, and scheming to win popular support—leading to intrigue, patronage, graft and all the evils we find today.

Because of this situation, parties become easy victims of big interests. To maintain a strong organisation, parties require funds which will readily be provided by big interests on conditions favourable to them. Thus parties become the tools of those who finance them.

At election time a divided and unorganised electorate is subject to a barrage of confusing propaganda. They are invited to vote for one party candidate or another. When elected, the party candidate represents his party and not his constituents; he is subjected to party control, and that means control by those who manipulate the party.

Is it any wonder that the people never get the results they want? That is not real democracy, because that kind of dog-fight, controlled from the top, can never yield the people the results they desire.

Control by the People

However, if the people are organised and united in a single Union of Electors, they will decide the results they want, *they* will choose *their* representatives, and *they* will control, not only those representatives, but every institution in the country and insist on getting the results they want.

How? It would be simple. A government under an organised electorate would be able to govern only so long as it obeyed the will of the people. Democratic government requires co-operation by the people—in the payment

of taxes, in the support of government regulations and so forth. If the government refuses to obey its "directors," the people, the people can demand and enforce the government's resignation, provided they are organised. No government and no institution could withstand an organised demand by a united people.

That is how the political voting system of a democracy can be made effective. But what about the economic voting system?

Yes, just as the people have a political voting system to enable them to get the results they want in the political sphere, so they have an economic voting system to enable them to decide what kinds of goods and services are made available for their use in the economic sphere.

This economic vote is provided by the money system. To the extent a person has money he has economic voting power. He can go into a store and demand the kind of goods he wants. This in turn decides what goods shall be produced, how much shall be produced and who shall produce them. For example, by buying a pair of brown shoes made by the Smith Shoe Company in preference to any other article, a person votes for: (a) the production of more shoes, (b) the production of more brown shoes, and, (c) the production of more brown shoes of that particular pattern by the Smith Shoe Company.

Money—the Economic Vote

To the extent a person has money he has economic voting power. To the extent he has economic voting power he has security. And to the extent he gets this economic voting power as a right and not as a concession granted by somebody else, he has economic freedom.

So you see how important it is that the people should control their monetary (*i.e.*, economic voting) system just as effectively as they control their political system. They cannot do so directly, but if they have effective control over parliament, and parliament has effective control over the monetary system, then the people will control their economic voting rights. The money system will be operated to give them the results they want.

Canada is a wealthy country. We have vast natural resources. Properly organised they could provide Canadians with a high standard of living.

Poverty can be abolished.

We can establish security and freedom for all Canadians in terms of the results they want.

The tyranny of unpayable debt and harsh peace-time taxation can be swept away—for they reduce the security and the freedom of all.

Fine homes; the best possible health services; adequate highways; a high standard of education for every child; these are all possible.

Adequate wages; just prices; more leisure for all instead of poverty-stricken unemployment for some; all these can be achieved.

BUT THIS IS POSSIBLE ONLY UNDER A PROPERLY FUNCTIONING DEMOCRACY.

Because only under a properly functioning democracy would the people control their affairs through the voting systems to get the results they want.

Freedom or Slavery?

Totalitarianism under any form means rule from the top. It means that the people must accept the conditions

imposed upon them. It means regimentation of the many by the few. It means that "the State" controls the people's political and economic voting system and thus controls them; and "the State" are those who are managing the people's affairs, who, under democracy are the people's servants, but under totalitarianism are their masters.

We know from experience that we have not given democracy a chance in the past. The poor inefficient thing that resulted in so much poverty, in unemployment and in debt-bondage was not real democracy. Yet we had the constitutional rights and the machinery to make democracy a functioning and glorious reality. But we, the people, failed to exercise our responsibilities as the "directors" of Canada. It has taken the tragedy of another war and the threat of totalitarian domination to make us realise this.

The vision of Canada re-born! The achievement of the Canada of our dreams! The inspiration of the Canada we can build under a strong and virile democracy! Is that not something worth fighting for, working for and making a reality?

Yes, it means hard fighting against the military forces of Nazi-Jap totalitarianism, which would deny us the realisation of that new and glorious future; it means hard work to get the people organised to obtain the results they want.

If in fighting totalitarianism, we become totalitarian ourselves, what kind of post-war world will we inherit? What will all the sacrifice and suffering in this struggle profit us? And what kind of world will we pass on to our children? Yet is that not a very real danger we face?

A Challenge to All Sincere People

Moreover, let us not shut our eyes to the fact that this great conflict raging in the world, which is centred in the clash between the principles of the democratic and totalitarian concepts of life, is but the physical evidence of a much more fundamental conflict on the spiritual plane.

"For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places"

You can see how great the issues are. You can see how urgent is the call to "action stations." Shall we go forward together?

CORN IN EGYPT

This account of the history of the Jewish hero Joseph is taken from "The Father of Lies" by Warren Weston.

Like his father, Isaac also grew rich in a foreign land, and famine also followed in his wake. The inhabitants of the country apparently realised the connexion between Isaac's new-found wealth and their own sudden poverty, and persuaded their king Abimelech to drive Isaac out, with the words: "Go from us; for thou art mightier than we." (*Gen. xxvi. 16.*)

The story of Jacob's rise is one of deceit, treachery, and meanness, too obvious to require explanation. He cheats his brother Esau out of the paternal blessing and birthright. By black magic, he cheats his father-in-law Laban out of his flocks. (*Gen. xxx. 30-43.*) He adds abominable cruelty to cunning in his treatment of the Schemites. (*Gen. xxxiv.*)

Joseph inherited all the family traits and improved on the teaching of his fathers. Sold as a slave into Egypt, he was quick in winning the favour of his new master, Potiphar,

who "set him over all he possessed." Passing over the affair with his master's wife,—a case of *his* word against *hers*,—one is amazed to read the chief keeper turned over all the prisoners to his charge and "whatsoever they did there, he (Joseph) was the doer of it." (*Gen.* xxxix. 22.)

There is but one explanation, and that a simple one. In antiquity as everywhere today, there were big, secret societies exercising great political control. As is clear from the sequel, Joseph had been initiated into such an order and, owing presumably to his own occult gifts, had become a high adept. The chief keeper therefore showed the customary deference to his "Masonic" superior,—to use a modern term.

It was doubtless through this secret sect and its ramifications, that he obtained his introduction to the king (or Pharaoh), at the age of thirty. From then on, his rise was phenomenal. By occult forces, described here as oneiro-mancy, he gained so much influence over the king, that the latter appointed him prime minister or governor of the whole land of Egypt.

Immediately he put into execution the scheme long before elaborated, we may assume, with the aid of the powerful fraternity. He organised a wheat trust and cornered the wheat market,—just as, in our own day, Shapiro has done in America, Louis Louis-Dreyfus in France, and a Moscow Jew in Soviet Russia. Wheat in ancient Egypt was more of a staple than with us to-day; the man who fixed the price of wheat was the arbiter of plenty and famine.

Joseph advised the king to "look out a man discreet and wise, and set him over the land of Egypt"—(of course, only a Hebrew was fitted for such a post)—"and let him appoint officers over the land, and take up the fifth part of the land of Egypt in the seven plenteous years. And let them gather all the food of those good years that come, and lay up corn . . . in the cities." (*Gen.* xli. 34-35.)

Thus Joseph advocated what we call to-day "Planned Economy" or "Regimentation," along the lines of P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning) of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff and the Fabians in London, and of the "New Deal" of Messrs. Brandeis, Frankfurter, Tugwell, and others in Washington.*

The plan was adopted, and under Joseph's direction the Government acquired and stored a large part of the wheat crop every year.

How did the plan work? Let us set the normal wheat crop for Egypt at some arbitrary figure, say, ten million bushels. If the Government purchased two million bushels—one fifth of the crop, as recommended by Joseph—the first year, the price of wheat would rise. In consequence, the following year more wheat would be sown to meet the increased demand. If the Government again purchased two million bushels, the price of wheat would remain high. The third year, still more wheat would be sown, with the result that Egypt would be producing two million more bushels of wheat than was required for home consumption and export. Under these conditions, it is easy to see that the Government

*Mr. Sieff is Vice-President of the English Zionist Federation; Mr. Brandeis, too, has always been an active Zionist. For an account of P.E.P., see *Waters Flowing Eastward* by L. Fry, p. 235.

Regimentation of agriculture under President Roosevelt is more advanced than in the United Kingdom: yet, even in America, it is still the "seven years of plenty." Exactly when the "famine years" will start, it is impossible to say, but it is certain that the present regimentation policy will result in a "planned scarcity."

as the purchaser of the annual two million bushel surplus, FIXED the price of wheat for the whole country.

When the wheat harvest came in the fifth or sixth year, if the Government offered a very low price, or deferred purchasing altogether for some months, the glut of wheat on the market would ruin the farmers; for the farmer is unable to store his wheat and await a more favourable market.

With the price of wheat very low, one could talk of a "year of plenty," but wheat-growing would become unprofitable. Farmers would then either grow other crops, for which the demand would be doubtful, or abandon tillage in favour of stock-raising. According to *Genesis* they apparently sought the last named solution.†

When a large portion of the wheat lands had been turned into pasture or abandoned altogether, there came the year of "planned scarcity" for which Joseph had been working. The wheat crop was so small that there was a rush on the market. The price of wheat soared upward. The great demand and high price induced the farmers to part with some of their seed. The following Spring, when the high price of wheat should have stimulated production, there was a shortage of seed. Consequently, the second year of planned famine, the crop was worse than the first, and prices rose higher.

"All the land of Egypt was famished; the people cried to Pharaoh for bread." Then "Joseph opened all the store-houses and sold unto the Egyptians." (*Gen.* xli.55-56.) So the tax-payers who had borne the expense of the original Government purchases and storage of wheat, had now to beg that they be allowed to buy some of it back at an exorbitant price. But they had to give a great deal of money and were not allowed to buy enough for their needs, nor were they allowed to buy any to sow. For, we are told, "the famine waxed sore in the land of Egypt" and continued for several years longer. "And when money failed in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, all the Egyptians came unto Joseph, and said, Give us bread" . . .

"And Joseph said, Give your cattle. . . And they brought their cattle unto Joseph: and Joseph gave them bread"—note, *not wheat to sow*—"in exchange for horses, and for the flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and for the asses. . ."

"When that year was ended, they came unto him the second year, and said . . . Our money is spent; my lord hath also our herds of cattle; there is not ought left in the sight of my lord, but our bodies, and our lands. . . Buy us and our land for bread, and give us seed‡ that we may live, and not die, that the land be not desolate." (*Gen.* xlvii, 15-19.) Of course the land was useless for tillage without the seed grain, as Joseph had known all along.

"The Egyptians sold every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them: so the land became Pharaoh's." That is, the land passed into Government ownership, as the Socialists and Communists to-day advocate. "And as for the people, he removed them to cities from one end of the borders of Egypt even to the other end thereof." (*Gen.* xlvii. 20-21.)

The original purpose of Joseph's "planned economy" was, in his own words: "That food shall be for store to the land, . . . that the land perish not through famine." (*Gen.*

†It is clear from *Gen.* xlvii. 17, that they had cattle long after the wheat famine had started. There is no mention of drought, nor of any natural cause for the wheat famine which was clearly the direct result of Joseph's market operations.

‡Our italics.

xli. 36.) When he announced this, times were normal, no sign of a future famine had appeared and nobody but Joseph contemplated a famine.

In the course of some nine or ten years of operation, the plan achieved the following notable results:

1. The tax-payers were obliged to carry the burden of the Government's unwise and gigantic speculations in wheat.

2. Agriculture, the mainstay of the country, was utterly ruined.

3. There ensued a planned scarcity of wheat, which, through Government mismanagement and market operations, became a serious famine.

4. The inhabitants were obliged to exchange all their money, cattle, and movable property, for bread: hence, mass poverty.

5. Those who owned land were obliged to give it to the Government, while thousands who had nothing perished of hunger: hence, abolition of private property and mass starvation.

6. The whole population was reduced to slavery and deported from one end of the land to the other.

Ruinous taxation, destruction of agriculture, mass poverty, abolition of private property, starvation, reduction of the people to slavery, and deportation: enough to delight the heart of the most ardent Marxist.

But one touch to the picture is lacking: it is found in *Genesis*. The Jews, thanks to Joseph's colossal fortune and official position, were able to acquire the best of the land; only in *their* houses, during the famine was bread to be found; some became Government officials; and "they dwelt in the land of Egypt, in the country of Goshen, and they had possessions therein, and grew and multiplied exceedingly." (*Gen.* xlvii. 27.)

The traits of Jewish character are well exemplified in Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and especially in Joseph. Their story should be a warning to Gentiles, not only against Jewish practices in general, but also against strange, mystical doctrines (*viz.* Theosophy, Spiritism, etc.) and occult sects, as well as grandiose utopian theories.

The king of Egypt had a weakness for oneiromancy. To interpret his dream, he was advised to call in Joseph. The latter was already a high initiate; to-day he would be a 33rd degree Mason and member of the B'nai B'rith Council. Joseph interpreted the dream in accordance with the designs of the secret society. Thanks to occult influence, the king accepted Joseph's interpretation and gave him full powers. Joseph appointed other high initiates as officers under him and the scheme was carried out,—with disastrous consequences for the nation. Without the support of the secret order, the plan would have met with greater resistance and the fraud would probably have been exposed in time..

This simple story of Joseph is known and read the world over. Yet it is nearly everywhere misunderstood by Gentile readers. This is in part due to Jewish talent for mystification on the one hand, and to Gentile attraction for the supernatural on the other. "God favoured Joseph and his brethren, and wished to punish the Egyptians," say the Jews and the adepts in the occult. Successful criminals and leeches are always anxious to be thought the *special objects of divine favour*.

Our children are taught that: "The Lord was with

Joseph, therefore whatever Joseph did, must have been right.' But when we read in Homer, that Odysseus did something because Athene told him to in a dream, we do not say: "What Odysseus did must have been right, because the Goddess told him to do it." Why should Joseph be always praised, and Odysseus blamed, for some wrong deed? Man for man, the Greek was in every respect the better of the two.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Warning Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
The Use of Money	6d.
"This 'American' Business"	3d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	2d.
The Rulers of Russia by Rev Denis Fahey.....	1/-

Leaflets

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

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

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

- BELFAST D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
 BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 73 Manor Rd., Blackpool.
 BIRMINGHAM (Midland D.S.C. Association): Hon. Sec., 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
 BRADFORD United Democrats: R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
 CARDIFF S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 8, Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
 DERBY: C. Bosworth, 25 Allestree Road, Crewton, Derby.
 LIVERPOOL S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Wavertree 435.
 LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
 Lunch hour re-unions on the first and third Thursdays of the month at 12-30 p.m., at The Plane Tree Restaurant, Great Russell Street, W. C. 1. Next Meeting September 17.
 NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE D. S. C. Association: Hon. Sec., 10 Warrington Road, Fawdon, Newcastle, 3.
 SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., 19 Coniston Road, Redbridge, Southampton.

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