

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51 No. 24

SATURDAY, 19 FEBRUARY, 1972

7p (1s. 2d. Fortnightly)

## H. G. Wells and World Government

In a chapter headed "H. G. Wells and Credit" in his book *Warning Democracy* (first published in 1931) Major C. H. Douglas commented on an article by Wells in an American magazine. Douglas wrote: "Mr. Wells has been writing about credit . . . he chides, very gently, the bankers". But "no banker could feel hurt about it". Wells apparently was "concerned to enquire" whether or no bankers "have any conception of what they are doing, or where their policy, if any, is leading us". Towards the end of the article Wells mentioned "the growth of a world-system of co-related and co-operative banks" which, he said, "may be, as people put it, 'a natural development' but also there may be more deliberate intention and lucid understanding than appears on the surface".

Wells claimed to know nothing whatever about finance although he was writing on the subject by invitation. But he laid down three provisos which an ideal money system ought to fulfil: "The first is trustworthy wages. By that is meant a payment for a day's work . . . that will surely keep its promise to the worker. It must represent absolutely stable purchasing-power. . . . If the worker chooses to hold his wages for a time, he must find that they will still buy what he reckoned to get when he obtained them". The second proviso was security of employment; and the third was that money and those in control of it should act as a restraint upon war. Wells pointed out that the banking system was a more powerful mechanism of control than had ever existed in the world before and implied that its results were more unsatisfactory than ever before. But, in spite of this, said Douglas, Wells's general remedy was to give the banks more power.

Although, superficially, Wells's three provisos might seem admirable, Douglas was able to criticise them strongly. After saying that they expressed in tabloid form not only the philosophy of Wells but of bankers and certain prominent politicians, Douglas commented: "It will be noticed that wages are accepted as being *axiomatically*, a sound institution. No glimmer of the tremendous physical revolution involved in the transfer of labour from the backs of men to the backs of machines and the consequent inadequacy of *any theory of wages whatever* to the new conditions seems to have reached him. Further, the rapturous folly of the idea that a piece of printed paper or other money token can be put away in a cupboard and can in some mysterious way ensure that a certain number of loaves of bread . . . can be produced at any unspecified moment when the 'saved' piece of paper is produced, appears to be with him in an acute form. . . . His conception of the word 'trustworthy' denies to the wage earner, for whom he is so concerned, any hope that prices will fall, and thus shuts him out from the benefits of progressive efficiency".

With regard to the second requirement, Douglas asked whether Mr. Wells felt "so confident that the modern world

is so enamoured of economically compulsory employment to such an extent that it wishes to be secure in it forever. Has he never heard of people who hope some day to get into a position in which, so far from being secure in employment, they would be secure from the necessity for it?" (As, indeed, Wells was himself.) And, as regards making the financial system a security against war, Douglas said: "The average man is not such a natural born fool that, having been maimed, blinded, killed or impoverished in the last war he requires restraining from war as an amusement. Just as Mr. Wells mistakes the nature of money, so also he mistakes the causes and nature of war". Indeed, as we now know, it was by the manipulation of the financial system that both Great Wars were deliberately brought about.

Douglas held that the money system should simply be a *faithful reflection* of the *facts* of the *productive* system. It was not its function, as Wells supposed or proposed, to impose on the world any particular philosophy or policy; yet, he said "it does so happen that a money system which would reflect the facts of the productive system would *co-incide with* an extraordinarily far-reaching philosophy". It is very much better, he went on, that philosophies should follow facts than that facts should be constrained in accordance with philosophies. The facts are that a very high standard of living for all is now possible with less labour than ever before.

It seems unlikely that in the article referred to Wells raised the question of World Government; otherwise Douglas would have mentioned it. But in 1928 Wells published a book entitled *The Open Conspiracy*, which he revised and enlarged in 1930. In the Preface to the first edition he said of the contents of the book: "This is my religion. Here are my directive aims and the criteria of all I do. . . . it is impossible to think of the world as secure and satisfactory until there exists a single world commonwealth". Later in the book he said that this might never become one single administrative system; we might have systems of *world control* rather than a single world state. But whatever form it took it would be a commonwealth; "it is impossible", he wrote, "for any clear-headed person to suppose that the ever more destructive stupidities of war can be eliminated from human affairs until *some common political control dominates the earth*, and unless certain pressures due to pressure of growth of population, ~~due to the enlarging of human operations, or due to conflicting standards and traditions of life, are disposed of~~".

Tradition is the embodiment of culture and, as Douglas observed, culture is the soul of a nation. A given variety of tree is the embodiment of a tradition, just as is the human family tree. Disposing of "the traditions of life" is like reducing all vegetation to grass. It can't be done; but the *attempt* to do it is disastrous, and may be fatal; that is where the maiming, blinding, killing and impoverishment come from.

(continued on page 3)

## 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

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Mr. Enoch Powell has repeatedly stated his conviction that Britain will not join the Common Market because, as he points out, Mr. Heath said that there could be no question of Britain's joining without the whole-hearted support of Parliament and people, and it has repeatedly been demonstrated that such support is lacking. Yet Mr. Heath announced that whatever the outcome of the last debate in the House of Commons before the date set for signing the Treaty which Parliament has had no opportunity of seeing, the Treaty *would* be signed.

It is more than twenty-five years ago that Douglas warned that the time in which Parliament could be used to check the power of the Administration was limited; and it is now evident that that time has elapsed. Probably the enormity of what is being done will be realised only after the effect is felt, when it will be too late. For who can suppose that ~~if the Socialists turn the Tories out, they will reverse a decision for the abrogation of local national sovereignty, which has always been a Socialist aim? Their dream is of a supra-national 'social-democrat' government; and if the House of Commons cannot restrain the Cabinet, nor the public restrain the House, how can it be imagined that the British electorate (if there remains anything for them to elect) can restrain or influence a 'European' government?~~

Professor Arnold Toynbee, and of course others behind him for whom, most probably, he was in the main a Public Relations Officer, understood very well that national sovereignty, embodied in an *effective* Parliament, stood in the way of international cartelisation. But the ultimate aim of international cartelisation is not abundance for all—quite the reverse. The aim is control of the world's resources in the interest of World Government by a self-perpetuating minority. It is now within their grasp. That is why in the past few years there has been a growing clamour about pollution, 'the environment', ecology, conservation, and all the rest of it. That is not to say that there are not serious problems in those fields; it is to say that the remedies for them enforced by a World Government will be highly distasteful to 'prosperous' peoples. If too much carbon monoxide is put into the atmosphere by too many cars—well, prohibit private motor vehicles, and divert the employment in motor-factories to the production of tractors to develop the 'under'-developed countries, and armoured vehicles to support "wars of national liberation" so as to reduce the population of the over-populated areas of the world—including, perhaps, Britain as well as Ireland.

Today, January 22, 1972, may well mark a turning point in history—a turning which those now living, and their descendants, will in time to come bitterly regret, without

having the means to mitigate their fate; unless, against all expectation, something quite drastic happens to Mr. Heath and the power-élite whose spokesman he has become, or was made.

The reports of Soviet Russia's military superiority (admitting freely what is already known) continue to assail us. R. H. C. Steed in the *Daily Telegraph*, Jan. 6, 1972, has an article which asserts "Russia emerged clearly last year as the world's greatest military and diplomatic Power". And the *Daily Telegraph* of Jan. 14, 1972, has a leading article based on a report by "an eminent study group of the Institute for the Study of Conflict" entitled "European Security and the European Problem". "As the Institute's report points out with the aid of figures showing Russia's crushing superiority, especially on the crucial Central European sector, Nato's forces have already been reduced to their irreducible 'critical minimum', and any further reduction would 'virtually mean the abandonment of a European defence system' . . . The only realistic basis for negotiations, the Institute rightly states, would be a unilateral Russian reduction to something like the strength of Nato plus France. What a hope! Yet, this is all the more necessary because, as the report shows, Russia already probably has an overall nuclear superiority, or soon will have." What a hope!!

Coming at this late date, all these revelations and warnings are simply intended to convince public opinion that Communist Russia cannot now be stopped from taking over Europe, including Britain, which is shortly to become "part of" Europe. The "threat of war", so efficacious in getting us to sign the Surrender of Brussels, is now to be replaced by the apparent certainty of disciplinary action by the Red Army if there is any threat of deviation from 'socialist democracy', i.e., the application of the Brezhnev Doctrine. If Russia has indeed achieved a "crushing superiority", why has she done so? Who is to be crushed? And, more importantly, why has she been allowed to achieve such a position? The answer is still quite adequately given in Professor Toynbee's words: "All the local sovereign states except one are doomed eventually to forfeit not only their sovereignty but their very existence; for . . . the anarchy will be ended not by agreement but by force; not by the organisation of a pacific League of Nations but by the imposition of a universal empire through the victory of one militant nation over all the rest" — *International Affairs*, Nov. 1931. "Anarchy", of course means, in the contemporary context, pollution, lack of conservation, disrespect for 'the environment', and so on—those things which *The Times*, that great 'Capitalist' newspaper, stigmatised as "the rapacity of industrial society".

It has been clear for many a long year that the Versailles Treaty was designed to make a renewal of war, if necessary to the strategy of the One-Worlders, 'inevitable'. It is an odds-on certainty that the Brussels Agreement—not available for public inspection before signing—is designed to make rebellion against World Government impossible. And despite Mr. Powell's optimism, it is not likely that, having obtained Mr. Heath's signature, the Conspirators will let us off the hook now, Parliament or no Parliament. There is now an Instrument to be enforced.

The serialization of "Get US Out" will be continued in our next issue. The article will be available later as a booklet.

## H. G. Wells and World Government (continued from page 1)

Since Wells thought he felt so deeply about this subject, it is understandable that the main theme and intention of the book is to encourage or even to promote the formation of a body of intelligentsia all dedicated to the idea and, ultimately, to the realisation of this commonweal of which they or their successors and converts would constitute the central directorate. Indeed, most men aim at power, most would like to become dictators if they could. Wells saw this as the only way to avoid and finally abolish war, although wars, which he hoped might be minor affairs, might be necessary to achieve it. This, of course, was before the rise, financed by the International Bankers to precipitate war, of Hitler in National Socialist Germany.

Wells designated the new movement the "Open Conspiracy", and all the things which in his opinion stood in the way of realising the ideal of world unification were enumerated at great length in his book. Religious beliefs and practices must, he said, undergo a profound change (haven't they just!). "The time has come", he said, "to strip religion right down to the desire for service, for subordination (of self), for permanent effect, for an escape from the distressful pettiness and mortality of the individual life. . . . The histories and symbols that served our fathers encumber and divide us; sacraments and rituals harbour disputes and waste our scanty emotions". And as regards the national life, "flags, uniforms, national anthems, patriotism sedulously cultivated in church and school, the brag, blare and bluster of our competing sovereignties belong to the phase of development the Open Conspiracy will supersede". Established governments will, he said, "be regarded as provisional" [he admitted there might be a flavour of treason about this] and all institutions which furthered the separate aims of states for domination and aggression were to be transformed so that they would serve mankind in general. This could only be brought about by the action of a conscious élite who would gradually penetrate and permeate the whole of society. They would, of course, be specially active in universities, schools and all the media affecting the spread of ideas. Armies and armaments are "a cancer", but "the repudiation of military service so far as this may be imposed by existing governments in their factitious international activities need not necessarily involve a denial of the need for military action on behalf of the world commonweal for the suppression of national brigandage, nor need it prevent the military training of members of the Open Conspiracy".

There is a good deal more in this vein but, on p. 178 of the revised edition, Wells summarised his views in seven broad principles "defining the Open Conspiracy and holding it together":—

- (1) The provisional nature of existing governments;
- (2) The resolve to minimise by all available means the conflicts of these governments, their militant use of individuals and property and their interference with the establishment of a world economic system\*;

\*Compare Prof. Arnold Toynbee: "Either our modern economic internationalism has to be sacrificed, or else we must learn to live our political and our cultural life on the modern world-wide scale, which we have achieved in our economic life already. . . . we should preserve our economic internationalism by internationalising our social life through and through. . . ."—*International Affairs*, Nov. 1931.

(3) The determination to replace private local or national ownership of at least credit, transport and staple production by a responsible world directorate serving the common ends of the race;

(4) The practical recognition of the necessity for world biological controls, for example, of population and disease;

(5) The support of a *minimum* standard of individual freedom and welfare in the world;

(6) The supreme duty of subordinating the personal career to the creation of a world directorate capable of these tasks and to the general advance of human knowledge, capacity and power;

(7) The admission forthwith that our immortality is conditional and lies in the race and not in our individual selves.

With these principles, and especially No. 3, in mind, it is not surprising that Wells was asked to write his article for the American magazine. He went on to say: "In this book we are not starting something; we are describing and participating in something that has started. It arises naturally and necessarily from the present increase in knowledge and the broadening of outlook of many minds throughout the world". And especially, he thought, in what he called the Atlantic countries—Britain, West Europe and perhaps Russia, Scandinavia and North America.

Wells poured scorn on the crudities of socialist thinking current in his time and on Marxism: "The Open Conspiracy", he said, "can have nothing to do with heresy that the path of human progress lies through an extensive class war". His revolution would be brought about by an élite and, to give him his due, it was to be brought about by persuasion and agreement as far as possible and not by compulsion. "Compulsion and restraint" he said "are the friction of the social machine . . . the less the better". Also, the Open Conspiracy must be open: "it cannot be righteous if it is underground. Every step to world unity must be taken in the daylight".

This insistence on publicity and also on free criticism seems unrealistic. An *Open Conspiracy* is a contradiction in terms and the title of the book is only one indication of the confusion in Wells's mind: indeed his remark about treason in connection with the first of his seven principles shows that he was uneasy on this subject. Arnold Toynbee and his friends at Chatham House had no such scruples: Toynbee confessed that "they" worked in secret to undermine national sovereignties, "denying with their lips what they are doing with their hands". It is hard to believe that Wells did not know about the Chatham House activities, but he does not mention them directly in his book.

On the other hand, Wells was a member of the Fabian Society, albeit apparently rather a peripheral one; and even apart from his direct connection, he associated constantly with circles dominated and permeated by the ideas of Fabian Socialism, in accordance with the formula laid out by Bernard Shaw, a much more active and militant member. In these circles he was a successful and prominent man, and the conceit arising from such success and the adulation it attracts disposes such men as Wells (whom Douglas once described as a typical example of lower middle-class mediocrity) to assimilate suggestions which they pass off as their own; they begin to believe in their own infallibility. This adulation is often calculated, so that its diminution will quite easily bring to heel anyone whose conceit leads him to deviate from the principles he has absorbed from interested parties.

So it was, in fact, on the literary and *apparently* autonomous activities of *literati* like Wells that the Society largely depended for the permeation of its aims into a society hardly conscious of the existence of the Fabians. All of Wells's 'principles' are Fabian principles, now current as the hullabaloo about pollution, 'the environment', over-population and under-development—a terrible brain-washing in preparation for ruthless Communist terror. And, of course, the Fabian Society and Chatham House have interlocking directorates.

Wells wanted to see a great Bureau of Information and Advice established "which would take account of the resources of the planet, estimate current needs, apportion productive activities and control distribution"—rationing on an international scale, and again the thing that lies behind the afore-mentioned hullabaloo. In case this sounded like compulsion, he said, it would be like a kind of map: "A map imposes no will on anyone . . . yet we obey our map". Wells wanted to see food, shelter and leisure for all. "The fundamental needs of the animal life" he said, "must be assured before human life can have full play" and to secure this, he thought, there must be central direction on a world scale.

In regard to banking and finance Wells seems to have covered much the same ground in the book as in the article noticed by Douglas. He said that "there are, no doubt, many bankers and practices in banking which make for personal or group advantage to the general detriment. They forestall, monopolise [he does not say what they forestall or monopolise], constrain and extort and so increase their riches". But he thinks that "there remains a residuum of original and intelligent people in banking or associated with banking . . . who do realise that banking plays a very interesting and important part in the world's affairs". No doubt he included those who subsidise Chatham House and the Fabian Society among these latter. He says that these people would be drawn into the Open Conspiracy and he implies that they would ultimately control credit, which he defined as "the community's permission to deal freely with material". Thus he conceives that credit and also transport and staple production should be "adequately controlled in the general interest by a socialised banking organisation" and, this being so, he says, "we shall have defined the entire realm from which individual property and unrestricted individual enterprise have been excluded"; beyond that "the science of social psychology will probably assure us that the best work is done by individuals free to exploit their abilities as they wish". Land and mineral owners (and, it seems, entrepreneurs) will disappear "but it will be the practice, the recognised best course, to allow the cultivator, who would be a tenant . . . to profit as fully as possible by his own productivity . . . and to fashion his own house and garden after his own desire"(!).

Money is defined by Wells as a kind of "liquidated property", whatever that may mean, and also as "a ticket for individual liberty of movement and individual choice of reward". Evidently it all has to be earned: there is not the slightest hint that every individual citizen is entitled to a share of property rights in natural resources and in the vast heritage of science and mechanism developed over the centuries (now visibly deteriorating in many places), and that he or she, as an individual, could, by a relatively simple rectification of the accounting system, draw an income from them in the shape of dividends, as some now do, and Wells himself probably did. Wells made no mention of such a reform

of accounting which would make universalisation of dividends possible, although he knew of Douglas's proposals. As Douglas said, "Wells accepts the wages system as axiomatic".

There is no reason to doubt that Wells sincerely wished to see a happy world from which the fear of war and poverty were forever banished, but the means and methods which he proposed to adopt would preclude happiness, no matter what happened to the other objectives. With a socialised world-banking organisation in complete control of credit, transport, staple production and military power, one wonders what realms lie beyond in which ordinary people could exploit their abilities in freedom. Also, what control would they have over the policy of production, *i.e.*, of the kind of production and its quantity and quality as, to some degree, they have at present? Surely they would have to put up with what the central directorate of experts thought was what was good for them—or, more importantly, in "the race's" interest.

In his opening chapters, Wells wrote of tolerance and persuasion, but, towards the end when he saw the Open Conspiracy occupying the seats of power, he was quite explicit that it would be a fighting force, omnipotent as well as omniscient, and possessing all the sanctions. He apparently assumed that it would be exempt from the corruption accompanying absolute power; that it would not have been infiltrated from the beginning with people whose objectives were far from being altruistic, and that it could never degenerate into the ultimate world tyranny.

We do not propose to discuss Wells's religious views: he tells us they have been developed in detail in some of his other works, which, together with the one under consideration, could, he thought, be accepted as the Open Conspirators' Bible. His views appear to us mainly humanistic but, whatever they are, they seem to have led him to support policies diametrically opposed to what Douglas called "the interest of man, which is self-development"—not development by, and in the interest of, others. And, as for Wells's tolerance, what are we to say when he requires Open Conspirators to accept his dogma on "conditional" immortality? How could Wells know anything for certain about immortality if it is to be forever, on his reckoning, outside individual experience, including his own?

But to return to World Government: a modern Indian sage\*, who also favoured human unity, wrote perhaps 50 years ago: "It is quite *improbable* that, in the present conditions of the race, a healthy unity of mankind can be brought about by State machinery, whether it be a grouping of powerful and organised States enjoying carefully regulated and legalised relations with each other, or by the substitution of a single empire, like the Roman, or a federated unity. Such an *external or administrative* unity . . . cannot be really healthy, durable or beneficial over the true line of human destiny [uniformity, he said, is a property of the State and is Death, not Life] unless something be developed, more profound, *internal and real*". By this he meant a widespread and lasting spiritual awakening difficult or impossible to realise under a centralised tyranny, but perhaps possible in an age of "increasing freedom and complete independence" for the individual—the basic tenet of Douglas's proposals.

—T. N. MORRIS

\*Sri Aurobindo: d. 1950; founded an Ashram and a University in Pondicherry.