

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 39. No. 8.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 8, 1959.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

### Flying "Saucers" as Saviours

For all we know, Dr. C. G. Jung may never have directed his attention, critical or otherwise, towards us, or may classify Social Credit among "those turbid fantasies which becloud the minds of world-improvers and other interpreters of 'signs and portents'", and Social Crediters as 'projection-carriers'—Freemasons, Jesuits, Jews, Capitalists, Bolsheviks, Imperialists, etc." (the *et cetera* would let us in) who "see the mote in their brother's eye without seeing the beam in their own."

The phrases quoted are taken from a new book\* one of several lately, by Dr. Jung, written because "my conscience as a psychiatrist . . . bids me fulfil my duty and prepare those few who will hear me for coming events which are in accord with the end of an era." He is "concerned for all those who are caught unprepared by the events in question and disconcerted by their incomprehensible nature."

We do not agree that present *events* are truly 'incomprehensible.'

Notwithstanding the sense of urgency and 'duty' implicit in these sentiments, Dr. Jung is not optimistic in regard to the effect of his book. Events are brewing "of fateful consequence for Europe"; but "I know that, just as before, my voice is much too weak to reach the ear of the multitude . . . my chisel will make no impression on the hard stone it meets." In the threatening situation of the world today, "people are beginning to see that everything is at stake." But what can they do? To every man of goodwill, the question, "What on earth can I do in the present threatening world situation, with my feeble powers?" seems important. But says Dr. Jung, "It were better for him to do nothing and to leave things as they are. To worship collective ideals and work with the big organisations is spectacularly meritorious, but they nevertheless dig the grave for the individual. A group is always of less value than the average run of its members, and when the group consists in the main of shirkers and good-for-nothings, what then? Then the ideals it preaches count for nothing, too. Also, the right means in the hand of the wrong man work the wrong way, as a Chinese proverb informs us." The context in which this all too unimpeachable sentiment occurs shows that if Dr. Jung is really backing up the 'inevitability technique' so widely practised, he is not aware of it. He has a positive answer. "'What can I do?' I know no other answer except 'Become what you have always been'". Cease to be mass-minded. Let your two selves (your conscious and your unconscious self) be reunited. Be whole. The Ufo (unidentified flying object) signs, whether material,

psychic, or part one, part the other, "appear in the heavens"—oh, no, not from Mars or Venus or Moscow or Tel-a-Viv, or Aldermaston, or Los Alamos; but from the 'collective unconscious'—"so that everyone shall see them."

In these notes, I am trying to make contact with Dr. Jung—with Dr. Jung's mind and motives. This is not a review. Adequately to review so short a book, so many-sided, so evocative of prejudice—particularly the prejudice, in this age of almost universal illiteracy against old words with new (but precise) meanings, references to myths and legends, new words (bottles) for wines of unknown vintage—would require at least three or four times the number (only 176) of its printed pages, reincorporating all that Dr. Jung has left out as discoverable (by the literate, of course, and only some of them) elsewhere. This condensation is in itself a sign, but one of several signs, of a sense of urgency, haste, hurry, to 'be in time' to avert some catastrophe the nature of which, presumably, is apprehended. The notion that what is being attempted is virtually the impossible emphasises rather than diminishes Dr. Jung's anxiety. A painter "*has summoned up the courage to admit [my emphasis] the existence of a deep-rooted and universal [again my emphasis] fear and express it. . . .*" Dr. Jung is more or less specific concerning the nature of this fear (which he stigmatises as an admission of inferiority). It is connected with "the conscious and unconscious will for destruction and . . . the collapse of our civilization in chaos," "It shrinks back from chaos and longs for solid, tangible reality, for the continuity of what has been, for meaning and purpose—in a word, for civilization. It is conscious that . . . we lack something vital which could halt the onrush of chaos . . . . We have become sceptical, and chimerical ideas of world improvement stand low in the list. The old panaceas that have finally failed are no longer trusted . . . ." There is a lack of any serviceable or even credible ruling idea . . . "almost anything might happen." Some years ago Douglas thought we were due for a miracle and said so in *The Social Crediter*. Let that stand aside for the moment. I think it is rather important to decide whether the 'universal' fear is shared, and in what respect if it is, by Dr. Jung. Who are the dreamers, painters, disseminators of rumour who have provided so much of the material for Dr. Jung's book? Mr. Harold Macmillan? Mr. Khrushchev? Mr. Eisenhower? Mr. Frankfurter? The Editor of *The Times*? No? The television viewers stigmatised in *The Times* (February 28, 1959) as "Feeble-minded"? Not quite. The dreamer of Dream 1 was "educated." She dreamed also Dream 2. Dream 3 was experienced by a 42-year old woman patient who "at the

\**Flying Saucers: A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Skies* by C. G. Jung (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1959. 14/- net).

(Continued on page 2.)

## 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. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

#### FLYING "SAUCERS" AS SAVIOURS—

(continued from page 1.)

time had heard nothing of Flying Saucers and the like." The dreamer of Dream 4 was an acquaintance of Dr. Jung's, an "amateur astrologer." Dream 5 came from "a woman with an academic education." She "fixed the vision" by painting it. The painting is reproduced in the book and shows the margin of the "saucer" manned by "cloaked figures all silvery white." In Dream 6 the dreamer was a young film actress. Dr. Jung is doubtful of her artistic vocation. The dreamer in Dream 7 was a painter who was also a patient of Dr. Jung's in need of 'revaluation' as an individual. Of the symbolically named Orfeo M. Angelucci (Orpheus with his lute together with the Angels—and a wife *née Borgianini!*), Dr. Jung is speculative and not a little contemptuous. Nevertheless, he says that "Without having the faintest inkling of psychology, Angelucci has described in the greatest detail the mystic experience associated with a Ufo vision. . . . The story is so naïve and clear that a reader interested in psychology can see at once how far it confirms my previous conclusions. It could even be regarded as a unique document that sheds a great deal of light on the genesis and assimilation of Ufo mythology. That is why I have let Angelucci have his say."\* An Epilogue is devoted to Angelucci's book, *The Secret of the Saucers* by Orfeo M. Angelucci (Amherst Press, 1955), together with another arrival when Dr. Jung's own book was in the press, Fred Hoyle's *The Black Cloud* (London 1957). A Supplement deals with still another, *The Midwich Cuckoos* by John Wyndham. To return to Angelucci, he is self-taught and describes himself as a nervous individual suffering from "constitutional inadequacy." "After working at various jobs he was employed at the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation at Burbank, California. He seems to lack any kind of culture, but appears to have a knowledge of science that exceeds what would be expected of a person in his circumstances. He is an Americanised Italian, naïve and—if appearances do not deceive us—serious and idealistic. He makes his living now by preaching the gospel revealed to him by the saucers. . . . His career as a prophet began with the sighting of a supposedly authentic Ufo on August 4, 1946. . . . He was [then] working in his free hours on a book entitled *The*

*Nature of Infinite Entities*, which he subsequently published at his own expense. He describes its content as 'Atomic Evolution, Suspension, and Involution, Origin of the Cosmic Rays', etc. On May 23, 1952, he underwent the experience that gave him his calling. . . ." The source of Orfeo's enlightenment was a being from another world speaking 'perfect English.' "Orfeo's book," says Dr. Jung, "is an essentially naïve production which for that very reason reveals all the more clearly the unconscious background of the Ufo phenomenon and therefore comes like a gift to the psychologist. The individual process, the central problem of modern psychology is plainly depicted in it in an unconscious, symbolical form which bears out our previous reflections, although the author with his somewhat primitive mentality has taken it quite literally as a concrete happening." Yes, most Social Crediters have had more than a nodding acquaintance with Orfeo for a long time. Does Dr. Jung contend that Help is coming from Above (or below)? In all probability, if we could ask him this question, he would say with the actress in "My Fair Lady": "Would-unt-it be lovell-ee?", and with much the same intention. "He was a tall handsome man with unusually large expressive eyes." (He "wished to be called by the name of 'Neptune'"). "The edges of the figure rippled like water in the wind. Neptune gave (Orfeo) more information concerning the earth, the reasons for its lamentable conditions and its coming redemption. Then he vanished." Orfeo does not tell us (his 'gospel' may fill this hiatus) the reasons for earth's 'lamentable conditions.' Does Dr. Jung?

Shall we inspect the textual evidence on this point?

(1) ". . . Terrified by their dreams . . . They took them for . . . In this matter there is little choice *today*: anything out of the ordinary can only be pathological, for that abstraction, the 'statistical average,' counts as the ultimate truth, and not reality . . . So no wonder that after her Ufo experience our patient woke up in hospital with a burned face. This is only to be expected *today*." (p. 37).

The emphasis on 'today' is mine. The suggestion it carries to my mind is that of something objective, external. Today is not a part of me: I live *in it*. Its relationship to me is casual and conditional: I do not cause or condition it.

(2) ". . . but the religious instinct requires for its evidence a more highly differentiated consciousness, thoughtfulness, reflection, responsibility, and sundry other virtues. Therefore it does not commend itself to the relatively unconscious man driven by his natural impulses, because, imprisoned in his familiar world, he clings to the commonplace, the obvious, the probable, the collectively valid, using for his motto: 'Thinking is difficult, therefore let the herd pronounce judgment!'" (p. 46.)

So the politicians say; but surely they could earn a more honest living if they wanted to. And are they not a part of our todays—and all our tomorrows?

(3) "It cannot be the aim of education to turn out rationalists, materialists, specialists, technicians and others of the kind who, unconscious of their origins, are precipitated abruptly into the present and contribute to the disorientation and fragmentation of society . . . the breathless tempo of modern civilization. . . ." (p. 54.)

The context from which this is torn urges the articulated

\* Television in England (May, 1959) has assisted the "Ufo movement" by broadcasting an interview with a man who said all our governments now contained Saturnians (incognito).

and subordinate rôle of the instincts. Education, like science, is aimless: it is educators who have aims.

(4) "The psychic catastrophes caused by the mental inertia of 'experts' do not appear in any statistics, and from this it is concluded that they are non-existent." (p. 62.)

No comment.

(5) "... young people have, or claim, the right to regard the problem of 'her and him' as ... fascinating ... Since youth lasts for a very long time and its peculiar state of mind is the highest that many human lives attain, this psychological limitation is equally true of the grey-haired, whose birthdays are nothing more than nostalgic celebrations of their twentieth. At best the outcome is concentration on one's profession, any further development being regarded as a mere disturbance. Neither age nor position nor education is any protection against this psychological standstill." (p. 91.)

There is there some suggestion of disapproval—as though the individual could himself do something about it.

Before citing further passages, I may perhaps interrupt the recital to observe that if a man, obviously writing under a strong sense of urgency, and in haste cries out: "Be prepared," he must have in his mind some clear idea of what constitutes preparedness, even if the possible limit of preparedness is only avoidance of some danger. Dr. Jung's doubt concerning the possible efficacy of his warning is neither here or there. He is still right to try to make himself heard, even if he thinks the odds are against him. That is what keeps the noses of some of us to the grindstone of the Secretariat, (parenthetically, if Dr. Jung classes us in this matter among the collectivist idealists who 'dig the grave for the individual,' he, like most other critics of our constitution has been misinformed or shrinks from understanding). At the root of Dr. Jung's urgency is a dichotomy. Something which divides into two may still have unity: the dichotomous seedling is still one plant. But on searching for this unity, in Dr. Jung's case, I can't find it. It is as though he himself were a victim of the schizophrenia he deems in need of cure. Witness: "Large political and social organisations must not be ends in themselves, but merely temporary expedients. [But they are not expedients, even temporary, but *inexpedients*.] Just as it was felt necessary in America to break up the great Trusts, so the destruction of huge organisations will eventually prove to be a necessity because, like a cancerous growth, they eat away a man's nature as soon as they become ends in themselves and attain autonomy. From that moment they grow beyond man and escape his control. He becomes their victim and is sacrificed to the madness of an idea that knows no master. All great organisations in which the individual no longer counts are exposed to this danger. There seems to be only one way of countering this threat to our lives, and that is the 'revaluation' of the individual."

But, "So vitally important a measure cannot, however, be put into effect at will, that is, by planning and insight. ... What is needed, rather is an involuntary faith, a kind of metaphysical command, which no one can manufacture artificially, with his own will and understanding. It can only come about spontaneously." However, in the light of his apprehension of the dangers which lurk in the exalted ego, the 'psychic epidemics' afflicting social or national

groups and 'destroying the individual,' Dr. Jung discriminates a page later between the salutary and the destructive reaction. "The process of unification is *only partly* under the control of our will; for the rest it happens involuntarily. With the conscious mind we are able, at most, to get within reach of the unconscious process, and must then wait and see what will happen next." (p. 99-100.)

"*Must wait.*" The inescapable means to an inevitable end—and that at a point in time approximating to infinity—may be determinative; but it is also, from our point of view, purely academic. Dr. Jung's urgency is passionate, not academic. Our urgency is political, not passionate. It may turn out to be academic; but we hope not. It would not turn out to be academic if what is, rather ridiculously, designated the "Social Credit Movement," particularly by those who do not like the Social Credit Secretariat, (and, like Oxford, may have 'moved' once—but 'never again'), filled the bill.

Setting aside Dr. Jung's evident desire to effect—(but 'effect' is too committal a word; you can't 'effect' the return, as the Jesuit Fr. M. C. D'Arcy puts it, of "the spiritual voyager out of the racial self" back to the racial self "to seek health there when he grows impoverished," even if anything not atavistic might be the outcome)—rather to see effected a cure of the split-mindedness of our generation, what objective has he in view? His therapy is means not end. A whole series of ends may be inferred from his exposition, even if they are not stated as objectives, political or otherwise. They make an interesting list. (1) Correction of our 'lamentable condition.' (2) Correction of our addiction to the insane multiplication of gadgets. (3) Reversal of the prevailing dominance of the group over the individual and rehabilitation of the individual as a 'whole man.' And surely something is disclosed, something rather more than just insight, in the following:—"When one speaks of Russia, one immediately thinks of 'Little Father' Czar and 'Little Father' Stalin. One also remembers all the talk about America being a matriarchy because the bulk of American capital is in the hands of women [in Dr. Jung's *sense of the words*, unless we are mistaken, an entire misconception] not to mention Keyserling's *bon mot* about the 'aunt of the nation.' It is clear that these parallels have nothing to do with the choice of symbols [the *servus* (red slave) and the *femina candida* (white woman) of the alchemists], at any rate not as a conscious causality. Comically enough—one must say—red and white are the nuptial colours. They throw an amusing light on Soviet Russia as the reluctant or unrequited lover of the *femina candida* in the White House . . ."

Speaking for myself, I do not believe Dr. Jung is exploiting this opportunity to add to his income by writing a spate of 'popular' books. His practice must have been highly remunerative. I do not believe that an understandable desire to advance his psychological theory of the 'collective unconscious' dominates his mind to the extent of writing, as he is now doing, under such high pressure is alone sufficient to explain his actions. Nor do I believe he has himself succumbed to black magic. Nevertheless, the precipitancy of the Tele-magicians, or Televisionaries, to extend the appeal of Ufo-seers is not without some meaning, and, in this connection, I have unearthed the following records of Douglas's opinion from *The Social Crediter*:—

October 30, 1948:—"It is not really very difficult to understand the root cause of our doom—all history demonstrates it, and empirical psychology adds emphasis to history. There is implanted in man a creative urge to embody ideas—an appetite just as definite as hunger and thirst. This urge is the main-spring of progress *which is possible, but not inevitable*, to the individual. If there is any truth in the pseudo-science of Freud, Jung, and Adler, it lies in the emphasis on the dangers of frustration. The life of the factory worker in one long unconscious or conscious frustration and war is incipient in the factory."

July 16, 1949:—Commenting on the 'detachment' of the Roman Catholic Church from what Fr. Levesque (and ourselves) consider an *effective* counter-blast to Communism: "Here we recognise the old game, Satan's everlasting tactics. From the first temptation in Eden until now he has used the self-same artifices; make a man believe that he is not responsible, that there is no Judge, that the Law is doubtful, that nobody will know, and that, moreover once the deed is done, he will be God himself, and therefore in the position of master, and able to fix good and evil as he likes.' In Mr. Denis de Rougement's weighty little book, *Talk of the Devil*, from which the foregoing quotation is taken, he seems to identify (the word is not adequate) the Devil with what the modern psychologists term the collective unconscious—that mysterious aspect of the race which was dealt with empirically by Gustave le Bon in *Psychologie de Socialisme* and *Psychologie des Peuples*. Kierkegaard had much the same idea.

"Whether the collective unconscious (or parts of it) can operate without conscious direction somewhere is not clear. That is what the people who ridicule the 'plot theory' (who are generally the same people who advocate world-planning) wish us to believe. But it is certain that the masses who are manoeuvred into collective catastrophe (it was the herd of swine who were possessed, and ran violently down a steep place into the sea) are not conscious of the import of their actions as individuals. We do not believe that one *per cent.* of the people who support socialism and communism—they are fundamentally identical, the politics of the collective unconscious—have any real picture of what they are supporting any more than it can be supposed that the swine visualised individual suicide. 'Father forgive them; they know not what they do.'"

Dr. Jung seems to agree that the cause (unless what he is dealing with a case of 'synchronicity'\*—a-causal phenomena) of the prevailing fear lies in the prevailing environment. The *proximate* cause of individual psychic disorder is social disorder, the 'conflict of opposites' between the Red Slaves of Russia and the White Woman of the White House. (Their clandestine union seems to have escaped Dr. Jung's notice.) Nowhere does Dr. Jung describe what it is which paralyses the individual's powers to fight back against a vicious progeny so prolific as to overwhelm him. "The Kingdom of Hell is within you." The few individuals who, with Dr. Jung's aid draw a 'magic circle' around themselves, do not, in fact thereby escape their doom which is virtually inescapable. The (black) Magic Circle of High

Policy ("History is Crystallized Policy"—not the uncrystallizable Collective Unconscious) includes the poor individual and his Magic Circle. It includes even Dr. Jung. Hence his sense of urgency.

So what? The lesser circle cannot extend itself to enclose the greater. There is no purpose served by Dr. Jung's writing books to prove it. Ben Johnson's emblem was a pair of compasses with its point resting in the midst of a circle partly drawn. The other leg pointed to the end of the broken line, but was itself broken. The motto?—*Abest quod duceret orbem*. Unfortunately, the English language does not provide for the refinement of logic implicit in the use of the Latin subjunctive, and the closest approximation to a translation which it can provide is: "There is lacking that which *would have* completed (it never could!) the circle." And so we say to Dr. Jung: "Abest quod duceret orbem." He sincerely believes he has invented what is lacking. He hasn't. What he has done he will see if he follows with his exceptional powers of observation and insight into the future course of political exploitation of the "Gospel of Orfeo." We hope that he will then give some equally fruitful consideration to the remedy *in our hands*, not the hypothetical remedy we cannot command. Our readers may say: "Ah, yes! Social Credit." In Douglas's sense, yes; in their sense, in most cases, no.

Anyone who refers to *The Social Crediter* for August 8, 1948, will see there a comment, written by Douglas, though unsigned, to Churchill's obsession with the Americans and particularly on one of its many consequences (all, by the bye, contributory to the 'Magic Circle' which the Devil has drawn around himself). The comment, like so many by Douglas, has a universal application: ". . . and we must think of the future. It is as much as to say to a navigator, 'It is of no consequence from where you started, and of little importance where you are; keep your mind on where you're going.' Try it on a map!"

Now, try it on a map!—You don't know where you started and never mind where you are. You want to get to London (Social Credit, or a cure for the world's split-mindedness and consequent inability to keep its insane rulers in check). Which way do you go? I suggest modestly, that you first ascertain without a peradventure where you are. If *someone* knew where he was he, as an individual, *might* get where he wanted to get, and someone else *might* decide to go with him, or after him. In the ranks of Douglas's followers, we have disgruntled route experts, whose only conclusion so far as we can see, is that Douglas was wrong in his routing and 'democracy' does it: the map (the Secretariat) must at all events be tossed aside. But the Constitution of the Secretariat is, in intention at least, more than a map. Many people can draw a fairly accurate map; they just don't. It should be obvious that (not in 1948 or 1952 but *now*) the first necessity of any co-ordinated effort to discover where we are is to set about doing so. We are doing that. Perhaps Dr. Jung will lend a hand? His book does not define where we are: all it does is to suggest that we can't get *anywhere*.

T.J.

\*See *The Interpretation of Nature and the Psyche*, C. G. Jung and W. Pauli (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955), for Dr. Jung's theory of an a-causal connecting principle.