

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 37. No. 15.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1958.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Formightly.

### Christianity and World Government

(The substance of an address given in June, 1958, by the Reverend H. S. Swabey, to the Banbury & District Clergy and Ministers Association, at the suggestion of the Reverend G. L. Marriott, known to us through the Christian Campaign for Freedom.)

Before the coming of Jesus Christ, the world had seen a number of great powers who claimed absolute control over their subjects—we read of a string of them in the Old Testament and of the Syrian regime in the book of Maccabees.

It is true that in Greece and Rome modifications had been attempted. The philosophers Plato and Aristotle opposed tyranny and tried to modify it through a kind of constitutional theory or mixed government. Athens had her divisions of power, but was always relapsing into a tyranny, and was surrounded by tyrants. Both writers saw clearly enough that power was dangerous and degrading—and Plato pictures the tattered souls of rulers as they entered the next world. But Plato had little effect on Demetrius of Syracuse, and Aristotle did not for long guide Alexander.

In Rome, the Republic persisted for centuries, with its consuls, senate and assembly and tribunes, but this empire too fell under a despotism and declined into an overtaxed bureaucracy. When Cicero protested, there was no place to which he could escape, for all was Rome. He had written of duty and even of the bond of charity, he had helped to save the Republic from the murderous Cataline, but in the end he was caught in his litter and coolly offered his throat to the knife.

But Our Lord gave us a principle, a canon of right conduct among many, when he was challenged—"Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, unto God the things that are God's." He refused power, from the times of temptation in the wilderness, to the day when He pointed out that if He had been a temporal ruler, His servants would fight. He told them to put up the sword. Yet He claimed the authority of the truth: He spoke as one having authority. And from that day to this, Christian countries have known the distinction between temporal power and spiritual authority. This distinction was embodied roughly in the two spheres of Emperor and Pope, never quite satisfactory and often over-lapping. But Church and state have persisted, the power and the guide, the truth and the sanction, each respecting the other. "Fear God, honour the King," is another expression of the right order.

Hence, Christian countries have respected liberty, recognising that man has a soul and conscience which cannot lawfully be violated, and that mere power is apt to corrupt and to monopolise and to trespass into the spiritual sphere. For ultimately we are responsible to God, our Judge, and society exists for man, not man for society. The truth shall

make us free, and we shall enjoy life more abundant.

This respect for ordered liberty has been made concrete in at least two directions. First, as St. Thomas Aquinas pointed out to Frederick II of Sicily, Christianity favours constitutional government with the separation of powers. Kings, Lords, commons; president, senate and House of Representatives; independent legislature, executive and judiciary. Secondly, the Common Law of England arose in the light of Christianity, and fostered by Christian men. The author of *Glanvil* was Bishop of Winchester, and Bracton was Archdeacon of Barnstaple. Coke was a practising Christian, as earlier was Sir Thomas More. Magna Carta was signed by numerous Churchmen, with its strict condemnation of monopolies. This charter was called the charter of liberties—concrete rights which could not be violated. "The common law hath admeasured the prerogative. Monopoly infringes the liberties of the subject," said Coke. Blackstone described the ideal balance between King, Lords and Commons.

I have stated these principles as a background that guarantees to the individual his integrity, his place and his dignity—unless violated. I fear they have been violated. Is World Government going to set things straight? We approach the problem as Christians. We have seen H. H. Lippincott's contribution to *Christianity Today* (February, 1958), and I will recall his chief points.

As he says, people are frightened. We recall P.E.P. saying, that only in war or under threat of war would the British accept large-scale planning. Democracies crumble within, and dictatorships have taken over—"sick democracies troop to strange doctors"—"the dangerous man is always waiting to exploit tensions." So democracy must not soften up and lose its "wondrous strength," for power over other people is "loaded dynamite."

He notes that spiritual ambassadors dream of a paradise organised on military lines, and notes also how impossible a world mob would be to handle. He refers to Burckhardt. I have just read his *Force and Freedom* and his reiterations that power is of its nature evil. But Commander Lippincott refers to the "rule of the masses." A super-government is not the answer, he says; power is not the way to the Kingdom. He recalls the saying of Pericles, "In crisis hours peace must be sacrificed for freedom but never freedom for peace"! and calls for responsibility to keep freedom, not

(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.*

### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

*Personnel*—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones. Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36, Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSon 3893.) Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420, Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

### Crystallization

Events since they were written have brought out or emphasised the meaning in numerous of the notes under the heading "From Week to Week," written or inspired by the late C. H. Douglas and published in these pages during the second phase of the World War. Of the near infinity of political commentators, Douglas alone penetrated to the very heart of world politics, and not only exposed the cause of our malady, but progressively elaborated the cure.

The cause is still operative, the cure untried. What Douglas had to say then is applicable to our present situation which is continuous with our previous situation, and for those of our readers to whom access to earlier volumes of *T.S.C.* is difficult, and for other reasons, we propose to re-publish a further selection of his notes.

The date of original publication is given in brackets after each note.

Jacob Schiff (Kuhn, Loeb and Company) was born in Germany. During the early part of the 1914-18 war, he did everything possible to help Germany to win, because he thought she was going to win anyway. When he thought she was not, he did everything to make her lose.

To-day in New York. "This group [young Jew bankers—Ed.] feels that the United States would make greater profits if British commerce and finance were destroyed, and if the United States could proceed alone to reconstruct Europe."—Madame Tabouis. Just like Russia you see.

(February 1, 1941.)

"If Wilson had been either simply an idealist or a caucus politician, he might have succeeded. His attempt to run the two in double harness was the cause of his undoing. The specious philanthropy which he exhaled upon Europe stopped quite sharply at the shores of his own country. . . .

"He did not wish to come to speedy terms with the European Allies; he did not wish to meet their leading men around a table; he saw himself for a prolonged period at the summit of the world, chastening the Allies, chastising the Germans, and generally giving laws to mankind. . . . In the Peace Conference—to European eyes—President Wilson sought to play a part out of all proportion to any stake which his country had contributed, or intended to contribute to European affairs."

—Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill in *The Aftermath*.  
 President Wilson was controlled by Strauss, Brandeis and Jacob Schiff. (November 29, 1941.)

At the time of Lenin's seizure of power in Russia, one of the most prominent and capable Communist-Socialists in New York, where Lenin had hatched out his schemes, was Max Eastman.

Eastman came to London in 1919, and attempts were made to put the Social Credit point of view to him, without much success. He was implacable in his conviction that Marx and Lenin together were all that a new and better world required, and that the first step was the confiscation of all private property. Now listen to Max Eastman, 1941 edition:

"Lenin believed religiously in the whole Marxian system. . . . Yet he was flexible, cunning, alive to new developments—an experimental, scientific, intelligence if ever there was one.

"In the name of Marx, Lenin led an actual revolution to victory, and set going on the scale of the Russian Empire the same experiment that Robert Owen had failed with on the banks of the Wabash 90 years before.

"The results were not better than Robert Owen's but a million times worse. You have only to compare 30,000 acres of land with the Russian Empire . . . to know how much worse Lenin's failure was.

"'Democracy from below!' he shouted. 'Democracy without an officialdom, without police, without a standing Army.'" (July 26, 1941.)

Colonel Wedgewood, the Labour Member of Parliament for the Pottery District of Newcastle-under-Lyme, who received a well-deserved snub from the Under Secretary for the Home Office for his attempt to have *Truth* suppressed because of its "anti-Semitic" (?) views, is a curious example of the interweaving of Liberal-Labour-Whig-Puritanism with strong Judaic sympathies and the worst manifestations of Finance-Capitalism.

The Staffordshire hill country, before the development of the pottery industry, was one of the most desirable and beautiful districts to be found in the British Isles.

The pottery industry developed by the Wedgewoods contributed largely to its transformation into a sullen refuse dump, with an industrial system perhaps the most abominable and repellant in the world's history. Contemporaneously, Calvinistic sects appeared everywhere in the district with a philosophy as gloomy as the smoking landscape.

(November 1, 1941.)

## CHRISTIANITY AND WORLD GOVERNMENT—

(continued from page 1.)

abdication. Yet he sees clergy crusading for “top-boss rule,” for “a monolithic state,” and warns of a Hegelian theology of the superstate, a world Napoleon. “Power turns those endowed with it into tyrants.”

The Commander concludes with a solemn warning, “Think or Perish!” Christianity would be swamped under a World Government which would represent two billion non-Christians. The persecutions under Roman times might indeed appear mild, or at least Christianity would sink into insignificance. He lists 800,000,000 communists, 700,000,000 Moslems and almost a billion Indians and Chinese and other kindred Asiatics. He calls World Government a bid to make communists and their allies the governors of the world. Every civilised value would be obliterated.

There would indeed be an end of any government representing us and a complete enthronement of the servile state. Gone would be the whole apparatus of the check and balance of power, of constitutional government, of the separation of powers, of the law, let alone the moral law, of trial by jury, family life and any sort of freedom that remains to us now. We should have abdicated our Christian and civilised responsibilities.

Commander Lippincott’s words receive support from J. Howard Pew, a member of the Presbyterian Church in U.S.A. The *Intelligence Survey* of February, 1958, under the title, “We must not appeal from God to Caesar,” introduces extracts from an outstanding address by Mr. Pew by saying, “Many well-meaning Christians are today unconsciously helping the growth of Communism by seeking to reform society by the power of the State instead of having faith in the fundamental message of Christ.” Mr. Pew points out that the Founding Fathers of America were students of history and knew that every government throughout recorded history had eventually fallen into the absolute control of unprincipled men, who enslaved the people, confiscated their property, and threw the objectors into gaol. They knew, too, that many of the great minds throughout the world had for thousands of years been pointing out that Divine Law, Moral Law, commonly called Natural Law, *must* be basic to all man-made laws, if dictators were to be prevented from destroying the freedom of people, for man is endowed by God with certain inalienable rights.

He says that the need for all Christians today is that of speaking out against Marxian socialism with one great voice.

He tells of a man and his wife who fell into a quarrel and afterwards went out and sat silently on the porch. When a magnificent team of horses pulling a wagon loaded down with stone came slowly up the hill and passed in front of the porch, the wife turned and said, “Wouldn’t it be wonderful if we could pull together like that?” He husband reflected, “Well, we could—if we had only one tongue between us.”

“One tongue against evil and the loss of our Constitutional liberties under God in this Republic of magnificent heritages, is what we Christians now need. . . . The issue is freedom, just as it was 180 years ago. . . . William Penn truly said: ‘Man will either be governed by God or ruled

by tyrants.’”

Mr. Pew went on to say that the wearers of the cloth had long realised that religious freedom is of paramount importance if their country is to remain great, but “*far too few realise that religious freedom cannot exist in a collectivist state, because freedom is indivisible. Thus, if we should lose our industrial freedom, then religious freedom, political freedom, and all other freedoms will certainly fall.*” Referring to the phenomenal material progress of his country during the last hundred years, Mr. Pew said this was accomplished by freedom of initiative. He reminded his hearers that the danger of people losing their interest in freedom is not a new one—Lincoln was deeply concerned over it. In 1864 he said, “The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty. . . . With some the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself, and the product of his labour; while with others the same word may mean *for some men to do as they please with other men*, and the product of other men’s labour.”

“Real liberty,” said Mr. Pew, “is the freedom of the individual to exercise his talents, his initiative, his ingenuity and his resourcefulness—it is freedom to be an individual. Bogus liberty is to have the security of a government bird cage.”

He continued, “In 1790, John Philpot Curran, the great Irish patriot, in a speech to his constituency said: ‘The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt.’ . . . It was Christ who taught us, saying: ‘If ye continue in my word, . . . ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.’”

“Your failure to fight for the preservation of liberty is a crime, and the punishment for the crime is servitude,” M. Pew concludes.

At this point we should examine something of what World Government advocates have to say, and where better than in the House of Lords where a debate on World Government took place on May 14, from 2.47-6.43 p.m.

Lord Beveridge asked the Government just what they meant by “world government” or a “World Authority” and invited them to descend from hot air to brass tacks. He said that many things—in his view most things—should be left to separate national Governments. All peoples desired both peace and their own way of life. How could they make certain of peace? He disagreed with the Prime Minister when he said (and this was also implicit in the Report on Defence) that our armed power was a contribution to peace because it maintained the balance of power—he found this open to serious question. He appealed to the Government to set down in black and white a design for a world authority strong enough to stop war with certainty while leaving freedom to every nation to live in its own way. Saying that the book *World Peace Through World Law* started by recalling the statement made by Eisenhower in 1956, “There can be no peace without law,” he said that *law involves a judge to declare justice when people or nations disagree and police to enforce the decision of the judge.* (Our emphasis—Ed.)

The Marquess of Salisbury thought that agreement would be easier to get from a few large blocs—yet felt that a clear statement of policy was necessary from the United States if the Western bloc was to win the cold war, about which he was deeply apprehensive.

Lord Boyd-Orr stated, "There is need for a central World Authority to get nations to co-operate in adjusting human society to the great changes which modern science has brought about." (Is this a police job?) "The great advance in technology . . . has enabled us to produce real wealth in such over-abundance that the economic system tends to break down because it cannot get that wealth dispersed." It may be noted that he was here equating the "economic system" with "distribution." The purpose of production is surely consumption? Yet Lord Boyd-Orr mentioned the "Peace Scare" announced in an American financial journal at the time when it appeared that the Korean war was to end and peace was to be made—"not hope, but scare—because that meant . . . unemployment would result." Among the conditions which he considered need to be adjusted he included, "We must increase world markets to carry the new wealth which is being created and prevent unemployment." The struggle for world markets is surely accepted as being one of the causes of war, and other methods of distribution are possible than continuous "employment." Surely the purpose of man is not employment, but something higher. A national dividend, to be distributed in accordance only with the availability of real wealth, would be a step to freeing man to rise from material preoccupations to a higher level.

(To be concluded.)

### The Use of Some Abstract Terms

(Concluded from H.E.'s article of October 6.)

RIGHT is the success of action taken towards an objective: WRONG the failure. *Right* is not in itself an objective, neither is it concerned with the direction of the action which inspires it.

From this point of view the universe is a limitless nexus of possibilities, trains of events which happen and which man in combining and re-combining may use; he cannot create them. He cannot alter this grain which is in the nature of things, but as his knowledge grows he can turn his action this way or that, and along whichever path he takes he will find his *Truth* and in finding it he will do his *Right*. The way he chooses may lead to that release of spirit in which is individual fulfilment, whether it is found in human relationship, in the English countryside, in Bach's Concerto in E. Major, or otherwise. Or his path may bring him to the subjection of that spirit whether by submission to hypnotic sanctions, or to bondage by "finance"—or to its early dissolution by tri-nitro toluene. For nature has complete detachment, "Seek and ye shall find" but there is no direction, that must come from man himself.

*Good* and *Evil* are concerned with the direction which man chooses, with the objective at which he aims; and whereas the subject of *Truth* and *Right* is the impersonal universe of which man is a part, the subject of *Good* and *Evil* is man and his Being with respect to his status as a part, i.e., to the conditions on which he is an individual.

The primary condition is Life and Death which, as individual experiences, transcend analysis. Observation shows them as an interwoven pattern in which all living creatures appear and disappear, the continuance of their existence being dependent on the extinction of other units of life. Life proceeds headlong and is checked by death which provides material for new life—with innumerable and sometimes circuitous variants this is the theme which persists. Yet everything which lives has an impulse towards retaining life and works to the end that it may be prolonged. Action towards this objective is the origin of species, each of which has developed and embodies its own technique, acquiring in body, brains and blood instinctive reactions towards life and away from death. It is from these depths that man, gaining the capacity for abstract ideas, has precipitated the conception of *Good* and *Evil*.

In the jungle *Good* and *Evil* have a simple outline, to kill or to be killed, and it is out of his contact with other men that this jungle-*Good* has become enlarged, the focus of this enlargement being co-operation for a common purpose. To give this purpose precision and to bring it towards fruition has been the endeavour of the see-ers among men, of whom few have reached the formidable realism of that statement which strikes at the roots and fulfilment of man's aims: "The Kingdom of God is within you," *Good* is not to be found otherwise than by your own fulfilment of your own aspirations, and the nature of man is such that therein also lies the fulfilment of the common purpose. The human creature has within him the desire to live, and to live "more abundantly," and his own nature contains powers whereby that desire may be fulfilled. That is the moving force which has so far sustained man against extinction, and it is that which, clarified and made effective will attain to further reaches now out of sight. It is a force the understanding and use of which is only possible with something of the faith with which the words were uttered—that the untrammelled pursuit of happiness by others is the necessary background of, and indeed part of our own.

*GOOD* is individual success in living according to man's objective, not in the sense of bending to something exterior but in Being (in understanding, in objectives and in action) in harmony with that objective. *Evil* is Being in accordance with an objective which is counter to man's. *Good* and *Evil* are not in themselves objectives.

"In my opinion, we want, first of all, security in what we have, freedom of action, thought and speech, and a more abundant life for all. Every one of these is possible, and every one of them in the present state of progress of the world can be reduced to the possession of more purchasing power, so that it is not too much to say, even though it may sound banal, that the first objective of a democracy should be a national dividend."

C. H. DOUGLAS.

So is the objective reduced to a substantial proposition. *Truth* is attendant on *Good* and *Evil* and *Right* brings either into Being, but it is the Objective which governs all, and that is not a cloud in the sky or an abstraction but is something real and then something real again in each man's life—without which those abstract terms are a snare and a futility.

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