

THE POLICY OF A PHILOSOPHY

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

ISBN 0-920392-16-4
First Printing 1937
Second Printing 1977
Copyright (C) C. M. Douglas, 1977

THE POLICY OF A PHILOSOPHY

BY C. H. DOUGLAS

An address to a Conference of Social Crediters in London, on June 26, 1937.

First of all, may I express my great pleasure in being able to talk, not to a general audience but to a company of friends. That is a special pleasure which I have not very frequently, consciously, given myself, because there is not very much sense in talking to the converted, and it is a harder and more difficult job sometimes to talk to a slightly sceptical audience. But this is a pleasant occasion, and I am very grateful for the opportunity.

I don't know that anything that I am going to say to you is of any transcendent importance. It is very largely a question of emphasising things which, in one way or another, you know probably fairly well at the present time, but which, like so many other things connected with this subject in which we are all interested, have certain very subtle emphases. I have come to the conclusion, and others in the Social Credit movement, so-called, have come to the conclusion with me I think, about these very slight differences of understanding — the very slight differences of emphasis one may place upon certain things which are quite familiar in one form, but which if you put a slightly different emphasis on them, appear in a different light — that it is, indeed, in this different emphasis that the most important thing which we have to contribute may be said to reside; and to begin with, I am going to define two words which will be used a good deal in what I have to say, and a good deal in what you all have to do, and the first of them is "policy".

We have had a certain amount of correspondence in regard to the use of this word "policy", and it is not a bad thing, I think, to go back to the etymological roots of a word; it may not lead to anything, but sometimes it does. Policy is allied to "police" and has, I think, much the same meaning. The just,

original meaning was that it was Civil Government applied to a recognised objective. There is a meaning of objective, a strong essence of objective, in the word "policy". It is not merely administration. It is actually, if you like, governmental action, but it is action taken towards a recognised and conscious objective, and it is in that sense that we use the word "policy"; it is a little more, but it comprehends and comprises the word objective. That is the first word.

What is Religion?

The second word that I am going to define, for my own purpose if you like, is the word "religion".

Now the word "religion", again going back to its etymological derivations, derives from a word meaning to bind back; it is related to the word ligament, and so forth, and sometimes it is defined as meaning to bind. Well, it obviously would have a slightly unpleasant flavour if you define it as being to bind, but I think that the agreed definition, its original meaning, was to bind back. In the sense that I am going to use it, and I think I will be using it correctly, the word religion has to do with a conception of reality. It is the binding back either of action, or of policy — particularly of policy in the sense that I was using the word policy — to reality. In so far as it means to bind back, to bring into close relation again, and in that sense I am going to use it, religion is any sort of doctrine which is based on an attempt to relate action to some conception of reality. It does not necessarily mean, for instance, that your conception of reality is a correct one, but it does mean that you are postulating that there is something which we refer to as real, and you are basing your policy upon that reality.

Not very long ago, a very competent member of the Social Credit Movement, in whose opinion I place great faith, said he thought the morale of the Secretariat and, on the whole, the Movement which was closely associated with it, was extraordinarily good, but that he thought the morale of the Social Credit Movement as a whole was bad, and he wanted ultimately to consider that state of affairs, from what it arose, and what could be done about it, Well now, first as to the facts. A little later, I shall come to one more definition of what we mean by Social Credit — but, first, as to the facts.

In a great many people's minds, Social Credit is a scheme of monetary reform, and the explanation of why any scheme of monetary reform at the present time is having rather heavy going, of course, is because we are all suffering under a wave of so-called "prosperity" and obviously, if your conception of Social Credit is that it is merely a scheme of monetary reform you will follow the curve of monetary reform. When things are bad monetary reform is always on the upgrade, and on the downgrade, at any rate temporarily, when things are a little bit better, and although I think we should all agree, those of us who really know anything about what is the position of this country, that there is a great deal more hot air than prosperity at the present time, the fact is indubitable that through rearmament, and things of that kind, there is more money being distributed and people are better off. I think it is very patchy, but at the same time, there is such a state of affairs; so that in the narrow sense of a scheme of monetary reform, it is perfectly easy to see why, just at the moment, we should not be especially progressive or making the headway perhaps, that people think we ought to make. But, in my opinion, it is a very superficial definition of Social Credit that it is merely a scheme of monetary reform; and this is where the definitions I insisted on come in to some extent.

Social Credit is the policy of a philosophy. It is something based on what you profoundly believe — what at any rate, I profoundly believe, and hope you will — to be a portion of reality. It is probably a very small portion, but we have glimpsed a portion of reality, and that conception of reality is a philosophy, and the action that we take based upon that conception is a policy, and that policy is Social Credit. It is in fact a policy based upon a philosophy, which is, incidentally, why, in many cases, it is no use arguing with many people about the technics of Social Credit, because they don't agree with your philosophy; often they don't even understand it, and, therefore, what you say in regard to policy and technics sounds like a loud noise to them, chiefly without any sense; and the best thing to do in the circumstance is, of course, to agree to differ.

Cavaliers and Roundheads

About the middle of the 17th Century we had a Civil War in this country between the Stuarts who were the protagonists of a theory of the Divine Right of Kings, and the Roundheads — the Whigs and the Puritans. It is a very unfortunate thing that very often the best causes have the worst protagonists, for there could probably not have been worse protagonists of what in one particular sense was a very sound thesis, than the Stuarts. I am not going to suggest that there is any reality about the Divine Right of Kings, because whatever there may have been in antediluvian ages, no one would be foolish enough to suggest that now. But the point I want to make is this: It was a perfectly logical proposition to have a civil war about the Divine Right of Kings, and the State Church — the particular sort of church — and even to have an idea that the King could impress a religion upon the country and at the same time have a particular policy.

If there is one thing which seems to me beyond dispute, it is that you cannot have a policy (here I use the word again in the way in which I have defined it), the policy of a country, policy of a race, or of a nation, without having a philosophy behind it. You cannot have a bridge without a model and drawing behind it, or without having had a desire to have a bridge. You might as well say the Sydney Bridge just grew although nobody had ever said they wanted a bridge. I am absolutely convinced myself that there must be somewhere behind the policy a philosophy, or you cannot have a policy. Now, if you remember, the religious aspect of the Civil War was freedom of conscience, so-called; in other words, you were to **be** allowed, and you very rapidly did have, under the Protectorate, 57 religions, all different, and the only reason that you did not have 570 religions was that people could not think quickly enough. I am not saying that any one of them was either right or wrong. I am not interested. The rather subtle point I am trying to make is this —that the philosophies in the mind of the people in the country became completely chaotic, and that left the way open to the dominance of a philosophy which was not any one of them. I am not suggesting that the

philosophy before the rise of the Protectorate was a right philosophy, What I am saying is that the attempt of the Stuarts was to have a unified principle behind their policy, and that it was completely offset under the plea of freedom of conscience, out of which there could not possibly come a coherent policy, nor did there.

The Perils of Abstractionism

The rise of the Protectorate, as, of course, we know, was financed by Manasseh ben Israel; and the first Act of the Protectorate was to readmit the Jews into England, possibly a good and sound thing ¹, but it had the undoubted effect of elevating Whiggism, which with one very short interval, that of the Restoration, has been dominant in this country ever since; and Whiggism is abstractionism. I am not here as a protagonist of Christianity (in fact I am eventually going to talk about "Local Objectives",² and I am getting there, though you may not think so!), but Whiggism is abstractionism, and this country, which is allegedly a Christian country, is probably the greatest exponent of abstractionism as a national policy in the world to-day. The whole of our protestations as to the way in which we govern our actions allege it to be Christian — as I say, I am not here as a protagonist of Christianity, I am looking at this from a very different point of view — but our actions in this country — our penal system, our industrial system, our methods of dealing with criminals and our methods of dealing with business — actually have no relationship whatever to Christianity or anything which could be remotely related to it at all.

Our policy, so far as it can be defined, and the policy of this country, by common consent of all other countries, is the most difficult to disentangle, is related philosophically to the adulation of money. Money is an abstraction. Money is a thing of no value whatever.

¹ It is possible that this is to carry broad-mindedness to excess in the light of subsequent events, —C.H.D.

Money is nothing but an accounting system. Money is nothing worthy of any attention at all, but we base the whole of our actions, the whole of our policy, on the pursuit of money; and the consequence, of course, is that we become the prey of mere abstractions like the necessity for providing employment. That is where Whiggism is so successful in that it puts forward in a moral form something which it is extraordinarily difficult to disentangle from its slyness, something at which, in fact, it is not really aiming at all. What is being aimed at so far as you can put it in a few words, is a pyramidal slavery system by which people are kept in their places, and it is done by elevating things into rewards, and giving them values which don't exist. For instance, take the Honours system in this country. Anybody of common sense knows that these "Honours" often are bought with a cheque. Well, there is nothing honourable about buying honour with a cheque. That is abstractionism — pure Whiggism — giving to a thing qualities which it does not possess.

You may remember, of course, that after a short interim while the Stuarts came back again, and there was the orgy of the Restoration when James II finally disappeared, William and Mary came to the throne as nominees of the Whigs. Well their first action, practically, to which you can attach any importance at all was the foundation of the Bank of England in 1694, and from that time, of course, we have been happier and happier every year! And that is where we are at the present time.

The Indispensable Sanction

Now just as I said to you at Buxton that you had to have a mechanism by which you could bring the desires of people to impinge upon the organisation through which things are

done and the organisation through which things are allegedly done, or could be done, in this country, is the Parliamentary system — just so you have to recognise (and this is nothing fresh to the people I have been inflicting my ideas more closely on for the past few years) that you have to build up in some way or other something which will prevent a state of affairs coming into existence such that, when you have, by the efforts of a few devoted people, shall we say, got together all the signatures which are necessary to place pressure upon the House of Commons to make them do what you want, you can be frustrated by a change in the rules. The danger which I have always foreseen, and which under certain circumstances would be inevitable, and even mathematically certain, would be for them to say: "All right! you have got to the position where you can get what you want, so now we'll abolish the Parliamentary system."

Behind any mechanism, you always have to have a sanction. It is the sanction which is the important thing. If you have the sanction, the mechanism can always be devised. You have, in the Electoral Campaign,² the mechanism which will deal with the Parliamentary system, but you have no sanction to prevent the Parliamentary system being abolished, and a dictatorship, say, set up. We should be lacking in judgment if we were to go forward without doing certain things along parallel lines, and this does not in the slightest degree detract from my inflexible opinion that we have got to push the Electoral Campaign right through, but we have to make sure that when we have won the

² A campaign among electors who were willing to pledge themselves to vote only for candidates for Parliament undertaking to secure a stated objective chosen by the electors — in this case the abolition (not redistribution) of poverty. Inaugurated in 1934, following Major Douglas's Buxton address, the movement, in various forms, continued until the outbreak of war. Its principles are still applicable.

game under the rules of the game as they are at present, the rules are not changed.

In one of those dreadful books which are always being quoted against me — *Credit Power and Democracy* or some other — I think I said that the essential nature of a Social Credit state was a democracy of consumers accrediting, and being served by an aristocracy of producers. Now that is the materialistic aspect of certain relationships to which we think we have claims in reality and I don't want you to take my word for it, but to consider it for yourselves whether, in fact, in the world that is working to-day, there is anything working successfully which does not really work along these lines. Nobody knows of a successful democratic producing concern. There is no such thing — or at least, I have never heard of it. It certainly does not exist in the Co-operative Movement, or in the Labour Movement. On the other hand, we have working to-day, to a certain extent, with powerful reservations, a democracy of consumers. The democracy of consumers is not properly financed, but it is a fact that no producing concern can go on producing against the inflexible dislike of all its consumers; to put it plainly, it cannot sell its goods, so it goes out of business.

The Power to make Decisions

Examine that statement for yourselves. Does it appear to be, and is it, in fact, in the nature of things that all producers must be hierarchical, that you must have a grade of precedence in all people employed in producing, so that you can always get a decision, so that there is always the possibility of a decision? Anybody who has any experience of very large undertakings will probably know as well as I do, and I have some experience of large undertakings, that the whole problem of making these undertakings successful is to devise a method by which you get quick decisions. That is where the big undertakings in this country, such as the railways, are unquestionably failing at the present time. The distance between where things happen and the man who has the power to say, "Do this about it", is too big.

There is too great a length of time before decisions come

through; that is the great problem, and in order to solve it you have got to have hierarchy combined with the power to make decisions quickly. Now it goes without saying that if you are going to devote a very considerable proportion of the lifetime of people to the economic process, as we do at the present time, though I hope we shall not continue to do so, you must have agreement on policy. We have all been over this before and know, therefore, that it is in the region of policy that democracy has its proper function, not in that of method, or, as you might say, production. Now we are getting a little nearer to the Social Credit Movement and our various objectives.

Whilst what I have been saying has received, at large, a certain amount of lip service, when it actually comes to doing something about the Social Credit Movement — and you must remember that actually doing something about Social Credit falls quite naturally into the relationship of producer and consumer, just exactly as everything else does, because when you have got to do something everybody cannot take executive positions — you have got to have this fundamental relationship which is one of the primary conceptions of the policy of Social Credit. That you must have policy democratic and execution hierarchical is one of our fundamental conceptions in Social Credit; yet when we actually come to the point in which we are doing things, quite a large proportion of the Social Credit Movement falls into the misconception of producer and consumer exemplified by an American baseball crowd. "A good time is had by all," telling people second by second exactly what those on the field are doing and should do, and how much better those sitting in the stalls could do it than those who are playing. I don't complain, because, as a matter of fact, I have nothing to complain of — far from it; but I am simply pointing out that in my opinion, to get a thoroughly sound morale right through the whole of the Social Credit Movement, this conception — which is one of the first and most elementary conceptions of how things can possibly be done, how it is in the nature of reality of things to be done — has to be grasped first of all. If anybody can show me a single exception, in industry or even in games, in which

that conception does not stand, then I shall be very pleased to reconsider my views, if I consider what they see a just example. I don't know of any example myself.

Now we are getting still nearer to what we call Local Objectives. The object of the Local Objective idea is at least threefold, but if I had to place emphasis on one aspect of it more than others, it is that it is a discipline, or an exercise. You will remember when I seemed a long way from the subject of Local Objectives that I said you could not have a policy without a philosophy. You could not have a country which was pursuing a consistent policy unless somewhere at the back of it there was a consistent philosophy. Now the first part of this policy based upon a philosophy that I should like to see driven home is the reality of this relationship between the people who are doing things and the people who are empowering them to do them, and I myself cannot see any better way than trying if it works. It is a well-known proposition amongst engineers in particular, that when you are trying something, which is in some of its aspects novel, you want to try it on the smallest scale you can to begin with; make a model of it and see how that works. First make a drawing, then a plan, and if it does not work well on the model, alter the model, until it does work, and in doing that, you will not only find out that you can do certain things, but you will get into the minds of the people who do things in that way the absolute certainty that they will always succeed if they proceed along these lines.

The Right Use, of Tools

The Local Objective proposal, then, is in no sense something to replace the Electoral Campaign. It is something which has, as I say, several aspects. In the first place, it gets something useful done. You pick out a local objective which wants achievement, and then you definitely train yourselves to achieve that objective in a particular way by the tools which on a small scale are those which could achieve the results you desire from the Electoral Campaign; and when you have got a sufficient number of people to believe in the only way that belief is useful, that is to say, belief founded on

successful experiment and knowledge — they will not tolerate a change in the rules of the game on the larger scale of the Electoral Campaign to which ultimately you will have to address yourselves. It is only by getting this knowledge, the knowledge which is gained by discipline, and thus only by accepting this discipline, that you will become strong enough to carry out a successful objective on a large scale — only by a knowledge which first of all imposes upon yourself the grasp of the fact that you must succeed if you will first of all be democratic about your objective, let us say, to have a lamp post moved from one side of the road to the other, and get people together to say: "We will have this done, and will resolve ourselves into a firm body and give orders for getting that lamp post moved from the left to the right", and thereafter leave the technician to do the job in his own way. You will succeed, I am absolutely convinced, and having succeeded, you will say: "This is the goods — if we can do it in this little thing, we can do it in a bigger thing, and when we do it in a bigger thing, we will not have the rules of the game changed."

Only Right Action Matters

That really is all I have of great importance to say to you. There is nothing new about it. What I feel is that we have got to the stage in which we must get out of a great many people's minds the idea that Social Credit is an unlimited license for what the Americans call a "free for all," that in some extraordinary sort of way, by uttering the word "Social Credit" or saying "I am a Social Crediter" or saying "finance is rotten" and so forth, you can achieve the millennium. You cannot achieve the millennium any more than anything else which has been achieved except by taking action along lines which will achieve it. All that you can say about Social Credit, either in its monetary aspects, or in these aspects I am discussing to-night, is that we see — and I profoundly believe that we do see — just a little bit of the way in which the universe does in fact act. We see, through the adulation, what the nature of money is, and knowing the nature of money, we know what we can make it do, and what we cannot. Our power is largely in this fact that we know a little, or

believe we know a little — and the sort of belief which made people fight for religious conviction in the Civil War is an important thing. The important thing then was not that religious conviction was right but that they believed in it. The trouble now is the people don't know where they are going, nor how to get there.

We have something we want to achieve so we have to get into our minds a conception of the mechanism of the universe in order to use it; whereas, of course, the average man in the street, including the average politician, the average statesman, and the average person, does not even know where he is going, much less how to get there. That is one of the chief explanations of the chaos now, and it leaves the way clear to those who have a conception of the world they want. So long as they have a clear-cut conception, together with the use of the organisation which alone can achieve success, and which is actually working in the world, they will continue to be the force which imposes present policy on the world. That is why the system stays, that is why it achieves the results it does in the relationship between the democracy of policy, and the aristocracy of the producer. That is why our present financial and monetary system hold together. If the consumers struck, if it were possible for every consumer in this country to buy nothing for nine months, the whole economic system, of course, would collapse, and you could make any new one that you wanted. It is the relationship which keeps it together, and you have got to recognise that relationship.

Our new philosophy will change the run of the universe at once. It will enable you to have a new conception. So if you can do that, and in my opinion you can do it systematically, you will, in an incredibly short time, become the most formidable force that the world holds, because you will have, in my opinion, the sounder philosophy, and you would have, in that philosophy, a better policy.

MAJOR DOUGLAS ANSWERS QUESTIONS

Questions are given in italics, followed by the answers.

A Discipline to get Results in Association

Major Douglas said that the objects of Local Objectives 'very threefold, and I only gathered one of the "folds" from Major Douglas, that is to say, discipline; or training. I am not quite clear on this.

The objects of Local Objectives are threefold. If properly carried out, it is the training that, in my opinion, is the most important thing. The second is that it achieves its objects. It gets something done which is in itself useful. The object is decided upon before you start a Local Objective amongst yourselves. And the third thing is that it is in association that the people who get involved in one of these things are working together; they get all the advantages which come from working harmoniously, as far as it is possible within the limits of human nature, in trying to achieve a common objective. Those three things, to my mind are of the greatest importance.

You must remember we want to get something *done*; nothing else is of any importance at all. I have no more interest in discussing the rights or wrongs of A plus B than I have in swatting a fly on the wall. We want to *do* something, and to my mind, this is the way to begin. This is a laboratory experiment.

An Exercise in Sovereignty

Would you emphasise the link between Local Objectives and the application of the Electoral Campaign?

Exactly the same thing is true in regard to the business of the country,

Just as long as you have these six hundred odd Members of Parliament day after day considering things which they

cannot possibly understand, and on which, even if they did understand them, they could not agree, because you can never get unanimity of opinion on a technical method in an assembly of that sort, you will continue to have the shortest way, and the cleverest way, and in my opinion, a conscious way by which democracy can be stultified, as it has been.

Now, having elaborated that at great length, to come back to the relation between Local Objectives and the Electoral Campaign: A Local Objective is a training of a kind which is particularly sympathetic, in my opinion, to the British mind, which is an inductive mind, and not a deductive mind. It is a training, and in seeing how it works people can learn to do the same thing with their Member of Parliament, and that is the proper thing to do.

A Local Objective consists of getting together a lot of people, organising them for the objective they want, getting signatures to a proper specification of the objective desired, and sending that specification through the proper channels to the technical official who deals, let us say, with lamp-posts, telling him, "We are not interested in how you do it. We don't want to know about lamp-posts. All we say is that the lamp-post has got to be shifted from one side of the street to the other. "

In exactly the same way, when you have got the Electoral Campaign in a position to control about 370 of the Members of Parliament, they will take the orders of their constituents. And, mind you, most of them agree that this is the right thing for them to do, but they say they never get the orders. "How can we carry out your orders when we never get them?" When you have got 370 Members of Parliament in that position, they must do what you say.

The House of Commons has the power, by voting 16 million pounds, and giving six months' notice, to take away the Charter of the Bank of England, if you want to do it that

way, but only when you have got the 370 Members of Parliament. Anyway, it would be cheap at the price.

Personality and Character in Organisation

Most businesses, Governments, and all forms and processes of living, are controlled by personalities. I have always felt that I would like Major Douglas to explain how the will of the people can be mobilised, and how, with so many individuals who have got personality, this mobilised will can be brought to bear, except by persons with the will to resist and defeat it.

Everything depends on personality. The whole world depends on personality.

The first thing which is essential in regard to the organisation of any movement, and that sort of thing, in my opinion, is to depend first, last and all the time upon character. Now that sounds like a platitude, but it is not quite as simple as it sounds.

If you start off with a clear conception of what the relationships which govern an organisation are, you will attract into that organisation the right sort of character to suit it.

It is the problem all over again of the hen and the egg — as to which came first.

If you get the wrong sort of personality, it is very unlikely, out of vacuo, that he will devise the right sort of organisation. Conversely, if you have got the organisation of the right kind, you will get into it the right kind of personality.

To my mind, the whole thing depends upon this question of reality. If you are working in accordance with something which is real (and when I say real, I mean something which is in the nature of the universe, in the same way as the law of gravity is in the nature of the universe), you will get results which cannot be got even if you are working along proper lines for something which is unreal.

I believe the whole philosophy of the modern world is

essentially unreal. Never before have we been going through such an orgy of calculated delusions raised upon a conception, which is consciously vicious, of what is important in the world; and up to a certain point it succeeds.

There is a curious potency in a correct technique, applied to an essential proposition or objective, which makes it succeed.

Good will always be vanquished by evil, so long as evil understands its tools better than good; but if good can only be taught to use its tools correctly, the good will vanquish evil. And what I mean by good is something which is just as much in the nature of things, as gravity is in regard to physics.

In my opinion, the same thing is true of things that we usually talk of purely metaphysically, and if you get the right science of metaphysics — and this essence of social dynamics is for the moment one small part of it — applied by the right type of personality, then the right type of personality will be attracted —but not if you don't know the proper rules of social dynamics.

The Power of Association

Would Major Douglas tell us to what extent he believes that the powers which control us would change the rules of the game and abolish the Parliamentary institution, as they did in Newfoundland?

I think they would be guided entirely by practical considerations. The thing is a question of manoeuvres for position.

If you can get a sufficient number of people, for instance, in this country forming a political organisation such as there is in France, and at the same time get the ideas that I am endeavouring to put forward tonight into the minds of the people in that political organisation, you would most infallibly prevent any change in the rules of the game.

Now the political organisation of France can be put into half a dozen words. The local prefect is practically all-powerful, but he has his déjeuner in the café, and if he is not functioning properly, he gets a damn bad time at lunch, and that is exactly how you want to behave.

Small and Large Scale Operations

Major Douglas suggested that the Local Objective Campaign is an exercise in control and practice in using tools. Major Douglas said that if we can make the model work, the Electoral Campaign can be done in the same way.

When I was a boy of 16, when they told me how to make a canoe, I attempted to make one and was very successful, and made a beautiful thing of sixteen inches. I said to myself, "I can make a bigger one," and I started, and as far as I know I was doing exactly the same thing. But the twisting of the planks against the floor when I was forcing it into shape made the whole thing fail.

I would like Major Douglas to warn us what we may do wrong in our Electoral Campaign exercise, although we may be successful in Local Objectives.

It is perfectly true, as a matter of fact, that there are plenty of things which will work on a small scale, which will not work on a large scale. That is a well-known defect in the use of models.

For instance, we had a great deal of that to begin with in regard to aeroplanes. You got all sorts of results in regard to small scale models which were not at all carried out when you came to building a big one, and the reason for that is that the relationship of the edges to the total area, of course, is much greater. The ratio is much greater in a small thing than it is in a large thing.

That is another way of saying that if a thing of that kind fails, when the model has been successful, it fails because you have omitted taking into consideration some factor which you have overlooked, otherwise it is bound to succeed.

But the fact is that the whole thing is essentially inductive. You do a certain thing and you find the first methods that you apply to it are not quite as successful as you thought they were, and you change them.

The difficulty which I foresee is one which has been raised, by people who do not understand it, as a conclusive argument against the Electoral Campaign, "You can get a whole lot of signatures, but they don't mean anything."

No Half Measures

As put in that way, it is just plain nonsense but there is a grain of sense in it, because there is a time lag. Some have moved and therefore are no longer in that electoral district, and so on, but the fact is this:

If you get a sufficient number of people who were really convinced in the same way that they are convinced that they have got to go to work in the morning — if you could get the same sort of psychology into people's minds about the Abolition of Poverty — you would most certainly prevent a change in the rules of the game, and you would also make those signatures, which some people say are of no value, of infinite value.

Some years ago I went up to Manchester, I think, six times at intervals of about a fortnight, and I had a very good lunch at the expense of about 16 or 18 very prominent business men, and we discussed the technics of Social Credit. This was in about 1920, and they were all very attentive and very interested, and very intelligent, and all that sort of thing. I was getting on beautifully, and at the end of the last luncheon one of them looked at his watch and said, "Well, this has been most interesting, but now I must get back to work." It is all that sort of thing which is the core of the lack of morale as far as it exists in the Social Credit Movement.

It is not real, they seem to say, but it is interesting. It is like reading a good detective story. Sometimes it is even better than playing bridge, but after all, "I have got to go to work tomorrow morning." I do sympathise with it. At the same

time we have to get the scale of this thing more into the scale which was behind those people in the days of the Civil War, when they were not going to work, but were going to stick their enemy in the gizzard.

There is no doubt about it; this thing is not going to be done by soft measures. We have had a demonstration in Alberta of the fallacy of imagining that you can make an omelette without breaking eggs, and that is exactly what most of us want to do. We want to live in a Social Credit state, complete with hot and cold water laid on, and at the same time "we must go to work in the morning."

Precept versus Practice

I would like to ask Major Douglas to what extent in conducting these Local Objective campaigns, must we drive into the minds of people the connection between the success of these Campaigns and the principles underlying them. The terms we have so far had from the Secretariat stress that the aim of these Campaigns is to raise the sense of sovereignty in individuals, but that we should not connect practice with principles.

I should agree with them. The average Englishman hates principles, and he will get the thread of the story all right if it works. I should not think of mentioning the word principle. I should say, "Here is the way to get the lamp-post shifted to the other side," I should say, "What about trying this with the Member of Parliament? It seems to have worked with the lamp-post!"

The purpose of the Local Objective Campaign is to arouse, by action, through a correct organisation, a philosophy to dethrone abstractionism.

With regard to the connection of Social Credit with Local Objectives, I'm afraid I don't agree with Major Douglas. If you are going to get this thing done, and you don't connect Social Credit with it, they will connect a party label to you, and you will lose the whole essence of the work that is being done. You will be nominated as a Councillor, and put under a party label, or as an independent, which is no party at all. Then you will find that all your work has

gone to the devil. There is a satisfaction of knowing that you have done something for the people, but that is the only satisfaction you will get. I am not afraid of saying I'm a Social Crediter, that I believe in Social Credit. What's the matter with it, anyway?

There is no principle involved in this at all, My experience of life, so far as it has been spent in this country, is that explanations are fatal — it is only because this is what I call a family gathering that I am making them, and it may be fatal to the family!

The main thing to do is to tell somebody to do something, and then let them find out, when you have told them to do it, that it does, in fact work, and for their own particular purpose they will draw the explanation that is required, and when you go to ask them to do something bigger, they will say, "It can work again." But if you mention Social Credit, they would say, "Oh! this is another of these damn financial money things," and drag into it difficulties which have nothing whatever to do with it, and then, of course, all sorts of arguments about technics arise.

I am inclined to think that the more simple and clear you make this thing (we have got to go back to school ourselves, and take the public with us) the easier it will be,

We have completely lost all sense of our relationship with the State. We are ready-made material at the present time for a dictator. We don't take any interest in our own affairs, and unless we take interest in our own affairs along proper lines, you may be certain our rulers will not take any interest in our affairs, but in their own!

There is only one way in which I can see that you will keep this thing with sanctions behind it. You must go back to school. I feel sure it will be impregnable then. We have to do things very quickly, but you can see the awful example there has been of endeavouring to do a perfectly sound thing by unsound methods, and we have got to do it a sound way.

A Question of Sanctions

If we regard Local Objectives as a try-out for children, and having in mind eventually the national objective, Major Douglas suggests that local bodies of electors should approach the Executives, the experts, or the Local Authority. I should be interested to know if he feels that it would be better to try through the local representative, through the Council, in every town, to educate people to get a national objective without direct approach to the expert.

That would be perfectly sound. Nobody has ever suggested that you should go to the Borough Surveyor about these things, unless there is some difficulty about going to your representative. Don't regard your Council as an expert,

By all means use, in every case, the mechanism by which democracy can impinge on action.

There is a local action, and national action, the whole theory being that the very nature of the British Commonwealth is based on the accepted proposition (we have not got to make the proposition — it is an accepted proposition) that ultimate sovereignty resides with the people; and where the theory breaks down is that other people have been clever enough to stultify it by putting up things to the sovereign power which no sovereign power can be possibly expected to decide.

I know of one or two Local Objectives in which the demand has been sent in a letter to the Local Surveyor or Waterworks Manager. I thought it was a mistake of technique. What, of course, would happen in a case of that sort would be that the local surveyor or water expert would take it to the Town Councillor and say, "What about it?" So you might just as well have gone to the Councillor in the first place.

You have no power to dismiss the Borough Surveyor, but you have the power to dismiss the Town Councillor. It is sanctions that matter.