

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 35. No. 11.

SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1957.

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

6d. Weekly.

The Situation and the Outlook

by C. H. DOUGLAS

Originally published in The Social Crediter in 1946.

The termination of large-scale military activities on the Continent of Europe—the pivotal theatre, to which the others were subsidiary and on which their destiny depended—is now sufficiently a matter of history for it to be possible to estimate their relationship to an ultimate objective, and to see also the pursuit of that objective “by other means.” Any attempt to do this intelligently must proceed from one of two hypotheses; either the world was, and is, in the grip of blind fate, “written in the pyramids,” *etc.*, or it is exhibiting the results of a policy derived from thinking man, in which case mundane fate, while conditioned to some extent by previous action and persistent deduction, is susceptible of “repentance” (thinking again or against) and compensatory action. It is on the latter hypothesis that the comments which follow are based, and if it is fallacious, it is obvious that neither they, nor perhaps any others, have any consequence. No policy, no cure.

It is necessary, in my opinion, to bear in mind that a policy *must* derive from a philosophy; and for this reason, and with some reluctance because I am well aware of the antagonisms which are aroused, I feel it would not be honest to omit the expression of an opinion which has been crystallising, so far as I am concerned, for some years. The more conventional form in which the idea to which I refer is phrased is that we are engaged in a battle for Christianity, and that is true. But it is surprising in how many ways, practically, realistically, factually, it is true. And one of these ways is almost unnoticed, except in its derivations—the emphasis placed by the Roman Catholic Church on the family, and the steady unrelenting effort to destroy the very idea of family and to substitute the State, by the Communists and Socialists, who with the World Financial Group, are the real body of Anti-Christ. Please observe that what most people mean by family nowadays is a unit *contemporaneously* composed of parents and children. It has no extension in time; the flash of consciousness we call the present is all that is allowed to this idea of “family”; and therefore it has no stability, because it lacks a dimension.

Now it is this very idea of impermanence and scorn of tradition which can be seen to be the key-note of the New Order which Mr. Anthony Eden, for instance, was so well informed as to prophesy almost before the first shot was fired in 1939. Life now is to have no stable principles; property is yours just so long as an institution does not want it; you are no judge of what is best for you, and what you

want does not matter. Everything is to be conditioned by “the common good.” The group is supreme over the individual, the flower exists for the benefit of the field.

This lack of stability is closely connected with a curious inversion. *Demon est deus inversus*. We mouth Social Security and live in a prison on the edge of a volcano. We decry privilege in favour of “the common good,” double our Cabinet Ministers’ salaries, and institute and maintain priorities in every one of the decreasing facilities of a dying civilisation. We cannot build houses, so we steal them. We cannot play the game, so we change the rules. In the face of the greatest crops in history we ration bread. We export immense quantities of goods we need ourselves to *e.g.*, France, and refuse to take payment in wines, having raised the price of Algerian claret from about twopence a litre, its cost of production, to about fourteen shillings, its “Government” price. We talk about the necessity to avoid inflation, and we negotiate immense and irrational wage increases unrelated to any intelligible wage policy and prevent the goods to which they relate from reaching the wage market; and, having with the support of fifty years propaganda against profits obtained control of the national resources, we install a Chancellor of the Exchequer who disposes of the National Credit to our disadvantage, and cuts off the National dividend at its source—a rate of interest on the national capital account—while arranging that the real wealth produced goes abroad to be credited to the national capital account of our active enemies.

These matters are not episodic, they are all connected with an intelligible philosophy. And the raw material of that philosophy is “the common man”—the amorphous group, the tool of that terrible Power which fights relentlessly for our destruction. It is very necessary not to confuse “the common man” with any economic class, perhaps more necessary these days than ever before, although its characteristic does not change. “Crucify Him. Release unto us Barabbas. Now, Barabbas was a robber.”

Majority “rule” with a secret ballot is the organising mechanism of “the common man,” the vehicle of the subconscious, the animal man. “Father, forgive them, they are *unconscious* of what they do.” Intellect is not concerned.

In order to disembarass oneself of the confusion involved in the use of words such as Fascism, Communism,

(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

In a useful article, "Why I am an Anti-Intellectual," in *Human Events* (January 26, 1957), Mr. Medford Evans lists some distinguishing features of "intellectuals." Among them are: "an intellectual is one who

"(a) thinks it all right for a Government employee to be a Communist, but wrong for him to represent a business corporation,

"(b) thinks atomic secrets should be published, but admires Communists who plead the Fifth Amendment, . . .

"(f) thinks theology is intellectually ridiculous, but that professors of theology who attack capitalism deserve great respect,

"(g) thinks that Dr. Kinsey, the sex expert, was correct in saying that science has no concern with morals, and that the real greatness of Dr. Oppenheimer is seen in his 'moral' objections to the hydrogen bomb,

"(h) thinks that Supreme Court decisions must be carried out because they are the 'law of the land,' and that Lincoln's defiance of the Dred Scott decision was a mark of his magnanimous patriotism, . . .

"(k) thinks that, of course, communism is bad; but that it is unshakably in the saddle in Russia and China; that Soviet power is forging irresistibly ahead of the West; and that the real danger is anti-communism."

We can add that intellectuals believe that Hitler wanted to rule the world, but that Zionism is a sentimental scheme to provide a home for the Jews.

• • •

Prelude

As a result of the coal shortage in Great Britain, Mr. Dalton announced on August 2, 1946, the Government would remove the import duty on fuel oil in next year's Finance Bill, and in the interim would pay a subsidy of £1 per ton on such oils, whether home-produced or imported, in order to encourage the "maximum conversions" from coal to oil in industry.

Thus sovereignty over another aspect of the control of industry is being expatriated.

—*The Australian Social Crediter*, August 24, 1946.
 "History is Crystallised Politics."

Springs of Action

Review.

The Age of Elegance. Arthur Bryant, The Reprint Society.

Sir Arthur Bryant touches several of the springs of action in his survey of the years 1812-1822. He notes that Napoleon defied the eighteenth century conventions or laws of war by threatening to shoot any Governor of a fortress who surrendered before it had been stormed, thus increasing the horrors of conflict. Also Napoleon did not allow his subordinates to retreat or give up anything. Wellington paid scrupulously for his provisions, and coined money for the occupied territories, although he employed professional forgers for the work; but the Revolutionary principle that war should support war caused fearful havoc.

Another spring that Sir Arthur touches concerns the freedom that Britain then enjoyed. In London, he says, "there were no police, yet there was no confusion." This would have amazed a foreign visitor, as would the sight of the Bank of England "where a private company of financiers successfully monopolised the most precious of all royal prerogatives, the issue of money." The notes of freedom and finance recur throughout the work, and distinguish Sir Arthur from the hack historian. He lists the voluntarily supported hospitals, almshouses and other charitable foundations when he praises the voluntary goodness of the citizens, claiming that England was then at its most beautiful, which resulted from the organic farming that scorned a quick return.

Immediately after this war, Britons alone stood for "cohesion without coercion, wealth without slavery . . . The fabric of their law had been woven in the course of centuries to sustain the freedom of the individual. The legal protection of his person and his property against all comers was England's distinguishing institution . . . Such hatred of constraint arose partly from a belief that power corrupted . . ." They scorned and resisted a bureaucracy that was "recruited by jobbery," and resisted attempts to introduce a secret ballot as un-English because "the franchise was a trust which an elector was bound to exercise publicly." They had at that time a "genius for voluntary co-operation." Their ingenuity too was on the credit side, for, as Sir Arthur puts it, "a society that venerated freedom of thought and action was a seed-plot for invention."

On the other hand the rich were "martyrs to display" and enjoyed brutal sports. We read in a note that the banker, Sir Richard Hoare, invented the rule that visitors viewing the house should not be allowed to sit down; the author accuses society of often being stupid and vacant, so that the title "Age of Elegance" often appears to be a misnomer. A narrow and rigid pride arose that was "something new" in English life, as were the high walls and Mammon worship. A previous writer called it the age of usury, and perhaps our author would agree. The virtues engendered by a free Christian society were, he says, being replaced by the pursuit of property and prestige, which resulted in the uprooting of growing numbers from the country's traditional life.

A new outlook towards work developed, for it was now regarded as "the best of all activities for body and soul, and an extended means of employment was hailed as a national blessing." Yet the forms of work, says Bryant,

were no longer adapted to man's nature—and of course women and children were brutally involved—and the mould from which Englishmen had been made was broken, while the new mould did not “seem to cultured contemporaries a Christian or a kindly one.” At the same time Bentham taught that all law was evil, being an infraction of liberty; and as an atheist Bentham also rejected the law of God. The war multiplied enclosure bills and the countryman's position deteriorated as he lost his traditional amenities. The author quotes a poem which opens:

“Hence, yeomen, hence!—thy grandsire's land resign;
“Yield, peasant, to my lord and power divine!”

Commenting on the recession that followed the war, Sir Arthur says, “from the moment the war ended a mounting shortage of purchasing-power developed in every department of national life.” In the same chapter, called “The Years of Disillusion,” he notes the activities of speculators and quotes a contemporary who wrote of landing at Spithead, where “the number of Jews who crowded the vessel was astonishing. They all sought for gold. . .” As a result of the paper currency, “what was physically possible had been rendered financially possible,” and for a time the Government resisted the pressure to return to gold, but failed to see that “the credit of the State might be used simultaneously to reduce taxation and enlarge consuming-power to a point that would equate it with the power to produce.” And so the nation resorted to usury, for the era of the Regency was, he says, the age *par excellence* of the money-lender.

“It was the age of the great bankers. . . . It was the age, above all, of the Jews who, pouring into England from Italy, Spain, Holland and Germany, found themselves with the wealth of a confused and warring world running through their fingers.” Sir Arthur quotes Byron's *Age of Bronze* in support of this fact—“all states, all things, all Sovereigns they control”—and calls the Rothschilds the greatest phenomenon of the age after Napoleon, weaving their “gossamer webs of usury.” Another was Ricardo “the great economist,” whose views were treated “almost as holy writ” by all parties, despite the warnings of Cobbett.

Sir Arthur tells of the ruin of 1816 followed by riots, the boom in 1818 terminated by the return to gold, the slump of 1819 with the Peterloo deaths at Manchester and the “six bills,” and of the somewhat better times of 1820-21. The land, however, still abounded in “dispossessed peasants starving in the midst of plenty,” and he concludes this chapter by remarking that all England needed in the peace was “a reform of her financial system to harness and canalise the productive forces unloosed by her inventors” and a return to Christian principles.

He opens his *Epilogue* by saying that, after true religion, true aristocracy is the greatest blessing a nation can enjoy, and includes two quotations from Coleridge: “Man must be free, or to what purpose was he made a spirit of reason and not a machine of instinct? Man must obey, or wherefore has he a conscience? The powers which create this difficulty contain its solution, for their service is perfect freedom.” The final quotation opens, “If we are a Christian nation, we must learn to act nationally as well as individually as Christians.”

Unfortunately, the worst features of war have persisted

as have the financial shackles, so that freedom has been crushed: yet there remain people uncrushed who are still proud of our heritage, and I think that Sir Arthur was writing for them.
H. SWABEY.

Benjamin Franklin on Jewish Immigration

Excerpt from the Journal of Charles Pickens of South Carolina of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of 1789 regarding the statement of Benjamin Franklin at the Convention concerning Jewish immigration.

There is a great danger for the United States of America. “This great danger is the Jew, Gentlemen.” In every land the Jews have settled, they have depressed the moral level and lowered the degree of commercial honesty. They have remained apart and unassimilated, and they have attempted to oppress and strangle the nation financially, as in the case of Portugal and Spain.

For more than seventeen hundred years they have lamented their sorrowful fate. Namely, “They have been driven out of their motherland,” but Gentlemen, if the civilised world should give them back Palestine, and their property they would immediately find pressing reasons for not returning there. Why? Because they are vampires, and vampires cannot live on other vampires. They cannot live among themselves. They must live among Christians and others who do not belong to their race. If they are not expelled from the United States by the Constitution in less than a hundred years, they will stream into the country in such numbers that they will destroy us, and change our form of government for which we Americans shed our blood, and sacrificed our lives, property and personal freedom.

If the Jews are not excluded within two hundred years, our children will be working in the fields to feed Jews, while they remain in the counting houses, gleefully rubbing their hands. I warn you Gentlemen, if you don't exclude the Jews, your children and children's children will curse you in your graves. Their ideas are not those of Americans, even when they lived among us for ten generations. “The leopard cannot change his spots.” The Jews are a danger to this land, and if they are allowed to enter they will imperil our institutions. They should be excluded by our Constitution.

(The original of this copy is in the Franklin Institute of Philadelphia.)

THE SITUATION AND THE OUTLOOK—

(continued from page 1.)

Socialism, and the like, and to avoid the elementary fallacy of supposing that our troubles began with the present so-called Labour Government, and can be ended by merely replacing it by a so-called Conservative administration, there is no better discipline than to turn back to the Mond-Turner Conference, and to observe its absorption in P.E.P.

The Mond-Turner Conference consisted of six of the most powerful industrialist employers in Great Britain, dominated by the international Zionist, Sir Alfred Moritz Mond and his able coadjutor, and co-racialist, Sir Hugo Hirst (Hirsch). Mond had belonged to both main political Parties; so had some of the others. The six so-called Labour

members of the Conference included Right and Left Wing Trades Unionists, Socialists and a Communist.

It would be difficult to get together a body of men less "political" in the Parliamentary sense. They were not there to discuss policy; they were there to make a given policy work. That policy was the World Empire of Big Business. "The high purpose of the Conference could not be more amply illustrated than by the fact that the first agreed resolution *published to the world* [my italics] was a Joint Memorandum on the Gold Reserve and its relations with industry.

"It is merely necessary for me to point out that the issue of that Memorandum to the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a definite result in the policy which he pursued."—Sir Alfred M. Mond, at Harvard University, 1928.

His Master's Voice, in fact.

It is necessary not to lose sight of the undiscussed question of policy; but, before dealing with it, the sequence of events following the Mond-Turner Conference should be noted. The Conference was in 1926. The Bank of England centralised currency in 1928; the financial crash and the world depression began in 1929; P.E.P. and the U.S. New Deal became dominant in 1932. Selected nominees of Big Business trained at the London School of Economics were installed in key positions in Australia and Ottawa. Mr. Coldwell, an Englishman, with a strong dislike for England, had the extraordinary fortune to meet Mr. Nash of New Zealand at Regina when he was so successfully founding the Canadian Socialist Party, and discovered that their views were identical. Dr. Arnold Toynbee announced that "we" are working with all our might to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations. "Hitler" undermined them by force, and at the outbreak of war a carefully prepared but unsuccessful propaganda was launched for "Union Now with Britain" [*sic*]. "Union" was, of course, carefully disguised absorption of the British Empire by the United States.

Two main features of this period can be discerned without much difficulty. The pressure to organise larger and larger units was accompanied by bigger and worse disasters. This pressure is the outcome of what, at one end of the industrial scale, is called Socialism, at the other end, Rationalisation. Both mean Monopoly under the guise of Collectivism, and both mean de-Nationalisation—an economic not a political organisation. And the second feature is that the British Empire is an insurmountable obstacle as such, and must be disintegrated before it can be replaced by economic world control. It may be recalled that William Randolph Hearst made just such a statement in an unguarded moment many years ago.

The outcome of the last catastrophe, the Second World War, is a fresh drive towards both these objectives from the same origins. And the two ends of the scale are, one unconsciously and the other consciously, working towards both objectives at the same time. That is what is coming to be called the Financier-Socialist Plot.

At this point, the divergence between a political and a business Empire becomes easier to discern. British Statesmen of the pre-twentieth-century type were constantly accused of hypocrisy. Without examining the grounds for this charge too closely, the mere fact that it was made is

instructive. Hypocrisy has been well and truly defined as the tribute vice pays to virtue. British tradition, therefore, either had, or pretended to have, a policy. What was it? Certainly not, traditionally, "business." Napoleon's gibe that we are a nation of shopkeepers was meant to be, and was accepted as, offensive at the time it was made. Nowadays we are not such successful shopkeepers, but regard shopkeeping as our highest aim.

Many books have been written on this subject, but a trivial phrase is perhaps as illuminating as any of them. In even remote parts of South America, thousands of people, many of whom have no idea whether England is a continent, a country, or a planet, and may never have seen an Englishman, assure each other of their sincerity by saying *Palabra de Ingles*—"On the word of an Englishman." Notice the suggestion of stability, of continuity, and the contrast with the predatory methods of "Enabling Legislation," the Managerial State, and other current fashions which accompany our decadence.

The point is not so much—although, of course, that is important—that a political Empire has a certain set of principles. It is that those principles should be stable. Out of this, as it were by a side wind, came success and power. The conception is closely allied to "quality."

Now the *direct* aim of an Empire of Business is power, and the ultimate *material* power is that over Life and Death—War. But the intermediate device is Fashion—Instability. Change. *Palabra de Ingles*, if it has any place at all in it, is a business device helpful towards increased exports. Use it on your letter headings. Learn from Marx and Lenin the uses of lying. In fact, learn from anybody or anything except the makers of your own history and from that history itself.

(To be continued.)

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of *annual* subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library contains, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 5/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 67, Glanmore Road, Slough, Bucks.

The following works, the gift of Dr. Basil Steele, have been added to the Library:—

- M 5. Cassirer, Ernst, *An Essay on Man*, 1944 (Doubleday).
- M 6. Eeles, Francis C., *The Coronation Service*, 1952 (Mowbray).
- M 7. Fromm, Erich, *The Sane Society*, 1956 (Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- M 8. von Hildebrand, Dietrich, *The New Tower of Babel*, 1954 (Burns and Oates).
- M 9. Huizinga, J., *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, 1924 (Penguin Books).
- C 134. Mabbott, J. D., *The State and the Citizen*.
- M 10. Parkin, Charles, *The Moral Basis of Burke's Political Thought*, 1956 (Cambridge University Press).
- M 11. Pieper, Josef, *Justice*, 1957 (Faber & Faber).
- M 12. Pryce-Jones, Alan, (Editor) *The New Outline of Modern Knowledge*, 1956 (Gollanz).