

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 31. No. 6.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1953.

6d. Weekly.

The Douglas Photograph

Concerning the photograph presented with this issue of *The Social Crediter*, the happy incident in which Major Douglas participates occurred at Christchurch, New Zealand, on February, 13, 1934, at one of the four Civic Receptions given to him in the Dominion during his tour of that year. He is in the act of shaking hands with one of the pipers, thanking him and telling him how good it is to hear the fine Scottish airs. At Wellington also the pipers serenaded Major and Mrs. Douglas, and led them to the Town Hall, through the hall and on to the platform, the Council Chamber, where such receptions were usually held being too small for the large and enthusiastic gathering.

The two other Civic Receptions were at Palmerston North, reported in the newspapers as the largest and most enthusiastic ever held in that town, and at Dunedin.

New Zealand, because of its geographical and political features generally, its close reflection of the Mother Country and its traditions on a small scale, was an ideal locus for a demonstration of Social Credit, as was perfectly understood by the financial hierarchy in England; and there is little doubt that in departing from the course at first set, and handing over responsibility for results to party hands, a unique opportunity never to return was missed.

(Major Douglas died: September 29, 1952.)

From Week to Week

In saying that he did not agree with the Party Whip system, as he did in addressing the Southampton Rotary Club on September 14, the Rev. Sir Herbert Dunnico struck at the tap root of caucus government. Sir Herbert was three times a Member of Parliament and is a former Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons. He expressed the very sound opinion that democratic institutions have never been destroyed from without, but only from within. Quite so: the loss of independence by members is an abdication voluntarily encompassed by themselves. If the whole lot cut themselves adrift from their conspiratorial commitments to

groups, not one of which has any constitutional sanction, they would restore respectability to the office of political representative.

• • •

We learn from the *Daily Telegraph* that £140,000 had been spent by Kuhn, Loeb & Co., in preparing its defence against the United States Government's suit for breach of the American anti-trust laws, before the action against seventeen investment firms, of which Kuhn Loeb was one, was dismissed. The complaint, filed in 1947, alleged that the investment houses conspired to keep the cream of the financing and underwriting business to themselves. Why does the *Daily Telegraph* single out the "British banker in New York," Sir William Wiseman, as being especially 'relieved' by the collapse of the case against 'his' firm, Kuhn, Loeb & Co? Well, in any case, public attention (for what it's worth) has again been drawn to a mysterious personage.

• • •

"German Communist leadership, if compared with the, alas, very able leadership of Italian Communism and the less able but still effective leadership of the French Communist Party, stands out only by its total incompetence." From this standpoint, Franz Borkenau, writing in *The Tablet*, remarks upon the "strange intimacy" which, he says, has always existed between the Moscow leaders and every favourable or unfavourable current in German events. "German affairs have always been treated in the Kremlin almost as if they were home affairs." "For several years now, Germany, almost more directly than the Soviet Union itself, has been the chief battle ground of Russian factions." In Borkenau's view, the defeat of Adenauer was to serve as a safety-valve to prevent a new outburst of intra-party struggle. But Adenauer has triumphed. Had it not, "the Western defence front, shaken in other countries, would have collapsed." A political, as distinct from a formal and administrative Russian paramountcy in Europe would have followed, and would have "done the trick"—i.e., to extinguish intra-party strife and prevent the Army leaders from coming to the top. "The Army does not yet rule."

Borkenau identifies Malenkov (and Ulbricht) with "an extreme version of antisemitism." He says that "on January 4, 1953, Ulbricht made his Central Committee . . . [take] up unchanged the antisemitic arsenal of Dr. Goebbels." He concludes that "The next turn, no doubt, will bring anonymous social forces, as distinct from organised intra-party forces, to the fore even more strongly than they are already." If they are not the Russian-transplanted forces of the *Vehmegericht*, we do not know what they are. The curtain seems about to go up on Act III. Will the notorious "V" sign appear on Moscow's walls before or after Sir Winston Churchill goes there?

(Continued on page 4.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: SEFTon Park 435.

Vol. 31. No. 6.

Saturday, October 3, 1953.

"But When Thou Givest Alms . . ."

"But when thou givest alms, thou shalt not so much as let thy left hand know what thy right hand is doing, so secret is thy almsgiving to be; and then thy Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward thee."

There has been promised some account of the reasons which prompted Douglas to place the restraint of his personal non-approval upon obituary notices concerning himself. The desire is unusual, and amidst the feverish rush for personal recognition and adulation which marks this age of the 'common' man more heavily and absurdly than most other times it seems unnatural. What is 'natural' is publicity at any price. If all a man has that is his own is his thumb print, let his thumb imprint itself upon all he touches. Let the world see whose thing it is, who has touched it in its flight. The perfect conductor (there is, of course, no perfect conductor) leaves no sign upon what it conducts: it does not stain the water passing through it, nor sour the wine, nor resist or reduce the electrical energy. It does not even personalise the truth. So in poetry, cadence and rhyme and rhythm, which are things pertaining to Law must give way to eccentricity, which alone is capable of dissolving the metal of the universe leaving visible only the individual stamp, the imprint of 'personality,' the mark of the thumb (*i.e.*, the mark of the beast). So our culture becomes all thumbs and no fingers.

And these things have been understood perfectly by all great men, by all great *servants*. And so, drawing an illustration from what had just then befallen a public figure who had ventured to tell the truth in parliament, how his truth was entangled in the reputation already established by his vanities, and he was answered with the recital of them and suffered the ignominy of the false praise of the enemies of his truth, and, caring for truth, Douglas said: "No, anonymity and impersonality is the only way. Truth is not manufactured by men, and if they chance to get a glimpse of it, they had better get as quickly as they can out of its way."

Detachment.

An Address by Major Douglas to the Eton Society: March 9, 1938.

To mark the anniversary of our separation from the life though not from the spirit of Douglas on September 29 last year, we reprint a little-known address:—

In considering what I should say to you tonight, it appeared to me to be more useful to deal with certain broad and general problems which confront us all, rather than to take up your time with technical matters of finance or otherwise, since it is the so-called axioms of our civilisation which are challenged and require examination, rather than the details.

There is a peculiar fitness in talking about these things to you who live under, and are inevitably influenced by, the force of a great tradition. Tradition has a hypnotic effect and crystallises in institutions. I can make to you at once, and in a few words, and count upon you to understand at once, the most important statement I have to offer: that *the future of civilisation hangs on a reversal of the present domination of individuals by institutions.*

To those who are not familiar with (and therefore do not venerate, as I do myself and as no doubt do you) the force and value of tradition, this statement might on first hearing, sound like an attack upon tradition and the institutions which embody it. Nothing could be further from my meaning. Tradition, with its institutions when they have survived through the centuries, represent an invaluable body of experience.

But it is most important, I think, to bear in mind that human social experience is in general relative to particular economic political systems, and there comes a time such as the present when the experience we have gained has to be employed with great judgement or it may be a hindrance, rather than a help. But if it is so employed nothing, in my opinion, can replace it.

Now, I think that in the world today there are two quite fundamental ideas which are struggling for acceptance. They are capable of various antitheses, and I have made two groups of some of these—not necessarily or probably comprehensive, which might perhaps be called Group A. and Group B.:—

Group A.	Group B.
Deductive	Inductive
Totalitarian	Democratic
Machiavellian	Baconian
Idealistic	Realistic
Jewish	Christian
Love of Power	Love of Freedom
Planned Economy	Organic Growth

Group A. comprises on the whole, those habits of mind which are effective in affairs and particularly, affairs of State, today.

With some hesitation, I will suggest that they may have been the more pragmatically useful group in the past. I have no hesitation in saying that the persistence of these habits of mind in our present world, threatens that world with general catastrophe.

The flowers of the Group A. ideas are the modern Dictatorships. I should like you, for a moment, to consider the fact that Messrs Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler, to mention the better known, are men of what Jane Austen would have called "humble" birth. I won't waste time by protesting

that there is nothing derogatory in this statement—it merely means that, *per se*, it is a start in life which seems, from our point of view, to limit the opportunities of experience, and consequently it tends to produce what is nowadays called an ‘inferiority complex.’ ‘Humble birth’ is, of course, a feature of a particular social system.

I do not think that this similarity in origin of the Dictators is accidental. Neither am I convinced that their meteoric rise is a compliment to their useful qualities as members of society. Rather I am inclined to regard it as a damning indictment of the systems for which they stand, as being the embodiment of the ‘inferiority complex.’ You will no doubt feel that this statement requires some amplification.

There is, I believe, a little difference of opinion amongst psychologists that the characteristics of Group A. are all characteristics of immaturity, of what we should call a genuine deficiency of education and culture. So is an ‘inferiority complex.’ The unfortunate victim of it yearns to inflict on others the slights and real or fancied injustices he has, or thinks he has himself suffered. A dictatorship is a grim confirmation of the prophesy “The last shall be first.”

The first characteristic of a dictatorship is the assumption that all wisdom in regard to the objects of the State is centred in the Dictator. Logically, if things go wrong, it is the fault not of the policy, but of individuals who are entrusted with its execution. Hence we arrive by rapid stages at what is so charmingly called ‘the blood purge.’

The second characteristic is the exaltation of abstractions, such as the State. The first article of the Italian Constitution, for instance, is that the State is everything the individual nothing except as he is of service to the State. This is typical of Group A. thinking.

You no doubt remember “Punch’s” story of the cross channel passenger in the saloon to whom the steward said “You can’t be sick here, Sir” and the passenger’s reply “Can’t I?” demonstrates that he could. The steward’s rebuke was Group A. thinking, and the passenger’s reply Group B. thinking. The steward’s insistence on tradition was right in its way, but he mistook tradition for natural law, which is a fatal mistake.

Great Britain, although not a titular dictatorship, is an oligarchy moving towards a dictatorship as a result of the elevation of financial and legal conventions easily recognisable as belonging to Group A. I see no reason to assume that, making allowance for the character of the people, the outcome will be less deplorable than is the case, say, in Russia. One immediate effect of it is that on the whole British Statesmen do not represent the best talent available, partly because the best talent available is repelled by current political practices.

That marvellous pioneer Francis Bacon, Earl of Verulam, in the “*Novum Organum*” saw the nature of the problem clearly, and stated it with precision. He said in effect “We can proceed no further along the lines of thought now prevalent. What is required is a just, (that is to say, a realistic), relationship, between the mind and things.” The scientists took his advice, and modern mastery of nature is the result. The lawyers and financiers did not, and civilisation is breaking up because they did not. Nations are striving for things which are no use to them, and suffering under necessities which have no real existence.

Instead, then, of endeavouring to impose some abstract

and immature organisation upon nations and upon the world, the first step would appear to be to examine the nature of nations. The first fact which seems incontestable about nations is that they are collections of human beings. Human beings can exist quite comfortably without nations but nations, or States, cannot exist without human beings. That would appear to settle once and for all the question of the relative importance of human beings and nations.

But it is a fact that human beings do tend to form nations. Why? The answer is, I think, quite simple. Human beings associate together originally *in order that each individually may benefit by association*. The simplest example is pulling on a rope. Men don’t pull on a rope for the benefit of the rope; they provide the rope for the benefit their associated effort brings to each of them.

Now there is definitely a form of Government which is associated with this conception—a genuine Democracy. No one takes seriously the verbiage prevalent about the struggle between Democratic and Totalitarian Governments—there are no Democratic Governments. But there might be.

Perhaps I might be permitted to touch on a few of the things that Democracy is not.

While it is inconsistent with arbitrary special privilege, economic or otherwise, it does not mean equalitarianism. It would be just as sensible to say, without amplification, that everyone had a right to a place in the Eleven. So they have, if they have the qualifications, and it is recognised that the number of places is by general consent limited.

Neither does democracy mean a referendum or an election on every detail of day-to-day national management. On the contrary, a realistic conception of democracy insists that a community is sovereign, but it is not technical. It has a right to demand results but not to dictate methods, the word ‘right’ being used in the pragmatic sense. But if the results desired are not being obtained it has a right to an explanation and, if necessary, the replacement of its administrators.

So far as Great Britain is concerned, I am inclined to think that the divergence from Democracy is not difficult to indicate. Easily the most glaring feature is our money and credit system, which is indefensible. The information it affords us is illusory, and no security is possible until it is drastically modified.

The Parliamentary System has been perverted to purposes for which it was not intended, and all real power has been taken from it by the Cabinet.

Finally, our legal system has been exalted to a semi-divine omnipotence, and invested with sanctions which make it a Master and not a Servant.

Obviously it would take much too long to examine each of these aspects of our decadence at length.

I do not believe that any of them will really be put right until there is a much wider consciousness of the natural relationship between the individual and his institutions.

If that can be obtained, and not until it is obtained, we shall dispense with a type of statesman who, in spite of Abraham Lincoln’s warning, still hopefully tries to fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, and instead obtain men who recognise that the advice “If any would be greatest among you, let him be your servant” is not sentimentalism but sound political organisation.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK— (continued from page 1.)

“ . . . if in any association such as a nation it is not possible to obtain agreement on policy, then it becomes imperative that the association should break up into smaller units, until in any unit the policy is agreed.” (Douglas, in answer to a question at the Liverpool meeting in October, 1936.) Douglas never put any lower limit to the operation of this principle, to which he frequently referred.

The application of it to the problem of the Medical profession when the storm over the stealthy introduction of a State Medical Service under the cover of a National Health Service was at its height would, certainly, not perhaps, have blown the scheme sky-high. Instead, the doctors chose to see what the lion's teeth looked like from inside, believing the situation best suited for also guiding the movements of the lion. Attention has now switched to the question whether their new quarters are tolerable, and 12,657 general practitioners, 'served' with a 'postal enquiry' by The B.M.A. have replied to it. Four thousand nine hundred and fifty-nine haven't.

It is useless to speculate concerning the opinions of those who have not answered. They may be too indifferent, too busy, or too disgusted to bother about another from to fill in—no one knows. However, more than four-thousand desire to retain “at least some private practice.” Very well, there is one way for them to do it, and that is for them to resign from the B.M.A. forthwith. It is not too late for such a shock to its executive to be effective.

It is now fairly widely recognised that the National Health Service is what it was promised not to be—a stepping stone to a complete State service. This will become rapidly more apparent, as the older practitioners drop out and the State-minded products of the Welfare State take their place.

To the question, 'hasn't the Health Service done some good?' there is, in our opinion, a quite unanswerable reply: 'Yes, at the cost of greater and more far-reaching evils, social and economic, than any it has repaired, and those it has repaired might have been more surely and safely repaired at a quarter of the financial cost had not control of doctor and patient not been the prime objective.'

There was a time when many people besides ourselves believed that from the position of intellectual and economic independence which the members of the medical profession held, and on account of their deep sense of professional and personal responsibility, they might save not only themselves but many others by resolute action.

The 'official' view is that, if there ever was such a time, it has definitely passed. What we are certain about is that there is no 'other way' of enforcing a policy contrary to that of the planners but by 'breaking down the association to the point of unity of policy.'

Mr. Aubrey Jones, M.P., has been writing to *Truth* [i.e., *The (New) Truth*] saying that the Conservatives “must fill the moral vacuum.” Vacua, it will be recalled, are those things which Nature abhors so much that, in one guise or another, 'she' rushes in to fill them. The possibility of forestalling her does not seem really to exist: what exists in human affairs is a certain latitude in effecting obedience in one of Nature's forms rather than in another. Here we may adjust the proverbial emphasis on the importance of getting in first and say that What a wise man does first, a fool (tries to do) last. Once a vacuum is filled, any excess which is

rushing to fill it gets left outside. We do not for a moment suggest that the folly of thinking otherwise is particularly Mr. Aubrey Jones's. The whole point is that there isn't a vacuum, and things in general would look much brighter if there were.

What faces any genuine Conservatives who remain in this country is not the delirious joy of rushing in to fill a vacuum, but the much more arduous and joyless toil of displacing an incubus. That Mr. Jones has some conception of the nature of the incubus is a hopeful sign, and may lead somewhere if he improves his technique. It is true that Great Britain needs balance and restraint, and both these in relation to the Constitution. It is not helpful to bring in the notion of expenditure as an “encroachment on the supply of capital which we hope to hand down to the generations to come.” If you look around, you will notice that we don't any longer hand down capital to the generations to come. We make it obsolescent overnight, with the rapidity with which air-speed records are broken overnight. To think otherwise is to miss the tragedy of human effort. A like reflection arises in considering the “cardinal tenet of our democracy that governments shall be kept responsive to public opinion, and that that opinion be given opportunity to reflect.” Public opinion is now a label stuck onto newspapers. If there is, rushing in to fill any vacuum due to its exhaustion, any *private* opinion that matters, whatever it reflects is not permitted to reach a sensitive surface. It is mere confusion to say that “the main evil of nationalisation has not been centralisation, but exposure to political influence.” Centralisation, on the contrary, is the technique whereby it is secured that the malign power under which we live cannot be deflected from its policy.

“Work”

A noteworthy article, written with great spirit, appeared in *The Spectator* for September 11 under the above heading. It is by Mrs. Jacquetta Hawkes, and we abstract the following, which is but a sample of its excellency:—

“Modern warfare is only made possible [we should add 'inevitable'] by our new and fearful capacity for work. That is why I said that in blind slavery to the God of Work men do more violence to themselves than in following the silliest superstitions.

The Gulf Stream

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

Sir,—An interesting position has been created by the swift passage through the Australian Senate of the Pearl Fisheries Act Amendment Bill.

The alteration of the international three mile limit to take over the sea bed of the Continental Shelf is terrific in its implications.

If the Continental Shelf principle is written into international law we have a danger of that law being used to control the Gulf Stream which originates in the Gulf of Mexico.

If that occurred, and the control of it was abused, Europe would suffer, and England would be difficult to live in.

East Fremantle, W.A., September 19.

DAVE BYERS.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton.