

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 32. No. 3.

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

SATURDAY, MARCH 13, 1954.

6d. Weekly.

### THE SOCIAL CREDITER

#### FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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 (Temporarily as follows):—*Business and Editorial:* 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: SEFton Park 435.

### From Week to Week

“I am the vine . . . .” (John XV, 5)

“ . . . be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.”  
(John XVI, 33)

Who (or what) is I?

• • •

No word they spake. What's speech to them  
Who once have freely spoken?  
When falls the leaf, what need hath stem  
To say: “Not I am broken”?

• • •

We gather that Mr. Charles Morgan, without ecclesiastical protection, has been consorting with publicans and sinners. From the *Catholic Herald*, we infer that the consorting is the major part of the offence, and from the unusually acid remarks of Mr. T. S. Gregory in *The Tablet* the lack of adequate protection. The behaviour of *The Tablet* is the more consistent. Having blue-pencilled the Pope, it must deride Mr. Morgan for blurring out summut-he-should-na. The inconsistency of the *Catholic Herald* consists in deriding one week and reversing its gears the next. Cardinal Griffin may have something to do with the prevailing uncertainty. He has said to the nuns of the Reparatrice Covent in Chelsea:—

“The present times have been hailed as an atomic age, but, whereas we are assured that atomic energy may be harnessed and brought to the service of man, in fact its discovery has led only to an increase in the feverish activity of those to whom it is said to be of value.

“How strange it is that all these discoveries of science should so absorb us as to increase the pace of our life rather than provide us with additional opportunity to praise Him Who is the source of all things. Increase in the speed and means of travel has led to further demands upon our services.”

Following the silliest condemnation of Mr. Morgan we have seen, the *Catholic Herald* reviews with more than approval Robert Jungk's *Tomorrow Is Already Here* (Rupert Hart-Davis, 16/-) to which reference has already been made in these pages. The newspaper quotes:—

“America is striving to win power over the sum total of things, complete and absolute mastery of nature in all its aspects. This bid for power is not directed against any nation, class or race. It assails no particular way of government but the ways of creation, which have scarcely fluctuated within the memory of man. Clouds and wind, plant and beast, the boundless heavens themselves are to be subjugated. The stake is higher than dictators' seats and presidential chairs. The stake is the throne of God. To occupy God's place, to repeat his deeds, to recreate and organise a man-made cosmos according to man-made laws of reason, foresight and efficiency: that is America's ultimate objective.”

• • •

Yet no one beside ourselves mentions the effective cause of the devilish impulsion towards this distortion of human motives: industry *must* expand continuously *unless* purchasing power to distribute its product reaches the public through other channels than wages, channels independent of the wage system. It is as simple as that.

• • •

Says the *Church Times* for March 5:—

“Miss Florence Horsbrugh, Minister of Education, is a person of courage. On Tuesday she announced that she had refused permission to the London County Council to close Eltham Hill County Secondary School for Girls. Her decision will anger the Socialist majority in the LCC. They had determined to close this old-established and highly successful school, in order to absorb its pupils and staff in the first of the new mammoth ‘comprehensive schools,’ to which the Council is so strangely wedded. The new comprehensive school is to have two thousand pupils. An internal broadcasting system is to be installed in order to organize them. The parents of Eltham dislike intensely the whole idea of this educational factory, where personal values will be so easily submerged in a huge administrative machine. Protests went to the Minister from nearly four thousand parents. The LCC are in favour of comprehensive schools, because in them all the distinctions between grammar and other forms of

*Continued on page 4.*

### Social Credit: Integral and Disintegral

The central and balanced position of Social Credit as the alternative to the dominant policy of the day is being constantly demonstrated; recently, in particular, by several new ventures in journalism which seek, each in its different way, to oppose the common enemy by adopting what is in fact, though the people concerned may not be aware of it, a fragment of Social Credit. Three of these papers may be taken as examples, in inverse order of appearance: *The Sun*, *Candour*, *The Defendant*.

*The Sun*, by taking the sub-title 'Social Credit World Review' obviously aims at a central and co-ordinating position in Social Credit, from which it completely excludes itself by accepting only the monetary analysis and proposals of Douglas put forward before 1930, before the movement's experience of political action enabled him to develop the application of his policy in the field of human association and political constitutionalism. Before also the real depth of Social Credit policy as an application of Christianity in the social field had become apparent, and before the enmity of the Judaic Power which this identity made inevitable had been openly acknowledged.

That *The Sun* should descend to the level of acting as an agent of that Power by spreading the 'anti-semite' smear against Douglas, as a matter, quite obviously, of imagined expediency rather than of conviction, is evidence not only of a lack of courage but also of a lack of realism. Whatever the dangers of opposing so powerful an enemy as the International Power, however we call it, it is better, even from the point of view of safety, to take a whole-hearted stand with Douglas, or else against him, rather than to adopt this half-hearted, facing-both-ways attitude, which merely invites disaster.

In contrast there is no lack of courage about Mr. A. K. Chesterton's 'Views-Letter,' *Candour*. It is strong exactly where *The Sun* is weak, namely in its identification of the enemy and its stalwart opposition to him. But Mr. Chesterton insists that this opposition shall take the form of a hopeless rearguard action in defence (if of anything) of a conception of a social order which is not only at its last gasp, but has proved its inadequacy again and again to withstand the forces against it. This heroic attitude makes its appeal to romantics, but it offers no hope of victory (indeed, it tends to dispel any such hope) and seems to aim only at a dramatic last ditch stand against overwhelming odds. The truth is that victory against such odds requires a miracle, an event which happens whenever men discover and apply the awe-inspiring effectiveness of correct action; but such a miracle requires not only faith, but knowledge—of the alternative to that which oppresses us, and of the means to obtain it—and by the nature of things these means must be other than the familiar features which have led us to our present predicament.

When therefore *Candour* (February 19, 1954) admits that "the enemy we fight is the International Money Power" but rejects any promotion of an alternative to the 'social order' imposed upon us by that Power as "a task for more tranquil times," it is in fact undercutting the foundations of the faith which makes the fight worth while and of the knowledge which gives hope of success.

Evidently it is a precise and realistic *imagination* which is lacking here. All the measures which Parliament nowadays 'inevitably' passes were first 'imagined' by a small minority

of people who then made use of appropriate mechanisms to put their ideas into effect, until now those ideas dominate the minds both of parliaments and peoples. Those mechanisms, among which are the accepted Financial and Electoral Systems, will not serve, unchanged, a policy diametrically opposed to that which they have been adapted to serve, and do serve so successfully in their present form. But if no alternative is to be allowed to challenge, or even disturb, the complete dominance of the prevailing policy and its mechanisms, how can any political realist imagine that any measure can ever be passed which would reverse the 'trend' or even seriously inconvenience its promoters?

Many people have failed to understand why Douglas always put forward his proposals in such precise and technical detail. As an engineer he must have known that, if you want action in developing a new or unfamiliar mechanism, a precise specification is needed; otherwise intelligent and efficient people, the only sort who are likely to be of use in the matter, will not believe in it. But when the necessary faith has been aroused, and the will concentrated upon a precise objective, however distant, then and only then are the necessary forces permanently channelled so as to be available for immediate steps in the required direction.

To Mr. Chesterton, there seems to be an impassable gulf between the concrete features of the here and now and the equally concrete features (as they will be when they materialise) of any future condition. A correspondent it seems has approached him on the subject of the responsible vote. Mr. Chesterton "could not imagine any Parliament's passing such a measure." That, of course, may be. If and when, by some means, voters can no longer evade responsibility in the casting of their votes, direct and individual responsibility, it will be through the operation of some piece of social and political machinery which, at present, Mr. Chesterton cannot picture. Does that matter very much more than the not inconsiderable loss *now* of Mr. Chesterton's advocacy of the propriety of making voting at elections responsible? Some one else may have more practical imagination. Indeed, Douglas *did* have greater practical imagination. As a technical problem, he solved it. As a political problem it remains. Mr. Chesterton's function, among others, is that of a solver of political problems. Our own political exploits have not been barren of suggestion. The Electoral Campaign method of using the vote, openly, to gain a specified objective, especially as it has been applied in local politics, is an obvious, though limited, first step towards the responsible vote, of proven efficacy. The Voters' Policy Associations, and other Policy Groups which followed the Rates Campaign were further fore-runners, as it were small pilot experiments, which preceded the formulation of Douglas's constitutional proposals. On the national scale probably the Negative vote, as suggested by Douglas at the 1945 Election, is at present the nearest approach to a responsible use of the vote available to the elector. Altogether it should be clear to anyone who will look that the responsible vote is a practical objective towards which we can move now and from where we stand, without waiting for 'Parliament' or 'measures' or using anything but our own initiative and perseverance.

Moreover, apart from the practice, in various limited forms, of the responsible vote, the idea is still so new that people have to be familiarised with it, and from this point of view Douglas's timing of his constitutional proposals was

as perfect as was that of his economic proposals. Just as the Financial Depression of the 1930's rubbed in what he had said earlier about Finance, so the constitutional crises of our present phase of history are creating the best possible conditions for his constitutional proposals to get a hearing. Just as the Money system was then in a state of flux, so the Constitutions of the nations are now in a state of flux, providing a tactical opportunity which is being thrown away by those who are too prejudiced or too apathetic to take note of the alternative to disaster provided by Douglas. From its very nature the control of a political system is more vulnerable (from within) than that of a financial system, which being entirely metaphysical can be completely centralised; but there is not a vestige of hope in the use of the accepted political methods; the *only* hope lies in the emergence of a new tactic, and that is what Douglas, and the Social Credit Movement, alone can provide.

*The Defendant*, the third organ of opinion which it is useful to consider here, owes its origin to the genius of G. K. Chesterton and of Belloc, but impinges on Social Credit on yet another side. As the name implies its attitude is largely defensive, and it shares also with *Candour* something of the Catholic spirit with which the name of Chesterton has become associated, but the spirit is gayer and the defence more intimate, sharing often with Social Crediters the same objection to interference with food and water and land, just as its predecessors of the *Weekly Review* shared in the struggle against medical monopoly and for the right to contract out of National Insurance. These defensive battles are often imposed upon us by the enemy. They provide *some* training in tactics, and if the ground is well-chosen often a limited success. They are honey in the comb for exploiters and agitators, a potential drain of resources, and in themselves they offer little hope because the initiative remains with the enemy, who can, if every challenge is accepted, absorb and divert energies needed for the determined and unremitting pursuit of policy.

It cannot be said of those who support *The Defendant* that they have no policy or alternative to the present social order. They have their Distributism; and that includes objectives—the decentralised ownership of land and capital and the challenge to what Douglas called “this fantastic overgrowth of industrial expansion”—which are shared with social crediters. This is a great deal of common ground, but there it ends. For to some extent the strictures of *Candour* apply here. Between the aims of the distributists and the present state of affairs there is scarcely the ghost of a bridge; or perhaps one should say that there are any number of bridges leading in every direction but that which they want, for they cannot yet see that the economics of the London School of Economics and the politics of the secret ballot will not serve them, and that Douglas has provided the only mechanisms which will take them where they want to go. Through this failure to discern policies and methods they are liable to give hospitality to a wild medley of incompatible ideas, often mistaking false decentralism for the true thing, yet always with a jovial innocence and integrity which may well save them from a fundamental perversion of policy. They have the weakness as well as the strength of the ‘literary’ mind.

Not that the distributists have not their feet on the earth in one literal sense; for many of them own land, and all of them seem to love it and to understand the nature of the links between men and soil and other living things. Here again is another aspect of Social Credit which we share with them and with that considerable and growing body, the ‘organic’ soil Movement. But here again is another thing which is good so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough; one of the foundations of the Social Credit which, if isolated from the whole Body of which it is a part, is liable to be captured by the Planners and used for their own purposes of Monopoly.

Every school of opinion holds itself to be central, and the others peripheral, but in actual fact Social Credit includes all these things and much more. Within it they fall into their places and form a balanced and formidable whole; without it they are ineffective fragments—ineffective, that is, against an enemy whose policy is complete and armed at every point, except at its very heart. It is easier, of course, to stick to a part, and these parts are big enough to satisfy many people, but there is no survival value in them. Social Credit itself is ‘a portion of reality, probably a small portion’ which cannot stand without the religion upon which it is based, but so long as it does so stand it is a viable, balanced whole, and there is no substitute for it. As a body of thought it is already so huge that there has been a tendency in recent years for social crediters to be satisfied with this or that fragment of it; but this will not do. All thought and action in time is concerned with the particular, and unless integrated tends towards the dis-integral. There is in fact no hope, and no reason for faith, in anything less than the complete doctrine and living policy of Social Credit.

C. G. DOBBS.

### “Wheresoever the Carcase Is . . . .”

“We recognise that what is lacking is something we call judgment, or (very misdescriptively) ‘common’ sense, and that this faculty, so rare that when it *is* combined with intellect it can almost command its own price, is an ability to check constantly and almost automatically theory and ideas against experience. It is exactly the lack of this faculty which is conspicuous in Socialist circles, which by common consent draw their support largely from the influence of well-meaning elementary school-teachers. The modern State-controlled school is the perfect model of bureaucracy, designed primarily for control by the Government rather than for any genuinely educational objective. There is no standard of output, except *si monumentum requiris, circumspice*. Once again, it is evidence of the magnificent material of the British people that a large and increasing proportion of these teachers are revolting against this tendency. But a good deal of harm has been done.

“Now to this type of mind, the fact that you can multiply  $x$  by itself five times, and the results is called  $X^5$ , is not merely proof of a fifth dimension, it is ground for a political world of five dimensions. Or to put the matter another way, ‘the Government’ can order golf-club secretaries to grow asparagus in bunkers. Therefore asparagus will grow in bunkers. This confusion between Aristotelian and Baconian thinking is one of the most valuable tools of arch intrigue.”—(C. H. Douglas, “*Wheresoever the Carcase Is . . .*”)

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

secondary education can conveniently be wiped out. That is the very reason why the parents dislike the proposal. The comprehensive school represents a grave threat to the maintenance of those high standards which the grammar schools of England have so splendidly created. In her letter to the LCC, Miss Horsburgh says that the authority has failed to satisfy her that it would be educationally advantageous to close Eltham Hill School. Educational advantage, not political theory, ought to be the outstanding factor in all decisions on the future of the nation's schools."

Wholly sympathetic with the parents in their antagonism to the modern mass-certification factories, we are still unconvinced concerning the nature of the other 'educational advantages' alleged.

The Welfare State seems to be making an end of the Poor House (of Commons). While objection to M.P.s voting themselves higher wages is hardening (even a *Times* letter points out that M.P.s would get higher wages by reducing taxes), we don't like the proposal to reduce parliamentary salaries to £750 a year and pay (untaxed) expenses and allowances. That is just the managerial revolution applied to the farce of political representation.

A Bill in Parliament proposes legislation to enforce greater safety in factory employment and it is agreed that most accidents occur in the largest factories. The factory owners say they are doing all they can to prevent accidents and to ensure safety. As this is in their own interest we can believe them. The promoters of the Bill do not suggest less industrialisation and fewer and smaller factories but "compulsory safety measures"—meaning Government Inspectors, Safety Committees and all the paraphernalia of State Control. They declare that the 700,000 accidents a year show that "the voluntary system has failed." One member says in debate that "the Bill is full of good intentions, but far the greatest cause of accidents is carelessness in the individual." One "side" accuses the other of making the Bill "a Party cause since all of one Party have spoken against the Bill." In all this confusion what is agreed, not about Parties, but about the need for the Bill? Do we wish our representatives to be "busy-bodies," a class of person resented in real life, or to belong to those who "teach their grandmothers to suck eggs." Do we approve a measure which can be torn to ribbons in a party-Parliament during a debate? We certainly want less wasteful talk and more careful consideration of what may be considered necessary legislation, but most of all we need less legislation. We detect in much current legislation, also, the tendency to place the cart before the horse. The Social Credit minded will look first for causes with the sure instinct that then effects will "wear off." He will be sure first to ask not why but when do most of the accidents occur, and women know that this is when they begin to flag. Will it not be found that the commonest cause of accidents is fatigue of men, of metals, of machinery. One member suggests "further education in prevention." But fatigue cannot be

educated out of an individual. Another regrets that nothing can be devised to force individuals to be careful.

It is declared that more Inspectors are needed. What for? To inspect the racecourse? To lower the fences? We know that they are too high, but no word is heard suggesting that they should be lowered.

On March 3, by 64 votes to 54, the Liverpool City Council upheld the decision of its Housing Committee to refuse to let to Co-operative Societies one quarter of all the shops on their estates. An attempt by the Labour Party to force a reference back of the decision led to a stormy scene, in the course of which it was stated that the Town Clerk had taken counsel's opinion on the question of the rights of councillors to participate in the debate. If members were receiving from the Co-operative Societies benefits which were more than 'trivial' they were not entitled to participate in the debate. He considered that contributions to councillors' election expenses from Co-operative funds would probably constitute a disqualification. The system of selection of tenants at present is on the basis of highest tendering. Birmingham was said to have a 'points' system and an autonomous committee which is not required to account to the City Council.

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Monopoly of Credit.....	12/-
The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
The Alberta Experiment .....	6/-
Economic Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket .....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England .....	8d.
Realistic Constitutionalism .....	8d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting.)

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at (temporarily) 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton.