

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49. No. 25

SATURDAY, 7 MARCH, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

More Law

Clifford Hugh Douglas, author of the *concept* of Social Credit, possessed to an altogether exceptional degree the ability to express the ideas arising from his concept in concise and unambiguous terms. In his first book on the subject—*Economic Democracy* (which does not contain the words Social Credit)—Douglas apologised to his readers “in respect of the severe concentration which its tabloid treatment of technical methods demands”. In subsequent books he elaborated various aspects of his fundamental concept; but at least in germinal form the whole concept of Social Credit is contained in *Economic Democracy*. And above all, he eschewed anything which could be construed as a system.

Such an approach invites exegesis; and so fertile were Douglas's concepts that exegeses appeared everywhere. He had occasion during his life to repudiate some of these; of others he remarked merely *nihil obstat*; and some ideas, inspired by and complementary to his own, he acknowledged and incorporated into his own work.

Raymond Hannagen has entered the field with a book* which is evidently intended to be something more than an exegesis; according to the dust-cover description it is a development “beyond the observations of Douglas . . . the basis of the new science which the author has detached from Douglas and called ‘realistic sociology’. It is, simply—the science of society. As such it throws a new light on social philosophy, politics, finance, administration and many other facets of social functioning”.

In his Preface, Mr. Hannagen indicates his *point d'appui*: “This study owes its origin, and some of its contents, to the writings of the late Major Clifford Hugh Douglas, whose controversial ‘Social Credit’ proposals received much publicity during the period during the two World Wars. Douglas had much to say, not only about economics and finance, to which his proposals related, but about the nature and functioning of society in general. While the writer finds many of Douglas's views unacceptable, there can be no denying his sincerity and competence in probing for the underlying causes of much of our social unrest, nor his valuable contributions to our knowledge of the inherent nature and purpose of society”.

“ . . . The label ‘Social Credit’ . . . cannot be applied, at least without redefinition, to a scientific study of the nature and purpose of society, no matter how much such a study may be indebted to the observations of Douglas”. However, science too is deficient: “Science so far has shown an unworthy tardiness in explaining the origin of the universe and

of man”.* Religion, even, is defective; “indeed, has become so enmeshed in social irrelevancies that man would look to it in vain for the knowledge that would enable him to use his stupendous powers without catastrophe. Science has given him these powers, but it has not given him the knowledge about his society that he needs. However, it has demonstrated the effectiveness of an instrument by which he may succeed eventually in winning it, namely, the scientific approach”. Mr. Hannagen is described on the dust-cover of his book as a scientist. (Douglas was only an engineer.)

The Preface further states: “A divergence from Douglas may be pointed out. Douglas was at pains to implicate by name certain groups as having a vested interest or long-term policy in social disorder, and consequently, to be the prime instigators of social disorder. The writer prefers to take the view that society's failure to discern and comply with the requirements of the Natural Order, as expressing the purpose of the Creator for it, not only leaves it vulnerable to anti-social activities, but produces conditions to which anti-social activities often are a reaction”. The divergence here is very much greater than Mr. Hannagen perceives it to be. “Society's failure” means the failure of a collectivity. To Douglas, “society” as a collectivity is an *atavism*. The central problem as he saw and stated it was the emancipation of the individual from the group.

Yet: In his first chapter Mr. Hannagen writes: “We may observe that the transfer of powers and rights from individuals to organisations tends to be a transfer to those *controlling* administration. In fact, organisations are often merely accommodation addresses [the phrase is Douglas's] for the exercise by their controllers of power without responsibility” (emphasis added). When Douglas originated this observation, he added after “responsibility” the words “the prerogative of the harlot throughout the ages”.

And Mr. Hannagen goes on to ask: “Is the fact that people everywhere are acquiescing in the alienation of their natural powers and rights a result of their subjection to coercive propaganda?” So it appears that Mr. Hannagen's “divergence” from Douglas is just that he does not want the “controllers” or coercers named. But if “society” is to blame for its misfortunes, why bother about the “controllers”, nameless or otherwise? If, on the other hand, society is more sinned against than sinning, it makes quite a lot of difference to know who the sinners are. Douglas came to the conclusion, after a great deal of practical experience of the world, that

(continued on page 3)

**Realistic Sociology*: by Raymond Hannagen: London: Regency Press Ltd. 40s. net.

*Mr. Hannagen undertakes the task in an Appendix.

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 45/-, Six months 22/6, Three months 11/6.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11.
Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1
Telephone: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA —

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

(Editorial Head Office)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel — Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q., Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It is more than half a century since C. H. Douglas set out the principles which were necessary for the survival of Christian civilisation. The year 1918 saw the defeat of the first attempt, under German auspices, to set up a World Government under Prussian hegemony. Even by the turn of the century the world stood on the threshold of unprecedented and probably unsuspected prosperity, whose potential stood revealed in the massive expansion of resources for the purposes of destruction and carnage. Before the war a genuine World Order was evolving under the protection of the British navy and rooted in a steadily spreading, though not fully understood, Christian culture. By its very nature modern industrial production obeys an exponential law in its growth—that is to say that its rate of growth is proportional to its state of growth, exactly as happens when money accumulates at *compound* interest. This process, if unimpeded, would more and more rapidly have raised the standard of living of the whole world; and colonialism, necessarily harsh in its beginnings, would just as necessarily have become increasingly benevolent in its operations.

It is clear now, as it was not in 1914, that the War was a conscious operation to impede this process. Great Britain, above all others, “won” the war, but was promptly subjected to the terms of defeat: “When the war is over, we can force them to our way of thinking, because by that time they will, among other things, be financially in our hands”.* At the end of the war, Great Britain was industrially stronger than ever before, and still mistress of the seas. But financially she was in “American” hands, and a policy of “paying for the war” was enforced on her. Later, in order to conform to “our way of thinking” she was forced (through the agency of traitors, conscious and unconscious) to contribute to the rearming of Germany, so that the whole process of conquering Great Britain and dismantling the British Empire could be resumed, this time to a fatal conclusion. *Why* is Great Britain, once the foremost industrial and cultural Power in the world, now reduced to a mere ‘Britain’ seeking dissolution in a “Europe” increasingly dominated by a vanquished Germany?

*See *The Moving Storm*, p. 114.

This result could never have been achieved without the active collusion of traitors within her shores—Quislings. Advocates of World Government have made themselves aliens—they have divested themselves of their nationality just as surely as an alien may acquire a new nationality through due process of naturalisation. This would be plain enough if there were a legal process of “denaturalisation” which formally categorised them as aliens; and then the fact that they have seized the government of the country would be plain to see, and their role as traitors understood. The position of internationalists in national Governments is completely anomalous; but because they have achieved their positions by intrigue, treachery and conspiracy over a relatively long period of time, while their co-conspirators have infiltrated and perverted ‘education’ and the mass-media, their advance to tyranny has passed all but unnoticed. But the present stand-ins for World Governors in the British Parliament will be replaced in due course by Kremlin-trained Administrators, backed by the International Police to enforce International Law. As this Law will be concerned with redistributing national wealth among the ‘needy’ areas of the globe, it will not be popular, and national police could hardly be looked to to enforce it. And this is what it will come to quite soon unless the traitors are arraigned in Parliament, and dealt with. To substitute an election for an arraignment, at this stage, will be a giant stride towards the end.

Culture and Ritual

The following was originally published in our issue for August 25, 1945:

We gather from a remark of Dr. W. R. Inge in the Sunday press that the idea of inevitable progress towards good as a result of the mere lapse of time—an idea closely connected, if not identical with Darwinism—is known to theologians as “the Western heresy”. It is singular that from every quarter we hear the opinion expressed that the European Age is passing, an idea linked with the rise of Eastern political ideologies such as Marxism. That is to say, we have succumbed to the East, because of our own unsoundness. It is highly important to realise that the idea and the retrogression have been contemporaneous; that it is almost possible to say that the prevalence of “the Western heresy” has driven out of Europe that subtle quality which gave poise and resistance to the European. If Europe (and Great Britain) are to be saved, they have to recover their soul. There is no hope in the stampede of the Gadarene swine. In the economic plane, as in the social structure, the future of this country lies, as it always has lain, with quality, not mass-production; and there will be no quality-production if Professor Laski has his way.

We make no pretence of ability to judge the inevitability or otherwise of cultural defeat. But we notice in many quarters a new awareness of what we have been proclaiming to the best of our ability for the past ten years—that the wars and economic depressions of this century were consciously planned to induce the psychological background for a world revolution which would use the exaggerated and manufactured prestige of “Labour” to eliminate the prestige of culture, and, “in war, or under threat of war” to replace the vitality and attraction of the old Europe by the drab uniformity of a Russian workers-ant-heap. That is a new feature

in the situation; and it may be that the shock of the election has wakened many people to the fact that the greatest war of all is still to be fought—to a conclusion, this time. For it is evident that the root of insecurity, both personal and national, is embedded in the rise of the politics of mass democracy. The mere mechanism is immaterial; what is deadly is the technique, however embodied, of using mass action against minorities.

It may quite reasonably be asked at this point, "What do you mean by culture—a word which in itself may mean anything from a bacteriological preparation to the output of a ladies' school?" While a short answer is not easy, we are more and more convinced that one very important component of the culture we have in mind is ritual. We are the more certain in this respect because of the existence of two factors amongst many. The first is that the most important forces in the world, the Catholic Church and Freemasonry, are obviously based on ritual. And the second is the persistent campaign of ridicule waged through the press and the "B." B.C. against the ritualistic basis of the English tradition. It is relevant to this matter that, on no less authority than that of Sir Paul Dukes, "The Comintern was founded with this specific aim" (the overthrow of existing institutions) "and the British Empire was declared to be the main target of the Revolutionary crusaders".—(*The Tablet*, August 11, 1945).

Every effort is made to suggest that ritual is a "class trick"; that "Manners makyth man" has no reality in comparison with a six valve radio or a rousing gangster film straight from Hollywood. There could be no greater falsity. The culture we have in mind is far more extensively diffused amongst the "lower income brackets" than amongst the ornaments of Big Business. But it is not politically effective—in fact, the generous tolerance which goes with, and is the outcome of it, has been used to enlist its suffrages to its own destruction as well as the permanent enslavement of the populace.

But of course the whole question is beyond argument. No honest person hesitates to admit the defects of the nineteenth century while claiming that it was the high watermark of modern civilisation. No instructed person has any doubt that it was, fundamentally, the corruption of the English tradition by the essentially "vulgar rich" on both sides of the Atlantic and the North Sea to which practically all those defects can be traced—the same vulgar rich who are using mass democracy to complete the ruin they have conceived. And the bulwark against these vulgar rich was tradition; a national ritual arrived at by centuries of trial and elimination. It is in the failure to present that tradition as a living force of which to be immeasurably proud, instead of as something for which to make apology, that the so-called Conservative Party—a body, as such, without a soul—has been guilty of the unforgiveable sin, and must suffer for it. And the most deadly error we can make is to look to it, in its present form, for salvation.

SOCIAL CREDIT IN 1967

A Review for New Readers

3/- posted

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.
245 CANN HALL ROAD, LONDON, E.11

More Law

(continued from page 1)

bringing the "controllers" out into the open and dealing with them offered a quicker and more practical way out of our troubles than a course in realistic sociology (supposing he could have imagined such a thing; but he did pay a great deal of attention to social dynamics).

In making full use of some of Douglas's observations, Mr. Hannagen makes his position clear in the end: "It may be suggested* that coherent systems [*sic*] of 'Social Credit' can be achieved only by selecting parts of Douglas's writings that seem to be related, and ignoring parts which are incompatible with the selection . . . Labels are convenient, but they mean little unless their use is defined and adhered to. If it were proposed* to make use of the label 'Social Credit' in connection with the aims suggested in our study—and such a proposal might seem* reasonable since they coincide to a large extent with some of the aims of Douglas—it would be necessary to define 'Social Credit' in terms of these aims, and to exclude aspects of Douglas's writings which were found to be in conflict with this usage. In so doing, we should be asserting the supremacy of 'Social Credit', considered as a science related to the nature and purpose of things, over the conclusions of Douglas. . . ." So he proposes: "Social Credit assumes that society is subject to Law, in the sense of Natural Law, and that, if it is to achieve harmony and stability, and confer benefits on its individual members, as such, it must have regard to certain principles, which can be discerned to be a consequence of the inherent nature and purpose of things".

The original of this, drawn up and signed by Douglas not long before his death to counteract the tendency of the Social Credit Movement, as of all movements which have a philosophical basis, to develop perspective disproportionately, is: "Social Credit assumes that Society is primarily metaphysical, and must have regard to the organic relationships of its prototype". An indicative chart† indicates concisely what these are.

Funnily enough, Mr. Hannagen quotes a "little catechism" offered by Douglas to ecclesiastical planners:

Q. Is God Omnipotent?

A. Of course.

Q. Then why doesn't God control human purpose?

A. Because that would interfere with free will.

Q. Oh, so you know better than God what "we need supremely?" (This refers to Archbishop Temple's statement that "we need supremely the control of human purpose"). [It was not a reference, implied or intended, to Mr. Hannagen. This is established by chronology. *Ed. T.S.C.*]

Mr. Hannagen, in his chapter on religion, uses, as usual, a text from Douglas: "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, largely discredited, and thus doubtfully on a par with many other sets of opinions, and having neither more nor less claim to consideration". But Mr. Hannagen considers that scientific

*In Mr. Hannagen's usage, "It may be suggested", etc., means "The induction on which I base my deduction" (see p. 209).

†See *The Development of World Dominion* (Frontispiece): C. H. Douglas.

observation supersedes knowledge obtained "by a process known as 'revelation'. It becomes necessary to point out, consequently, that such special 'revelations' have not achieved, nor can they be said to be within measurable distance of pointing the way to, social harmony and stability". Mr. Hannagen's method is to make some inductions concerning the discernible Law laid down by the Creator for the attainment of a harmonious and stable society, deduce a theory of consequences, and compare the results of relevant observations with this theory. "Our conception of a realistic society assumes that a Creator has devised such natural rights and relationships, and we have taken the viewpoint that they are discernible by observation and experience, over a sufficient period of time". Observation and experience tell us something of ideologies also; "Ideologies are systems of ideals, and are pursued by all groups to a greater or less extent. Usually they are desirable and beneficial. . . . Any particular ideology may not be the best possible system in its sphere of influence, but it is usually much better than no system at all", and it may be harmful to discredit them too suddenly. However, "It would seem that all ideologies . . . inevitably include undesirable ideals . . . and surely the most important of these is what might be called 'spiritual exclusiveness'. This is a kind of snobbery which asserts that those who do not conform to a particular set of ideals are inferior to those who do. . . . [Sometimes] spiritual exclusiveness has shown itself to be a germ of destruction that can multiply with devastating rapidity in conditions favourable to it".

Mr. Hannagen deals with the Problem of Evil in an Appendix. "If Creation is a correct induction, we must regard it as comprising everything. Consequently, since there is nothing external to it that an evil Purpose can exploit, whatever Purpose is involved must be completely good". Further deductions follow, leading to "In other words, it must be our deduction that all evil is derived from the action of man, whose free will is its origin and source". To explain that some people are evidently born with a greater disposition to evil than others, "we make the induction that this life is partly a consequence of former lives". This runs into trouble with the Revised Version of the Bible: "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents, but that the works of God should be made manifest in him". However, "It seems probable that we are dealing with translations from a defective record of what Jesus actually said. If, however, we adapt the latter version slightly, while admitting it is no longer the recorded answer of Jesus, we can make it illustrate the point of view we are considering: 'Neither did this man sin, nor his parents—in this life; but that the laws of God should be fulfilled in both the man and his parents for their sins in previous lives' ". This adaptation must be regarded as an induction, not a revelation, of course.

A difficulty arises, however, in "the apparently unnecessary and unjustifiable suffering of animals in nature" which might be considered as "evidence of evil in the Purpose of Creation". But: "Have we considered the possibility that the suffering may be confined to unobservant human minds? Do we know that animals are unconscious and capable of suffering?" To Mr. Hannagen, it is at least doubtful: "Again, is the yelp of a dog necessarily more indicative of consciousness or pain than the squeak of a toy teddy-bear? . . . It might seem, on the face of it, that the scream of an animal is an alarm signal to the species, and not an expression of

pain. It is not suggested, of course, that the animal feels alarm any more than, as we suggest, it feels pain".

Well . . . the upshot is that "the problem of evil resolves itself into the problem of the evil which human individuals have produced for themselves and others. Evil, unlike good, is not inherent in creation, but is imposed on it by human free will [so] that the individual should make the best of his circumstances as he finds them, and that his society should conform to the requirements of Order".

All this gives a sort of superior yard-stick for interpreting Christianity, and demonstrates, *inter alia*, that Christ's references to the Devil were symbolic only ("it is obvious that there is no high mountain from which all the kingdoms of the world can be viewed"). This is a great advance, for "belief in the Devil causes us to be presented with pictures of certain individuals and groups as being inherently evil, and beyond the application of Christ's injunction to love one's [*sic*] neighbour". Thus, "Even the incident of the ejection of the money changers from the Temple does not imply that Christ set himself against those who had wronged him or his ideals [*sic*], or condemned individual evil-doers, as is frequently suggested. If these had been his intentions, he could have invoked the sanctions of the law, or led his followers in a combined assault on the money-changers. Instead, he acted alone against overwhelming odds; and his action was clearly in the nature of a rebuke, which the money-changers accepted, without compulsion". Just telling the money-changers that they had made the Temple a "den of thieves" was quite sufficient. It seems a pity, in a way, that Douglas did not think of this; a few quiet words to Mr. Montagu Norman *et al.* in their accommodation address was, perhaps, all that was needed in 1918.

And it seems an even greater pity that Douglas did not live to study Mr. Hannagen's scientifically revised, but Unauthorised* version of Social Credit. He surely would have recognised that changing the contents of the bottle, while retaining the label, is a distinct scientific advance over the old practice, common with earlier exegetists, of changing the label while retaining the contents. Mr. Hannagen's great merit is to have achieved a synthesis of the old and the new.

We heartily recommend *Realistic Sociology* to those of our readers, and others, who have access to Douglas's works. A comparative study is, indeed, a revelation which, perhaps, would need a second and even greater Mr. Hannagen to place in a realistic scientific perspective.

*Of Bibles, Mr. Hannagen prefers the New English Version.

THE MOVING STORM

Contemporaneous commentaries on linked events of 1964-1968, with an Introduction on historical significance

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

A selection of notes from *The Social Crediter* with an Introduction and an Index.

Paper cover 13/- posted

Hard cover 26/- posted

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

245 CANN HALL ROAD, LONDON, E.11

Circular Press Limited, Colwyn Bay.