

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 55, No. 7

OCTOBER, 1975

15p Monthly

The New Dark Age

The final chapter of the late C. H. Douglas's book *Social Credit*, first published in 1924, is entitled "The Critical Moment." In it, Douglas foresaw the possibility of a return to the Dark Ages, and the latter years of his life were devoted to attempting to avert it.

~~The Social Crediter~~ has continuously carried forward this endeavour, but several years ago emphasised the imminent approach of "the point of no return." In our opinion, in the British context, the point of no return was passed with the treason of the last 'Conservative' Government. A 'Common Market' of Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Rhodesia—and any other Commonwealth countries wishing to adhere—combined with appropriate financial reform, might have averted the present catastrophe which is intensifying daily. Such a grouping would have been self-sufficient in raw materials and technological ability, and could have demonstrated the practicability of Social Credit principles, and so ushered in the Age of Splendour envisaged by Douglas. But we have now entered yet another Dark Age, and the Satanic technology available to the new tyrants for global enslavement makes a re-emergence into a new enlightened civilisation a diminishing possibility in the foreseeable future.

C. H. Douglas's text follows:

There are two hypotheses as to the method by which changes of so far reaching a character as those we have been discussing might come about, one of which may be described as the evolutionary method, and the second as the revolutionary. For my own part I am inclined to believe in the probability of a combination of the two.

The outstanding fact in regard to the existing situation in the world at the present time, is that it is unstable. No person whose outlook upon life extends even so far as the boundaries of his village, can fail to see that a change is not merely coming, but is in progress; and it requires only a moderately comprehensive perception of the forces which are active in every country of the world today, to realise that the change which is in progress must proceed to limits to which we can set no bounds.

That is to say, the break-up of the present financial and social system is certain. Nothing will stop it; "Back to 1914" is sheer dreaming; the continuation of taxation on the present scale, together with an unsolved employment problem, is fantastic; the only point at issue in this respect is the length of time which the break-up will take, and the tribulations we have to undergo while the break-up is in progress. But while recognising this, it is also necessary not to fall into the error which has its rise in Darwinism; that change is evolution, and evolution is ascent. It may be; but equally it may not be. That is where the necessity for

the revolutionary element arises; using, of course, the word revolutionary in a constructive sense.

There will probably come well within the lives of the present generation, a period at which the blind forces of destruction will appear to be in the ascendant. It does not seem to me to be necessary that this should be so, but it does seem to be probable.

There is, at the moment, no party, group, or individual possessing at once the power, the knowledge, and the will, which would transmute the growing social unrest and resentment (now chiefly marshalled under the crudities of Socialism and Communism) into a constructive effort for the regeneration of Society. This being the case, we are merely witnesses to a succession of rear-guard actions on the part of the so-called Conservative elements in Society, elements which themselves seem incapable, or undesirous of genuine initiative; a process which can only result, like all rear-guard actions, in a successive, if not successful, retreat on the part of the forces attacked. While this process is alone active, there seems to be no sound justification for optimism; but it is difficult to believe that the whole world is so bereft of sanity that a pause for reflection is too much to hope for, pending a final resignation to utter catastrophe.

When that pause occurs mankind will have reached one of those crises which no doubt have frequently been reached before, but which so far have failed to avert the fall of humanity back into an era of barbarism out of which new civilisations have slowly and painfully risen.

The position will be tremendous in its importance. A comparatively short period will probably serve to decide whether we are to master the mighty economic and social machine that we have created, or whether it is to master us; and during that period a small impetus from a body of men who know what to do and how to do it, may make the difference between yet one more retreat into the Dark Ages, or the emergence into the full light of a day of such splendour as we can at present only envisage dimly.

It is this necessity for the recognition of the psychological moment, and the fitting to that moment of appropriate action, which should be present in the minds of that small minority which is seized of the gravity of the present times. To have a clear understanding of the principles which underlie the problem is essential to those who may hope to play a part in its solution; it is even desirable that skeleton plans should be in existence to meet the situation as it can be seen to exist; but nothing can be more fatal to a successful issue than the premature publication of cut-and-dried arrangements which are likely to be out of

date before their adoption can be secured. As the world is constituted today, effective action is only possible through certain centres of influence; that is to say, short of complete social anarchy as a preliminary to a new world, it is necessary to work through the arrangements which have grown up in the system with which we are all familiar.

While the evolutionary process depends most probably on the formula to which the present civilisation is working, and, given adherence to that formula, is independent of human psychology, it is fairly obvious that the effectiveness of "constructive revolution" does depend, to a large extent, on this latter factor alone. In other words, although we can float down the Rapids and over the Falls without any struggling either on our part or on the part of those with whom we come in contact, the possibility of avoiding that uncomfortable journey, if there remains a possibility, requires definite exertion. And if the cataract must be run, a safe arrival on the waters of the placid lake which may lie beyond, is surely conditional on some sort of expert navigation. If the present onerous taxation is continued into an era of rising prices, we shall not have long to wait.

There are certain factors operative in human psychology which it is possible to recognise as helpful or the reverse. During a visit to New York I saw considerable numbers of fervent men and women carrying sandwich-boards and collecting boxes through the financial quarters in and around Wall Street, bearing on them the legend, "The Salvation Army is Father Knickerbocker's best friend." It is perhaps hardly necessary to explain that Father Knickerbocker is generally taken to represent the respectability of solid, or perhaps preferably, liquid capital. That is to say, it may be taken as a scientific statement of fact that one of the most dangerous opponents of a better, cleaner world, is the sentimental spirit which is entirely concerned with the beauties of a prospective Heaven, whether that Heaven is theological or moral. The head of the institution to which I have just referred, has recently elaborated the preceding statement by an intemperate attack on the "dole," basing his objection to it on the "demoralisation" of the recipient and not, of course, on the financial jugglery which accompanies it—an attitude entirely similar to that of the Puritan in his abolition of bear-baiting; not because it was cruel to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the populace. The practical outcome of this Puritanism is always negative. In short, there is a type of sentiment which, under existing conditions, is able to attain great respectability, but which can, with very little difficulty, be identified with the formalism against which the Great Reformer of 1900 years ago launched his most bitter invective; and wherever that is found, the prospect of effective assistance is not encouraging.

Again, it is only rarely that we find a response from those who have been "successful in business." On the whole, the most promising type of mind is either that which has always been free from financial anxiety and yet, at the same time, is familiar with the technique of the modern world, or, on the other hand, the worker, whether by hand or brain, whose incentive is very largely artistic in origin, in the ranks of whom may of course be included practically all persons of really scientific temperament. Most unfortunately this latter class is, of all the divisions of Society, that least equipped, either by temperament or organisation, to exercise effective pressure.

Since, however, most men are complex characters, it is probably true that an effective appeal can be made to a large majority if the appeal is made in the right way. It is my considered opinion that the right way with most people is to discountenance severely any discussion of the general advisability of such matters as we have been considering, and, as far as possible, to put the appeal in the form: "Suppose that you yourself were offered certain conditions, such as we suggest, under which to carry on your business or your own personal economic life, would you accept them?"

With a majority of persons there is (no doubt as the result of the collective hypnotism generally referred to as education) a tendency to uphold a social ideal from which their personal existence is a continuous effort to escape. That is to say, their social ideals and their social actions bear about the same relation to each other that the aspirations of the average individual in regard to an immediate translation to Paradise, as expressed on his occasional Sunday church-going, do to his wishes as expressed by his business activity during the week, and his concern at the onslaught of a cold in the head. If he can be kept on the more or less solid ground of his individual tastes, and the means which would enable him to achieve them, he is amenable to reason; let loose on social ideals, and we generally have something of about equal value to the theology of the Salvation Army—a thing which clearly has definite uses in connection with a given set of premises, but is not a hopeful source from which to look for a new direction of objective—is, in fact, frequently a vicious obstacle.

It hardly needs emphasis that a constant binding back of proposals for reform, to the moving events of the world, is of the utmost value; in fact, if it be possible to clarify the relation between the analysis of the financial system, the foci of discontent, and the logical remedy, with sufficient emphasis and over a sufficiently wide area, then the stage will be set for the greatest victory which the human individual has, within history, achieved over the forces which beset him to his fall.

MYSTERY, MAGIC, MUSIC AND METAPHYSICS

By Bryan W. Monahan

£2.50 posted

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E11 3NL

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

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 £2.60. Six months £1.30, Airmail one year £3.50.

Offices—

Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E11 3NL. Tel. 01-534 7295

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX. Tel. 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, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX. Telephone: 01-387 3893. General Deputy Chairman and Secretary: H. A. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

An Increment of Creativity*

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

For almost all—all but the past century or so—of civilisation's history men have been craftsmen. Certainly, heavy labour was performed by slaves. But manufacture was indeed by hand, aided by such simple devices as the potter's wheel and the hand-loom. Yet what marvels of art and construction were achieved!

Man's basic requirements are food, clothing and shelter; and throughout history he has provided them by little more than his own efforts—the little more being provided by animals, and water- and wind-power. That only part of his time was occupied in the provision of necessities is demonstrated by the lasting monuments he has left, and this is a fact of the most fundamental importance. Man's time is not ~~fully occupied in the provision of necessities~~; what does he do with the remainder? He may do what the spirit in him demands, or he may do as he is told.

With the coming of the industrial revolution, man's potential for leading a free creative life was enhanced beyond the imagination of even a hundred years before. Now it is quite vital to grasp the fact that man's activity is divided in two: the necessitous, and everything else he does. There is a *ratio* of necessity to freedom, which over a very long period of time remained fairly constant. The development of agriculture and methods of animal breeding, the invention of simple machines for weaving and for processing food, shifted the ratio in favour of freedom slowly but not greatly. With the harnessing of power and its application to industry the ratio was rapidly and drastically altered. Working for necessities now became only a small fraction of man's time. And it is precisely at this point that the Christian Church failed. Christ's promise ("Seek ye not what ye shall eat") might have been fulfilled, had the Church seen more deeply into the meaning of Christ's teaching. For Christ spoke in the language of his day; He could do no other. But the Church in the face of the industrial revolution was like an arithmetician who turns his back on algebra. "And this know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through."

~~The house—Graeco-Roman Christian civilisation—now lies in ruins.~~

The harnessing of power, first through steam, and then through electricity and oil, represented something *absolutely new* in the history of the world; it meant such a shifting in the necessity to freedom ratio as offered an unprecedented opportunity for spiritual development. Now certainly the birth of the modern industrial system was accompanied by horrors—sweated and child labour, and the creation of slums by the emptying of the countryside in favour of work in the cities. Perhaps this was inevitable, for few could have seen what the revolution portended. Still, a watchful Church could have foreseen; a rapidly increasing rate of production for a given expenditure of human effort must in the end mean abundance for all. The primary objective is the production of a sufficiency of food, clothing and shelter. Since in the days of Merrie England that could be and was done,

and cathedrals built as well, how much more readily could it be done now! But what a man does when he has contributed his share to this provision should be a matter of the individual's choice and responsibility. If, perhaps, on the average an hour or two a day suffices for this, *let him be free to decide whether he will or will not co-operate with others in such projects as may be put before him, not be constrained under an imposed moral system to be fully employed for a stated number of hours, and regardless of the outcome of his work.* Let there be no misunderstanding here. The Church has acquiesced in this policy of work for the sake of work. "If a man work not, neither shall he eat." That is St. Paul, not Jesus. Jesus said: "I came that ye might have life more abundantly," and "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you."

The Church should see that Governments everywhere are organised pre-eminently to ensure full employment, as an alternative to men's being *set free* by the miracle of modern productivity—loaves and fishes almost by automation. Where one blade of grass was sufficient to sustain life, ten now grow; we are exhorted to grow ten times more, even if only to cast them into the oven. Remember the burning of wheat "to keep up prices" while people starved? Full employment, maximum production, means absolutely too much production, not to mention the waste of the earth's resources. But the scheme now is "full employment to develop the underdeveloped countries" (and further enslave mankind). The objective is the total (totalitarian) organisation of the whole world. This policy is dressed up in a completely spurious economic theory which is merely a rationalisation of a legalised system of robbery by taxation. And it is vital to see how this comes about.

In a given community, in general, every day enough food, clothing and shelter is provided and (in the sense that houses wear out) consumed by that community. Under modern conditions this *basic* production can be set at any desirable level. As human capacity to consume on this basic level (the matter of "luxuries" is a separate question and involves a *theory of morals*) is limited, this level can be reached with increasing ease. In addition to this basic production the community, and at an ever increasing rate accelerated by the continuous harnessing of power (now including atomic power) and improvement of process (now including automation) produces relatively non-consumable goods. These goods represent a continuous expansion and accumulation of the community's resources, and the greater part of production is due to their use, *not* to human labour. "Labour" nowadays produces only a fraction of total wealth, being more of a catalyst than anything else. Now one horse-power of harnessed energy is capable of displacing about ten man-hours of "work," and the horse-power units already far exceed the number of the population in an industrialised community. Furthermore, if displaced man-power is employed on further harnessing energy and improving process, the system accelerates still further. In fact, once industrialisation is commenced, it follows an exponential law of growth—its *rate* of growth is proportional to its *state* of growth, precisely like the growth of a sum of money at *compound* interest.

There is nothing theoretical in all this; it is a description of physical fact. Theories arise only when it becomes a question of what to do about the fact. This is a moral issue,

*This title has been added for this reprinting of Chapter XII of Dr. Monahan's *Mystery, Magic, Music and Metaphysics*.

and it is here that the Church should take its stand. A stand *has* been taken, and the Church, either passively or actively, has backed it; but it is not a Christian stand, and the Church has been beaten with many stripes. With the increasingly doubtful exception of the Roman Catholic Church, the Church has become a whited sepulchre.

The community may be regarded as divided into two parts: those engaged in producing and distributing consumable items, and in the provision of services; and those in producing non-consumable items—houses, factories, machines, public works, office buildings, etc.—i.e., things which *accumulate*. Those engaged in either activity, however, are remunerated in the same way—i.e., they are paid a wage or salary for work *in progress*, so that the community has a total undifferentiated income in respect of both consumable and non-consumable (accumulating) production. Now the vitally important *fact* is that the whole of this income, less *personal* savings (a *very* small proportion of total distributed income), is withdrawn through the prices paid for *consumable* production (cost of living), and through taxation. This means that the community, considered as the set of all the individuals who produced *all* goods, gets delivery only of the consumable goods, although it has “worked for” the non-consumable goods. That is to say that although the community has produced the non-consumable goods, it has no *equity* in them beyond its *personal* savings. This is not a necessary state of affairs, but it is certainly the existing state of affairs. And it is precisely on the future of this situation that the future of civilisation depends. We are back at the issue of imposing a preconceived moral system on society, or of allowing a full flowering of individuality in the manner that Jesus taught. Every family in an industrialised community could be “rich”—i.e., relatively independent. The industrial world, however, represents “all the kingdoms of the world,” and the temptation was to seize control of it. And control has been seized. The money-changers are in the Temple. What did Christ *do* about that? What is the Church—the mystical body of Christ—doing?

Now quite apart from the moral issue, the results of this system are what we see—strikes, growing anarchy, crime, social disorder, amorality, filth, all intensifying. And this situation is quite certain to get worse until a police-state takes control, or Christian society breaks down. Whether a Christian order would ever again arise is hardly even a matter for speculation.

So much for the immediate consequences. But in the larger view we see more. In the first place, “large-scale planning” (that shibboleth of ‘social science’) is not only the potential death of all small-scale planning, and certain death of medium-scale planning (take-overs and mergers)—if it goes wrong, the effect may be catastrophic. Nor does it allow for changes in circumstances, among others the possibilities of radical new inventions, nor foresee what new and unpredictable circumstances it will itself almost inevitably create—the mass production of motor vehicles has been responsible for an enormous death-toll on the roads and even more severe or crippling injuries.

In the second place, although the details of the plan fall to subordinate experts, a hierarchy of co-ordinating and subordinating experts is required, and the whole thing must be master-minded. Where does the master mind come from, and how does he get there? And thirdly, large-scale planning

may lead to unnatural catastrophes, and magnify the effect of natural catastrophes. Large-scale planning means a community permanently organised as if for war, and in fact leads to economic ‘war’ which has in the past led, at least proximately, to military war to prevent the “capture of our markets.” So we hurl millions worth of our military ‘production’ into “the enemy’s” country to stop him, and get into international debt to do so.

And finally—if anything in this situation can be called final—it leads to grossly excessive production without regard to the human value or harm of the product, or the squandering of the earth’s resources.

But suppose the “final solution” is World Government. No more wars (only police-actions on an international scale); but then how do we “employ” the many millions of soldiers and others indirectly involved in maintaining armies, and the “workers” engaged in producing munitions? They are all being clothed, fed and sheltered already, without contributing to the ‘wealth’ of their countries.

To see this matter in perspective, it is necessary to look at an alternative. Instead of confiscating almost the *whole* of the community’s income in respect of only a *part* of its production, let that part of the income representing the accumulation of labour-saving devices—i.e., non-consumable production—be refunded to families in the form of non-transferable interest-bearing bonds. The interest on these would represent income in respect of labour “saved”—i.e., it would represent leisure which, from the Christian point of view, could be devoted to the greater glory of God—i.e., free creative activity.

There is absolutely no question that this alternative is possible—the technical details are child’s play. It is an alternative which has been *rejected*, and this precisely because full employment is a means of imposing a pre-conceived idea of what the world “ought” to be like, rather than allowing it to become what it might have become—was becoming—under an approximately Christian order.

Perhaps the easiest way to grasp what is at stake here is to realise that those who impose this system are consciously anti-Christian (*cf* Communism). Also, they want men to be “bad” so that they need to be rigidly governed. To govern the kingdom of the whole world, they must enslave its peoples. And looking to a future World Order, they do not care how many people perish, how much crime they endure, in its attainment. Or another way of putting this vitally important matter is to say that man would be better off if we had not developed the industrial system, *insofar* as industry has *enabled* the perversion of man’s nature. The industrial system *enabled*, not caused, the terrible *world* wars, and the subjection of whole peoples to the systematic falsification of fundamental truths. For no one could doubt that the peoples did not want those wars, and they would never have occurred if the peoples had not been organised into collectivities which could be manipulated into wars for the benefit of third parties. Properly used, industry could free man from such organisation; but it has enabled an enslavement impossible otherwise to achieve, let alone sustain.

(To be continued)