

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 65 No. 1

JANUARY — FEBRUARY, 1986

## A CALL TO REALITY

The first number of *The Fig Tree — a Douglas Social Credit Quarterly Review* edited by C. H. Douglas appeared in June 1936. The following is an extract from his first Editorial entitled "Regarding the Canon". Introducing *The Fig Tree*, he wrote:

"Its object is Realism dissociated so far as is possible from either qualification or pose. Most of its contributors, and certainly its editors, hold that Idealism is just as inseparable from Realism as one end of a stick is from the other and that environment reacts upon ideals just as, and possibly more generally than, ideals affect environment.

"There is a third factor, however, to which I have on occasion referred as the Canon. Probably none of us knows what it is, but nearly all of us recognise it when we meet it. Adam the architect had it, as anyone who knew the disappearing Adelphi Terrace would admit. The bungalowoid growths which disfigure our South Coast emphatically have not got it, nor the newspapers whose circulation is based on trials of murder and divorce cases.

"The new Bank of England, which is a calculating-machine-fortress inside and a Sir John Soane classical facade outside, has not got it. An apt phrase, a racing yacht, the Quebec Bridge, all in their special way may have it. They are Right in the sense that the engineer speaks of having got it Right, because they are as nearly as possible the embodiment of the ideal in the mind of their creators, and they do their job.

"Probably few of those who have had the patience to read the foregoing words would deny that civilisation has departed from the Canon. We believe that the major reason for this is quite simply that a financial criterion rather than a realistic standard of Rightness has become its guide, and that in consequence the world is given over to the Father of Lies — the Enemy of Truth — and that the Money System is his chief tool.

"We believe this because we know how the Money System works, who controls and benefits from it, and, further, what changes would tend to make it realistic.

"But while holding these views strongly, we hold even more strongly that it is Results, as measured by human satisfaction, which are important. To put the matter beyond question, we believe in Democracy of the Common Will, but emphatically we do *not* believe in Democracy either of the Intellect or of the Emotions which lead direct to

dictatorships. Dictatorships either of the proletariat or the banker are abominable and in essence similar. Both are slavery more or less concealed and both almost equally distort and pervert industrial and economic work, or employment, into the chief object of existence in order that the slavery they desire may be perpetuated by one means or another.

"No informed reader of, for instance, the chief London newspapers can be under any delusion as to the consciousness of this aim. It is subordination to a system which is desired. Results, to our moulders of thought and action, are to be measured in abstractions such as balanced budgets, monetary profits, increased trade. Human statistics, are, it is true, valuable to insurance companies as a guide for the assessment of premiums on a profitable basis, but 'it's your money we want'.

"If this appreciation of the state of world affairs is just, we think the gravity of our case must be apparent. If ideals and environment react mutually, the ideals, even of well-disposed persons, which are formed by reaction from an environment consisting of false abstractions, must and do take us still further from the Canon.

"The immeasurable harm which is being done by enthusiastic and no doubt wholly well-meaning 'planners', not to mention the political spell-binder with Old Testament proclivities, is in the main due to this acceptance of false premises, and, as was so wisely said by Professor MacDougall in *Character and the Conduct of Life*, increasing familiarity with world affairs does not in itself provide a remedy. What is necessary is de-hypnotisation — a task in which all the Interests, the Dominion and Glory are ranged on the side of the hypnotist, and every invention and advance in material science is pressed into his service by the control he exercises over the mechanism of Finance.

"If ordinary standards of measurement were to be applied to the task I have endeavoured to outline, the disproportion between the means, of which this Review is one, and the end, would be so ludicrous as to raise legitimate doubts as to the sanity of our outlook.

"But in fifteen years the associated ideas of Social Credit have spread from a few articles in the *English Review* to every country on earth." However, *The Social Crediter* is not a Christmas card. Our role is to be both encouraging and disturbing in furtherance of attacks primarily against fraudulent finance.

## 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.

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

—Editorial: 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 6LR.

—In Australia (Editorial and Business): Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

**Personnel**—Chairman: C. R. Preston, Meadow Cottages, Burndell Road, Yapton, Arundel, West Sussex BN18 0HP, U.K. General Deputy Chairman: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX. Deputy Chairman, Australasia: H. A. Scoular, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

## CONTINUITY

### New Year Greetings to the Readers of this Paper

Douglas, in his address to the Marshall Society of Cambridge in October 1938 (Reported in Vol. 1, No. 7, of T.S.C.) said:

“We are supposed to be a democracy in this country. We are, of course, nothing of the kind. We are a skilful and not very scrupulous oligarchy, tending rapidly to a financial dictatorship, with an administrative dictatorship in the background. We have become infected with Oriental ideas, and all the forces of education and propaganda are enlisted in their service.

“At this point it may easily occur to anyone to ask ‘To what does this tend? What is the objective?’

“It is not easy to answer this question concisely, but probably the nearest approximation to a correct answer would be ‘The perpetuation of the Slave State’.

“. . . a reasonable standard of living ought to be available for all of us, with a very trifling amount of work.

“Now why do we find that economic insecurity is greater than it ever was? For myself, I have no hesitation whatever in giving you a short answer: it is the insistence upon a policy of universal employment, a policy which is pursued in flat opposition to the fundamental necessities which are revealed by the general economic position.

“. . . I am confident that . . . the hysterical cry for yet more work, yet more employment, sacrifices, higher taxes and all other corollaries of this policy, together with the bureaucracy and encroachment on elementary rights and liberties which is its accompaniment, should not only be firmly resisted, but reversed.”

In the previous month, Douglas, writing in Vol. 1, No. 2, of T.S.C., had said: “The responsibility for the advice is mine and will be judged not now, but many years hence. The acceptance or rejection of it rests with others and the responsibility for that decision rests with them also.”

It rests with the individual to accept or reject Douglas's advice. How that advice can be implemented depends to some extent on the ever-changing currents of the political and economic tides in different countries, but it is not difficult to identify the central issues which demand the attention of concerned individuals. “Economic insecurity”, “a policy of universal employment”, “bureaucracy and

encroachment on elementary rights and liberties” all remain characteristic features of today's industrialised societies.

Technological advances have multiplied productive capacities whilst simultaneously reducing both the need and the prospects for “full employment”. Economic insecurity has spawned a huge bureaucracy to mitigate its worst effects whilst increasing dependence on State provision. Economic growth in developing countries is undermining the industries of the older societies, increasing “unemployment” and giving a spurious credence to calls for “wage restraint”.

What then is there open for a concerned individual to do? To attack the concepts of the Work Ethic and “full employment” as being absurdly anachronistic in an age of sufficiency based on the ever more efficient harnessing of energy resources and, for the first time in the history of mankind, the application of machine intelligence. And to attack the spurious financial system which distorts these realities and induces the hypnosis which paralyses effective action.

Social Credit has been likened to a jewel complete — of many facets. Each of us has a personal responsibility to illumine the facet(s) of our choice, whatever be the basis for that choice. At this late hour, however, it is imperative that those in Government be required to act on truth and reality and not on falsehoods. It seems to us that change, if it is to come in time, will come from the top. We must keep our aim high therefore to ensure that those at the apex of our affairs know that we know, and know what we know.

## A WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY

The unusual volatility of the electorate shown up in recent opinion polls bids fair to continue in the run-up to the next General Election. All the parties have their internal divisions and public relations problems but a three-horse race looks to be inevitable and the prospect of a “hung” Parliament not unlikely. In circumstances where only a minority of sitting M.P.s may be wholly confident of retaining their seats and no party can be certain of winning, both present members and their rival candidates cannot fail to be more sensitive to pressure from voters. The best use of this situation must clearly lie in a concerted effort concentrated on a narrow front and with a limited objective.

There will be no salvation in Party Politics. Nevertheless, considering the contrasting philosophies and policies of the parties, it will be clear to readers of this paper that the point of application of whatever pressure can be generated must be primarily the Conservative party, and particularly its leaders. Can they be brought to see that the essential key to assured continuance in office lies in challenging the financial orthodoxy which at present unnecessarily constrains all policies for economic health and individual enterprise? Is it not very odd, for example, that there should be such fierce competition between rival spending departments for the extra million or two, while the annual debt charges of between £16 and £17 billion for the ever-mounting National Debt appear to be accepted without question?

Can the present determination to limit the size of the Public Sector Borrowing Requirement not be transformed into an awareness that, for a supposedly “sovereign” state, borrowing is itself a self-inflicted handicap?

## CENTRALISATION AND CONSTITUTION

The first issue of a new weekly, *The New American*, Belmont, Mass., 30th September 1985, contains a review by Dr. Charles A. Moser (Professor of Slavic Studies at George Washington University in Washington, D.C., and editor of *Combat on Communist Territory*) of a book by M. E. Bradford. The reviewer, in this article entitled "Remembering the Republic's Roots", writes:

"*Remembering Who We Are* is a selection of fifteen articles and addresses by M. E. Bradford, an eminent American historian who is a professor at the University of Dallas. . . .

"Several of the most important of these pieces deal with the question of just what the Founders of our nation and the Framers of the Constitution of 1787 believed they had created. Bradford also examines just what sort of nation these men did call into existence during that period of intrigue which would explode into the French Revolution of 1789.

"He believes that the American and French Revolutions were entirely different. The Fathers of our country, he says, did not claim the 'metaphysical privilege of founders', that is, the right to establish something entirely unprecedented in human society. The Framers made no religion of political equality, they were not committed to 'perfectionism and its twin, the envious and cowardly dream of uniformity', as Bradford phrases it: nor did they at all insist upon 'mandatory brotherhood' of the sort which drove fomentors of the French Revolution.

"Instead, he argues, they worked to restore as far as possible the legitimate social system which had existed before the advent of the King's tyranny and the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. They thought that the political structure they were establishing should not only be limited, but should protect and preserve the established social order, the already existing reality, and the traditions handed down from previous generations and derived for the most part from English practice. As the Founders debated at the Constitutional Convention and in the several states, their 'highest authority' was the appeal to 'experience' and to history, a discipline in which many of them were exceedingly well versed.

"In short, Bradford maintains, the founding of the American Republic was a profoundly conservative undertaking, in which already existing states entered into an agreement with one another to form a 'more perfect union' for the purposes of protecting liberty within an established social order. That agreement, once made, could also be abrogated if it ceased to be advantageous to all parties involved. That was the way the South — and indeed most of the country — regarded the Union until 1860.

"Of course, even while the Constitution was being written, there existed some philosophical radicals yearning for 'equality' in the French spirit who wished to establish an entirely new political entity. Thomas Paine was one of these. Seeking to be a citizen of the world, he went to France after the French Revolution. Eventually, he was arrested for ideological deviation and might have been executed had he not successfully appealed to the principles of the American Revolution and the advantages of American citizenship.

"But the 'refounders' persisted until finally, as Bradford sees it, they found their champion in Abraham Lincoln. The

Civil War resolved the question of the political structure. The Union was not a compact among semi-sovereign states from which they could withdraw, but instead a unified entity with its own philosophical and ideological commitments — a whole different from the sum of its parts.

"*Remembering Who We Are* concludes with Bradford's most controversial single work, 'The Lincoln Legacy: A Long View'. In this essay, he not only advances his interpretation of Lincoln as the man who successfully 'refounded' the Union on centralized principles, but he also draws up an indictment of Lincoln as a wartime President. He sees Lincoln as a man who seriously abused his powers as President, who helped to bring on the war to begin with, who needlessly prolonged it for his own political purposes, and who cloaked his dubious arguments in the rhetoric of morality. This indictment is written in a harsh tone — a tone quite out of keeping with that of the other essays in the collection — and it will offend the vast majority of Americans who have simply absorbed the view of Lincoln as martyr-President. That view, of course, is embodied in the Daniel Chester French Lincoln Memorial in our nation's capital, very possibly the most impressive monument of a statesman to be found anywhere in the world. But scholarship should deal with historical truth, not with images, and we certainly should not be forbidden to examine even as strongly held a consensus as what is believed about Lincoln. Bradford knows, however, what a price he has paid for his intellectual courage.

"... M. E. Bradford is a man of the intellectual periphery, limited on the whole merely to mounting brief forays into the citadels of the intellectual establishment from his base in Dallas. A first-rate scholarly writer with a stimulating mind, his 'southern Conservatism' and his thoroughgoing rejection of the prevailing intellectual orthodoxy make it impossible for him to be accepted in our greatest universities. And, if he should by chance gain admission to one, he would soon be driven forth again. . . .

"It may well be that the tradition which Bradford exemplifies in this book will one day become the most powerful one in our culture, and eventually point the way to the restoration of true intellectual and political liberty across the globe."

—DR. CHARLES A. MOSER.  
(Article quoted by permission.)

**Note.**—Comments on the words and actions of two American Presidents, Lincoln and Roosevelt, made by C. H. Douglas in 1946 and 1948 were reprinted in the September-October 1985 issue of *The Social Crediter*. The first appeared in the article *The Political Problem* and the latter in a "From Week to Week" note dated 17th July 1948, in connection with President Roosevelt's Inaugural Address in 1933.

In *Realistic Constitutionalism* (1947) Douglas said: "... one of the ablest commentators on 'Origins of the American Revolution', John C. Miller observes: 'In rejecting natural law, Englishmen also denied the colonists' contention that there were metes and bounds to the authority of Parliament. The authority of Parliament was, in their opinion, unlimited; the supremacy of Parliament had come to mean to Englishmen an uncontrolled and uncontrollable authority. Indeed the divine right of kings had been succeeded by the divine right of Parliament. . . . It was the refusal of Americans to bow before the new divinity which precipitated the American Revolution'."

## SAVE OUR SOVEREIGNTY

(From a leaflet from the League of Concerned Conservatives, 1985)

“To our freedom-loving English minds it seems that the proper judge of how a man should shape his life, his work and his pleasures is not the State — but a man himself. We do not want to be ruled from the cradle to the grave by bureaucracy or Gauleiters. We want, under God and Law, to rule ourselves.”

SIR ARTHUR BRYANT, 1941.

In 1928 the Communist International presented a three-stage plan to achieve World Government:

- (1) Socialise the economies of all nations.
- (2) Bring about regional unions of various groupings of these socialised nations.
- (3) Amalgamate all these regional groupings into a final world-wide union of socialist states.

In 1942 Stalin produced further clarification of Marxist intentions when he was co-operating with agents in the U.S.A. to lay the foundations of the United Nations Organisation.

- (1) Confuse, disorganise and destroy the forces of capitalism around the world.
- (2) Bring all nations together into a single world economy.
- (3) Force the advanced countries to pour prolonged financial aid into the under-developed countries.
- (4) Divide the world into regional groups as a transitional stage to total world government.

(Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question*, N.Y. International Publishers 1942.)

The Tindemans Report recommended that a gradual step-by-step approach to European Union should be adopted, with priority being given to objectives likely to succeed. This approach is now being used.

The Foreign Ministers of the Community wish to amend the Treaty of Rome so that decisions may in future be made by majority voting. It is not only the Luxembourg Compromise that allows individual states to veto decisions in the Council of Ministers. Articles 57, 100 and 235 of the Treaty of Rome all refer to decisions or voting being unanimous. Article 236 says that amendments to the Treaty must be determined by common agreement and thereafter be ratified in accordance with the respective constitutional requirements of all Member States. It is this Article that represents an impediment to the introduction of the Draft Treaty (for European Union. Ed.).

**WITHOUT THE POWER TO VETO DECISIONS, MINISTERS WOULD BE REDUCED TO THE STATUS OF MESSENGERS, ONLY ABLE TO TELL US WHAT HAD BEEN DECIDED BY OTHERS ON OUR BEHALF. BRITAIN COULD BE OUTVOTED ON EVERY ISSUE.**

Why have the British public been so consistently misled, and why has the truth about the real intentions and goal of the E.E.C. and European Union been concealed from them? Why has Mrs. Thatcher been so frequently attacked by the media and the Press since she rejected European Union?

“Demand of your M.P. that British Law prevail even if that means withdrawal from the E.E.C.”

(Continued at foot of next column)

## JUDGMENTS ON THE MONEY POWER

**Bishop Burnet** in *History of My Own Times*, 1693.

“The fear of the centralization of the money power was indeed the grounds upon which the Tories in Lords and Commons fought bitterly against the founding of the Bank of England, thinking that the Bank would grow to be a monopoly. All the money of England would come into their hands; and they would in a few years become the masters of the stock and wealth of the nation.”

**W. E. Gladstone**, four times Prime Minister and former Chancellor of the Exchequer.

“From the time I took office as Chancellor I began to learn that the State held, in the face of the Bank of England and the City, an essentially false position as to finance. . . . The hinge of the whole situation was this: the Government itself was not to be a substantive power in matters of finance, but was to leave the Money Power supreme and unquestioned. In the condition of that situation I was reluctant to acquiesce, and I began to fight against it. . . . I was tenaciously opposed by the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank” (from Morley’s *Life of Gladstone*).

**His Holiness Pope Pius XI** in his Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno, The Social Order, Its Reconstruction and Perfection*.

“. . . It is patent that in our days not wealth alone is accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination are concentrated in the hands of a few who, for the most part, are not the owners but only the trustees and directors of invested funds which they administer at their good pleasure. . . . This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, also govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life-blood to the entire economic body and grasping in their hands, as it were, the very soul of production so that no one can breathe against their will.”

The line of thought of “Save our Sovereignty” is expanded in the following:

### What Price Europe?

“Europe is the faith” said Belloc. That however was before the emergence of the present European Community. The European Parliament is already dominated by a Left-of-Centre consensus comprising Freemasons and Marxists of varying hues. The mind of contemporary Europe is therefore rather that of Lodge and Party rather than of the Church. In fact, therefore, the socio-political-moral consequences of the European Community as at present constituted are to be feared even more than the E.E.C.’s CAP.

There would therefore seem to be no justification for Christian support for the present “European Movement”. On the contrary, both the rights of God and man’s inalienable human rights demand that Christians should unite in resisting the pretensions of all existing European institutions, in defending the prerogatives of their national governments and in doing everything possible to defend what little is left of Christ’s social kingship in legal, social and cultural institutions.

Hamish Fraser, *Approaches*, No. 90, 1985.