

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 39. No. 17.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1959.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

## AD CLERUM

Notes for an Address to the Clergy.

I read in the paper a few weeks ago that some containers had been fished out of a lake, and inside these tins were numerous five pound notes. These fivers had been forged by the Germans with the intention of undermining the British currency. If we compare the very mild effect these notes would have produced with the present state of our currency—which has lost two thirds of its purchasing power since those days—and if we compare the nefarious designs of our enemies with the protestations of our leaders, we indeed wonder how it can be that friends can succeed where enemies failed. In those days the Germans had occupied the Channel Islands. Once more we may compare the enemy's success in the past with the drastic recession of British prestige and position in the modern world. As *American Opinion* for October puts it, "Macmillan . . . has done everything in his power to disarm England even diplomatically . . . Macmillan has succeeded in scratching England off the racing chart altogether."

I begin with facts that are well known and that hit us all, and that hit the clergy especially hard. The Archbishop of Canterbury claims that the average stipend—whatever he means by that—averages £700 a year. I think the pre-war figure was about £400. The equivalent of that now would be £1,200 a year. All of us are familiar with the heroic shifts and sacrifices that the clergy and their wives make to educate their families and indeed to keep going at all. A Stewardship or Christian Giving campaign is now proceeding and doubtless the laity should contribute more. I am not disputing that. But two points emerge. The first is the totally changed status of the clergy in this country—I know it is different elsewhere as I served three years in Canada—and the second is the acceptance of an inherently ridiculous and unnecessary situation.

When I was in Canada, as a matter of fact, a General Election was held and the then Prime Minister, St. Laurent, announced that "the people have never had it so good." And the British Prime Minister uses the identical words. Of course the people should have it good, because productive capacity has increased enormously and is increasing all the time. Yet despite the improvement of process, which means that less is consumed in producing, prices have trebled themselves.

Only the other day the wife of a clergyman said that she bought her clothes at jumble sales. Domestic tragedies of this kind abound, but the root cause is not tackled by politician or by priest. And what I wish to convey is that this is far larger than a material or a domestic issue. It is a spiritual issue and it is world-wide: the freedom of the individual and of the nation is being torpedoed.

The *Daily Telegraph* stated that Britain's hire-purchase debt rose in August by £14 million or less than two per cent. (Sept. 31, 1959). At the end of August the total owing to

household goods shops and finance houses reached £756 million. We may at first blush feel shocked that people run into so much debt—and we do not know the total of personal or business overdraft—yet this £756 million is owing on goods that have been produced and delivered. What is abundantly clear is that prices increase faster than incomes, and that there is no shortage of goods to buy. People have anticipated their future incomes, and when total debt plus tax amounts to the total of all incomes, we may expect standstill and chaos. Goods would still be available in mounting piles. Production is not our problem, however the Malthusians may argue. The maladjustment is of course material, but it proceeds from mental and spiritual causes—possibly from the Devil himself—and we are here to deal with spiritual sickness and to supply the remedy.

Most of you will have seen or read my pamphlet which shows up something like a conspiracy to pitchfork us into a world government, controlled possibly by the least desirable elements, and in which I gave the views of some sound men who were opposed to the idea. They said it would rob us of our freedom of choice, and freedom of choice is of the essence of the Christian religion. A world government would probably be anti-Christian and would incontestably be anti-British and anti-European, and would make quite sure that quality was swamped by quantity.

I wish to examine the notion of freedom more narrowly, and this may help us to see what is wrong. Now while I was putting these notes together, I felt I was "having it good," to use the politician's deplorable phrase. Similarly, while visiting the sick or administering the Sacrament, I feel that life is kind. These two examples are of leisure activity and work activity. I have been fortunate in being able to choose my work or vocation, but if I was forced to work at some uncongenial activity, I should be utterly miserable or frustrated as they call it. Creative activity, whether paid or not, is the kind that all desire. But it has little weight with politicians. They have another standard, all of them—the standard of paid employment, whether it is satisfying or not and even whether it is necessary or not. The test of political success is employment, because otherwise no money is distributed. It would seem as if they wanted everyone to be in the position where he has to go to someone else for his livelihood, to be under someone else's control, in their power in fact.

I mentioned the radical change in the clergy's position, and the point needs expanding. Previous to the great inflation, the clergyman held his parson's freehold and was a pretty free man. His income was about adequate and his position respected. But all that has changed. While his £400 has risen to £700 (so they say), the Member of Parliament has increased his salary several

(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.

### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

*Personnel*—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones. Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36, Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSton 3893.) Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420, Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

## From Week to Week

William S. Schlam, who contributes the "European Survey" feature to the magazine *American Opinion*, is at present in Europe investigating the situation and opinion on the spot. He writes in the October issue:

"Harold Macmillan, I dare predict, will go down in history as the most unlikely Prime Minister even England ever had. Baldwin knew that Hitler was arming for war, and yet he kept England disarmed. Chamberlain knew that war was coming, and yet he simulated 'peace in our time.' But Macmillan knows much less and does much more than either; he does not know the irreducible aims of the enemy—and yet he has done everything in his power to disarm England even diplomatically. For, while Baldwin renounced Britain's military strength and Chamberlain abdicated morally, Macmillan has succeeded in scratching England off the racing chart altogether. For the first time in modern history England will not sit on a decisive international conference. And, mind you, the President of the United States was pushed into the arrogance of bilateral negotiations with the Soviets by the British Prime Minister himself! Macmillan's unprecedented campaign, which was to win Khrushchev's favours for England, ends with the *one* thing intelligent Europeans have always feared more than the H-bomb—direct negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States, with the exclusion of Western Europe's big powers . . ."

"Mr. Duncan Sandys must also have been a teasing problem. Most observers have felt for a long time that he would have to be moved. In two years, he has sunk our ships, decimated our army, and grounded our air force, substituting for them a small stock of what are perhaps merely decorative bombs. Indeed this carnage is so frightful that one cannot help feeling a certain awed admiration. At the same time, one should remember that Mr. Sandys has not been pursuing his own policy. He has been carrying out the directive of the Prime Minister. To have dropped him after such faithful service would have been manifestly unjust."

—*The Observer*, October 18th, 1959.

In general, it appears that the trap for Christian civilisation is about to be sprung. The culmination of Dimitry

Manuilsky's forecast "most spectacular peace movement on record" clearly began with the visit of Mr. Mikoyan to Wall Street.

If Mr. Khrushchev is billed for the role of world dictator, it is only as the indispensable head of the police force. Control of policy, in the U.S.S.R. as elsewhere, resides in finance, and the policy of the financiers is slavery, more evidently in the U.S.S.R. at the moment than elsewhere, but world-wide police organisation will soon put that right. What other meaning has our "duty" to the 'underdeveloped' nations than that? The massive surpluses of American production are a 'capitalist' affront to the 'socialised' countries, but, like incomes above subsistence-plus-gadget level, easily disposed of by 'strong' government.

The one thing effective to prevent 'strong' government is the wide distribution of independent incomes—a condition made ever more possible by the accelerating progress of the industrial arts. Yet not only have independent incomes become highly exceptional—even those opposed to centralisation in general or Communism or Socialism in particular have sheered off the idea of a National Dividend, the one thing which might have saved us. It would have killed for ever the threat of 'unemployment', which has been used with diabolical ingenuity to force acquiescence in a 'strength' of government that free men would never (nor ever did) tolerate.

The universal confiscation of income above the gadget-subsistence level demonstrably makes only a trifling contribution to public finance. Anyone who can see that ought to be able to understand that confiscation is an act of policy, intended to lead, as it has led, to the virtual impossibility of resistance to 'strong' government, and progressive centralisation as a step to world government. If a grasp of the manipulation of the financial system is difficult for most people, as appears to be the case, it should not be difficult to grasp, in principle at least, that a policy the *opposite* of the one in force is the way to freedom and security.

Bowling out Mr. Eisenhower is not going to make the slightest difference at this stage. He and all the other figure-heads are in the grip of forces far beyond their control. If anything can save us now, which is doubtful, it is the break-down from within of centralisation. One step in that direction would be to follow an old suggestion of Douglas's: to force a break-down of the bureaucracy by such a multitude of *reasonable* requests as to be beyond its powers to deal with: Requests for explanations, information, services—anyone who knows the working of bureaucracy can visualise the effect of such a campaign. It might, of course, precipitate an explosion—but in a premature explosion some people might get hurt who had intended to be safely out of the way. And that is about the best we can hope for.

## THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

by C. H. DOUGLAS

12/6 plus 1/6 postage

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

## AD CLERUM—

(continued from page 1.)

times over. The priest, from his unassailable position, has entered the army of the employed, those who have to go to others for their money.

We may notice the current wrangle between the Gas Board and the Coal Board, as reported in the *Daily Telegraph* (Sept. 30, 1959). One would have imagined, judging from the mountains of unused coal, that modern methods resulted in coal being produced with far less effort and cost. Yet the retiring chairman of the Gas Board complains of a rise in the price of coal so steep that the Gas Council has looked for methods of producing gas without coal, and has found them. Mr. E. Jones, President of the National Union of Mineworkers together with the general secretary retorted, "The Gas Council would have been better employed in spending money on research into improving the processes of gas and coke making from indigenous fuel, rather than spending money on importing methane . . . Surely it is not in the national interests of Britain to import fuel from abroad with all that means in terms of the balance of payments, sacrificing as it will the livelihood of British miners and gas workers and inflicting widespread social misery."

I passed four years in a colliery village in North East Derbyshire, and the frequent accidents, some of them fatal, made me wonder whether coal was really necessary, at least in such quantities. The same thought is re-enforced by the recent Scottish mining disaster. On the other hand, methods are said to be improving, and we do not have to pass through the Suez Canal to obtain coal. On that score, one feels some sympathy with the views of Mr. Jones. But when he goes on to say that the import of fuel will sacrifice the livelihood of thousands of British miners and gas workers and will inflict widespread social misery, one should ask the question, "Why?" Why should they have to produce unsaleable coal to gain a livelihood and to avoid social misery?" And the answer resides in the outlook or philosophy of Mr. Jones and indeed of officialdom in every position. The answer does not reside in reality, for the goods are there in plenty. The philosophy is identical with that of the Russians, or the Americans or Chinese or Germans for that matter: if a man will not or can not become engaged in employment, he must be subjected to social misery. The real questions are not even asked, let alone answered.

It would appear that the financial-economic system is an instrument turned against freedom, loaded against the individual. Some may try to escape by devious methods—writing scandalous histories of their parents, for instance. But apart from the luck of the pools, the majority, and an increasing majority, are compelled to go to someone else for their meal ticket. If this community is as prosperous, is doing as well as the politicians would have us believe, then it is high time that it declared a dividend to all its citizens, as a right. As a cry of fear usually greets this suggestion, may I add in passing that I would counter the objection worded "something for nothing" by saying that the degree of freedom which the dividend would afford has been earned by our forefathers and it would simply help our existent and indeed *visible* inheritance to be distributed.

But the political parties, particularly at elections, remind me of a perverted version of the parable of the two sons. One says he will do it (protect our freedom, in this case) and does not do it. The other says he will not do it and indeed has no intention of doing it. The freedom of the individual and of the family unit, just because individual genius is unpredictable, is a latent threat to those who thirst for absolute power—just as a man with medical knowledge is a latent threat to a poisoner

or, one might say, as a Christian is a threat to a communist.

"Surplus Eggs Crisis in Poultry Industry", reads a large morning headline (*Daily Telegraph*, Oct. 1, 1959), so the world is not short of eggs. 17 million eggs more a week are reaching the packing station than in 1958, and producers have received an appeal from the chairman of the Egg Marketing Board not to increase supplies. It is against the law to export eggs but the question whether needs at home have been met is not considered. Yet even more surprising was the reception given by a London daily to the news of bumper harvests of grain. The paper noted in an editorial that Whitehall was not impressed, because there was plenty of corn elsewhere. In another breath the politicians are telling us that we live on our exports. Of course people do not live on what they send away, but on what they have at home or bring home.

Centralised power over the person has increased, is increasing, and must be decreased: at one time it was the power of the divine right of kings, now the power is exercised through bureaucracy. We are compelled to pay over a large proportion of our income, to go to work where we are told, to have the doctor and school intended for us, while food and drink deteriorate in quality.

I should now like to say a word about prophecy: there have been those who have warned us of being crushed between the upper and nether millstones of Russia and America. These people had prophetic insight into events that are, as they say, still unrolling.

But I wish to mention three modern prophets in particular. One of them (C. H. Douglas) wrote before the outbreak of the last war that the purpose of the war was to break up the British Empire and to bring us back to gold—or words to that effect, and many more very accurate words. Then we turn to Sir Samuel Hoare, former Ambassador in Spain. Franco told him during the course of the war, that it looked as if Russia were emerging as the great military power of Europe. Hoare retorted that he was quite wrong, that Britain would emerge as the dominant military power in Europe.

I am not primarily interested in the views of foreigners, but of our native prophets. Hoare was officialdom speaking, Douglas was a voice in the wilderness with no official documents to go on, but he was uncannily correct. We have seen the break-up of the Empire, under the taunts of "colonialism" and "imperialism" hurled indifferently by American and Russian officials; we know all about dollar stringency. In short, the British system of independence has been dealt crippling wounds. There is nothing more fashionable than belittling British achievements or than handing out British possessions.

It looks on the face of it as if there were some kind of conspiracy to destroy the stabilizing forces of the world, particularly the British contribution to stability. We can hardly believe that it is pure cussedness that the British—notably in America and Russia—are always represented as wrong, or that the laboriously constructed British system is collapsing like a pack of cards through internal weakness. We may recall that Disraeli held—and he should have known—that the rulers of the world were very different from the people who appeared to rule. I have not had many contacts with our rulers, but one of them I met struck me forcibly as being made of cardboard.

That curious historian, Hugh Ross Williamson, provides us with another instance of underhand government when he insists that the French Revolution was fomented by the secret society

of the Illuminati, and that Cagliostro was a prominent and powerful figure among them, under a charlatan's mask.

Our Lord said that He was the Light of the World. God is Light, wrote St. John. And our Christian way of life leads us from the darkness of underground activity and dishonesty into the light of truth. We insist on freedom from deceit and from the corruption of absolute power, particularly from irresponsible power, which has so vastly increased with the growth of bureaucracy.

In a phrase, we require freedom to keep the Law—and by Law I mean the Law of God, particularly as it applies to Man. For man's purpose and destiny is being distorted by the present set-up, and his finest creative achievements are either destroyed or being lost. All the time trade rivalries are causing unnatural friction, and instead of Growth, we have Control to look forward to.

Mr. Cyril Osborne, M.P. for Louth, writing to the *Daily Telegraph* on Oct. 7, 1959, admits that the system, of which he is one of the advocates, is precarious. He calls Mr. Gaitskell's promise to guarantee full employment permanently for all, "misleading and wicked. We have to export about 30 per cent of all we manufacture in order to pay for our essential imports of food and raw materials. Some 4 million people must be employed on exports. Since Mr. Gaitskell cannot compel the foreigner to 'buy British', how can he honestly guarantee full employment to those who make these exports?" One would like to know what proportion of the 30 per cent of exports is devoted to importing raw materials in order to keep people employed, in order to export, and what proportion is exchanged for food.

I must insert a last Press cutting. Egon Ronay wrote in the *Daily Telegraph* (Oct. 8, 1959), "The only grudge I have against coffee is its price. The import price is now quite low, not to speak of the fantastic surplus of last year's world crop, the biggest ever experienced. Fourteen nations agreed last month to restrict exports to prevent a catastrophic crash in the world's price level."

I would submit that the Christian objective is Freedom with Responsibility. To advance towards freedom, we clearly need a realistic appraisal of the purpose of production, which surely is consumption, and not the creation of work. This involves a great deal more purchasing power in the hands of individuals to buy the increased production, and a reduction of price and tax to match the advances in industrial process. It means Growth instead of Control. But all must be under the Law of God, and all advance is thrown away unless new political responsibility is assumed: unless the vote becomes responsible, so that voters are involved in the decision they have made, for preoccupation with the material and to salvage Quality—of food, creation, thought and spiritual life—from the obsession with Quantity. This would restore dignity to the person and it might then be recognised that the thoughts of a few are not insignificant; I do not think that the New Testament anywhere regards the thoughts of a few as insignificant.

H.S. SWABEY.

### Credit of the Mississippi

"Complaint is made that the planter remains grouty toward the former slave, since the war; will have nothing but a chill business relation with him, no sentiment permitted to intrude;

will not keep a 'store' himself and supply the negro's wants and thus protect the negro's pocket and make him able and willing to stay on the place and an advantage to him to do it, but lets that privilege to some thrifty Israelite, who encourages the thoughtless negro and his wife to buy all sorts of things which they could do without—buy on credit, at big prices, month after month, credit based on the negro's share of the growing crop; and at the end of the season, the negro's share belongs to the Israelite, the negro is in debt besides, is discouraged, dissatisfied, restless, and both he and the planter are injured; for he will take steamboat and migrate, and the planter must get a stranger in his place who does not know him, does not care for him, will fatten the Israelite a season, and follow his predecessor per steamboat."

—Mark Twain in *Life on the Mississippi*.

The above was written in 1882, a mere decade and a half after the close of the American Civil War, alleged, before, during and after that war, to have been fought to "free" the slaves.

## 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/-
Approach to Reality .....	1/6
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.
Dictatorship by Taxation .....	3d.
*Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.

ALSO

The Struggle for Money, by H.M.M. ....	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Espionage in Canada .....	7/6
An Introduction to Social Credit, by Dr. B. W. Monahan .....	5/6
On Planning the Earth, by Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs .....	6/-
Protocols of Zion .....	5/-
The Problem of the Medical Profession, by B. W. M. ....	1/-
Neither Do They Spin, by B. W. Monahan .....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans, by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S. ....	1/-
Social Credit and Catholicism, by George Henri Levesque, O.P. ....	1/-
The Planners and Bureaucracy, by Elizabeth Edwards ..	8d.
How Alberta Was Fighting Finance .....	4d.
The Beveridge Plot .....	3d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate .....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus .....	3d.
The Social Credit Secretariat (Constitution) .....	3d.

(\*Terms for quantities to bona fide  
Social Crediters on application.)

(Please allow for postage when remitting.)

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.

N. IRELAND.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.  
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.