From Week to Week

"The idleness which is a general charge against the Maoris is sometimes defined: 'They'll work all right, they'll work hard, so long as they're interested in what they're doing. But when they lose interest they'll quit.'—Now this may be a criticism of industrial civilisation rather than of the Maoris;..."—Eric Linklater in *A Year Of Space*.

"In this age of excessive activity—is not activism a major malady of society today?"—The Bishop of Sheffield speaking on the topic "Our Work" at the Anglican Congress in 1954.

"You cannot stock-pile faith, hope and charity. You can store gas in a container, but not love. Love increases the more it is given away."—The Bishop of Sheffield at the Anglican Congress, 1954.

The characteristic of the beehive and the anthill is group purpose, to which all individuality is subordinated; life is functional, a function of the group purpose. To the extent that life becomes functionalised faith, hope and charity become 'stockpiled,' contained. Faith, hope and charity are individual manifestations of a sacramental love; not symbolic, but living, outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace. There is a fundamental difference between functional and sacramental. We should like the Bishop of Sheffield to give attention to the connection between this and the activism which is being fostered in our society.

Freemasonry, which is frequently referred to as the Royal Art, is one of the major instruments of the art of government. Professor Adam Weishaupt, the founder of the Order of the Illuminati, described the object he had in mind as being "permanently to unite thinking men from all parts of the world, of all classes and religions, in a single society, by means of a given higher interest, without prejudice to their freedom of thought, and in spite of all their different opinions and emotions, and to make them, whether they be inferior or equals, enthusiastic and responsive to such a degree that the many may act as one and desire to do of their own volition and with the truest conviction, that which no public compulsion has been able to effect since the world and mankind have existed. Such a society is the Master-piece of human reason, in it and through it the art of government has reached its highest perfection."

Would-be Christians were exhorted to SEEK.

Eugene Lennhorf, in *The Freemasons*, says: "A so-called seeker will find nothing worth seeking here, even if he seek for a thousand years, unless he has within him, when he makes his entry into the Temple, that natural tendency to what constitutes the essential character, and the virtues of, a genuine Freemason." A sorting house?

There is a connection between the subjective approach to a problem, a subject (of a State) and the subjective approach to God of institutional religion. Vanity and conceit are subjective states of mind. They are the opposite to humility, and fatal to an objective study of any problem. Social Credit ideas will become predominant in society in proportion to people's high and low, objectively recognising that in all natural things there is Authority which punishes the unnatural.

The astronomer Kepler claimed that a chief reason for studying nature is to "discover the order and harmony impressed on it by God."

"If God exists, our gaze must be directed at the whole of the Universe, with all that it comprises."—Karl Heim.

"By considering what God has made we can—first of all—catch a glimpse of the divine wisdom which has in some measure impressed a certain likeness to itself upon them."—St. Thomas Aquinas.

"Most men's knowledge of God,' said an ancient writer, 'is derived from visions.' I do not think that such a sequence will prove acceptable today: and the reason lies almost entirely in the growth of science. If God is found, or chiefly found, in the unusual, then there is no significance in the commonplace and we deny one of the deepest implications of the Incarnation."—From The Rede Lecture for 1954 by C. A. Coulson, F.R.S.

"Looking back, for example, over the controversy between Goethe and Newton as to the nature of light, it can now be seen that what Goethe missed in Newton's approach was an attitude of reverence. No one can move among the scientists of today without feeling much the same. There is respect and excitement, sometimes astonishment, but all too seldom reverence."—Ibid.

"This intermingling of man and nature may be seen in several other ways. For man is never only a observer of nature; he is always an actor within nature as well. He can do nothing within the universe—and certainly he can do no science—without implicit assumptions about the order of nature."—Ibid.

"It would be very singular that all nature, all the planets, should obey eternal laws, and that there should be a little animal, five feet high, who, in contempt of these laws, could act as he pleased, solely according to his caprice."—Voltaire.
We have been told that the bishops will only take up the ideas, which in particular have been propagated in our counterpart Voice, if they can think, or others can be allowed to think, that they are the authors of the ideas. We, for our part, have no objection to the bishops taking credit for the ideas, but we do not believe that the menace with which we are confronted can be defeated by such a spirit. More and more we are convinced that somehow the 'high ups' on whom the main responsibility for inaction lies, have, as one of the prior urgencies, to be convinced that failure to discharge their responsibility as it has been clarified will bring punishment to them from Authority.

The cause of Social Credit has some devoted adherents whose splendid work is largely anonymous. But the cutting edge of the movement of the Social Credit idea is provided by those who not merely have understanding: it is the effective focus and presentation of the idea which does the cutting. To be able to do that requires conscientious application, perseverance, practise and discipline. Hard reading, hard thought and the refusal to be put off by initial failures or criticism is necessary. There is in our 'Movement' a grave deficiency of such people. That seems to suggest a failure of a sense of responsibility somewhere.

Speaking at the Bournemouth Round Table a former Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, Mr. E. M. King, said that one evening about four months after the 1945 election he was alone in the House of Commons smoking room with Sir Winston Churchill. The latter told him: “About four months ago I was the most powerful man in the world. Now, no-one will tell me what is happening.” If that was truly meant either Sir Winston's power of self-deception must be extraordinary or Baruch must be a singularly deceptive person. Or could it be that there is about Sir Winston’s conception of power that exceptional quality of vanity which Mr. Punch put his finger on when he raised Mr. Charles Morgan to a dukedom in his ‘New Year's Honours List’ for the unstated, but presumably intended, reason of a birthday gift of fulsome laudation in verse.

On the other hand Sir Winston Churchill can be uncommonly frank. When Mr. King told him that he had just returned from witnessing the bomb devastation caused in Germany, he replied: “Yes, I have been. I have seen. I know I was responsible for it at the time. Looking back I believe it was wrong. History will not forgive me for it, and it is with me in the watches of the night.”

Has History the power of forgiveness?

The U.S.A. National Debt is now approximately $300 billion (in America a billion is a thousand million), and is more than seven times as large as it was in 1939.

In Great Britain, at approximately £27,000 million it is rather more than three and a half times as large as it was in 1939.

Before the last war some fifteen hundred Local Authorities in Great Britain received a letter from the United Ratepayers Advisory Association telling them that if they adamantly insisted on it they could monetise their own assets through the agency of the banks, and by doing so eliminate Local Government Debt. They were told that it could be done at a single charge of not more than one half of one per cent.

That child of the New Deal, the Tennessee Valley Authority, is able to sell power cheaper than any private company, because it escapes payment of all taxes. Private companies pay 23% of their revenue in taxes in the U.S.A., and dividends to those who put up their capital absorbing another 27%. The T.V.A. interest payment on its power plant investment (approximately $13,000 million) is less than 1/10 of one per cent. per annum. Wages are a minor cost in the ‘generation of power.

The T.V.A. capital came out of Federal Taxation. But the National Debt rises on average nearly $100 million each working day, on which the taxpayers pay $6 billion a year in interest.

Now that the Bank of England is nationalised the Chancellor of the Exchequer has prima facie control over the financial system of this country. The Chancellor, Mr. R. A. Butler, is a Roman Catholic. We notice that a monthly claim which is due for expert inside knowledge on almost every subject, credits Mr. Butler with extraordinary qualities of heart and head. We would very much like to see a competent Social Crediter, arguing from the standpoint of the Moral Law, and with the Pope's Christmas Address as a basis, point out to Mr. Butler how he could bend financial policy to eradicate so many of the evils which beset our society. In conformity with what the Pope has said the Catholic Hierarchy in this country could be invited to take up the matter with Mr. Butler. We should like to think that on reading this a good many of our readers will essay this task, if only as a useful exercise for their faculties and knowledge.

J.M.

Policy in relation to Authority and Freedom

Douglas on one occasion referred to Social Credit as “The Policy of a Philosophy” ; on another he described it as “Applied Christianity.” Combined it appears that Social Credit is a Policy of Christian Philosophy—an idea that is inherent, and easily discerned, in most, if not all, of Douglas's other works and public utterances.
Christian Philosophy conceives the Almighty as a Society-in-Unity; the Catholic Declaration of Faith—The Athanasian Creed—affirms that the Three Persons are not to be confounded nor the Substance divided; and that Such as One Person is, so is Each of the Others. Yet there are not Three Almighties but One Almighty—the One and Supreme Authority.

Compatible with its Philosophy, the Doctrine decrees that the Almighty's Purpose (Policy) in Human Creation was to enable the individual "to know Him, to love Him and to serve Him." That is to say "Truth," "Love," and "Service" (Freedom) have been revealed to man not as Three Authorities, nor Two Authorities but as a "Society-in-Unity" of Policy.

It seems as if this fundamental issue of Policy in relation to Authority and Freedom has exercised the mind of man for many centuries. St. Thomas Aquinas asserted that "Human Reason cannot be exercised freely (my italics) unless it be disciplined (my italics) authoritatively." It is also significant and worthy of note that the importance of this matter did not escape the early attention of Douglas. In 1920 he observed: "We are confronted by the fundamental alternatives of freedom and authority but it should be possible if the previous pages have conveyed the intention (my italics) of this writer, to see that these are not necessarily alternatives at all—they are policies each fundamentally (my italics) 'right' on its own plane of action. Self-expression of the individual is not only the certain eventual outcome of these present discontents—it is the only outcome which will make possible a perfect voluntary discipline (my italics) in execution based on a faith amounting to knowledge that thereby each private in the human army is fighting the fight which concerns every man—freedom of judgment, movement, influence, and work."

Now it has been observed that on this physical plane all action involving the action and reaction of cooperation has a "Society-in-Unity" foundation—the three factors being Policy, Administration and Sanctions. Each of these is identifiable separately, are equally important, are not to be confused, and must be a correct and balanced relation to Natural Law. Yet they cannot be divided but must eventually be brought to a balanced integration from whence will proceed the "perfect voluntary discipline" to which reference has already been made. Unaided by this "Discipline" human reason fails!

Douglas has put the issue this way: "Social Credit assumes that Society is primarily metaphysical and must (my italics) have regard to the organic relationships of its Prototype."

Thus it is that LOVE in its Super-human Authority and Perfect Freedom is the Only Policy, and it may be that Douglas had something of this nature in mind when he entitled his favourite work—"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom?"—Whose Service is Perfect Freedom.

AUSTIN O. COOPER.

NOTES:

(1) A far more profound political document than is commonly realised (Realistic Constitutionalism, C.H.D., page 9).
(2) "In the Beginning was the Word."
(3) Whose Service is Perfect Freedom.
(4) Theologia S. (St. T. Aquinas).
(5) Credit Power and Democracy (C.H.D., page 144).
(7) To the question "What will establish Social Credit?" Douglas made the monosyllabic reply—"Events!"

**The Battle through the Centuries**

Ever since Christianity had reached that stage in its growth when the pagan world had to recognise that it could no longer be ignored, nor suppressed by persecution, a period roughly coincident with the time of the Emperor Constantine, its history has been one of continual warfare with principalities and powers.

The first great Christian emperor has been represented in many lights; as a defender and a perverter of the faith, protecting or merely using it for his own ambitious ends. The truth, no doubt, is that like most men his motives were many and mixed. He was statesman enough to recognise the value of peace and harmony within the Empire, and unity within the Church. He does not appear to have interfered unduly with its affairs, and when he did, it was sometimes at the request of the dignitaries of the Church, which itself was still in its early period of consolidation, and torn with the dissension of heresies. The relation of church and state had scarcely been defined. At Nicæa he is said to have taken no part in the discussion, nor attempted to influence its course. Presiding, he exhorted the participants to "courses most pleasing to the supreme God" and to the "removal of perplexities, whereby you will confer an exceeding favour on me your fellow servant." Nothing more could be desired if his actions matched his words.

Such a state of affairs was not to last long. When a council was summoned to condemn Athanasius, his successor, Constantine said, in reply to a statement that such action would be uncanonical, "Whatever I will, let that be esteemed a canon." Later we have what appears to be the first brave voice of authority, when the aged bishop Hosius, writing from exile admonished him—"Intrude not yourself with sacred matters. God has given into your hands a Kingdom, to us lie has entrusted the Church." Time after time in the succeeding years, and all through the Dark Ages, till a deeper insight began to arrive at some sort of balance, church and state came into conflict, sometimes one and sometimes the other achieving ascendancy. The great St. Ambrose on several occasions succeeded in restraining the unchristian actions of the Emperor Theodosius, twice on account of the infliction of punishment too severe. Once he refused to celebrate the Eucharist till sentence was revoked, and again he closed the doors of the church in the Emperor's face, till the latter admitted to having "learned the difference between a bishop and a prince," between authority and power.

In England, Henry VIII was not the first to set himself up as an authority on spiritual affair. The Conqueror, aided and supported by the Church in his conquest, repudiated it and Pope Gregory as soon as he was established. Each had exceeded his prerogative. The battles between Beckett and Henry II, between Langton and John are well-known to history if the principles at stake are not. Despite the various matters involved each was a challenge to absolute power. Edward III, on the other hand, successfully resisted a pope's bid for temporal power. Queens were rebuked as well as kings. Parliaments, in these degenerate days, can break the laws of God unchallenged. Archbishop Peckham wrote to Queen Eleanor as follows:—"Late passing by our town called Westcliffe, I heard by the complaint of the people, that they are destroyed and oppressed because more
is demanded of them for the farm of the town than it amounts to. Besides this, my lady, for God's sake when you receive land or manor acquired by usury of Jews take heed that usury is a mortal sin to those who take it and those who support it, if they do not return it. And therefore I say to you, my very dear lady, before God and the court of heaven, that you cannot attain things thus acquired if you do not make amends to those who have lost them. . . . My Lady, know that I am telling you the lawful truth." She is required to abstain from "this illicit and damned gain," to restore the property and satisfy the sufferers, otherwise she may not obtain absolution, even if an angel were to assert the contrary. Our modern planners, who confiscate land at will, need to be addressed in similar terms. The term usury, as used in the middle ages, needs exact definition, but the Archbishop recognised that the misuse of money was a potent cause of poverty and loss of liberty as a result.

So down through the centuries the struggle went on, while that marvellous trinitarian order, reflecting eternal stability was conceived in men's minds and made effective, slowly and never perfectly, but rooted in reality. Out of it came Magna Carta, and the freedom and consequent strength of Great Britain and her Empire, which continued as long as its cause was remembered and declined as it was lost. It spread to other countries too, in varying degree, till at last for a whole century our civilisation seemed secure and Europe was at peace, except for minor outbreaks originating in those states where power remained unchecked. The decline, it is true, had already set in, but there is always a time-lag between seed-time and harvest. America too grew strong, in this strength, and not through its great material advance which was only a result of the initiative released.

Dr. Benes and the Grand Orient

Sir,—I derived great pleasure from reading Count Raczynski's illuminating and accurate story of the late and unainted Dr. Benes' political manoeuvres. He omits, however, any reference to the important fact that Benes was not only a thirty-three degree Mason, but actually, for a year at least, Grand Master of the United Lodges of the Czechoslovak Republic, which of course were closely affiliated to the Grand Orient, whose orders they were eager to obey. To appreciate the complexities of Central European politics, especially during the recent war years, a study of international Freemasonry is imperative.

After the Grand Orient had issued its famous order to oppose the Pope's noble efforts for a fair and negotiated peace, it may well have been surprised at its success. The next mot d'ordre to all its adherents was, of course, to do the bidding of Soviet Russia without ever joining the Communist Party. Dr. Benes may have been instrumental in the ruin and destruction of his unhappy country, but his loyalty to his Masonic oath was never questioned.

Yours faithfully,

102, Oakley Street, S.W.3.

GERALD HAMILTON.

—From The Tablet, January 22, 1955.

Atomic Scientists and atomic scientists

We understand that the relations between science and politics comprise the exact field of Atomic Scientists. The following is taken from an article by Medford Evans in Human Events of January 8, 1955. Mr. Medford Evans had eight years with the Atomic Energy Commission:

ATOMIC SCIENTISTS (the capitals are essential) are not necessarily scientists at all. Their leading organisation, the Federation of American Scientists, is a registered political lobby, with a walk-up office at 1749, L. Street, N.W., in Washington, across the street from Duke Zeibert's restaurant and around the corner from the Mayflower.

You do not have to be a scientist to belong to the Federation. I know this because I was asked to join by the President of one of its constituent organisations. He knew very well that I was not a scientist. He assumed that I might help with the propaganda. I am sure it never occurred to him that there was anything improper in suggesting membership to me. For, as a scientist himself, he knew that the purpose of the organisation was propaganda and not science, and therefore the fact that I was not qualified as a scientist could not hurt the organisation. The trouble is that the very considerable influence of the organisation depends on the assumption by the public that the "Federation of American Scientists" is a scientific organisation, in the same sense that the American Chemical Society is. It is not. It exists in order to pass resolutions, distribute selected bits of news and influence legislation. A current advertisement contains the following exhortation: "JOIN THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS, the national organisation of scientists in all fields that maintains a 'listening post' for your information and guidance through contacts on Capitol Hill and with the press." That is both frank and accurate. Too modest, really. FAS influence on Capitol Hill is formidable, and with the press almost miraculous. It probably generates more agit-prop power per dollar than any other political outfit in Washington. Affiliated with the Federation is the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. While the Federation is frankly political, and registered as a lobby, the Bulletin is "educational" and does not pay taxes. It is supposed to be financed by the Ford Foundation. The Chairman of its "Board of Sponsors" is J. Robert Oppenheimer, and the Vice-Chairman is Harold C. Urey. The Editor is Eugene Rabinowitch. A leading member of the editorial board is Edward A. Shils, who is not a scientist. The influence of the Bulletin is enormous. Its own circulation is small, but its views are reflected punctually in such newspapers as the Christian Science Monitor, New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Washington Post, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, San Francisco Chronicle, and many others. In fact, never did so many agree so promptly about such important subjects which they understood so little. It has been the same with periodicals. The Nation, New Republic, Atlantic, Harpers, American Magazine, Look, Newsweek, Police Gazette, and Foreign Affairs may not have much else in common, but they all remain basically consistent with the position or positions of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.