

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 42, No. 8

SATURDAY, AUGUST 4, 1962

6d. Fortnightly

### "O MIGHTY CAESAR . . ."

*We conclude the article re-published by permission from "Intelligence Digest" for June 1962. The first part appeared in our last issue prefaced by our comments.*

#### THE QUEEN

A very important factor is that the Queen is wholly apart from the Establishment. She is surrounded by the Establishment but is not politically or psychologically a part of it. She is a link with the past and correct towards the present. She is by no means a convinced believer in the infallibility of the Establishment.

It would be a great mistake to think of her as the summit of the existing Establishment. She is rather the expression of the nation as the nation would like to be but is not. There are many signs to suggest that she will personally become institutional; but that is quite different from being the expression of the Establishment. She may well see further than almost anyone else at present. She may well be aware that an epoch and its Establishment are moving towards their close.

It is possible that the Royal Family as such is slowly moving into a position very often occupied before—*viz.* less powerful than, say, in Victorian times. *But the Sovereign is involved in no such change.* Far from it. The Sovereign may well be moving in the opposite direction—towards far greater prestige, apartness, and influence than many yet imagine.

Apartness and oneness are the sense of Monarchy (and it is for that the Coronation service provides). The difference between the Queen (who represents both an age-long concept and a yet unachieved mission) and a dying Establishment is important. It is an absolute difference. A great gulf exists. She may see further than the nation, but she seldom moves at a faster or slower pace than her people—or only very slightly faster or slower as the case may be. The fractional difference in pace can be decisive.

#### TWO VIEWS OF THE MONARCHY

There have been two popular views of the Monarchy. One has been that the Sovereign belongs to the nation; the other that the nation belongs to the Sovereign. Neither is correct. Sovereign and nation belong to God. The Sovereign is not the servant of the nation, but of God.

A nation may become Godless. A God-fearing Sovereign cannot, without surrendering God's authority, accept the dictates of a nation which has the intention of flouting Divine Law. Furthermore, a Sovereign who flouts Divine Law and exploits a nation is eventually rejected by God.

Thus, although the Sovereign is of very great importance, he or she has no automatic rights. Like everyone else, his or her authority is governed by conditions which, if flouted, will mean eventual disaster. In Britain, the Sovereign has very often been extremely God-fearing and for the last 150 years this characteristic has been pronounced for the greater part of the time.

#### A SPIRITUAL GULF

It is strange that this has been accompanied by a devolution in the nation's attitude towards spiritual things. There is now a very wide gulf indeed between the convictions of Sovereign and nation. Nonetheless, the nation derives a certain satisfaction from the Queen's religious observance. It is looked upon as a possible safeguard—harmless at the worst, of future value at the best.

About ninety per cent. of the Establishment in Britain is agnostic. (In America, about thirty per cent.). Of the ten per cent. which is not, some five per cent. is actively practising. The ninety per cent. does not object to the ten per cent. provided that belief is not militant. The really activist churchman is considered mildly odd.

The ninety per cent. contains about five per cent. of really strong atheists. This group contains the more dangerous Communists, homosexuals, and other subversive or potentially subversive elements.

#### MAJOR OPPOSITIONS

In British history there have been relatively few major oppositions to the Establishment. The most important have been:

1. That of the Barons under Stephen Langton.
2. That of the Barons under Simon de Montfort.
3. That of Parliament against Charles I—continuing at intervals until the accession of George I.
4. That of the masses, starting before the Reform Bill, up to 1921.
5. That of the Labour Party, which arose from (4) and derived power therefrom.

The strange thing is that the last of these oppositions encountered less resistance than any of the others, because Establishment and opposition made far-reaching compromises. The changes brought about by the Socialists were nothing like so basic as those which were inherent in the actions of the Parliamentarians or the Reformists.

(continued in column 2 overleaf)

# 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.

## The Middle Ages

"This grossly inaccurate conception of the Middle Ages (as Totalitarian monarchies) is deeply embedded in the unlettered, whom it serves as a convenient starting-point.

"There is not a word of truth in all this. Let us remember, without at the moment stressing it, that Power was shared in the mediæval times (with the *Curia Regis*), limited by other authorities which were in their own sphere autonomous, and that, above all, it was not sovereign."

—Bertrand de Jouvenel: *Power, its natural history and growth*, p. 35.

## A. H. M.

It is with the deepest regret that we record the death at his home in Jersey of Arthur Hamilton MacIntyre, C.A., an active Social Crediter from the earliest days and one of the earliest recruits to the group of Social Crediters formed in Glasgow by Mr. H. M. Murray.

Typically a west of Scotland man, shrewd, kindly, straightforward and balanced, he was already a professional chartered accountant and partner in a Glasgow firm of accountants when *The New Age* first introduced him to Douglas's ideas, qualifications which made his contribution particularly valuable. Absolutely fearless, he wrote and spoke with effect, and rendered invaluable service in helping Scottish Social Crediters to avoid the pitfalls of under-estimation of the enemy and to keep their feet, where his were, on the ground. His mastery of Social Credit principles was complete, his exposition clear, totally unspoiled by display

or 'enthusiasm' and correspondingly impressive in the best sense—just as Douglas thought it should be. Since his retirement, Mr. and Mrs. MacIntyre had made their home in Jersey.

For the moment, a volume of cuttings from a wide variety of sources recording his earlier work is not available for study, but memorable are his masterly treatment of the Mining Industry at the time of its crisis and the outstanding "False Balance Sheet of the Budget" published by *The Free Man*, a journal as famous in Scotland as *The New Age* was at one time in England. Chapter XV of the *Elements of Social Credit*, on "Bookkeeping", signed with MacIntyre's familiar initials, was from his pen. The chapter illustrates his style and methods to a nicety.

If "Mac" needs an epitaph other than the gracious memories he has left in the hearts of many friends, it might well be the words, which record a matter of fact and knowledge: "Douglas thought well of him".

*The Social Crediter* extends its warm sympathy to Mrs. MacIntyre in her personal loss.

### "Whose Service is Perfect Freedom"

by C. H. Douglas

5/-

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
9 AVENUE RD., STRATFORD-ON-AVON, WARWICKS

"O MIGHTY CAESAR..."

(continued from page 1)

The Socialists and the Establishment having come to terms, nothing really drastic occurred. There was no definite or precise change. Since the return to power of the Conservatives, the trend towards disengagement from an Imperial role, the Socialism of outlook, the entrenchment of materialism, and the attempt to seek a compromise with Communist thinking have become even more pronounced.

Thus, both the large political parties are involved with the Establishment in an attempt to survive. A real opposition does not yet exist. Nevertheless, a large part of the British public is in a mood of opposition to something which it cannot fully explain or pinpoint. This finds partial expression in the Liberal vote.

### WHY A REVOLT?

But against what is the British public in revolt? The Welfare State? But, surely, the public wants all it can get?

Imperial disengagement? But was the public ready to maintain an Empire?

Appeasement of the Communist bloc? But is it not true that the British public wants peace at almost any price?

A somewhat irreligious Government? But is not the public more irreligious?

A sex-slant outlook? But is it not the public which puts sex at the very top of the list of priorities?

There can be no doubt that the answer is hard to discover. The public is in revolt, yet it adheres to many of the very slants which are characteristic of the Establishment.

#### THE CAUSE OF RESTLESSNESS

So what is it that is causing so much restlessness?

We think the answer is this:

The public is irreligious, but does not feel comfortable when the Establishment is also so. The public does like to be indulged, but knows it to be dangerous and would like to see a strong Government which was more realistic.

The public does fear war and does endorse appeasement, but is afraid this may be wrong and would like to see a Government which was brave enough to do and say what the public is afraid to do and say.

The public did not want to enforce Imperialism, but it does think the Government has gone much too far in surrender to bad men and people unready for self-Government and it expects the Government to be braver than itself.

The public does like a sexy slant to everything but does not think the Government should tolerate as much as it does.

#### LOST IN SPACE

Above all, the public has a secret fear that, its leaders having abandoned the great anchorages, ordinary men and women are somehow left to drift in a nameless, frightening experiment with time and space. The public has a dread fear that it is lost in space; that if its leaders do not know where we came from or where we are going, how should the public? Better to be led into some sort of positiveness than lured into a nameless lostness.

The public is suffering from wealth without substance; learning without knowledge; prolonged life without any spiritual basis. In fact, the British public is discovering that man cannot live by bread alone. It is discovering that something is lacking and it knows that its political parties perhaps lack what the country wants to an even greater extent than does the country.

Despite great prosperity the British public is aware that, in reality, what has been gained socially has not satisfied its aspirations. It cannot articulate; it cannot put this sense of lostness into words; it tends towards braveness but it knows that this sense of lostness amidst plenty is becoming a terror.

It knows that to vote Liberal bears not the remotest relationship to its problems or its anxieties. But it is something to do.

#### LOOKING FOR SPIRITUAL SECURITY

The British public is looking for an inspiration; for an explanation of life and death; for a purpose; for some system of thinking which provides real security. It now knows that social security alone is not the answer. It wants spiritual security.

The Establishment has no grasp of this problem at all. It is convinced that the public should learn the cult of self-

contentment, but the public cannot do what the human spirit does not permit.

Many political observers say that the present revolt is due to the irritation of the white-collar class over higher house mortgages, etc. This is very difficult to believe. The Conservative Government has generated the greatest prosperity ever known. The official Opposition is unpopular.

There is a far deeper reason for an otherwise incredible switch in votes and for all the dissatisfaction which can everywhere be felt. To ascribe this to some irritation over mortgage interest rates seems rather lame. The British public is inclined to be politically sober and would scarcely threaten to wreck a prosperity Government over a small matter.

#### THREE EVENTS

All in all, the evidence points towards a deep opinion-movement influenced by fundamental anxieties. This is, without doubt, increased by the persistent trend of events which demonstrates the fundamental errors in Establishment thinking. Three have occurred within the last month:

1. We were told that Russia was actively assisting the western powers in Laos. A compromise between local Communism and liberalism was possible. To achieve this we were told that we must stop giving active help to our undoubted friends.

Result? The usual one. You have seen it. The Establishment was wrong.

2. We were told that if we would show liberal understanding of African aspirations in Kenya, even if it involved compromise of principles, we should be rewarded.

Result? A strong Kenya mission to Russia and a sharp swing towards the Communist bloc.

3. We were told we should make compromises over Berlin. Russia was ready for a new era. We started talks.

Result? Total Russian rejection of the concessions offered, and the very split between the western Powers for which Russia has been striving for years.

#### THE CASE OF BOURNEMOUTH

Perhaps a constituency example of the sort of thing which has taken the spirit out of Conservative workers is worth giving.

At the time of Suez (an operation which seventy-five per cent. of the British public supported) the Conservative member for Bournemouth East and Christchurch turned against Eden. He was a Mr. Nigel Nicolson, a well-known Conservative left-winger. The local Conservative Party selected in his place a Major James Friend—an extremely capable Conservative of strong views. This selection received the official approval of the Conservative Central Office.

What then happens?

The son of the Conservative leader—Mr. Maurice Macmillan—goes down to speak against Major Friend. A campaign follows in which it is said that Major Friend had associations with the League of Empire Loyalists—a lively

but quite harmless right wing group which has lent some colour to politics and has certainly never done any harm to anyone. So Major Friend is kicked out—though why, no-one can explain.

An Establishment aspirant is then put in—a certain Mr. John Cordle—part owner of the *Church of England Newspaper*, of semi-Liberal slant.

What next? We find Mr. Cordle in Kenya, photographed with ex-Mau Mau leader Kenyatta and cabling the British Government to recommend that disgraceful man's release from house detention. He is released and is now leading Kenya toward tribal war and Communism.

Somewhat naturally, Bournemouth Conservatives tend to give up. They feel the forces of the Establishment too much for them. They see no further purpose in working for the Party.

Major Friend was the man they really wanted. But the Establishment would not have it. They got Mr. Cordle and Kenyatta is supported from what is supposed to be the most Conservative constituency in England.

#### OTHER FACTORS

What other sort of things trouble the public about the Establishment?

1. Parents were asked to sacrifice their boys' lives to save Cyprus from Archbishop Makarios. Many lives were given. Archbishop Makarios is now a Commonwealth Prime Minister. The whole operation was worthless.

2. We were asked to spend millions in Kenya against Mau Mau. The Mau Mau leader is now in virtual charge. If surrender was the intention, why not before rather than after the loss of life and treasure?

3. We were told that the Central African Federation was basic. We invested millions in that belief. Result . . . ?

4. We were told that in no circumstances would Britain allow the Suez Canal to be dominated by Nasser. It is. The effort, treasure, and anxiety were all to no purpose at all.

5. We were told that we must pull in our belts and stop wage increases. In fact, by threat of strike the dockers have got some 9½ per cent. rise (*de facto*). So (ask many) does it not pay to be unpatriotic?

The public thinks that the Government and Establishment drift from expedient to expedient and at this present time it would be hard to eradicate that impression. It is quite absurd to put the reaction down to house mortgage interest rates. Quite absurd.

Nevertheless, the Government has created the greatest prosperity on record. The fact that, despite this, there is a reaction is of great interest.

#### THE NUCLEAR WEAPON

In days gone by the errors of the Establishment mattered a great deal, but they were not directly linked with the supreme issues of existence or extermination. Now they are. The Establishment in all the great countries possesses absolute control of incredible nuclear weapons. One mistake and (humanly speaking) that will be that.

From the time this weapon came into our possession until today, a number of policy mistakes have been made. Not every act of policy was a mistake, but many have been. The situation is now such that there is no room for any further major mistakes at all. This is doubtless a reason why public opinion is disturbed and troubled and doubts if it should allow the Establishment unrestricted power.

British public opinion has a very uncomfortable feeling that the Establishment which has made so many mistakes could very easily make the supreme one.

No-one fears the Establishment suddenly going mad and letting off the bomb. What is feared is that the Establishment will continue to miscalculate the whole world situation until it is beyond control. It fears that this predisposition to mistake-making will go so far that the Communist bloc is misled into a fatal error of judgment—and that will be that.

#### DEEP ANXIETY

The public does not discuss this. Most people change the subject when it is raised. But careful research shows that, despite a good deal of superficial optimism and pleasure-seeking, there is a deep sense of anxiety gradually changing into a profound pessimism.

There is a sense of frustration that every occasion for averting the real danger has been missed or abandoned at the crucial hour. When a strong policy was on the point of reaching total success it was abandoned.

This is far more widely recognised by public opinion than the political party experts will allow. They are far too expert at diagnosing small parochial complaint trends—much more so than is useful. They are gravely inexpert at discovering the really deep opinion-trends.

George John Whyte-Melville once wrote† that the British are not much interested in motives, but only in results. It does not help the Establishment to have good motives ascribed to it. The results are what count, and Britain knows very well that despite prosperity, plenty to eat and drink, lots of gambling and endless sport, the world is on a knife-edge and that the Establishment is partly to blame. The country feels and knows this to be true.

---

†*Holmby House.*

---

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon.  
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., (T.U.), Woolton, Liverpool.