

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 35. No. 10.

SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1957.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: At home 2d., abroad 1d.

6d. Weekly.

"If Any Would Be Greatest . . ."

A short address given by Major C. H. Douglas to a Society in a Great School, March 9, 1938.

In considering what I should say to you tonight, it appeared to me to be more useful to deal with certain broad and general problems which confront us all, rather than to take up your time with technical matters of finance or otherwise, since it is the so-called axioms of our civilisation which are challenged and require examination rather than the details.

There is a peculiar fitness in talking about these things to you who live under, and are inevitably influenced by, the force of a great tradition. Tradition has a hypnotic effect and crystallises in institutions.

It is with full consciousness of this that I can make to you at once, in a few words, and count upon you to understand at once, the most important statement I have to offer: that *the future of civilisation hangs on a reversal of the present domination of individuals by institutions.*

To those who are not familiar with (and therefore do not venerate, as I do myself, and no doubt do you) the force and value of tradition, this statement might on first hearing, sound like an attack upon tradition, and the institutions which embody it.

Nothing could be further from my meaning. Tradition, with its institutions, when they have survived through centuries, represents an invaluable body of experience.

But it is most important, I think, to bear in mind that human social experience is in general relative to particular economic and political systems, and there comes a time, such as the present, when the experience we have gained has to be employed with great judgment or it may be a hindrance, rather than a help. But if it is so employed, nothing in my opinion, can replace it.

Now, I think that in the world today there are two quite fundamental ideas which are struggling for acceptance. They are capable of various antitheses, and I have made two groups of some of these—not necessarily or probably comprehensive, which might perhaps be called Group A and Group B:

Group A.		Group B.
<i>Deductive</i>	v.	<i>Inductive</i>
<i>Totalitarian</i>	v.	<i>Democratic</i>
<i>Machiavellian</i>	v.	<i>Baconian</i>
<i>Idealistic</i>	v.	<i>Realistic</i>
<i>Jewish</i>	v.	<i>Christian</i>
<i>Love of Power</i>	v.	<i>Love of Freedom</i>
<i>Planned Economy</i>	v.	<i>Organic Growth</i>

Group A comprises, on the whole, those habits of mind which are effective in affairs and particularly, affairs of State, today.

With some hesitation, I will suggest that they may have been the more pragmatically useful group in the past. I have no hesitation in saying that the persistence of these habits of mind in our present world, threatens that world with general catastrophe.

The flowers of the Group A ideas are the modern Dictatorships. I should like you, for a moment, to consider the fact that Messrs. Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler, to mention the better known, are men of what Jane Austin would have called "humble birth."

I won't waste time by protesting that there is nothing derogatory in this statement—it merely means that, *per se*, it is a start in life which seems, from our point of view, to limit the opportunities of experience, and consequently it tends to produce what is nowadays called an "inferiority complex." "Humble birth" is, of course, a feature of a particular social system.

I do not think that this similarity in origin of the Dictatorship is accidental. Neither am I convinced that their meteoric rise is a compliment to their useful qualities as members of society. Rather I am inclined to regard it as a damning indictment of the systems for which they stand, as being the embodiment of the "inferiority complex." You will no doubt feel that this statement requires some amplification.

There is, I believe, little difference of opinion among psychologists that the characteristics of Group A are all characteristics of immaturity, and what we should call a genuine deficiency of education and culture.

So is an "inferiority complex." The unfortunate victim of it yearns to inflict on others the slights, and real or fancied injustices, he has, or thinks he has, himself, suffered. A dictatorship is a grim confirmation of the prophecy "The last shall be first."

The first characteristic of a dictatorship is the assumption that all wisdom in regard to the objects of the State is centred in the Dictator. Logically, if things go wrong, it is the fault, not of the policy, but of individuals who are entrusted with its execution. Hence we arrive by rapid stages at what is so charmingly called "the blood purge."

The second characteristic is the exaltation of abstractions, such as the State. The first article of the Italian Constitution, for instance, is that the State is everything,

(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.

From Week to Week

There could hardly be a more devastating criticism of a Government than the mass emigration which is taking place from the British Isles; but Mr. Macmillan's self-satisfaction at having achieved his highest ambition appears to be quite puncture-proof. He is arranging a further rise in the cost of living, and it cannot be very long before there is a flight from sterling and acknowledged bankruptcy. We hope the Bermuda jaunt is not spoiled by a fit of Mr. Eisenhower's sulks.

An article in the January 4, 1957, issue of *U.S. News and World Report* summarised a Congressional Committee Report on the effect of integration of public schools in Washington. Integration is the word used to indicate the mixing of white and negro children.

Shortly, the results are summarised as follows: "Tests showed wide disparity between white and negro pupils in mental ability.

"Teachers in integrated schools have spent most of their time on retarded pupils.

"Disciplinary problems have become 'appalling'; sex problems are 'a vital concern.'"

Now, as in much else today, the significance lies less in the results of the policy of integration than in the persistence in the policy in the face of the results. As usual, we do not believe this arises from any 'mistaken' attitude, but that it is evidence of Satanic intention bent on our destruction. And it is also evidence that while 'America' is being used as one of the instruments for the destruction of the British, the turn of the American *people* will come in due course.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom".....	5/-
The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
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.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.

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

Samaria — 1957

Botta found in Sargon's castle at Khorsabad his reports on his campaigns in Syria and Palestine, and his capture of Samaria in Israel.

"... in the first year of my reign I besieged and conquered Samaria." Sargon II reigned from 721 to 705 B.C. According to that the northern kingdom in Israel collapsed in 721 B.C. (2 Kings, 17, 6).

"People of the lands, prisoners my hand had captured, I settled there. My officials I placed over them as governors. I imposed tribute and tax upon them, as upon the Assyrians." So reads the account of the conquest of Samaria in the annals. The Old Testament describes the uprooting tactics employed in this case by ruthless dictators, the first large scale experiment of its kind in the world made by the Assyrians: "And the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria, instead of the children of Israel: and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof" (2 Kings, 17, 24).

Tens of thousands of human beings were violently driven from their homeland, deported to foreign lands, and their places filled by others dragged from different areas.

The aim of this war was clear: National consciousness, and with it the will to resist, was to be broken. . . . Samaria shared this fate. Its motley collection of inhabitants became known as "Samaritans." "Samaritans" became a term of abuse, an expression of abhorrence. They were despised not only on religious grounds but also as individuals: "For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans" (John 4, 9)—pp. 246/7 of *The Bible as History* (Keller).

In Australia, where the native born is fast becoming as a foreigner, a modern Chronicler, period 1939-1957, might well observe that the Churchmen were/are as blind as Moles. The need for Christian Charity—good Samaritanism—is but one factor in the situation. *Ignorance* is as much a sin as selfishness or un-generosity. They have allowed themselves to be used, to break up national consciousness. This is Samaria, filled with new Samaritans.

W.H.P.

This England

This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England
This nurse, this teeming womb of royal kings,
Fear'd by their breed, and famous by their birth,
Renowned by their deeds as far from home,—
For Christian service and true chivalry,—
As is the sepulchre in stubborn Jewry
Of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son:—
This land of such dear souls, this dear, dear land,
Dear for her reputation through the world,
Is now leas'd out,—I die pronouncing it,—
Like to a tenement or pelting farm: . . .
With inky blots and rotten parchment bonds:
That England, that was wont to conquer others,
Hath made a shameful conquest of itself.

—Richard II, Act 2, Scene 1.

The Development of World Dominion

During the period of the Socialist Administration in Great Britain, following the end of World War II, *The Social Crediter* analysed the activities of that administration in our progress to disaster; and emphasised over and over that a change of administration would not mean a change of policy. The Constitutional issue, philosophy, politics, economics and strategy were examined in the notes under the heading "From Week to Week." Written or inspired by the late C. H. Douglas, these notes are a permanent and invaluable addition to our understanding of the policies of opposed philosophies, and we propose to re-publish a considerable selection of them, both for their relevance to a situation which has developed but not otherwise altered under a 'new' Administration, and for the benefit of new readers of this journal to whom otherwise they are not readily available.

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

A liberal estimate of the percentage of the electorate of Great Britain at this time who have even an approximate idea of what is being prepared for them, *whether they vote Labour, Socialist, Communist or Conservative under present electoral conditions*, would be one half of one per cent. There is one policy which can be effectively pursued in this country without constitutional reform of the most drastic nature, and that this is so is proved by the fact that only one policy *has* been pursued since 1906, no matter what Party has nominally administered it. It was more stealthily pursued before 1911 when the Parliament Act destroyed its last effective barrier; it was more openly pursued after the General Strike through the agency of P.E.P. with the Mond group of industrialists in the background; and it is now the official policy of Mond's opposite numbers, personified by Shinwell, Silkin and Aneurin Bevan. Ernest Bevin, who was originally part of it, has "run out" to use a steeplechase idiom. The policy is that of the Slave State and Factory ghetto, of which Mr. Harold Macmillan is so strong a supporter.

We are not sure that there is any effective answer at this late date. What we *are* sure of, is that there is no possibility—not the very slightest—that an Administration could be elected under the present ineffective Constitution under any title or with any available personnel which could be "left to put things right." Consider Dr. Dalton's purrings to Mr. Churchill at Manchester University.

There are three alternatives open to the reader of this note. He can do the things which will ensure the early triumph of the Slave state, such as playing party politics or doing nothing at all, the latter being, of the two subdivisions, the more sensible. Or he can bring the maximum pressure to bear, on any M.P. in sight, to hamstring bureaucracy, or finally, he can demand that a statement of Constitutional Rights and Functions be prepared and submitted to *The Lords, the King and the Commons for clarification*.

The Omnipotence of the Cabinet has to be challenged. It has no traditional basis, no pragmatic justification. It has led us from one disaster to another, and we are most

unwise to tolerate it. Vicious and unsound in itself, it automatically selects inferior Ministers. (June 7, 1947.)

All serious students of affairs must realise that "the climate of opinion," and "the technique of organisation" are two of the major factors of a civilisation: and that the civilisation we recognise as European is the result of a special relationship between these two factors which we ascribe, and rightly ascribe, to something we call Christianity. What is not so widely appreciated is that there are two Christianities, the Judaic and the Graeco-Roman. It would be simple to say that one is not Christianity at all, but it would not be wholly correct. It is correct, however, to say that the culture which is being sacrificed in Europe to-day is the flower of Graeco-Christian influence; and the engines of destruction which are laying Europe waste derive their terrible efficiency from the incarnation of Judaeo-Christianity in modern industrialism. Whether both Peter and Paul are essential to the Kingdom on Earth, we do not know; but it is easy to see that if they are, the words, "I came not to bring peace, but a sword" require no further explanation.

It is far from unlikely that one key to the World problem is involved in these matters. Only a simpleton would suppose that twenty-five years of anti-god societies have seriously modified the influence of a thousand years of Greek Orthodoxy, on the essential Russian peasant; the soulless efficiency of the Prussian has been nurtured on the iron predestination of Luther, Calvin, and Huss. Yet Byzantium is overrunning Geneva, the jewelled cope is triumphing over the black gown. And it is obvious that the conflict is in Russia itself, just as much as between Russia and Germany. (March 24, 1945.)

"IF ANY WOULD BE GREATEST . . ."—

(continued from page 1.)

the individual nothing except as he is of service to the State. This is typical of Group A thinking.

You no doubt remember *Punch's* story of the cross-channel passenger in the saloon to whom the steward said, "You can't be sick here, sir," and the passenger's reply, "Can't I?" as he demonstrated that he could.

The steward's rebuke was Group A thinking, and the passenger's reply, Group B thinking. The steward's insistence on tradition was right in its way, but he mistook tradition for natural law, which is a fatal mistake.

Great Britain, although not a titular dictatorship, is an oligarchy moving towards a dictatorship as a result of the elevation of financial and legal conventions easily recognisable as belonging to Group A.

I see no reason to assume that, making allowances for the character of the people, the outcome will be less deplorable than is the case, say, in Russia, although it may take an immediately less murderous form.

One immediate effect of it is that on the whole British Statesmen do not represent the best talent available, partly because the best talent available is repelled by current political practices.

That marvellous pioneer, Francis Bacon, Earl of Verulam, in the *Novum Organum*, saw the nature of the problem clearly, and stated it with precision. He said in effect, "We can proceed no further along the lines of thought now prevalent. What is required is a just, that is to say, a realistic, relationship, between the mind and things."

The scientists took his advice, and modern mastery of nature is the result. The lawyers and financiers did not, and civilisation is breaking up because they did not. Nations are striving for things which are of no use to them, and suffering under necessities which have no real existence.

Instead, then, of endeavouring to impose some abstract and immature organisation upon nations and upon the world, the first step would appear to be to examine the nature of nations. The first fact which seems incontestable about nations is that they are collections of human beings.

Human beings can exist quite comfortably without nations, but nations, or States, cannot exist without human beings. That would appear to settle once and for all the question of the relative importance of human beings and nations.

But it is a fact that human beings do tend to form nations. Why? The answer is, I think, quite simple. Human beings associate together originally *in order that each individual may benefit by association*. The simplest example is pulling on a rope.

Men don't pull on a rope for the benefit of the rope: they provide the rope for the benefit their associated effort brings to each of them.

Now there is definitely a form of Government which is associated with this conception—genuine Democracy. No one takes seriously the verbiage prevalent about the struggle between Democratic and Totalitarian Governments—there *are* no Democratic Governments.

But there might be.

Perhaps I might be permitted to touch on a few of the things that Democracy is not.

While it is inconsistent with arbitrary special privilege, economic or otherwise, it does not mean equalitarianism. It would be just as sensible to say, without amplification, that everyone had a right to a place in the Eleven.

So they have, if they have the qualifications, and it is recognised that the number of places is by general consent limited.

Neither does democracy mean a referendum or an election on every detail of day-to-day national management. On the contrary, a realistic conception of democracy insists that a community is sovereign, but it is not technical.

It has a right to demand results but not to dictate methods, the word "right" being used in the pragmatic sense.

But if the results desired are not being obtained it has a right to an explanation and, if necessary, the replacements of its administrators.

So far as Great Britain is concerned, I am inclined to think that the divergence from Democracy is not difficult to indicate. Easily the most glaring feature is our money and credit system, which is indefensible. The information it affords us is illusory, and no security is possible until it is drastically modified.

The Parliamentary System has been perverted to purposes for which it was not intended, and all real power has been taken from it by the Cabinet.

Finally, our legal system has been exalted to a semi-divine omnipotence, and invested with sanctions which make it a Master and not a Servant.

Obviously it would take much too long to examine each of these aspects of our decadence at length.

I do not believe that any of them will really be put right until there is a much wider consciousness of the natural relationship between the individual and his institutions.

If that can be obtained, and not until it is obtained, we shall dispense with a type of statesman who, in spite of Abraham Lincoln's warning, still hopefully tries to fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, and, instead, obtain men who recognise that the advice, "If any would be greatest among you let him be your servant," was not sentimentalism, but a brilliant maxim of social and political organisation.

The United Nations and The League of Nations

It is claimed by one of our permanent officials that The United Nations compares very unfavourably, both in intention and in performance, with its predecessor The League of Nations.

He claims that The League was predominantly a European institution and that its most conspicuous personalities were European in nationality, culture and tradition. In matters of voting the European and Commonwealth bloc was able to override all others.

By comparison, the writer continues, the European bloc in the United Nations is completely submerged, and the dominating figures do not include one European. The big battalions are both nondescript and irresponsible.

It is taken for granted that the use of force between one country and another is to be deprecated, but the use of force by the United Nations would be justified.

An atmosphere and appearance of bedlam were arising out of the practice by the United Nations of debating the internal affairs of particular countries. Indeed, one European Foreign Minister had described it as "an institution for the organisation of collective chaos." There has been more fighting and loss of life in ten years of the United Nations than there was in the century preceding the League of Nations and World War I.

Social Credit and Suez

12 copies @ 2/6. 24 copies @ 4/6.
50 copies @ 8/-. 100 copies @ 15/-.

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