

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 41, No. 24

SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1962

6d. Fortnightly

There should be an Act of Parliament etc.

(From *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal*, June 23, 1860)

When a Briton sees anything wrong which the law does not already provide against, he is pretty sure to be heard saying: 'There ought to be an Act of Parliament to put it to rights'. But in nine cases out of ten, it will be found that an Act of Parliament on the subject would only do further harm, and no good; and this is because in nine out of ten cases in which the Briton wishes for legislation, he is only expressing offence at something displeasing to his own prejudices or inclinations, but which is agreeable to the prejudices and inclinations of other people: he wants, in short, to impose a restraint upon the liberty of some of his fellow-citizens, in points indifferent to the general interest, conveniency, and taste, and which, therefore, had much better not be meddled with.

Though our function is not political, we may be permitted to express surprise that so much attention has been given for eighty years past to possible improvements of the legislative power, and so little to the character of the acts which it is desirable to see any legislature pass. While we think of the claims of Jack and Tom to vote in the election of a legislator, and deliberate whether Little Peddlington should have one or two representatives in the Lower House, scarcely a remark is ever heard about what are and what are not the proper objects of legislation. The great body of the public remains on this subject very little enlightened. It must be admitted that things were at one time worse in this respect. In the seventeenth century, it was considered as proper and fitting that Parliament should prevent the use of expensive dress; that it should compel holders of grain, during a scarcity, to bring it to market, and sell it at a price below its value; and even that it should prescribe the proper stuff in which a corpse should go to the grave: while much more lately, it was allowed to the legislature to forbid the lieges to deal with foreign countries for needful articles; in other words, a modified starvation in the community was absolutely enforced. We have cleared ourselves of these errors; but many remain behind, and above all, that of a too great tendency to look to government for the enforcement of prohibition of things beyond its sphere.

The evil, in reality, consists in an inclination we all have to impose what we think salutary rules and restraints upon each other. Generally, the object aimed at is something we think highly moral, something we believe to be fraught with great blessings to the community. Only let us get it embodied in a law binding on all, and which the executive must enforce, and a step will be made towards a regeneration of society.

The intention is usually good, and this naturally makes us only the more earnest in our desire to effect our purpose. But the worst things that fanaticism ever dictated were based in good intention. We are bound, in the first place, to consider if we have a right to impose our own views upon others, to the detriment of their liberty of action. We are bound to make sure that, in working out this supposed good for our fellow-creatures, we shall not inflict upon them great and overbalancing evils.

Now, every restriction that is put upon our own healthy spontaneous action, we feel to be an evil—this is acknowledged by all. That we submit to any restraint, indeed, is only a concession we make for the sake of some indispensable good. Each man is entitled to the free exercise of his judgment regarding matters concerning himself, whether of a secular or a religious nature, so long as he does not allow this to interfere with the like freedom of others. Each man is entitled to the free use of his faculties of body and mind, for the promotion of his own material interests, so long as he respects the same rights in others. If this be granted, it must follow that there is more need for a government to be watchful to prevent, than to favour the imposing of clogs on our several freedoms of thought and action. In all matters affecting our personal movements and habits, the way we shall spend our time, the access we shall have to enjoyments and recreations, or what we severally consider as such; in all matters in which our profoundest feelings and convictions are concerned; if a state power is to interfere at all, it should be as a guardian to protect each individual and group of individuals from the restraints which others would impose.

"Ah! freedom is a noble thing," says old Archdeacon Barbour. "Freedom makes man to have liking." Seeing how all enjoyments are a mockery without it, how *with it* even poverty may be blest, it becomes of importance that the control which we exercise over each other by mere force of opinion should also be conducted with gentleness. To most men, ridicule is as terrible as an Act of Parliament. There may, consequently, be as great a tyranny exercised in censorious remarks on our neighbour's dress and manners, the way he spends his leisure hours, and the opinions he is known to entertain, as there could be through the medium of statutes and police offices. It would be well that we took more liberal views of all such matters, since a greater freedom in them would undoubtedly conduce to the general happiness. It is

(continued on page 4)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat 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: 9, AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon, 3976.

Editorial: PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON, N.W.1. Telephone: EUSTon 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA:—

Business—Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Editorial—Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

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.

Pointers

(1) "If two people invented a game and then discovered in the course of play that the rules did not cover certain contingencies that inevitably arose, or that they were contradictory, neither of them could hope for victory, and the only reasonable thing for them to do would be to go back and make the rules more realistic." (*The Times Literary Supplement's* review of "Philosophical Papers", by J. L. Austin, February 9, 1962).

NOTE: In philosophy, yes. Politics is also a game. The game, as played, was not invented by either of the 'players' nor do they often 'discover' that 'the rules' do not cover the contingencies which most concern them, or that they are self-contradictory. The remainder, however, applies very strictly, and our future depends upon 'those who know what to do and how to do it'. (Douglas's prescription on the last page of "Social Credit").

(2) "Sir Harry Legge-Bourke... is... correct in thinking that... the Government... (etc). The growing number of Don't Know voters which every Gallup poll reveals bears witness to this, and it will indeed be a curious conclusion to democracy if one day the Don't Knows should be returned with a clear majority over all other parties." (*The Tablet*, February 10, 1962).

NOTE: We suggest that the conclusion which the newspaper foresees for democracy is curious only because *The Tablet* has not yet discovered that 'the rules of the game' do not cover the contingencies which most concern them, even as politicians. The 'Don't Knows' of Gallup polls must, of course, not be confused with the Don't Knows of reality, who are, *inevitably and always* in an overwhelming

majority. Examples: Ask Mr. Macmillan if he *knows* what changes in centralised banking and commerce will ensue from entry into the so-called 'Common Market' and with what ensuing results for British voters; or ask Mr. Peregrine Worsthorne why, "*But he wouldn't understand!*" was an 'inevitable' retort to Mr. Macmillan by students at Oxford on February 2 when the Prime Minister said, "If anybody knows the answer, I suggest he should write to the Chancellor"—the answer, that is, to the country's economic difficulties. Does the journalist or do the Oxford students, let alone Mr. Macmillan or the Chancellor, know what 'the country's' 'economic difficulties' are? Are there any? Will *The Tablet* (with us) not adopt the motto *ad diem tendo*?

The British Constitution

Professor A. V. Dicey in his classical work, *The Law of the Constitution*, quotes Hallam (1818): "No unbiassed observer who derives pleasure from the welfare of his species can fail to consider the long and uninterruptedly increasing prosperity of England as the most beautiful phenomenon in the history of mankind. Climates more propitious may impart more largely the mere enjoyments of existence; but in no other region have the benefits that political institutions can confer, been diffused over so extended a population; nor have any people so well reconciled the discordant elements of wealth, order and liberty. These advantages are surely not owing to the soil of this island, nor to the latitude in which it is placed; but to the spirit of its laws, from which, through various means, the characteristic independence and industriousness of our nation have been derived. The constitution, therefore, of England must be to inquisitive men of all countries, far more to ourselves, an object of superior interest; distinguished, especially, as it is from all free governments of powerful nations, which history has recorded, by its manifesting, after the lapse of several centuries, not merely no symptoms of irremediable decay, but a more expansive energy."

Little more than a century later, decay, perhaps the beginning of 'irremediable' decay, had advanced from within so far that Lord Hewart, in another classical work, drew attention to the process and indicated the means by which it was being accomplished. We say 'accomplished' advisedly, for it was clear to the Lord Chief Justice that the Rule of Law was being undermined deliberately and of a purpose, to install the bureaucrat as the governor of mankind and to place him and his decisions beyond the reach of Law.

Despite the attention attracted by *The New Despotism*, the evil it exposed has increased until Great Britain has become gripped in the iron hand of a barely concealed dictatorship. The British Constitution was characterised by a system of checks and balances, which one by one have been overthrown until now National Socialism stands almost naked, and not in the least ashamed, in the place of the system it has subverted. Parliament has become the home of a mob, possessed by the group-mind, drunk with its apparent power, and noisily proclaiming its 'emancipation' from the traditions which brought England to the highest civilisation. The end is not yet.

False Commentaries

(Originally published in these Pages in 1946)

To anyone with a mental digestion robust enough to read through the tidal wave of "literature" let loose upon the hapless British public from such centres as the Left Book Club and certain Jewish publishers (not alone those proclaiming Left opinions), the anatomy of the present chaos, and its probable extension, can hardly offer a problem. The first feature common to all the books intended to appeal to the more responsible type of reader (as distinct from those primarily abusive) is their general accuracy in regard to contemporary phenomena, and their false derivation. To a reader entirely ignorant of economics, politics and history—we are not referring to the "1066 and all that" variety—the statement that the Public School system is or was an outstanding feature of Edwardian England, is in itself so obviously true that the comment, "This system was unique, because the *product* [our emphasis] of a phase of history which was unique. It had started as the usual aristocratic training for rule through command and domination, dating from the time when an unbridgeable gulf divided aristocracy and the masses" passes as reliable. The quotation is from a book by the German Jew, T. R. Fyvel (schooled, we believe, at St. Paul's London). We instance it, not because of any special urge to defend the so-called Public School system but because of the mixture of concrete fact with false and fallacious commentary typical of Jewish Socialism.

There never was an unbridgeable gulf in England between "the masses" and the aristocracy, and the very quickest mechanism of *transition* was the Public School. The most powerful Peers of the Middle Ages were the Spiritual Peers. At the heyday of his power, no Duke dare cross the will of Cardinal Wolsey, the butcher's son. What turned the public school into Public School was not aristocracy but *money*—the special province of the Jew. And the whole blast of Jewish Socialist propaganda has been directed against the dividend system—"profits"—because that system was the only avenue ever so far devised which promised release from the domination and rule of the Jewish financier and universal release from privilege founded on fallacious accountancy.

The Individual and The Community

"If the exaggerated forms of exploitation which are now observed amongst us are studied with care, it will be seen that, almost without exception, they spring from community-given monopoly or privilege.

"They do not spring from the relation between individual and individual or from the institution of private property itself. They spring from the relation between the individual and the community. Those relations would be multiplied, not diminished, in a socialistic democracy.

"The Socialistic democracy assumes, and must assume for the success of its programme, a condition of individual perfection which the whole of history denies."

—Nicholas Murray Butler, 1907.

The Jewish Technique of Subversion

In 1948 we published the following extract from a private letter written by a distinguished Arab leader. It is republished for the benefit of those who have not previously read it—

"Logic is insufficient to predicate action. It is merely a method of combining pure assumption into a sequence of consequences and by its very nature it is incapable of supplying one with the assumption it uses, for human action requires the adoption of some premises before it can be effected. Therefore arbitrary conviction precedes the logical superstructure. The Catholics know this and that is the basic reason why the Jews hate them intensely and work incessantly for their downfall. The Protestants, on the other hand, are so hopelessly muddled by the inconsistent methods of trying to extract a moral code from logic that they have no strong conviction in any direction. For logic has nothing to do with morality—a criminal can be very logical.

"The Jews, aware of this, are enabled to discredit and corrupt all existing structures of religious, social and economic nature. They want this and effect it by exploiting every discontented group without shaking their own solidarity in the midst of anarchy, as happened in Russia. Small groups seek reforms of special interest and are divided into various sections; only the Jews are always agreed on what they want and that is control. Every one else wants to control for some purpose but they want merely control for its own sake, that is to say for *their* sake. This is the thing which appealed to the U.S. Jewry, composed mainly of Russian Jewish immigration. Therefore they have become ardent purveyors of Communist philosophy, and hailed Marx as the Saviour of people everywhere.

"They themselves do not love Communism, but rather use it, to serve their purpose. They would love any form of government enthusiastically if they were assured of control at the highest level.

"Every Jew was pro-British in the days when d'Israeli was Prime Minister but today they find the British are not so easy to control as they did the ignorant masses of Russia. This indicates their adherence to the principle of transvaluation, that is, striking at the most vulnerable point in human behaviour, that of sincerity, for instance: they pretend to champion the rights of Negroes, object to segregation and advocate mixed breeding, yet they seek a segregated and separate community in Palestine. They wait at being forced to live in a separate district of their own, and yet are rabid for the establishment of a ghetto-like state, where they can hoard without sharing the proceeds they extract from the people of the world. No day passes without presentation of some play, radio sketch or movie showing the "Great Jew," the "Suffering Jew," or the "Humane Jew" struggling for the betterment of all. Was virtue ever so loud? They affect concern over anti-Catholic prejudice, while spreading lies and prejudice against the very Church they fear because it is strong enough. In New York they purchased a monthly magazine, the *Protestant*, and they have financed it to malign and smear the Catholic Church. Currently they direct a smear campaign against all Muslims and Muslim nations everywhere for fear

that Muslims will resist their infiltration. They cry out for freedom of speech in a voice so loud that it drowns out opposition and creates a steady foul wind, always blowing from one direction and never ceasing to permit an honest difference of opinion. That is why they love democracy next to Communism, because a democracy is a state without conviction, which can be pushed hither and thither, guided solely by the loudest voice. No wonder Europeans don't understand the American government; the Americans are not insane (and this may apply to Canadians as well). They are merely unable to recognise the trouble into which they can be projected by this wailing minority voice, and the erratic and indecisive course followed by the democracies' government is a sign that the democracies have not been completely controlled.

"Democracy died with the industrial revolution and the dependence on centralised coal and steel deposits, and will not again be a feasible form of government until it is possible completely to decentralise industry, when each community will become self-sufficient. Communism insists upon freezing for ever the form of society to the age of steel and perpetuating a central control."

THERE SHOULD BE AN ACT OF PARLIAMENT, ETC.

(continued from page 1)

remarkable that liberality in this particular does not necessarily advance hand in hand with political freedom. On the contrary, America, the freest of states, has a people believed to be more enslaved to each other by the tyranny of public opinion, than is to be found in any other country.

The Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt, brother of the celebrated Alexander, and a man of large experience in high political situations, wrote a work on *The Sphere and Duties of Government*, in which he gave the weight of his great authority to the conclusion, that the solicitude of the State should be confined to the preservation of the security, and not extended to the positive welfare, of the people. We are not inclined to discuss this proposition at present. At the utmost, we would ask our friends to keep it in view as a principle which it would do well to lean to in future, as that most favourable to our great object, the utmost possible freedom of individual action. With the account of M. von Humboldt's ideas, which has been given by an able English writer, we shall conclude this paper.

"His investigation starts from the postulate that the welfare of men as individuals is the end for which the state exists, and not the increase, wealth or prosperity of the *association* formed by those individual men, other than as the association is the mere sum-total of the elementary individuals. He proceeds to assert, that the happiness of men lies not in possession, but in activity, for it is activity and not possession which strengthens and elevates the faculties. It follows from that that men require a sphere in which they can freely choose where and how to exercise their faculties; and, moreover, that a vast variety of situations should exist, so that each man may find a sphere suited to the specialities of his own individual case. But government implies authoritative direction, and leads to uniformity of situations. Authoritative direction suppresses the delightful action of the faculties which is necessary to the growth of the individual man; uniformity of situation, the necessary consequence of control from a centre, deprives the

individual man of the choice of situation and circumstances for the exercise of his faculties which would otherwise naturally exist, and want of a harmonious situation enfeebles the faculties themselves. The suppression of the spontaneous action of the individual is followed by the decline of active energy and the deterioration of the moral character. Reliance on the care of and provision of the state is substituted for the vigour of personal interest and resolution, while essential right and wrong are confounded with mere external obedience to the accidental law. To think and cater for men may make them easy and quiet, the great object of despotic governments, but it is not to make them substantially happy. Men so treated are helpless; they are overwhelmed when inevitable emergencies happen; they do not rise under the pressure which should stimulate and strengthen them; they are dwarfed in spirit; they accomplish nothing great. Governments at best can look only to what is profitable; but the true nature of man requires abundant exercise about that which is great and good, independent of results, and which cannot be regulated, or even defined, by rules and forms, the necessary implements of government. Governments can contemplate only external issues, true life of man is concerned only with the spirit and manner with which a thing is done; the issues, in this view, are of inferior moment. Government can only impose commands; but morality commonly grows feeble where its office is superseded by authority. Government can only act by general rules, framed according to the average condition of the mass; but the true life of the individual requires guidance according to the infinite fluctuations of circumstances, and government injures the individual whenever it hinders the corresponding adaptation. Government can only order its business in relation to the truths already discovered, and interests already established; but where true manhood is active, new truth is constantly appearing, and new interests are being created, the office of which is to discipline and exalt still further the manhood out of which they have sprung; but government, always and necessarily unprepared for them, inevitably embarrasses their operation, and greatly damages their effect. Finally, these interferences of government, once begun, always go on with ever-increasing necessity. The first of them creates relations and interests which could not be foreseen; these require new interferences, which in turn create new complications, until at length law becomes a mystery instead of a guide, and the spurious business of the state can be managed only by a vast class artificially raised up, and separated in feeling, views and interest from the people who have only to obey them."*

**Westminster Review*, October 1854.

Judges of a Policy

"An Athenian citizen," said Pericles, "does not neglect the State because he takes care of his own household; and even those of us who are engaged in business have a very fair idea of politics. We regard a man who takes no interest in public affairs, not as a harmless, but as a useless character; and if few of us are originators, we are all sound judges of policy."

—*Thucydides*, Jowett Translation.