THE

SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 72 No. 6 **NOVEMBER - DECEMBER 1993**

On October 12, 1993, the German Constitutional Court's eight judges ruled that the Maastricht Treaty did not intrinsically infringe the German constitution. This cleared the way for Germany to ratify the treaty, the last of the twelve European states to do so. The treaty has thus entered into force from November 1, 1993.

The Court nevertheless issued a number of caveats. It retained the right to review progress towards European unity to ensure that German constitutional principles were not infringed. One condition of membership of a closer EC would be that it reflected popular will. In particular, there could be nothing "automatic" about joining a monetary union or a single currency. Prior approval would be required either by the parliament or by a referendum.

Both sides of the German political divide claimed the decision as victory. The foreign minister said "The European express can continue on its way. The signals are at green". The leading Euro-sceptic said "The court has tied a leash around the neck of the monster and has pulled some of its fangs."

Reporting the decision, "The Times" Bonn correspondent noted that "the case has revealed a strong current of Euro-scepticism among ordinary Germans... A recent opinion survey showed that 80 percent of Germans favoured a referendum to decide on the treaty".

Its Paris correspondent reported "A year since the treaty squeaked through the French referendum, it is hard to find even the most pro-Maastricht official who believes the 1980's vision of a unified West Europe will come about as promised".

"The government's own Gaullist MPs," he said, were "heavily opposed to what they see as a technocratic attempt to sap French sovereignty. The collapse of the Exchange Rate Mechanism in August and the failure of Germany to come to France's aid over the GATT trade negotiations have only heightened a sense that Maastricht is part of a raw deal inflicted on Franceby the world".

"Experts and politicians on both sides of the Rhine are aware that the mutual needs that gave birth to 'German brawn and French brains' are fading as Germany resumes its old role as continental giant". In the U.K., the cross-party Anti-Maastricht Alliance is re-grouping to fight on – with Government voices making sympathetic noises off. This accepts the reality. As "The Times" commented, "the treaty is widely seen to be alien to national traditions and political cultures, and resented for putting political dogma before the prosperity of ordinary citizens".

EUROPE'S UNION ON HOLD

The Wall Street Journal said it all: *At the end of a long dispute, the Maastricht Treaty has emerged victorious – and dead. Bring a funeral wreath to the ratification ceremony.*

But it doesn't end there. The treaty is recognised to be unworkable in the letter but its spirit, like John Brown's body, will go marching on. And so we enter the most dangerous phase of all – the politicians will now consider the spirit as law since the law is inapplicable in practice. We thus find the leaders of "Europe" able to say in effect "the law is what we say it is". This Alice-in-Wonderland development is largely due to the diminution of law by sundry judicial office-bearers across Europe. British courts refer what is within their rightful province to the European Court through irresponsibility among the law Lords; Lord Rees-Mogg is shot down in his legal challenge to Maastricht not on objective grounds but on political grounds; the German courts, well used to making political decisions on behalf of government, ratify Maastricht for them. The Irish courts have always been avowedly political (*vide* the non-extradition of IRA fugitives). The French courts, republican in foundation, have dealt on principles of vengeance (*vide* the war crime trials). The Dutch courts have long bowed to liberal social instructs. The Spanish courts are still in the Franco mode. Luxembourg bows to situational ethics (*vide* tax havens).

Across the EC, natural justice has been replaced by political expediency. The European Court, superior to all national courts, is essentially a political animal, created and mandated to decide in favour of what is "best for Europe", not what is necessarily right in principle.

This declension has brought politics into the seat of judgment and politicians have no longer need to act as servants of the people when they know their place as masters. The European politician thus rules the national politician who only nominally can represent a constituency. The latter is rendered powerless by the powerlessness of the Maastricht Treaty to deliver what it says it will deliver – subsidiarity, a return to grass-roots accountability.

Since political buck-passing to the courts has co-opted the courts into politics, the people are no longer represented, they are ruled. If we, then, agitate for a return to people power, we will merely rouse the rabble – law-abiding citizens having no stomach to challenge 'authority', however that authority has been achieved. An apathetic British populace scorned Maastricht as an irrelevant and obtuse document best left to the powers-that-be. Heedlessly sowing wind, we reap the whirlwind, one liable to blow us not only off-course but over the horizon into communal oblivion.

The Wall Street Journal could well have intoned 'Dust to dust; ashes to ashes' over the demise of national self-rule. For our part, we would still believe in eventual national resurrection.

PAYING

All life is a statement of faith, and assuredly politics and economics constitute the burden of proof. If these fail, then we must have a false god in our midst. The very existence of failure, fruit of a false god, posits the existence of success, the true god. If there were no such ideal, no criterion, no yardstick, we could not identify or evaluate failure. Forever seeking the goal of success, we reckon any failure is ultimately intolerable.

Thus, around the world, however resigned people might be to failure, they persist in the belief that somehow, sometime, something will turn out right. In this pursuit, they resort to God or Mammon. Some think they can do both... indeed, convert Mammon to God's purposes. Therein would be: success.

As it stands, the Christian faith, so replete with institutional triumphalism, boasts little success – no more than the unbelieving multitude. The main claim to success is failure spiritualised: one put to death as an untouchable is nonetheless universal king; poverty is a small thing in view of the riches to come; suffering is no more than the itch of a moment, to be relieved by imminent heaven.

When there is no answer to present problems, the Christian constituency looks to the hereafter. Yet it still wants an answer now. Thus we have a minor phenomenon – the rise of Christian Fundamentalism amid political and economic depression. Anyone among the believers who can essay to be a realist in a material way and a supremacist in religion can be certain of a following, or at least a hearing. There is a whole career in it. You do not need to be a Mother Theresa or an Earl of Shaftesbury or a Dr Barnardo or a General Booth, just be an academic with a data base and you can play with the eternal verities as others play with toy soldiers.

It is predictable that the heart of the American Bible Belt would yield up such theology and commentary as this:

> *"What does the Bible say? It says that God has placed a curse on man's labour (Genesis 3: 17-19). We are required to work six days out of seven. 'Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work' (Exodus 20: 9). What God promises is that the curse on human labour will be reduced as sin is progressively removed from our lives through God's grace. Any movement that promises to increase our personal wealth and simultaneously reduce our need to labor must also suggest a program of ethical restoration as its foundation, not merely some promised magic pill: a one-shot restructuring of ownership or some other revolutionary piece of government legislation. There is no escape from the requirement that we work for our dinner. 'For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat' (2 Thessalonians 3: 10).*
>
> *"Again, we see that the basic premise of Social Credit is that the Bible's view of man, labour, and rewards in history is a false view. Social Credit would substitute a legislative magic pill instead of God's grace, a single restructuring of the system of ownership instead of widespread ethical sanctification."*

This is the essence of the theme of a new book coming out of Tyler, Texas, from what appears to be a one-man thinktank called The Institute for Christian Economics, with a Post Office Box 8000 as its published address. Called *Salvation Through Inflation,* it purports to be the conclusive exposé of Social Credit.

Dr Gary North has found a niche market among those broadly identified with The Moral Majority in the U.S. He has spent his life theorising within personal plenty and has prospered from his association with what is known as Dominion Theology. The worldview adopted is known as Christian Reconstructionism and has an appeal for a certain strain of Calvinist.

The book itself, an excitable challenge to the supposed 'leadership' of the Social Credit movement, merits scant attention because it is so full of errors and misrepresentations about Social Credit; but the mindset it represents must be addressed, since it is humanism posing as high piety.

Dr North's assertion about being placed on 'God-given assignment' to debunk Social Credit can be dismissed as the kind of delusion so rife among believers, but any appeal to the Bible has to be heeded. Even Lenin cautioned that we could learn from our enemies – if the perception be true, we are rightly corrected, if false the perception would have to be corrected by us... it being our fault that it arose. So we must hear what 'The Bible Says'.

The trouble is: what is The Bible? In Dr North's eyes, it is the inspired, inerrant, very Word of God. Not only does it contain divine truth, it is Divine Truth – every last comma of it. He invests with divinity not only the compilers of the Bible – the original scribes and the early church selection panel – but also their translators and editors, copyists and plagiarists. Without question, he embraces fragments of the now-lost texts, the gross contradictions extant, the non-sequiturs, the crude and obvious editing, the crass interpolations, translators' creedal bias and blatant stabs at meaning from misunderstood and lost language forms. All these have survived the ages from an oral tradition in one small turbulent part of the world and have been preserved for the sage of Tyler, Texas, to interpret for today.

In our submission, the Old Testament is a rare collection of tribal histories, folklore, records of approaches to and assumptions about the nature of God. The New Testament endorses the pure Law and The Prophets (but not all those available to us today in our Bibles). It does not support ritual and legalism – the historical baggage being carried by Christian fundamentalists and cults because of inclusion in "The Bible". In our submission, the Old Testament is a partisan chronicle of a Middle Eastern people who, being at the centre of the known world, were in a position to be prepared for the advent of God's Revelation in Jesus Christ. He is clearly foreseen in the Old Testament but that does not sanctify the record itself. We would aver that God can and does speak through the Old Testament but not by it.

Anyone seeking to be loyal to every jot and little of the Old Testament as an equally inspired section of the Bible is bound to be forever gouging out eyes and doing dental extractions. They must also perform mental and spiritual acrobatics as they observe the O.T. then the N.T. This is pick'n'mix religion. Will they never learn?

Blinded by literal interpretations of the ancient texts, The Vatican rejected Galileo's discoveries. The Flat Earth Society also claimed "Biblical" justification for its views. Now Gary North claims scriptural authority for scarcity – the local situation of a primitive economy is taken as the norm for the present age. He implicitly rejects any notion that the scientific advances

)UR WAY

responsible for modern productivity (including his computer) are part of God's continuing revelation. He would reject the substitution of machinery for human toil as an outworking of God's grace. Obviously, his practice makes his theology ludicrous yet let his work go on:

Dr North has one rest-day in seven – whether it is Saturday or Sunday is up to him – but what about the other six? Is sitting at a computer, tapping in code words, really work? Does the gold-miner in South Africa consider **that** work, as against his own slavery? And does Dr North count gold-digging among his accredited tasks for mankind? Very much so – he reckens the gold standard is in accord with biblical principles, if only because the substance is highly prized and not condemned as a substance in the sacred pages. But does Dr North consider the conditions of work for the gold-miner as acceptable? To him, work is work – no matter the conditions.

Then again, if Dr North is required, as he says, to work six days out of seven, does he allow himself to measure this by hours or by days? For example, his domestic concerns keep him occupied and away from his flickering screen for the first few hours of the morning. Does he feel that is 'work' or must he make up his duties, his rightful assignment, into the early hours of the following day?

Also: do all his false starts and poor judgments count as 'work' – yea though they add up to a fair waste of time? Admittedly, this is not strictly applicable to him – he seems to think at his keys and scorns proof-reading. See his foreword:

> *"This book is an antidote for economic deception. It is designed to help you understand economics. Read it, pay attention to it, and follow its arguments. When you have finished it, you will never again be easily deceived by politicians and other professional deceivers when talk about taxes, prices, and money."*

If work is a six-day toil, is there any warrant for holidays, part-time or flexi-time? Does a Bible-believing Christian sin when he takes what others would call a well-earned break from making money?

And how do you define work in quality, as against quantity? Were Victorian child chimney-sweeps as liable to a six-day week as latter-day profs in mid-west redoubts? Does nursery play come into the category of work within the curse factor of God? If so, play is not only our earliest work experience but also our introduction to the curse of God.

This kind of theology majors on individualism. Dr North asserts:

> *"The curse on human labour will be reduced as sin is progressively removed from our lives through God's grace."*

Thus we can guess that Dr North is rapidly becoming a saint – what curse is left on his workload? He has been assiduous in the cleansing of his soul – if only the Third World billions had followed his example, the curse would be almost extinct in their lives, too.

Of course, the grace that shines on Texas is not readily available in Mogadishu. Still, Dr North is relentless in his compassion, direct from his holy God:

> *"There is no escape from the requirement that we work for our dinner."*

Can he really be saying, in effect: 'No excuses, now: no limbs, no reflexes, no mind? Huh, you still breathe, don't you!'

This kind of Christianity denies Social Credit is Christian. However, we look to the New Testament with its emphasis on justice, mercy, peace through mutuality before the face of God. In the Acts of the Apostles, we read how the believers held all things in common, none claiming their possessions as their own – even their fruits from labour were shared. They loved their neighbours as themselves. In fact, individual earning is so far from essential that when called to pay tax, Jesus sent for a fish. Was this the act of a layabout, a scrounger – one who would rather find a coin than work for it. Or is Social Credit thereby authorised as a doctrine?

Dr North has a look at the parable Jesus told where men toiled all day for a penny, only to find a band of Johnny-come-latelies got just as much for a few minutes. He sees this literally as the employer's right to set the rate for the job, spiritualised as God's prerogative to do as He thinks fit.

Our position is: people should be paid not what they agree to, but what they deserve. And what they deserve is at least a living income. Those who worked eight hours and those who worked half an hour still had the same needs, the same demands on their bodily existence. The cost of living was the same.

What we take out of the parable is this: bearing in mind the circumstances of that time, all had willing hearts and hands, not all had the chance. Given variable skills and energies, it is possible that those who did the eight hours did no more than those who did the half-hour for the all-in effect of the project. It was not their own endeavours at issue – it was God working in them severally and communally to do of His good pleasure.

There is a present-day illustration: a football cuptie. A striker has given his all and is taken off, exhausted, five minutes from time – without a goal being scored. The substitute comes on and with the first touch of the ball, he puts it in the net. Glory! Who contributed more – the man who ran himself into the ground, harrying the opposing defence, ensuring they were as exhausted as himself – or the fresh leg that put it away? Or was it the manager who, from the bench, made the decision to switch? A mere moment's mental exercise, albeit based on previous years of experience. In team terms, 85 minutes is paid the same as 5 minutes.

The N.T. standard is that one sows, the other reaps, but it is God who gives the increase. Here, then, is the Social Credit base – anybody's wealth and any country's wealth is in their direct energy – not in their energy evaluated in simplistic financial terms. Further, it is in their common energy – not in individual energy, evaluated in financial terms. Individual energy pits one man against another. Shared and pooled energy works for all, regardless of value placed upon it in financial terms.

That Dr North sees money as under-pinning energy is quite clear. He sees no Mammon in conflict with God. His evidence:

> *"Jesus was not opposed to money-lending as such. He was not opposed to banking and interest. He was not opposed to high profits. After all, the good servants in the parable had made 100% on their investment of the master's money (Matt. 25: 20, 22). What He was opposed to was servants who do not increase the talents which God has entrusted to them."*

Dr North would probably claim he was talking about banking and interest and high profits here in the abstract, not the

(Continued on page 4)

PAYING OUR WAY
(contd. from page 3)

operation – but the fact remains that there is no abstract, it is all operational where money is concerned and he would have Jesus endorse current practice. Today, banks create and regulate the flow of money as they wish. Where Social Credit deals with how money is distributed, Dr North confines himself to how it is circulated. Indeed, where Social Credit sees money as a token, Dr North sees it as a commodity in itself.

In his concept, it is a gambling chip that can bring prosperity if the move is right. He assumes that those holding the chips have them by right and can use them by right and can also lose them by right and can win them back again by right. He ignores how the chips can and should be come by, in the first place.

Looking no further than upon Westernised society, Dr North upholds 'consumer sovereignty' whereby poor firms go to the wall and the fittest survive. This fitness is defined as selling good product, not shoddy. Consumers can eliminate con-men and corner-cutters by going for quality.

Dr North says:

> *"Where is the locus of sovereignty in capitalism? With the consumers. They decide which producers win and which lose. They vote with their money. They bring sanctions: positive (profits) and negative (losses)."*

In his book, money is a weighted vote. The more of it, the more it counts – and the more a voter has, the more he counts. He is all for that: we must have money because it is "the most marketable commodity... the incarnation of wealth".

He does not quite make the connection to Jesus here, that penniless incarnation of God, who made the either-or of God and Mammon mandatory.

However, pursuing Dr North's argument that money is a commodity and that we should do less sinning, there is a link. He quotes Deuteronomy chapter 28 and advises:

> *"... the Bible teaches, our external prosperity is related to our external obedience to God's law."*

For him, our soul is saved internally through acceptance of Christ in our hearts but our every day life is externally saved by works, not by faith. In whatever context, salvation by works is an Old Testament teaching, not a New. Where works occur in the latter, it is through Christ's enabling – not our own. In any case, in human terms, all work we do is based on another's work before us – where there is salvation in works (not by), it is through someone else, not ourselves. Previous work becomes a heritage, a gift. Experience handed down becomes a free gift. Technique and progress is a free gift from the past. **Our** external prosperity is the gift of God, passed on from the generations before, and is not related to **our** external obedience unless we fail to utilise such as computers and mailing services that God has kept in existence. We are all, then, living by the gift of God. Our working is as much a gift as our breathing.

Thus, whilst a gift cannot be evaluated in financial terms, it cannot by its nature be a duty. A gift can only be a privilege. It is, therefore, a privilege to live and work. Work must become no longer a duty but a God-energised service to humanity, undertaken freely. Those who cannot or will not partake of the gift or the privilege must nonetheless partake of the fruits of others' labours because they become the focus for a gift. Without them in their inadequacy, there is no reason to "work" – their existence offers others God's reward – "it is more blessed to give than receive". Their existence is justified in commercial terms, too: without their mouths to feed, there would be no feeders. No consumers, no producers. Back of it all, Jesus says: "I am come that they might have life, and that more abundantly."

Social Credit sees this as wealth in energy, progressing through people. Dr North sees this as wealth through facilities, primarily in money. But let him have the last word:

> *"Men are required by God to pronounce judgment in terms of the Bible."*

Quite so – pity about men's understanding thereof.

Iain McGregor.

CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR HOLIDAYS

Will subscribers please note that printing and distributing of the January/February number will be a little delayed. We take this opportunity of extending Christmas Greetings and Best Wishes to all our readers.

Editor, *The Social Crediter*

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas. The Social Credit Secretariat is non-party and non-class, neither connected with nor supporting any political party.

Subscription rates (one year): U.K. inland £10.00; overseas surface mail £12.00; overseas airmail £15.00; Australia $14.00; New Zealand $15.00; New Zealand airmail $16.00.

Offices – Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 76 Constitution Street, Edinburgh EH6 6RP
– Editorial: 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 6LR.
– In Australasia (Subscriptions, Business and Books): 3 Beresford Drive, Samford, Queensland 4520.

BOOKS and booklets on the subject of Social Credit and allied subjects are available from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and in Australia from The Social Credit School of Studies, 3 Beresford Drive, Samford, Queensland 4520.

ADDITIONAL COPIES of THE SOCIAL CREDITER and back numbers are available from the above addresses.

U.K. enquiries phone 031 657 4740.

RECOMMENDED READING

Douglas, C. H.	The Brief for the Prosecution.
	The Development of World Dominion.
	Economic Democracy.
	The Monopoly of Credit.
	The Policy of a Philosophy.
	Social Credit.
Maré, Eric de	A Matter of Life or Debt.
Monahan, Bryan W.	Why I am a Social Crediter.
Robertson, Thomas	Human Ecology.
Social Credit Secretariat	Elements of Social Credit.

* Please send me **The Social Crediter** for a year

NAME: .....

ADDRESS: .....

.....

.....

Enclosed: £ .....

Printed by Paramount Printers, 199 Causewayside, Edinburgh.