

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 39. No. 4.

SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1959.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

The Survival of the Unfittest by Unnatural Selection

by JAMES GUTHRIE

(Continued)

The ever-increasing use of hire purchase, *i.e.*, the payment of last year's production with next year's wages, shows that the community cannot buy back its own production, and obviously is not in a position to finance any capital construction.

How many roads are to be built, how much our debts have to be increased, how much foreign capital is to be imported, how long a severe credit restriction is to last, and which firms are to be allowed to survive is decided not by parliament nor by the Treasurer, but by the governor of the Central bank.

At the present time all the universities are short of money and they are expecting help from the commonwealth government, *i.e.*, from the Commonwealth Bank. No money is given without conditions attached to it—what these conditions will be is not in any doubt.

The international tie-up between nations is important. When loans are made between nations, and loans are always being made between nations, the international banks which can monetise the nation's wealth can also export to where they like.

The British people are going to trade with China; they are going to send millions of pounds' worth of high class machinery, but what are they going to receive in return? Perhaps a few very ancient eggs. In this case, as on many a previous occasion, the British people will get nothing, but they won't know anything about it of course. The International banks, which parted with nothing when they financed the loan, will achieve what they planned—control over China.

The British people have exported their wealth to every country in the world; they have exported it to countries which had no possibility of paying for it. In these transactions they have lost thousands of millions of pounds, but the international banks lost nothing; on the contrary they gained tremendous powers. When the British left India the Internationalists remained in complete control, without any supervision from white men. It is now the turn of the Americans to have their wealth monetised, and their natural resources plundered and exported by the International Fraternity. This process started in a big way in the 1914-1918 war, when the New York bankers took complete control of the conquered people (all the people were conquered).

Many books have been written giving documentary evidence showing how the international fraternity dominated Presidents of America and Prime Ministers of Great Britain;

let it suffice here to indicate where lies our present peril.

"At a Presidential enquiry in America in 1912, it was disclosed that one, Jacob Schiff, controlled 112 banks and financial institutions, had sole control of no less a sum than 22,245,000,000 dollars." (*The Mysterious Protocols* p. 12).

"In April 1927, Jacob Schiff made a public declaration that it was thanks to his financial help that the Russian revolution had succeeded." (*Ibid*, p. 99).

Since 1927 the credit monopoly has become more centralised and better organised and the liquidation of the British Empire goes on apace according to plan. And it is hard to tell whether the Jacob Schiff Fraternity operate from Moscow or New York, or from both together.

We do know that the stranglehold of essential raw materials, especially oil, is tighter now than ever and the elimination of the British from the Middle East has been a consistent policy of Moscow and New York.

When we survey the visible and tangible side of our cultural inheritance in the form of Churches, schools, roads, railways, factories, *etc.* we see an investment worth thousands of millions of pounds. Most of this is the work of our forbears—a gift from the past; but, as for all such gifts, the Credit Monopoly says: "This is our property, and you must pay us for its use." (The fact that a few people originally held shares in some of these undertakings is merely a smoke screen to hide the origin of all loans). *Accordingly, we are compelled to pay, per medium of rates, taxes and prices, for this vast capital equipment built by people long since dead. We are also compelled to pay for new capital equipment built by us for people not yet born.*

I think the representatives of the Christian Churches should ask the professors of the universities to explain to us why the financial system is organised in such an obviously un-Christian manner. The leaders of the churches cannot all be blind to what is happening; they cannot always shelter behind the excuse that finance is the sole province of experts.

Much has been written about the narrowness and shallowness of highly trained technicians, and in these days when men are being trained to "know more and more about less and less" society is becoming a collection of robots incapable of understanding what the other man is doing, or why. Such a society is dangerous and has no natural cohesion, and it falls an easy prey to those who understand where lie the control points of organised society.

(To be continued)

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. Scoulat, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

From Week to Week

Signs are not wanting that Mr. Harold Macmillan, like the British Empire, having served his turn with the international financiers, has got to disappear. We confess a feeling of profound nausea at the spectacle of Prime Ministers of the once-great British Empire rushing all over the globe in a ridiculous endeavour to placate the implacable. Quite obviously they do not know what it is all about. One after another they have presided over the disarming of their country and our Empire, and yet do not see the fate in store for us—and them.

Of the greatest service to the Plotters is the sedulously propagated fiction of the Cold War, which may become Hot. What is in preparation—indeed, in being—is World Revolution, strictly in accordance with the strategy expounded by Stalin (*Problems of Leninism*). Now, if we play soldiers while Communism makes revolution in the conditions brought about by high financial policy, *i.e.*, trade war, and the altogether excessive consumption of and hence dependence on raw materials—the anticipated collapse of “Capitalism” is a certainty. It may well be too late to rectify the situation now: but if it is not, somehow or other those in a position to bring about a rectification will have to be shocked into the necessary action. The time is about two minutes to midnight.

The Terribly Uncanny Power

To this observer, nothing demonstrates more sharply the terribly uncanny power of modern propaganda to control minds, sway emotions and brutalise people than the Zionist propaganda on the Arab refugees during the last decade. It literally succeeded in turning black into white; a big, blatant lie into a truth; a grave social injustice into an act of justice glorified by thousands. It has turned clever people with more than average intelligence into starry-eyed fools, believing everything they are told; and has converted kindly and gentle men and women with a strong sense of mercy into callous fanatics, insensible to the suffering of any people except their own. In no other way can this writer explain

the many paradoxes which the Arab refugee problem has created in Jewish life.

For instance, why should Israelis and Zionists expect the Arab refugees to forget, after a few short years, their homeland in which they and their forefathers had lived for centuries, while Israelis claim that they are unable to forget Zion after nearly two thousand years? Are the Arabs an inferior people, made of different flesh and blood, mind and heart from the Israelis? Did not the Zionists reject Uganda and other better and more fertile lands offered to them before the Balfour Declaration and insist on a return to their two-thousand-year-old homeland? Why should the Arabs not want the same thing? . . .

From an article excerpted by *Human Events* (Feb. 25, 1959) from the December 1, 1958 issue of the *Jewish Newsletter*. The article is by William Zukerman, the Editor of the *Jewish Newsletter*.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF CHURCH AND STATE AS EXPRESSED IN THE ANGLICAN PAROCHIAL AND PASTORAL SYSTEM (continued from page 4)

“Mrs. Baker, of course, is not sure that the State can educate her children better than she can. Neither am I;” (Peter Simple is writing) “neither, I dare say, is Mr. C. A. Joyce, who, as the headmaster of an approved school, has a peculiar knowledge of the State’s failures.

“In a remarkable article in this week’s *Solicitors’ Journal* Mr. Joyce expresses his alarm at the lack of discipline, of moral training and of religious teaching in our schools.

“He speaks of children being allowed to ‘flounder about in a mess of insecurity and uncertainty,’ to take the law into their own hands and ‘to sneer at orthodox justice.’ Schoolmasters tell him that they are afraid to use corporal punishment or other proper sanctions for fear of legal redress.

“He reports that over 90 per cent. of the boys who pass through his hands openly declare that they have no time for religion. The majority do not even know what the Ten Commandments are. He ‘strongly protests’ against the rule that prospective teachers cannot be questioned as to their religious views.

“This is the system to which Mrs. Baker is expected to entrust her children. She would do better, perhaps, to entrust them directly to Mr. Joyce.”

Even the electoral system, which is supposed to make persons more responsible, really elevates anonymity and so irresponsibility. Would it be too much to say that the principle of open choice (such as is still practised at smaller Church elections) is the traditional and Christian principle? I do not mean that people should be penalised for their views but that they should be responsible for them, and for the good or bad results of their choice.

In the same way rights and duties are closely connected. We do still enjoy certain rights and a status in the country as the established Church, but these rights involve us in heavy duties of understanding and of teaching about the nature of man and his vocation and his associations with the truth to the nation. Even as it was said, “Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.”

The Relationship of Church and State as Expressed in the Anglican Parochial and Pastoral System

An Address given on March 12, 1959, by the Reverend Henry S. Swabey to a Chapter Meeting of a Rural Deanery in the Diocese of Lincoln.

"Church and State are best together, like strawberries and cream," remarked a clerical character in one of Disraeli's novels. And the Bishop of Lincoln has asked us to examine the situation as it is, not as it might be, so I shall have little to say about the desirability of the tie. This year might be called the millenium of the parish, for parishes were established about the time of Dunstan, it seems, who was consecrated as Archbishop of Canterbury in the year 959. The civil division of the country into units of ten families, tithings or townships, dates from the remotest antiquity. So that these two principles—civil and ecclesiastical—have gone hand in hand in our country for a thousand years or more.

The relationship was expressed in the memorable first clause of Magna Carta, when it was declared that the Anglican Church should be free and hold her rights inviolable. This was an expression of separation, and indicates that she should be free to pursue her vocation. When the Provost of Southwark interviewed a German Bishop the other night, the Bishop, who had suffered horribly in prison, said that there was a point beyond which the Church could not submit to the State. And the history of religious persecution in our time shows that trouble arises when either party trespasses into the domain of the other.

So we shall have to see what these regions are, and to what extent the Church needs the State and the State needs the Church. The phrase often used is that the Church is the conscience of the Country, and it can be stated more exactly if we say that the Church's public office is to declare what is right and true, and to condemn what is false and wrong. For we believe there to be a moral law in the world and that violation of this law leads inevitably to disaster. Against such a view stands the doctrine that Might is Right.

I heard a bishop, who has since then retired, declare a few years ago that the Church should not pull the Lion's tail too hard. This rather suggested that we should be identified with the State, as the Byzantine Church tended to be at some periods. It is in fact most undesirable to confuse the separate realms of Authority and of Power. For the Church stands for Authority, and the State for Power, and it is for us to see that the two duties are not merged; that we do not take our ethics from political thought of doubtful origin, for instance.

As C. H. Douglas expressed it in *The Realistic Position of the Church of England*, "It must be insisted that Christianity is either something inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe, or it is just a set of interesting opinions." He went on to say that the difficulty in the subject was that the Mills of God grind very slowly, though they grind exceedingly small.

Under existing arrangements, as the Bishop of Lincoln pointed out in his recent pastoral letter, we are obliged to maintain facilities in every parish for baptism, marriage,

burial and for less occasional offices. A church that is not established, on the other hand, ministers to its congregation and elects its officials. I have taken part in the election of a bishop of Toronto, and unfortunately a day was sufficient for a nominee to win a sufficient majority. We also elected rural deans and their period of office was three years.

Incidentally, Matthew Arnold deplored Irish disestablishment—which Gladstone accomplished and wrote a tract about—and Arnold would have preferred several established churches. Henry James missed a Church, in this sense, on his tour of his native America, although America abounds in churches, as is well known, from episcopal Methodists to independent missions (little Bethels).

I know that there is a view that all we can do is to make better Christians of individuals, or better functionaries of them, and that the mention of principles is an excuse for vagueness. Such a view, associated with the name of Dr. Vidler I believe, is valuable if it stimulates Christians to avoid vagueness. Yet the policy or direction of a person or a society must be either right or wrong. We should, I suppose, condemn as wrong the ergastula or working gangs of Roman times; English law has always outlawed slavery; and anything that degrades or distorts man, like collectivism, is irreconcilable with the Christian view of man.

Likewise interference in our own doctrines could not be tolerated. When Athanasius darted out and seized the Emperor Constantine's horse by the bridle, he was protesting in a vivid way against what he thought was the wrong attitude of the Emperor towards Arians. The Eastern Church was not always subservient, and the Early Fathers suffered many adventures rather than allow distortion of doctrine.

But the classic account of Church and State appeared some thousand years after Athanasius, in Dante's book *On Monarchy*. In those days the Pope claimed too much, and he banned the book owing to the author's views in the last of the three sections of the book. We to-day should protest against what he said about arbitrary power, for we quite rightly mistrust it in any guise, but his conclusion is admirable. Church and State are called Peter and Caesar, and this is how he puts it: "Let Caesar observe that reverence to Peter which a first-born son should observe to a father, so that illuminated by the light of paternal grace, he may with greater power irradiate the world." The Lambeth Encyclical Letter says that the Church cannot "uphold the claims of a State to an absolute authority which denies the purpose of God for men."

Dante's work is further so important because the author expresses the Christian idea of man and his destiny. This is what he said, in about the year 1300: "The work proper to the human race, taken as a whole, is to keep the whole capacity of the potential intellect constantly actualised, primarily for speculation, and secondarily (and for the sake

of the other) for action In sedentary quietness the individual man is perfected in knowledge and wisdom." The translator compares Ecclesiasticus: "The wisdom of the learned man cometh by opportunity of leisure and he that hath little business shall become wise." I am sure that these words are in advance of most current thinking. And they led the author to declare that "the human race is best disposed when most free . . . The first principle of our freedom is freedom of choice . . . This freedom is the greatest gift conferred by God on human nature."

We may then say that what respects man's lawful freedom and leisure is in accord with his first nature and with God's will, "For nature is in the mind of the first mover, which is God." I'm afraid that the Caesar and the Pope of the time did not ensure such an order for man, but the end in view was desirable enough. And our parochial and pastoral system gives us opportunity to give guidance on the nature and vocation of man, and on the nature of his work.

Here of course we meet something like a contradiction. On the one hand, current jargon commends something like the dictum of St. Paul's, given in totally different circumstances, "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat." On the other hand, current jargon insists above all on efficiency, which means the abolition of work. The difficulty was partly overcome by the Bishop of Oxford when he said that work for work's sake is not a Christian maxim. In the Christian's view, it makes a difference how we use our time, and unworthy employment differs radically from vocational work, and men should not be forced into it. Our assumptions need re-examining. We might add that sometimes women are forced away from their family duties by necessity, and go out to work to earn money when their children need them at home.

What has happened is that bad money has driven out the good, as they say. The creative use of time, often in unpaid work, has been thrust aside by the emphasis on paid jobs, and the Work proper to the human race is neglected. The Greeks perhaps understood things when they talked of Leisure and un-leisure; and as leisure to develop their minds was their object, so should it be our object to enjoy leisure to make our souls.

But after all, it may be said, are we really necessary in this public connection and can we affect policy in a desirable direction? Now this question, or the first part of it, may be answered in a way if we consider a Canadian book called, *Freedom Wears a Crown*. The author, a son of the late Bishop of Montreal, is not concerned particularly with the Church of England, but he is very much concerned with what happens to a country when all sanctions of authority and tradition are dropped. He bitterly attacks the politicians of his day (1954, and they are no longer with us) for what they were doing to Canada. "Power is freed from respect for authority; opinion from concern for truth; will from principle."

He lays the strongest emphasis on the Coronation Service, for he holds that our order is rooted "in the sacramental anointing of a person; and that basic principle, the sanctity of person, is the guiding principle of the whole order." He too sees the importance of giving a right account of Man, and says that the real issue between the two sides

of the Iron Curtain is whether man is a worker (homo-fabricans) or a speaker (homo-linguans) primarily. Marx would say we are just producers but Farthing says that if we put speech first, we still retain all that is of value in the second aspect. Our freedom, in fact, if it is to be genuine, must be rooted in truth. And Farthing contrasts the British notion of freedom, with the responsibilities it involves in a family or society, with the American idea of independence for the pursuit of happiness. Farthing was doubtless familiar with the phrase from Morning Prayer, "Whose service is perfect freedom."

It is then, in our context, the Church's task to see that the ideal and the truth are not forgotten, and that the life of the State and individual are not reduced to mere and disastrous expediency. We are unlikely to be accused of trespassing by advancing extravagant claims, nor are we likely to meet with the fate of state non-conformists in absolutist countries. But we know that centralised power tends to increase and tends to advance. In the spheres of education and indeed of medicine, of labour and of big business, great power is concentrated. The family unit becomes weakened, and the person is shorn of a good deal of freedom and dignity. We need to observe the command to Watch: but not, of course, in silence.

We have sometimes heard other forces referred to as the Establishment. I think they consisted of the Editor of *The Times*, the Governor of the Bank of England, and perhaps an Archbishop. It sounds like a sort of state within a state or irresponsible power. But when our Archbishop was recently asked what he thought of the establishment of the Church, he had in mind the arrangements we have been discussing. And his answer was quite neat. As long as we are wanted, he said, we will continue the work. That is, continue to operate the Established Church.

Things have declined since there was what a wit called a gentleman in every parish, in the person of a parish priest. But even yet there is a church within walking distance of most houses, and the opportunity to witness for the truth is still wide enough. The collect for St. John the Baptist's Day asks that we may "constantly speak the truth, boldly rebuke vice, and patiently suffer for the truth's sake." I have heard it suggested that the rebuking of vice is thoroughly out of fashion and that as a result our profession may have come to be regarded as "time," so that vocation to the ministry is not being felt.

Freedom and responsibility are inextricably related, and an attack on the one injures the other. We may well feel concerned at the idea that the State now takes away a lot of money from individuals and does things which they could do themselves, perhaps much better, like educating their own children. You have probably heard of Mrs. Baker's case; I would like to read this extract from *The Daily Telegraph* (12/2/59) "Mrs. Joy Baker, the mother of seven children, has lost her appeal to educate her children at home. Mr. Michael Havers, for the Norfolk education department, said that Mrs. Baker's 'selfish obstinacy' was depriving the children of the education which the State thinks should be provided.

(Continued on page 2)