

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 39. No. 23.

SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1960.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

On the Distinction of Words

The following extracts are from a series of lectures addressed to Winchester College by the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, the Rt. Rev. R. C. Trench, D.D., and first published in book form, under the title *On the Study of Words*, in October 1851:

"It will happen continually that rightly to distinguish between two words will throw great light upon some controversy in which those words play a principal part, nay, may virtually put an end to that controversy altogether . . .

"There is indeed no such fruitful source of confusion and mischief as this—two words are tacitly assumed as equivalent, and therefore exchangeable, and then that which may be assumed, and with truth, of one, is assumed also of the other, of which it is not true. Thus, for instance, it often is with 'instruction' and 'education.' Cannot we 'instruct' a child, it is asked, cannot we teach it geography, or arithmetic, or grammar, quite independently of the Catechism, or even of the Scriptures? No doubt you may; but can you 'educate,' without bringing moral and spiritual forces to bear upon the mind and affections of the child? And you must not be permitted to transfer the admissions which we freely make in regard of 'instruction,' as though they also held good in respect of 'education.' For what is 'education'? Is it a furnishing of a man from without with knowledge and facts and information? or is it a drawing forth from within and a training of the spirit, of the true humanity which is latent within him? Is the process of education the filling of the child's mind, as a cistern is filled with waters brought in buckets from some other source, or the opening up of its own fountains? Now if we give any heed to the word 'education,' and to the voice which speaks in the word, we shall not long be in doubt. Education must educe, being from 'educare,' which is but another form of 'educere'; and that is 'to draw out,' and not to 'put in.' 'To draw out' what is in the child, the immortal spirit which is there, this is the end of education; and so much the word declares. The putting in is indeed most needful, that is, the child must be instructed as well as educated, and the 'instruction' just means furnishing; but not instructed instead of educated. He must first have powers awakened in him, measures of spiritual value given him; and then he will know how to deal with the facts of this outward world; then instruction in these will profit him; but not without the higher raining, still less as a substitute for it."

"As involving in like manner a distinction which cannot safely be lost sight of, how important the difference, of

which the existence is asserted by our possession of the two words, 'to apprehend' and 'to comprehend,' with their substantives, 'apprehension,' and 'comprehension.' For indeed we 'apprehend' many truths, which we do not 'comprehend.' The great mysteries of our faith—the doctrine for instance of the Holy Trinity, we lay hold upon it (*ad prehendo*), we hang on it, our souls live by it; but we do not 'comprehend' it, that is, we do not take it all in; for it is a necessary attribute of God that He is *incomprehensible*; if He were not so, either He would not be God, or the being that comprehended Him would be God also. But it also belongs to the idea of God that He may be 'apprehended,' though not 'comprehended,' by his reasonable creatures; He has made them to know Him, though not to know Him all, to 'apprehend,' though not to 'comprehend' Him. We may transfer with profit the same distinction to matters not quite so solemn . . . and I am sure there are few who would not shrink from affirming, at least if they at all realised the force of the words they were using, that they 'comprehended' Shakespeare; however much they may 'apprehend' in him.

"How often 'opposite' and 'contrary' are used as if there was no difference between them, and yet there is a most essential one, one which perhaps we may best express by saying that 'opposites' *complete*, while 'contraries' *exclude* one another. Thus the most 'opposite' moral or mental characteristics may meet in one and the same person, while to say that the most 'contrary' did so, would be manifestly absurd; for example, a soldier may be at once *prudent* and *bold*, for these are opposites; he could not be at once *prudent* and *rash*, for these are contraries. We may *love* and *fear* at the same time and the same person; we pray in the Litany that we may *love* and *fear* God, the two being opposites, and thus the complements of one another; but to pray that we might *love* and *hate* would be as illogical as it would be impious, for these are contraries, and could no more co-exist together than white and black, hot and cold, in the same subject at the same time. Or to take another illustration, *sweet* and *sour* are 'opposites,' *sweet* and *bitter* are 'contraries.' It will be seen then that there is always a certain relation between 'opposites'; they unfold themselves though in different directions from the same root, as the positive and negative forces of electricity, and in their very opposition uphold and sustain one another; while 'contraries' encounter one another from quarters quite diverse, and one only subsists in the exact degree that it puts out of working the other. Surely this distinction cannot be an unimportant one either in the region of ethics or elsewhere."

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

“ . . . Industrialism has put its formidable drive into private property, enhancing the man of property's social power while diminishing his social responsibility, until an institution which may have been beneficent in the pre-Industrial Age has assumed many of the features of a social evil.

“In these circumstances our society today is confronted with the task of adjusting the old institution of private property to a harmonious relationship with the new force of Industrialism. The method of pacific adjustment is to counteract the maldistribution of private property which Industrialism inevitably entails by arranging for a deliberate, rational and equitable control and redistribution of private property through the agency of the state. By controlling key industries the state can curb the excessive power over other people's lives which is conferred by the private ownership of such industries, and it can mitigate the ill effects of poverty by providing social services financed by high taxation of wealth. . . .”

—A. J. Toynbee: *A Study of History*; abridged version by D. C. Somervell, 1947: Oxford University Press: p. 291.

The above passage seems quite out of place in a study of History, since it adumbrates a policy for the future, and for this reason suggests a bias in the selection and treatment of such facts of history as are ascertainable as such (“Genuine history, that is to say, the flow of events, is just as unwritable as a spring morning . . . written history is five *per cent.* fact, and ninety-five *per cent.* historian, even at its best.” —C. H. Douglas: *The Big Idea*).

But apart from this, Professor Toynbee's passage is worth a second look. “By controlling key industries, the state can curb the excessive power over other people's lives which is conferred by the private ownership of such industries. . . .”

We do not know of a single ‘key’ industry—or of anything which could be called an industry—which is privately owned. The ownership of contemporary industry is diffused, unevenly, it is true, over various communities in various countries, and the greater the diffusion of ownership, the less the control of the owners. Professor Toynbee here is quite

clearly confusing “ownership” and “control.” Proximate control of industry is vested in management, not in ownership. What control ownership can exert over the management is an inverse function of the number of owners.

What Professor Toynbee is advocating is the superimposition of bureaucratic Socialism on the expert management of industry (“bureaucratic Socialism is probably the most inefficient method of conducting an economic system which has ever been devised.”—C. H. Douglas: *The Big Idea*)—a process which has been shown in practice merely to lower the efficiency of industry considered as the process of converting raw materials into products useful to individuals.

The second sentence of Professor Toynbee's which deserves close attention is, “it can mitigate the ill effects of poverty by providing social services financed by high taxation of wealth.” Taken literally, this is quite true. But from the context it is clear that what Professor Toynbee means is not wealth, but incomes. The distribution of a tax on *wealth* (“the *capacity to produce goods and services as, when, and where required*”—C. H. Douglas) is simply the universalisation of the dividend. As a tax on capacity, it can only be a requisition of credit, the distribution of which to individuals would not only “mitigate the ill effects of poverty” (besides eventually leading to the abolition of poverty, an objective obviously within the capacity of the industrial system as such) but lead to the response of industry to the demands of consumers as such, and with an ever-increasing capacity up to the limit of primary resources of materials and power.

High taxation of incomes, however, transfers initiative and independence from individuals and concentrates power in the state—and a satisfactory state is an extreme rarity in the forty or fifty centuries covered by Professor Toynbee's study. For example: “. . . the question arose how the lord and master of the Egyptians would use the marvellous human organisation ready to his hand and responsive to his will . . . We know the answer. He built the pyramids. . . .” (*Op. cit.* p. 207): Nowadays we have hydrogen bombs and sputniks; but the idea is just the same.

It is extraordinary to find in a study so extensive as Professor Toynbee's no reference to control of finance as an element in history, despite the fact that high taxation leading to the ruin of a whole class has more than once been a prime cause of the “troubled times” which have preceded the disappearance of one whole civilisation after another. Professor Toynbee wonders a little about the uncertainty of the future of our own civilisation. He might find an answer in the history of financial power.

The Social Credit Secretariat

Additional directors of The Social Credit Secretariat in Great Britain and Northern Ireland have been appointed as follows:

Mr. Louis A. Lyons (Organization).
 Mrs. Geraldine Starky.

Mrs. J. Hyatt has been appointed Secretary to the Secretariat.

Basil L. Steele (Deputy Chairman).

Looking Ahead to the 'Sixties

The following letter was addressed by the author to *The Glasgow Herald* but not published:—

Sir,

In the Hogmanay issue of *The Glasgow Herald* your science correspondent forecasts some of the things he thinks science may have in store for us in the 'Sixties; but however well-founded and desirable they may be, it doesn't follow that we shall ever see them. Why? Because, as things are, it is quite as probable that the 'Sixties will see the end of the human race. No amount of summit conferences can possibly prevent that happening unless we first of all solve the problems that have made things "what they are."

Let me list some of these problems—ever-rising prices (inflation), falling markets (deflation), bankruptcies, unemployment, poverty in the midst of ever-increasing potential plenty, strikes, official and unofficial, revolutions, and world-wars, cold and hot, with all their attendant miseries, not excluding the hydrogen bomb lurking in the background, ready at any moment to be dropped by some desperate, or frightened, government or dictator, exasperated beyond bearing by their problems, and blaming them on their foreign competitors—all equally exasperated—and with considerable justification; for world conditions to-day are a vast "free-for-all" struggle for trade, money, and existence, with every industrialised country a combatant, and all their rulers in process of becoming exasperated. Actually, the seeds of war exist and generate in every village and town where people have to compete and struggle with each other for jobs and money to keep them alive, however plentiful food and other necessities and luxuries may be.

All these problems are financial in origin, and can be cured, not by wars or strikes, but by financial changes—that is, by abandoning the fatal financial canons that govern everybody's life and living to-day, and give rise to exasperated, desperate, and frightened governments and dictators.

The foremost of these canons is the universal belief, held firmly both by employers and employed, that all wealth is produced by labour—interpreted as present-day labour (a glaring error)—and, therefore, that all incomes must be worked for. That is impossible of attainment in mass-producing societies, and still more so in automation ones, with men becoming rapidly and increasingly redundant as they are replaced by machines. Machines create costs, but no incomes are distributed to anybody to offset these costs; hence all the world's seething troubles.

At the same time, few people realise that, for the world to attempt disarming before it has solved these problems—as peace-loving people everywhere are strongly urging should be done—could be as deadly as the hydrogen bomb itself; for, as it would throw all the world's armies and war-workers out of their jobs, it would create the biggest slump in history, which could easily wreck all governments and dictatorships, put an end to law and order, and send the world "rattling back into barbarism."

On reflection, extinction by hydrogen bomb seems preferable, as being more humane!

My text for this little sermon is a pregnant remark found in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, that "the banker creates the means of payment out of nothing."

That is perfectly true, and inevitable—somebody has to create it—but there is no *necessary* harm in the fact. On the contrary, the world's possible salvation depends largely upon it; for it means that, since money and credit ("the means of payment") cost the banker nothing to create, there is nothing to prevent him giving it away free to the community if circumstances require it, as they most assuredly do to-day, if the debts he creates so willingly against us and all human societies—via hire purchase, for instance—are ever to be liquidated.

The harm it admittedly does at present resides in the fact that the banker regards the costless money and credit he creates as his own personal property, oblivious to the fact that he creates no tangible real wealth of any kind to back up his loans.

Also, the fact that he only lends, and never *gives away* the "means of payment" to anybody means that the debts he creates and imposes on the community every day, to enable it to carry on its business, can never really be liquidated, they can only *grow*; and all the world's huge National Debts testify to the fact that they do grow.

To-day's borrowings and debts can only be liquidated (nominally) by larger borrowings and debts to-morrow—larger because of the added interest—and all succeeding to-morrows must repeat the process.

It follows from these facts that every *new* credit the banker creates and lends is an act of inflation, which automatically dilutes and devalues everybody's money, raises prices, and increases taxation. Sooner or later the Government, or the banks—or both—taking fright at the debt-monster they have created or tolerated, decide that loans must be cut down, in a futile attempt to reduce debts, prices, and taxation; a proceeding that automatically creates a slump, with all its attendant evils—dull trade, bankruptcies, unemployment, poverty, robberies, murders, and suicides.

Ever-increasing prices create demands for higher wages; with strikes to re-inforce the demands; a form of warfare that benefits nobody, and may easily wreck the country—every country. Higher wages mean higher prices that the strikers themselves will have to pay; so, if they want a real remedy for their probably well-founded grievances, they would be well-advised to make a demand for a share of some of the bankers' costless money, as a free gift that will appear nowhere as a cost in prices.

The manufacturer, to cope with his chief problem—sales—and so escape dull trade and bankruptcy, tries to cut down his costs, so that he can undersell his competitors. This he does by means of mass-production and automation. These give him a greater output, with a great saving in labour costs; but this saving, unfortunately, reduces the community's power to buy his greater output. This again forces producers to seek out markets abroad, in the hope of acquiring money there—not imports—to make good the shortage at home, and enable him to pay off his debts to the banks. If import goods are received in return for these exports, the home population is still without the money to buy them, and therefore solves no problems.

The need to sell abroad is imperative, as things are, if the economic system is to be kept from breaking down altogether. Hence, every industrial country, although up to

the eyes in debt—national and other—and with mountainous taxation in force, makes lavish loans to under-developed countries, not from motives of kindness or generosity, even if such motives are present, but chiefly to enable them to buy, and take off its hands, its surplus products—surplus only because the home population hasn't enough money to buy them.

That means, in effect, that these industrialised countries are giving away large masses of their goods practically for nothing—while keeping the recipient countries more or less permanently in debt to them—besides supplying them with capital goods, and so raising up future competitors against them in the process; and all merely because their financial book-keeping is not correctly geared to the true economic facts.

The struggle for, and capture of, foreign markets is another form of warfare—the cold war—which can be almost as deadly in its effect as the shooting wars it inspires; it was the fundamental, animating, cause of our two world-wars; and sets the stage for the coming third one.

The remedy? As the present financial system fails to keep the world's consumer purchasing power equal to its production costs I suggest that every country should tot up its total incomes, and also its total production costs; subtract the smaller sum (incomes) from the larger one (costs), and then instruct its bankers to create—out of the traditional “nothing” enough money to make good the shortage so revealed, and distribute it, in equal amounts, as a National Dividend, and a free gift, to every member of the community—man, woman, and child, whether working or not working.

That would enable every country to buy everything it produced or imported—while exporting goods of the same money value to balance its imports. This would put an end to the struggle for money, and should, and would, create a new and peaceable world, whether it disarmed or didn't.

Strictly, all money and credit belongs, by right, to the community as a whole, as the creator—and therefore rightful owner—of all real wealth produced, even if it is created by the banks: money and credit being merely a medium or mechanism for distributing that wealth where it is needed, a service it fails to perform satisfactorily at present.

In conclusion, I would suggest to your science correspondent that if scientists don't want to see all the wonderful discoveries they and their predecessors have made throughout the centuries come to naught, they should withdraw their gaze for a time—and the sooner the better—from the heavens and outer space, and come down to earth for a little and tackle the money problem, in their own and everybody else's interest. They have the mental equipment and training for doing what our economists and politicians have so far failed to do, and never seem likely to do. Lord Boothby said recently, in a B.B.C. “Any Questions” programme, that M.P.'s never get time to think.

If they succeed—as they should, if they remember that “what is physically possible is financially possible”—they will wipe out the stain that the Hydrogen Bomb has made on their record; and the 'Sixties might become the greatest turning-point in the world's history—from hell to heaven in fact; and the way would then be open for them to resume

their scientific pursuits, and spend a pleasant holiday in their favourite spot—exploring the hidden side of the moon!

Yours faithfully,
H.M.M.

[“H.M.M.” is well-known as the author of an early pamphlet on Social Credit.—Editor, T.S.C.]

Being and Wisdom

Robert E. Cushman, who published *Therapeia* in U.S.A. seems to have been thorough-going in compiling a compendium dealing with the lives of Socrates and Plato and the value of their impact on the Grecian community affairs and culture.

Socrates must have been a sort of a bolt out of the blue. Plato is often felt as the doyen of philosophers, and his wide view of a number of metaphysical problems may have stemmed largely from the wisdom of Socrates. As far as I remember, Dean Inge called himself a Platonic Christian.

Cushman (p. 291) writes:—“Plato asserts that ignorance (amathia) in its greatest form is that which is always in process of dissolving the order of States. Consequently the lawgiver will endeavour to implant wisdom (phronesis) in so far as possible, and root out ignorance, for ignorance is also folly.”

The trial and capital punishment of Socrates may have qualified Plato's approach to the problems of finding better arrangements for more sane conditions in, and around, the conduct of community affairs.

For Plato, ideas about *Being* were related to wisdom; and in much which he wrote there was much pristine enlightenment by dealing mainly with abstractions.

If we compare the tackling of wisdom by Jesus, and by Plato, we may say that Jesus was more homely, and that He harboured less abstract ideas, as far as the Gospel records show.

I can feel in my bones that human *intuition* and *domestic life* should be made more *use* of.

—C. H. ALLEN.

Pulling the Long Bow

The extraordinary tale that the German National *Socialist* party in six years exterminated six million Jews is again being given world wide publicity. Allowing for one leap year, there are 3,155,040 minutes in six years, so that if the extermination was carried on continuously night and day it would require of the disposal of two Jews per minute—one hundred and twenty per hour, or about 1,000 per eight-hour shift.

Obviously, some group is taking advantage of the fact that the concrete reality behind very large numbers is unimaginable by most people, in a way that is never done in connection with the alleged achievement of the Russian National *Socialist* party in ‘liquidating’ the kulaks, etc.