

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 34. No. 23.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1956.

6d. Fortnightly.

Democracy

Statistical studies reveal a declining *hereditary* intelligence, which is due, in the main, to birth-control amongst the more intelligent, combined with a higher rate of survival amongst the more numerous progeny of the less intelligent.

Superimposed on this situation are the effects of modern education and environment, until we have reached a condition well described by Sir Edwin Herbert in his presidential address to the Law Society (*Daily Telegraph*, September 26, 1956). He points out that everyone these days has a smattering of education, the effect of which is to make a man believe he is the equal of everyone else in ability and knowledge. "In consequence there is abroad in society something amounting to envy mixed with hatred of the man of intellect. The tide is running against him."

All this, no doubt, is a large part of the explanation as to why intelligent protests against the policy which is leading us to world-wide organised slavery appear to be ineffective. That acute analyst, F. A. Voight, exposes the more superficial idiocies of the United Nations Organisation in a long letter to *The Daily Telegraph* (October 1, 1956), which in anything but the Age of the Common Man should be decisive. Mr. Voight writes:

"Sir—Those who have been insisting that even the threat of force may not be used against Egypt have been equally insistent that the case be referred to the United Nations. They have thereby endorsed a threat of force immeasurably greater than any the British Government could have dreamt of, a threat made explicit in the Charter itself in Articles 39-49.

"A conflict which Britain and France could have decided expeditiously with limited means has now been vastly enlarged. Two world-wide coalitions, each supported by its dependent or auxiliary Powers, face one another on a world stage.

"I am not suggesting that the British Government was wrong in referring the case to the United Nations. In doing so, it merely honoured our contractual obligations under the Charter. However impolitic it may seem to enlarge, prolong and complicate the conflict instead of keeping it within the narrowest limits and making it as short and simple as possible, these obligations allow no alternative.

"But the fact remains that we are now committed under the terms of a contract which is wretchedly drafted, and replete with questionable abstractions.

"The case is, under the Charter, to be adjudicated by one of the most paradoxical institutions ever known, a sort of bicameral Court. The Upper Chamber, the Security Council, consists of judges, as it were, each one inevitably being a judge in his own cause—a matter not of disloyalty on his part, but of divided loyalties. The Lower Chamber, the General Assembly, is in the nature of a jury which, for similar reasons, is inevitably a packed jury.

"To this institution the modern world has entrusted the right to make decisions which may legally institute universal war, for it is all-embracing; it arrogates the use of armed force in the 'common interest' as stated in the preamble to the Charter (the common interest being the interest of all), and imposes its 'principles' even on States that are not members, as stated in the Charter itself (1, 6).

"The Charter, therefore, prescribed, in certain eventualities, not only the right to wage wars involving the whole of mankind, but the right to determine the nature and conduct of the war and the terms of the peace which will, it is supposed, bring it to an end (15, 3). . . ."

Canadian Notes

From *Vers Demain*, Montreal, a report dated August 21, 1956, has been received which is translated as follows:

The Congress of the Mayors of Canada is being held at Hamilton at the present time. There is a report that the Mayor of Shawinigan Falls declared there that the civic authorities should cease to worry the Federal and Provincial Governments by asking for money and begin to tax property owners in earnest.

On hearing the news, the Social Crediters sent a telegram immediately to protest, addressed to Mayor Hardy. Copies of this telegram were sent to the Secretary of the Congress of Mayors and the Municipalities.

The telegram in question ran as follows:

"Social Crediters of the whole of Canada protest against your statement that you mean to tax property owners. You do not represent the opinion of the citizens of Shawinigan or the rest of the country."

The telegram was signed by Gilberte Côte-Mercier.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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 and Editorial:* 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.
Telephone: Belfast 27810.

*Note: The above rates cover subscription to *Voice*, appearing fortnightly in alternate weeks with *The Social Crediter*.

From Week to Week

The *Sunday Pictorial*, September 28, 1956, publishes a report of a plan which it attributes to Mr. Charles Geddes, leader of the Postmen's Union.

The plan is stated to be that:

"Unions should get together to make a co-ordinated claim for price cuts instead of pay increase;

"Every time productivity in an industry goes up, then, by joint agreement, prices must come down."

The document embodying Mr. Geddes's plan is said to be in the hands of the T.U.C. Council.

Writing in 1939, Major Douglas stated as one of the true, as against the ostensible aims of the war, the return of Palestine to the Jews and the establishment of Palestine as the headquarters of world political control; and in 1944, he wrote, in *The Brief for the Prosecution, as follows:*

"Zionism is something very different to a simple scheme for the return of the Jews to Palestine. That is incidental to the moulding of events and Governments to procure a World Dominion for 'Israel.' The objective involves a perfectly clear, coherent, and continuous policy on the part of Zionists. The conditions for successive and major crises must be created and maintained in the world; the means required to deal with each crisis as it arises must be in the hands of Zionist Jews, directly or indirectly: and the use of these means must only be granted to the highest bidder in the surrender of power or the guarantee of its use in the interests of Jewry. In the past the control of money, gold and credit has been the primary weapon of the Zionist.

"But the money myth has been exploded; and legal control of raw materials is essential to the pursuit of the policy to a final and successful issue. . . ."

With this in mind, consider the "legal control" of Persian oil obtained by 'American' oil interests. And consider Suez.

'America' three years ago helped to put Colonel Nasser in power; 'America' supported the Aswan scheme; 'America' suddenly withdrew that support—all nicely arranged after

the withdrawal, to please 'America,' of the British troops from the Canal Zone; and all nicely timed when 'America' can't do anything because it is election year. Yet Mr. Dulles seems able to put his foot in it whenever there appears to be any chance of any sort of settlement of the dispute.

A chapter of 'accidents'? We do not think so. Nor would we care to be in Colonel Nasser's shoes.

"Now, in the middle of the twentieth century, that situation has been produced which is propitious for the completion of the revolution of destruction, with its attendant results of depopulation, deportation and death. Two volcanoes have been built, one in Europe and one in Arabia, which can be set in eruption at any time. The power of secret men over politicians has been repeatedly proved in the events leading to this situation. Now it extends to nations, or at any rate to those who claim to speak for them. The decision, by large majority vote, of 'The United Nations' to resume the armed invasion of Arabia is unique in history. It cannot in my judgment be further doubted that, if and when either or both of these eruptions are begun, different purposes will again be pursued, behind the flame and smoke, from those which would be publicly announced."—Douglas Reed, *From Smoke to Smother*, 1948.

Mr. George Schwartz (*Sunday Times*, October 14, 1956) estimates the combined incomes of Socialist voters as some £6,000 million annually, and makes the neat suggestion that a mere one *per cent.* of that would provide £60 million "for our distressed brethren overseas."

"Why doesn't the Socialist Party, instead of talking big, act big? If it wants to invest its one per cent. abroad, it needn't wait until it comes into power.

"Instead of talking about the 'obscene exhibition' in the City of London, why doesn't it go into the City and set a clean example? What is to prevent it setting up an issuing house in the City which would float loans for our depressed brethren in all lands? Come on! Keir Hardie and Co., Paid-up capital £5 million, backed by the goodwill and credit of 12 million sturdy Britons. It could start off with a bang with its first issue of £30 million for the Aswan Dam, underwritten by the T.U.C. Lists opened at 10.00 a.m., closed at 10.01 a.m. Surely no overseas country would default on such an establishment and rook subscribers prepared to back six away to win. It would be denounced as sacrilege, and, worse than that, an affront to dear old Jim."

Mr. Colin Clark, an Economist of Repute, makes an obituary notice on the late Professor Soddy in *The Tablet*, October 13, 1956, the occasion for display of his own scientific erudition combined with a review of his own notions of Social Credit. "By making an elementary error in his accounts [!], he [Douglas] thought he had demonstrated that the productive capacity of all machinery was many times greater than the product which we in fact obtained from it. . . ." Now what would the late H. W. Fowler have thought of that? The inexactitudes of Reputable Economics extend further than we thought.

Moral Relativity

“UNDETERRED BY THE FACT THAT HUMAN INDIVIDUALS HAVE WITH ALMOST MONOTONOUS REGULARITY INDULGED DESIRES AND FOLLOWED AFTER ENDS WHICH THE MORAL CODE REPROBATED, UPHOLDERS OF THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN HAVE CONDEMNED THESE DESIRES AND OBJECTIVES AS EVIL, AND IT IS ONLY WITHIN THE PRESENT CENTURY THAT A CONSIDERABLE BODY OF OPINION HAS OPENLY VOICED THE SUGGESTION THAT IT WAS PERHAPS THE REPROBATION AND NOT THE HUMAN NATURE WHICH WAS IN ERROR. BELIEF IN THE ABSOLUTE NATURE OF SIN HAS BEEN REPLACED BY WHAT CAN BE DESCRIBED AS A MORAL RELATIVITY, AND THE ADJECTIVES GOOD AND BAD ARE TAKING ON A MEANING THAT CAN BE BETTER EXPRESSED AS SUITABLE AND UNSUITABLE.”

—C. H. Douglas in *The Monopoly of Credit* (p. 7.)

The above is a truly remarkable statement, appearing within the first few pages of what Douglas regarded as his final and most comprehensive assessment, both technical and philosophic, of the position taken up by him and his followers in respect of society in general, in conjunction with its system of finance. Every line of it is packed close with meaning in Douglas's exact, engineering style. Its main target is, of course, orthodox rigidity; in less polite terms, vested interest in the mental sense. No human doctrine, which is a relative transcription, is correct or suitable for all time; if it were, it would not be human. Its virtue is in fact defined by its willingness and ability to adjust itself to the relative truth, which is fluid, dynamic, a flow. Einstein with his mathematical demonstraton of Relativity; of the fact that two plus two does not make four under all conditions, and that what he termed “the observer” cannot be safely excluded from his own observations—or, we might add, the Creator, from his own creation—did in fact blow all dogmatic orthodoxies sky-high, moral as well as economic. In regard to this particular detonation, which officially took place in 1915, when Albert Einstein first published his calculations, few, if any, heard the noise. Speaking here for his own followers as well as himself, Douglas concludes this passage with one of those rare glances which he permitted himself. “Not only do we desire a new earth, but we conceive of a new heaven, in which state concepts have no place.” In fact, the ever-present Kingdom envisaged by the Founder of Christianity himself. This is the plane of advanced thought to which all healthy intelligences must, and naturally do aspire; where the individual is relatively free, and in comparative possession of his own mind at whatever intellectual level he may have attained to, and enjoys the essential liberty to choose or refuse one thing at a time. Over against this encouraging prospect, we, as a movement, appear always to be confronted by the fact of our own uncoveted uniqueness. Not understanding the secret of our own faith, we have lacked any practical answer as to why an outlook, appearing so naturally and Christianly compelling to a comparatively few, by no means exceptionally endowed individuals, belonging to no particular class, or type, or area, but thinly scattered over the whole of the English-speaking world, should have no appeal whatsoever for the great majority to whom it was expounded.

It is true, we appeal to reason, not to emotion, and we demand a voluntary contribution of faith, based on a natural bias in favour of factuality and commonsense. But in an age calling itself “scientific,” in which all higher education is, in theory at least, one hundred per cent. materialistic,

and where the church-going population is a very small percentage, one might have supposed the average individual would be ripe to welcome such an appeal. Or if it is true that man must have forms (formulae, formalism) on this relative plane of consciousness, as seems inevitable since without them we could not think and so act, then I know of no fool-proof formula for successful living, no relatively infallible test by which we may judge the correctness of any course, other than that of the indivisibility of Truth and Goodness. To bring the matter down to the plane of practical politics; factuality (relative truth) is the essential foundation for every kind of satisfactory achievement.

I put this forward then, very diffidently as a possible explanation of his own relative confidence in face of the overwhelming implications of what we have grasped from Douglas. For it is not improbable that by a process of negative reasoning, back from an appreciation of the cause of our confirmed confidence, we may discover the clue to a better approach to the incredulous. Might it not be this: that having assured ourselves, on the basis of the above formula, as to the relatively disinterested nature of Douglas's investigation of the current operation of the financial system, we are by that fact automatically reassured as to the benefits to be gained by the correction of the serious defects revealed. Unlike the superstitious citizens of Athens, honouring their Unknown God, the object of our faith is known to us, not dogmatically but reflected in a relative form, or formal working Principle, that comprehends the indivisibility of Truth and Goodness, and of which we have actual experience. “Action and reaction are equal and opposite.” As Douglas has said, “That is good which works”; or that works which is good.

Now, to translate what I have been trying to say as to the reason for this unwelcome “difference” between the followers of Douglas and the vast majority of their neighbours, who, if they regarded the matter at all, would no doubt attribute it to the Social Crediter's lack of common caution, if not commonsense—to translate that from dialectical, into metaphorical form. Might it not be this: that we, by holding tightly on to this single, simple article of Christian faith, like a shipwrecked crew on to a raft, have been drifted ashore, *i.e.*, to a firm foothold and a consequent confidence and absence of panic, as it seems, fortuitously and with no further effort on our part, but in fact by the operation of an irresistible law, linking together these two phenomena of relative truth and goodness? If the above is even approximately correct, what emerges from it is the fact that there is no external, objective condemnation, which is

without a way of escape. Man is only self-condemned. He holds the key to his own cell; as who should know better than we, with our understanding of the gift of potential plenty and leisure, and of how it is being wilfully sabotaged. When Douglas, referring to the Calvinistic moralist's adverse judgment—his reprobation of human nature—suggests that "it was perhaps the reprobation and not the human nature which was in error," continued; "Belief in the absolute nature of sin has been replaced by what can be described as a moral relativity . . ." it seems to me he made it perfectly clear that he found himself unable to identify any such absolute "thing" as sin. He would agree, I think that if any approximation to it exists, it was to be found in the deliberate ignorance of personally unwelcome facts; in which the moralist defenders of orthodoxy, ecclesiastic no less than economic, are the chief offenders.

Douglas has warned his generation of the impending collapse of the financial system as it exists, due to the malignant growth at its vitals. During his lifetime, and with his help, we strove to make society aware of the need of what appears to us the relatively simple operation (as indeed it is) recommended by Douglas. But one wonders if we sufficiently understood the extent of the psychological change-over that had already taken place within ourselves, to give us the confidence of our convictions. It wasn't the beauty and technical perfection of the Douglas proposals, as so many of us thought, that was the deciding factor in our immediate adherence, but their oppositeness to the philosophical policy which was already ours, as a result of some previous event in our experience. It is not unreasonable to suppose that some equivalent must take place in the social climate before our ideas become generally acceptable. Douglas, himself, said in reply to a somewhat naive inquiry as to what, in his opinion, would bring about Social Credit, that it would be "events." Obviously we are just a part of this great abstraction that has gripped modern society, the impact of which no individual nor institution can hope to avoid; though it is by no means unlikely that we may find ourselves in the van of whatever is taking place, by virtue of Douglas's altogether exceptional prescience. Seen from this angle the world-situation suggests a great psychological upheaval, caused by the effort to bring to the surface what has hitherto been instinctive; to bring it up in to the light of intellectual consciousness. It would be useless to attempt to oppose such a movement; our policy should be to assist and at the same time to deflect in the direction of our understanding of things.

This is the change-over in moral relativity, with its substitution of faith, relative truth, as our guide in all things, in place of the current absolute moral code, so rapidly losing all authority and respect. It is to this wider prospect that we must begin to accustom our minds, if we are to be in a position to give Douglas's great achievement its rightful place in the tremendous adjustments that are already taking place. It won't be easy, for mental revolutions are not achieved without considerable labour, birth-pangs, in fact; the pains of re-naissance. For what to Douglas and his followers appears as, "not only a new earth but a new heaven," in the light of our transformed values, will present a most distasteful, not to say humiliating prospect, to those who, in spite of all the signs to the contrary, still cherish intellectual pretensions in regard to what is good for their neighbours.

For as long as they are able, they will ridicule and condemn any idea to the contrary as a reactionary philosophy of the second-best and the make-shift. But to the realist, a genuine make-shift—and my metaphorical raft, which has proved our individual salvation, is that: something substantial and buoyant to hold on to in the general turmoil—is infinitely to be preferred to the most perfect abstraction.

It would seem then, that as Social Creditors we owe our comparative confidence, and particularly our release from the Calvinistic pessimism and suspicion regarding humanity in general, which is the conspicuous feature of the age, to the happy identification of relative truth and relative goodness—relative means and ends—which is the simple basis of our understanding of what Douglas had to teach us. There is obviously very much more than that to be learned. But as a start, that is no small amount, and, in fact, what may be said to constitute a Social Crediter; for lacking that, there is no such experience as Social Credit to be had. It marks the "difference" about which we have been exercising ourselves here. This is *moral relativity*, Douglas's glimpse, or vision, of a world of relative reality; of real association, and real knowledge, and real forms, and last but not least, real wealth—Economic Realism, as the sub-heading of this journal has it—which Christianity, the cult of Truth, holds in readiness to reveal to society as soon as it really wants it. The Social Crediter's faith, which is the identification within his individual mind of philosophy and policy, ends and means, consists in his understanding of its feasibility; his confidence in the realisability of that vision here and now, in time and space, just as soon as we are ready to accept it in a relative form. You will see, if you will examine it carefully, what a complete and perfect combination that makes; indeed, a real trinitarian cohesion of philosophy, policy, and method, achieved by that truly catalytic term relativity.

NORMAN WEBB.

" . . NEITHER DO THEY SPIN . . "

by

BRYAN W. MONAHAN

World Copyright Reserved

Published by

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
LINCOLN CHAMBERS,
11, GARFIELD STREET,
BELFAST, N. IRELAND.

ONE SHILLING