

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 35. No. 21.

SATURDAY, JUNE 15, 1957.

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

6d. Weekly.

The Great Betrayal

by C. H. DOUGLAS

(Originally published in *The Social Crediter* in 1948)

II.

Mr. Winston Churchill is by ancestry half Hanoverian Whig and half American, and by political upbringing and association a Lloyd Georgian Liberal with powerful Jewish support. None of this would suggest a tendency to produce a starchy eyed political idealist with a trusting temperament of a Babe in the Woods, and it is therefore doubly significant that Mr. Churchill (it is stated on good authority) has refused to accept his salary as leader of the Opposition in the present Administration. It suggests that the trend of events is not such as he had anticipated, or at any rate, he has no wish to be paid for even passive complicity in it.

With no desire or competence to find excuses for him, I find it difficult to believe that he has not been double-crossed. And the nature of the double-crossing is not far to seek. Mr. Roosevelt, it would seem, took his measure accurately, recognised his overwhelming passion to be a second Marlborough, and gave him a fairly free hand to win the war so long as not many Americans fought seriously, making, however, complete and effective arrangements to win the peace. Clearly, as Mr. Roosevelt's friends would assure him, no better plan could be imagined than that outlined by Mr. Jaques. How it was arranged that the "Labour" Party should be returned is difficult to know, but that it was arranged is nearly certain. Never in the chequered history of the secret ballot conjuring trick, has such a bare-faced imposture been staged as in the election of 1945, with its hundreds of thousands of U.S. soldiers all canvassing against "the feudal system" ("why don't ya have a d'markrazie like Amurrica?") and its three months' interval between the ballot and the vote counting.

At this point, it is useful to obtain some idea of the nature of the Parliament which was "palmed," to use the appropriate conjuring term, on the British Isles under the name of a "Labour" Government. Of the 398 members accepting the Government Whips, 124 are Trade Union officials, 48 publishers, journalists and authors, 45 Municipal politicians, 41 barristers and solicitors, 41 businessmen, 34 schoolmasters, 12 Co-operative employees, 12 doctors and dentists, 10 university teachers, 10 farmers, five Army, Navy and Air Force officers, three civil servants, three Free Church ministers, one policeman and five unclassified.

Whatever may be said of this collection, and a good

many things may be said of it, it is not "Labour" in any reasonable or distinctive meaning of the word. Anyone with the slightest acquaintance with the subject would recognise its character. It is a Parliament of Fabian Socialists and P.E.P. nominees hand-picked for Mond-Turnerism, united by a common preference for white collar jobs over "workers" employment, and an equal determination to tell other people how to work rather than to work themselves. That is to say, it is almost identical with the New Deal background which had propagandised Franklin Delano Roosevelt and blanketed its failure by precipitating the Second World War. While many of its constituent members did not know it, it was an international, not a British body, committed in advance to wreck its native country.

It is almost certain that the genesis of the Parliamentary victory of the so-called "Labour" Party can be found in the conditions imposed on Mr. Churchill in 1940 after Dunkirk as a condition of "Labour" support, and the situation at this time can be synthesised by observing that *every party outside Mr. Chamberlain's group was being advised by the same international body*, and that the present interests of that body are geographically centred in New York. In consequence the complete elimination of Great Britain as a Power is essential to the role so engagingly recalled by Mrs. Roosevelt, that "Britain" is the first line of defence of the United States. "That," added Mrs. Roosevelt recently, "is true to-day." That is a proud thought for the survivors of the British Empire.

Obviously, every piece of advice, now practically amounting to an order, which was tendered by Mr. Roosevelt's entourage has been good advice—as viewed from Wall Street and Washington. And, in the main, Mr. Churchill took that advice, which probably included a suggestion to hand over the post-war baby to the trained arms of Mr. Attlee and the London School of Economics. To provide Mr. Attlee with a loyal background on the American model, Lord Citrine (T.U.C.) is now Chairman British Electrical Authority at £8,500 *per annum*. Sir Frederick Burrows (ex-railway clerk) was made Governor of Bengal (!) at £9,000 *per annum*, Sir Ben Smith, a most admirable ex-able-seaman, is paid £3,500 *per annum* for running the West Midland Coal Mines, Mr. Jack Benstead,

(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 and Editorial:* 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.
Telephone: Belfast 27810.

From Week to Week

In a letter to *The Times* (May 13, 1957) which comes closer than many we have seen to defining satisfactorily the requirements of a monetary system, Mr. Bernard Knowles remarks that "an efficient monetary system should be so constructed as to reflect the facts of production and distribution." But he also refers to "the fundamental need of equating the power to produce with the power to consume."

It is basic to a correct understanding of real economics to grasp the fact that the ability to produce is, and always has been, in excess of the ability to consume. If this were not so, no progress in the ability to produce would have been possible. With the introduction of tools and power, the ability to produce has expanded at an ever accelerating rate, and, so far as the *individual* consumer is concerned, has enormously out-distanced the ability to consume—not, of course, merely as a monetary phenomenon, but physically. Thus, an ever-increasing proportion of "production" is of a kind which is of no use to the individual, and the "consumption" of which is either by the further expansion of productive capacity, or by export. Our current monetary system unfortunately (albeit deliberately) reflects this fact quite correctly: inflation.

The root of the trouble is that the policy governing "production" is wrong. It is a producers', not a consumers', policy. The remedy is to give the consumer control over the policy of production, by giving consumers control of the credit which initiates production.

If, as seems probable, Mr. Knowles would agree with this short analysis, perhaps he would agree to amend his definition of the "fundamental need." We suggest that this is to give the ultimate consumer control over the programme of production so that he, collectively, can alter in his favour the ratio of capital to consumer production, which at present is heavily and increasingly adverse to him.

We cannot but agree with *Candour's* succinct description of current events: a "Phased advance towards the One World hell which idealists, spurred on by diabolists, are busily engaged in planning."

Those of our readers who remain convinced that local

objective campaigns of the anti-fluoridation type have an important part to play in the strategy of resistance to world diabolism might well give consideration to putting governments in difficulties over the association between cigarette-smoking and lung cancer.

That there is a highly significant statistical correlation between cigarette smoking and lung cancer is certain. The correlation is such as to make it highly probable that heavy smoking causes cancer of the lung; and, of course, governments are well aware of it. On the other hand, revenue derived from taxation on tobacco is so great and—more important—so widely spread, that governments give the facts far less publicity than they warrant. A study of *Hansard* soon makes it clear that the subject is one from which Ministers shy clear.

The upper class having been abolished, and the middle class almost abolished, taxation of "the workers" is the real base of taxation—a fact which is concealed by indirect taxation, but which would become more evident were smoking to become appreciably less. There is a very strong case to be made out in favour of a strenuous endeavour to persuade young people not to begin smoking. We should like to see the Government's concern should such a campaign be effective; but we think that the demonstration of the Government's resistance to such a campaign would be equally instructive.

Majority Rule

"Ortega y Gasset sums up the situation in his well-known book *The Revolt of the Masses* with a harsh candour we shall do well to ponder. He says:

"The characteristic of the hour is that the commonplace mind, knowing itself to be commonplace, has the assurance to proclaim the rights of the commonplace and to impose them wherever it will . . . The mass crushes beneath it everything that is different, everything that is excellent, qualified and select. Anybody who is not like everybody, who does not think like everybody, runs the risk of being eliminated. And it is clear, of course, that this 'everybody' is not 'everybody.' 'Everybody' was normally the complex unity of the mass and the divergent specialised minorities. Nowadays, 'everybody' is the mass alone. Here we have the formidable fact of our times, described without any concealment of the brutality of its features." —F. M. R. Walshe.

If anyone has an explanation of majority rule which will meet this criticism, we should like to hear of it.

Social Credit and Suez

by BRYAN W. MONAHAN.

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.

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.

That peculiar tenderness to Collectivism, Socialism, and their inseparable brother Statism which seems to characterise the evangelical "Christian" churches is well illustrated by the Amsterdam Conference "Draft Report on the Church and the Disorder of Society." After observing, very properly, that "We must, however, say to the advocates of socialisation that the institution of property is not the root of corruption of human nature" it adds that property ownership is not an unconditional right, and must be preserved, curtailed, or distributed in accordance with the requirements of justice. It is perhaps unnecessary to add that the report offers no definition of justice.

We are confronted once again with this curious passion for policing as a cure for social ills. If there was any body of evidence to show that the individual man had administered property worse under the conditions of possession existing, for instance, at the time of Magna Carta, there would still be fundamental objection to institutional interference in what ought to be individual responsibility and initiative.

But in fact, all the evidence, properly understood, is in the opposite direction, and lacking some further pronouncement, we can only conclude that broad platitudes well separated from criticism of Finance and Administrative Centralisation, are all we shall get from Amsterdam.

"So the student of sciences finishes his education with little left of his earlier (Christian) belief about man. He may have made the change gradually and without any open argument or even conscious decision. In fact, this transition from one belief to another, is, in most cases a subtle drift of attitude in response to the viewpoint of teachers and books; it can be as much the result of pure suggestion as was the childhood acceptance of the older concept of man."

—*The Reach of the Mind*, Dr. J. B. Rhine; p. 13.

"Do not suppose for a moment that these statements are empty words; think carefully of the successes we have arranged for Darwinism, Marxism, Nietzsche-ism. . . .

"Who is going to verify what is taught in the village

schools? . . .

"We have fooled, bemused and corrupted the youth of the *goyim* by rearing them in principles and theories *we know to be false, although it is by us that they have been inculcated.*"—*Protocols of Zion*, Marsden Translation.

(October 2, 1948.)

Much of the prestige of the Church of England derived from the character and social status of its clergy, and its influence has declined *pari passu* with the change in the general type of individual attracted to its ministry.

Only that curious perversity which appears to form an essential component of dialectical materialism prevents the recognition of this factor in some of the wild nonsense attributed to many incumbents of Anglican Orders. The Communism which is rampant amongst them is often defended by the statement that Communism is an arrangement by which all things are held in common, and thus the Early Christian Fathers were Communists. We often wonder what meaning these people attach to the injunction "Thou shalt not steal," to take one example only of the matter contained in the Book of Common Prayer. How do you steal common property? Ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The general argument is of course just as sensible as to assert that all First Class passengers on the "Queen Mary" are Communists because they share a common means of transport and have a common right to order from a common menu at meals. It is becoming increasingly clear that the touchstone of economic civilisation is freedom of association with the right to contract-out. All economic progress grows from property based on contract freely made and inviolable except by consent. We have retrograded thousands of years under the partly half-baked and partly traitorous teachings of the post-1848 Communism absorbed by inexperienced "workers." Defective as the nineteenth century money system undoubtedly was, nothing has ever come so near to a perfect economic device, and its rectification would have made the present discontents not merely unreasonable but incredible. That is why the rectification was not permitted.

The fundamental of that system was *communism of claims* ("my money is as good as yours") *subject to rights of property*. Anything which was for sale could be bought by anyone with the money. Under even the half-baked Socialism of the current Governments, both rights and money disappear. The fundamental idea is robbery.

(July 10, 1948.)

In the course of a review in the *Tablet*, it is remarked that the theory of Evolution, as generally understood, with its associated idea of Progress is in direct opposition to the *facts of entropy*.

This is important, and the antithesis, so far as we are aware, has not previously received attention. It has always appeared to us to be axiomatic that all *genuine* progress is conscious, the result of directed effort. Darwinism, as generally understood, is an automatic, deterministic, process, similar or identical with entropy, and in opposition

to conscious effort towards an objective which is not evident in environment. (October 2, 1948.)

We abominate assassination, and it may be supposed that the threat to "do him in" which is said to have been levelled at Mr. Strachey, is a threat of assassination. But if Providence, in its inscrutable wisdom, and during the prevalence of the present high winds, should cause a particularly heavy chimney-pot to fall on him, we could temper our sorrow with resignation. Mr. Strachey is an example of the human being (we suppose that is a correct description) who has been given opportunities of upbringing for which he is unfitted; and it is notorious that nothing is more certain to produce something undesirable by even Marxian standards. Mr. Strachey belongs to, but does not come from, what the Americans call "the lower income brackets"; by the peculiar workings of our present institutions (perhaps) he is a Minister of His Britannic Majesty's Government. We do not grudge him his £5,000 *per annum*; but we do object strongly that his type should be invested with powers over the essentials of life greater than those possessed by Peter the Great. (October 16, 1948.)

In these days of paper restriction and consequent pressure upon our space, we should not mention Mr. Strachey if he did not exemplify a matter of fundamental importance. We have in mind the automatic relationship of character to particular social and economic forms of organisation and may recall that it was examined at some length thirty years ago in *Economic Democracy*. Professor Hayek has put similar views in his much discussed *Road to Serfdom*, under the heading "Why the worst get on top." To quote him: "If we wish to find a high degree of uniformity and similarity of outlook, we have to descend to the regions of lower moral and intellectual standards, where the more primitive and 'common' instincts and tastes prevail."—(p. 69 abgd.—*Editor*.)

Since the prevalent political theory is that the majority must not merely be represented, but that their views must prevail, we obtain quite automatically by a ballot box democracy, the government of the whole by the worst.

(October 16, 1948.)

THE GREAT BETRAYAL— (continued from page 1.)

a Trades' Union official, £5,500 as a member of the Transport Commission, *etc., etc.* There are dozens of others. These are "out in the country." But, if my addition is correct there are between sixty and seventy Ministers or near-Ministers on the higher pay-roll, all of whom, together with the ordinary Members of Parliament, were immediately rewarded for their allegiance by a large rise in salary. Many of the Opposition Members feel also that it would be a pity to be too censorious of an Administration with such sound principles, more especially as their leaders appear curiously willing, or even anxious to be more Socialist than the Socialists.

Briefly, then, the public at large may have lost the peace once again. Great Britain may now be "Britain"; but with the aid of significant sections of all political parties,

we have achieved the proud position of the First Line of Defence of the U.S.A., are in process of becoming a Work State on a standard of living arranged from Washington, America will be free to treat the world as her oyster while we fight for her mistakes, will take what she wants from us, and give us what she can't use herself, and it will, and has, become clear that as in Hitlerite Germany and Russia only fools will work either manually or technically—all the knowing ones will be good Party politicians.

It has been the fashion in Bloomsbury, and in those places where the Fabians sing, to jeer at the British Empire ("pure Kipling, old boy, ha! ha!") and in general, the ways of the Victorians. While many valid criticisms can be made both of the organism and the period, most of them traceable to that financial system the Fabians are so careful not to attack, it would be a cardinal error not to assess the significance of this attitude. Passing over the fact that the Socialist is not naturally a traveller or an adventurer, except in the less desirable sense of the word (the very roots of Socialism are antipathetic to individual initiative) he is a worshipper of logic—of pure reason, which he mistakes for intelligence. The Fabian Society itself is the descendant of the Encyclopædists who ushered in the Age of Reason. That this is not a British trait—in fact, the typical Englishman distrusts logic to a degree which denies its legitimate use—is only one of many indications of the alien philosophy sapping our native vigour. The *premises* for arguments in favour of the Empire are in the main hidden, and the deductive method does not apply. But the *proofs* are clear, even if to the man in the street, the reasons are not, that the British Empire was a far more admirable growth than any mechanistic League or Union of Nations, precisely because it was not reasonable—it was organic.

(To be continued.)

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom".....	5/-
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.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST, N. IRELAND.