

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 42, No. 7

SATURDAY, JULY 21, 1962

6d. Fortnightly

"O MIGHTY CAESAR . . ."

We reproduce the following by permission from "Intelligence Digest" for June, 1962. Widely distributed in monthly instalments to subscribers only under this title, this review of world affairs covers a wide field.

If it is true, as the American Charles Ferguson asserted in "Revolution Absolute", that "control of credit and control of the news are concentric", "Intelligence Digest" is influential enough and informative enough to rank for 'concentric' control. On the surface (not much deeper down), this consideration might cause the unwary to view with surprise some at least of the statements the article contains. We make only a brief comment:—

(1) The article is, in our opinion, nearer the truth than other efforts which have been made to define The Establishment realistically, (2) The various statements made do not cohere perfectly, and (3) concerning H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh, the very great energy devoted by Prince Philip to propaganda on behalf of the unrestrained expansion of Science and Industry as an intelligible end in itself does not seem to us to argue any high degree of separation from "The Establishment". The opinion expressed in the article that a major transformation is due and impending is noteworthy. But (and this does not necessarily bear upon the "Digest" but is a general warning) timeo Danaos et dona ferentes. Before this world of ours is restored to any satisfactory measure of civilisation, we shall see quite a few gift-bearing Greeks about. We note, without comment, the absence of reference to the resolute adhesion of the 'Catholic' (Anglican and Roman) hierarchies to The Establishment though two Anglican prelates are mentioned as not being in it. The dissenting sects probably do not qualify for consideration either way. Yes, indeed: "O Mighty Caesar!"

Millions of words have been written about the Establishment in Britain in the last ten years. Recently a half serious, half facetious article has appeared in the American magazine *Esquire* (May issue), about the American Establishment. It was fetching and quite important.

But what is the truth about the Establishment?

For as long as the human race has lived, all communities have been influenced by an Establishment. It has always existed, it always decays, it always endures by replacement. Its characteristics never change. While it is true that, in a sense, the Establishment always finally prevails, it is never quite the same Establishment. It is an Establishment which survives.

The story is always this:

A leader or group rises to power; he or it collects around

himself or itself servants who beget other servants. As time goes on the vested interest of these servants becomes greater and greater. They make policy, and the policies made are often faulty.

The supreme need of the servants (like that of the master) is to cover up those mistakes and to survive them. To achieve this, every device is employed and towards the end of a phase very dangerous devices are used because the situation becomes more desperate.

Always, at a certain point, intelligent people not in the Establishment and being clear of any obligation towards it, observe the mistakes made, the cover-up, and the devices. They revolt. The Establishment, sensing defeat, reacts—and always reacts with increasing rear until finally its doings become so unwise that the critics get their chance to strike.

They then become the power and regenerate the Establishment.

Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.* The more powerful a leader or Government, the more he or it needs servants and the more prone he, it, and they are to corruption. The more prone, the more certain is reaction or revolt. It is a constant, consistent story of reaction and revolt and the return thereafter of an Establishment.

TIRED ESTABLISHMENTS

Somewhat tired Establishments exist now in America and Britain, because the last real upheavals occurred a long time ago in both countries. Consequently, the ruling system has had plenty of time to make many mistakes and there is more and more cover-up. The last great upheaval in America was the Civil War. The last great upheaval in Britain was the Reform Bill.

It so happens that during this period Governments have been faced with the most serious issues in recorded history and the Establishment well knows that if ever the critics prevail it will be a serious matter indeed. The mistakes have led to nuclear weapons and world-wide Communism. Let the critics really be heard and the Establishment would be on the political gallows. It knows this.

It is therefore engaged in a desperate effort, employing every possible device to keep the critics silent and to find some means—any means—to justify what has been done. The supreme mistakes arise, of course, from certain actions and policies in the two world wars—actions which made Communism, helped and aided it, and created the nuclear problem.

(continued on page 3)

* Lord Acton (1834-1902). Letter in *Life of Mandell Creighton* (1904) 1.372.

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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices—*Business:* 9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: *Stratford-on-Avon* 3976.

Editorial: PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON N.W.1. Telephone: *EUSon* 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business—Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Editorial—Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones. Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36 Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1. (Telephone: *EUSon* 3893). Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420 Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O. Sydney, N.S.W.

Greek to You ?

"We are all in Bed together, but we can choose what we are going to do about it. Some may be a good fit: when Productivity says 'work', they work; when Consumption says 'buy' they buy; when The Radio says 'laugh', they laugh. These people do not want to be freed; once their stumps are healed they enjoy their sleep. Others may suffer themselves to be mutilated or compressed or deformed by the rattling busyness of the technological machinery.

"But for some, there may come the spirit of Theseus to give courage to resist. Theseus had as well the wit to see that Procrustes had a substantial treasure, which when distributed to the local inhabitants of the countryside could give them a better and more enjoyable life. No one of us may be a full-blown hero like Theseus, capable of killing the wicked Procrustes outright, but if we club together some of us may at least give him a fright and even wake up a few of the sleepers as well."

—Magnus Pyke: "*The Science Myth*".
John Murray, 18/-. 1962.

Book Review

Unless he is familiar with the sea and knows how to assess its powers and its mysteries, a man standing on a sea-shore is often quite unable to determine whether a tide is ebbing or flowing. With the catastrophic changes of the tremendous Present, no one can claim familiarity. The times are apocalyptic. Hundreds if not thousands of tons of 'print' vomit from the presses, purporting to deal with the ebb and flow of the

tides of our history. What effect has this mass of printing matter on the minds of us all? Yes, *all*: Social Crediters admitted 'free of charge'! Much? Any? None?

One effect which it may be possible to identify is the prophylactic effect—or more correctly the immunisation effect. Exposure to small doses of the Truth establishes tolerance. Tolerance improves resistance. Truth is disarmed. The Englishman 'laughs it off'. In fact, of course, he has laughed it *on*, not *off*! The evil which Truth opposes is henceforth not banished but here to stay and be lived with.

These considerations occur to us after reading a book dedicated "To Guy Boas, Sir Jack Drummond and my Wife by all of whom I have been moulded." It is "affectionately" so dedicated—so we should think! To have been so moulded is something to write home about. The moulded is Magnus Pyke and his book, published by John Murray at 18/- net, is called "The Science Myth". The wise counsellor who persuaded us to read it told us that "though popularly written it is important". It is. Well, does it banish or immunise? Honestly, we do not know. Dimly, we see signs—"O Mighty Caesar", the spate of Orpingtons, the increasing uneasiness of even that preposterous sheet *The Times*, the comical antics of Her Majesty's 'Ministers'—of what? Reaction to inoculation? The 'healthy' reaction which promises 'immunity'? The 'venomous' bite of the Serpent of Truth? The mortal thrust of the Sword? No: we cannot say. Alas! But, read it, the book.

The Prince of this World

London, July 1, 1962.

Dear Sir,

On a number of occasions in his addresses and writings Douglas describes the conspiracy which threatens to subjugate the world as "diabolical". His use of this adjective is no accident.

In the Protocols of Zion (III. 9.) we read: "When the hour strikes for our Sovereign Lord of all the World to be crowned, it is these same hands which will sweep away everything that might be a hindrance thereto." It is therefore not without significance that Jesus Christ refers to the Lord or Prince of this World as the Devil, "and in me he hath not anything." (St. John Ch. 14 v. 30).

The authors of the Protocols also make it quite clear that their arch-enemy is the Papacy (XV. 3 and XVII. 3 and 4). In this connection it is interesting to quote from a private letter which Douglas wrote on 21st September 1946 and which has not previously been published: "While I am not formally a member of the Church of Rome, I am coming to believe that it more nearly represents a Christian social order than any other. . . Also for a long time I have felt that there is no organisation of which I have knowledge which has the experience and influence to deal with the terrific and worsening world in which we find ourselves other than the Catholic Church. . . The derivations of Social Credit ideas are largely inductive, but as always happens when inductive processes begin to form a pattern, one looks for a frame. I hope and believe that that frame has proved to be Christianity."

At the risk of labouring the point, it is also worth quoting from the last page of "The Elements of Social Credit" the remark once made to Douglas by a priest of one of the great Orders of the Church: "You know, WE know that what men call the Sins of the world are not of much greater consequence than the pimples on a man's face. But behind all that there is a diabolical wickedness which will take all your time, and us all our time to surmount."

If, as all the evidence strongly suggests, it is the Lord of this world and his servants whom we are fighting, then it is reasonable to suppose that our practical efforts to expose the devilment of which the world is a victim may be furthered by resorting to the "Sword of the Spirit". In other words we might with advantage try the additional weapon of private prayer. There is ample inductive evidence to indicate that the Lord of this World has an intense dislike and fear of it.

This advice is offered entirely in the spirit that Douglas himself would have offered it. No one need accept the advice: anyone is free to contract out. But no one will lose anything by trying it. The simpler and more fervent the prayer is, the more effective it will be.

Yours, etc.,

A. F. JOSLIN.

Note

Yes. It will be noticed that the sentences quoted by our correspondent from Douglas's letter of 1945 were, as always with Douglas, very carefully phrased. While four different substantives are used 'Church of Rome', 'Catholic Church', 'organisation', 'Christianity'—these are very far from being synonymous, and thus justify the attribution to them of functions not only different in themselves but capable of dissociation. Another point which should not pass unnoticed is the date of Douglas's letter. During the second world war, the pronouncements emanating from the Vatican, discretionary or *ex cathedra*, did indeed "deal with the terrific and worsening world in which we find ourselves." Now, sixteen years after Douglas wrote his letter, that world is more capable of inspiring terror than it was even then, and is still 'worsening' almost hourly. It is a matter of opinion whether, in face of this predicament, the Church acts steadfastly more effectively or less effectually than it did. Its difficulty is evident—almost palpable—Caesar! God? Caesar? Which is which? What things *are* Caesar's? What things are God's? At every step which Caesar takes to claim Authority (which is a thing neither distributable nor destructible) the Church, embarrassed perhaps by an ambiguity latent in its own claims, seems to retreat instead of advancing. It was not the present Pope but, we believe, the last, who complained that much that he said, and much that was important, either fell on deaf ears or was obliterated by other voices audible to his flock and thus never fell anywhere at all. A great and adored teacher of the writer of this note once told him: "It is useless to speak of advancing Truth in the abstract: what you need to do is to uncover Truth in the here and now, as it comes to your experience." Let the Sword of the Spirit be tempered and sharpened and made—"... bright, broad and trenchant; yea, and seven spans from hilt to point, O Lord!"*

* William Morris: *Rapunzel*.

"O MIGHTY CAESAR..."

(continued from page 1)

The Establishment is therefore drawn together in a supreme effort to avert discovery and the pay-off. To admit the cure is inevitably to admit the crime. Thus, the cure cannot be undertaken. It would involve explanations which would destroy the Establishment responsible for the disease.

HISTORIC MISTAKES

Ninety per cent. of the stupid policy actions now evident are not due to Communist agents in our midst but to a cover-up by those who dare not admit their part in the errors committed.

A list of some Establishment mistakes is worth looking at. One led to another.

1. In 1917, the German Imperial General Staff, desperate to cover up its mistakes, used Lenin to destroy Russia.

2. In 1917, the British Establishment, having made reckless concessions to leftism, dared not make separate peace with Austria even though to do so would save tens of thousands of lives and would perhaps have averted the rise of Nazism.

3. In World War II, having to make good its neglect of defence between the wars, having failed to face the facts about France and the Little Entente, having landed itself in a wholly needless war (itself having been responsible for the rise of Hitler), and believing that a face-saving victory could be got only with Russian aid, it made the surrenders to Russia which have caused the present world crisis.

And so on.

Now, any effective policy to avert World War III involves telling the public the whole truth and that would involve the fall of the present Establishments and the rise of new political forces. Thus, the truth cannot be told. Thus, we have a huge cover-up. It will, of course, fail.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS

What are the chief characteristics of an Establishment?

It detests anything or anybody which pre-dates it. It is progressively unwise. It adheres to an outward form of integrity but will accept, excuse, and cover up gross lapses if they involve the Establishment.

As power slips, it loves power more. It tolerates non-Establishment manifestation, however violent, which does not really challenge the Establishment as such.

Lord Beaverbrook, for example, has never been of the Establishment, but he has always been tolerated even when apparently attacking the very leaders of it. Why? Because, despite all his crusading, he has never really challenged the basic record of the Establishment as such. That is to say he has never attempted to uncover what the Establishment dreads.

He has attacked the Establishment's tactics but not its fundamental historic role. Those who have cannot be named, because they were obliterated and their names would mean nothing to the reader.

Above all, however, towards its climax the Establishment hates two things—the old religion (whatever it may be or

have been) and persons springing from uncorrupted historic families which pre-date the existing Establishment. The hatred of these two forces is always bitter and profound. The Court of Henry III loathed Simon de Montfort.

POSTPONING EXECUTION

The strange thing is that any Establishment can think it will escape the inevitable doom which awaits all Establishments. But it tries to postpone the date of execution. Yet part—the best part—of the Establishment projects itself into the next chapter and thus there is continuity. This is very important. An Establishment is seldom wholly corrupt.

In Britain we are moving towards the end of an epoch. We are at the end of the life of the present Establishment. Being at the end, we can observe some very odd things. The Establishment has tried to revive itself by recruiting, so we can see some odd faces here and there.

Occasionally, we see an Establishment man trying to put half a foot in the new camp. Establishment loyalties are not quite as strong as they were in some ways, yet stronger in others.

IN A PANIC

Thus, we see contrasts. Lord Salisbury leaves a Government and becomes patron of the Monday Club. At the other extreme we see the entire Establishment in a panic lest Burgess and Maclean come home, and every penny that can be sent to Moscow to keep them in comfort is sent. Even writs are issued to keep them away.

Burgess and Maclean could, if they wished, blow the Establishment sky high. Whitehall trembles at the dreadful thought of what they could say. And, if not provided for, they would tell all.

There is very little difference between the Establishment situation in Britain and in America. In both cases the object is the same—cover up mistakes in the hope that on this occasion history will make an exception and an alibi can be arranged.

THE RESURGENT GROUPS

This Service suggests that none will be. We suggest that the events fostered by the mistakes of the Establishment cannot now be stopped from developing into consequences, and those consequences will arouse great waves of public opinion and that opinion will hoist new men into power who will not only wish, but be forced, to reform the Establishment.

Notice, however, that an Establishment always continues. It is only an opposition which, having done its work, wholly disappears.

The present resurgent groups in both America and Britain tend to think that the Establishment is so powerful that it will wreck the world before it can be reformed. We doubt that. It is more frightened than powerful these days.

There is, however, the extreme danger that while America and Britain experience these pangs, a powerful and still youthful Communism may step in. That is the danger. The resurgents have to fight on two fronts—against this dying Establishment and against a vigorous, young Communism. That requires every ounce of energy and resource.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES

Another interesting characteristic of the Establishment is

that it contains a certain number of people who venture into intellectual, but not active, explorations across the line. You can find plenty of young personal assistants in the Establishment like that. You can find Cabinet Ministers too. Mr. R. A. Butler is one. He never goes beyond that point and will therefore never be fully accepted by the reaction. And at the same time, he is on nodding terms with it and is not appalled by it.

Perhaps historically he has less to fear. Mr. Butler's war record has still to be written. He had more vision than 99 per cent. of the Government of the day. He was convinced, however, that his vision was a premature political inconvenience and he stayed in the Establishment while making sure that when the story is written it will not exclude what he foresaw.

Then you have Lord Hailsham, who is not part of the Establishment though a member of the Government. He is an unusual case. He probably foresaw much less than Mr. Butler, but he has emotions exceeding those of Mr. Butler.

It is important to remember that the Establishment is both a ghost and unreal and yet is a very serious thing and wholly real. It is perhaps a psychological condition rather than anything else and a condition to which one must be prone in order to gain acceptance by persons who are responsible for actions and slants which have governed or do govern great affairs.

UNCONDITIONAL PARTS

If one were forced to be precise, one would say that the following are unconditional parts of the Establishment:

1. Senior Civil Servants (all).
2. The Court staff, but by no means all members of the Royal Family.
3. The Cabinet Secretaries.
4. Most Bankers.
5. All Issue Houses.
6. Most leading law firms and many leading Counsel.
7. Twenty-five per cent. of stock-broking firms.
8. Twenty per cent. of all the larger industries.
9. Ninety-nine per cent. of Public School Headmasters.

Like the author of the *Esquire* article, we think that still more interesting is a typical list of those in Britain not in the Establishment:

1. The Dukes of Edinburgh and Windsor.
2. The Archbishop of York.
3. Lord Hailsham.
4. Lord Hankey (ex-Secretary of the Cabinet).
5. Mr. Paul Bristol (Monday Club).
6. Sir Walter Benton-Jones (President, United Steel Co.).
7. The Dean of Windsor.†
8. The Editor of the *Sunday Telegraph*.
9. Field Marshall Montgomery.
10. Sir Tom O'Brien (former President of the T.U.C.).

(To be concluded)

† The late Dean of Windsor who died on May 21—after this report was written.