

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 33. No. 5.

SATURDAY, MARCH 19, 1955.

6d. Fortnightly.

A Constitutional Battle

The following are extracts from the Introduction by Dr. G. Huehns to his edition of "Clarendon—Selections from *The History of The Rebellion and Civil Wars* and *The Life, by Himself*" (World's Classics, 1955).

Edward Hyde was born on February 18, 1609, of a family of good standing in the counties of Cheshire and Wiltshire. His father sent him first to Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and later he entered the Middle Temple . . . he moved among 'the tribe' of Ben Johnson and entered the highly cultured circle around the Earl of Falkland . . . throughout his life he continued to place high value on such personal relationships.

The political events of the 1630's, however, soon routed the ambitious young lawyer out of his pleasurable obscurity. After initial storms the reign of Charles I seemed then to proceed quietly, but behind this façade the troubles of the next twenty years were preparing, for since the sixteenth century England had been undergoing a long period of disturbance, economic as well as religious and political. The coinage was depreciated, and periods of high prices, as well as higher standards of living, had all tended to accompany or succeed one another, and many people could not adjust their mode of living to these changed circumstances, or find sources of income elastic enough to enable them to survive. Hence occurred a great shift of wealth, particularly among the owners of landed property. Among the greatest losers in this process was the new dynasty. James I had come with exaggerated ideas of England's wealth, only to find his sources of revenue too inelastic to enable him to fulfil all his desires. As the national debt rose, he had to fall back on exploiting obsolete or novel sources of income, for both Parliament and the law courts, the strongholds of the new "possessor" class, were unwilling to provide him with means of tapping the wealth of the country.

The law courts were not always refractory to the king's wishes, but the Common Law was then undergoing a period of expansion: first it tried to assert its supremacy over all other jurisdictions in the realm; and secondly it, too, was concerned with the novel conditions and attempted to deal with them by a reinterpretation of its terms. In both aims it came into conflict with the king. Faced with the troubled state of the kingdom and concerned with its security from exaggerated and undefined attacks by the Counter-reformation and its agents, James had come to stress more and more those of his rights which gave him the greatest freedom of action. Proud of his philosophical ability, he confronted Parliament and the common lawyers with his personal interpretation of the divine right of kings and the royal prerogative. His theory was anchored firmly on an extended notion of royal responsibility; the responsibility of the king

to God for the well-being of his people, now and hereafter. The royal theory thus comprehended every aspect of life.

With the accession of Charles I the disagreements latent in these various theories came more into the open. Charles was less intelligent and more open to influence than his father had been, and the people by whom he allowed himself to be influenced were not acceptable to the leading men of the nation . . . there was, after 1628, the Arminian Laud with his ideal of a purified clergy and well-conducted services, which was interpreted as a design to rule the country with the help of a subservient clergy. Unfortunately for the cause of both the king and the archbishop, extremist statements made by clergymen and lawyers only too often seemed to give substance to these apprehensions; especially as there was a deep-seated distrust of the king. The good intentions of the government were therefore nullified by the fears of those who had to execute them.

The tension caused by these mutual misapprehensions became particularly obvious after 1628-9. Then the two Houses of Parliament united against Buckingham and by violent action pressed through the Petition of Right. It was accepted by the king but not observed during the eleven years (1628-40) of government without calling Parliament. These were in many ways years of peace and good government. Charles and his advisers were influenced by worthy ideals of public service and social justice, but their ideals were outmoded and they did not succeed in imposing them by means of councils and prerogative courts. Local government remained in the hands of the nobility, whose influence in the counties would not be broken—as was proved later in the civil wars when adherence to either side was often determined by local loyalties. Even so, Charles might have succeeded in his attempt to rule without Parliament had he not countenanced Laud's ill-judged attempt to change the Scottish ecclesiastical establishment. This drove the Kirk to combine with the Scottish nobles, whose possessions had already been threatened by the Act of Revocation (1625). To oppose the combination Charles had to have men and money and these he could get only by calling Parliament. As the Short Parliament concentrated on the discussion of grievances rather than on the provision of supply, it was dissolved. The trouble continued, however, and so the Long Parliament was called in the same year, 1640. . . .

But the debate on the "Grand Remonstrance" in November, 1641, showed for the first time a split in the ranks of the opposition. . . . Parliament therefore divided into two factions: the one distrusted the king and most of his councillors, and was prepared in the last resort to use force to oppose its own solutions to the problems of the Church and the militia. The other party was that of the moderate legalists. They, too, opposed the policies Charles and Laud had pursued since 1629, but thought that a com-

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*.

promise solution was not only possible but also desirable. Hyde joined this group. He had previously played an active part in the opposition, but both as a sincere Anglican and as a lawyer with deep respect for precedent and custom he now felt impelled to dissociate himself from Pym and Hampden. It did not seem to him that by so doing he gave up his previous convictions. From his remarks on law and politics we see that he belonged to that school of seventeenth-century thinkers which saw in Law the true sovereign of the State. These men believed in a hierarchy of laws, immutable and eternal, whose existence was bound up with the existence of the deity. Law was for them an emanation of the divine will and/or reason. The positive laws of any State, as well as what there was of 'international' law, were considered merely approximations to this primarily moral code. It provided a standard by which all action could be measured. Men knew of it by virtue of their possession of reason; they could be assured of the accuracy of their findings by the concordant judgment of the ages. Thus the theory could acquire either a revolutionary or a conservative tinge according to whether one or the other factor, reason or custom, was stressed. But in any case it was a concept which disallowed the ascription of sovereignty to any one man or body of men. It appealed greatly to the minds of the men of the seventeenth century, who seem always to have looked for some 'objective truth' in order to defend themselves against the solipism which was the logical end of most of their lines of thought. Thus, as Puritans they stressed the authority of the very words of the Bible; as lawyers and thinkers, the authority of a past whose remains, however, they interpreted to fit their own desires; as scientists, they relied on the immutability of the laws of nature as understood by them.

Finally, we find the same approach in the political thought of the age, whether in the paternal absolutism of the Stuarts, in the republican egalitarianism of the Levellers, or in the Millenarians' method of government by 'pneumatically' inspired Saints.

In England, the last great attempt to fit all life into a scheme of reason and law had been made at the turn of the century by the Anglican divine, Richard Hooker. The influence of his exposition of the nature of law can be traced in the ideas of both Pym and Hyde. Indeed Clarendon deliberately modelled the first paragraph of his *History* on the beginning of Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity." (Note: S. R. Gardiner, "The Great Civil War," Vol. III, pp. 122-3) in his constitutional thought the notion of the

sovereignty of law led him to envisage the possibility of an equitable balance of co-ordinated parts. But as a shrewd observer of human nature he was also aware that, in order to work, such a theory needs constant and well-directed effort. He was therefore opposed to anything which might endanger the balance. Hence, before 1641, he objected to Charles's government by council and prerogative; and afterwards he opposed the oligarchs' attempts to arrogate power to themselves as would-be representatives of the nation. . . .

"Can Parliament Survive?"

"When I served on the Lord Chancellor's committee for the reform of County Court procedure, everybody was agreed that, whatever other changes might be introduced, it would be the worst of errors if, in a foolish hope of saving time, judges were asked to sit for inordinately long hours. If they did so, they would merely give bad judgments. More injustice would be done and in the end more time would be wasted. Why is the same argument not applied to Members of Parliament? Obviously because what the judges have to say makes some difference and what the Members of Parliament say makes no difference. At half-past three in the morning of a Finance Bill debate, bleary-eyed Members of Parliament troop through the division lobbies to vote away some hundreds of millions of public money, most of them without the foggiest notion what it is they are voting about. If they really were taking the decision at that time and in these circumstances, it would be a scandal of such dimensions that not even public opinion—which will tolerate almost anything—would tolerate it. But, of course, as everyone very well knows, the decision has been taken between the Minister and his expert civil service advisers—long before the Debate started—as to which amendments would be accepted and which rejected. The course of the Debate was quite irrelevant to the decision, and the result of the division which was to follow it a foregone conclusion."—Mr. Christopher Hollis, M.P., in an article in *Encounter*.

On the other hand the result of the South Norfolk by-election and the speedy recoupment of farmers for increased wage costs, indicates that what the electorate says when there is a possibility of losing marginal seats still influences the Government. But what influences the electorate?

The Psychology of the Crowd

We can distinguish three main factors which constitute the psychological structure of the crowd. These are the psychology of transference and detachment, of pride and fear, and of the libido or love energies in the personality. . . .

TRANFERENCE AND DETACHMENT

The first of the factors can best be understood through the relationship of the child to the parent. In early years a child is necessarily weak, seeking a protective love from the parent, and focussing an emotional love and often an idealisation on to the parent. If the child succeeds in reaching maturity, he should achieve a new relationship to the parent as equal and friend. He will no longer be intellectually or emotionally subservient, and he will find the freedom of his own adult personality in a free fellowship with other adult personalities. This transition from the

child to the adult has to be won through the storm and stress of adolescence; it is seldom achieved in full, and there are generally relics of the earlier subservient attitude in the subconscious recesses of the personality. The wise parent will discern the process, and will encourage the adolescent to find and exercise his or her own liberty of judgment and decision. If the growth forward has been arrested, then it may happen that some other person becomes a substitute for the parent, and may then literally stand 'in loco parentis.' The immature personality may focus on to this other personality the earlier desires for a protector and guide; the person who stands 'in loco parentis' should then help the immature person forward into the discovery of his own free personality.

We can discern this process working in the religious field. At the heart of the Christian Gospel, Christ for a time trains and teaches His disciples. The day then comes when He says to them, "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go away, the Comforter will not come unto you: but if I depart I will send Him unto you." Whether these are the original words of Christ, or the reflection of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, they represent a brilliant insight that the disciple must not remain in a dependent relationship toward the teacher; only if the teacher effaces himself and the disciple comes into a direct relationship to the Spirit of Truth, will the disciple then grow into the maturity and power of his own free personality. We can discern the same psychological undertone in the wise saying, "Call no man your father on earth, for one is your Father which is in Heaven." There is a similar insight, when Baron von Hugel writes to his niece, "I wonder if you have seen how much you will be called on to help people—to help souls. The golden rule is, to help those we love to escape from us." In all Christian pastoral work, whether through the Confessional or through pastoral advice in the study, the priest must be aware of this transition. In all pastoral relationships there is a danger that the adviser, secretly flattered by an emotional attachment in the person he is trying to help, may hold that other person in a relationship of subservience to himself, instead of setting him free. In the missionary play, *The House of the Octopus* (by Charles Williams), the old missionary Anthony under the compulsion of the Spirit of Truth makes the damaging admission to his converts, "I do not wish you to live from God alone; I wish always to be your means to God."—From the Report on Moral Re-Armament by the Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly.

From Week to Week

The great publicity which has been given in recent months to Orwell's brilliant satire on the Totalitarian State, "1984," has a purpose which is not immediately apparent. Whether its author was expressing a personal helpless despair, or whether it was intended as a warning, a book which finishes on a note of utter hopelessness and fails to express one positive idea has a demoralising effect on most people.

The telephone number of the National Council of Civil Liberties is Bayswater 1984—Peterborough in *The Daily Telegraph*.

No doubt Mr. D. N. Pritt, Q.C., would assert that the possession of this telephone number, like the adoption by the Soviet Government as its national emblem of the Kabbalistic sign of human sorcery (the five-pointed star), is merely a coincidence.

The Recorder has published figures showing that with the exception of 1931 the Socialist vote has increased steadily in the nine General Elections from 1922 to 1951, when they polled 48.73 of those who voted. The same paper claims that there has been a higher birthrate during the past few decades in the households of those who vote Socialist than there is in Conservative households. It is claimed that unless offset by some other factor this fact alone will add another million votes to the Socialist poll—Socialism by gradualness.

The Archbishop of Canterbury is reported as saying that the Welfare State will not work without the aid of Christian principles. On the contrary, perhaps the sole hope for England (and the world) is that the Church can be brought to see that the Welfare State can never be a Christian social order, because its structure is not built on correct, *i.e.*, Christian, principles.

The Archbishop was addressing fifteen hundred men of the Deanery of Hastings. He urged his hearers "to seek after holiness. Be marked as men who try to find the right thing, and put it into action."

There is in the public statements of the Archbishops and Bishops today, and in a new militancy in the Church, an opportunity and challenge to Social Crediters which has never happened before and may not occur again. We urge our readers to take up these challenging statements in personal correspondence and interviews with bishops, deans and clergy. The printed word has only a limited effect; probing questions can supplement it and often do more. The number of our readers who are doing this work is continually growing, but can become much larger. Some are obtaining interviews with bishops and lesser dignitaries; and those who keep carbon copies of their letters, even if they have no typewriter, and send us copies with the replies provide useful intelligence. In this paper and in *Voice* we have published a great deal which can form the basis for searching questions in short opening letters, and as a guide for subsequent correspondence which may develop. Here is an opportunity for every reader who wants to pull an oar, and provides scope for those who can exercise either a modicum or a great deal of skill.

A copy of the first half of the notes published in "From Week to Week" in our last issue was sent to all the bishops under a covering letter inviting comment. At the time of writing none of them has ventured a comment, although the northern Primate and a number of bishops have written personally expressing interest.

Sir Winston Churchill in his speech in the House of Commons Debate on Defence said, "All deterrents will improve and gain authority throughout the next ten years. By that time the deterrent may reach its acme and reap its final reward." The Prime Minister suggested that the reward would be a Christian social order.

But this is a social order built on fear; whereas Christianity is concerned with God as love. What connection has the development of an idea of frightfulness associated with nuclear weapons with the Old Testament, or Judaistic, conception of 'Holy': the presence of a *mysterium tremendum*, as distinct from the New Testament idea of wholeness and health?

The Evangelist, Billy Graham, expressed delight after reading the Prime Minister's speech.

But, theology apart, when you are threatened by a wild beast a negative policy is a prior essential; and adequate deterrents are the obvious answer. And, in this connection the Prime Minister's statement in regard to the "Americans": "I cannot feel that we can have much influence on their policy or actions, wise or unwise, while we are largely dependent, as we are today, on their protection," if it can be taken at its face value, shows a surprising and welcome realism concerning the identity of the wild beast.

What is clearly happening now is that people are being conditioned to make them pliable agents of an imposed policy. "You can condition people from without," said St. Thomas Aquinas, "but you can educate them only from within." A Christian social policy can only proceed from the basis of the immanent sovereignty of each individual person ("The kingdom of God is within you"). True education consists in helping people to grow physically, mentally and spiritually in the knowledge of the truth as persons. A social policy to be Christian must take account of this; but needs for fulfilment exemplary action by the Church in the political field demonstrating to the electorate, to quote Cardinal Newman, that "Truth is not purely an intellectual matter. . . . Truth implies not only accuracy but integrity and fidelity."

The hope is that the Church leaders can be persuaded to urge the nation "to seek after holiness," to quote Dr. Fisher, not only in their private actions, but in their political actions.

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Junior, has just given to his philanthropic institution, the Sealantic Fund, Inc., £7 million, "to strengthen and develop Protestant theological education in this country." He had already given £10 million for the same purpose.

But Christianity is still getting the widow's mite.

Why the Churchill myth should still dominate Australia if, as is said, pro-American feeling is developing there under the impulsion of the belief that once-great Britain regards Australia as 'expendable' in the 'cold' war is difficult to see. A good deal of practical political 'sense' is just words.

Social Credit Secretariat

Lectures and Studies Department

Examination for the Diploma of Associate of the Social Credit Secretariat: The Examination which was arranged to take place between April 10 and 24 has been postponed until May 21—June 4. Intending candidates should send their Entrance Fee (10/6) or enquiries to The Registrar at 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6, by April 7 (Overseas: April 30).

From Sex and Society

by KENNETH WALKER and PETER FLETCHER.

(A Pelican Book, 1955.)

(Appendix. The Meaning of Fear.)

FEAR AND ORGANISATION.

The question at once arises, then, is there any kind of human relationship that first compels the individual to become acutely aware of every contrast between himself and other people severally or collectively, and then convinces him that the 'power of the Not-self' revealed in the contrast can be met and overcome only by an exercise of physical strength? The answer is plain beyond argument. In any utilitarian relationship, any form of organisation, the individual must derive his sense of his own reality and significance from the contrast between himself and the other participants in the corporate action, for they cannot help accepting or rejecting him according to their estimate of his ability to contribute effectively to the performance of the common task, and he cannot help appraising them by the same criterion. Moreover, since the reward of effort in an organised action depends upon the amount of strength—physical energy, manipulative skill, mental ability, experience, or the power of wealth—which the individual can offer, he cannot avoid reaching the conclusion that only an exercise of strength can enable him to redress any adverse balance of power he perceives between himself and his associates in the corporate enterprise, with the consequence that fear and the will-to-power become the dominant motivation of all his actions.

It comes to this. Fear is generated in the act of organisation just as electricity is generated when copper wires are brought into the vicinity of magnets. It is not the fault of the managers or leaders of organisations that the members become afraid of their power. It is not the fault of the followers that people in positions of power become afraid of losing their authority. The cause of fear between man and man is inherent in the kind of relationship we form when we enter into association with each other for the purpose of getting something done; and the extent to which this fear develops into hatred and hostility depends on how far our organised life and its values control our thought and behaviour.

This being so, it seems that the more completely our lives are wrapped up in organised activities and interests the more self-centred, competitive, and frightened of each other we are likely to become; and since all these attitudes or dispositions are destructive of mutual trust, friendship, and reciprocity, it should be clear that there is a stark contradiction in the idea that we can make people more friendly and humane by creating bigger and better organisations; yet the implicit assumption that this can be done informs most of the social and political thought and action of our times.