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Culture and Ritual

The remarkable television broadcast of the Royal Wedding in London on July 29 was an extraordinary actualisation of C.H. Douglas’s article under the above title published 36 years ago. In this period more than a generation of those born before World War II will have passed away, while many of the oncoming generations will have had no experience of the glory that was Great Britain.

The telecast was like a resurrection of times now long past, and the conduct of the enormous crowds who were present — but mostly could see little of the total ceremonial — bore witness to an underlying, but probably unconscious, or latent, stratum of the British character, the importance of which Douglas so clearly recognised.

Britain is now infested with traitors and aliens. But while that latent culture survives, and if the traitors were to be exposed — as they would have been if they had tried to disrupt the Wedding ceremonies — the way might be opened to a regeneration of the British character and tradition. That, combined with political and economic realism as advocated these many years through The Social Crediter and founded on Douglas’s profound insights, might release us from the present nightmare state of crime, violence and amorality into the light of a better day, and that promising future of which we have been deliberately deprived, as Douglas’s article, which follows, makes clear.

We make no pretence of ability to judge the inevitability or otherwise of cultural defeat. But we notice in many quarters a new awareness of what we have been proclaiming to the best of our ability for the past ten years — that the wars and economic depressions of this century were consciously planned to induce the psychological background for a world revolution which would use the exaggerated and manufactured prestige of “Labour” to eliminate the prestige of culture, and, “in war, or under threat of war” to replace the vitality and attraction of the old Europe by the drab uniformity of a Russian workers-ant-heep. That is a new feature in the situation; and it may be that the shock of the election has wakened many people to the fact that the greatest war of all is still to be fought — to a conclusion, this time. For it is evident that the root of insecurity, both personal and national, is embedded in the rise of the politics of mass democracy. The mere mechanism is immaterial; what is deadly is the technique, however embodied, of using mass action against minorities.

It may quite reasonably be asked at this point, “What do you mean by culture — a word which in itself may mean anything from a bacteriological preparation to the output of a ladies’ school?” While a short answer is not easy, we are more and more convinced that one very important component of the culture we have in mind is ritual. We are more certain in this respect because of the existence of two factors amongst many. The first is that the most important forces in the world, the Catholic Church and Freemasonry, are obviously based on ritual. And the second is the persistent campaign of ridicule waged through the press and the B.B.C. against the ritualistic basis of the English tradition. It is relevant to this matter that, on no less authority than that of Sir Paul Dukes, “The Comintern was founded with this specific aim” (the overthrow of existing institutions) “and the British Empire was declared to be the main target of the Revolutionary crusaders.” — (The Tablet, August 11, 1945).

Every effort is made to suggest that ritual is a “class trick”; that “Manners makyth man” has no reality in comparison with a six valve radio or a rousing gangster film straight from Hollywood. There could be no greater falsity. The culture we have in mind is far more extensively diffused amongst the “lower income brackets” than amongst the ornaments of Big Business. But it is not politically effective — in fact, the generous tolerance which goes with, and is the outcome of, has been used to enlist its suffrages to its own destruction as well as the permanent enslavement of the populace.

(Continued on page 3)
The Mystique of Inflation

World-wide inflation: what is this? A disease, like malaria, parasite-borne; or an epidemic, like influenza or typhus? Is it a physical entity, with mass and dimensions. Or a malign influence, even a person, or group?

According to politicians – briefed by certificated economists – it is “the enemy”; number one target, to be fought as top priority of Governments. The Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Malcolm Fraser, has even promised to “throttle” inflation, if only the Trades Unions will share with him restraint in demands for more money. So?

The Oxford English Dictionary: “inflation n. inordinate rise in prices; (formerly) inordinate increase in the supply of money regarded as the cause of such a rise”. That “formerly” suggests that the ‘regard’ has been abandoned; but current usage rather suggests that it has been reanimated. And current usage simply amounts to obfuscation of the real issue confronting civilisation—the catastrophic destruction of centuries of progress from the Dark Ages towards, as C.H. Douglas put it, “the emergence into the full light of a day of such splendour as we can at present only envisage dimly”.

The Social Credit usage of the term inflation is: “Inflation consists in an expansion of the figures of money available accompanied by a corresponding rise in prices”. With the proliferation of “modern” but conflicting official economic theories—beginning with J.M. Keynes’s “pump-priming”, which opened the door to the idea that elected governments should “manage” the economy—the road has led on to the current disputation concerning methods of management.

It amounts almost to an article of faith among professional (i.e., certificated) economists that inflation is due to “too much money chasing too few goods”. The actual situation is that there is too little money chasing more than enough goods. Hence—depression and misery.

There is undoubtedly a correlation between so-called inflation, and the progressive deterioration of the economic system and the state of society. So the question arises: is “inflation” a cause, or an effect? The first step towards an answer is to define inflation in a mathematically precise form, as follows: Inflation is defined as the loss of purchasing-power of the unit of money over a unit of time. That is, to establish it as a ratio.

Now if the unit of time is, say, one month, and the purchasing-power of the unit of money is, say, $30 of price values of consumable articles of production (for example, 30 articles at $1 each) at the beginning of the month, while at the end of the month the unit is only 29 articles, the purchasing-power of the unit has fallen by 3.3%.

The thirty articles (or units of production) can be taken as the productive capacity per unit of time, and from a physical point of view may be postulated to remain constant over the month. But from the seller’s point of view, one unit of the production will remain unsold.

If in the second month $30 will purchase only 28 articles, the purchasing-power has fallen by 6.7%, and the seller now has 3 unsold articles of production—5% of his two month’s production. At the end of 4 months, 8.3% of his total production will be unsold. Hence—reduced production, and unemployment, as fixed costs (rent, maintenance, energy etc.) overtake profits.

The essential point to grasp is that under normal circumstances a given level of production per unit of time is at least sustained, but with increased efficiency of process is more likely to be increased, so long as demand for its products, mediated by purchasing-power, is sustained.

However, again under normal conditions (chiefly, absence of war or of preparation for war; or excessive capital expenditure—all of which generate incomes which are spent on consumer goods) the industrial system as a whole does not distribute sufficient purchasing-power to purchase the total output of consumable goods, and over a period of time, the deficiency increases, giving grounds for industrial unrest and social disorder.

That is the case is mathematically demonstrable with complete certainty*; but that is not the province of this article.

Thus “inflation” is not the cause, but the consequence of the disruption of the economic process through progressive loss of consumer purchasing-power. (The average household income in Australia in 1976-77 was about $1500, and assuming a 15% annual increase, would now be about $2500—an increase of 66%. Gross domestic product in 1976-77 was about $1650 per household, and would now be about $2900—an increase of 75%.)

The sustained claim that inflation is the cause of our economic woes is simply the calculated promotion of a delusion. This delusion suits the purposes of politicians—steady increase in the powers of politicians. Politicians do not “fight inflation” they pass more and more laws, which beget multiple Regulations, which progressively restrict the freedom of individuals.

And that is the Big Idea. Behind the will-to-power of the politicians is the greater will-to-power of the international money oligarchy, centuries old, and aiming at eventual total world government, appointing its own successors for all time to come. And, in Douglas’s words, “they care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow”. The state of the world, thirty-five years after the end of World War II (which was only an incident in a long-term plan) should be evidence enough of that. The key to an understanding of this situation is that persistence in the operation of a defective financial system is the core of the strategy for world conquest. In C.H. Douglas’s words, published more than half a century ago: “We are more than ever, if possible, convinced that a falling price level without loss to producers and entrepreneurs, is the very core of social and industrial pacification. And we are equally convinced by 30 years specialised experience and observation that the coterie which is at the core of world unrest knows it too, and is determined that at whatever cost, extending to the complete destruction of civilisation, and even of the terrestrial...

* See The Monopoly of Credit, 3rd or 4th Edn., by C.H. Douglas for a full analysis.
The Common Market

Written from 2, Park Village East, London, and dated July 10, 1981, the following letter was addressed to the Editor, The Times, London:

"Sir,

"In the leading article in The Times of May 4, 1971, the writer predicted that if negotiations for British entry to the Common Market failed, 'That would be a total, disastrous and unmitigated defeat for us, threatening our industry, our currency, our standard of living, our level of employment and even our political institutions with a crisis in the 1970s to which we have no apparent answer'.

"Since, regardless of our having joined, the threat has become an actuality, where do we go from here?

"Yours faithfully,

Basil L. Steele"

A reply, dated July 17, 1981, read:

"The Editor thanks you for the letter you kindly sent recently, which has been read with interest. He regrets, however, it has not been possible to find a place for it in the correspondence columns".

The Survival of Christian Civilization

(Reprinted from our issue for February 21, 1970)

It is more than half a century since C. H. Douglas set out the principles which were necessary for the survival of Christian civilisation. The year 1918 saw the defeat of the first attempt, under German auspices, to set up a World Government under Prussian hegemony. Even by the turn of the century the world stood on the threshold of unprecedented and probably unsuspected prosperity, whose potential stood revealed in the massive expansion of resources for the purposes of destruction and carnage. Before the war a genuine World Order was evolving under the protection of the British navy and rooted in a steadily spreading, though not fully understood, Christian culture. By its very nature modern industrial production obeys an exponential law in its growth—that is to say that its rate of growth is proportional to its state of growth, exactly as happens when money accumulates at compound interest. This process, if unimpeded, would more and more rapidly have raised the standard of living of the whole world; and colonialism, necessarily harsh in its beginnings, would just as necessarily have become increasingly benevolent in its operations.

It is clear now, as it was not in 1914, that the War was a conscious operation to impede this process. Great Britain, above all others, "won" the war, but was promptly subjected to the terms of defeat: "When the war is over, we can force them to our way of thinking, because by that time they will, among other things, be financially in our hands". At the end of the war, Great Britain was industrially stronger than ever before, and still mistress of the seas. But financially she was in "American" hands, and a policy of "paying for the war" was enforced on her. Later, in order to conform to "our way of thinking" she was forced (through the agency of traitors, conscious and unconscious) to contribute to the rearming of Germany, so that the whole process of conquering Great Britain and dismantling the British Empire could be resumed, this time to a fatal conclusion. Why is Great Britain, once the foremost industrial and cultural Power in the world, now reduced to a mere 'Britain' seeking dissolution in a "Europe" increasingly dominated by a vanquished Germany?

This result could never have been achieved without the active collusion of traitors within her shores—Quislings. Advocates of World Government have made themselves aliens—they have divested themselves of their nationality just as surely as an alien may acquire a new nationality through due process of naturalisation. This would be plain enough if there were a legal process of "denaturalisation" which formally categorised them as aliens; and then the fact that they have seized the government of the country would be plain to see, and their role as traitors understood. The position of internationalists in national Governments is completely anomalous; but because they have achieved their positions by intrigue, treachery and conspiracy over a relatively long period of time, while their co-conspirators have infiltrated and perverted 'education' and the mass-media, their advance to tyranny has passed all but unnoticed. But the present stand-ins for World Governors in the British Parliament will be replaced in due course by Kremlin-trained Administrators, backed by the International Police to enforce International Law. As this Law will be concerned with redistributing national wealth among the 'needy' areas of the globe, it will not be popular, and national police could hardly be looked to to enforce it. And this is what it will come to quite soon unless the traitors are arraigned in Parliament, and dealt with. To substitute an election for an arraignment, at this stage, will be a giant stride towards the end.

CULTURE AND RITUAL

(Continued from Page 1)

But of course the whole question is beyond argument. No honest person hesitates to admit the defects of the nineteenth century while claiming that it was the high watermark of modern civilisation. No instructed person has any doubt that it was, fundamentally, the corruption of the English tradition by the essentially "vulgar rich" on both sides of the Atlantic and the North Sea to which practically all those defects can be traced—the same vulgar rich who are using mass democracy to complete the ruin they have conceived. And the bulwark against these vulgar rich was tradition—a body, as such, without a soul—has been guilty of the unforgivable sin, and must suffer for it. And the most deadly error we can make is to look to it, in its present form, for salvation.

*See The Moving Storm, pp. 114.
The British Empire

(Originally published in these pages in February, 1968)

Sir Arthur Bryant, writing in The Illustrated London News, Jan. 27, 1968, observes: "Despite the inevitable short-comings and mistakes of any institution operated by fallible human beings, the British Empire, above all the British raj in the east, during its period of ascendancy increased the sum total of justice, impartially and pacifically enforced law, and a certain kindliness and mercifulness of dealing—qualities in its rulers of which mankind has stood in need ever since human society began and stands in desperate need today." And he quotes the philosopher George Santayana writing of the British colonial administrator and serviceman: that "never since the heroic days of Greece has the world had such a sweet, just, boyish master. It will be a black day for the human race when scientific blackguards, conspirators, churls and fanatics manage to supplant him".

That day has come, says Sir Arthur. But to Mr. Richard Crossman devaluation and withdrawal from 'East of Suez' are "giant strides towards the historic mission of British Socialism".

Of course, there is no such thing as 'British' socialism. As Marx said, the British are too stupid to make their own revolution, therefore foreigners must make it for them. The overall benevolence of British colonialism was the outcome of the Anglo-Saxon character, which was mutilated in two contrived world wars, and swamped by alien immigration.

Sir Arthur says: "There are certain transmitted qualities in the British fighting services, allied with certain temperamental aptitudes in the British character when conditioned by discipline and esprit de corps, which are ideally suited for dealing with the violence engendered by inflamed popular passions and for combating the kind of war to which such passions and the Communist technique of infiltration and armed intimidation give rise. It has grown out of our history, and particularly our military and naval history, and is a quality of great price, desperately needed in the world of today."

Invective

They say there are only seven archetypal jokes. Lady Astor's "I wish there were poison," alleged to have been uttered in handing Senator Joseph McCarthy a drink, seems closely related to "If I were your wife I should poison you," a gently expressive sentiment reported of the same Lady to (then) Mr. Churchill. Churchill's "And if I were your husband I should drink it" is (in our opinion) less good than McCarthy's "I understand that some nice old lady made that remark, but I didn't hear it." Perhaps it all depends on whether you think wrath should be turned-on or turned-away.

The poor old world hears far too much. There are too many "Masterpieces of Invective."

These paragraphs are from our "Week to Week" notes for October 17, 1953.

Britain – Once Great

Upon the whole, it appears to us that the British empire has made an advance in all the prime elements of greatness during the last hundred years, such as cannot be found paralleled on the same scale in any history. If we look into the past, we nowhere see such a bound forward made by any country; so we may fairly say that here is a new exemplification of the power of a naturally well-endowed race to advance in national greatness when circumstances of a greatly unfavourable kind, such as war, are not allowed a strong operation. It is very clear that no persons living in 1645, and looking abroad on his past and present, could have seen grounds for supposing that a century later was to commence such a period as we now see closing. Does not that period argue a degree of national improbability to which it might be difficult to set limits? Does it not show that, if no worse catastrophe than has marked the past century shall mark the future career of this empire, the condition at which it shall have arrived in 1945, in physical and moral greatness, must be something of which we would vainly at present endeavour to imagine the particulars? What, this great and 'still increasing London may in 1945 be a town of eight million of inhabitants—a phenomenon which the world has not heretofore witnessed. A vast amount of the waste barbarous parts of the earth—perhaps all Asia, excepting that belonging to Russia—shall have yielded to the British sway, and begun to adopt the manners, language, and moral ideas of this people. To how many of distresses of the sons of earth will remedies have then been applied? How many great questions in physical science and ethics will then have been solved? How sweetly will the wheels of the social machine, as well as the current of individual life then move!

Alas, why have we been condemned to live in the early part of this darkling century, streaked but with the dawning of so much glory! How enviable those who shall be born unto our children's children!

—Chamber's Edinburgh Journal, March 1, 1845.

Negative Capability

"At once it struck me what quality went to form a man of achievement, especially in literature, and which Shakespeare possessed so enormously—I mean Negative Capability, that is when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts without any irritable reaching after fact and reason"—Keats.
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