

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 8.

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

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

POSERS FOR PLANNERS. If it takes four years of Planning and Export Drive to bring down the pound sterling from \$4.03 to \$2.80 and we have been highly successful (*vide* Socialist Press), how long will it take to bring the pound down to zero by intensified pursuit of the same policy? And when it is down to zero, how long will it take to pay off the American Debt?

Answer: Let the Tories worry. We couldn't care less.

While we prefer to take our *Listener*, (the journal of the Cahmon Man) in small doses, they are sufficient to enable us to assure its producers (unasked) that its tone reflects, with fair accuracy, the ideals to which it has evidently been dedicated. There is the same atmosphere of the second division of the Civil Service, at its best in Post Offices and in the answers given to those absurd requests for a telephone; the curious and unmistakable mixture of atheism and pietism, combined with the 'holier than thou' attitude of a Middle Western American town—in short, the dessicated odour and rectified interest of a card index, constructed by a motion-study expert.

Where all is so Fabian, it would be invidious to introduce the obsolete concept of distinction, but we may refer to an article by Mr. A. P. Ryan entitled "Have the Middle Classes any Future?" because it does bring out the fundamental idea of the Planner—that the human being exists to be Planned by the Fabian. Mr. Ryan, we believe, graduated to the "B".B.C. from the *Manchester Guardian* ("what Manchester thinks to-day, the world will think to-morrow") and cannot be suspected of inability to say or write what he means; and what he means is clear—it doesn't matter much that *the human beings* who comprise what he calls the middle-class, are, in flat defiance of any conception of justice and decency, being forced to suffer the slow agony of economic extinction under the cold vivisectionist interest of the London School of Economics ("to train up the bureaucracy of the Socialist State"). The only matter of importance is whether the *Class*, the bloodless abstraction of the Rationalist mind, will fit into P.E.P.

Surely the Day of Judgment cannot be long delayed.

It is not infrequently said, with truth but usually without pursuing the matter to the point of technical explanation, that a Socialist economy breaks down at once when faced with a buyers' market—where the customer doesn't care if he doesn't. The reason is quite simple. "Full employment" is a policy in itself, and requires a purely fictitious "export drive"; and, although it has been carefully kept from the attention of the British domestic consumer, British exports were consistently sold far below home prices long before any kind of a Labour Government, to the real impoverishment of the country. We have only got the old traitors in a new dress. But there was, in the nineteenth

century, always a sellers' market available, and a comparatively small proportion of total home production brought at least its true cost, and so enabled the purchase of raw material to be financed without unduly lowering the standard of living. "Invisible exports" also brought real imports. This is no longer true, and the policy is sheer suicide, pursued to cloak the criminal lunacy of the present Government.

"The Labour Government can force the British consumer to purchase at British prices by barring from the market other goods, or assessing sales taxes to bring them up to the British level. But it cannot force non-British buyers to purchase anything. Actually, Socialism of the British variety is compelled to be national socialism, incompatible with a competitive international market. It is, therefore, logical that the British Labour Government, in international trade, is indulging in a form of the trading system invented for Nazi Germany by Dr. Schacht.

"No one can accuse Socialists of the wicked 'profit motive.' They genuinely desire 'the welfare of the masses.' But this righteousness regarding their own motives induces a peculiarly irritating smugness, blinding them to the fact that 'noble' bureaucratic costs can greatly exceed 'wicked' profits, and that the welfare of the masses has to demonstrate itself by facts, not by theories.

"The British Government needs to overhaul its theories, before it will successfully overhaul the economy."—Dorothy Thompson.

Dorothy Thompson (Mrs. Sinclair Lewis, *etc.*) is a reformed Socialist or Communist, and for our part, we should be quite willing to believe that she has "the welfare of the masses" at heart. But to suggest that the dominating spirit of Socialism is an altruistic urge to world betterment is just one of those ugly hypocrisies for which the Sanhedrin can always find employment. Quite simply; the Socialist is almost invariably a conscious or unconscious careerist suffering from a frustration complex; he thinks, often with some justification, that the game is not giving him an innings, and that bureaucracy will do better for him, in which he is abysmally mistaken except on the shortest view. "Success" in Socialism is a far worse racket, and mainly confined to more repulsive rogues, than any system previously inflicted on suffering humanity.

"Tut-tut," says *The Spectator*

A correspondent sends the following from a recent issue of *The Spectator*:—

"... Even Mr. Acheson, the Secretary of State, is continually being harried at a time when he needs to give all his time to the Paris conference. All this can no doubt be traced to the demand for checks and balances embodied in the American Constitution. And the American Constitution is, no doubt, a very great document. But is there no limit to this process, even when it affects world affairs, as well as American domestic affairs?"

The Role of Congress

By EDNA LONIGAN*

The first session of the 81st Congress is slowly dragging to its end. President Truman denounced the "do nothing" 80th Congress in what was perhaps the bitterest verbal attack ever made by an American President against the legislative process. Whether the President really likes the 81st Congress better is not our concern here. The one important question for the citizen in regard to Congress is: What is the role of this representative organ in the fight to save the Republic?

Our political textbooks (following Montesquieu) have given us a picture of government as divided into three parts, legislative, executive, and judicial. Popular usage tends more and more to refer to the executive power alone as "government."

Actually popular usage here is the more accurate. The executive power is profoundly different from the legislative power. The elected "representatives" of the people speak for the people in opposition to appointed officials responsible primarily to the Executive. It is therefore the duty of Congress to restrain the "government" to "do nothing" that will improperly increase its power at public expense.

Montesquieu emphasized the English separation of legislative and executive powers because he clearly saw that this separation was necessary for freedom. If the French would deprive their absolute monarchy of the power to make its own laws, they could also enjoy the liberty for which the English so resolutely fought. The men who wrote our Constitution fully realized the importance of "balanced powers."

Today that realization greatly needs to be revived. Our legislative agencies are still visibly separate from the executive arm, but under the surface the separation of powers is disappearing. The Executive is regaining the power to make its own law, and to control the courts, although the structure outwardly appears unchanged.

There is no need for Congress if its function is merely to write "laws" conveying to the President in pleasing language the power to do what he likes. Clark Clifford or any other clever appointee could do that. The role of Congress is to do what the White House naturally resents: to lay down *restraints* on the Executive, to define the channels through which the executive power is to flow.

Since 1935, as a result of "must legislation," lump-sum appropriations, manufactured "emergencies," and foreign entanglements, the President has been arrogating to himself the power to decide the restraints which he will heed, and to define the channels through which he will dispose of the vast resources at his command.

II

We tend to forget that executive power is physical and substantial. It is the power of the military leader or commander in chief. All the elaborate developments of the executive arm partake of the nature of the army. Whether a government agent is arresting dope peddlers, or promising Federal subsidies to all and sundry, he is not acting in his own person, but exercising an authority derived from the ability of the "government" back of him to seize persons and property by force.

Legislative power, on the other hand, is not physical. It is legal and abstract. Executive power can be wielded by a strong and ruthless individual and his henchmen. But legislative power requires the voluntary support of a sophisticated and self-disciplined people.

Every city-state and nation, as it grew strong, was forced to realize that the chief could use the physical power at his command against unarmed citizens who displeased him. The history of Parliaments is essentially the story of how the people, after their chief had created an army, learned how to impose restraints on the force under his control.

The great forward step was made when the English-speaking people turned from the council or mass meeting to a small body of "representatives," to keep watch over the chief and his personal aides. These "representatives" of the people stumbled on the all-important factor, in protecting the citizens, when they learned that the ruler would be very reasonable if he needed money, and only if he needed money. The political problem of the Republic today is still as simple as that. It is to insure that the ruler is curtailed for money.

We call the parliamentary protection of our liberties "the Power of the Purse." It used to be called, more accurately, "the separation of the Purse from the Sword." Our forefathers knew, what we forget, that the chief of state always possesses the Sword. The people can control the Sword only if they keep control of the Purse, which is the power to supply the ruler's armies, or in our more refined age, to vote the salaries of the bureaucracy.

So it should be realized that Congress is not really so much part of "government" as a defense against government. It is a wall which the people have built to insure that the chief cannot send his armies to punish their leaders, or to take their property, except as they decree. When the colonists said, "No taxation without representation" they knew the score. They meant that the head of the state should not collect a penny in taxes unless their own elected agents were in full control, with power to decide where and how all taxes should be spent.

III

The Twentieth Century has witnessed a world-wide abdication by the people of their dearly bought right to control the Sword. The people have everywhere surrendered to the personal government of the commander in chief. They have forgotten that any party which accepts personal government thereby undermines the Congressional wall protecting the unarmed people against the government's arbitrary will. But no modern dictator has been rash enough openly to abolish the Legislature.

Mussolini said: "I will not take from the people their legislative toy." Hitler made the Reichstag what was well called "the world's most expensive male singing society." Stalin appears at the pageants that mark the meeting of the Soviet Congress. But in all these cases the leaders themselves usurped the Power of the Purse.

Similarly, our different programs of Big Spending, since 1933, have been variants of one central plan—to give the President free money. In WPA, PWA, Lend Lease, ECA, MAP and all the rest of the always "emergency" legislation, Congress was never allowed to say just how the money should be spent, or to define the exact powers and duties of the spending agencies. That discretion is all the President needs. For if the law is not precise, Congress

*Reproduced by permission of the Editor of *Human Events*, (Washington, D.C.) in which journal the article appeared on September 21, 1949.

will never know whether or not the President obeys the law. Generalities are not law, no matter how legally they may be dressed up in sections and articles. Keeping the traditional form of law is merely part of the deceptive process. It is through vague and general language, cast in legal form, that the Executive has regained the power to decide what laws it will observe.

When appropriations grow large enough, Congress has no hope of knowing what is really done with the money. And nowadays Congress is confronted by the Executive with a budget deliberately made so huge and complex that it cannot be analyzed. Our representatives have been driven to the expedient of suggesting that Congress tell the Executive to make its own cut of 5 or 10 *per cent.* of the amounts appropriated. But this, as Senator Styles Bridges has virtually admitted, is open abdication by Congress of the Power of the Purse.

While Congress was deliberately immobilized by the pressure of real or fake emergencies, the Executive has been using the people's money to deluge their representatives with vials of ridicule. When ridicule was not enough, the factions which we call the party in power have turned to "purging" those Members of Congress who have fought valiantly to keep the Purse separate from the Sword.

IV

It is tragic to hear Americans speak of contests between the President and Congress as though we were mere bystanders at a prize fight. The Congress has no army, no bureaucracy, no courts, no jails, no propaganda arm. Its one real power, the power to withhold money from the bureaucracy, has meaning only to the extent that people support the representatives who guard the Purse.

When President Truman denounced the 80th Congress as a "do nothing" Congress, he was really calling it a great Congress, one which held the line against Executive aggression. What an opportunity the Republicans missed! How richly their last candidate deserved defeat!

When President Roosevelt tried to purge Senator George he was logical. When President Truman recently attacked Senator Byrd, he was consistent. These Executives merely sought to punish independent thinking in their own party, as everyone who seeks power must do. It is encouraging that among Democrats, rather than among Republicans, the plain people have risen to defend their defenders, as the colonists did.

The world-wide political crisis is in every country a struggle between the unarmed citizens and the chief, with his personal following, who directs the armed forces. It makes no real difference whether the head man is from the Left or from the Right, whether he is called a leader or a dictator or a president. In each case he and his personal aides have the all-essential physical power, and, if they can shake off the restraining influence of the people's representatives, they have power as absolute as that of Louis XIV. In almost every country, except the United States, this battle for the people is now definitely lost.

The people depend for their liberty on the strength with which Congress can impose restraints on their spending. Otherwise the Sword and the Purse are reunited in the hands of the ruler and his following. Then all the gains the unarmed citizenry have made in 300 years will be lost. Our

Congress is the last free Parliament. It contains wise and valiant men who have been fighting for fifteen years to hold the line, in the hope that the people will realize in time what is at stake.

The Leisure State—A Criticism*

By ERIC GILL

The conditions of industrial employment admirably depicted with comic exaggerations in Charlie Chaplin's film "Modern Times," are such that what is now called "the leisure state" seems not only the desirable but the inevitable conclusion of industrialism. Looking at the thing from the point of view of those who profit by it, and from that of those who enjoy the gadgets and conveniences which it produces in such multitudinous variety, the only thing wrong with it seems to be mal-distribution, and the wars, economic and military, which the present financial arrangements make inevitable. It seems clear that, assuming the goodness of the produce, there is nothing wrong in our world but the misery of unemployment (that is to say, leisure without the means of enjoying it) and the poverty of many in the midst of plenty.

And assuming that the solution offered by Social Credit is right and practicable, it seems clear that all just men must accept that solution and work for it.

It will not perhaps be out of place, however, in this first number of the new quarterly, if the assumption above referred to be enquired into. The assumption is that the products of mechanised industry are good; and ultimately that must mean good for those who use them. This is a world of men and women; that fact must be constantly in our minds, not merely not forgotten but constantly remembered. The famous saying of Corbusier: "A house is a machine to live in" must be criticised in its human applications.

Let us take the common statement of those enthusiasts who support our industrialism, that their aim is so to arrange things that all necessary things shall be made by machinery, so that man may be free for "higher things." It is argued that if machine industry were properly organised, both technically and financially, the hours of labour might be reduced not only very considerably but perhaps to as little as a few hours per week per man; and that this labour would then be undertaken willingly as a kind of patriotic duty, just as many munition workers worked during the stress of the last war.

Now what are these necessary things? It is obvious that in a general way they may be said to be food, clothing, shelter and furniture. And, it may be added, amusement is a necessity, and so this also must be included in the things to be provided mechanically. But whether or no we include amusements, we are generally agreed about the other things. And the assumption is that suitable kinds of food, clothing, furniture and shelter can be produced mechanically suitable, that is to say suitable for men and women. There are then two things to be considered:

1. Are the products of machinery really suitable for human beings?
2. Whether there are in fact for human beings any higher

(continued on page 7)

*From *The Fig Tree*, June, 1936. See editorial comment on page 4 of this issue.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free:
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFion Park 435.

Vol. 23. No. 8. Saturday, October 22, 1949.

Centralised Production

Sooner or later, if criticism in any true sense of the word is allowed to continue, and sooner rather than later, the moral bases of large-scale production, production which entails a high degree of centralisation as a condition of its performance, must be developed. That Marxian *deus ex machina*, the "mode of production," is overdue for inspection, to see whether, by the familiar inversion, it is not a satanic instead of a divine entity. We are tired of being prevented from doing right things merely by "the way" in which other things, right in their presumed intention, are being done. The ascription of necessity to what is open to choice is itself a choice, and it restricts the sphere of choice. Freedom and choice are inseparable. Even if only within limits, the mode of production is open to choice—ultimately. If it isn't so, make it so. Choose to make it so.

The first issue of the Douglas Social Credit Quarterly, *The Fig Tree*, published in June, 1936 (and still, though in abeyance, in reserve) contained an introduction to the study of these matters by the late Mr. Eric Gill, entitled "The Leisure State—A Criticism" to which criticism Miles Hyatt, the associate editor of *The Fig Tree*, replied in continuation. Neither the criticism nor the reply exhausts the topic, a circumstance quite distinct from the eminence and ability of the writers. But, if anything further is to be said on either side, we may as well go back to the start made under Social Credit auspices thirteen years ago. To make these articles accessible to the Social Crediters, and others, of to-day, we reprint them in this week's issue of *The Social Crediter*.

To Amateur Photographers

A considerable amount of copying (printed and written matter) has recently been done for the Secretariat by a simplified process involving the use of contact printing, developing and fixing. The work, which effects a great saving of labour, calls for no special skill but requires access to a photographic dark-room with a cold water supply. It is admittedly monotonous. A sheet of plate glass is almost the only apparatus needed, besides the usual fittings of a dark-room. The demand is fitful, but occasionally rises to three or four hours' time a week. The Editor of *The Social Crediter* would be glad to hear of any reader willing to undertake work of this character at no cost to the volunteer.

Whom to Blame?

The Times Literary Supplement, desiring to apportion blame for the neglect, by the children of to-day, of the attractions of knowledge of anything but their jobs, says it makes all the difference in the world whether education is directed towards developing the powers of the individual, with "due regard to the needs of society" or towards equipping him to be a member of the community "with due regard to his innate potentialities." We agree that there is

a difference. The point seems to be that it is more practicable to teach a child to do what is required of him than to do what he likes (he can't do what he likes; but he likes to do what he can't): square pegs in round holes. The newspaper claims that the concentration of attention is to-day on the square pegs (the children).

May we suggest that, if even a square peg were living it might object to having its edges cut away just as much as a round hole conscious of the injury might resent the chisel which squares it up? But, since holes (jobs) don't suffer pain, it might be well to trim them up a bit?

Social Credit Secretariat

Examination for the Diploma of Associate (Overseas Candidates) 1949

The following candidates have satisfied the Examiners in the recent Examination for the Diploma of Associate:—

CANADA—

Donald S. Hamilton.

NEW ZEALAND—

Henry W. Bell.

Hugh Alfgar Hamilton.

Elizabeth King.

Jack Simon.

AUSTRALIA—

Henry Alfred Scoular.

(Signed) B. M. Palmer, Director.

The following is the text of the Examination Paper set, the Candidates being required to answer all the questions:—

Question One.

Paragraph 2, page 6, "Realistic Position of the Church of England"; with the aid of the translation of Magna Carta, illustrate the statement that Magna Carta "remains as a witness that this conception was inherent in English life seven hundred years ago."

Question Two.

Discuss the statement, "The Church has a *locus standi* on the Just Price." What is the Just Price?

Question Three.

Discuss the resemblance between (a) "the face of power changes, but not its nature" (Bertrand de Jouvenel) and (b) "Power cannot be destroyed: it can only be transferred." Which, in your opinion, is the more useful proposition for application, and why?

Question Four.

(Answer only that part of the question which relates to your own country).

Canada.—In not more than 500 words, write an information concerning Mr. Manning's present political objectives, embodying any points of importance which you deem to be unappreciated by English Social Crediters.

Australia.—In not more than 500 words, write an information concerning Mr. Menzies's present political objectives, embodying any points of importance which you deem to be unappreciated by English Social Crediters.

New Zealand.—In not more than 500 words, write an information concerning the present political objectives of the New Zealand Opposition Party, embodying any points of importance which you deem to be unappreciated by English Social Crediters.

Planning the Earth

By C. G. DOBBS

IX

(Continued)

'The jungle of individualism' is a curious choice of phrase with which people try to discredit a Society not centrally Planned. Usually it is used to denote a state of recurrent financial crises and chronic insecurity, bearing all the signs of central Planning, such as that which occurred between the Wars; but let that pass. What seems to escape notice in this 'scientific' age, when 'ecology' is all the rage, is that the jungle is a *balanced* community. From the point of view of the living things which dwell in it the jungle is the only place where they can live and develop their proper character. Normally, of course, the word 'jungle' suggests the primaeval forest in which human beings have little or no part; but let mankind be added to it and allowed to play its part in the community, and in the course of time we get a gradual transformation of the 'jungle' such as that which, in a thousand years or so, transformed the north temperate broad-leaved forest into the English countryside.

That is the true 'jungle of individualism'—the product of countless millions of acts of planning of varying scope by *responsible* individuals, each man planning his own and having to abide by (and live with) the consequences. It is noticeable that Planners, if they have the opportunity, usually prefer to live in it, but how it came into existence must be a complete mystery to them. For though they may live *in* it, they certainly are not *of* it; the term 'jungle', as applied to the free actions of their fellow-men, clearly reveals that. The implication is that, just as mankind has the right to cut and clear, to dominate and Plan the lowlier organisms of the jungle, so the Planner has the right similarly to treat the lowlier masses of humanity. And he hasn't! nor is the 'right' absolute in either case.

Indeed, the treatment meted out to animals and to human beings by their managers is becoming too similar to be pleasant. No sooner has artificial insemination been tried on cattle than it is extended to human beings. To quote Sir John Russell in his Presidential Address to the British Association at Newcastle (August 31, 1949):

It is estimated that by suitable dilutions the number of cows inseminated per bull could rise to 10,000 or even 15,000 per year.

We may yet live to see bulls, other than a small *select* [my italics] aristocracy, become unwanted anachronisms.

On the other hand, of the human male we read⁵:

... a fecund donor ... could, with ideal conditions, produce 400 children weekly (that is, about 20,000 annually).

... It seems desirable to limit the number of children any one donor should be allowed to have, lest the risk of marriage between sibs not known to each other should assume dangerous proportions. For this reason we have set an arbitrary limit of 100 children for each donor—not yet attained by any one donor.

From the same article we learn also that the donors are *selected* by the clinic, but "The prospective parents should never be aware of the identity of the donor." Also that: "to most balanced men the task of donation is unpleasant", and that there is danger of the introduction of infection, and of

⁵British Medical Journal, January 13, 1945, in an article based upon practical experience by Mary Barton, M.B., B.S., Kenneth Walker, F.R.C.S., and B. P. Wiesner, D.Sc.

abnormal sperms, into the womb. In fairness to the medical profession, it should be mentioned that this article was followed by a lengthy correspondence in the *British Medical Journal* in which a good many doctors condemned the whole business as disgusting and immoral; but there was a surprisingly large 'progressive' faction which defended it on 'social' and 'scientific' grounds. One writer ventured to use the adjective 'diabolical', and perhaps he was nearer the mark than he knew. What may interest medical men and women engaged in this pursuit is that they are carrying out the precise function attributed by an earlier age to the demons known as incubi and succubi⁶. That, no doubt, will give them a great deal of amusement! but no consideration of faith, of reason, or even of his own declared knowledge, are likely to deter a Planner from the fascination path of Planning, quite literally in this case, other people's lives.

It is hard for normal sane people to realise that these things, which a generation ago were regarded as mere flights of satire, are actually happening in the world; or that there is *no limit*, except that set by the awful retribution of nature, to the lengths to which those obsessed by the craving for centralised power will attempt to go. If these men and women acknowledge no power superior to themselves, if they think, as they do, that mankind is the Boss of the Universe, and that they are the Bosses of mankind, if the word 'sacred' is to them, as it is, superstitious nonsense, then it is useless to expect them to treat anything as sacred, inviolable, inalienable, or to set any limit upon the power of the World Monopoly for which they strive. It is the most fatal delusion to imagine that the thing will somehow moderate itself. Such moderation as is now exerted is entirely to be attributed to the division and separation of powers which yet survive in the world. The strengthening of this division and separation against the forces of Monopoly, is the first duty of all who desire peace or the survival of human dignity; and that means, broadly speaking, the courageous defence of every traditional, non-aggressive power against which public opinion is being organised, as well as the separation of more recently developed powers (e.g. the Trades Unions) from the State, and of the State from the Superstate.

But above all it means the defence of the land, the ultimate basis of all separation of powers—the land in decentralised, separate, *responsible* ownership. It means a steady, unflinching, struggle against collectivisation, and especially its first stage, Committee control; the defence of every field, every farm, wood, valley, hillside, mountain range, region, against remote control by monopolies, with their *irresponsible* Planning, and against the industrialisation of the land, just when industry is losing its spirit and its incentive. Not merely a dumb, blind, purely instinctive, even if sound reaction always in retreat against the conscious, informed,

⁶The following is taken from the *Malleus Maleficarum*, the great Catholic attack on sorcery published about 1490, and quoted from Charles Williams's book on *Witchcraft* (Faber & Faber, 1941):

"... and however much, in a horrid parody of the holy substitutions of love, they may convey seed from one living being to another—here the succubus to receive, there the incubus to deliver—yet one thing they cannot do: they cannot themselves beget. They have no formative energy, either in the heavens above or in the earth and the hells beneath. The child born of the transferred seed is the child of the man whose seed has been transferred. The child of a wizard and a witch it may be; it is not and cannot be the child of the Devil."

It is evident that a.i.d. is not quite so modern as it is thought to be.

organised, determined action of the Planners, who know what they want, and will stop at nothing to get it, even though it is evil; but a resistance equally conscious, better informed, more determined and courageous, because it knows what it is doing, and that it is essential to save the world.

The great strength of the Kingdom of Heaven is that it is not a totalitarian State; it works when and where and to the extent that it is tried; it cannot be 'ruined by a few recalcitrant objectors', they simply and automatically contract themselves out, thus strengthening the remainder. The place to start saving the physical world from the evil things which are destroying it is to start saving the place you live in—the hillside above you, or the stream at the bottom of your garden. The way for the Welsh, at the present time, to start saving the world, is for them to save the Welsh Highlands; but unless there is some grasp of the great issues at stake it is easy to lose heart and determination.

The momentum towards centralisation is so great that there are sure to be many more retreats and disappointments before the corner is turned. But that is no reason for letting things go. It will never stop of itself, except, indeed, through the prolonged effect of wholesale disaster and catastrophe; but to rely upon that is suicidal.

So long as there was room for honest doubt, the Planners were rightly given the benefit of it, and resistance was necessarily sporadic, and limited to special cases, supposed to be blemishes in an otherwise wholesome policy for the good of mankind. But there is no longer room for honest doubt. The evils which beset and threaten us are not mere blemishes, they are part of a consistent policy; and those who consciously support that policy must either call evil good, or deny that it exists, which amounts to saying that good and evil are one. For those who cannot do either of these things the path is clear; confusion and bewilderment are left behind. It is not that the whole world is mad, but that certain men are bad; not merely weak and liable to fall into error like the rest of humanity, but corrupted by power in their purpose and philosophy. It may well be said that they have been offered all the kingdoms of the earth, and have not jibbed at the price. The road to hell is not paved with good intentions, but with 'good' intentions, which are just the opposite.

This can be at first a frightening and unwelcome conclusion, but it is infinitely preferable to the conclusion that appalling evils can arise from good policies, or the hypocritical pretence of all bullies and tyrants that it is those who resist their will and their aggression who are responsible for the evil results which follow. To share in these is to destroy one's own integrity. The prospect of opposing such a concentration of evil power is somewhat intimidating, particularly when it is realised that it holds control of finance, upon which depends, in large measure, our access to bread and butter and the other things we need. But fortunately there are, at least in the Western Hemisphere, counterbalancing powers which so far have protected us. Our survival depends upon their survival, and their survival depends upon us. The British Empire and Commonwealth is the largest of them.

All this being admitted, it is also true that a great deal of the immense structure of power which looks so intimidating is no more than a vast balloon of propaganda and mass hypnosis concealing the essential weakness and internal conflict which besets all monopolies. That is perhaps why they feel no confidence in themselves until they have moulded

matter to their purpose in a big way—big dams, lakes, factories, skyscrapers, roads, bombs, bangs—bigness is essential, but it is never big enough. No size can ever give stability to a mass balanced upon a single point; and that is a realistic picture of a monopoly.

The struggle has been described as between all the brains and abilities which can be bought against all those which cannot be bought; but that does not mean that the real alternative to monopoly is merely another group of men plotting for power. The strength of the forces on our side is of quite a different nature to that of the Planners. Its strength lies in its dispersal; to centralise it is to betray it. Anyone who has tried to keep the weeds down in a garden knows what a power the Planners have pitted themselves against; but it is possible for men, by conscious and determined and unremitting effort to master temporarily the growth of unconscious and lowly plants. It is even possible for conscious and determined men to treat their fellow-men as if they were lower organisms and to impose their will upon them, so long as they remain unconscious of what is being done. But let consciousness awake—let them find themselves dealing with a consciousness and intelligence and determination as great as their own, and they cannot succeed indefinitely. It is hard enough to keep plants down, but to keep men down who know what they are about is, in the end, impossible.

There is a specific and effective reply to every plan and plot and trick which aims at centralisation of power. The key to it, the one word which Planners cannot abide when used in its correct relation, is *responsibility*.

(To be continued)

Belfast D.S.C. Association

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*,

Dear Sir,—I am writing to you to ask you to have the necessary change made in the name of the Belfast D.S.C. Group in *The Social Crediter* notice necessitated by the sudden death of Crothers. This is now Belfast D.S.C. Association, Hon. Sec., L. A. Lyons, 42, Upper Cavehill Road, Belfast.

The sale of books etc., is being taken on by Miss Z. Irwin, 12, Ravenhill Gardens, Belfast, who no doubt will be contacting 7, Victoria Street.

Crothers' death is a big loss to Social Credit and to the Belfast Group, and to me personally. He was a near as perfect secretary, as I suppose this world could supply, and the soul of unobtrusive efficiency. And such a nice chap in every way.—Yours, etc.,
NORMAN F. WEBB.

Reissued in Canada:

DICTATORSHIP BY TAXATION

By MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS.

(The text of the Belfast Address of November 24, 1936).

PRICE: THREEPENCE.

From:

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., Liverpool or Electoral Campaign Headquarters, 207/413, Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C.

A CRITICISM*(continued from page 3.)*

things than those which are necessary. For it is clear when we consider man's history, however briefly and with whatever meagre apparatus of knowledge, that up to the present, that is to say up to the industrial revolution, it is precisely the things necessary to him upon which he has expanded all his love and imagination and tenderness. We might go so far as to say that tenderness is of all his virtues the most characteristically human. And it has been upon the making of what he needed that man has chiefly shown his nature.

It matters little which category we examine. Take, for instance, even the lowly business of food production, and consider the love and care of which the arts of agriculture and of the kitchen have been the occasion. It may sound sentimental to our town and factory populations, but it is true to say that even bread may be holy or unholy, and therefore human or inhuman. And when we consider the high art of architecture, it seems obvious that the house is only a machine to live in, if the word "machine" be used as a purely fanciful and literary conceit.

It is all very well under the stress of wartime, and the immediate need for millions of bombs, to organise the mechanical production of munitions. The bomb is an inhuman contrivance anyway, and might therefore just as well be made mechanically. Indeed it were better so made. But houses, town halls and churches are not munitions of war. Why then should we think it suitable that they should be made as if they were a kind of bomb? And does it really improve the operating-theatre house that it has upon its walls photographic reproductions of "old masters" or even modern ones? Does it really improve the machine-made hat that mother ties a machine-made ribbon round it?

This is obviously a question which cannot be dealt with in a few lines. It reaches into every detail of human life. But at least it seems desirable, when we consider the financial tyranny under which we at present live and labour, that in our enthusiasm for financial rationality we do not lose sight of man's nature. Perhaps we have already too far lost sight of it. Perhaps what I am writing will seem to the majority of town dwellers reading this in their tubes merely fantastic nonsense. What is wrong with the tube, they will say? What is wrong with my machine-printed newspaper? What is wrong with the machine-made cloth of my "fifty-shilling" suit and with the aniline dyes which adorn my natty tie so that it goes with my equally natty socks? What is wrong with electric light? And is it not incredibly foolish of that moribund institution called the Roman Catholic Church to refuse to have anything but bees-wax candles on its altars and to look with distaste upon machine-made vestments?

But whether or no at first glance all this seems to be nonsense, it will at least be worth consideration and eventually need refutation. The dilemma is a real one, because human nature is such and such and not otherwise. Man is not a machine, and he can rest only in that which is in accord with his nature. Wartime is one thing and the things of war; but it is at least doubtful whether the conditions of human life are such that even in peace men must proceed as if they were at war. For this frame of mind in which we say that poverty and scarcity can be abolished only by the mass production of necessities is a wartime frame of mind. It is a kind of panic, and it is doubtful whether the implications can find historical support.

Moreover, we must never forget the historical origins

of our industrialism. There is no justification for kidding ourselves that the origins of our machine industry were the enthusiasm and kindness of heart of manufacturers endeavouring to supply a starving world with the necessaries of life.

At any rate, these questions need debate. And it will not be sufficient for the advocates of Social Credit merely to prove their financial rationality. It will also be necessary for them to say that the world they envisage will be a human world, and not one which merely perpetuates and rationalises the inhumanity of the present.

The Leisure State—A Reply

By MILES HYATT

I have no quarrel with Mr. Gill. We both want the same thing—the most human life possible for human beings. Nor do I think we differ much in what that life is. It is certainly not idleness enlivened by the intermittent consumption of canned goods and music, leaving behind no monument save "the asphalt road and a thousand lost golf balls."

But Mr. Gill does not realise that the kind of life we both desire, and any other kind of life that other individuals with different tastes desire also, is possible of fulfilment under Social Credit only. It is a plain fact that only Social Credit offers men complete freedom to order their lives as they choose, without reference to a superimposed system. The inevitable alternative to Social Credit is a slave System of one kind or another—the simplest and most venomous that of Money—which must end either in complete chaos or the final reduction of human personality to mechanical servility.

Under the present financial order, Mr. Gill, be he never so rich and free in his own person, cannot hope to escape from ugliness and limitations. Even supposing he fled with others like-minded to the remote Bermudas (and succeeded in getting a passport, permission to land, exemption from income-tax, initial supplies of materials in the shape of tools and something to eat and wear during the first year, all without entailing a money-bond of any kind), his island-society would at once become a sphere of influence and a market, and be either attached to some giant financial organisation or blown out of the water by a cruiser. This last fate would almost certainly befall it in time of war.

In a Social Credit society Mr. Gill would find no limitations other than those of physical possibility. He would be perfectly free to collect around him any group of people with similar views and set up any kind of community he desired, wherever he wished. It would be quite unnecessary to leave England to do it. Mr. Chesterton* might rally his Distributists with one short, sharp blast in the Editorial of his Weekly and roar away to Sussex, there to pull down the shutters of the corner-shops and delight the soul of every rollicking English publican. We should have Montague Fordham able to stride gleefully through the Chilterns, explaining, if my halting intellect has not in some way misinterpreted him, that the end of production was not consumption, but satisfaction, and getting no end of satisfaction out of it. Maynard Keynes himself, even if he never really managed to grasp the theory, would still in practice discover that it was possible, in company with Professor

*G.K. died on June 14. We shall all remember with respect and affection one whose life was spent in the cause of individual freedom

Gregory, Sir Josiah Stamp and the entire academic staff of the London School of Economics, to amble down to some pleasant corner of Cambridge, where the propensity to consume might continue to wax and wane with the lunatic persistence of a marshlight.

I am not one of those who hate the machine itself, but I wish it to be my servant, not master. As Mr. Gill properly asserts, the humble art of cooking is as much a craft as that of architecture, from the subjective angle of the cook; and even considered objectively, sixty thousand persons who admire a well-built cathedral are not relatively of more importance than six who enjoy a well-cooked chicken. I like making tea for myself, and for anyone else who will let me. Nothing short of financial compulsion will reconcile me to that never-to-be-abided abomination of mass-production, tea from an urn. Even so, there still remains the washing-up, and the conditions under which the kettle boils.

Frankly, I prefer washing-up, washing-down, and also the washing itself, to be done by a machine. I feel that these things, as crafts, like cleaning out sewers and dust-bins, may have their devotees, but not many. Most cooks admit to preference for an electric cooker in a well-fitted kitchen, rather than a heap of damp twigs in a cave. It is by no means probable that the making of electric cookers efficient in practice appeals to many as a possible craft—though the designing of them very decidedly is one. Certain things, the sordid and mechanical jobs of life, can best be done by machines, leaving human capacity free for the more creative and satisfying aspects of work; and it is usually better that the tools also be machine-made, except in the case of a musician composing on a Strad.

Social Credit would allow a man to decide for himself what he preferred to make and to have made by people, and what he could best leave to mass production. The opposite is true of the present financial tyranny. Sordid and unskilled jobs are the most common, and in fact are often artificially created to keep the unemployed occupied, whereas human craftsmanship of every kind has almost disappeared. Things made with loving care by the mind and hand of a man take time; and time, we are told, is money.

Money, we know, is invested in machines, not in hands or minds.

The Party Front and the Secret Ballot

Under the above heading, the following letter has appeared in *The Sentinel*, Carinbah, New South Wales, in which State at least one active Voters' Policy Association is in being:—

"Dear Sir,

"I see from a recent issue that the up-and-coming young Liberal lion, Mr. Ray Watson, is not in accord with the older Liberal lion, Mr. Munro, regarding the Council's financial position.

"This is, of course, regrettable, and if either party were to ascertain the exact truth of the matter and make it known, he would be rendering a public service. However, for my part, consideration of that aspect of the argument is deferred in order that a related issue, of equal importance, may be touched upon. I refer to the Party Front *vis a vis* the Secret Ballot.

"The seeming lack of cohesion (in the Party) this little

fracas reveals, is explained away by the younger member as evidence of retention of individuality and as a reflection of the *latitude* the Party allows its members. This bold claim surely requires some backing? Some might be impressed, but others would not be. Could the question be put to a test? Let us try it.

"All members of the Party seem to favour the Secret Ballot, especially in regard to Trades Unions and the election of representatives. Very well then. Suppose they adopt the same principle in Parliament? Will they?; or is that somehow different? At present, voting in Parliament is quite open and definitely on Party lines, and the voters' names are recorded in *Hansard*. In all matters of importance the Party Members are brought into line by the ever vigilant Party Whip, and fear of Party discipline, (plus desire, ever to be contended with, the Devil's delight) ensures obedience; an ideal situation for an anonymous group using Parliament for its own ends (*vide D'Israeli, Coningsby*), and one which could not be maintained otherwise.

"Now, as intimidation appears to be the main argument used by those who favour secrecy in the Ballot; if there is anything in the Secret (*i.e.* anonymous) vote, how soon may we expect to hear the Liberals demanding a Secret Ballot in Parliament?

"Surely the adoption of this as a plank in the Party's Platform—and its implementation in the House—would result in vast improvements all round?—W. PRESCOTT."

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(<i>reprinting</i>)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(<i>edition exhausted</i>)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	13d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....	(<i>Cloth Edition</i>) 7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage 7/-	
Introduction to Social Credit by Bryan W. Monahan	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Odium v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
The International Jew by Eric D. Butler	2/6

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.