

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 36. No. 26.

SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1958.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

### Letters from Douglas

TO KEEP THEM ON RECORD, AND FOR THE BENEFIT OF THOSE READERS WHO HAVE NOT PREVIOUSLY SEEN THEM, WE CONTINUE THE RE-PUBLICATION OF A SELECTION OF LETTTERS WRITTEN BY MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS TO, AND PUBLISHED BY, *THE SCOTSMAN*, INCLUDING ONE NOT PUBLISHED.

TO RETAIN CONTINUITY, A LETTER FROM ANOTHER CORRESPONDENT IS ALSO INCLUDED.

#### The Objection to Planning

Sir,

The question of post-war planning concerns, on the one side, the few, the "planners," and, on the other, the many, the "planned for." It would seem from your correspondence that the planners are dissatisfied with the apathy of the "planned for." But have the planners really asked themselves the question, "What are we planning for?" Model cottages, schools, public parks, and so on, are surely means to an end, not ends in themselves.

Imagine asking a man the Catechism question, "What is the chief end of man?" or, if he did not understand that, simply "What do you want from life?" If he replied, "To live as comfortably as possible; to work as short a time for as much money as I can get; to have the least possible responsibility for the upbringing of my children, or for their support, or that of any aged or sick relative; to have my pleasures arranged for me with as little effort to myself as possible," I imagine most people would be shocked at such a grossly selfish materialistic outlook. But that life is precisely what the "planners" are offering the "planned for," even if they call it good housing, short hours, high wages, crèches, schools, pensions, and so on.

People are better than that, and so the planners' "paradise" fails to evoke enthusiasm because it does not answer the real human need for a worthy ideal for life, an "end" for man. The same people who are apathetic about planning a "heaven upon earth" will volunteer cheerfully for difficult, dangerous and unpleasant jobs, be enthusiastic for creeds that offer their followers not comfort but sacrifice. This may be surprising (and awkward for the materialist), but it is human nature, and must be taken into account.

Your correspondent "Neptune" puts down the lack of public enthusiasm for "planning" to fear of his being "let down," and Mrs. Westwater to lack of understanding, but I venture to think the real reason is more profound. The planners must show us that good housing, schools, pensions, etc., are necessary means to some known and desirable end, or, to put it more simply, tell us what they are planning for. The people ask for bread, but the sugary cake offered

by the planners looks suspiciously like a disguised stone. They are too wise to "bite."

I am, etc.,

August 23, 1943.

SITA M. SCOTT-MONCRIEFF.

Sir,

In concurring with the wise letter of your correspondent, Miss S. M. Scott-Moncrieff, in your issue of August 23, perhaps I may be permitted to carry her argument a stage further.

There is really only one major issue at stake in the world to-day. All others are derivatives. That issue is whether, or no, it is possible to impose a Utopia from above, a proposition which involves a standardised human being whom it would be incorrect to call an individual. The planning to which, in my opinion fortunately, so many people object is planning which takes this question as having been settled in the affirmative.

The opposite conception is that each human being is to some extent unique, and that the common interest is best served by assisting him to work out his own Utopia, and to discourage him from imposing it on his neighbour. That is why we are fighting Hitler, and why the more advertised planners in our midst would be well advised not to assume that the major issue is *chose jugée*.

It is, unfortunately, true that no way has so far been explored which avoids the dilemma that the more obvious methods of resistance to aggression, either in the form of international war or internal planning by the supreme State, involve a surrender to the principles of Utopianism. This is clearly recognised by our planners, who have said, in so many words, that only in war or under threat of war, would the British people and Government allow their destinies to be taken out of their own hands. But to say that the way has not been explored, is not to say that there is no way.

The ideal of the Utopians was fully dramatised by Kipling in his story, *As easy as A.B.C.* If the issues of

(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.

### Communism by Stealth

The frightening thing about our perpetual crisis is the success which is being achieved by secret and subversive forces in our very midst. They have permeated every political party, and now apparently control them. Thus a single over-riding policy is now being pursued in this country; a change of government has not meant a change of policy but only a change of name.

The continuing and triumphant policy is MONOPOLY, the centralisation of power and control. The conception of our land as a single factory with several departments all controlled from the manager's office is alien to our people. The proto-type is Soviet Russia.

If anyone should doubt the extent and success of the infiltration, let him consider that the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels in 1848 has now been incorporated into our public life. Its ten points have all been adopted by governments calling themselves Liberal or Conservative. Voting has become not merely a waste of time, but suicidal, since a vote cast for any party is a vote for the medicine as before, the advance of monopoly and the centralisation of control.

From a government labelled "Conservative" comes the ultimatum to the aircraft industry to amalgamate itself into a monopoly. This must demonstrate to the sceptical that the label is quite meaningless and Communism so securely enthroned that secrecy is no longer necessary.

It is many years since the amalgamation of all firms in each industry was advocated in the publication *Industrial Reconstruction*. The author was an active member of P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning), an organisation saturated with alien influence and devoted to the concentration of control in every field. The author was Mr. Harold Macmillan.

In the light of our present predicament, an observation which was made by Major Douglas exactly twelve years ago appears to be truly prophetic:—"It is little less than insanity to waste time in trying to substitute a 'Conservative' for a 'Labour' Government. For ten years a so-called Conservative majority was in power at Westminster. It passed more P.E.P. Socialist legislation than has the present Administration, and it served no interest but internationalism and Kartels. Any one who is foolish enough to suppose that it would do any better under, say, Mr. Harold Macmillan deserves what he would undoubtedly get."

It is not hard to think that Mr. Macmillan was selected for steady advancement because he was the self-proclaimed

protagonist of the concentration of power and the centralisation of control. The Socialists could have no quarrel with him.

Centralisation on a national scale only, is a process begun but not completed. Mr. Macmillan's policy leads us into the international field where the unit is no longer the nation-state, but is swollen to continental size. Policy has taken command and bears him along to some sort of a tie-up with Europe which would involve our submergence or absorption. At the end of that road lies world-control.

"What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" The objective of Communism is the whole world. The Communists could have no quarrel with Mr. Macmillan's policy. The Christian standpoint is very different—"the truth shall make you free"—"He who would be greatest among you, let him be your servant"—freedom, not control—service, not dominion.

The decline of once-Great Britain is contemporaneous with her adoption of an alien and un-Christian policy. Big organisations are not more efficient—they are less efficient. It was not long before our nationalised industries decentralised themselves into smaller regional units in order to be able to proceed at all. If a Third World War were to come about and we were found with all our eggs in one basket, our enemies could be certain of our catastrophic defeat this time.

JOHN BRUMMITT.

### A Christian Thought

"And Christianity means too that the one thing that matters in this world is what each individual becomes in the sight of God" ". . . but Social Credit would have speeded that evolution as nothing else could have done since it provides the basis of that rather awful freedom where a man becomes responsible to God for his own development and achievement." I am quoting from Dr. B. W. Monahan in *Why I am a Social Crediter*. Catechisms of some of the Christian denominations, in response to the question: 'What is man's purpose here on earth?' give answers which can be interpreted similarly to the above.

Christianity and Social Credit then, are at one in their purpose, as they must be—the worth of the individual and his responsibility for the nurture of his own spirit before God.

What are the conditions under which that responsibility can be most fruitfully carried on? Freedom, yes—by the very nature of the responsibility freedom is necessary. But one other essential condition for the individual to co-operate with to his own betterment is friendship. Why do I say that? Because experience shows it, but for authority John 17: 20 and 21: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in me; that the world may believe thou hast sent me." That may mean a great deal more but it does mean friendship, not just toward people in general but to individuals whom we come to know and value.

But what is the point in saying the above? It is this: by the very nature of Social Credit, Social Crediters are deeply interested in the truth and doctrines of Christianity,

as of Social Credit. But if they truly sense the truth of its teachings, they realise that this matter of friendship or fellowship is essentially important to their own true development, to their life.

The lesson is that, being Social Crediters, we cannot help but feel it is important that the truths of Social Credit should become more widely known. But they will become more widely known if we observe what is believed to be the truth above. For our own sakes we need to find and enjoy a widening number of friends. Let us do that. It is a rich and at the same time a humbling experience. But friendship does not exist in a vacuum. Some friends are deeply interested in what is in the other friend's mind. Show him, as lucidly and fully as you can. If he wants more give him or direct him to more. If not, don't! You still have a friend, of whatever cloth. And some friends will be interested in the thoughts which you believe to uncover some truth.

D. S. HAMILTON.

### Realisation

"Your education is You, realising God's Meaning . . . These three sum up the purpose and also the history of the University. Historically, the University developed precisely in that order. Historically it will decline in precisely that order reversed . . . Historically, universities began with 'Man is the Measure.' It was at that point that Athens qualified for the title, because of all the cities of antiquity she really believed that dangerous doctrine. She has taught us the Humanities ever since . . . Humanism is not enough. For, having become the measure, Man becomes the circumference, the All. He begins imperceptibly to take it for granted that truth and goodness are only functions of himself, his profit, his utility; he puts beauty before them; and beauty only as a means to pleasure. When that instinct of exploitation takes possession of him, and he thinks he is a god, a Socrates has to die to teach him that reality cannot be distorted, and Aristotle has to live upon the lowly and laborious spade-work of science. By slow experience he discovers such a thing as *jus*—Law, Right,—and the lesson stated at the opening of Justinian's *Institutes*—'Justice is the perpetual will to give to everything its own.' . . . Such realising is science. That is, to obey and to share the being of things that are not himself [a man's self], are not his property. That is to say, the core and essence of science is precisely not that part of it which is 'technique.'"

—T. S. Gregory to the Joint Christian Societies of the University of Liverpool.

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution .....	8/6
"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom" .....	5/-
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Big Idea .....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War .....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket .....	2/-
The Realistic Position of The Church of England .....	8d.
Realistic Constitutionalism .....	8d.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST, N. IRELAND.

### LETTERS FROM DOUGLAS—

(continued from page 1.)

life were decided by logic, his plan would go through. Fortunately they are not.

I am, etc.,

August 24, 1943.

C. H. DOUGLAS.

### The Idea of Liberty

Sir,

The arguments employed by Mr. C. de B. Murray in his differences with Lord Teviot provide almost classical examples of the logical fallacy known as *petitio principii*—"begging the question."

(1) Postulate: "An employer underpays and overworks his men." Argument: "The employer ought to be controlled." Fallacy: (a) He may still be underpaying and overworking his men when he is controlled; (b) if the workman can contract-out, he can avoid being underpaid and overworked. All people with a private income can contract-out (Mr. Murray sees this, but apparently prefers control).

(2) Postulate: "The patent and glaring fact of the twentieth century is the failure of private enterprise to find employment, and therefore self-respect." Argument: "Every one of the controls imposed during the war must be maintained after the war." Fallacy: (a) Private enterprise, as a "patent and glaring fact," succeeded most admirably in its legitimate objective—to make more goods with less labour—i.e., employment. It is not the objective of industry to provide employment. (b) The common complaint made about people with private incomes is that they have too much self-respect.

There was nothing very much the matter with Victorian Liberalism except that it was tied to the Gold Standard. In consequence, the problem of the individual was always purchasing-power, money, not goods. We now have more controls than ever existed in the world, and the problem is goods, not purchasing power. High amongst the reasons which cause many of us grave concern over the activities of the planners is their failure to demonstrate that they understand the working of the system which they did little or nothing to bring to its present stage of amazing success, while confusing it with a financial system which itself is a demonstration of the viciousness of control from above.

I am, etc.,

July 14, 1943.

C. H. DOUGLAS.

### Individualism

Sir,

There is, I think, a certain congruity in the appearance in the pages of *The Scotsman* of a discussion on the merits and place of individualism, and there must be a considerable body of readers, not only in these islands but overseas, who would be well satisfied to see the subject pursued to a definite and helpful conclusion.

It is not necessary to invoke the authority of the Christian philosophy (although that is unequivocal on the

point) to realise that the relationship of the individual to the group is not arguable. The group exists for the benefit of the individual, in the same sense that the field exists for the benefit of the flower, or the tree for the fruit. Groups of any kind, whether called nations, business systems, or any other associative label, inevitably decay and disappear if they fail to foster a sufficient number of excellent individuals, using those words in their precise significance. It is also true that excellence involves exercise—a man does not become a good cricketer by reading books on cricket.

But not everyone wants to play cricket, and not every cricketer wants to play seven days a week. If the M.C.C. becomes so all-pervasive that in place of being a group for the encouragement and progress of cricketers who freely choose cricket as their game, it becomes an organisation directed to the abasement of non-cricketers, then it is a field which has not been farmed with proper understanding.

The individualism which is justifiable and necessary is not that which insists on making the rules of every game, and at the same time, devises methods of compulsion to provide players.

It is obvious that advantage is being taken of the orgy of waste through which we are passing to stampede us into mere units in an industrial-financial group. The case which the Society of Individualists has to make for itself is, I think, less concerned with the value of individualism than with the methods by which it proposes to restore to the individual the opportunity of becoming excellent by the exercise of his possibly unique talent rather than by the life-long performance of a mechanical task.

I have read many of the attractive writings of Sir Ernest Benn, who is prominent in the Individualist movement, and they never fail to amuse and delight me. But I notice that Sir Ernest is a stalwart supporter of the orthodox financial system. And there is no more future for the genuine individualist if the pre-war financial system is not radically modified in the interest of the individual than there is for the deluded victims of Karl Marx.

I am, etc.,

September 14, 1943.

C. H. DOUGLAS.

The following letter was sent to, but not published in *The Scotsman*:—

Sir,

Mr. Arthur A. McDougal is doubtless a competent agriculturalist but his incursion into the free-for-all of political economy is hardly more happy than that of Mr. Fraser. Both are fundamentally anti-individualistic.

There is no connection whatever between "rendering such great services to the community" and "reaping a considerable reward for one's enterprise." The examples Mr. McDougal gives, Lord Nuffield, Ford, etc., did not grow rich by making things; they grew rich by selling things for more than it cost to make them. If Mr. McDougal grows rich by "growing double," as I hope he does, it is not because he "grows double," it is because a wicked price ring respectably camouflaged as a controlled price, assures him of a gap between his costs and his receipts, and the War Debt, camouflaged as "deficit spending" pro-

vides the public with money to buy. I hope Mr. McDougal will not tell me that money is not wealth. I said that one some time ago.

One of the major catastrophes of history was the failure of the Mediaeval Church to grasp the idea that the Just Price was a ratio, not a moral aspiration. As a result of this failure, we have lived in a welter of meaningless phrases such as "fair wages," "reasonable prices." Not unconnected with this is the entirely unjustified attack made by Mr. McDougal on specialised forms of purchasing power which in the past have provided the means to bridge the gap between what it costs him to grow his potatoes and the larger sum he charges for them, such as rent, royalties (I notice he does not mention banking). The fact that they are technically inadequate for this purpose, is beside the point. Mr. McDougal's argument is that economic services are the only services to humanity, and that considerable purchasing-power unaccompanied by the rendering of economic services is simply "piracy."

This is pure dialectical materialism, and leads straight to the totalitarian State, with which genuine individualism can make no accommodation.

Perhaps the most curious psycho-political phenomenon of this odd period is the glorification, by considerable numbers of people whose memory comprises records of a world glut, both of preparations for the onset of an incomparably greater glut, and the imposition of every conceivable hindrance to its absorption.

I am, etc.,

September 30, 1943.

C. H. DOUGLAS.

## A Political Economy of Quality

"No writer on economics has yet told us what are the limits to expenditure in public arts, whether a beautiful city is an investment, or an extravagance. The modern political economy of quantity should be corrected by a political economy of quality. Writers who have set out theories of corporate life talk much of utilities, but they often have a very narrow view of what makes a utility; and the blind may lead the blind down so steep a place that they drive those who have eyes along with them. . . . Every noble city has been the crystallization of the contentment, pride and order of the community."

—*Architecture*, W. R. Lethaby.

Re-issued **The Approach to Reality**  
Address to Social Crediters at Westminster on March 7, 1936  
Together with Answers to Questions  
by C. H. DOUGLAS.

World Copyright Reserved.

1/6.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
Lincoln Chambers, 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.  
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.