

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 32. No. 22.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly.

### Obituary

#### ALFRED HEWLETT EDWARDS

We deeply regret to announce the death, at his home at Austrey, Warwickshire, suddenly in the early morning of Wednesday, October 20, of Mr. A. Hewlett Edwards, "H.E.", Director of Overseas Relations and Director of Organisation in The Social Credit Secretariat.

Born on April 24, 1883 at Enderby, Leicestershire, he was a son of the Rev. George Edwards, Vicar of Enderby. Despite a strong family leaning to the Church as a vocation, he studied Architecture, and qualified as an architect at the age of 25, and in the same year married Miss Elsie Sedgley of Leicester. His first professional work was done at Liverpool, which he left to take up a position in H.M. Office of Works. When war broke out in 1914 he joined the Royal Engineers and served throughout the war with His Majesty's forces at home and abroad. Resuming his profession under the Office of Works when the war ended, he went in 1923 to Constantinople in *liason* with the Embassy staff, returning in 1928 to England, from which base he travelled extensively in Europe for some years. When war again broke out, he went to Cumberland engaged on the construction of war buildings and retired in 1944, settling at Austrey in Warwickshire.

The funeral was conducted at Austrey on Friday, October 22, by the Rev. Morgan Lewis, Vicar of Austrey, assisted by the Rev. Stephen Edwards, Vicar of Staindrop, near Darlington, a nephew of the deceased.

H.E.'s connection with Social Credit dates from 1930 when he was persuaded to attend a *New Age* dinner, at that time an annual event outstanding in the life of followers of Major Douglas, himself usually a speaker. It is not recorded that H.E.'s host on this occasion was particularly devoted to the cause; but the effect of the new field of ideas on the guest was profound, leading rapidly to a complete reorientation of his interests and his energies. He set himself to master his subject and did so, soon communicating his knowledge and enthusiasm to the members of his family, a little, perhaps, to their surprise but greatly to their satisfaction. Living at that time in rural surroundings at Ruislip in a charming old farm-house which he largely remodelled and restored, H.E. (to use again the designation by which he is best known) soon came to know the London Social Crediters, and it was natural that he should gravitate to the Secretariat when it came to be formed. Following the crucial election of 1935, when a Representative Body was constituted, and at the same time the policy of Major Douglas secured by the independent, but contemporaneous choice of Douglas himself as Chairman of an official movement, a Selection Committee to advise Douglas on personnel was nominated, its first and indeed its only, proceeding being the recommendation of three Directors to reinforce the then existing members of the Secretariat. Douglas approving,

Hewlett Edwards thus became Director of External Relations on February 18, 1936. In this capacity, he organised the 'exemplary' campaign afterwards known as The Local Objectives Campaign, and acted as *liason* officer between the Secretariat and the Lower Rates Campaign in the hands of Mr. John Mitchell and Captain Story. Probably his greatest work was as Director of Overseas Relations, an office to which he was transferred in May, 1940.

A man upright and of undivided loyalty, he stayed the course.

### H.E.: A Personal Tribute

by NORMAN F. WEBB

I saw him last at the end of March this year. He came with me in the taxi to Tamworth after a week-end spent with him and Mrs. Edwards at their cottage at Austrey. He accompanied me on to the station and, as the London train drew out, I stood at the window and watched his tall, austere figure, with an empty rucksack over one shoulder, fade into the background.

In spite of H.E.'s stern and somewhat uncompromising eye, there was more true humility in his make-up than I have met in any living person, except his great mentor and friend, Douglas. From the time he took up the cause of Social Credit, H.E. worked for it silently, unobtrusively, doggedly, yet never hiddenly. I know of no one—again, excepting Douglas—to whom the word occult would less apply. Everything about him was above-board. His terse, helpful letters of advice, framed on the model of Douglas's, have been received and appreciated all over the British Commonwealth, which has assuredly lost one of its links with H.E.'s passing. They were as pointed, those letters, and economical and essential as the lovely tinted pencil drawings he produced of mountains and architecture; as strong and precise and yet as exquisite as 17th century English prose. The thought and care put into the smallest matter in them was prodigious.

A week-end with the Hewlett Edwards was a delightful experience, full of simple comfort and good cheer. But it was astringent too. There was no mental idling indulged in; always a minimum of gossip and speculation. H.E. personified for me the term Purpose which, in its proper sense, is at the root of Christianity. The antithesis of that awful modern business *drive* which seeks to involve everyone else in its own heated impulses. His was just a quiet, undeflectable certainty that Reason is at the basis of all things real, and that it was his job to discover and promote it in everything, and to make his discovery known to the best of his ability.

If what I have written suggests a somewhat inhuman picture, it is all wrong. There was nothing superhuman or inaccessible about H.E. Quite the contrary. Like his  
(Continued on page 4.)

## 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: 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST. Telephone:  
Belfast 27810. Editorial: 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL,  
15. Telephone: SEFton Park 435.

\*Note: The above rates cover subscription to *Voice*, appearing fortnightly in alternate weeks with *The Social Crediter*.

### From Week to Week

“ . . . when, in his sixties, he planted with his own hands an immense orchard of orange and grape-fruit trees at Lambaréné, he laid out many more than were strictly necessary. ‘I don’t like stealing,’ he said in explanation, ‘and if there is really enough for everybody, nobody will need to steal.’” (John Russell about Dr. Albert Schweitzer.)

“ ‘I see no reason why in the next quarter of a century, if we run our policy properly and soundly, we should not double our standard of living in this country.’ Such was the conclusion of the speech delivered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Blackpool on October 8, 1954. Make a note of it, you people who hope to be around on October 8, 1979.

“ . . . I . . . even suspect that some of you cannot wait patiently for twenty-five years.

“ ‘No reason why we should not double our standard. . . .’ Who’s we? Could not the Chancellor have put it more tactfully? Couldn’t he have put it in the passive voice. ‘I see no reason why our standard of living should not be doubled in the next quarter of a century.’ That gives a more spontaneous and less personal flavour to the whole idea?”

—(George Schwartz in *The Sunday Times*.)

There may be little more in the following than a young barrister’s sense of good professional judgment. The order in which the reporter (for the *Liverpool Daily Post*) arranges his material nevertheless suggests that Mr. Cunningham’s candour touches the spot, which is increasingly a spot floodlit in the public eye:—

“ Widnes Conservatives to-day [October 16] begin another quest for a prospective Parliamentary candidate following the decision of their Executive Council . . . to accept the resignation of their former candidate, Mr. C. J. I. Cunningham, a Liverpool barrister.

“ After the meeting, Councillor H. Scholes (party agent) said that the council ‘felt simply that Mr. Cunningham had not carried out his job to their satisfaction and would ignore the accusations made against them.’

“ Mr. Cunningham told the *Daily Post* at his Birkenhead home after the meeting: ‘So far as they are concerned collectively I think they should crown their Herculean efforts for the Socialists by joining them.’

“ ‘They have completely and absolutely wrecked any hopes of a Socialist defeat not only for this coming election but for the one after as well.’”

Mr. Cunningham described the meeting in advance of its occurrence as a meeting “of nobodies, capable of deciding nothing.” Yet, in fact, it is such gatherings which *do* decide the future of the world and of ourselves—unfortunately: this is ‘d’markrazy.’

The short dictionary definition of one who is ‘antinomian’ is that he does not believe that the moral law is binding on Christians. The discussion of Antinomianism as it has proceeded from apostolic times (though the word ‘came in’ at the Reformation) is one of those discussions which lead one to wish that a new and finer language than any of common speech were invented in order to carry it to a conclusion impossible of attainment if the disputants are trammelled by the pitfalls of linguistics. This does not mean that the issue is not perfectly simple really; but only that it is practically impossible to say in words what the issue really is. That’s where words fall in on you: unless you’re a poet you’re nothing, and poets don’t grow on blackberry bushes. However, uncertainty concerning the real nature of the charge does not prevent people who like words from labelling such historians as H. A. L. Fisher ‘Antinomian,’ or the ‘school’ to which he belongs, ‘Antinomian.’

Professor Arnold Toynbee has just published volumes VII-X of *A Study of History*, and general consent suggests, if it does not prove, that, overcoming the “mulish perversity of Human Nature,” the ‘antinomian’ self-contradictory, latter-day Western historians, are now superseded, and Professor Toynbee has come down (is it ‘down’?) on the side of ourselves and the angels, is Christian and believes we must ‘do something about it’—*i.e.*, about the crystallisation of policy in history. The oft-quoted sentiment, which sounds so cynical, suggesting that we should ‘do something’ double-faced, to which Professor Toynbee gave expression some years ago at Copenhagen—that we are right, where the sovereignty of nations is concerned, to say one thing and do another—prevents the development in our hearts of full enthusiasm. Is it not time that Professor Toynbee should explain clearly where he now stands in this matter? Hailed as a modern and a greater Gibbon, Professor Toynbee cannot both desire and not desire to be the soft-spoken harbinger of the downfall of Christian Civilisation?

Was Lloyd George ever a candidate for the Conservative Party leadership? Realism (not cynicism) should dispose an intelligent observer to view the possibility with equanimity. The question, which is new to us, is suggested by *The Tablet’s* remark that the appointment was “just too much for the Party’s very tolerant stomach; but ten years after *his rejection* . . .” [our italics], the press lords, Rothermere and Beaverbrook came near to unseating the similarly indeterminate Baldwin. In the same article (issue of October 16), after likening Sir Winston Churchill’s assumption that he can select and appoint a successor during his lifetime to the practice of a Roman Emperor, our concerned temporary points out that it is surprising how little anyone

(Continued on page 4.)

## Orientation

Dr. Erich Fromm's equipment, though genuine and extensive, does not, apparently, comprise an understanding of the price structure as Douglas understood it. In this respect, he is like other writers whose activities are productive in present society.

We have chosen the adjective 'productive' in the foregoing sentence because it defines a line of discrimination in his own thinking and because the attribution is, in our opinion, just.

Anyone who sets out to implement the idea of Social Credit must furnish his mind with the sort of understanding of the medium in which he is operating—the medium of individual nature and psychology—to enlarge which Erich Fromm and others are working.

Fromm describes himself ("Man for Himself," *Eng. edn.*, 1949) as a psychoanalyst. He lectures, or has lectured, at the William A. White Institute of Psychiatry to post-graduate students and at Bennington College to undergraduates. These are American institutions. In his writings he cites the Talmud, Buddha, Lao-Tse, Plato, Hosea, Aristotle, Spinoza, St. Thomas Aquinas, Lucretius, Calvin, Kant, and others from standard English translations, which may be a concession to American readers or a reflection of personal non-participation in the lavish early education common even half a generation ago in Central Europe, or an indication that Dr. Fromm is American born. Occasionally, when there is defect in the English translation, he himself translates from the German. He has published *The Fear of Freedom*, *Man for Himself*, *Psychoanalysis and Religion* and *The Forgotten Language*, the first in 1949 and the latest in 1952 (English editions). Routledge and Gollancz have been his English publishers. These facts, and something of what is in his mind, are all we know of Dr. Fromm.

Whether Dr. Fromm's humanism is basic or not we cannot determine. As presented, it seems to be so, and probably he would say that, of course, it was. He says man "can act in the name of God, the past, or duty, but not in the name of himself. The authoritarian character receives the impulse to act from a superior power which is neither assailable nor changeable, and is constantly unable to heed spontaneous impulses from within himself." This is intended to be an indictment. We deem the anti-thesis to be false—evidence, perhaps, of a background of Judaism to Fromm's thought. Is it the same inability to resolve the bound-free complex—bound back to reality, yet free because responsible—which prevents understanding of Social Credit? The obstacle is both real and almost universal. Yet, in spite of what seems to us to be quite an alien leaning, Fromm establishes a correct perspective in a number of ways.

For the present, we content ourselves with some details taken from his treatment of orientation of personality (Chapter III of "Man for Himself": *Human Nature and Character*). Romantics dislike analysis of character, particularly if it is formal, because they have, generally, poor memories for propositions in the form: 'In-so-far-as *xs* are *ys*, as are *bs*.' Such propositions have their uses. We know, of course, that if all individuals are uniquely individual, classification cannot exhaust their possibilities. But

this does not mean that they have not clearly expressible possibilities, compatible or otherwise, within themselves.

It is Fromm's thesis that there are non-productive orientations of human persons and productive orientations,—or at least one productive orientation—which, he says, have an assimilation and a socialization. His 'productive orientation' is Working, and its socialization Loving and Reasoning. He distinguishes reasoning (or reason) from mere intelligence, which he regards as simply instrumental, while reason is, with its emotional counterpart, love, a power which "enables [man] to penetrate through the surface and to grasp the essence of his object by getting into relation with it" (reason) or "to break through the wall which separates him from another person and to comprehend him." Intelligence, on the other hand, is merely a mental adjustment to one or other of the non-productive orientations, chiefly the 'marketing' orientation (*Vide infra*). Man *comprehends* the world through the productive orientation.

"For the last few centuries Western man has been obsessed by the idea of work, by the need for constant activity. He is almost incapable of being lazy for any length of time. This contrast, however, is only apparent. Laziness and compulsive activity are not opposites but are two symptoms of the disturbance of man's proper functioning . . . the opposite of both is productiveness. The crippling of productive activity results in either inactivity or over-activity. Hunger and force can never be conditions of productive activity."

Again: ". . . man has accepted the contents of the Calvinistic doctrine while rejecting its religious formulation. He has made himself an instrument, not of God's will but of the economic machine or the state. He has accepted the role of a tool. . . ."

Further: "I have pointed out that while the canalising of all human energy into work and the striving for success was one of the indispensable conditions of the enormous achievement of modern capitalism, a stage has been reached where the problem of *production* has been virtually solved and where the *organisation* of social life has become the paramount task of mankind. Man has created such sources of mechanical energy that he has freed himself from the task of putting all his human energy into work in order to produce the material conditions for living. He could spend a considerable part of his energy on the task of living itself." Or: "A case in point would be an obsessional business man who enjoys his bookkeeping activities tremendously and is greatly pleased when his accounts prove to be correct to the penny. If we examine his pleasure we will find that he is a person filled with anxiety and doubt, he enjoys bookkeeping because the correctness of his figures is a symbolic answer to his doubts about himself and about life. Bookkeeping to him has the same function as playing solitaire may have for another person or counting the windows of a house to still another. *The means have become independent of the aim*; they have usurped the role of the end, and *the alleged aim exists only in imagination*."

We know (or think we do) something about Fromm's notion of *productive* (creative) work. Yet some of the things he has to say of non-productive orientations concern us too. He distinguishes four non-productive orientations, *viz.*, the 'receptive,' the 'exploitative,' the 'hoarding' and the 'marketing.' To some extent (not necessarily altogether,

for Social Crediters have their own armoury of *alibis* and *aliases*, some of which may have legitimacy) these non-productive orientations interest us as possible sources of our lack of success in producing the results we desire. At least they are 'places to look' for the present missing virtue.

We may dismiss the well-understood 'receptive' orientation briefly. Such characters like to be loved. They are 'sensitive,' good listeners, feel paralyzed when left to themselves. "Since they need many hands to feel secure, they have to be loyal to numerous people." They love to say 'Yes,' are dependent on others and helpless particularly in regard to those acts which by their nature must be performed alone, such as making decisions and taking responsibility. They are fond of food and drink, and 'look up to be fed.' Doing things for others "assumes the function of securing their favour."

The 'exploitative' orientation also is common and so familiar as not to call for detailed description. "Like the receptive orientation it has as its basic premise the feeling that the source of all good is outside." "They feel attracted only to people whom they can take away from somebody else. . . . Such people will tend not to produce ideas but to steal them. . . . Their motto is 'Stolen fruits are sweetest.' . . . Since they are satisfied only with things they can take away from others, they tend to overrate what others have and underrate what is theirs." The hoarding orientation is similarly familiar—and barren.

Over fifteen pages of Fromm's chapter are taken up with what he calls the 'marketing' orientation. He says of it, rightly in our opinion, that it has developed as "a dominant orientation only in the modern era." Here is indeed a stage even worse than that exemplified by the bad workman, who 'does bad work with any tools, and, in addition, spoils good tools.' For here is he who spoils men, tools, produce and everything there is to be spoiled without so much as being a workman even in name. Here is the false judge of a Day of False Judgment: the Mammon of Unrighteousness in person: unproductiveness personified, even anti-productiveness, the mere seller, who will sell anything whether it is real or unreal, and, above all is the salesman of himself.

"The marketing orientation," says Fromm, developed as a dominant one only in the modern era. In order to understand its nature one must consider the economic function of the market in modern society as being not only analogous to this character orientation but as the basis and the main condition for its development in modern man.

"Barter is one of the oldest economic mechanisms. The traditional local market, however, is essentially different from the market as it has developed in modern capitalism. Bartering on a local market offered an opportunity to meet for the purpose of exchanging commodities. Producers and customers became acquainted; they were relatively small groups; the demand was more or less known, so that the producer could produce for this specific demand. The modern market is no longer a meeting place but a mechanism characterised by abstract and impersonal demand. One produces for this market, not for a known circle of customers; its verdict is based on laws of supply and demand; and it determines whether the commodity can be sold and at what price. No matter what the *use value* of a pair of shoes

may be, for instance, if the supply is greater than the demand, some shoes will be sentenced to economic death; they might as well not have been produced at all." A pity he does not more clearly distinguish effective from non-effective demand. However, he goes on:—" . . . the emphasis on exchange value rather than use value has led to a similar concept of value with regard to people and particularly to oneself. The character orientation which is rooted in the experience of oneself as a commodity and of one's value as exchange value I call the marketing orientation."

Side by side with this new feature there has come into being 'the personality market.' "Clerks and salesmen, business executives and doctors, lawyers and artists all appear on this market . . . all are dependent for their material success on a personal acceptance by those who need their services or who employ them. The principle of evaluation is the same on both the personality and the commodity market: on the one, personalities are offered for sale; on the other, commodities. Value in both cases is their exchange value, for which use value is a necessary but not a sufficient condition. . . . Although the proportion between skill and human qualities on the one hand and 'personality' on the other as prerequisites for success varies, the 'personality factor' always plays a decisive role. Success depends largely on how well a person sells himself on the market, how well he gets his personality across, how nice a 'package' he is; whether he is 'cheerful,' 'sound,' 'aggressive,' 'reliable,' 'ambitious'; furthermore what his family background is, what clubs he belongs to, and whether he knows the right people."

Fromm says the most important means of transmitting the desired personality pattern to the average man is the motion picture.

"I am what I do." A fluctuating 'market' means ultimately (and ultimately is very near) a fluctuating *identity*. Indeed the man loses his identity.

All this is, of course, social *pathology* (individual as well). What we need is the application of a social therapeutics. THIS CASE NEEDS TREATMENT.

H.E.— (continued from page 1).

mentor, Douglas, he was essentially approachable, except on frivolous pretexts. He had, to my knowledge, no moods. I might not see him for a twelve-month, but when we met he was exactly the same objective, dependable individual, awaiting my return like a well-found house, and our association began again exactly where it had left off.

It was certainly a well-starred event when Douglas and H.E. met. They are both gone now, and it should be a double challenge to Social Crediters everywhere.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK— (continued from page 2).

knows of what either Mr. Butler or Mr. Eden would do in domestic politics if they attained 'power.' It ought not, it says, "to be good enough for a Conservative Chancellor merely to be greatly preferable to a Socialist Chancellor, or to justify *The Economist* in observing that the real choice, and the only choice, before the electorate is between two socialist parties."