

SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 72 No. 4

JULY – AUGUST 1993

NO LOOSE CHANGE

"...If (Francis) Bacon had been told that the country's minerals were "nationalised" and he could have grasped some idea of the strange new word, he would probably have asked what the Queen could do with them... But if told that the minerals were to be put at the disposal of a monopoly, he would have understood.

To put into contemporary terms the way his mind would have worked, we might say he would have asked "Do I get cheaper coal? More coal? Better coal? If I don't, is there some new, rapid, effective way by which I make my dissatisfaction felt upon those responsible? No? Then who is benefitting?

He would have gone to the heart of the problem. He would have grasped at once that here was the Divine Right of Kings in operation, raising up this man and putting down that. Two things would have concerned him. Where is the King? Is he doing a good job?

To leave the wise and witty Francis at this point to which he has led us, we can see that the transfer of powers and privileges from an individual to an organisation simply means the transfer of those powers and privileges to the persons controlling it. The organisation is an accommodation address. The police always suspect them. To call that organisation the State or the Nation is quite legitimate if you are quite clear that you have put the Divine Right of Kings into commission. If you imagine that there is anywhere in the world, either a democracy or any other system, which confers on Mr John Citizen an effective control or a beneficial share in those powers which he has been persuaded or jockeyed into transferring from a tangible to an intangible executive, then you are labouring under what may quite possibly prove to be a fatal delusion.

At the time of writing these lines (January 1944), it is already evident that "monetary reform" is coming out of the wilderness into the most respectable circles. That is good. But the idea that John Citizen must automatically benefit thereby is premature. Various well-meaning if somewhat naive organisations have stated, as though it were both axiomatic and desirable, that only "the State" has the "right" to issue purchasing power. That is the Divine Right of Kings complex once again. Mr Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of "England" may be heard to murmur "Nationalisation? We welcome it". A much abler, if less theatrical, banker, Sir Edward Holden, Chairman of the London, City and Midland Bank (Midland Bank) during the 1914-18 war, when told that his policy was leading directly to nationalisation of banking, replied, "Well, I don't care. I should still manage it".

To put the matter quite shortly, transfer of power almost certainly means transfer of policy. We have seen the transfer of power. What is the policy? Whose is the policy?

The policy is MONOPOLY."

[From "*The Brief for the Prosecution*", p.5 et seq., by C. H. Douglas]

TRUTH WILL OUT

The following is taken from *The Times* of June 1993:—

"The modest spring recovery in consumer confidence was confirmed by a rise of £194 million between March and April in consumer credit outstanding, almost identical to the previous month's rise of 0.6 per cent.

The two months together were the most buoyant period for two years.

The increase shows that consumers were not paying credit off so quickly, rather than that they were spending more. New consumer credit at £4.42 billion was £300 million lower than the revised £4.74 billion in March.

New credit advanced over the latest three months was still 7 per cent higher than in the previous quarter, with bank card credit rising 10 per cent. The figures exclude home loans."

Douglas's A plus B Theorem demonstrated mathematically that the rate of flow of consumer purchasing power is always slower than the rate of flow of prices to the consumer. But "they" still argue it is flawed!

C R E D O

In a world of PLENTY, there is no need for POVERTY and DEBT. We have the technology to feed, house and clothe all people on EARTH without destroying our environment. Whatever is physically possible and socially desirable can be made financially possible. This is EVERYONE'S CONCERN and it is URGENT.

One day he is happily at work, the next he is made redundant or is retired, and the next he is dead. Or as good as. In times of recession, the man who lived for his work is likely to die for it. He finds his *raison d'être* gone. Not only has he invested his time in his labour, he has invested his talents – his very being. He is suddenly bereft of work, of income and of self-esteem, and of largely unspoken social acceptance. Such is the legacy of the Protestant work ethic.

Circulating a paper on a "*Campaign for Real Work*", Dr Barrie Hopson and Mike Scally of Leeds University, put the position:

"Calvin secularised the priestly concept of 'vocation'.

Every person had a vocation and should endeavour to discover it, work hard at it for the good of the community and one's soul, for in that way lay the path to the Kingdom of Heaven".

They note:

"Feelings of guilt and shame at not being 'gainfully employed' still considerably affect the twentieth century conscience. Not to be and not to be seen to be working is to invite criticisms of laziness and idleness."

Yet, as Eric Butler has pointed out:

"...it is starting to dawn on a growing number of people that, in the absence of a major Third World War, 'full employment' is no longer remotely possible. The dynamic of the technological revolution is such that adequate production for all is possible without the services of the millions described as unemployed".

He develops the theme in the January 1993 *The New Times*, observing:

"In Australia at present, less than 40 per cent of the **total** population are currently 'employed', with approximately only 5 per cent being engaged in agriculture, including forestry."

In Australia, as in the UK – and indeed everywhere in the industrialised world – everyone needs income but not everyone can get a job.

As Hopson and Scally put it:

"...and getting a job in itself may satisfy only one need – the need for money. If that is all it satisfies, the employed person still needs to discover meaningful work."

Butler avers:

"All attempts to sustain an economic system based upon the goal of providing as much employment as possible require programmes designed to keep centralising power, the ultimate objective being some type of World State. But every attempt to reach such an objective must result in more of the social disintegration now a major feature of the world scene. The basic issue concerning employment is not employment as such, it is whether the individual cannot be trusted with freedom and must therefore be employed under central direction, generally on activities which are both economically and environmentally destructive, or whether the individual should be placed in a position where he can engage in self-employment".

As he emphasises:

"Basically, the much-discussed economic problem is a moral issue. If the true purpose of production is consumption, and if a diminishing minority of people operating an economic system based upon a capital and cultural heritage can easily produce an abundance of

THIS FIXATIO

required consumer goods, there is no **physical** reason why the abundance should not be readily made available to all members of a society. In all modern communities, money, a man-evolved system of symbols, is the mechanism by which individuals obtain access to what has been produced. It is elementary that if the technological revolution could be taken to its ultimate conclusion, with only a handful of people engaged in supervising the production system, then most people would be left without any financial incomes, and thus be unable to buy what was being produced. Rather than face the reality of a situation which makes it possible to provide the basic requirements of genuine independence for all, those with the power insist that no one should gain access to even a portion of the abundance without being employed. In other words, ready access to abundance is denied purely on **moral** grounds."

Hopson and Scally ask:

"How long are we going to perpetuate an outdated ideology that only values paid employment, when there will be less of it around for all and none of it around for some?"

How long are we going to allow politicians, the media, and our schools to develop policies and reward behaviour which pretends that nothing more significant than a temporary economic recession is causing our problems?"

But having posed the right questions, they miss the right answers.

They continue, "We need real jobs which may be from ten to forty hours a week, short-term or long-term, with opportunities for individual development and satisfaction built into them; real jobs, not any old jobs just so that unemployment figures are reduced.

"By real jobs we mean those with a real task, a real relevance in producing a product or a service which is needed by our/other communities. There should be no promotion of pseudo-jobs which contrive activity which is undervalued by those who carry it out or those who witness it. The task content of jobs must be experienced and seen as worthwhile, and not simply dreamed-up to keep people busy or to produce an excuse for giving them money."

Disregarding the value-judgments implicit in all that, it seems clear that **jobs as employees and on terms** are what the authors have in mind. The vision is of some agency, whether central or local government or some quango, busying itself in trying to generate such "real jobs". Certainly there is enormous scope in that direction, provided always the money were forthcoming to fund it. The building of modern housing to replace remaining slums; the restoration of areas of industrial dereliction; the upgrading of the social infrastructure in transport, water and sewerage systems, etc., etc. They represent "real jobs" as previously defined, and are all physically possible. And they could all be made financially possible – but only through a radical reform of our monetary system. And sadly, Hopson and Scally have nothing to say on that subject, though elsewhere they go so far as to say "We must separate out the issue of income from that of work".

ON ON WORK

They are similarly silent on how to finance the basic state income they advocate so strongly. "By real income we mean an amount sufficient to live a healthy and stable life. At present in our society we would advocate an income for each adult of £5,000 per year. This could be adjusted for particular age groups to match periods of higher need but would be regarded as a basic state income which is available to every adult citizen. It could be supplemented by other earnings, but even without those it would sustain an individual whether or not that extra was available. Already, we have a society in which a workforce of 24 millions supports a population of 56 millions, and nearly 63% of the post-16 population gets some kind of state income in the form of pensions, student grants, unemployment benefit and supplementary benefits. Given new technology, which is labour-saving and wealth producing, one prediction is that 10% of the population working with the new technology will be able to support the remainder..."

But again, the perceived physical possibility is not translated into the financially possible, and without that, their advocacy seems doomed. The more the pity, because a basic income would do far more than just provide people with the basic necessities of life. It would give them a platform of economic security which would enable them to **choose for themselves** how they should use both their time and talents. People of "independent means" already enjoy that freedom. They do not need a quango to organise their activities. They have the freedom to choose for themselves. The freedom is the essence.

The authors' brief reference to "the informal economy" gives a glimpse of the potentials. "More than half our working lives are spent in and around the home. More than a third of all work is done there; more than a third of all capital is invested there; more than three-quarters of subsistence, leisure and recreational activity is carried out there. The informal economy includes the production of arts and crafts, voluntary services, do-it-yourself activity, community services, food production in the garden or the allotment, and much else besides. The so-called black economy is an indication that a great many people find ways to be productive and creative even when jobs are not available."

And that exemplifies the difference between work that is compulsory and work undertaken from choice. Social Credit aims to expand people's options to choose by progressively underpinning their economic security – and hence their personal satisfaction.

Economic advances have rendered that entirely possible. What is urgently needed now is that the monetary system be adjusted to truly reflect the underlying economic realities instead of distorting them.

NOTE: An invitation to the authors of "Campaign for Real Work" to comment on this article received no response.—Editor, T.S.C.

Correction: We regret that in "One Step Further" in our last issue, the book entitled *The Great God Waste* was wrongly attributed to Thorsten Veblen. The author was John Hodgson. The book was published in 1933.

THE THREE ALTERNATIVES

"The policy of the world economic system amounts to a philosophy of life. There are really only three alternative policies in respect to a world economic organisation:—

The first is that it is the end in itself for which man exists.

The second is that while not an end in itself, it is the most powerful means of constraining the individual to do things he does not want to do; i.e., it is a system of Government. This implies a fixed ideal of what the world ought to be.

And the third is that the economic activity is simply a functional activity of men and women in the world; *that the end of man, while unknown, is something towards which most rapid progress is made by the free expansion of individuality, and that therefore economic organisation is most efficient when it most easily and rapidly supplies economic wants without encroaching on other functional activities.*"

C. H. Douglas

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas. The Social Credit Secretariat is non-party and non-class, neither connected with nor supporting any political party.

Subscription rates (one year): U.K. inland £10.00; overseas surface mail £12.00; overseas airmail £15.00; Australia \$10.00; New Zealand \$11.00; New Zealand airmail \$12.00.

Offices – Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD. Tel. 0787 76374.
– Editorial: 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 6LR.
– In Australasia (Subscriptions, Business and Books):
3 Beresford Drive, Samford, Queensland 4520.

BOOKS and booklets on the subject of Social Credit and allied subjects are available from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and in Australia from The Social Credit School of Studies, 3 Beresford Drive, Samford, Queensland 4520.

ADDITIONAL COPIES of THE SOCIAL CREDITER and back numbers are available from the above address.

U.K. enquiries for editorial and publicity phone 031 657 4740.

RECOMMENDED READING

Douglas, C. H.	The Brief for the Prosecution. The Development of World Dominion. Economic Democracy. The Monopoly of Credit. The Policy of a Philosophy. Social Credit.
Maré, Eric de	A Matter of Life or Debt.
Monahan, Bryan W.	Why I am a Social Crediter.
Robertson, Thomas	Human Ecology.
Social Credit Secretariat	Elements of Social Credit.

* Please send me **The Social Crediter** for a year

NAME:

ADDRESS:

.....

.....

Enclosed: £

Review**REAL ROYALTY**

What is Royalty actually for? This has to be answered definitively if the UK's form of it is to survive the Maastricht-required demise thereof in the interests of "ever-closer union". But not only the Euro-club is seeking the end of the Crown as we know it. There is unmitigated hostility emanating from the Australian prime minister and his cohorts. It would be polite to call the attack 'contempt' or 'detestation' but the sustained invective and powerful propaganda carries in it something more than personal opinion – it is an ideological crusade mounted for some as yet unfathomable reason. Whatever that is, it does prove one thing: Royalty is a danger to someone, somewhere whose authority is otherwise nigh total.

For such a one, the book of sundry speeches by Prince Charles over the last few years can only provoke a mightier outpouring of contumacy. *The People's Prince*, with a foreword by Sir Walter Crocker, erstwhile ambassador of Australia and Lieut-Governor of South Australia, published by Veritas for The Australian Heritage Society, goes quite a way to illustrating just why we must still have a monarch, and in particular this heir to the throne.

These addresses to architects and psychiatrists, doctors and scholars show the prince to be both humorous and perceptive, widely-read and topically informed. But they do more – they emphasise that here is a man at work. Here he is performing his function, his vocation. The texts are manifestly his own, with the input from advisers no more than the provision of press cuttings. He quotes knowledgeably from poets and dreamers, straight from his own predilection, yet also from the media and official statistics. In this, he is indeed the people's prince. It is almost gratuitously defensive for the cover to explain the contents as "Discovering the real Prince Charles".

No wonder that the Bilderberg-fomented Press froths at the mouth over the vicissitudes of his private life – if this man ever gets to the throne, some sanity will be restored to the UK and may rub off on the continental 'partners'. Charles will have to be stopped if 'One World' is to go ahead.

In this well-printed, well-presented volume, we have the reason for royalty. It gives an overview, a non-political critique of life and times. It is not detached, it is involved; it is compassionate; it is insightful. It is also highly spiritual.

Its questions are searching; its observations sharp. Of course, various thoughts are left tantalising in the air; sometimes they are banal where they could be cutting; they pull punches when the soft underbelly of government is exposed – but there is no greater multi-pundit who is a natural leader and thinker in these isles today. Thus, we hail this prince caught among the wastrels and wish he could impose his will upon them. Not that there is anything remotely Social Credit about his analysis. His solutions to prevailing problems are mainly ad hoc. They are pragmatic though he believes them to be principled. He bases his thinking on deistic lines, seeking the answer all too often in the soil. He lambasts commercialism yet can come up with simplistic notions to make one shudder:

"I was encouraged to learn, for instance, that the Group of 7 Summit meeting last year led to a close dialogue between the World Bank, the European Community and Brazil to define a pilot programme for Amazonia."

The Prince comfortably avers:

"It will no doubt include reserve areas as well as new models of harvesting the forest's resources."

Of course, of course, sir!

He considers this "the local approach" and adds:

"When people have a right to participate in defining what happens around them, when they have secure tenure to land and when they have a source of credit that is short of usury, they do invest in the long term."

That is typical of the waffle – "credit short of usury".

Yet he can also praise the late planner/philosopher Lewis Mumford's view: "if you fall in love with a machine, there is something wrong with your love life. If you worship a machine, there is something wrong with your religion."

Surely the prince can see that global finance is an invisible machine, but none the less monotheistic for that, and none the less wrong.

The nearest he comes to criticising the real politics of the world is noting the "anxieties of many Western Europeans not to allow their national identities to be subsumed in some characterless, grey, multi-national bureaucracy."

Apparently the valiant prince, scourge of city planners, does not dare to criticise the EC. Rather he adopts the tactic best displayed by Sir Geoffrey Howe and Mr Douglas Hurd who turn its warts into beauty spots. In refuting obvious overstatement, the audience is then led to refute the real trouble, too.

This failure to identify disease and simply to settle for dis-ease weakens the prince all through the book. He comes closest to both in his architectural assessments. He tells us:

"One prominent architect recently confessed airily and with no apparent sign of shame, that some of his own earlier buildings have ceased to interest even him, now that the thrill of creativity has worn off."

The prince is incensed:

"There is a terrible fecklessness to all this, when grown men can get whole towns in the family way, pay nothing toward maintenance, and call it romance."

Yet it is when wearing his environmental hat that he looks his finest. He advocates "a sense of partnership and dialogue that respects sovereign rights, a recognition that poverty is a key factor in environmental destruction, and that the solution to this involves liberating the human spirit and entrepreneurial effort from un-necessary bureaucracy, unacceptable corruption and inequity everywhere."

If this is his view of South America, does it not equally hold for Europe? And so?

Perhaps he is most comfortable in the realm of language. He makes spirited defence of the King James Bible, Shakespeare and The Book of Common Prayer; quotes Ruskin and Wordsworth, Shelley and Orwell; and quotes one-liners from Saki, Dr Johnson and Samuel Goldwyn. He even brings in a Greek god to edify psychiatrists. If this paragraph sounds a bit glib, it is because he can appear so with such diverse allusions. No doubt he is conversant with his sources, but the sheer cleverness of it leaves one caught between a gasp and a cheer. Still, there is no denying his sincerity and integrity as he expatiates to the Royal College of Psychiatrists upon their motto 'Let wisdom guide'. He does this for himself, and it is to be hoped that under him the nation will do likewise. Indeed, The Commonwealth – and especially Australia – must stand in the way of One World aspirations to eliminate Charles and his Divine calling. In human terms, a Statute of Westminster (11 Dec 31) requires the assent of Dominion Parliaments as well as the UK's to any change in the role of our monarchy.

Iain McGregor