

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 12. No. 14.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1944.

6d. Weekly.

The Brief for the Prosecution

By C. H. DOUGLAS

CHAPTER VIII*

On November 11, 1918, at eleven o' clock—the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month, an Armistice in the World War came into force between Germany and the Allies, France and Great Britain, with the Associated Nation, the U.S.A., concurring. The slightly mystical character of the date and hour is not without interest.

Germany was beaten. The military history of 1918 is curiously unconvincing, but certain facts stand out. Powerful forces were at work behind the German Front to halt the war before American casualties became serious. And the German Staff was determined that the destruction wrought in France and Belgium should not be repaid in kind on German soil.

Palestine had been conquered by General Allenby's Forces, and Russia had been reduced to chaos, through the agency of a sealed train of expert revolutionaries, headed by Lenin (Oulianoff) and Trotsky (Bronstein), almost all of whom came from New York.

London abandoned itself to an orgy of relief and rejoicing. Mr. Lloyd George stampeded the country into a General Election with the main items in his programme announced as "Hang the Kaiser" and "Make the Germans pay." The Kaiser died a peaceful, natural death in the Castle of Doorn, Holland, twenty-two years later, Herr Hitler, the National Socialist, having given orders to the German troops invading Holland that they were not to approach the Castle nearer than one mile, so as not to disturb him. It is instructive to consider the success of the second item.

It should be remembered, however, that hardly had the guns ceased fire, than numbers of distinguished and well-patronised economists the world over announced that it was impossible to make Germany pay. The basis of this statement was not that Germany *could* not pay. It was that the Allies could not afford to be paid. A conspicuous exception to this attitude was the United States, the Associated Nation, which not only insisted on being paid "out of pocket expenses" by Germany but the much more considerable debts incurred by the Allies, and underwritten by Great Britain. It must be remembered also that Great Britain entered the war a large creditor of America; parted with gold and securities to an amount almost equal to the debt; and received in

return war material, much of it so inferior as to be almost useless, and all of it at tremendously inflated prices.

The freedom previously enjoyed by Great Britain in regard to foreign policy disappeared with the entry of the U.S.A. into the war. And President Wilson was influenced preponderantly by German Jews such as Jacob Schiff, with their own policies to further. What did the economists mean? There is little doubt of what they meant. It was not that Germany could not pay, and not even that Germany could not be made to pay. It was that all the politicians were in the hands of the financiers, and had been made to understand quite clearly that the interests of finance were paramount. This involved certain clear issues. The first of these was that every effort must be made to re-establish gold as the basis of payment. (Rufus Isaacs, Lord Reading, had agreed in Washington that British debts to U.S.A. should all be paid in gold). The second was that everyone should be poorer—or think themselves poorer—so that "employment" for wages might be re-established everywhere as quickly as possible. Whoever was to be paid, it must on no account be the ordinary individual. The third was that debts to bankers must be given priority over debts to Governments. And the fourth was that the American-speaking German-Jewish bankers such as the Warburgs and Schiffs who were paramount at the peace conferences, were determined that Germany should be in a position to renew the struggle at the earliest possible moment. Apart from other reasons they had done too well not to wish for a repetition.

The first payment ordered by the Reparations Commission was in kind. The German Government were ordered to deliver 2,234,000 tons of coal per month. After numerous protests at non-delivery by the French Government, the Reparations Commission informed the Allied Governments on June 30, 1920, that Germany had voluntarily defaulted on coal deliveries. She could deliver, but she would not.

At Boulogne in May and June, 1920, the Reparations Money Indemnity was fixed at 269 milliards of gold marks, spread out over 42 years. The Germans did not pay. The paper mark began to fall in exchange value which would normally indicate that she was importing more than she exported. Enormous quantities of paper marks were sold to speculators in foreign countries for gold currencies. When these became valueless the Germans had received a considerable war indemnity and wiped out their own National Debt.

Germany had agreed to supply large quantities of timber. On December 26, 1922, the Reparations Commission declared Germany in voluntary default in the delivery of timber.

On January 26, 1923, the Reparations Commission declared Germany to be in general default both in respect of deliveries in kind, and in monetary payments.

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

By this time, France and Belgium were ranged in solid opposition to Great Britain and the forces working through the British Government were assisting Germany in every way to defy France. On August 11, 1923, the mark collapsed completely, and became worthless. As a consequence German properties were bought up for trivial sums in dollars by Jews with foreign balances.

We now enter the almost incredible period of the Dawes and Young Plans by which Allied and American bankers, under an American Chairman, supervised the building up of German credit, and provided the funds for the modernisation of German industry. With Mr. Montagu Norman as Governor, and a nominee of the Federal Reserve Board, Dr. Sprague, to advise him, the Bank "of England" co-operated with New York banks in assisting Dr. Schacht, described by Lord Vansittart as "the most oleaginous rascal I have ever met," to obtain large sums of money from both countries, small fractions of which were returned as "reparations." This fantastic situation finally came to an end with the failure in May 1931 of the *Credit Anstalt*, a large Austrian bank which had been supported by the Bank "of England," which coolly transferred a loss of £40,000,000 from its own accounts (the Bank "of England" being a privately owned bank) to the debit of the Exchange Equalisation Account, which is national property. Germany declared a moratorium which finally terminated all reparations payments. At the same time President Hoover declared a moratorium which temporarily suspended Allied payments to America.

Turning to the military aspects of this period, Article 160 of the Treaty of Versailles read, "The Greater German General Staff and all similar organisations shall be dissolved, and may not be reconstituted in any form." The G.D.G.S. merely went into plain clothes. The Treaty limited the German Army to 100,000 men. General von Seeckt trained them all as officers, which most of them had been before. Von Seeckt made a secret arrangement (and this is significant) whereby army units were trained in the Soviet Union, and an aviation school was established near Moscow. The "Black Reichswehr" was set up to thwart the Allied Control Commission, and to spend secret funds where they would further the main object: to weaken the military power and national morale of Great Britain and France, and to build up that of the Reich.

This steady pursuit of a fixed and unalterable objective was completely independent of the various forms of Government which succeeded each other in Germany in the fifteen years between the Armistice and the accession to power of Adolf Hitler, the ex-corporal who had been a paid spy for the Army. To suppose that he came to power without the consent of the G.D.G.S. is simply to misapprehend the possibilities of political Germany.

It may be convenient at this juncture to emphasise an aspect of the matter which has an importance, if possible, greater at the present time than during the period of German re-armament. Both Britain and France had staffs of men in Germany on the Reparations Commission, and in other capacities, who knew what was going on, and reported their findings. British business men visiting Germany reported the drilling of thousands of armed men in every district of Germany. Mr. Douglas Reed, for some years a foreign correspondent for *The Times*, has stated that his warning

despatches were suppressed.

Almost up to the outbreak of war in 1939, the British public was abysmally ignorant of the situation, so that Mr. Stanley Baldwin, with that engaging honesty which must ensure him a place in history, remarked in 1936, "Supposing I had gone to the country and had said 'Germany is re-arming; we must re-arm.' Does anyone think this pacific democracy of ours would have rallied to that call?"

The British Press, with a few honourable exceptions, played down the dangers which lay clearly ahead, and were supported by the "British" Broadcasting Corporation, the latter under the obvious control of the Bank "of England." Broadly speaking, the British Press is controlled by international Big Business and Finance. The Labour-Socialist Party did everything possible to hamper re-armament, and actually stopped the completion of the Singapore Base (not on technical grounds, which appear to have existed, but for pacifist reasons).

At the present time, we are being presented with the same description of distorted information on the social conditions of the totalitarian states, and notably of Russia, whose military prowess is systematically confused with social well-being.

It is impossible to dispute the evidence which is available that there is a tacit conspiracy between the international financier with his controlled press, and the international socialist, to stampede the general public through the agency of continuous mis-information, just as the same forces prevented the British Government from utilising the unemployment period of 1928-1933 to anticipate and suppress the German re-armament which proceeded throughout with unabated vigour. Does Lord Baldwin or anyone else suppose that the unemployed in the Distressed Areas would have refused to make guns in 1930?

It must be obvious to anyone who will give the matter serious consideration that *the interests which control British publicity consciously worked to emasculate British military power and to build up that of Germany, and that they were assisted, whether consciously or not, by certain carefully selected Trades Union leaders who moulded the policy of the Labour Party in accordance with the parallel policies of the German-speaking Jew-inspired Fabian Society (later, P.E.P.) and the Zionists.*

In the Report of the (U.S.A.) Custodian of Alien Property, published in 1919, after explaining the care with which German control had been concealed, it is remarked:

"In many of the large German-owned companies taken over by the alien property custodian after investigation it was found that espionage was one of their chief functions. Every scrap of information of commercial or military value to Germany, was carefully gathered by the representatives of these concerns in this country, and quickly forwarded to the home office in Germany.... Especially the American chemical industry was a natural centre for German espionage."

J. Carlton Ward, President of the Fairchild Engine and Aeroplane Corporation, speaking at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in New York on January 20, 1943, said:—

"Britain began to re-arm very slowly in 1935. That so-called slow phase of re-arming extended through 1937.

The British political situation at that time has had a fairly close parallel in the United States. The Government was not free to spend the monies required for armament."

The control of the money policy of Great Britain is predominantly in the care of the Bank "of England." The control of the monetary situation in the United States is predominantly in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board.

Since it is probable that the Jewish question will be one, if not the major, preoccupation of the twentieth century, the obvious contradictions of German policy in this regard demand attention. In the world's press at this time (1944) "Nazi," a Jewish word meaning "Prince" as well as National Socialist, is made to appear synonymous with the persecution of the Jews. How much persecution there really has been will not be known until a much later date. That there has been some, is quite logical and understandable. The inflation racket inflicted untold hardships on the general body of the German people. German-speaking Jews were conspicuous exceptions. They appeared to be possessed of large quantities of American currency or credit, and used it to buy out every German business, and even personal property, from a population which saw its means of contact with food and lodging disappear overnight. A raging thirst for revenge was undoubtedly widespread, and in the lawlessness of the times some of it found satisfaction. But that the genuine *higher* policy of Germany is anti-Jew is patently absurd. There is abundant evidence that Hitler received exactly the same kind of support from powerful Jews as did the Kaiser.

On the authority of the pre-*Anschluss* Vienna police, Hitler himself is an illegitimate descendant of a Viennese Baron Rothschild. Martha von Haushofer, the wife of the leading German exponent of geopolitics, who is said to exercise almost the major influence on Hitler, is a Jewess. Many important German-speaking Jews are just as powerful in Germany so far as can be gathered from relevant evidence, as they were in the reign of the Kaiser, *and after*. They are in accord with the G.D.G.S. or they would not be there.

In comparison with the atrocities perpetrated in Russia on Russians at the behest of German and Russian-speaking Jews, both in numbers and nature, it appears certain that the "atrocities" stories are exaggerated out of all proportion. But they have an obvious use. They form an excuse for forcing the barriers of immigration laws. And the objective is exactly that of parachute troops—to get behind the enemy's lines. The effect on internal politics of the "refugees" in every country ought to be sufficient indication as to the identity of the enemy.

The indisputable fact is that there is a coherent Jewish policy everywhere. At the present time it can be seen in full operation in practically every country in the world, *and on both sides of the fighting-line. It is the conditions which are inseparable from total war which alone make possible the erection of the bureaucratic state alike envisaged by the Jews and the Great German General Staff as the instrument of World Dominion. Hence, so long as this influence is allowed to operate, we can expect one war after another until someone has enslaved the planet.*

The Rooseveltian "New Deal" was an attempt at a more or less bloodless revolution which would centralise power in the U.S.A. It failed to achieve sufficient success to be stable. The war was the next step. "War is the pursuit of policy by other means." (CLAUSEWITZ.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

Vol. 12. No. 14.

Saturday, June 10, 1944.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

We lost the trick of going all starry-eyed over the doings of what are laughingly called politicians, some time ago. But we have to admit that the gyrations of the professional socialists, communists and other 'ists,' since Uncle Joe took them in hand, make us feel that it is quite time we became a better boy. If things go on in this way, pink rats all over the counterpane will be the next stage. Jumping to attention with the announcement that the Internationale is old stuff, Mr. Pethick Lawrence for the Old Testament or London-School-of-Economics Socialists, Mr. Emmanuel Shinwell for the true blue English (complete with Star of David) and Mr. McGovern for the I.L.P., not to mention light cavalry such as Mr. R. R. Stokes, join with the disbanded Communist Party of America, the New Zealand Labour Party, and the professional Professors who seem to be running Australia, not to mention *The Times's* particular protégé, the C.C.F., in singing local variants of "We don't want to fight, but by jingo if we do." Not five years ago, every branch of Socialism and Communism was supporting internationalism in the interest of Germany, whether it knew it or not. But the main idea of politics is to be on the winning side.

"When Father says turn we all turn."

When times are good for Jones, Robinson is to be taxed more, and when times are bad for both of them they'll both be taxed equally. This seems to embody the Big Idea, that taxes always go up. Obviously, Robinson hopes for bad times, and Jones doesn't think it's worth while doing much work nowadays.

"There is some taint in the blood or brain of one of the greatest Powers of the modern world . . . His chief professor, Dahlmann, represented the Reformation as the starting-point of a new civilisation, in which Prussia was to take the lead."

—JOSEPH McCABE in *Treitschke*, pp. 7-22.

"The famous clause of Magna Charta, that no one shall be arrested without a warrant, is undoubtedly a great achievement; but it is equally true that in large modern cities this right is antiquated."

—*Ibid.*, p. 126.

Of course it's only Hitler we're fighting.

Whose influence-exalted Thomas Carlyle, and his travesties of history, *Frederick the Great* and *The French Repvo-*

lution, into a position of political importance in the early nineteenth century?

The *Farmer-Stockman*, of Oklahoma, U.S.A., published two photographs of the results of soil erosion, one of which was a deserted and decrepit farmhouse, and asked for essays, offering a prize for the most helpful. A Cherokee Indian won it with the following:—

"Pictures show white man crazy. Make big tepee. Plow hill. Water wash, wind blow soil, grass all gone. Squaw gone, papoose gone. No pig, no corn, no hay, no cow, no pony.

"Indian no plow land. Keep grass. Buffalo eat. Indian eat buffalo. Hide make tepee, mocassins. Indian no make terrace. No build dam. No give a dam. All time eat. No hitch hike. No hunt job. No ask relief. Great Spirit make grass. Indian no waste anything. White man much crazy."

CANADIAN DESCRIPTION OF "B".B.C. BROADCASTING:
"Soap, Dope, and Hope."

From an American source:

"The Allied Powers will probably take control of Germany's heavy industries... this control will start at the top with Allied representation on boards of directors. *Decision has not been reached as to whether the giant cartels are to be broken up, or operated as they are.*

"The big landed estates of East Prussia and North Eastern Prussia will be broken up and re-distributed." ("It is essential at whatever cost, to deprive them of their land." — *Protocols*). "The Junkers who now own them will have to move elsewhere."

Now, where have we heard something like that before, Clarence?

It is becoming increasingly clear that it is standards of values, not a standard of value, which the world lacks. Values are a "spiritual" thing—"value" is a Judaic perversion. Our "progressives" with their New Orders and mass remedies are de-grading standards of value because they have lost all anchorage to values. The contribution to the discussion on "social economics" of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, which has just concluded, is enough to make the angels weep.

In the face of the unquestionable fact that Socialism and Collectivism have become more powerful with every fresh slip back into barbarism, that they are intimately connected with the propagation of the Darwinian Theory of automatic progress, which has been the deadliest enemy of Christianity and that they have been demonstrated to be closely interlocked with the attempt to impose a Financial Government of the Gold Standard upon the world, a resolution was brought forward which was indistinguishable from a demand for a Socialistic Government. Fortunately, it was not allowed to pass unchallenged or unaltered, but the confusion of thought which appeared to be nearly general on the subject ought to be a warning of the abyss to which our pseudo-democracy has led us.

Mr. Mackenzie King, the Canadian Prime Minister, flew to the Conference of the Prime Ministers of the British

Empire in a United States Liberator plane flown by United States officers, and landed at a U.S. Army airfield in Great Britain.

We are convinced that there is a lesson to be learned, if we could disentangle it from irrelevancies, in the persistent repetition of the idea that British prestige and power have passed to America and Americans. We pass over the wishful thinking aspect as merely obvious.

Mr. Bertrand Russell (Earl Russell), is writing on the theme in numerous American journals, mainly, but not entirely, those openly anti-British, and that in itself is informative. Mr. Russell, as he prefers to be called, is a man of great intellectual ability who has been almost uniquely ineffective. It would be difficult to name any British-born individual who started life with more advantages of birth, reasonable financial security and mental capacity. Every situation with which he has been confronted, so far as his history is known to us, has been met by him with a negation.

And the arguments adduced by him to dispose of the future of the British Empire are precisely those arguments which you would expect from a man who has failed signally, with every advantage, to deal with any of the problems of his period. A conscientious objector to war, he announces the passing of England because she has (in his opinion) lost the command of the seas, and so cannot wage effective war. A professional philosopher, he admits by implication that a hundred philosophers are of less practical importance than one infantry man with a Tommy-gun.

It is this rapturous folly of thoughts without things—a dichotomy which derives directly from Encyclopaedism—which is indeed our greatest danger. Anyone who had not succumbed to it would see that "the acquisition of an Empire in a fit absence of mind" has nothing in common with the planned Empire of Wall Street. The next few years hold many surprises for all of us, but we do not think that the automatic conquest of the world by the machine tool is one of them.

DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT BUREAU OF CANADA

The Douglas Social Credit Bureau of Canada, which has its headquarters at Ottawa, has applied, through its President, Mr. Ralph L. Duclos, for affiliation to the Social Credit Secretariat, and the application has been accepted.

THE READER

"A Cabinet Minister of much sagacity, lunching with our chief observer the other day, said that he reads Macaulay's essay on Frederick the Great once a fortnight with regularity."

— *Review of World Affairs*, June, 1944.

Note by the editor, T.S.C.:—Once for a student, twice for a 'professor' of modern history and 'once a fortnight with regularity' for an English 'cabinet minister of much sagacity.' It is unfortunately by no means needless to point out that the essay referred to is completely in that 'episodic' tradition which has recently been exposed to the ridicule of Major Douglas. It occupies nearly 95 pages in the Albany Edition of Lord Macaulay's *Works*, and consists exclusively in a romantic narrative concerning the meddling, fiddling, flute-playing poetaster and metaphysician who, "enemies all round him, despair in his heart, pills of corrosive sublimate hidden in his clothes," poured forth "hundreds upon hundreds of lines, hateful to gods and men..." which successfully opposing powers many times greater than himself.

Control of the Executive

NOTE: The following, which will be completed in a later issue of *The Social Crediter*, is the text of Bulletin 12 issued by the Medical Policy Association under the title, *The Apostasy of the B.M.A.: An Analysis of the Council's Report and Its Consequences*.

The Bulletin is of interest in view of the issue it raises of control over the Executive of a "representative" body. It has, however, a wider interest in the light of the recent extension of the battleground by (1) the suggestion embodied in a "Government" White Paper that "Local Education Authorities alone will have all the data on which to reach a decision . . . and the ultimate responsibility for deciding which type of secondary education an individual pupil should follow must therefore rest with them"; and (2) the reported imminence of a "private advance agreement" between the Trade Unions and the "Government," accepting the Essential Works Order after the war.

The first mentioned of these 'chain steps' implies the extension of "direction to employment" to schoolchildren, and the suppression for life of freedom to choose one type of forced labour rather than another. The second would perpetuate the existing "direction to employment" (forced labour) adopted as a means for winning the war. With these announcements, the Medical White Paper, with its control of certification, is placed in its proper perspective as an incident in the plan for wholesale regimentation in "the new age." Details of the technique employed by the Medical Policy Association are correspondingly of interest to anyone who desires to pursue the argument in another field. Also, *The Social Crediter* reaches the United States, where there is keen interest in the revolt of the doctors of Great Britain. If the issue ever was a professional issue purely, it has now definitely ceased to be so. It is a public, a national and extra-national issue.

THE APOSTASY OF THE B.M.A.

The Background

The Medical Policy Association has shown, in a series of Bulletins, that the Ministry of Health, and the Executive of the British Medical Association (B.M.A.), have been following an identical policy—a policy which has a long history, but a policy of which the leading contemporary exponent is the semi-anonymous organisation calling itself Political and Economic Planning (PEP). In Bulletin 10 we quoted the relevant passage from the foundation document *Freedom and Planning*, which called for "... a big change in the organisation of the medical profession." (This document is reproduced in full in *All These Things*, by A. N. Field, and in *Waters Flowing Eastward*, by E. Fry—books unfortunately difficult to obtain. Valuable information, and several excerpts, are, however, given in *Our Peace Crisis*, by Arthur Rogers).

The "big change" called for is **the setting-up of a central authority to control doctors by means of Regulations having the full force of law**, and the additional advantage, so far as the controllers are concerned, of being beyond the challenge of the Law Courts. This is what Lord Hewart called "administrative lawlessness," and in his in-

valuable book (*The New Despotism*) he chose the Panel System as a particular example of the tyranny it entails. This power of making, interpreting, and enforcing "law" is what is meant by a Central Authority. It is highly significant that the *British Medical Journal* (B.M.J.), the organ of the Executive of the B.M.A., never discusses this power and its implications. Yet the subjection of a profession, hitherto free within the Common Law and the ethical tradition, is the essential implication of any form of central authority. The purpose of an authority is to control, and the mere form of that authority makes no difference worth bothering about, if it possesses the power to make Regulations and inflict punishment for offences against these.

Bulletin 10 showed that the White Paper was a particular plan to carry out the purpose of control of the medical profession. The whole significance of the White Paper is in the purpose it reveals; the administrative details embodying that purpose are of completely secondary interest, and in any case doctors are not administrative experts. Now the resolutions that have poured in to the Executive of the B.M.A.—despite the instruction that no resolutions were to be passed at that juncture—have demonstrated the complete opposition of the profession to the White Paper. And that opposition is unquestionably to the purpose of the plan, not to the administrative details; the resolutions confirm the result of the M.P.A. Plebiscite, in which 77 per cent of 10,000 doctors voted against control by any form of central authority. Thus it is clear what policy the profession wishes its leaders to follow.

We have warned the profession for many months that its great danger lies in the fact that the Executive of the B.M.A., as well as other "leaders" of the profession, have, **under the influence of PEP and other planning organisations**, been "sold" this idea of a central authority. Consequently they have steadily pressed on the profession, through the B.M.J., *The Lancet*, and the "machinery" of the B.M.A. and other professional associations, planning propaganda backed up by talk of "inevitability." **The policy of the Executive of the B.M.A. is for control of the profession by a central authority**, and this policy is clearly revealed, when you know what to look for, in the *Report of the Council on the White Paper*, B.M.J., May 13, 1944).

The Council's Report

It is not what people say, it is what they do which is important; and what they advocate is equivalent to what they do. Now the report begins with a criticism of the White Paper which might have been taken from Bulletin 10,* though some essential criticisms are omitted. In view of the present hostility of the profession, it would have been fatal not to make this gesture. It is, however, worthless. Quoting the leading article of the B.M.J., May 13, merely substituting "Executive" for "Cabinet" and "Report" for "White Paper," we may say "If, as we understand, the Report is in essence an Executive document, it would seem that the right hand of the Executive was unaware of what its left hand was up to."

The Report is a different plan for the same purpose of

*Reprinted in *The Social Crediter*, March 4, 1944—Ed. T.S.C.

control. Like the White Paper, it begins with fair words, and its proposals, like those of the White Paper, belie the words. Those proposals are for a central authority, differing extraordinarily little from that advocated in the White Paper. (See Bulletin 10).

1. **THE AUTHORITY.**—In both plans the “Minister”—i.e., the bureaucrats—is to be “responsible.” That means “he” will issue the Regulations ordering doctors about.

2. **THE EMPLOYER.**—In both plans there is to be an authority under the “Minister” with whom the doctors will enter into contract; that is to say, they will be employees, in common with clerks and cleaners, of this authority. The White Paper authority is called the Central Medical Board; the Executive refers to it merely as a “central body.”

3. **THE COUNCIL.**—In both plans there is to be an advisory council. Here there is a slight difference in the two plans. The Central Health Services Council of the White Paper is a rather feeble body which advises the “Minister.” The reconstituted C.H.S.C. of the Executive is a statutory body with its medical members elected instead of appointed, and with powers of tendering advice to the Minister, a right to publish, and to call on the Ministry for information; in addition, “consideration should be given to the delegation by the Minister to the Council of specific powers and duties in defined fields of work.”

4. **LOCAL ADMINISTRATION.**—The White Paper plan makes use of the Local Government machinery for local administration of the Service. The Executive wants “radical re-examination and re-organisation of local government in this country.” This, of course, means regionalisation, as advocated by PEP—further evidence of the influence of this sinister organisation. The B.M.A. has about as much competence (or right) to offer an opinion on the local government of this country as the Local Authorities have to offer an opinion on the “radical re-organisation” (“big changes”) of the medical profession. PEP has used the medical profession to promote its attack on the traditional local government structure of this country.

The position is clear enough. After years of work and propaganda, the medical planners found themselves left out in the cold by the White Paper. They were given no place in the controlling hierarchy. So they have produced another plan—a slight modification which leaves the essential principle of control by Regulation untouched, but gives a little power and prestige (“the delegation of specific powers and duties in defined fields of work”) to the C.H.S.C., the medical members of which are “elected.” We can guess who expect to be “elected.”

Now, so long as the vital power of the “Minister” to order the profession about by Regulation is left intact, he can well afford to make the “concessions” desired by our “leaders.” And probably this has been intended from the start. “He” knew that the White Paper would rouse opposition, so that elementary tactical considerations would dictate that it should contain inessential features which could be “modified” to meet “the profession’s” wishes. And sure enough, in the written answer to the Representative Committee’s questions 9, 10, and 11, the “Minister” displays the spirit of sweet reasonableness: “The Minister is anxious to consider in much more detail with the profession’s representatives the whole question of consultative

machinery...” (B.M.J., May 13, p. 649). But nowhere in the questions is the principle of Government by Regulation challenged or even queried.

It is of extreme importance to realise that, once central planning and Government by Regulation start, everything standing in the way must be sacrificed. It should also be remembered that, once a central authority is set up with powers of making Regulations, a more radical Government can use it to bring about any changes it requires. Consequently verbal assurances by the present Government are beside the point. That is why the Socialists are anxious for the Conservatives to create the central controlling authorities; they fully intend to use them for their own ends if they come to power (H. J. Laski, *Democracy in Crisis*—see Bulletin 11). We must refer readers unfamiliar with this subject to *The New Despotism*, and F. A. Hayek’s *The Road to Serfdom*, especially Chapter V.

We conclude this section by emphasising again that it does not make a pennyworth of real difference what precise form a Central Authority takes, or what form the local administration takes, so long as the whole is centralised, and forms an **administrative structure capable of carrying into practice Regulations formulated at the centre.** Both the Ministry of Health and the Executive of the B.M.A. are carrying out the same fundamental policy, each for its own reasons. The policy is totalitarian, and it is the policy advocated by PEP, the Fabian Socialist Society, the London School of Economics, and similar bodies. **The essential features are (1) An Authority at the top; (2) a centralised administrative organisation to apply the Regulations and Orders; (3) Powers of punishment for offences against Regulations.**

What to do now

The Executive’s Plan of Campaign.—The Council’s Report, discussed above, is a document of 62 long paragraphs. In its Annual Report, 1943-44 (*Supplement*, May 13, p. 103) the Council recommends to the Representative Body “That the report of the Association’s policy on a National Health Service be approved.”

The procedure is that the Report will be discussed by Divisions, and resolutions will be passed. These will be forwarded to the Executive, which will incorporate them in the agenda of the Annual Representative Meeting. There are likely to be some hundreds of these resolutions, and these, together with the rest of the material put up for discussion by the Council, will be considered and voted on by the Divisional Representatives, who make up the Representative Body. On the assumption that 200 Representatives attend, and that the Meeting lasts three days of six working hours each, each Representative would have about five minutes in the whole period to put before the Meeting the views of his Division. But, in practice, the Council speakers monopolise a considerable proportion of the time. The situation is a gift for the Executive.

But that is not all. It is fairly clear that with a large number of diverse resolutions and amendments, **most will cancel out, leaving the Executive proposals unscathed.** Now it is important to recognise that the Executive, which is free to devote a great deal of time to getting its own way, has a clear view of what it wants, and how to get it. It

controls the agenda; it controls the time-table; its speakers can intervene at any time; it has a plan of campaign; it controls the Chair; it is highly experienced; it commands expert orators; it possesses a number of technical devices, such as "passing on to the next business," ruling "out of order," etc. To label all this "the democratic machinery of the Association" is to make words meaningless. The whole set-up is a machine which can be controlled by the Executive to secure the result it wants. It wants a Central Authority.

The Remedy.—The remedy for all this is much more simple than would appear at first sight. The first essential is to have a clear idea of what our objective is, and the second is to adopt the correct means to gain it.

1. **POLICY** is the choice of objectives—the choice of the *result required*, irrespective of the means employed to achieve it. Policy is the proper subject of democratic discussion.

2. **ADMINISTRATION, or TECHNIQUE, or METHOD**, is the means of carrying out policy, or achieving the results required. Administration is always a matter for experts, taking their orders on policy. Administration is not a suitable subject for democratic discussion, still less for discussion by doctors, practically all of whom are completely unfamiliar with the technique of administration.

3. **CONTROL OF THE AGENDA TECHNIQUE.**—This technique enables the Executive to get the result it wants under cover of democratic forms. The technique is to put up for vote two or more *methods* of getting one result. Thus the choice between the White Paper plan and the Executive plan gives no choice on policy, only a choice between two slightly different administrative structures both designed to control the profession on totalitarian lines. You can be boiled in oil, or shot.

If these important fundamental relationships are grasped, it is not difficult to work out what has to be done. The crux of the matter is this: **Is the profession to control its Executive, or is it to be controlled by its Executive in matters of policy?**

The true democratic relationship between Members and Executive is that Members should formulate policy, and the Executive should devise the means of carrying it out. That is the very meaning of the word Executive—the executive of a policy. Consequently the Executive should have no voice in policy, except to the extent that its members vote with other members in the ordinary way. Control of policy by the Executive, however, is the exact definition of totalitarianism; its concealed form, exercised by the controlled agenda technique, is pseudo-democracy.

Now, it is a fatal mistake for general members to interfere with the technical methods of carrying out policy. That is the responsibility of the experts—the Executive. **The primary requirement is that a democratic association should choose the result it wants, and hold its Executive rigidly responsible for obtaining that result, and no other—if necessary under penalty.** For example, an Executive that is not getting the result it is commissioned to get, should be dismissed. The democracy should have a clear conception of its rights in this respect, and the determination to use them.

In order to get a wide-spread agreement on policy, certain principles must be observed:—

1. Policy in this connection may be defined as the *specification of the result required*.
2. The result required must be attainable.
3. The policy must be reduced to fundamentals, so that a clear division of opinion is possible.
4. The specification must be precise.

As regards medical policy at the present time, two fundamental opposed policies can be clearly defined:—

- (a) **INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM.**—Freedom to enter into individual private contracts, with the doctor responsible solely to his patient within the frame-work of the Common Law and the ethical tradition. (See Chapter III and IV of *The Problem of the Medical Profession*).
- (b) **CONTROL** of individual doctors by some form of central authority which assumes responsibility.

Both these objectives are practicable. With regard to (a) the objective would be to make private practice available to everyone; this would undoubtedly satisfy the public's requirements. *How to do it* is a technical matter for experts. The M.P.A. would certainly be prepared to produce a technical plan to a competent authority, for trial under penalty. It is worth noting that policy (a) does not exclude the possibility of any group of doctors organising themselves under their own authority, and giving their system a trial.

Policy (b), on the other hand, relies not on individuality and initiative, but on the power to punish. Moreover, as shown in *The Road to Serfdom*, it leads inevitably to more and more control, and cannot tolerate the existence of a non-authoritarian system along-side it. The system automatically becomes more rigid and inclusive. (Note that the White Paper proposes "disciplinary powers" for the C.M.B. The Executive plan does not comment; it takes the powers for granted). Anyone can see to what the administrative powers of the White Paper plan could lead; is anyone so naive as to suppose that those powers appeared by accident? **It is the intention underlying the White Paper which is significant.** The same intention underlies the Executive plan.

(To be concluded)

WHO CONTROLS THE CONTROL?

"For a long time there has been a steady flow of critical literature from the extreme Left. This flow has brought with it anonymously written books like *Guilty Men*, *The Trial of Mussolini*, and latterly, *Your M.P.*... They will turn on Mr. Churchill whenever it pays them... it won't be long... Of this latter book [*Your M.P.*] over 100,000 copies have already been sold. Lord Maugham... could only get enough paper for 5,000 copies of *his* book."

— *Review of World Affairs*, June, 1944.

"THE CHIEF GIFT OF NATURE"

When besieged by ambitious tyrants I find a means of offence and defence in order to preserve the chief gift of nature, which is liberty.

— LEONARDO DA VINCI.

"Conservative Principles"

The following letter was published in *Truth* of June 2, 1944:—

Sir,

The matter is of such importance that I beg to be allowed to reply to my critic who signs himself "True Blue" in your issue of May 12. As to Disraeli, the evidence is overwhelming. Can "True Blue" possibly be ignorant that he first stood for Parliament as an extreme Radical, that as a "Conservative" he was notorious for "educating the Party in the art of stealing the clothes of the Whigs," especially in the matter of the extension of the suffrage in 1867, and that his Suez Canal deal has been quoted by Socialists ever since as the first example of "State enterprise"? I have produced evidence in my letter of April 21 that a contemporary Communist in Germany regarded him with "boundless admiration," but that is true also of similar people in England. H. M. Hyndman, the Marxist, and leader, first of the National Social Party (significant title!) and later of the Social Democratic Federation, tells in his *Reminiscences* (Vol. I) how he urged Disraeli to take the leadership of the Left in this country. As for the confidence of his Sovereign, I should have thought that the extraordinary charm of Disraeli, and the fact that he exerted it to the full in order to gain and retain her favour, would have been sufficiently well known. The Disraelian "principles" which "True Blue" is sure are the antithesis of Socialistic philosophy are to be heard in one form or another on the lips of every prominent Socialist in the country. Mr. Shinwell and Mr. Morrison, for example, emit them with monotonous frequency, and I do not know a single Socialist who would disagree with them. They sound well, but can be made to mean almost anything. "To maintain our institutions," for instance, can mean to maintain Parliament as a Soviet or Reichstag which, as at present, will "rubber stamp" all forms of State control directed against the individual without even a single dissentient vote. "To preserve the British Empire" can mean transforming it into a centralised Stalinist Empire, or an American-type Federation, as well as it can mean preserving that independence and free co-operation which is its essence. What I am concerned about is the *result* of this perversion of the Conservative Party into the mere Right Wing of the Socialist Party, which is to be seen to-day in a predominantly Conservative Parliament which is pushing through, under cover of the war, a mass of National Socialist legislation, to the accompaniment of hearty applause from the whole Left Wing. We get a "Conservative" Minister who hurries through, "rather as an edict than as a Bill" (to quote Lord Quickswood in *The Times*, April 11), an Education Bill which interferes with our children's lives, our responsibilities as parents, with religion and with local government. And now we get Fuehrer Willink telling us (at Croydon, May 17) that there is no question of *whether*, but only of *how*, his Human Veterinary (which he calls National Health) Service is to be imposed on us. Before the war such a proposal would have been fought tooth and nail; now the Government thinks it can rely on 100 per cent. of yes-men in the House, and so far has been justified. What on earth has happened? Are there no honest men left in Parliament with the courage to meet this challenge? If there are, in God's name let us hear from them!

C. G. DOBBS.

Programme for the Third World War

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

This work, which has appeared serially in *The Social Crediter*, is now published in one cover,

Price 2/-

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Reconstruction	6d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
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.....	4d.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin.....	4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet)	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.)	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	1d.
The Representative's Job	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.