



**THE LEFT AND THE RIGHT**

**AND THE TRUTH**

**by Geoffrey Dobbs**



# THE LEFT AND THE RIGHT AND THE TRUTH

by Geoffrey Dobbs

Many people who are repelled or alarmed by the continual drift towards totalitarian socialism have been driven to support what is known as The Right, under the impression that this holds the answer to The Left. To their dismay they soon find that they are wrong.

Some things may be slightly better, others much worse, but the general direction is the same. After all those brave words and promises to put things right, it is most discouraging and confusing, and many people just give up all interest in politics and become quite helpless and inactive. Others decide that perhaps The Right was not Right enough, and move to the Extreme Right, only to find that they are in company which, apart from style and language, is scarcely distinguishable from the Extreme Left, with which it enjoys a perpetual game of mutual abuse. Indeed, neither side could do without the other.

How can all this be? It is necessary, I suggest, for us to go deeper than the surface of politics as seen in the Party contest, and to realise that the Left-Right confrontation is itself an essential part of a policy of division and conflict—the policy of revolution.

The terms Left and Right in the political sense had a revolutionary origin which is still implicit in their current usage, though now forgotten and lost to view.

After the French Revolution the legislative assemblies in France and elsewhere were seated in a semi-circular arrangement, the more enthusiastic vanguard of the revolution being on the left, the more solid, critical

and cautious rearguard on the right - but all were revolutionaries, or at least had to go along with the revolution. No one opposed to it, even if he survived and was left at large, could take any part in the Government, any more than the Tsarists could now in the USSR, or a pro-Shah party in Iran. That is what revolutions are about: the total elimination of the *Ancien Regime* and its traditions, making an impassable gulf with the past.

### **Slow revolution in English-speaking world**

We have now to realise that the World Revolution has in fact become worldwide. Because, in the English-speaking world it is taking place in stages, and more gradually than it did in France, Russia or Iran, and its opponents are merely excluded from effective power or publicity, rather than murdered or imprisoned (but remember Ross McWhirter and Airey Neave!) this does not mean that the above statement does not apply to it. It does!

In Britain the critical step was taken under cover of the blood-spilling of the second World War, when a coalition of all parties from Right to Left combined to introduce the Socialist (called Welfare) State. It should be noted, however, that in Britain this was somewhat modified by certain elements, perverted indeed, but derived from the influence exerted by the Social Credit Movement before the War; notably the agricultural subsidies which gave us cheap food for a generation, and the basic insistence that, in a world of technological plenty, no one should be reduced to the extreme forms of monetary poverty, such as were endured by the unemployed in the 1930's.

That these have been applied in such a way as to encourage the maximum irresponsibility, frustration, resentment and work-shyness is very largely the responsibility of the Conservative Party, which, while rejecting Social Credit as a form of alleged ‘funny-money socialism’ which (they said) would produce these deplorable results, has consistently preferred the irresponsible, inflationary and work-discouraging doles and hand-outs of Socialism to the responsible, work-supplementing, and wealth-related proposal of the dividend. This has produced a predictable degeneration in the social morale and credit, issuing in the sort of irrational and furious discontent which can be channelled into revolutionary violence; but there is still surviving, in Britain, a tough core of common sense and mutual faith which may well yet save us from the worst extremes of socialist tyranny. The time may even come when we shall thank God for the dogged obstinacy and ‘solidarity’ of the British working man, at present suicidally directed against the public (i.e. himself); but it may look rather different when the comrades try to take him over.

The greatest danger comes from Conservatives, who seem determined to consolidate Union power over their members as in the Communist State.

### **The trap of “the mass-power game”**

Looking back over nearly half a century I can see quite clearly that our situation is not as bad as it would have been had C. H. Douglas never been born, or if a small number of people had not tried to apply what he taught them. As it turns out he came too late to halt the momentum of events, but what has been won has been

time; and the effects have been quite out of proportion to the number of people engaged. If only one per cent of the energy formerly wasted on mere Leftism and now being wasted on mere Rightism were to be directed towards the constructive resolution of the pathogenic Left /Right dialectical conflict, the course of history could have been, and could still be, changed. But so long as people continue to believe that the way to use a small force is to throw it into the mass-power game, they are deceiving themselves when they imagine that they are exerting any influence over events.

Since the point seems so hard to take, let me put it with a different emphasis. There is no 'happy mean' between running and walking to Hell, between Right and Left, Conservative and Labour (let alone Liberal or Social Democrat!); between monstrous borrowing to keep the economy going with massive hand-outs, and strangling it with monetary restriction; between Tory inflation and Labour inflation; between multinational financial monopolies and State-controlled national monopolies; or between the typical bum's rush of a Labour or Tory Government (but the Tories are worst) to give instant 'recognition' to any gang of Leftist murderers who seize bloody control of a country. Indeed, when one compares them, it is clear that the Right has done a more competent job of encouraging the World Revolution than the Left, at least in Britain.

The Carrington-Thatcher hand-over of Rhodesia to Marxist control was a thoroughly professional bit of work which would have produced howls if Labour had done it, and so, of course, was the surrender of the nation to the Brussels oligarchy; while the destruction of effective

local government with the creation of gargantuan and remote County bureaucracies, with Soviet-style appointed tribunals and quangoes (such as Area Health Authorities), was a masterly preparation on the part of the last Conservative Government for the present one's self-righteous demands for cuts in 'socialist bureaucracies' causing the appropriate flog-up of revolutionary fury and resentment!

No doubt I shall be told that what the mass media call 'Conservative' or 'Right' is not the 'true' Right, but it is what 999 people out of 1,000 understand by those terms, and in the case of the word 'Right' it is the correct and traditional use of the term, as used also, for instance, of the present Marxist Government of China, which has ousted the former Leftist group, and of the Islamic revolutionaries in Iran, now trying to suppress the Left.

### **The importance of the correct use of words**

Many conservatives naturally identify 'Rightism' with something genuine, an emotional reaction to an over-intellectual Leftism, calling upon an instinctive wisdom and accumulated experience. But this is not the Rightism of the revolution, but that which is appealed to by its verbal propaganda for the purpose of its stifling and betrayal. A mere matter of words? Yes! And desperately important, as the correct use of words is. It is a fatal thing to accept the enemy's terms at face value, or to upgrade and idealise them; for that is exactly how the Devil operates.

'Antilanguage', or 'the reverse technique in words', i.e. creating a verbal image as a cover for doing the opposite, is now a standard, indeed a necessary routine

in party politics, since it automatically neutralises the main opposition. Of course it had to be the party with the patriotic image which could get away with the betrayal of Britain's national sovereignty. If it had been done by declared international socialists and anti-patriots they would have been up against the whole patriotic feeling of the nation. Likewise, if the socialists had handed over Rhodesia to Mugabe the out-cry would have been ten times greater. With the Tories doing it, the protests have been reduced to impotence. On the other hand, it has to be the verbal champions of the poor and the 'exploited masses' who persuade them that universal wage slavery is their proper fate, and indeed, their 'right'; that they should 'demand' with menaces, the loss of their freedom of choice in joining a union; and that any working man who tries to control his own labour is a 'scab'!

Imagine what would be the reaction of the British 'worker' if told by some Conservative boss that his sort existed to be hired underlings, and that he must damn well knuckle under and join the union, or he would be kicked out! But coming from the champions of 'Labour' it is accepted.

This sort of realistic analysis, relating actual policy as expressed in deeds with the use made of words in relation to it, is commonly rejected by those who have swallowed the anti-language at face value, as 'cynical'; but though these people (e.g. the average patriotic Conservative voter) think of themselves as 'sincere', they lack integrity in so far as they refuse to face the 'deeds'. If they did so, all the parties would have been forced to fit their policies to their words long ago, or else would have been left high and dry with a mere handful of supporters.



But human nature has its weakness, and it is this which the propagandist and the 'antilinguist' are expert in exploiting.

It is very important not to help them by copying their misuse of words, however innocently. This is a mistake which is most serious of all in its effects when made by Christians of an excessively verbal faith, who are liable to 'sanctify' the lie of 'common ownership' (meaning State bureaucratic control of resources) by associating it with the genuine community of goods practised in some religious orders under vows of poverty, celibacy and obedience, and which has never survived in the absence of those vows, or when they have been broken.

I hope that it will not be thought that I am criticising without charity or understanding the real aims and feelings of those who deem themselves to be of the Right because those aims and feelings are the power-base which is exploited by the Right Wing of politics. Indeed, I share them very strongly, as is natural for an elderly man of the academic middle class, brought up in the tradition of Christian patriotism; which is perhaps why I have such a peculiar loathing for the Conservative Party, whose main function is to betray just those aims and beliefs. But I try also to understand and share the aims and feelings of the Left which are betrayed and exploited as a power-base by Leftist politicians, such as, for instance, the real meaning of those perverted terms 'equality' and 'social justice', the correct application of which I am aware of, because I am a social creditor, and therefore am seeking to relegate (bind back to the reality of action) the Christian religion.

Men are not equal, and to try to make them so is a gross tyranny as it is a denial of their unique personality. But all men, indeed all living things, equally need the means of living fully. A man, a flea and a plant equally need free access to the air, which is given equally to them all, though they do not use it equally or even in the same way. But this does not make them equal. Equality is something we receive, not something we possess. The misuse and misunderstanding of this word has always been disastrous.

### **The Left/Right conflict is a divide-and-rule strategy**

The Left/Right conflict is a divide-and-rule strategy, and it is remarkable how closely it has succeeded in splitting the population down the middle, so that a ‘swing’ of only a few per cent can change governments. The two sides are at one on their evil policy, they differ only on the truth, which they divide between them and so render impotent. To a large extent the difference between the real power base of the Right and the Left is a matter of age and temperament. Naturally enough, the older one gets, and the less adaptive to change, the more one perceives the importance of maintaining the status quo, of law and order, of heredity and tradition and the cultural inheritance; the younger one is, the more urgent for growth and change and adventure and activity, and the more passionate for fairness-and justice and the righting of wrongs. And it is obvious that both sides are needed if we are to resolve our miseries— not a compromise between lies, but a combination of differently perceived truths.

For instance, Conservatives once used to defend both the cultural tradition and the right of individual inheritance, but only for those families which had managed to accumulate some personal property. This restriction very largely to their own propertied class conflicted with natural justice, since the earth and its resources are a free gift to man; it also revealed that they did not really believe in inheritance as a general and inalienable right since they would not concede it to the moneyless proletariat who had been driven off the land; so that, in the end, even ‘Conservative’ belief in inheritance has withered away, just when technological advance and invention have made it blatantly obvious that, so far as real productivity is concerned, there is ample provision for a large element of inherited wealth for all.

Meanwhile the Socialists, instead of accepting the reality of this cultural inheritance, and demanding its distribution, condemn inheritance altogether as ‘unfair’, and apply their thwarted desire for ‘equality’ and ‘social justice’ in the wholly inappropriate field of ‘employment’, demanding, not the abolition, but the promotion to power of the proletariat. The appalling results of this further react upon the Conservatives who then reject the whole idea of ‘equality’ as ‘rubbish’, because they have rejected its just application in its proper field, that of our collective cultural and technological inheritance, which has nothing to do with our merits and our personal differences.

### **The resolution has been called Social Credit**

Both sides of the dialectic declare that ‘full-

employment', i.e. remote-controlled hired underling-age for all, is their aim, and regard the liberation of people from this by technology as a disaster. Both support the socialist or 'Welfare' State, which is based upon the proposition that the inability of a large part of the population to pay at the economic rate for the major services, such as Health, Education, Housing and Transport, is due to the 'mal-distribution' of the national income, thus implying that it would be sufficient if 'fairly' distributed. That this proposition is now seen and declared to be manifest nonsense has made no difference to the policy being pursued by both 'wings' of the revolution, which continue to subsidize the major services and industries with vast inflationary borrowings, while asserting that inflation is due to too much money in the hands of the public!

The difference between Right and Left, between slightly less, and more borrowing, though sufficient to divide the nation and make it impotent, is quite minor. There is no possibility of actually stopping inflation by monetary restriction, without bringing the economy to a virtual halt in chaos, starvation and revolution.

That is the threat of the revolutionary, 'monetarist' Right. The function of the present Government under Mrs. Thatcher appears to be to demonstrate that there is no alternative to socialism (because the alternative has been rejected) and to disillusion the public until they are ready for another, and more extreme, Left-Wing Government; which, incidentally, will probably get in, again by playing the anti-E.E.C. card once more.

So inflation will go on, and inflation means progressive transfer of power from the individual to

the Government as it approaches the final position of being the sole source of money, because it is the sole loan-credit-worthy agency owing to its power of compulsory taxation. And inflation is world-wide, as is the totalitarian Revolution of which it is an essential cause (though not the only one). It is not a question of 'fighting' or avoiding it; it is now going on, and is far advanced in Britain.

But it is a question of how far, and to what extremes of terror and misery it will be allowed to go here, as compared with the horrors we have seen elsewhere. And that depends upon the number and quality of the people who have some grasp, not merely of the evils of the present momentum towards disaster, which are rubbed into us every day by the media and, by themselves, lead only to despair, but of the alternatives, in the political, the economic, the philosophic field.

In this, I can see no hope anywhere but in Social Credit, which finds the truth in a way which cuts right across the Right/Left conflict. I can see no hope in Left or Right, not even in those who claim to be the 'true Right' and who call upon the virtues of courage, loyalty and discipline, which are so much needed, but will all be misdirected if they reject what is the key to the situation.

However few we may seem, this nation already has had the leaven of Social Credit working in its daily bread for sixty years. I am full of confidence that it will make a radical difference to our revolution as compared with others (i.e. a bigger element of resolution) and I can see no virtue in wasting time and energy on promoting anything else.

## **Other Works by Geoffrey Dobbs**

A Memorandum

A Personal Basic Income For All

On Planning the Earth

Religation

Responsible Government in a Free Society

The Church and The Trinity

The Douglas Legacy

The Just Tax

The Local World

The Strategy and Tactics of Spiritual Warfare

What is Social Credit

Who Was CH Douglas



