

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 37. No. 2.

SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1958.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

### The Political Problem\*

by C. H. DOUGLAS

It is a curious commentary on our carefully directed educational system that what is perhaps the most quoted phrase of that useful tool of international Finance, Abraham Lincoln—"Government of the people, for the people, by the people"—is an exposure and condemnation of Lincoln himself. What is a people?

The United States in 1861 consisted broadly of two Anglo-Saxon settlements, the "Yankees" or new Englanders, in the North, the descendants of the bitter Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Settlement, and the Southern land-owners, very much of the George Washington type, the Lees, Randolphs, the cadets of many Scottish Lowland families. Hereditarily, these were a "people" in any usual sense of the word. The rest of the population was an undigested mass of Dutch, German and Mid-European elements, the disappearing "Red Indians," and the negro slaves.

It is only necessary to contemplate these unquestionable facts to be convinced that Lincoln's words are "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." Two parts of the only recognisable whole led the two sides of the American Civil War: Lincoln's actual policy (*i.e.*, the policy of which he was the visible executive) contradicted almost every one of his spoken statements—as for instance, his declaration that any country had a right to secede if it had the power—and a cold analysis of his most publicised apophthegms indicates that they can bear any meaning which it may appear desirable to read into them.

If the orbit of the ideas for which Lincoln's verbiage was supposed to be the expression were bounded by the North American Continent, they might be left to work out their true meaning, as they are doing to-day, on the graveyard of the noble redskin. But of course, they did not originate in America, and they are not confined to it. Lincoln's travesty of "Democracy" is the sheet anchor of the Supreme State; *vox populi, vox Dei* is the travesty and blasphemy of the Immanence of Good; and Tool Power Politics is the Incarnation as manifested in the Coming of the Prince of This World, the False Messiah.

Nothing is more remarkable in matters of politics than the sheer inability of even thoroughly honest and well-intentioned people to realise the consequences of their opinions.

\* Originally published in *The Social Crediter*, February 16, 1946.

There are as many definitions of "democracy" as there are men; yet, in fact, as has been admirably expressed in an Australian Broadcast, the key to democracy is to reduce a problem to the limits of interest and understanding of those concerned. That is to say, democracy is not so much a question of the mechanism of voting (although that is not of negligible importance); but rather a rigorous exclusion of matters for which the franchise is too wide: and at the present the number of persons who think they understand everyone's business, but cannot manage their own, would suggest simple electoral issues.

It is not too much to say, I think, that anyone who cannot grasp this simple idea, or, having understood it, will not admit its validity, is unworthy of a vote and is a public danger if in possession of it. In the light which it throws upon the limitations of democratic theory, it is perfectly understandable that the condition of the world in general and Great Britain in particular has deteriorated in proportion to the extension of the ballot-box plot. No one would give a child of six a ten-pound note, turn him loose with a box of matches in a firework shop, and tell him to set off the pretty rockets. But that is exactly what has been done by giving the initiative to an uninstructed—worse, a misinstructed—electorate, and allowing it to provide something claimed to be a mandate to interfere in the business of everyone having "a vested interest."

There are many matters which require attention; but interference with them will only deliver us from bad to worse until we can admit that power without understanding is the tool of the Devil. There is only one worse thing than the fool in politics and that is the technical expert who knows everything about his business except its legitimate object. We have often miraculously survived the former; but the latter shows signs of writing our epitaph.

Re-issued **The Approach to Reality**  
Address to *Social Crediters* at Westminster on March 7, 1936  
Together with *Answers to Questions*  
by C. H. DOUGLAS.

World Copyright Reserved.

1/6.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
Lincoln Chambers, 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

### FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which 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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.*  
 Offices—*Business and Editorial:* 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.  
 Telephone: *Belfast 27810.*

### Many Inventions

By B. C. BEST.

In the *Hibbert Journal* for October, 1957, "The Religion of Nature" by Dr. Basil Willey is reviewed by H. J. McLachlan. Both the author and the reviewer are agreed that the religion of nature is not enough; but the subject of Dr. Willey's book is not here in question. What is questioned is a statement of Mr. McLachlan's which he makes towards the conclusion of his review. "Mechanisation can be, and is, soul destroying," we read. It is a statement that, made without comment or qualification, is simply not true and, further, is misleading and monstrous in its implications. But it is accepted today almost as a truism by both thinking and unthinking people alike. One might suppose that those who are concerned for the preservation of man's soul, would, with one accord, make their voices heard in condemnation of mechanism and demand its abolition. But no; to any such suggestion the cry is always—"We cannot put the clock back." So evidently man's soul must remain in jeopardy.

The question to be considered, however, is who put the clock forward *and for what purpose?* Mechanisation is a means not an end, and it is *mechanical*, and can have no will or purpose of its own, either, in the case in point, to save, or destroy the soul. It has been designed and is not a designer, and is the outcome of man's imagination and powers of invention designed by him to save labour. It has an ancient lineage, and goes back to the invention of the wheel, which is itself strictly mechanical, and a part of a great deal of important machinery, and at the start, attached to a barrow or cart, saved time and labour in transport. Time and labour, the saving of which, over the centuries, has been immeasurably increased by man's further inventions and discoveries, and which could and should be regarded by him as an inheritance, endowing him with the leisure and freedom to use his powers in directions other than for purely material ends—to consider the "Lilies of the Field"—to choose "the better part."

Why, then, has man been deprived of his inheritance, and permitted it to be deflected from the end which he intended, and used as an instrument to destroy his soul? Why, put more directly, has he stood by unheeding while his inheritance of leisure has been directed and transformed into an unemployment problem? Why has he allowed himself to be referred to as a "cog in a wheel," otherwise as part of the machine designed to serve him, until he himself becomes completely robotised and loses his status as a human being?

Whoever or whatever has done this thing man cannot be acquitted of guilt and responsibility with regard to it. It is a heinous offence for a man to cast away his inheritance, or worse, to stand by tacitly and allow it to be filched from him and used for ends inimical to him, and for a purpose alienated from truth and reality. He might at least ask himself the question as to how a policy of Full Employment can be made to go hand in hand with a process of increasing and rapidly increasing mechanisation without resulting in a state of mounting conflict and chaos. What have the scientists, who are supposed to stand for fact and reality, and whose prestige and importance are being emphasised today, to say about such a policy of alienation? And what of psychologists? The cause of such a schizophrenic condition should engage their attention, and be a subject for their analytical research.

It is idle to quote the dictum: "If a man will not work neither shall he eat." Such a dictum can only, in reason, be made to apply in the case of a community which depends entirely on the labours of its members to produce a sufficiency for all: in such a case it is only fair that the member who will not work should be the one to go short. Unfortunately, however, the word 'work' has been given a moral connotation wholly inapplicable. For work is a means, not an end in itself; and while, in cases, moral judgment may be passed on the end for which one works, to apply such a judgment to work itself is to confuse the means with the end, and to make a virtue of a necessity. But the result of such a judgment has been to give the 'worker'—as understood and determined by the Labour and Leftist parties—an undeserved prestige to which, nevertheless, it should be noted, no privilege is attached or allowed; for should he be displaced by some mechanistic device he becomes dependent on the state. Indeed he is at all times dependent, either on a job if he can find one, or on the state if he cannot, and it denotes a certain measure of realism on the part of the 'worker' that he refers to his work as a 'job,' since he knows quite well that the end of the work for him is and must be the pay packet. He is in fact and perforce a mercenary. It may be retorted here that the business man, the industrialist, the 'wicked profiteer,' who employs the 'worker' is also a mercenary. And in the sense that, and in those cases in which, with all the cards stacked against him, his living depends upon his making a profit, this is of course true.

By contrast the privilege that pertains to the privileged class, referred to by the 'worker' as 'the idle rich,' lies in the fact that its members are free to choose the end and nature of the work they do, and to seek and find satisfaction therein. Their security and freedom are based upon the surety and security of free income, whether acquired from their own past endeavours and savings, or from that of their forbears, based in short, on an inheritance. But the common, the national inheritance and its beneficial results of freedom and leisure, due to man's many inventions and discoveries, is denied to man. It has been filched from him, not for the sake of its material and cultural benefits which could be made accessible to all, but for the sake of that power with the intention to destroy man body and soul, and at the last to gain complete dominion over him, and which perforce must forever be the sworn enemy of man's freedom and leisure. The plan to establish a World

Government should make this clear and nothing could serve this plan better than to attribute the destruction of man's soul to mechanisation, for it helps to preserve the anonymity of the real perpetrators. Further, the policy of Full Employment is perfect for their purpose. Although such a policy must clash with the increasing and continuing rate of mechanisation and must, inevitably, be the cause of tension and conflict, no one questions it. Those who are free from the tyranny of such a policy, either from a jealous dislike of seeing their privilege extended to all, or through sheer stupidity, fail to see the inroads made upon their own freedom, by means of the many devious methods of taxation and inflation, with the intent to reduce them also, in the end, to the level of paid 'workers,' or state dependents. Even the scientists who pride themselves on their fidelity to facts and reality make no protest. So there is no need for brain-washing and propaganda to induce people to accept such a policy; it works, as it were, automatically. Also, ironically enough, mechanisation can be drawn in to serve its purpose by putting it to the use of grandiose schemes and projects, not in the interests of man's well-being, but to foster man's pride, and create the need for a multiplicity of agents and employees to further them, and thus maintain the fiction of the need for Full Employment.

It should perhaps be said in fairness to Mr. McLachlan that he does not intend to leave us entirely in the lurch. For, while agreeing with Dr. Willey that nature worship can be no substitute for religion, he does suggest that if resorted to, it can "to a great extent, restore the soul's balance." Leaving aside the fact that the view of nature as a balm, a restorer is purely myopic, the healing to be found in its fairer face can only act as a dope, or a way of escapism. If used as an aid to enable man to accept a situation based on lies and deception, and blind him to facts and reality, resort to it can only be at the best sentimental, and at the worst a matter of the grossest hypocrisy. For what warrant or authority can be found in nature, or what efficacy for healing, while the end result of man's obedience to and application of nature's laws is perverted, and presented not as the freedom from compulsive work, but as the tyranny of soul-destroying mechanisation?

An answer to this question is long overdue. It should provide an additional and juster occasion for our "Angry Young Men" upon which to vent their spleen.

An effort to evade it and one becoming increasingly popular—and incidentally of great advantage to the Powers-that-be, and probably instigated by them—is to state categorically that man's technical knowledge and skill have outstripped his wisdom. This makes the course of events appear to be inevitable and irrevocable, and thus seems to render man powerless to arrest them, and to acquit him of responsibility. But the statement in itself is meaningless, for wisdom does not accompany knowledge, it belongs to another and higher category and cannot be outstripped. Notwithstanding, unless based on common sense wisdom is chimerical, and lures along strange paths to vain and dubious conclusions. Common sense is, therefore, wisdom's indispensable foundation. It is, as denoted, common, and accessible to all, and its importance cannot be over-estimated, for it lays on man a common responsibility, neglected and evaded at his peril. But, faithfully observed and properly directed, it is the faculty that can throw light on this question

of the use and abuse of mechanisation and its relation to employment and freedom, which is today of momentous and fateful concern.

### Education\*

by G. D. GILLING SMITH

The fight for the independence of the school at Lindsell and the opposition of the Catholic Church to certain measures in the 1945 Education Act are but isolated exceptions to a general acceptance of education, without any qualifying adjective, as the least disputable benefit conferred by the state in its relatively new capacity of chief spender of the subject's income (43 *per cent.* I believe is the current figure). It has become as axiomatic to greet it as synonymous with automatic "progress" as the axiom of automatic progress which it has so successfully helped to propagandise. Occasionally doubts about its nature seem to ripple to the surface in letters to the national newspapers about the number of Communist candidates who are school teachers or the fact that low salaries in the profession have the effect of attracting the better men out into industry leaving more posts in schools open to hacks who are more likely to "move with the accepted tendencies of the time" or, if need be, to do as they are told. In the not so public forum of *The Nineteenth Century*, Professor W. L. Burn made, a year or two ago, an interesting observation on the 1945 election. He pointed out that the standard syllabus for history in the School Certificate Exam was the 19th century. It was probably the only history taken seriously by the bulk of that "educated" population which took jobs after the School Certificate or specialised in other subjects. It was the easiest thing he said to make socialism attractive within this limited framework on the level at which the subject was studied. You had the century beginning with details of the slums occasioned by the industrial revolution and the conditions in factories along with the employment of child-labour. You then build up the humanitarian movement, eulogising en route such figures as Shaftesbury and finally tagged it on to the Utopianism of the Fabians at the end of the century. The period usually finished in 1914 so there was room to fit in the Lloyd George budget "showing that people came to realise that society must *etc.*" and relating its national insurance schemes with "the benefits we have to-day and those we will have." The overall impression of automatic and inevitable progress (perhaps assisted by the teaching of pseudo-Darwinism on the "general science" side of the school) not only helped the mass-production of socialists but did much to weaken the opposition to socialism among those who refused to accept it as an ideal by presenting its measures as things that just happen. Now Professor Burn holds the chair of Modern History at Kings College, Newcastle and will therefore have intimate knowledge of the setting of a syllabus on at least one Matriculation Board. However he treated the subject purely in its electoral effects and left untouched the possibility that such an aspect of the educational system which provided excellent opportunities for socialistically minded teachers might be other than accidental. It might be an interesting field for investigation but a more important job must be

\* Reprinted from *The Social Crediter*, June 24, 1950.

done first. You have no firm ground for attacking men who take advantage of an educational system for political purposes antagonistic to your own if you have no clear idea in your own mind as to what education is. 'What is education for?' is a different question from 'What is education?' The first is daily answered—a sort of panacea that helps the sons of "common men" to rise up in the world, something that will make men reasonable and stop them fighting (I suppose that is the excuse for U.N.E.S.C.O.), that will stop people from coshing each other over the head and shop-breaking (the Borstal brothers), in other words something that can be put across as a substitute for religion, and at the same time a form of enlightenment which will cause people (usually Africans and Asiatics in this context) to abandon their deep-rooted superstitions (their religion). In addition to these frequently admitted aims there is that, which is most respected perhaps in the States, of education as an effective means for a man to make "good conversation." Perhaps this is the most straight forward and justifiable aim of "general education." But we have the testimony of Sir Thomas Beecham concerning its efficacy—"the public's taste in music has not improved in the last 50 years; it has merely become more streamlined, centering round a few well-known frequently played composers."

I do not wish to side-track into an argument on aesthetics: I merely mention the subject in passing to show where it fits into the conception of what education is for. The question "What is education?" still remains unanswered. It is as vague and undefined in contemporary thought as the other archetypes of twentieth century mythology—"democracy," "social security," "full employment," "money," "human rights," "social justice" and what is perhaps best described as "Ethical Christianity." A clue is perhaps offered about the nature of what most people mean by education if we look at the extreme examples of its products or more exactly the products of those institutions which are gradually being more closely copied by the majority of institutions elsewhere. I speak of the average American University graduate or undergraduate whose cultural expeditions to that quaint old museum Europe are no doubt familiar to the majority of readers. The aim and practice seems to be to find as much as possible of the detailed lives and arts of other men with as few as possible points of reference in their own lives. In this lack of relationship of course lies the reason for the complaint so often made about American voluminous literary scholarship—that it has no sense of proportion, the often quoted example being the satirical chapter heading, "How many children had Lady Macbeth?"

The movement in the direction of a "comprehensive general educational system" seems to be mainly a feature of the last 50 years or at any rate it is convenient to take the 1902 Education Act as a landmark in the canalising of education into the channels where it is now thought to belong. An essay written fifty years ago on "The Value of Education" (In *Le chemin de velours*—Mercure de France 1900) by Remy de Gourmont contains some extremely important observations on what education is and does. Unlike the majority of his successors in the criticism of education he does not concern himself with what education might do if certain conditions (smaller classes, better text books, more playing fields, no School Certificate

*etc.*) were fulfilled. The process had not gone far enough for his thought to be seriously assailed by the self-justifying axioms of education which greet us continually today. At the same time the process had already begun and he was familiar with the writings of those who were keen on fostering and directing it. Though many of his philosophical views would be unacceptable to Social Crediters such as that which accounts for the widespread belief in immorality as resulting from inability on the part of most egotistical human beings to imagine themselves as not existing, what has been described as his "caustic intellect" can be of assistance to us in our manifold task of questioning and breaking down axioms that are not axiomatic. He begins his essay (I quote from the authorised English translation by William Bradley) on a prophetic note:—"Without being as widespread as it might be, and as it will be, education is very much in vogue. We live less and less, and we learn more and more. . . . I have seen a man laughed at because he examined a dead leaf attentively with pleasure. No one would have laughed to hear a string of botanical terms muttered with regard to it; . . ."

(To be concluded)

### Views on Fluoride

The following letter was published by *The Mercury*, Hobart, October 14, 1957.

October 14, 1957.

Sir,

There are many objections to medicating the public water supply, but assuming that fluorides in water are harmless, and no man is in a position to prove that, let us look at other objections.

If a man cannot have access to fresh food and clean unadulterated water then he has lost one of his fundamental freedoms. If people want their water supply medicated that is their business. If they want to impose their ideas on everybody it is the business of the people to stop them.

Unless an intelligent man can exercise a choice in those things which he considers important for himself and his family he is not a free man.

The question which responsible men have to consider seriously is are we to have a free Christian society or a collectivist paradise for a few planners, a paradise where all decisions are made by a few at the top and no decisions allowed at the bottom.

It may take several generations to discover what are the repercussions from tampering with our water supplies. Let those who are interested club together and experiment with their families.

Fern Tree.

J. GUTHRIE.

### Intellectual Half-Caste

The initials of the author of the note in our last issue, under the above heading, were P.L.