I would like to recap a little from last month’s Part I article.
As you will remember A.R. Orage, in “Nietzsche” wrote:

“‘Dionysians’ is the word employed by Nietzsche to describe the writers of his type; and now that the word is in general use on the Continent among enlightened minds, and is moreover in prospect of becoming familiar to the few in England, chiefly through its use by Mr Bernard Shaw, we cannot perhaps do better than employ it…”

“Dionysus was the Greek’s god of fertility and wine, later considered a patron of the arts. He created wine and spread the art of viticulture. ... Dionysus was the son of Zeus and Semele, and he was the only god with a mortal parent…

Apollo was the son of Zeus and Leto, twin brother of Artemis. ... He was also known as the Archer, far shooting with a silver bow; the god of healing, giving the science of medicine to man; the god of light; and the god of truth. ... Apollo was also considered as the god of healing and medicine, either through himself or through his son Asclepius. At the same time, he could also bring forth disease and plague with his arrows; it was considered that a god that can cause disease is also able to prevent it…”  

--- Source: https://www.greekmythology.com

Among his earlier ‘Dionysian’ writers/poets, A.R. Orage listed William Blake (1757-1827). For present-day readers, the work of Blake could be of help in gaining a better understanding of Nietzsche.

“The Marriage of Heaven and Hell” by William Blake:

The work was composed between 1790 and 1793, in the period of radical ferment and political conflict immediately after the French Revolution. The title is an ironic reference to Emanuel Swedenborg’s theological work Heaven and Hell, published in Latin 33 years earlier. Swedenborg is directly cited and criticized by Blake in several places in The Marriage. Though Blake was influenced by his grand and mystical cosmic conception, Swedenborg’s conventional moral strictures and his Manichaean [1] view of good and evil led Blake to express a deliberately depolarized and unified vision of the cosmos in which the material world and physical desire are equally part of the divine order; hence, a marriage of heaven and hell. The book is written in prose, except for the opening “Argument” and the “Song of Liberty”. The book describes the poet’s visit to Hell, a device adopted by Blake from Dante’s Divine Comedy and Milton’s Paradise Lost.

“The Marriage of Heaven and Hell” is a series of texts written in imitation of biblical prophecy but expressing Blake’s own intensely personal Romantic [2] and revolutionary beliefs. Like his other books, it was published as printed sheets from etched plates containing prose, poetry and illustrations. The plates were then coloured by Blake and his wife Catherine.

Proverbs of Hell

Unlike that of Milton or Dante, Blake’s conception of Hell begins not as a place of punishment, but as a source of unrepressed, somewhat Dionysian energy, opposed to the authoritarian and regulated perception of Heaven. Blake’s purpose is to create what he called a “memorable fancy” in order to reveal the repressive nature of conventional morality and institutional religion, which he describes thus:

“The ancient Poets animated all sensible objects with Gods or Geniuses, calling them by the names and adorning them with the properties of woods, rivers, mountains, lakes, cities, nations, and whatever their enlarged & numerous senses could perceive.
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And particularly they studied the genius of each city & country, placing it under its mental deity; Till a system was formed, which some took advantage of & enslav’d the vulgar by attempting to realize or abstract the mental deities from their objects: thus began Priesthood;
Choosing forms of worship from poetic tales. And at length they pronounced’d that the Gods had order’d such things. Thus men forgot that All deities reside in the human breast.”

In the most famous part of the book, Blake reveals the Proverbs of Hell. These display a very different kind of wisdom from the Biblical Book of Proverbs. The diabolical proverbs are provocative and paradoxical. Their purpose is to energise thought. Several of Blake’s proverbs have become famous:

“The road of excess leads to the palace of wisdom.”
“The tigers of wrath are wiser than the horses of instruction.”

Blake explains that, “Without Contraries is no progression. Attraction and Repulsion, Reason and Energy, Love and Hate are necessary to Human existence. From these contraries spring what the religious call Good & Evil. Good is the passive that obeys Reason. Evil is the active springing from Energy. Good is Heaven. Evil is Hell.”

Interpretation

Blake’s theory of contraries was not a belief in opposites but rather a belief that each person reflects the contrary nature of God, and that progression in life is impossible without contraries. Moreover, he explores the contrary nature of reason and of energy, believing that two types of people existed: the ‘energetic creators’ and the ‘rational organizers’, or, as he calls them in The Marriage of Heaven and Hell, the ‘devils’ and ‘angels’. Both are necessary to life according to Blake. [2]

Blake’s text has been interpreted in many ways. It certainly forms part of the revolutionary culture of the period. The references to the printing-house suggest the underground radical printers producing revolutionary pamphlets at the time. Ink-blackened printworkers were comically referred to as a “printer’s devil”, and revolutionary publications were regularly denounced from the pulps as the work of the devil.

Influence

The Marriage of Heaven and Hell is probably the most influential of Blake’s works. Its vision of a dynamic relationship between a stable ‘Heaven’ and an energized ‘Hell’ has fascinated theologians, aestheticians and psychologists.

Aldous Huxley took the name of one of his most famous works, The Doors of Perception, from this work, which in turn also inspired the name of the American rock band The Doors. Huxley’s contemporary C. S. Lewis wrote The Great Divorce about the divorce of Heaven and Hell, in response to Blake’s Marriage…”

C.S. Lewis in “The Great Divorce”

Lewis writes: “Blake wrote The Marriage of Heaven and Hell. If I have written of their Divorce, this is not because I think myself a fit antagonist for so great a genius, nor even because I feel at all sure that I know what he meant. But in some sense or other the attempt to make that marriage is perennial.

The attempt is based on the belief that reality never presents us with an absolutely unavoidable “either-or”; that, granted skill and patience and (above all) time enough, some way of embracing both alternatives can always be found; that ere (earlier-ed) development or adjustment or refinement will somehow turn evil into good without our being called on for a final and total rejection of anything we should like to retain. This belief, I take to be a disastrous error. You cannot take all luggage with you on all journeys; on one journey even your right hand and your right eye may be among the things you have to leave behind.

We are not living in a world where all roads are radii of a circle and where all, if followed long enough, will therefore draw gradually nearer and finally meet at the centre: rather in a world where every road, after a few miles, forks into two, and each of those into two again, and at each fork you must make a decision.

Even on the biological level, life is not like a pool but like a tree. It does not move towards unity, but away from it, and the creatures grow further apart as they increase in perfection. Good, as it ripens, becomes continually more different not only from evil but from other good.

I do not think that all who choose wrong roads perish; but their rescue consists in being put back on the right road. A wrong sum can be put right: but only by going back till you find the error and working it afresh from that point, never by simply going on. Evil can be undone, but it cannot “develop” into good. Time does not heal it. The spell must be unwound, bit by bit, “with backward mutters of disserving power”- or else not. It is still “either-or.” If we insist on keeping Hell (or even earth) we shall not see Heaven: if we accept Heaven we shall not be able to retain even the smallest and most intimate souvenirs of Hell. I believe, to be sure, that any man who reaches Heaven will find that what he abandoned (even in plucking out his right eye) was precisely nothing: that the kernel of what he was really seeking even in his most depraved wishes will be there, beyond expectation, waiting for him in “the High Countries.”
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In that sense it will be true for those who have completed the journey (and for no others) to say that good is everything and Heaven everywhere. But we, at this end of the road, must not try to anticipate that retrospective vision…”

But, along came men such as C.H. Douglas and A.R. Orage who, in this case, ‘saw further’ than C.S. Lewis. Eric D. Butler observed:
“The further individuals are divorced from the consequences of their actions, their decisions, the greater the evil”

All policies for centralising power are evil and satanic. The sins which many worry themselves about are but pimples compared with the evil of robbing the individual of his heritage of real freedom, rooted in economic freedom, and the opportunity for self-development through making choices and accepting personal responsibility for the choices made.

Ambulance work in a sick society is important, but deliverance from the basic evil threatening mankind is not possible if there is an undue concentration of ‘sins of the flesh’ by over zealous moralists whose view of what is immoral does not extend beyond sex and alcohol…

There is also the deadening soporific of various forms of welfarism, including that of some service clubs, which enables some to justify themselves, and to create an inner glow of self-righteousness, by being seen to be helping what are often called ‘worthy causes’. This is much safer than joining the ranks of those attacking those evil policies which prevent people from being in the position where they can solve their own problems…”

**SOCIAL CREDIT SEEKS A RESOLUTION – A RECONCILIATORY TECHNIQUE**

“…. Social Credit is not itself an ‘Opposite’, but a reconciliatory symbol, a reconciliatory technique. It would resolve the opposite of what we have with what we have, progressively, so that ‘a new and powerful life may issue forth just where no life or force or new development was anticipated’.”

**EARLY 20TH CENTURY’S FORK IN THE ROAD**

In the 1974 edition of *Economic Democracy* Geoffrey Dobbs wrote in the Introduction:

“It is one thing for the teacher to write a foreword to the pupil’s work, as C. H. Douglas once did for mine, and quite another, even twenty-two years after the author’s death, for the pupil to introduce the master’s; but I am glad to undertake this not only because it is an honour to be asked to do so by the author’s daughter and copyright-holder, but also because some introductory explanation has now become very necessary for a book written in the idiom of fifty years ago, some of which has been changed or even inverted in meaning, although its substance remains singularly up-to-date and critically relevant to the circumstances of the present day.

Economic Democracy, one of the ‘key’ books of the Twentieth Century, first appeared serially in the pages of *The New Age*, beginning in June 1919. That is to say it was published in what is now generally acknowledged to have been the most brilliant English-language journal of the time, and by an editor, A. R. Orage, who has become a legend.

**Cleavage Between the Will-to-Power and the Will-to-Freedom:**

*The New Age* has an undisputed place in the cultural history of the early Twentieth Century, and it was the leading journal of the Fabian Socialists until the founding of the *New Statesman* in 1913, which marked a stage in that cleavage between the will-to-power and the will-to-freedom (to use Douglas’s terms) which inevitably occurs, as the history of politics so clearly shows, in every movement dedicated, at the outset, to the betterment of mankind.

It must be remembered, however, that although *The New Age* was in contemporary terms a leading ‘socialist’ or ‘progressive’ journal – even ‘avant garde’ in its day – the meaning of those terms has now been changed, sometimes to the point of inversion after half a century in which the world has been rushing down the other fork of the cross-roads at which Douglas and his contemporaries stood, having ignored the signpost which he set up, and having now discovered, to its bitter cost, that it has taken the wrong path.

It is therefore particularly appropriate that this book, long out of print, should be republished, and that signpost set up again, so that a disillusioned world can realise that there exists an alternative to disaster, though not without a radical change in the sort of thinking which now accepts the centralisation of power as ‘progressive’, and condemns its distribution as ‘reactionary’.

**Orage and The New Age Chose Freedom**

Even before Douglas appeared on the scene, Orage and *The New Age* had chosen the path of freedom and had turned their backs on collectivist State Socialism, that is, on the socialism of the will-to-power, as well as on the soul-destroying wage-slavery of Capitalist mass-production.

Under the heading of Guild Socialism they were inclined to look backwards to the craftsmanship of mediaeval times, and to reject all science and technology as of the Devil. Douglas supplied just what these people lacked, for although *The New Age* was the forum for the leading literary and political writers of the day, it was then, even more than now, taken for granted that politics and economics were subjects for the men of words.
It was unheard of for someone with practical knowledge and experience of the actual processes of industry and accountancy to take a hand.

In this, Douglas was far ahead of his time, as he proved to be in other ways. To those who believe that the pursuit of power – that is of centralised power to force one’s ideas upon others – is the only conceivable course for any movement to take which seeks to better the human condition, it will appear obvious that Douglas and Orage and those that followed them in opposing the trend of centralising Finance-Capitalism merging into State Socialism, had made the wrong choice, and have paid the penalty of defying the course of history.

If such power-seekers are satisfied with the course of history they need not trouble to read further. But for those who believe that the truth alone can set us free, though not now until the lesson has been learnt from the consequences of the mass-pursuit of untruth, it may be noted that Douglas’s analysis, based on a practical knowledge of modern technology and accountancy, went accurately to the core of the matter, whereas the analysis of Marx and of Lenin, men of words and of word-power, was fundamentally abstract and inaccurate, although surrounded by a vast mass of detail and of repetitive and hypnotic verbiage, in contrast to Douglas’s condensed statements…”


BERNARD SHAW’S WILL-TO- POWER AND THE FABIANS

John Stormer, in his book None Dare Call It Treason gives much information about the Fabians and their influence in the universities. Discussing Bernard Shaw, one of the founders of the Fabian movement, Stormer says:

“Shaw, after an earlier trip to Russia, had praised Lenin as the ‘greatest Fabian of them all’. Shaw helped formulate the Fabian concept of eventual control through infiltration, permeation, and piece-meal acquisition of power.

He strongly admired Lenin and Stalin. He said they publicly championed Marx and his principles of world revolution while quietly working to communise one country after another. They used, Shaw said, the Fabian methods of stealth, intrigue, subversion, and the deception of never calling socialism by its right name.”

Stormer gives some history of the Fabian Society:

“Following Marx’s death in 1883, his theories were made a world force by two developments. They were: the rise of the Fabian Society in England and Lenin’s Bolshevik movement.

In 1884, a small group of English intellectuals formed the Fabian Society. It was their goal to establish the same classless, godless, socialist one-world Society envisioned by Marx. Leadership of the group was assumed by Beatrice and Sidney Webb and the Irish author and playwright, George Bernard Shaw. Shaw described himself as a ‘communist’ but differed with Marx over how the revolution would be accomplished and by whom... Shaw and the Fabians worked for world revolution not through an uprising of the workers but through indoctrination of young scholars. The Fabians believed that eventually these intellectual revolutionaries would acquire power and influence in the official and unofficial opinion-making and power-wielding agencies of the world. Then, they could quietly establish a socialistic, one-world order…”

AUSTRALIAN FABIANS’ WEBSITE

Our History

“The Australian Fabians was established in 1947 and is Australia’s oldest, continuous political think tank. The Australian Fabians Inc. is a Not-for-profit, membership organisation, incorporated in Victoria, Australia. For over 65 years the Australian Fabians have promoted debate and research into political ideas and public policy reform. Fabian publications have played an important part in determining both state and national political agendas.

Gough Whitlam adopted the Fabian approach from the day he entered parliament, and the seminal 1972 Whitlam policy speech – the most comprehensive program ever submitted to the Australian people – was a drawing together of twenty years of systematic Fabian planning and research.

Arthur Calwell before him was proud to call himself a Fabian, and the tradition has been carried on through subsequent Labor leaders including Bill Hayden, Bob Hawke, Paul Keating, Julia Gillard, Bill Shorten, John Cain, Don Dunstan, John Bannon, Neville Wran and Bob Carr…”

Continue reading: http://www.fabians.org.au/history

THE SOCIALIST PHENOMENON


(continued on next page)
This venture into history is a remarkable example of the breadth of his interests and learning. As Solzhenitsyn noted in his preface to this book, the profession of historian being almost extinct in the Soviet Union (except for Party hacks of whom it was joked that none of them could predict the past), it was necessary for physical scientists and mathematicians (who had some mental space for creative work since the Party needed their discoveries for military purposes) to stand in for their massacred colleagues in history and the social sciences.

Shafarevich notes that Socialism (defined here to mean movements or societies that attempt to monopolize all means of production) bears a number of recurring characteristics throughout history:

- the abolition of private property,
- abolition of the family,
- abolition of religion,
- and communality or equality.

Experiments in Co-Habitation

While some of these characteristics are certainly familiar enough from the example of Communism, others are lesser known. In the earliest days of the Soviet state, various experiments in cohabitation by men and women were permitted on the grounds that the family was a ‘bourgeois’ institution that should be superseded and allowed to die out. For a time at least, childbearing out of wedlock was encouraged on the grounds that children could be better brought up in state-run institutions while mothers worked. These experiments so disordered a society already reeling under forcible collectivization, the imprisonment and mass-murder of ‘suspect’ classes, and economic collapse; that the Bolsheviks soon abandoned them.

Far from being innovative, the origins of these ideas go back at least as far as Plato, and recur frequently throughout the history of utopian Socialism, as Shafarevich abundantly and cogently illustrates with examples drawn from a number of cultures widely separated in time and space.

Shafarevich is especially astute in his observations of various medieval chiliastic* groups, of which he considers Communism to be a sort of modern-day offshoot. In them the goal of commonality and equality were typically taken to grotesque extremes, including not only commonality of goods (no private property—not even personal possessions), but frequently commonality of wives as well, i.e., every man could have sexual relations with whichever woman he fancied. This stress on perfect equality ultimately works itself out in the infliction and, even the willing self-infliction of mass death (certainly the one state in which all human beings are completely alike).

Shafarevich writes with all the passion of a Russian patriot and Orthodox Christian repulsed at the effects, both moral and material, of decades of Soviet Communism on his homeland. Anyone expecting a dry treatise will not find one here. It is here, perhaps, where Shafarevich’s thesis finds its gravest weakness as well as its greatest strength. Shafarevich’s view of history is passionate—and brilliantly insightful for this, yet it is (perhaps necessarily) impressionistic. Although many of his observations have been independently confirmed by Western scholars such as Norman Cohn and Karl Wittfogel; Shafarevich’s linking of utopian socialism and the ‘scientific’ socialism that displaced it is not quite as self-evident as he would claim—though it is suggestive.

Yet this only means that it is now necessary for other scholars to take up these questions anew, and research them more thoroughly. The credit for blazing this trail goes to Shafarevich, and however wrongheaded some of his most recent work may be, he deserves praise for researching and writing this book under arduous conditions, and for his courage in seeing to it that it would see print—whatever the consequences to him.”

Note:
** chiliasm. n. c.1600, from Latinized form of Greek khiliasmós, from khílias, from khiliou ‘a thousand - the number 1,000,’ of unknown origin; supposed by some to be related to Latin mille. The doctrine of the millennium, the opinion that Christ will reign in bodily presence on earth for 1,000 years.

***

Jerusalem

[“And did those feet in ancient time”]
by William Blake

And did those feet in ancient time
Walk upon England’s mountains green:
And was the holy Lamb of God,
On England’s pleasant pastures seen!

And did the Countenance Divine,
Shine forth upon our clouded hills?
And was Jerusalem builded here,
Among these dark Satanic Mills?

Bring me my Bow of burning gold:
Bring me my arrows of desire:
Bring me my Spear: O clouds unfold!
Bring me my Chariot of fire!

I will not cease from Mental Fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand:
Till we have built Jerusalem,
In England’s green & pleasant Land.
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George Dobbs in The Social Crediter, April 1953, wrote of the importance of ‘balance’ in our conception, our thinking and understanding:

**Balance in Social Credit:** The conception of Social Credit which Douglas left with us was a balanced conception. As his first book, *Economic Democracy*, showed, it was so from the first in his own mind, but it seems to have taken a weary time before this inherent balance was grasped by others, as it has, by now, been grasped by those who have followed Douglas closely.

One of the last things which Douglas left us was what we know as *The Chart*, a diagram setting out certain relationships in the real world. At its focus is the word Policy, which more than any other single word, summarises what he had to teach us. This is implicit in everything he said and wrote on Social Credit, and especially in his first book, *Economic Democracy*, but in June, 1937, it became explicit in his address to Social Crediters in London, in which he defined Social Credit as ‘the policy of a philosophy’ and further defined his use of the word ‘philosophy’ as meaning a ‘conception of reality’.

*The Chart*, first published in February, 1951, specifically to counteract the tendency to disproportion in the Social Credit Movement, is an immensely massive and condensed statement. It is not permissible to alter it, but it will often be necessary to abstract from it, and to consider special cases in its application to current situations. For the special purposes of this article, the consideration of balance in the conception of Social Credit at the present time, I want to draw attention to the balanced, triple structure of the centre of *The Chart*, the three words surrounding the central word Policy.

Now Social Credit has also been defined as ‘applied Christianity’, and it has been made clear that if the Policy is correctly called Social Credit, the philosophy is the conception of reality which we find in the New Testament.

The word ‘Administration’ is of wider application than the word ‘Politics,’ but it is convenient here to consider this aspect of it, in relation to ‘Economics’. These basic relationships of Social Credit may therefore be considered in the following form:

A tripod is the ‘first’ structure which will stand, and it is not possible to ignore, or to mix and change the nature of any one, or more, of these three components of policy without either overthrowing, or changing the nature of the policy.

There is a law, called *Gresham’s Law*, which applies to money and credit; it applies also to policies. When they are mixed the bad drives out the good. This is very obviously happening with Compromised Social Credit: the Old Politics have completely neutralised the New Economics.

**The ‘Economic’ Disproportion**

Two clearly defined stages can be distinguished in the development of the Social Credit Movement under the direction of Douglas. In the first from 1918 to 1934, the emphasis was on economics; in the second, from the Buxton speech *The Nature of Democracy* (June, 1934) to *Realistic Constitutionalism* (May, 1947) on politics. Running through everything that he wrote or said on Social Credit was a gradually increasing strand of ‘philosophy’; better, perhaps, referred to as religion, for it was specifically Christian, and never expressed in theoretical form without being bound back to practice in economics and politics, so that the three threads were always intertwined. With this important qualification, however, it is true to say that, during the last few years of Douglas’s life, this ‘philosophic’ element, as represented for instance, by *The Realistic Position of the Church of England*, came more into prominence, so that at the end the structure of Social Credit philosophy, economics, politics, had acquired that massive equilibrium and symmetry which was part of his character.

No more than Shakespeare does he need
The labour of an age in piled stones,
Or that his hallowed relics should be hid
Under a star-pointing pyramid. ²

Social Credit is his ‘star-pointing pyramid.’ It is tri-podal; it stands firmly upon the earth; and it points to Heaven. Si monumenium requiris, circumspice! ³

(continued on next page)
It is sad, therefore, to ‘look around’ and see some of the one-legged and two-legged monstrosities ‘dedicated to Douglas’ by their creators.

The great heresy of the age is the ‘economic’ heresy, the Marxist-materialist heresy, the idea that history is determined solely or primarily by ‘economic’ forces, that man lives by bread alone. To describe Social Credit as merely another name for ‘The New Economics’, to describe Douglas as an ‘economist’ or a ‘monetary reformer’ is to describe him as a crank, as a man who had got something out of proportion.

Both ‘economics’ and ‘finance’ are techniques. Techniques, of course, have their importance, but to form a World Movement and to argue and advocate and oppose techniques, without reference to the policies they are used to promote, is insane. But if policies are to be upheld or opposed, that is politics, and the assessment of policies is only possible on a basis of philosophy; so that all the components of Social Credit are immediately brought in unless sanity and a sense of proportion are abandoned.

Those who insist on restricting ‘social credit’ to economics and finance presumably mean that the philosophy which finds expression in Douglas’s economic proposals is not at variance with the prevailing mechanisms of ‘politics’ which, to anyone who has followed Douglas, can be seen quite obviously to be a part of the structure of the opposing pyramid of centralised power. It is significant that every reference to social credit in the national or other antagonistic press treats it as an ‘economic’ theory or ‘heresy,’ and every reference to Major Douglas, including his newspaper obituaries, treated him as some sort of an ‘economist.’

ORAGE & THE NEW AGE IN EARLY 20TH CENTURY

“We are sometimes prone to forget our origins; that the social credit movement was the sole victorious and surviving issue of all that turmoil of intense mental activity and discussion which centred around Orage and the New Age in the early years of the 20th century – a turmoil of socialists dissatisfied and repelled by the centralising tendency which they could already see to be far advanced in socialism. Douglas’s radically different approach to economics was altogether too much for most of these people, and great credit is due to those whose integrity and mental energy enabled them to overcome the prejudices instilled by their socialist background. Even so, economic’ prejudices are seldom so deep seated as are those occasioned by politics or religion.

It is not surprising that as the full implications of the philosophy which found expression first in the economic proposals emerged in the fields of politics and religion, many of those who had made the tremendous effort required to overcome their prejudices in the first place found that further, and even greater, efforts were too much for them.

As a result, since ‘economics’ cannot exist in a vacuum, many have slipped back into the old rut of their ‘social democracy’ within which the congruous ‘New Economics’, if retained at all, survives as a foreign body, sealed off from all practical influence by relegation to some hypothetical future time when the successful pursuit of ‘social-democratic’ polities on a World scale will ‘bring in Social Credit’.

That is to say, they continue through force of habit, the habit which has been the downfall of all libertarian efforts within the body of Socialism, to ‘look to’ the politics which centralise power to bring about its decentralisation; so that this arrested ‘Social Credit,’ which finds its inspiration rather in the successful pursuit of power by the methods of ballot-box democracy than in the new methods and new hope provided by Douglas, is merely giving one more demonstration of the hopelessness of trying to escape from the trend of socialism without making a clean break with it.

The effect of this is, of course, that through the continual practice of the ‘Old Economics’, even such grasp of the ‘New Economics’ as has been obtained is progressively weakened. It is impossible to stop moving against the trend without being carried backwards by it. At every step forward a number of people have dropped out and some of them have turned against Douglas rather than change their opinions; while others have been encouraged and have turned towards him.

This is inevitable, for social credit is antidotal to the social disease of the age, and therefore must stress precisely those truths which constitute a denial of the most strongly held prejudices. It is not lightly held and easily surrendered opinions which are responsible for the prevailing ‘trend’ towards disaster: it is precisely those prejudices which are so widespread and strongly held that people are afraid to oppose or expose them. In fact, the courage required to join issue with a false opinion is a measure of the necessity for doing so.”

Geoffrey Dobbs invited us all to ‘join in this great adventure’.

Notes
1. Manichaean Dualism, with its belief in an eternal dualism of conflict between God and Satan as the ultimate reality, but because Marxism-Leninism, with its materialism and atheism, rejects both God and Satan, it is not thought of as a religious heresy.
2. Definition of ‘ypointing’ archaic: pointing or reaching toward a specified thing —usually used in the phrase star-ypointing
3. Si Monumentum Requiris, Circumspice - Latin “if you seek his monument, look around”.

***
When a Government can not raise enough funds from taxes to fund all planned Government spending, they borrow. To do this, they issue bonds to the privately owned banks, which they use as collateral. The privately owned banks then issue credit (in the form of computer blips) secured by these bonds. Money is created out of nothing and interest is charged.

To get the necessary funds to pay the interest, Governments are forced to increase taxes, reduce spending or borrow further.

As all tax dollars only exist as a result of debt, increasing taxes only adds to the overall national debt, and removes purchasing power from the hands of the nation’s consumers, thereby forcing a push for higher wages to overcome the shortage, which adds to inflation, or lowers the living standards of the public.

If governments reduce spending, this again takes purchasing power out of the hands of consumers and at the same time, reduces services available to the people. Again a lowering of living standards.

In 1815 the people of Guernsey Island wanted to build a market place that was going to cost 5500 pounds. Now their local government only had 1000 pounds of English money, but they didn’t want to put their small population into debt by borrowing for what they wanted.

They had all the materials and the manpower needed, all they lacked was money.

What they decided to do, was to get the printing press going and print 4590 pounds of their own currency. This was done and the work was carried out.

All the materials were paid for, the builders were paid to do the work, and the printed notes (Guernsey Pounds) went into circulation as money so the people could use it to buy other goods and services that they required.

What the planners had done to ensure that their island did not become flooded with worthless cash, was to extinguish the money they had created. This is how they did it:

At the completion of the job, rent was charged for the use of the market place, which the people didn’t mind at all, because they now had a wonderful facility that they had always wanted, but thought they couldn’t afford.

At the end of every year after construction, a certain amount of this (Guernsey) money, that they received as rents, was extinguished, simply by taking the notes and throwing them in the incinerator. This went on each year, until finally the entire amount that had been printed in the first place had been destroyed.

The strange thing was, that they still had their marketplace, everybody had been paid, all the materials had been paid for, and they had “no debt as no interest had been applied for issuing of their own credit.

This true story well describes the nature of money.

Guernsey Island still to this day issues a part of its own money supply and they have no debt and no unemployment.

**

THE EXPERIENCE OF GUERNSEY ISLAND IS AVAILABLE FOR ALL OUR (LOCAL) GOVERNMENTS by Rod Linger
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BOOKINGS FOR THE SEMINAR DIRECT TO Head Office: Ph 08 8387 6574 - M 0415 527 121 heritagebooks@alor.org

THE LEAGUE’S WEBSITE: — alor.org

Subscription to On Target $45.00 p.a.
NewTimes Survey $30.00 p.a.

and Donations can be performed by bank transfer:

A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)
BSB 105-044
A/c No. 188-040-840

or by cheques directed to:
‘Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)’
or on the Veritasbooks.com.au website:


“The New Times Survey” is published by Australian League of Rights
Postal Address: PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.
Telephone: 08 8387 6574 email: heritagebooks@alor.org
Head Office Hours - Mon., Tues., Wed. 09.00am - 3.00pm