

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 31. No. 8.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 14d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1953.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

THE SWING OF THE PENDULUM: Professor Auguste Piccard, 10,335 feet below sea level. The Man in the Moon is said to refer to some of our more recent exploits as "sheer terracy."

. . .

We are not sure that the prevailing confusion of 'the policies of philosophies' does not stem from the obsession that the so-called ancients were unfamiliar with certain ideas of which 'modern' man has possessed himself. Partly this obsession is a consequence of the quite unwarrantable application of crude Darwinism to human concerns and the easy but ignorant inference that 'it must be so.' Partly, it is a mere confusion of size with scale, and thus ought to be easy for Social Crediters of all people to divest themselves of. Take the historical intuitionist Spengler: Spengler thought he could 'grade' the civilisations according to the prevailing concept of Space contemporaneous with each. To the Greek, geometry; to the 'Magian,' algebra; to Western Man, the calculus. Thus history "consists of a long, secret and finally victorious battle against the notion of magnitude." Faustian man craved infinity. The characteristic constructions of the Egyptians are not 'buildings' but *paths* down which "The Egyptian soul saw itself moving . . . to end before the judges of the dead." The Chinese 'wanders' through his garden: he is "conducted to his god or his ancestral tomb not by ravines of stone . . . but by friendly Nature herself." The mercantilist apotheosis, Modern or Faustian man, knows he has farther to go. He must at least blast himself to his infinity, an idea which suggests that he has not yet grasped the notion of infinity, and only his vast conceit supports his absurd opinion that he has 'evolved' at all. "Consider the lilies of the field. They toil not, neither do they spin . . ." Observe that even Solomon, though glorious, is individual and bounded by a robe.

We are satisfied that there is some connection between all this and the observation of the Reverend Ivan R. Young, who, in the course of an article in *Laudate*, the Nashdom Benedictines' quarterly, observes that "it requires more than the legacy of an essentially middle-class outlook to face the future." The omniscient State is the construct of massed commerce. It destroyed More. It *must* always destroy or be destroyed.

. . .

The reaction against world-dictatorship ("internationalism") is growing. Most evidences are 'straws in the wind,' and, like straws, present an aspect of untidy confusion. The following is by no means confused. It is said to have been written by Salazar, the Portuguese leader:—

"The belief in the virtues of internationalism seem to me morbidly exaggerated, since it appears unlikely that the whole world would be free from the individual frailties and shortcomings of the component parts. Our idea of international community has been nurtured on realities, and we desire above all to make our contribution to the concert of nations truly helpful. Therefore, with that end in view, our very first duty is to become ourselves a constructive factor and not a means of ill contagion and destruction. The order which we have established in Portugal, our modest achievement is an appreciable contribution to the general welfare.

"All that we demand in return is that those who cannot or will not save themselves, shall refrain from trying to impose upon us their own standards of perdition.

"I merely state my sincere conviction that 20th-century man is not yet capable of seeing or solving world problems except through national, free and independent entities. People of exalted imagination, armchair politicians engrossed in abstract solutions and unconcerned with the many realities bound up with the lives of peoples, will maintain the view that something better is possible. Nevertheless, prudent persons will agree that a national basis is still the most solid, the easiest and safest on which peoples can co-operate for their mutual well-being.

"Internationalism, concealing as it does pronounced tendencies towards national imperialism, is indeed a source of complication and danger to-day. The ideas of super-national organisation and the tendency towards 'citizenship of the world' are either definitely erroneous or humanly impossible. They are so far from possible under present conditions that they can only act as disturbing elements."

The Faustian 'standard of perdition' is not unattainable. When, under the impact of the atomic hammerings on the great land-masses, do volcanic eruptions begin to appear in the Hebrides and the islands included in Munster and Connaught?

. . .

They say there are only seven archetypal jokes. Lady Astor's "I wish it were poison," alleged to have been uttered in handing Senator Joseph McCarthy a drink, seems closely related to "If I were your wife I should poison you," a gently expressive sentiment reported of the same lady to (then) Mr. Churchill. Churchill's "And if I were your husband I should drink it" is (in our opinion) less good than McCarthy's "I understand that some nice old lady made that remark, but I didn't hear it." Perhaps it all depends on whether you think wrath should be turned-on or turned-away.

The poor old world hears far too much. There are too many "Masterpieces of Invective."

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: SEFTon Park 435.

Vol. 31. No. 8.

Saturday, October 17, 1953.

The Late Duke of Bedford and Social Credit

De mortuis nil nisi bonum (concerning the dead:—nothing unless good) is in all circumstances counsel of the highest authority. Yet all counsel, and the higher the authority which inspires it the truer it is, calls for more than perfunctory inspection before it is acted upon. 'Concerning the dead.' It is characteristic of man that he does not wholly die, and that which belongs to him which does not die is infinitely more important than whatever it may be that dies. Even had he lived to do so, the late Duke of Bedford could not have disengaged himself—doubtless he would not have tried—from the vulgar nonsense of the *Sunday Express* on the point of his addiction to Social Credit; nor, probably, would he have wrestled with the more studious innuendoes of *The Times*—more studious and more consequential. The most satanically-inspired of all journals, in whatsoever language, *The Times*, (if His Satanic Majesty were himself to die, in a bed chamber near-by the great congregation of his descendants gathered together by news of the approaching fatality, *The Times's* Obituary Notice would be the world's greatest masterpiece of obsequious insolence—*Nil nisi bonum*) knows how to part innuendo from 'accurate reporting.' So, under a section-heading all to itself, it said last Monday:—

"ASSOCIATION WITH MAJOR DOUGLAS.

"Round about 1928 he was presented with a copy of Marshall Hattersley's *This Age of Plenty*. He did not then pretend to be a social theorist, and found the economic arguments of Social Credit heavy going (as many have done before and since); but he gave close study to the book and began to think it likely that Major Douglas's theory offered a solution to the problem of poverty existing in a world of plenty, without the disadvantages either of Socialism or of the current monetary and economic system. He brought prominent Social Crediters and orthodox economists together in debate; and, being convinced that the former had in nine cases out of 10 the better of the argument, embraced Social Credit with enthusiasm. He became one of the most ardent exponents of the theory, and wrote *The Road to Real Success, Poverty and Over-Taxation*, and a flood of pamphlets (which last he would forward to a very large number of people, both prominent and obscure).

"He found the economic arguments of Social Credit heavy going." Certainly he did; and to the end of his life, like his amateur instructor, Marshall Hattersley, he never mastered them; but was for ever writing to Major Douglas and to the Secretariat notes of incredulous enquiry, the painstaking and courteous replies to which he either did not read, or could not bring himself to assimilate to a wayward per-

(continued on page 4.)

Deviations

by H. SWABEY.

III.

Prussia has violated conspicuously the principle of balance, and Colonel G. B. Malleon described the process in *The Refounding of the German Empire* (1893). He quotes one of Napoleon's officers, the Baron de Marbot, who thought that Napoleon made a mistake in reducing the number of the small principalities of Germany to thirty-two, for he "introduced the spirit of union" into the German forces, and they combined against France.

In 1849, Frederick William IV of Prussia rejected the crown of the German Empire which the Frankfurt Assembly offered him, and ended "the great attempt to secure the federal union of Germany." Prussia, however, "silently connected with itself, through the ties of financial union, States which had hitherto looked to Austria." While other countries were content with the armaments in vogue at Waterloo, Prussia perfected the needle-gun; and in 1860 she adopted von Roon's plan to extend conscription to three years.

William I, who had acted as Regent for five years, became King in 1861, and nominated Bismarck as Minister. "Bismarck had shaped in his mind a policy which was to place Prussia at the head of Germany. With the carrying out of that policy, which he took an early opportunity of announcing as a policy of 'blood and iron,' nothing was to be allowed to interfere, neither scruples of conscience, regard for truth, considerations of honour. . . . Well had Bismarck studied the career of Frederick II. . . . He had invented the theory that if the three great constitutional bodies could not agree, the view taken by the majority of the three should prevail." He had the backing of the King and Upper House, which combination he held over-ruled the Lower House. "By the legal fiction which Bismarck had invented, the taxes refused by the Lower House, but approved by the Crown and Upper House, were still levied."

Bismarck tricked the Austrian foreign minister into joining Prussia in the Danish War (1864), then persuaded Napoleon III of France to hold his hand in Italy so that Prussia was free to fight Austria. ("Austria by her conduct in Holstein, was pandering to the democratic principle" he alleged.) The Germans cheered the Austrian troops as they marched from Frankfurt, but when the Prussians left, says Malleon, 'Egypt was glad at their departure.' The Prussians poured in petitions to William I for the continuation of peace. But the King preferred the policy of Bismarck supported by von Roon, Minister of War, and the able slaughterman von Moltke, Chief of the General Staff.

Prussia first defeated Hanover, in 1866, as a result of which the order was issued that "the House of Guelf should cease to reign in Germany. . . . It was a case of Might against Right. The King of Hanover had been told that he must either espouse a cause against which his conscience and the conscience of his people revolted, or be attacked." Then Hesse was annexed, and Austria decisively defeated at Königgrätz. Hungary obtained autonomy in 1867.

Some of the secondary States, however, still resented their inferior position. "It was felt at Berlin that war and only war could remove this feeling." A Hohenzollern accepted the vacant Spanish throne, then withdrew. Bismarck took the opportunity of provoking the French, by

publishing a telegram in Berlin, which described semi-officially an altercation between the Prussian King and the French ambassador. The French received the impression that "the Prussian King had deliberately insulted France in the person of her ambassador." So the French declared war, in 1870, "though the Emperor still declared for peace." Most Frenchmen, it afterwards turned out, desired peace, but the Paris mob shouted them down.

One French army was defeated at Sedan, when the Emperor was taken prisoner. Malleison does not hesitate to "charge the entire responsibility to those short-sighted politicians who, to save a dynasty, refused to admit within the defences of Paris an army which well commanded would have prevented the ultimate capitulation, but preferred to send it to certain destruction. . . . The dynasty which had not wanted the war, which had entered upon it almost under the compulsion of the Parisian mob, was expelled because that war—their war—had been unsuccessful." A second army, under Bazaine, surrendered at Metz, and politics again had something to do with it. It is "certain that political considerations—for Bazaine was a strong supporter of the Bonaparte dynasty and hated the faction which ruled in Paris—greatly swayed the mind of the general." Despite the efforts of Gambetta ("He obtained arms, uniforms, munitions, and other necessaries from foreign countries, especially from England"), France was defeated (1871) and forced to cede most of Alsace, N.E. Lorraine, and to pay 5% on any unpaid indemnity. The war, says Malleison, "by the manner of its ending, especially in the matter of the harsh conditions insisted upon by the victors, laid the foundations of enmity and future warfare between the two most important countries of the continent."

The King of Prussia received the title of Emperor of Germany on the first day of 1871. William II, however, dismissed Bismarck "to pour out his grievances to every passing listener, to speak in terms not far removed from treason of the sovereign who had declined to be his pupil." Germany, by 1893, had "failed to conciliate the people torn unwillingly from their long connection with France. . . . These difficulties a little less greed would have avoided."

In fact, the policy did not succeed for either Bismarck or for Germany. Bismarck did not have the excuse of Frederick II of being beaten in public by his father, or of being forced into a marriage, nor did he have the 'personal enemy' at his elbow. One must conclude that the Old Firm alone benefited from these personal and national failures.

IV.

Machiavelli shewed, without reservation and from his own observation, what absolute power involves. He had acted as ambassador to Ceasar Borgia, and wrote a dispassionate essay on the murder of Vitelli and others by Borgia. He recorded the feats of a sort of bandit, Castruccio Castracani, who encamped near Florence, "parting the spoil and coining of money, thereby exercising with great ostentation a kind of sovereign right over their territory." He described the State of France, and while noting the natural richness of the country, added that "by reason of the scarcity of money among the people, it is with difficulty that they are able to raise so much as will pay the impositions of their lords, though they are generally but small." The prelates carry away two fifths of the revenues and "hoard it according to the natural covetousness of the prelates and religious."

The king could only appoint a bishop by force. Yet in those days (about 1500), taxes only furnished *extraordinary* revenue, for war. The king supplemented taxes by loans "which are seldom repaid." Germany, however, abounded in men and money—four shillings clothed one of them for ten years—and it was hard to allure them to war owing to their good condition. Yet emperor, princes and states distrusted one another as well as the Swiss, who in their levelling enthusiasm detested all gentlemen. The empire would have to be united "before any great thing can be performed by the emperor."

England produced correctives to monopoly in her common law and three-fold constitution. The greatness of the system differed fundamentally from Machiavellian ideas of greatness in that it rested on the distribution of power and ensured social stability for centuries. This went so far that all individuals enjoyed certain absolute rights.

After listing the right of personal security and the right of personal liberty, Blackstone says (I-139), "The third absolute right, inherent in every Englishman, is that of property . . . without any control or diminution, save only by the laws of the land.

"So great moreover is the regard of the law for private property, that it will not authorise the least violation of it; no, not even for the general good of the whole community. . . . It would be dangerous to allow any private man, or even any public tribunal, to be the judge of this common good. . . . Besides, the public good is in nothing more essentially interested than in the protection of every individual's private rights. . . . The legislature alone can, and indeed frequently does, interpose . . . by giving him a full indemnification . . . and even this is an exertion of power, which the legislature indulges with caution, and which nothing but the legislature can perform."

Irresponsible power undermined, and reorganised, the system which had grown up through centuries of experience, and gradually introduced the foreign idea of a centralised state. Comic writers often display a little more licence than accepted dignitaries or 'rebels.' Cuthbert Bede wrote a hundred years ago (1853) in *Verdant Green*: "These dates we withhold, from a delicate regard to personal feelings, which will be duly appreciated by those who have felt the sacredness of their domestic hearth to be tampered with by the obtrusive impertinences of a census-paper."

We may sometime know whether the men of 1936 consciously applied correctives. A German, Herr Hess, has written a book praising the actions of Edward VIII and Neville Chamberlain which averted war, so I understand. Hector Bolitho's *Edward VIII* tells little. George IV, he says, signed over the revenue of the duchy of Cornwall during his lifetime to Coutt's Bank. "Thus a banker became Duke of Cornwall in all but name." But Edward VII developed his father's schemes and between 1909 and 1914 they ploughed a third of a million pounds back into the estates. Kennington Council (Labour) considered Edward one of the best landlords in the kingdom, and as a landlord he gave "solid proof of his ability to govern the vast lands under his control."

Mr. Bolitho tells of Edward's horror in 1923 when he saw a man at a soup kitchen with no shirt under his coat, and of his self-questioning, 'What can I do? What can be done?' He notes his remark in Glasgow when he saw the *Queen Mary* and the slums, 'How do you reconcile the world that has produced this mighty ship with the slums we have just visited?' And his Glamorganshire declaration, 'Some-

thing will be done.' The author says that "Many members of the Government resented his campaigns among the poor." *The Times* called it 'A constitutionally dangerous proceeding . . . he drew attention to the alleged apathy of the Government . . . such actions on the part of the King would entangle the throne in politics.' We may well ask which Government and what politics.

A King's Story, as Mr. N. F. Webb has pointed out, does not tell us a great deal either. We may note the character its author gives of George V—believing in God, the invincibility of the Royal Navy, the essential rightness of whatever was British—which he substantially claims for himself. The Duke "was not a supporter of the League of Nations," and contrasts "realism or the League of Nations." He opposed anything, "including the controversial imposition of sanctions, that might tend to throw the Italy of Mussolini into the arms of Hitler."

Edward VIII felt that another great war in Europe was probable, and "saw all too clearly that it could only bring needless human suffering and a resurgent Bolshevism pouring into the vacuum of a ravaged and exhausted continent." He saw too that Parliament had done quite well under the bargain of the Civil List, which it grants in return for the surrender of the hereditary revenues of the Crown Lands. He rejected Anthony Eden's request that the King should receive the exiled Negus at the Palace, as he considered it "might well give unnecessary offence to Mussolini and drive him closer to Hitler." In fact, he disagreed with his Ministers' "futile policy of coercing Mussolini, which had utterly failed of its purpose. . . . It was more important in my eyes at this stage to gain an ally than to score debating victories in the tottering League of Nations."

He contrasts the positions of King and President of the United States; the King in opening Parliament is reminded of his figurehead role, but the President is judged by what he says. Like his grandfather, he found reading the Declaration on maintaining the Protestant Faith "repugnant." The flurry that his words in Glamorganshire caused showed him that complicated economic issues rendered it "almost impossible for a monarch to continue to play the role of the Good King, free to move unhindered among his subjects, and to speak what is in his mind."

In the last wretched days of the reign, Mr. Churchill came to dinner and was taken up with the threat to the constitution: "the Executive had forced a constitutional issue for political reasons," and had taken steps against the King without warrant in law. And so it ends, in the Rothschilds' country home at Enzesfeld.

Yet the need for the corrective is only emphasised by the results of not applying it.

THE LATE DUKE OF BEDFORD AND SOCIAL CREDIT—

(continued from page 2.)

sonality, clinging desperately to the 'rights' of a decayed tradition.

The Times mentions the 'evangelical' obsession of the Duke of Bedford's activities. We wonder what the temperament of the Russells was like *before* the Reformation. Can we infer anything from the qualities of "Mr." Bertrand? We do not regret the millions with which the Duke might have endowed, but did not endow the Social Credit movement. Money has uses and misuses; and so has patronage.

The Duke had his private hobby, as so many 'evangelicals' have their private 'communion.' He had courage (which is, however, not so rare a virtue as cowards suppose); but, like Mr. Manning and Mr. Hargrave and many others in their several ways, he thought it more blessed to give than to receive—even if you really had nothing to give. The late Duke of Bedford was never a 'follower' of Major Douglas.

The 1953 Examination Paper

The Lectures and Studies Section of the Secretariat has been asked to prepare for publication 'model answers' to the questions set at the recent examination (April, 1953) for the Diploma of Associate. The usefulness of such a practice is doubtful. Assuming that answers written by any hypothetical candidate could be described as a 'model,' publication of them would not lead usually to comparisons which are serviceable to others. Inessential resemblances would be magnified and essential discrepancies overlooked, or mere details of style and length would be given undue importance. It is, however, possible to point out what should *not* be omitted from an answer to most questions which invite a factual answer.

The following are examples:—

Question 1: What is a "tax"? In what circumstances is taxation (a) economically, (b) politically justifiable?

Answers which did not recognise that any arbitrary addition to the Just Price of commodities, properly computed, is a tax, would be insufficient. Taxation is *not* justifiable unless as the expression of a negative dividend (economic) and/or an agreed policy of restriction (political).

Question 2: Explain the phrase "price adjustment." What reason is there for the proposal to distribute a "national dividend" in addition to adjusting prices?

Assuming his knowledge of the implications of the A + B theorem to have been proved by the candidate, his failure to discriminate between that part of current production which arises from the cultural heritage and that part due to current effort would be penalised, also failure to recognise the effects of spending national dividend in adjusted prices. Suggestions for computing the real national dividend at any time would receive high marks.

Question 3: What is "Mortmain"? Discuss its implications.

Answers to the first part borrowed from an encyclopaedia were acceptable. One candidate only at the examination recognised the importance of the principle from the point of view of an association such as the Social Credit movement, in which it is desired, in face of powerful external opposition, to continue a policy over more than a generation. (A candidate said: "It set me thinking"—as well it might.)

Question 4: Write short notes on . . . (a) to (e).

Such questions give opportunity for recovery of *some* marks which may be lost elsewhere.

SOCIAL CREDIT IN 1952

(Leaflet reprinted from *The Social Crediter*.)

Price 1d.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Walston.