ENGLISH EDITION

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 52. No. 1 SATURDAY, 1 APRIL, 1972 7p. (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

Get US Out!*

THE U.N. THREATENS THE UNITED STATES

By Gary Allen

(Continued from our issue for February 19, 1972)

Attempting to explain away the incredible appeasement of the Soviets at Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, and at the San Francisco Conference, "Liberal" folklore has it that Stalin and Company had to be cajoled into joining the U.N. The truth is that the Bolsheviks couldn't have been kept out unless the door were barred with a steel plank. As Earl Browder, former General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and twice its candidate for President of the United States, wrote in his book *Victory And After*: "The American Communists worked energetically and tirelessly to lay the foundations for the United Nations, which we were sure would come into existence." And a formal preamble to the constitution of the Communist Party, U.S.A., states that the Party believes "the true national interest of our country and the cause of peace and progress require . . . the strengthening of the United Nations as a universal instrument of peace".

Political Affairs is the official theoretical journal of the Communist Party, U.S.A., through which the official "Party Line" is transmitted to Comrades and the much larger body of Party sympathizers. In April 1945, two months before the San Francisco Conference, *Political Affairs* published the following directive:

> *Great popular support and enthusiasm for the United Nations policies should be built up, well organized and fully articulate . . . . The opposition must be rendered so impotent that it will be unable to gather any significant support in the Senate against the United Nations Charter and the treaties which will follow.*

A corollary to the "Liberal" myth that the Communists did not really want to be included in the U.N. is that the World Organization has proved a constant thorn in the side of the Soviets and their satellites, producing constant frustration as symbolized by Khrushchev pounding his shoe on the lectern of the General Assembly. It was good show biz, but that is all it was. A former Czecho-Slovakian intelligence officer, Colonel Jan Bukar, has testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that he heard a General Bondarenko deliver a lecture at the Frunze Military Academy in Moscow in which the Soviet general declared:

> *From the rostrum of the United Nations, we shall convince the colonial and semi-colonial people to liberate themselves and to spread the Communist theory over all the world. We recognize the U.N. as no authority over the Soviet Union, but the United Nations serves to deflect the capitalists and warmongers in the Western World.*

Dr. Marek Korowicz, a member of Communist Poland's delegation at the U.N. who eluded his guards and sought asylum in the United States, put it well when he said: "The Communist Party regards the U.N. as the most important platform of Soviet propaganda in the world . . . ." On October 7, 1961, the West Coast newspaper of the Communist Party, the *People's World*, actually carried an editorial entitled "Save The U.N.". It declared in part:

> *The U.N. commands a great reservoir of support in our country. This support should now be made vocal. People should write President Kennedy, telling him—*
>
> *Do not withdraw from U.N. Restore U.N. to the Grand Design of Franklin Roosevelt . . . .*

New Times, an official Soviet publication printed in Moscow, reported in its issue for July 8, 1970:

> *As stressed by Premier Kosygin . . . on June 19, the Soviet Union attaches much importance to the United Nations. In the future, as in the past, it will spare no effort to steer the Organization's work.*

It is equally fictitious to claim, as did the C.F.R.'s James Reston in a recent column, that the Communists want the United States to get out of the United Nations. If the U.S. gets out of the U.N., the U.N. collapses as a springboard for Communist attempts at world domination. And the Comrades know it! On January 21, 1962, the official Communist newspaper, *The Worker*, carried an article headlined, "Birchers Take Warpath Against UN Peace Hopes". The Communist *Worker* warned the Comrades:

> *The John Birch Society has instructed its members to prepare a hate campaign against the United Nations. In his secret "bulletin" for members, Robert Welch . . . orders his followers to place this anti-United Nations drive at the top of their 1962 political agenda . . . . It was in the spring of last year that the ultra hate campaign to destroy the United Nations actually began.*

The Birch Society's education campaign was very effective indeed. Then came the counterattack. In late 1964 and early 1965 the Xerox Corporation sponsored a national prime-time television series to propagandize for the U.N. In commenting on one of these programs in its issue of July 23, 1965, the Communist *People's World* noted:

> *It's not a little horrifying that in our country at this time a pitch is needed for the UN and for peace, but that is the case, and we're all for figuratively hitting people over the head with the message. The* [Xerox] *program did that.*

Meanwhile the Communists have continued to solidify their U.N. control. So complete had it become by 1965 that

(continued on page 4)

* From *American Opinion*, January 1972.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat 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 £2.60 (52/-), Six months £1.30 (26/-).

Offices—
Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Tel. 01-534 7395
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Tel. 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—
Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001 (Editorial Head Office)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougement, P.Q., General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

* * *

Amongst periodicals recognised by the Establishment (sometimes quoted, for example, by the BBC), the *Spectator* of Feb. 19, 1972 must have made unique post-war British journalistic history by referring in a substantive rather than a derogatory sense to a conspiracy. It said: "Without a conspiracy to delude the people as to the true nature and purposes of the continental policy of the Heath Administration [as the White Paper stated, the policy is that of successive Governments] until it could be presented to them in its present garb, as the technical enactment of decisions already taken in principle, it could never have been presented at all . . . It has sought, brilliantly and successfully, to deceive the public; and its chief ally in this scandalous procedure has been the press."

What might be described as a technical conspiracy to deceive the public only makes sense as a component of a larger conspiracy. So far as this concerns the British, this is a conspiracy to replace national sovereignty as represented by the Queen in Parliament, symbolising and embodying the will of the people, by subordination of Britain to a Council of Ministers in Europe (and whatever that Council conceals). But thanks to the disclosures of Professor Arnold Toynbee* we know that the larger conspiracy is "to transfer the prestige and prerogatives of sovereignty from the fifty or sixty [not ten] fragments of contemporary society to the whole of contemporary society". So the transfer of sovereignty from Britain to 'Europe' is only an intermediate step. Since Professor Toynbee admitted that the group — an international group — engaged in this effort was "denying with our lips what we do with our hands", this is quite obviously a conspiracy; and it is in this that the Heath Administration is engaged.

Now it has been abundantly established that the richest men in the world, comprising international financiers and the inner directorates of international industrial cartels (whose economic internationalism Professor Toynbee aims to preserve at the expense of local national sovereignty) financed the Communist Revolution in Russia and have supported it ever since. Behind the apparently nationalistic military confrontation of "Russia" and "America" as "Great Powers", organisations such as the Royal Institute of International Affairs, the Council on Foreign Relations, and their equivalents in the other "fifty or sixty local fragments of contemporary society" maintain a friendly communistic "cameraderie", while the industrial component furnishes goods to Russia to enable Russia to supply munitions to North Vietnam which is killing Americans in South Vietnam. Meanwhile, by the manipulation of exchange-rates, the financial component produces international crises as, when, and where required, thus maintaining a pool of discontented proletarians among whom Communist Party agents sow subversion and anarchy.

In the same issue of *Spectator*, A "Conservative" writes of the Government's Common Market campaign as "distinguished for its prevarication, dishonesty and evasion"; and of the Government's tactics as having become "more bullying and more dishonest". An attempt to intimidate Parliament is, by definition, *treason-felony*.

And for good measure in this campaign, a Colonel van Straubenzee has published in the *Darlington and Stockton Times* a letter accusing Sir Robert Turton, Father of the House, and 14 other members of the Conservative Party of being traitors, having "treacherously voted against the party line" — a crime in Communist countries. It is to be noted that the Colonel does not accuse Sir Robert of being a traitor to the Queen in Parliament, but to the Party Fuhrer — Mr. Heath. The Government, who, of course, are working in their own way for the establishment of World Government, are said by Colonel von Straubenzee to be "heavily involved in a desperate struggle to save the country from the anarchical action of a minority of trouble-makers". Confusing, *n'est-ce pas*?

In a letter to the *Daily Telegraph*, Feb. 26, 1972, Louis FitzGibbon (Hayling Island, Hants.) writes: "Grim warnings about the Soviet military build-up have recently been uttered by such widely separated people as Axel Springer, Adml. Elmo Zumwalt, Gen. Sir Walter Walker, and now Dr. Luns. All this comes at a time when sudden upheavals shake Rhodesia, when the Red IRA increases its terrorist activities, and when England is rocked by politically planned industrial revolt.

"Astonishingly we continue to imitate the Ancient Mariner, who dared not turn his head, although the grisly fiend of Communism is now so close that its fetid breath is searing hot. Our country, and indeed the whole of Europe, is being besieged. We are in peril as never before, and we have little time to defend ourselves, both without and within, against the Red lava which threatens to bury us all".

* See *"Under Threat of War"*: K.R.P. Publications Ltd.

The situation which is the subject of "grim warnings" is not new; it was described in detail in these pages in the articles and notes entitled *The State of the World** in 1967. What *is* new is that the public is now being made aware of it officially — when it is obviously too late to rectify it by conventional means. No country which has struggled for as a top priority and achieved such massive strategic, military and logistic superiority as we are urged to believe Communist forces have achieved, is going passively to allow such superiority to be eroded. Europe is indeed besieged — militarily probably, but morally and psychologically certainly. And the conspiracy to destroy British national sovereignty is part of the process.

The effect of the European Communities Bill — *enacted* — will be to include Britain in besieged Europe *by Treaty*, so that Britain would be automatically subjected to any ultimatum which the Communist forces might utter —say, in the face of Europe's attempting to redress the military 'imbalance' which we are officially assured exists — an obvious 'provocation' to the peace-loving Communists. And then, through the re-unification of the 'two' Germanies on socialist lines (Herr Brandt is an 'ex'-Communist Socialist), the Brezhnev Doctrine would apply. And it is precisely to this that the Heath Government's "bullying and dishonest" tactics expose the British people. *Why*?

* * *

"For half a century the Soviet Union has felt threatened, militarily inferior, and surrounded by enemies. It has suffered death and destruction through invasion of its territory on a scale unknown in the west. Its defensiveness is therefore understandable. Of course — given the chance — as it was by the Red Army's pursuit of German forces in 1944 and 1945 — it will carry revolution forcibly to other countries. But *it will probably not itself initiate* the events that could lead to foreign invasion." — *Guardian*, Feb. 23, 1972.

The words we have italicised are the key (a word to the wise?) to the present situation. "Given the chance . . . ." In fact, the Soviets are awaiting what they confidently anticipate, and are promoting by every means available, including the complicity of International Finance and what Douglas called "the Chatham House gang" and its international affiliates: a universal economic and political crisis, which is obviously not very far ahead. As Stalin said: "The revolution in the victorious country must regard itself not as a self-sufficient entity, but as an aid, as a means of hastening the victory of *the proletariat* in other countries".† Or, as Brezhnev said more recently (1971): "The total triumph of socialism the world over is inevitable, and for this triumph . . . we will fight, unsparing of our strength."

In short, what we face is not a conventional military confrontation, but a revolutionary *situation*, carefully designed and prepared in order to enthrone permanently an international oligarchy, whose current inner personnel are unknown (the INSIDERS), but whose main characteristic is their determination to preserve the *power* to appoint their own successors.

The military forces available to national sovereign states are usually sufficient to contain local revolutions; but as national sovereignty, and hence control of its military forces, is transferred to supra-national authority, so suppression of revolution becomes a justification for intervention by Soviet forces — for it becomes a threat to the total triumph of socialism the world over.

The necessity for defeat of the European Communities Bill is very much part of this total situation. For reform of the monetary system is fundamental to the solution of this disastrous crisis, and reform in any one country would force the Conspirators into the open. The necessary reform is quite simple, but technical — and probably well known to those in a position to effect it, and even more to obstruct it. The main motive power of revolution is economic insecurity, and the financial system operates — and is designed to operate — to perpetuate this insecurity in the face of the enormous advances in the progress of the industrial arts. In the late C. H. Douglas's words: "Its banking system, methods of taxation and accountancy counter every development of applied science, organisation and machinery, so that the individual, instead of obtaining the benefit of these advances in the form of a higher civilisation and greater leisure, is merely enabled to do more work. Every other factor in the situation is ultimately sacrificed to this end of providing him with work, and at this moment the world in general, and Europe in particular, is undoubtedly settling down to an intensive policy of production for export, which must quite inevitably result in a world cataclysm, urged thereto by what is known as the Unemployment Problem".

Now the solution of the Unemployment Problem is the *distribution of leisure*, and the preliminary step in this direction is the reduction of the compulsory retiring age, combined with an adequate income for the retired *as a right*. Combined with this should be a general and progressive reduction in the prices of consumers' goods, initiated by the abolition of Purchase Tax.

There is no doubt that these steps are physically possible; and finance should reflect what is physically possible, not an outworn ethic of compulsory labour—which is the cornerstone of the present financial system — when the whole *rationale* of labour-saving devices is the progressive distribution of leisure and the cultivation of the arts.

As we have remarked before in these pages, there is no question of the relative 'competence' of alternative Administrations. The condition of Britain is much worse under the Conservative Government than it was under the Socialists; but the deterioration is the outcome of the *policy* which successive Administrations have pursued. The present policy is proved wrong *in its manifestation;* if continued it will lead to permanent slavery, enforced in the not-so-long run by some form of Red Guards. The only hope is conscious and practical repudiation of that policy — even at the risk of war. But because atomic war is precisely what the would-be World Governors do not want the decision by Britain (and thereafter the declared) intent to use nuclear missiles if anyone should attempt to interfere with a fundamental British reconstruction would give the British an opportunity to save themselves, and by demonstration the other peoples of the world. And nothing else will.

* K.R.P. Publications Ltd.: 16p. posted
Foundations of Leninism: J. Stalin

Get US Out *(continued from page 1)*

Mikhail Sergeyevich Lvov, an official Soviet spokesman on U.N. affairs told a *Moscow Radio* audience on June 27, 1965:

> *There can be no doubt that with the United Nations constituted as it is at present, the consistent line of the Soviet Union in pressing for the United Nations to face fully up to the problems of strengthening peace and ensuring freedom is producing more and more positive results.*

Of course the Communists have controlled the U.N. staff from the beginning. The Secretary-General has traditionally been portrayed as the epitome of neutralism, the ideal non-Communist. But Trygve Lie, the first U.N. Secretary-General, was a dedicated Socialist, and a high-ranking member of the Democratic Labor Party of Norway—a spur of the Communist International. After the resignation of Dr. Lie, Dag Hammarskjold was elected to fill the office. He too was a self-declared Socialist and openly approved the goals of world Communism. Hammarskjold even refused to support a very timid resolution condemning Red China's invasion and genocide in Tibet.

After Dag Hammarskjold was killed in a plane crash in 1961, the Soviets pressed demands for leadership to be shored by a three-man "Troika". Then, suddenly, they turned off their "Troika" talk and backed Burmese Marxist U Thant as Hammarskjold's successor. According to Thant, "socialism ought to be the wave of the future for rich and poor alike". A dedicated apostle of world government, Secretary-General Thant is a consistent supporter of the Communists who deplores America's "suspicion of Communist motives". Thant, both a Marxist and a Leninist, is openly running the U.N. to support Communist purposes. The following is the complete text of an Associated Press report as it appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* for April 7, 1970:

> *U.N. Secretary-General U Thant praised Vladimir I. Lenin, founder of the Soviet Union, as a political leader whose ideals were reflected in the U.N. charter.*
>
> *Thant released Monday the text of a statement sent to a symposium on Lenin at Tampere, Finland, sponsored by the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.*
>
> *"Lenin was a man with a mind of great clarity and incisiveness, and his ideas have had a profound influence on the course of contemporary history," Thant's statement said.*
>
> *"(Lenin's) ideals of peace and peaceful coexistence among states have won widespread international acceptance and they are in line with the aims of the U.N. charter . . . ."*

Clearly, the Soviets got their Troika when they got Thant. He has had two primary assistants: one a Soviet national, and the other Dr. Ralph Bunche (C.F.R.). Dr. Bunche, who had been an assistant to Alger Hiss, has been identified under oath as a member of the Communist Party by both Manning Johnson and Leonard Patterson, former top Communists, in closed Hearings before a government Loyalty Board.* They had attended cell meetings with Comrade Bunche. Patterson and Johnson, both Negroes, had been trained in Moscow, but defected from the Party when they became aware that the Communists were working to enslave people of all races.

Ultimate control of the United Nations is in the hands of the members of the permanent staff of the Secretariat, where resolutions and edicts of the General Assembly and Security Council are either neutralized or given teeth with which to bite. The United Nations has approximately 6,000 employees in the Secretariat. About one-fourth of these hold supervisory and policy-making positions classified as professional. These "professional" appointments are filled according to the geographic origin of the member nations and in proportion to their contribution to the U.N. Budget. The United States meets approximately one-third of that Budget and is therefore entitled to approximately one-third of the "professional" appointments. The other two-thirds come from the other member nations, Communist as well as non-Communist. And, as *U.S. News & World Report* observed as early as December 12, 1952: "An informed estimate suggests that as many as one-half of the 1,350 administrative executives in the UN are either Communists or people who are willing to do what they want."

(To be continued)

*See the *New York Daily News*, May 26, 1954.

Printed by Circular Press Limited, Colwyn Bay.

Brussels, Dunkirk and the British

NOTE

The synopsis of the current political situation given here is issued by the Social Credit Secretariat in conformity with an appreciation by the late C. H. Douglas of an approaching crisis — which we believe to be now upon us — as long ago as 1924 in his book **Social Credit:**

". . . it is difficult to believe that the whole world is so bereft of sanity that a pause for reflection is too much to hope for, pending a final resignation to utter catastrophe.

"When that pause occurs mankind will have reached one of those crises which have no doubt frequently been reached before, but which so far have failed to avert the fall of humanity back into an era of barbarism out of which new civilisations have slowly and painfully risen.

"The position will be tremendous in its importance. A comparatively short period will probably serve to decide whether we are to master the mighty economic and social machine that we have created, or whether it is to master us; and during that period a small impetus from a body of men who know what to do and how to do it, may make the difference between yet one more retreat into the Dark Ages, or the emergence into the full light of a day of such splendour as we can at present only envisage dimly.

"It is this necessity for the recognition of the psychological moment, and the fitting to that moment of appropriate action, which should be present in the minds of that small minority which is seized of the gravity of the present times. . . ."

The "pause" is represented by the delay in Parliament of the enactment of the European Communities Bill. If this enactment is pushed through, it is the opinion of the Secretariat that no second chance will occur or be permitted. Already the previously unfettered sovereignty of the House of Commons has been abridged by the influence of a Treaty which is not yet in effect. Certain amendments to the Bill have been ruled out of order — in effect, as being **ultra vires** of a Treaty which does not exist. That this should be so is an indication of the ruthlessness of those few in the shadows who would be the real beneficiaries of the Treaty.

Regular readers of **The Social Crediter** could play a vital part in clarifying the situation in their various constituencies, and the Secretariat would welcome their cooperation in activating genuine democracy.

A number of pamphlets bearing on the situation, and supplies of printed cards, are available in bulk from K.R.P. Publications. Communications concerning the campaign should be addressed to the Card Campaign Coordinator, c/o K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

BRYAN W. MONAHAN,

APRIL, 1972. *Chairman, Social Credit Secretariat.*

Sovereignty and History

More than four hundred years ago King Henry VIII asserted the reality of British national sovereignty and his country's independence, which came to be embodied as the sovereignty of the King or Queen in Parliament, representing the will and identity of the people of Britain. It became a constitutional tradition too that no Parliament could bind its successor.

It is now proposed that this sovereignty shall be surrendered, that laws, regulations and taxation promulgated in 'Europe' in the past **and** in the future are to be given the force of law in the United Kingdom **without further enactment.** This is rule by Decree, the mechanism of totalitarian government. These 'laws' cover government, taxation, and the methods of justice. This would be the reversal of a thousand years of British history, and of a major influence in the development of civilisation throughout the world.

Law and Sanctions

There can be no law unless there exist sanctions to enforce it. In a democracy, laws are made with the consent of the governed, and that consent supports the forces — the police — which keep the peace.

But when there is no general consent, there is apt to be rebellion; and then the forces to maintain the law become military forces. The most recent example is Ireland; but before that there was Czechoslovakia. And because the use of its own military forces against its own people is repugnant to those forces, foreign troops are employed. That is the meaning of the Brezhnev Doctrine, which commits the use of Soviet troops to the support of socialism — soon, according to Brezhnev, to be extended throughout the world.

So that if Britain rebelled against "Community" law foreign troops could be called in to quell the rebellion; and this would be legal under the European Communities Act, if ever such came into being.

Reparations

By 'joining' the European Community, Britain undertakes to pay in levies hundreds of millions of Pounds

sterling annually and in perpetuity to Europe. This is precisely the same as paying **reparations** for having lost a war. And, of course, as wars are fought on one side at least to preserve national sovereignty, the paying of levies to Europe would mean that we acknowledged defeat in war — without even fighting.

These reparations must be paid out of the **profits** made by outside trade, or else by a lowering of the standard of living of the British. This necessary expansion of trade means a great expansion in the importation of the raw materials of manufacture, and these have to be paid for, together with freight-charges, insurance, and the deterioration of plant. Thus, if Britain buys wool from Australia to make clothes for Europeans, most of whom are already fully clothed, or for under-developed peoples who cannot pay for them anyway, it is only the profit on manufacture which is available for the extra taxation required to meet the European levies.

But further: Nobody has yet stated what actual benefits Britain — or rather the British people — would gain by joining Europe. Indeed, it has been suggested even by the Government that no benefit at all might be felt for several years to come. Worse still, it is felt in certain influential quarters that the poor countries are poor because the rich countries are not only rich, but wastefully rich, calling for, as the **Times** newspaper put it, "a re-direction of the collective energies of men [by] a drastic revision of political and social energies". As in Eastern Europe for example. Even Chairman Mao could hardly have put it more succinctly.

The Ills of Europe

All the countries of "The Six", and Britain — even America! — are suffering from rising unemployment and rising prices — a deadly combination — with consequent social unrest and increasing disorder. But if you have several people suffering from smallpox you do not cure them by bundling them into a common ward. But you make it easier to administer unpleasant treatment, for hospital "warders" are not inhibited by family feelings.

Inflation and unemployment in several countries are not abolished by making them one. But the draconian remedies which may be necessary are more easily ordered **and policed** by a Government remote from the people. You can probably have a drink with your local Councillor at the pub; but some of those European bureaucrats might be hard to get to know.

The Will of the People

Democracy is supposed to be government in accordance with the will of the people — or at least a majority of the people, so far as that can be ascertained. An election is a test of a government's ability to retain the consent of the majority — which Mr. Heath now seems pretty sure he could not. Hence his **threat** of an election — a tacit admission that many of his Party would lose their seats. This of course reflects his own estimate of the degree of consent now obtaining for his European policy.

Nearly every test of public opinion concerning joining the Common Market has shown a majority against; and those who "Don't know" cannot be said to have given their consent, let alone their "full-hearted" consent.

But it is not democracy to manipulate the machinery of Parliament to secure adhesion to a Treaty even before its contents and implications are generally known; or to engage in "intimidation and shady dealing" to coerce Members of Parliament; or to use the immense resources of government to mount a propaganda campaign which cannot be matched by its opponents.

The Assertion of Sovereignty

In this situation it is necessary to assert the fundamental sovereignty of the people. It could be done by an election, if the issue were narrowed. It could be done by a referendum, if the question were properly put. But if these expressions of the popular will are denied to them, the people must themselves move.

This can be done if sufficient **individuals** assert their individual sovereignty and initiative by addressing to their various Representatives in Parliament, their lack of consent — their **opposition** — to Mr. Heath's European policies.

This on a sufficient scale would make it evident to the Government, the people themselves, and the enemies who require reparations from us, that there is **not** that full-hearted consent without which, Mr. Heath promised, there would be no question of joining Europe — just as there was no question when Hitler wanted us to join.

The initiative of the little people saved Britain at Dunkirk. But this time postcards, not fishing-boats, can win this battle for Britain.

The Means to Hand

> Among ten people who are prepared to address and post a card to their Representative, there will probably be one at least who can find ten others; and amongst those ten, another who can find ten more. . . . The sum total of these individual acts, **all directed to a common purpose,** could be a massive demonstration and assertion of the peoples' will, and a unique act of democracy which no government could withstand.

We must <u>ourselves</u>

SAVE OUR SOVEREIGNTY