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The Big Idea

BY C.H. DOUGLAS

As we can see by observation, the only result of building up a “strong” State is to force the building of one still stronger. The British traditional policy of the balance of power was the only practical way of dealing with this outcome of the State system, and had the British Government retained that integrity (in the sense I have defined the word) which it began to lose with the rise of the Whigs and their backers, there would have been no world war. But the oblique vision which was the inevitable result of the conflict between a national policy and a policy warped to advantage the international interests of Rothschilds, Sassoons, Schiffs, Sterns, Schroeders, and other sibilants has been fatal to that single-mindedness which was essential. If anyone supposes that a mass grouping of Power will do anything but hasten the coming of a still more appalling war, if we survive this one, then I can only ask him to consider the rapidity with which this one has come upon us, when, twenty-two years ago we appeared to have reached a period of impregnable.

On the other hand, provided that absolute integrity of purpose, combined with freedom to contract out can be maintained, progressive decentralisation must succeed. The integrity of purpose required is not in opposition to human nature, as in the case of progressive centralisation, but in its best interests. It is in fact essential to the further progress of humanity, just as exercise is essential to the growth of a child. Nothing is so destructive as continual frustration (that is one of the worst features of Government Departments) and nothing develops a man like achievement. Such virtues are peculiar to the newer countries derive directly from the absence of unnecessary hindrances. The British are being stifled with them.

Finally, we come to the question of technique. There are obvious reasons, more particularly at the present time, which are a valid argument against “plans of campaign,” just as against “planning.” But certain considerations may be emphasised.

Every prohibition of individual initiative is a victory for the enemy to exactly the extent that it is effective. Not only does it, in itself, represent one more step towards the Slave World, but, except under certain conditions, it sets up a habit of apathetic acquiescence which is exactly what
is desired. One of the Planners “hoped to keep the war going” for exactly this purpose; those conditions, however, are not unduly difficult to create.

The first strategy has many times been emphasised—it is to insist that Members of Parliament are representatives, not delegates. I am still of the opinion that so long as Parliamentary institutions subsist, which may not be much longer, this line of action is vital.

But the same principle can be carried into every official quarter. Once get the mental attitude well established in oneself that institutions exist only legitimately to serve individuals, and it is possible to make demands of Government Departments with which their organisation cannot deal, but are yet entirely reasonable. It is not necessary and not desirable, to organise this kind of action. The underlying idea is to call the bluff of institutionalism, and to make it either deliver the goods or expose the fact that it can’t.

It is necessary to face up to the fact of institutionalised Judaeo-Christianity, the official philosophy of England, Scotland, and Wales, which is simply Liberal Judaism. I may perhaps repeat my belief, not only that Christianity has not failed because it has not been tried, but that it has not been tried mainly because Judaeo-Christianity has taken care that it should not be tried.

At the present time, ecclesiastics of the Churches of England and Scotland, are making every effort in their power to identify the Kingdom of God upon Earth with Jewish Socialism (which is State Capitalism with monopoly control by Finance), and, in many cases, doing it from what, in a restricted sense, might be called the highest motives—derived from assuming as axiomatic, the tenets of a philosophy systematically inculcated almost from birth. Against this hypnotic obsession, argument is useless—de-hypnotisation is essential.

It is of the essence of Social Credit ideas that there is an organic connection between peoples, races, and individuals, and the soils of particular portions of the earth’s surface which are individualistic. The Russians are fighting, not for internationalism, but for nationalism.

It is important to enquire into, and to pillory, the fact that the Socialist Party, while demanding the evacuation of the native of these islands can be trusted to hammer out his best destiny. He will not be assisted by Secret Societies.

And the root of the matter is—mind your own business, and allow no man to make a business of minding you. Listen, in reason, to what advice seems to be backed by proper experience and ability, and pay no attention to windy idealism. And then—mind your own business. It is in sore need of your attention. (Concluded)
stuff about. What they think may be detrimental to us
(i.e. the systematic lowering of the threshold for 'newspeak'
and raising of the threshold for genuine ideas—T.J.) may
be the thing that's keeping us alive.” Here Major Douglas
spoke with approval of Voigt's article in The Month. All
the error and evil of centuries had been heaping up, and
there was now too much of what the Arabs call “ripe fate"
for there to be any other outcome, but it had got to work
itself out. This might seem pessimistic, but it was realistic.
“Ripe fate” was only another way of asserting what we were
asserting: that there is Law, that you can't invent it, but
at best discover it, etc. If you must go the long way
round and wait for it to assert itself unpleasantly, you do,
course discover it, but have the unpleasant effects as well.

(T.J. reported that a dead-wood circulation of The Social
Crediter collected during 1946-8 had been rigidly pruned,
reducing the circulation temporarily to 200 below the peak
of the early war years. This ground had now all been re-
covered, there was an increased trade sale, and the circula-
tion was again rising very slowly but steadily.)

Major Douglas linked this up with what he had said about
"stronger drinks". It was a good thing that an unknown
public was increasingly interested in us even if only to a
numerically small degree. The Social Crediter should be
continued and without altering its essential qualities and
character. It wasn't a paper for everybody; but it must
not speak with two voices. No one else was doing what we
were doing. It was from one point of view lamentable to
see papers of some merit going down one after another,
until literally we were the only one left; but it was significant
that it was safer to be right than only half-right from a
sales point of view.

"Intellectual and moral prestige is closely linked with
credit and the value of the £.” If they or we were to find
salvation, the very first thing to do was to drive down prices
at any cost and increase faith in the £. (* the Government.)

In passing Major Douglas mentioned a chapter, "Tennis
and the Ape Man" in a book by Capt. W. C. Bruges,
Principles of Liberty published in £1937 by M. F. Robin-
son, 57 High Street. Lowestoft, and also Hinton's The
Fourth Dimension in conjunction with Dunn's treatment
of Immortality. (Hinton's book calls for rigid logical appli-
cation.—T.J.) Major Douglas remarked later, but with
reference to such matters as are discussed in the works
mentioned, that "orthodox methods of dealing with the
situation are obviously no good—they simply aren't work-
ing".

The position in Canada was discussed at somewhat
greater length than is here represented:—

"It does look at the moment as though, here and in
Canada and indeed everywhere, the Constitutional issue
is the issue which is uppermost. We want to make it
clear to everybody that what you can do in the way of
Constitution-making is very little. We have to bring out the
Truth—the nature of the Universe. Either what the situa-
tion yields is in accordance with the nature of things, or it
isn't. The nearer you get to the way things work, the less
need there is for a Constitution at all. No Constitution can
decide that it would be better to reap all the wheat at
Christmas and sow again in summer. If you say that,
you're calling in two doctors. We must destroy this idea
that the House of Commons can do anything; our answer
is the correct one: 'Yes, but we don't want to be the
victims of its follies!'"

The right course in Canada, "which, of course, they won't
take, is for someone to blow the gaffe on the whole thing.
What they could do there is to hammer away at the iniquity
of having their laws disallowed. But they won't do that
because they're all politicians". It was one thing to fight
the financial system—but a triangular fight was hopeless.

Major Douglas scouted the idea that there was anything
behind the effort being made to revive political Liberalism.
A distinction had to be made between what the Liberal
says and what he does. The finances of the country were
better conducted under Gladstone; but there were two
possible views of Gladstone—that he was one of those
people with a genius for deceiving themselves; or that he
was one of those who say "I can get most done by playing
in with these people". Up to a point, and then what?

Major Douglas again referred to the notion of "ripe fate".
The whole of the matter was the contradiction in
the present world between those who behaved (with dis-
astrous results) as though the world and only the world
could give and take away, and those who knew there was
something the world could neither give nor take away.
"The net result of 'science' is that we know nothing of
any value to us."

For Review

The Constitutional issue, philosophy, politics, economics
and strategy were examined by the late C.H. Douglas in his
regular notes under the heading "From Week to Week" in The
Social Crediter in which, in 1957 and early 1958, after his
death, a wide selection of these notes was republished. Later,
in 1969, this selection was published in book form under the
title The Development of World Dominion.

The notes which follow, with dates of original publication
shown in brackets at the end of each item, are again offered,
for the benefit of new readers and as a review by others.

* * *

The set of ideas which became the movement known as
Social Credit began with an examination of the problem
of the relationship of the individual to the group, and the
financial proposals which emerged were consciously, and in
all their developments, designed to free the individual from
group domination. It is evident that the essential nature of
the problem, not merely has not changed, but has become
more sharply defined.

It was, early in the elaboration of the ideas, recognised
that the group is essentially atavistic; it is something from
which the individual has emerged, and his return to it is in
the nature of spiritual death. Without, in this place, elabo-
rating the connection between the anti-religious aspect of
Communism, the soullessness of mass production, and the
incompatibility of cartelize and Trades Unionism with
peace, it may be emphasised that there is a connection be-
tween all of them, and it is epitomised in that amazing
reply: "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's, and unto
God that which is God's." Caesar is, of course, functionalism,
and if functionalism can be made paramount, if the William
can be paralysed by the Arm, if the Good which I Will I do not can be made uniform by the omnipotence of the atavistic Group over the emergent individual, then indeed the Devil is triumphant.

(Nov. 1, 1947.)

There is a certain body of opinion which is under the impression that we have abandoned the financial aspect of Social Credit. In this connection, we are reminded of a pungent criticism made some years ago, that the great disadvantage under which the Social Credit movement then laboured, was that it was largely composed of Socialists who wanted nationalisation of banking.

People who hold this type of opinion have not taken the trouble to grasp the fundamental subject matter with which we have always been concerned, which is the relationship of the individual to the group. Thirty years ago, that relationship was predominantly a financial relationship. Quite largely through the exertions of Socialists, strongly assisted by the highest powers of International Finance, the Central Banks have become practically impregnable, and the sanctions which they exert have shifted from the bank balance to the Order-in-Council.

It ought to be, but unfortunately it is not, apparent to everyone who takes an intelligent interest in these matters, that the fundamental problem has been greatly complicated by the developments of the past twenty years; and that the immediate issue is in the realm of Law and military power, not of book-keeping. That does not mean in the least that book-keeping is one penny the less important than it was when we directed attention to it; but it does mean that it is the second trench to be taken, not the first. For that, we have to thank in great part, the obsession with "nationalised" banking.

The problem presented by the centralised ("majority") political vote is the same in its fundamentals as that of which it is only another manifestation—the monopoly of credit.

(Oct. 16, 1948.)

From many and varied quarters we receive proposals for lines of action which rely for their validity on an appeal to the moral law. Let us hasten to say that we have the greatest sympathy with this appeal.

But we do not think it is generally recognised, at any rate with sufficient clarity, that this appeal begs the primary issue now before humanity. There is no law without a sanction; has "Right" or Decency, or Justice or Mercy any sanction? It is not a question which permits of a facile answer; in fact the answer may be what religion has always contended it to be, one which may be so final as to dispose of any subsequent problems.

(Oct. 14, 1950.)

There appears to be a tendency (which we have done our best to discredit) to suggest that the Social Credit Secretariat should mould its activities on those of the American statesman who concluded his electioneering address with the words, "Them's my principles, gents, and if you don't like 'em, I'll change 'em". So far from complaining of this attitude, in moderation, we recognise that it represents a degree of confidence for which we are grateful.

But in fact, the idea that there is some magic word which if discovered and pronounced would transform the situation, can be very dangerous. At some risk of being platitudinous, may we repeat what in effect we have been proclaiming for thirty years—that policy, function and power are all different, and that the fundamental "sin" of our present era is that we allow policy and power to be dependent on function. To put it in the simplest manner, to our orthodox philosophy, there's nothing like leather.

It is from this fundamental fallacy that we derive such fatuous ideas as the "right" of "Labour" to do this, that, and the other, e.g., "Full Employment", "Labour" has no rights whatever except the right of the individual labourer not to function—to contract out.

If this situation is clearly grasped, and it is surely not too difficult of apprehension, it should be obvious that the best of policies (and it must be remembered that we can only impinge upon ideas which go to form policy) is quite powerless without function and power. We commenced our crusade by emphasising that finance controls policy, and (because we have a fraudulent financial system) our policy is fraudulent.

Finance is part of our Constitutional system (more so than ever since the "nationalisation" of our Central Bank) and to rectify Finance, we have to rectify our Constitution. We have made consistent suggestions, alone amongst contemporary movements to embody these policies. They have not so far been pushed very hard (that is neither our business, nor within our competence), but we have no bright ideas to offer which will make the walls of Jericho fall down even without trumpets.

"Them's our sentiments, gentlemen, and if you don't like them, we're sorry."

(June 10, 1950.)

Privilege at Risk

The following letter appeared in the London Times, February 9, 1984:

Sir, Following a verbal attack in the South Australian Parliament on a sitting royal commission the Australian Government is proposing to legislate "to abrogate or otherwise affect" state parliamentary privileges, particularly of free speech. Representations in writing were invited and Senate committee hearings will shortly be held.

Freedom of speech has hitherto been subject only to the various Parliament's own rules. Unsuitable comment on sitting royal commissions could surely be controlled by voluntary extension of the sub judice rule. The present proposal is of concern to the whole British Commonwealth.

Yours faithfully,
J.P. HALDANE-STEVENSON,
Canberra, A.C.T. 2601
Australia.
January 28.