

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 63 No. 2

MARCH – APRIL, 1984

The Big Idea

BY C.H. DOUGLAS

THIS TREATISE, HERE CONTINUED, WHICH FIRST APPEARED SERIALLY IN THESE PAGES BETWEEN JANUARY AND MAY, 1942, AND LATER IN BOOKLET FORM, WILL NOT BE FAMILIAR TO MANY OF OUR PRESENT READERS. FOR OTHERS A RE-READING SHOULD PROVE ENLIGHTENING.

XVII

While, unquestionably, control of Financial Credit is, or was, the most powerful weapon in the armoury of the Enemy, the attack upon integrity—that is to say, the steady policy of corruption and perversion—is made by many other mechanisms—patronage to High Office, or any office, bits of ribbon, titles, mere advertisement. They are all variants on the Credit theme, and to imagine that money alone (although undoubtedly first in priority) requires decentralisation, is to court failure.

I do not think that, at any rate in the first place, “morality of objective” has much to do with integrity—I should not deny a much higher degree of integrity to a New York gangster than to quite a large number of highly esteemed ecclesiastics. It consists in a certain simplicity and directness—a clear view of what you want to do, and an indifference to by-products. To achieve anything, you must have it, and without it, you will achieve just what your effort is worth. So far as I can judge, little or no integrity has been applied to political affairs in this country for some years, but a great deal to the advancement of politicians and functionaries. For instance, I should regard Mr. Winston Churchill as a man of high integrity—I should judge that he regards every situation from the single-minded point of view of its effect on the fortunes of Mr. Winston Churchill. What is wrong is that far too many other fortunes are affected at the same time. That is to say, a centralised system of totalitarianism requires, even if it could be made to work, a completely *selfless* integrity which is not only unknown, but is not Christian. “—thy neighbour as thyself,” presumably means what it says. So far as I understand Christianity it is the easy (not necessarily the immediately easy) way—*e.g.*, the proper way—to do things—“my yoke is easy, my burden, light.” It is not a pathetic and everlasting effort to do the undoable. The Satanic ideology of work, employment, austerity, sacrifice, is not an ideology of achievement. Surely anyone can see that. It is an ideology of sabotage, destruction, corruption and decay.

Superficially, it would appear possible to make a success of centralisation of Power. The situation is not unlike that involved in the “conveyor-belt” production publicised, but not invented, by Mr. Henry Ford. Until it was copied by his competitors, it gave him command of the market. Nowadays, he is obliged to obtain business by much the same methods as other manufacturers.

As we can see by observation, the only result of building up a “strong” State is to force the building of one still stronger. The British traditional policy of the balance of power was the only practical way of dealing with this outcome of the State system, and had the British Government retained that integrity (in the sense I have defined the word) which it began to lose with the rise of the Whigs and their backers, there would have been no world war. But the oblique vision which was the inevitable result of the conflict between a national policy and a policy warped to advantage the international interests of Rothschilds, Sassoons, Schusters, Schiffs, Sterns, Schroeders, and other sibilants has been fatal to that single-mindedness which was essential. If anyone supposes that a mass grouping of Power will do anything but hasten the coming of a still more appalling war, if we survive this one, then I can only ask him to consider the rapidity with which this one has come upon us, when, twenty-two years ago we appeared to have reached a period of impregnability.

On the other hand, provided that absolute integrity of purpose, combined with freedom to contract out can be maintained, progressive decentralisation *must* succeed. The integrity of purpose required is not in opposition to human nature, as in the case of progressive centralisation, but in its best interests. It is in fact essential to the further progress of humanity, just as exercise is essential to the growth of a child. Nothing is so destructive as continual frustration (that is one of the worst features of Government Departments) and nothing develops a man like achievement. Such virtues as are peculiar to the newer countries derive directly from the absence of unnecessary hindrances. The British are being stifled with them.

XVIII

Finally, we come to the question of technique.

There are obvious reasons, more particularly at the present time, which are a valid argument against “plans of campaign,” just as against “planning.” But certain considerations may be emphasised.

Every prohibition of individual initiative is a victory for the enemy to exactly the extent that it is effective. Not only does it, in itself, represent one more step towards the Slave World, but, except under certain conditions, it sets up a habit of apathetic acquiescence which is exactly what

is desired. One of the Planners "hoped to keep the war going" for exactly this purpose; those conditions, however, are not unduly difficult to create.

The first strategy has many times been emphasised—it is to insist that Members of Parliament are representatives, not delegates. I am still of the opinion that so long as Parliamentary institutions subsist, which may not be much longer, this line of action is vital.

But the same principle can be carried into every official quarter. Once get the mental attitude well established in oneself that institutions exist only legitimately to serve individuals, and it is possible to make demands of Government Departments with which their organisation cannot deal, but are yet entirely reasonable. It is not necessary and not desirable, to organise this kind of action. The underlying idea is to call the bluff of institutionalism, and to make it either deliver the goods or expose the fact that it can't.

It is necessary to face up to the fact of institutionalised Judaeo-Christianity, the official philosophy of England, Scotland, and Wales, which is simply Liberal Judaism. I may perhaps repeat my belief, not only that Christianity has not failed because it has not been tried, but that it has not been tried mainly because Judaeo-Christianity has taken care that it should not be tried.

At the present time, ecclesiastics of the Churches of England and Scotland, are making every effort in their power to identify the Kingdom of God upon Earth with Jewish Socialism (which is State Capitalism with monopoly control by Finance), and, in many cases, doing it from what, in a restricted sense, might be called the highest motives—derived from assuming as axiomatic, the tenets of a philosophy systematically inculcated almost from birth. Against this hypnotic obsession, argument is useless—dehypnotisation is essential.

It is of the essence of Social Credit ideas that there is an organic connection between peoples, races, and individuals, and the soils of particular portions of the earth's surface which are individualistic. The Russians are fighting, not for internationalism, but for nationalism.

It is important to enquire into, and to pillory, the fact that the Socialist Party, while demanding the evacuation of India by the British (which, in a proper, dignified, and far from apologetic manner, is ultimately desirable) insist on the admission and retention at their pleasure of the most undesirable Oriental the world has produced—the Jew.

The Jew and his philosophy, which is epitomised in the one-way street—must be provided with a country after the war, and returned to it. I cannot imagine a more distasteful fate for him.

Uninfluenced by alien intrigue, and inoculated, as he will be by the harsh realism of war, against windy abstractions, the native of these islands can be trusted to hammer out his best destiny. He will not be assisted by Secret Societies.

And the root of the matter is—mind your own business, and allow no man to make a business of minding you. Listen, in reason, to what advice seems to be backed by proper experience and ability, and pay no attention to windy idealism. And then—mind your own business. It is in sore need of your attention. (Concluded)

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 £3.00.

OFFICES—Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD. Tel. Sudbury 76374 (STD Code 0787).

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX. Tel. 01-387 3893.

In Australia (Editorial Head Office): 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: H. A. Scouler, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099. General Deputy Chairman: C. R. Preston, Rookery Farmhouse, Gunthorpe, North Norfolk NR14 2NY, U.K. Deputy Chairman, British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX.

A Reference Back*

During the war period and afterwards until the death of Douglas, confidential memoranda were circulated by the Secretariat to selected readers and, additionally, notes written by Dr. Tudor Jones of conversations (usually of an extended nature and occurring at fairly frequent intervals) between the then Chairman of the Secretariat and the Advisory Chairman, Major Douglas. Both the material embodied in the so-called "Internal Bulletins" and that in the "Notes of Conversations" were (any reflections on individuals being first removed) checked by the Advisory Chairman for inaccuracies and sanctioned for distribution. Some notes still remain to be transcribed. Among those circulated is the following, dated April 20, 21, 1950, which refers *inter alia* to the progressive raising of the threshold for genuine ideas. Since Douglas's death, this process has accelerated, and now constitutes the major problem of such people as ourselves.

The Notes:

In these conversations, Major Douglas reverted several times to the Apocalyptic idea in one or another of its various forms: *apo* (from) *kalyptein* (to cover). Hence uncovering, revelation, "ripe fate" (an Arab expression). He looked more and more to an Apocalyptic outcome of the present situation, and not to any piecemeal adjustment. Evil was now so all-embracing, so active, that the whole of Life had received a shock. "You won't do more than we have done in prescribing particular remedies. Look how they treat the idea of the Compensated Price. In *The Scotsman* this morning there is a review of a book, the author of which is credited with *making* the altogether new discovery of a time lag, *etc.* All this is attributed to the assistance of this man and that, and to Keynes. It is A plus B put out once again as one of many theories. We don't get any credit for it. They twist and use the Compensated Price to get what they want out of it. Nothing is so remarkable as to observe objectively what very close attention is paid to us all the time. They just listen and use what they hear for their own purposes. At the same time it is quite true that the scene is changing. The ordinary person seems to be taking his drinks stronger than he used to. The diluted stuff we're expected to drink is simply being thrust aside. There's a good deal of strong

* Reproduced from T.S.C., December 21st, 1963.

stuff about. What they think may be detrimental to us (i.e. the systematic lowering of the threshold for 'newspeak' and raising of the threshold for genuine ideas—T.J.) may be the thing that's keeping us alive." Here Major Douglas spoke with approval of Voigt's article in *The Month*. All the error and evil of centuries had been heaping up, and there was now too much of what the Arabs call "ripe fate" for there to be any other outcome, but it had got to work itself out. This might seem pessimistic, but it was realistic. "Ripe fate" was only another way of asserting what we were asserting: that there is Law, that you can't invent it, but can at best discover it, etc. If you must go the long way round and wait for it to assert itself unpleasantly, you do, of course discover it, but have the unpleasant effects as well.

(T.J. reported that a dead-wood circulation of *The Social Crediter* collected during 1946-8 had been rigidly pruned, reducing the circulation temporarily to 200 below the peak of the early war years. This ground had now all been recovered, there was an increased trade sale, and the circulation was again rising very slowly but steadily.)

Major Douglas linked this up with what he had said about "stronger drinks". It was a good thing that an unknown public was increasingly interested in us even if only to a numerically small degree. *The Social Crediter* should be continued and without altering its essential qualities and character. It wasn't a paper for everybody; but it must not speak with two voices. No one else was doing what we were doing. It was from one point of view lamentable to see papers of some merit going down one after another, until literally we were the only one left; but it was significant that it was safer to be right than only half-right from a sales point of view.

"Intellectual and moral prestige is closely linked with credit and the value of the £." If they* or we were to find salvation, the very first thing to do was to drive down prices at any cost and increase faith in the £. (* the Government.)

In passing Major Douglas mentioned a chapter, "Tennis and the Ape Man" in a book by Capt. W. C. Bruges, *Principles of Liberty* published in 1937 by M. F. Robinson, 57 High Street, Lowestoft, and also Hinton's *The Fourth Dimension* in conjunction with Dunn's treatment of Immortality. (Hinton's book calls for rigid logical application.—T.J.) Major Douglas remarked later, but with reference to such matters as are discussed in the works mentioned, that "orthodox methods of dealing with the situation are obviously no good—they simply aren't working".

The position in Canada was discussed at somewhat greater length than is here represented:—

"It does look at the moment as though, here and in Canada and indeed everywhere, the Constitutional issue is the issue which is uppermost. We want to make it clear to everybody that what you can do in the way of Constitution-making is very little. We have to bring out the Truth—the nature of the Universe. Either what the situation yields is in accordance with the nature of things, or it isn't. The nearer you get to the way things work, the less need there is for a Constitution at all. No Constitution can decide that it would be better to reap all the wheat at Christmas and sow again in summer. If you say that, you're calling in two doctors. We must destroy this idea that the House of Commons can do anything: our answer

is the correct one: 'Yes, but we don't want to be the victims of its follies!'"

The right course in Canada, "which, of course, they won't take, is for someone to blow the gaffe on the whole thing. What they could do there is to hammer away at the iniquity of having their laws disallowed. But they won't do that because they're all politicians". It was one thing to fight the financial system—but a triangular fight was hopeless.

Major Douglas scouted the idea that there was anything behind the effort being made to revive political Liberalism. A distinction had to be made between what the Liberal says and what he does. The finances of the country were better conducted under Gladstone; but there were two possible views of Gladstone—that he was one of those people with a genius for deceiving themselves; or that he was one of those who say "I can get most done by playing in with these people". Up to a point, and then what?

Major Douglas again referred to the notion of "ripe fate". The whole of the matter was the contradiction in the present world between those who behaved (with disastrous results) as though the world and only the world could give and take away, and those who knew there was something the world could neither give nor take away. "The net result of 'science' is that we know nothing of any value to us."

For Review

—The Constitutional issue, philosophy, politics, economics and strategy were examined by the late C.H. Douglas in his regular notes under the heading "From Week to Week" in *The Social Crediter* in which, in 1957 and early 1958, after his death, a wide selection of these notes was republished. Later, in 1969, this selection was published in book form under the title *The Development of World Dominion*.

The notes which follow, with dates of original publication shown in brackets at the end of each item, are again offered, for the benefit of new readers and as a review by others.

* * *

The set of ideas which became the movement known as Social Credit began with an examination of the problem of the relationship of the individual to the group, and the financial proposals which emerged were consciously, and in all their developments, designed to free the individual from group domination. It is evident that the essential nature of the problem, not merely has not changed, but has become more sharply defined.

It was, early in the elaboration of the ideas, recognised that the group is essentially atavistic; it is something from which the individual has emerged, and his return to it is in the nature of spiritual death. Without, in this place, elaborating the connection between the anti-religious aspect of Communism, the soullessness of mass production, and the incompatibility of cartelism and Trades Unionism with peace, it may be emphasised that there is a connection between all of them, and it is epitomised in that amazing reply: "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's, and unto God that which is God's." Caesar is, of course, functionalism, and if functionalism can be made paramount, if the Will

can be paralysed by the Arm, if the Good which I Will I do not can be made uniform by the omnipotence of the atavistic Group over the emergent individual, then indeed the Devil is triumphant.

(Nov. 1, 1947.)

There is a certain body of opinion which is under the impression that we have abandoned the financial aspect of Social Credit. In this connection, we are reminded of a pungent criticism made some years ago, that the great disadvantage under which the Social Credit movement then laboured, was that it was largely composed of Socialists who wanted nationalisation of banking.

People who hold this type of opinion have not taken the trouble to grasp the fundamental subject matter with which we have always been concerned, which is the relationship of the individual to the group. Thirty years ago, that relationship was predominantly a financial relationship. Quite largely through the exertions of Socialists, strongly assisted by the highest powers of International Finance, the Central Banks have become practically impregnable, and the sanctions which they exert have shifted from the bank balance to the Order-in-Council.

It ought to be, but unfortunately it is not, apparent to everyone who takes an intelligent interest in these matters, that the fundamental problem has been greatly complicated by the developments of the past twenty years; and that the immediate issue is in the realm of Law and military power, not of book-keeping. That does not mean in the least that book-keeping is one penny the less important than it was when we directed attention to it; but it does mean that it is the second trench to be taken, not the first. For that, we have to thank in great part, the obsession with "nationalised" banking.

The problem presented by the centralised ("majority") political vote is the same in its fundamentals as that of which it is only another manifestation—the monopoly of credit.

(Oct. 16, 1948.)

From many and varied quarters we receive proposals for lines of action which rely for their validity on an appeal to the moral law. Let us hasten to say that we have the greatest sympathy with this appeal.

But we do not think it is generally recognised, at any rate with sufficient clarity, that this appeal begs the primary issue now before humanity. There is no law without a sanction; has "Right" or Decency, or Justice or Mercy any sanction? It is not a question which permits of a facile answer; in fact the answer may be what religion has always contended it to be, one which may be so final as to dispose of any subsequent problems.

(Oct. 14, 1950.)

There appears to be a tendency (which we have done our best to discredit) to suggest that the Social Credit Secretariat should mould its activities on those of the American statesman who concluded his electioneering address with the words, "Them's my principles, gents, and if you don't

like 'em, I'll change 'em". So far from complaining of this attitude, in moderation, we recognise that it represents a degree of confidence for which we are grateful.

But in fact, the idea that there is some magic word which if discovered and pronounced would transform the situation, can be very dangerous. At some risk of being platitudinous, may we repeat what in effect we have been proclaiming for thirty years—that policy, function and power are all different, and that the fundamental "sin" of our present era is that we allow policy and power to be dependent on function. To put it in the simplest manner, to our orthodox philosophy, there's nothing like leather.

It is from this fundamental fallacy that we derive such fatuous ideas as the "right" of "Labour" to do this, that, and the other, e.g., "Full Employment". "Labour" has no rights whatever except the right of the *individual* labourer not to function—to contract out.

If this situation is clearly grasped, and it is surely not too difficult of apprehension, it should be obvious that the best of policies (and it must be remembered that we can only impinge upon ideas which go to form policy) is quite powerless without function and power. We commenced our crusade by emphasising that finance controls policy, and (because we have a fraudulent financial system) our policy is fraudulent.

Finance is part of our Constitutional system (more so than ever since the "nationalisation" of our Central Bank) and to rectify Finance, we have to rectify our Constitution. We have made consistent suggestions, alone amongst contemporary movements to embody these policies. They have not so far been pushed very hard (that is neither our business, nor within our competence), but we have no bright ideas to offer which will make the walls of Jericho fall down even without trumpets.

"Them's our sentiments, gentlemen, and if you don't like them, we're sorry."

(June 10, 1950.)

Privilege at Risk

The following letter appeared in the *London Times*, February 9, 1984:

Sir, Following a verbal attack in the South Australian Parliament on a sitting royal commission the Australian Government is proposing to legislate "to abrogate or otherwise affect" state parliamentary privileges, particularly of free speech. Representations in writing were invited and Senate committee hearings will shortly be held.

Freedom of speech has hitherto been subject only to the various Parliament's own rules. Unsuitable comment on sitting royal commissions could surely be controlled by voluntary extension of the *sub judice* rule. The present proposal is of concern to the whole British Commonwealth.

Yours faithfully,
J.P. HALDANE-STEVENSON,
Canberra, A.C.T. 2601
Australia.
January 28.

THE BIG IDEA by C. H. Douglas, which has been reprinted in these pages is also available in booklet form, price £2.50 from Bloomfield Books (agents for K.R.P. Publications Ltd. for book sales only) 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD.