

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 36. No. 15.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1957.

Postage: At home 2d., abroad 1d. 6d. Fortnightly.

Modern Science

By TUDOR JONES, Sc.D., M.D., F.R.S.E.

A REVISION OF THIS ESSAY, ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN THESE PAGES IN THE LATTER PART OF 1943 AND EARLY 1944, HAS FOUND NO MAJOR ALTERATIONS NECESSARY. DR. JONES HAS, HOWEVER, ADDED A NUMBER OF FOOTNOTES AND A POSTSCRIPT.

(XIV)

George Holt was a Unitarian. On his way to enter upon his apprenticeship, "We stayed for a short time at the Old Swan and from that place turned off driving down Edge Lane, which, at this period, being unpaved, [These names, or their aliases in Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Bristol, etc., etc., are all too familiar to English citizens waiting in the rain for overcrowded 'publicly-owned' transport vehicles] was a deep sandy road, and I well remember as we passed the Lower House (now in our own possession) Mr. A. pointed it out to me, saying a gentleman from Rochdale had married the lady thereof and now resided there. I noticed the greyhound on the horse-stone, and somehow I fancy I had an unusually strong impression and notice-taking of that place. Since that time I have perhaps magnified it somewhat into a presentiment—but certain it is that, for years before I became acquainted with the Durning family and the dwellers of that house, I had always in passing it a renewal of that peculiar interest and curiosity. . . ."

George married Miss Durning, and "The most important merely private event of Mr. Holt's life after marriage was his sincere adoption of the principles of Unitarian Christianity in which his wife had been brought up."*

When travelling, "he always aimed at spending the Sunday, if possible, in some place where there was a church of Unitarian Christians within reach. If the congregation was very small, or seemed poor, he would generally enter into conversation with some one after the service, and rarely leave without a more substantial mark of his fellow-feeling than its mere expression in words. . . ."

"Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest . . . my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." The radical nature of the protest against the perversion of Christian teaching which Unitarians, I believe, claim to have made would be more impressive if, in every other respect than their theological beliefs (or innocence of them) they had not, as a body, steadfastly worked to demonstrate their complete conventionality. "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you full employment." The financing of subversive and quasi-subversive movements is not my immediate concern, although it is evident that not much would go wrong, and still less

would stay wrong if the power of credit were decentralised. For example, however rich you were, and however 'independent' in your views of the cosmos, even carrying your peculiarity to the extreme of considering yourself independent of even the cosmos itself, you could possibly only enjoy a private odour of sanctity shorn of all but the material surroundings of mass support unless your private convictions were steadily and naturally shared by others numerous enough to build up a 'setting' which you jointly deemed necessary and appropriate. I can understand a man's claiming the right of private judgment on any matter under the Sun, including the opinion that T.N.T. is not explosive, provided he does not employ others to demonstrate the truth of his convictions. I cannot really understand the frame of mind which feels comfortable listening to tactful evasions which are to be paid for in disproportionate 'financial support,' in the midst of architectural features which have been paid for by disproportionate 'financial support,' and in the presence of a congregation which might, without gross exaggeration, be described as 'hired' for the purpose of lending an impression of mass feeling to what would otherwise be the sort of ritual enjoined in the sixth Chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew. The late Lord Asquith was not a very certain Unitarian, and I notice that when he lectured to the Unitarians in 1925 on *Some Phases of Free Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century* he could quite justly assess the flavour of Cobbett's "complete contempt for the whole principle and machinery of 'public education' for the poor." Cobbett said it was as absurd "to suppose what is by Mr. Whitbread" (the then Whig leader in the House of Commons) "called education, necessary to those who labour with their limbs, . . . as it would be to suppose that the being able to mow and reap are necessary to a Minister of State or an Astronomer."

However, Mr. Holt's sympathies were "warmly and steadily" on behalf of popular education, and he took an "unceasing interest in all schemes in any way connected with the education and improvement of the young." While England was still "educationally destitute," the Mechanics' Institution in Liverpool "rose to be the most important in the kingdom, having for many years an income of about £10,000; three day schools; evening classes with some 1,600 pupils; above 60 teachers and officers; 3,500 members; a large library, museum, sculpture-gallery and lecture room,

*A Brief Memoir . . . ; 1861.

(Continued on page 3.)

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—*Business and Editorial:* 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.
Telephone: Belfast 27810.

Costs and Continuity

As indicated in our last issue a second copy of *The Social Crediter* will now be available to readers: it will be sent, however, only if requested through the Editorial Office (address above). We hope that, in view of the very critical political situation, readers will avail themselves of this opportunity to extend the influence of this journal.

You Cannot Know Light Without Shade

"It may have been noticed that large-scale, Comprehensive Planning-in-a-Big-Way, is, in the main, the ambition of people with a clear marked disinclination to make anything concrete. This may be due to the fact that when anything concrete is made 'wrong,' it is difficult to disguise the fact, and a certain amount of distrust in regard to the maker is engendered. But if you can induce people by a large scale confidence trick, to surrender all their liberties to an omnipotent organisation (which is what Big Plans generally amount to), it really doesn't matter much whether The Plan is found to consist, at the bottom, in a Scheme to set all the World to Work on the Extraction of Sunbeams from Cucumbers. It's just too bad, and it's too late anyway.

"But, on the other hand, Jesus of Nazareth was a carpenter. His ways were more humble. 'Consider the lilies: how (do) they grow?'

"Christianity, Democracy and Social Credit have at least three things in common; they are all said to have failed, none of them is in the nature of a Plan, and every effort of some of the most powerfully organised forces in the world is directed to the end, not only that they never shall be accepted, but that as few persons as possible shall even understand their nature.

"It would not occur to me to attempt a comprehensive definition of what Christianity *is*; but negatively, I think I can do better. The curious amalgam of tabu and folklore which most of us derived from the teaching of our schooldays in the hours devoted to religious instruction bears about the same relation to Christianity that the real Government of England does to democracy, or the policy of the Bank of 'England' does to Social Credit.

"At this point, I can sympathise with any reader who might ask, 'Why do you want to drag Christianity into a discussion of, *inter alia*, the defects of the bureaucratic system? What has the Civil Service, the monetary monopoly, or the Jewish Problem, to do with either Christianity, or "Perfect Freedom?" Or, more immediately, with an Allied Victory.' The short answer is, 'Everything—if there is a European culture.'

"Everything of which we have any knowledge is relative. The fact that the Dark Forces seem in the ascendant is a proof that they are temporarily in the ascendant over something else. You cannot know light without shade, you cannot know what anything is, if you don't know what it is not. If you are able to believe that this is a country whose effective Policy is that of a Christian Philosophy, or if you think that Politics (in the real sense) has nothing to do with Christianity, then you will be able to agree that it is reasonable at one and the same time to fight a war for a return to the Gold Standard, the enthronement of International Finance, together with the culture of Hollywood and Tin Pan Alley and the bureaucracy of the Russian Ghetto, while proclaiming that you are fighting to preserve Christian Standards against the onslaught of Paganism. But otherwise, not.

"It is just as certain as anything can be in this uncertain world, that Christianity is not a Plan, it is a Philosophy which we have hardly begun to grasp. As such, it must have a Policy. That Policy was and is rejected by the Jews, consequently it cannot be a Jewish Policy. That is to say, Jewish Policy is what Christianity *is not*. What is Jewish Policy? That is much easier to answer, because the present state of the world is the result of it. The short answer is 'Power Politics—The Servile World.' The Philosophy from which it proceeds is that of non-immanent Sovereignty. . . .

"One of the delusions skilfully fostered by those Dark Forces which assail us, then, is the idea of human equality under a non-immanent Sovereignty. It is quite probable that this conception held, where it is held, in defiance of everyday experience, observation, and history arises from inability to grasp the meaning of words, an inability which is coming under skilled observation in many quarters. It is perhaps unnecessary to pursue the disproof of the first aspect of it further than to suggest that, if no two persons possess *one* attribute, a finger-print, alike, persons could be found to possess *every* attribute alike.

"But this idea underlies the whole Socialist-Bureaucratic-Totalitarian propaganda. They are all the same, as any observer of events in Russia and Germany can see for himself. It is insinuating itself into such phrases as 'the standard of living.' There is only one place in which there is an effective 'standard' of living, and that is a goal."

—C. H. Douglas: *Whose Service is Perfect Freedom*.

The Enduring Spirit

The Descent of the Dove by Charles Williams. Meridan Books \$1.25.

The sight of a row of atheists on the B.B.C. "Brains Trust" on a Sunday afternoon, advocating their brand of infidelity, might well call for the kind of assurance which Charles Williams mentions in this book, when the early Church leaders proclaimed, "It seems good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

The Alexandrian School, the author suggests, were *all gentlemen*. Their work does without "the macabre, the terrible, the smell of corruption." Origen developed the allegorical method of Biblical criticism, "the most valuable, perhaps the only valuable method with much of the text

of the Bible." If it had been pursued, we should have been spared Cromwell. Augustine noted another great development when he saw Ambrose reading silently. By the time of the second millenium, "men began again to have time to talk, to argue, to think." We may envy these men and wonder however the people of the third millenium will clear a space from the clangour of radio and television to talk and think for themselves.

But, the candid author continues, the Inquisition was established in 1233 and delation was everywhere encouraged, while in 1204 the third crusaders had sacked Constantinople, and in the war against the Albigenses "there were horrible cruelties, more than those habitual to war." In 1252 the Pope "permitted and encouraged the use of torture." So a type of rationalism had ousted charity and forgiveness, and the critic wonders whether the replacement of the humane and godly Plato by the mechanic of reason, Aristotle, with his iron magnet of a god, had anything to do with this withering of the Christian intellect, for it was evidently accepted that the end justified the means.

But while we read of this penetration by the Devil, the World is not neglected, for Canon Law banned usury and even war at certain times. In 1307 all the Templars in France were arrested, but the priesthood were less adept at dealing with the Flesh, for when Dante's *New Life* was at last printed in 1576, they censored and expurgated it, which leads Charles Williams to contrast the affirmative and the negative ways.

We note the author's own interpretation, as he approaches the Reformation crisis, when he says it was assisted by "two characteristics of Christendom—exchange and conversion." In fact "co-inherence, the very pattern of Christianity," was distorted when the Fuggers, great bankers of those days, advanced money to the Pope on condition that they should be awarded receipts from the Indulgences: "Tetzl and the Fuggers' agents together were a little too much."

We may however jib at the description of Calvin and Loyola as "cavalry commanders of the Spirit in the new Campaign," unless this is not intended as a compliment, and probably shall enjoy more the writer's typical juxtaposition of two significant ladies, Elizabeth of England and Catherine de Medici of France. Both, he says, would have read with relief the sentence engraved at Trent, "Here the Holy Spirit spoke for the last time."

And so we reach the nineteenth century when the Redeemer's name seemed to many "the password of the black parasites of financial tyranny," says the author. But he certainly oversimplifies when he says that the Russian persecution had partly arisen from the intention of "saving the poor" and that the atheist societies were "honestly meant to break the chains of all men." We have learned that the financial tyrants were themselves behind the revolution, that the end no more justifies the means in crimes of an egalitarian than of a religious aspect, and that absolute power cannot be dissociated from absolute degradation. The macabre and the cruel had returned in satanic completeness.

The book's freshness is often a matter of presentation rather than of judgment, but its conclusion should touch the intellect: "If Christendom indeed feels intensely within itself the three strange energies which we call contrition

and humility and doctrine, it will be again close, not only to the wars of the Frontiers, not only to Constantine, but to the Descent of the Dove. Its only difficulty will be to know and endure him when he comes . . ." Some of us are convinced that the creative Spirit has not deserted mankind, but has sent prophets to warn and to illuminate: but so many prefer a row of well-paid atheists with their stale clichés to the kind of thought that this journal and its founder would convey. —H.S.

MODERN SCIENCE—

(continued from page 1.)

where twice a week lectures were delivered, frequently to as many as 1,200 hearers." It became the Liverpool Institute, and Holt's name is particularly associated with the development of its Girls' School, Blackburne House, opened in 1844, which, in 1861, was "self-supporting, and . . . contains 20 teachers, 8 normal teachers, and 300 pupils, the impossibility of admitting more being the only check upon its numbers."

Blackburne House has to-day 20 mistresses and two visiting teachers. There is nothing exceptional about it excepting its history. George Holt did not teach. He aided, abetted and organised teaching: he began the centralisation of teaching. It is rare for one man to hand on to his heirs and successors his hobbies as well as his material possessions. But Holt did that. So far as effective influence goes, the Council of the University of Liverpool and the Council of Ullet Road Unitarian Church have been for many years if not interchangeable bodies at least something very like it. The present University Treasurer, whose promise of "ruthless elimination of people not benefiting from their university education" was quoted earlier in these articles, is the first for many years not chosen from the charmed circle, and he is a partner in the firm of Rathbone Bros. and Company. Lord Woolton rose from his position as Warden of a Students' Hostel while he was a member of the same group. To go back into the past, the John Brunner who was Mond's partner was a Lancashire Unitarian. Until impoverishment and public notice drew attention to the fact that there were at Liverpool no fewer than five professors of chemistry, an expansiveness reflected in the university's total of 53 to Manchester's 37, Birmingham's 32 and Edinburgh's 43. Every Chair is a commitment, even when it is itself sufficiently endowed. There is no Faculty of Divinity, and a Unitarian has been a Vice-Chancellor. Its present Vice-Chancellor was Secretary to the Sankey Commission. Its member of Parliament is Miss Eleanor Rathbone. Banking, Insurance, Industry, Politics and Philanthropy occupy the seat of administrative power. Do they "interfere"? It would surely be gross mismanagement if there were any need to interfere, and what is "interference"? "Their officials and professors will be prepared for their business by detailed secret programmes of action from which they will not with immunity diverge, not by one iota. They will be appointed with special precaution, and will be so placed as to be wholly dependent upon the Government." Is the day passed or to come? I don't know.

They influence and administer. They establish reputation—for themselves as well as for others. Look at our

'reputable' economists, who wait upon occasion, often long in coming, for the enunciation of 'truth.'

An institution, which is, in the last analysis, only extended, associated individuals, is healthy (sane) in proportion as it advances towards the realisation of an idea, in proportion as it has a policy. Its objective must be simple, which is quite a different thing from saying that it must be easy of attainment. The universities of England have ceased to have a policy. The mere mutual accommodation of the Vice-Chancellors' policy, through the Vice-Chancellors' Committee, which received a measure of State recognition (for temporary? purposes) on the outbreak of war, or of one Vice-Chancellor's Policy, the Treasurers' policy, the Industrialists' policies, the thirsty policy of parents for certificates and of students for brevity and adjustment of the load to their capacities is to have no policy at all. To be merely a piece of machinery for favouring one or some of these policies at the expense of others is to have the worst possible of policies—the policy of distortion and control, control of the intellectual and spiritual life of the nation. Even Oxford, according to the Master of Balliol, Dr. A. D. Lindsay, is in this predicament, and it is gratuitous of him to say that *on that account* it is "admirably fitted to preserve . . ." I quote from *The Government of Oxford* (1931):

"In devising a form of government for any institution—political, educational, religious, commercial—or in criticising its existing government, one would naturally begin by inquiring what was the purpose of the institution, what functions it was expected to perform. For Oxford the problem is in a sense inverse—not to construct a government capable of fulfilling a given purpose, but to render a given form of government capable of expressing a purpose as yet unformulated. There is no person or body in Oxford competent to declare what the functions of the university are."

If the universities are the mind of Christendom, then Christendom has an insane mind, and by ignorantly and incompetently 'planning' to abolish 'Educational destitution' our idealists have conspired to produce almost universal intellectual and spiritual destitution. Why did not George Holt, penning his lament that "such important and vast affairs should have fallen into such incompetent hands" take heed and ask himself: "And what is it that has fallen into my hands, and what am I, 'self-taught (but well-taught)'" And, had he done so, could he have answered? Or couldn't he? It has been my fortune to notice, in many books "From the Library of George Holt" the underlinings and marginal notes which must be in his hand. I am inclined to say that "at one period" he *knew* what was the vast issue of his time and of ours.

(XV)

It is reported of the philosopher Aristippus that, when reproved for offering an indignity to philosophy by falling at the feet of Dionysius, the tyrant, to crave a favour, he said it was not his fault if Dionysius's ears were in his feet. Presumably Aristippus got what he wanted. I notice that he didn't take his seat at Dionysius's side and harangue the multitude on the subject of the immense benefits it was about to receive from the institution of a more philosophical tyranny.

Our modern philosophers do not fall at the feet of the tyrant. There is a sense in which it is true that they are the feet of the tyrant. Upon them the tyrant walks. Watch anyone walking, and observe that it is not his head which bears to the left (or to the right) but his feet, and not both feet at once, but the left foot first, whereafter the right is merely natural and accordant and bears neither one way nor the other, but sticks nobly to the path. If there ever was a time when I shared the naive view that scholars were chosen to conduct delicate political missions because of their halos, I have long since abandoned it. The meaning of these unacademic occupations first dawned upon me when it was suggested to me by a brilliant but disgruntled scholar that what really mattered was not intellectual distinction so much as the good fortune to be regarded as the 'good little boy' of particular people. The particular person he depended upon was the late Sir Henry Jones, who was both a professor of Moral Philosophy and a personal friend of Lloyd George. He preached. He propagandised in a fluent Welsh way. Gusto, zeal, and a knowledge of Hegel which may, for all I know, have been profound, were his high cards; but usually it was his gusto which carried the day, as when, in a village on the shores of the Kyles of Bute, a gentle Scottish body objected that it seemed to her that the Professor questioned the Divinity of our Lord, Jesus Christ. "Madam," he said, so the story goes. "Madam" (with a strong Welsh accent, and of course gusto) "Far be it from me to question in the slightest degree the deevinitee of *any* man! Oh, no, no, no!" It is evidence; but it is not evidence of the kind which is admitted to whatever court there is that remains uncontaminated for reference of the kind of matters I am proposing.

And so I have constructed a table, which occupies, in my small hand, about a square yard of paper. It bears the names of the Universities of England and Scotland and that of the University of Wales, and of the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge. Against these entries are the names of the Vice-Chancellors (who were formerly generally called Principals) and the names of the Masters, Provosts, Principals, Wardens, Presidents, Rectors, of the Colleges. The other entries are, where possible from *Who's Who*, and concern the education these men have received, their initial successes in academic pursuits, the opinions concerning them entertained by their fellows (as indicated, for example by their election to a College Fellowship), the past and present academic positions they have held, their known connection with politics and administration, the sources of the distinctions conferred upon them, and the time intervals between the recognisable phases of their careers. But, having done all this, I notice that the record is incomplete, not merely because the distinguished do not write indiscreetly to *Who's Who*, but because a very large number of the entries disclose that Mr. This or Sir John That had some official task allotted to him many years before he rose to eminence in University circles, and, unless the long succession, under the impact of "the greatest crisis of their history," with which Mr. Vere-Cotton has threatened the Universities, is suddenly broken, there must be large numbers of 'swimmers' who have not (as it were) yet broken surface in the waters of the pool.

Nevertheless, the table is interesting.