

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 42, No. 12

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1962

6d. Fortnightly

Power and Authority

"The objective is establishment of effective distinction between Power and Authority: Power, which cannot be destroyed, and may be distributed, and Authority, which can be neither destroyed nor distributed. Law, in nature and human society, is the discoverable expression of Authority; 'laws' are enactments of Power. Only when laws truly reflect Law, is the 'State' of society healthy. We can proceed towards making the necessary distinction effective only by stages". (Social Credit Secretariat directive).

It ought to be, but unfortunately it is not, apparent to everyone who takes an intelligent interest in these matters [the "fundamental subject matter with which we have always been concerned, which is the relationship of the individual to the group"] 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.

—*The Social Crediter*, October 16, 1948.

The lawyers are in an incomparably better position to discuss their affairs (and ours) with either the public or the Government than the doctors were or than the educators are going to be. The former were tripped up from the start by their false assumption that because they were experts (such as we have) in the treatment of disease they were experts in politics and administration. The educators should know better, and would know better if their foundations had not been undermined; but their foundations have been undermined, and they don't. The lawyers are playing an 'at home' game, and know the terrain—or should do so. At the same time, they are by habit and training literalists rather than social philosophers, and the reference to them in the New Testament, and the charge brought against them there should not pass unremembered—that they took away the key of knowledge, and not only did not enter in themselves but "them that were entering in, ye hindered". We shall see how they get on.

In the meantime, we think we have spotted a confusion of the essential point in M. de Jouvenel's treatment in that excellent book, *Power*, to which reference has been made in these pages. The point is the relationship between Power and Authority, and M. de Jouvenel's book IV opens with the statement that "Power is authority and makes for more authority". He goes on to say that Power (which is authority) "is force and makes for more force. Or, if a less metaphysical terminology is preferred, ambitious wills, drawn by the lure of Power, expend unceasingly their energies in its behalf that they may bind Society in an ever tighter grip and extract from it more of its resources".

As a proposition concerning *something*, this is incontestably right; but is that something authority? In a later passage M. de Jouvenel reveals that he has been not so much 'meta-physical' as rhetorical in his identification, for he recognises that, when Power is expanding, 'those who wield authority in Society' are Power's 'natural enemies'. So there is an authority which is not Power's authority until it has possessed itself of it. As we thought, just as there is power with a 'lower case' p and Power with a capital initial, so there is an ambiguity about the notion of authority. The Authority in which we, and we believe the world, are vitally interested is an Authority which no one can 'wield', not even Power.

There is nothing mystical in this conception. What Douglas has given to the world is at once a conception of the just relationship of Power and Authority and the technical means of effecting their separation from one another in any other relationship but a Right relationship. This resolution is *necessary* to the continuance of human life and society.

—*The Social Crediter*, December 25, 1948.

We cannot too highly value some words of the Dean of Winchester at the close of an article in the June (1951) number of *Theology*. While they are meant to refer to the present position of the Church of England *vis-à-vis* what is called 'Reunion', and do explicitly refer to it, by a parenthesis they are placed within the legitimate range of this review. These are the words —

"The issue which I believe underlies the whole process (and indeed much else that is afoot in the world to-day) is that of authority, and until that issue is tackled on a far larger scale than is the case at present, I do not think we shall get much farther. But that is another matter, and one that may well call for at least a century of work".

By all the means in our power we should endeavour as Social Crediters to underline this objective, for the re-establishment of authority as the basis and the sole basis from which successful social life can proceed is fundamental to our case. "Power cannot be destroyed: it can only be transferred. Authority cannot be destroyed neither can it be transferred". Both these assertions, which are complementary, contradict the prevailing pretensions of current thought, and action based upon these pretensions departs from reality in the same measure as they depart from truth.

The dogmas from which the whole world suffers are cunningly contrived: that authority can be redistributed by Act of Parliament, and that power can be destroyed by 'democratising' it. Perhaps with the Dean of Winchester's estimate before them, Social Crediters will cease to deem themselves slow if they do not accomplish their task this year.

—*The Social Crediter*, June 23, 1951.

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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
Offices—Business: 9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon 3976.

Editorial: PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON N.W.1. Telephone: EUSon 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business—Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Editorial—Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones, Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36 Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia, Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSon 3893) Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420 Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O. Sydney, N.S.W.

From Week to Week

A major political reality of our time is that the 'uncommitted', 'neutral' or merely 'colonial' nations have, neither individually nor collectively, any independent significance. Their apparent significance arises from the fact that the real Powers sustain a forum, the United Nations, by which they can make an appearance on the stage. Clearly, however, not one of them could make war against a policy of a real Power; and collectively they do not possess an organisation by which they could exert their collective will, if they had such a thing. But as a means for the dismantling of the British Empire—the objective pursued by the Financial Power through the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.—they have been indispensable.

The object of all this? To obtain legal control of the raw materials of industry, and thus, by control of industrial civilisation, to control the world.

To see this matter, or policy, in true perspective, it is necessary to consider the 'sins' of Capitalism. *Private* Capitalism 'exploited' the Worker for the sake of Profit. What did the Capitalist do with his profit? In a limited way, he indulged in luxury living—limited, because the possibility of personal consumption is limited. On a much larger scale, however, he invested his profit, which means that he further expanded industry, and since expanded industry required a market, he expanded it to provide for the requirements of the 'exploited' workers.

But *States* as Capitalists (and so called Communist States are as Capitalist as others) spend their 'profits' on grandiose schemes, such as space exploration, which are most unlikely to benefit the Common Man for generations—if ever. And an International Capitalist Government—controlling the Capital of the world, it would necessarily be Capitalist—would carry this sort of exploitation to the ultimate: the reconstruction of the globe over an indefinite period in the interest of a master-plan. It is not difficult to imagine the whole world organised as a launching-site for space 'probes'.

The 'Freudian' Pair

"Yet the new Russia has not ceased to be a 'Messianic' nation; quite the reverse. For she is, even more blatantly than America, setting before all the nations of the world a conception of life and of existence which far transcends the political and social order . . . Either from resignation, or from a yearning for new adventures, certain not ignoble spirits have already agreed to hand over our destiny to one or other of the despots. Is it, in fact, so very easy to distinguish between them? Both by instinct and sentiment, America remains individualist in theory, but in practice the irresistible logic of a system of production is pushing her towards collectivism . . . [Quoted from *Foreign Affairs*, 1949]. 'America should first resolve the conflict developing within her own borders between the tradition handed down by the Fathers of the Constitution, and the methods imposed by an over-industrialised society, now committed up to the hilt to a policy of militarisation. There is a clash between the old ideal which still lingers on, and the new spirit of technology which is obtruding itself.'"

" . . . In Russia, it is true, the machine for stamping out individuality may be simpler to operate, but the fact remains that America and Russia are using techniques which in the human sphere produce almost identical results: in both, man is sacrificed, destroyed, transformed into a *thing* . . . 'Technology, the mother of big business, is the grandmother of State intervention, and it is the same in Pittsburg as in Magnitogorsk'."

—Henri Massis in "*The Choice before Europe*", by Marshal Juin and Henri Massis, 1958.

Freedom of Choice

The problem of free will, freedom of choice, and predestination, arises in the affairs of nations to at least the same extent as it does in the lives of individuals. "We couldn't do that *because* . . ." is, of course, a colloquial assertion of the theory of determinism.

It is for this reason, amongst others, that we endeavour, in these pages, and to the best of our ability, to direct the attention of our readers to those points where, it appears to us, the major obstacles of effective free will can be found, and we have no doubt whatever that it is in the nature of collectivism itself—"the common good", "the people", "the public", that we find the soil from which the Devil grows his crop. The Anima Mundi is not human; only individuals are human, but not all of them. The subject is both subtle and comprehensive; it is complicated by intentional miseducation which suggests, against all experience, that a mob is the sum of the individuals in it. A library could well be devoted to the subject; but at the moment we confine ourselves to one aspect, collective murder, or war.

The *Protocols of Zion*, an unsurpassed treatise on the use of collectivism to murder individuals, remarks, "Nothing is so dangerous" [to us, the authors] "as initiative". There is no possibility of initiative coming from a collectivity; a collectivity is *formed* to carry out a policy. That is to say, a collectivity is the *tool* of policy.

Now, and we beg our readers to realise it, firstly we are enmeshed in an era of tool-power politics, and secondly, that the human being, and the mechanisms he uses are becoming nearly homogeneous. We will not stress the point, because no serious student of affairs would question it.

This situation is not the outcome of a similar initiative spontaneously emanating from every individual and producing that characteristic, Satanic fable, the Common Will, so effectively used by Rousseau. It proceeds from the presentation of the World and Society as living under certain compulsions—at the present time, "Russia", "dollar shortage", "Food shortage". And, because war is a function of tool-power, war is the final sanction of tool-power politics. "Only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large scale-planning" (P.E.P.: Chairman Moses Israel Sieff).

There is nothing novel in this statement. "That there is no contradiction between *practical* Socialism (Planning) and extreme militarism, was fully recognised in Germany sixty years ago. In 1892 August Bebel, a leading Social Democrat (State Socialist) told Bismark that 'the Imperial Chancellor can rest assured that German Social Democracy is a sort of preparatory school for militarism'. It could not be anything else, and remain socialism". —(*The Brief for the Prosecution*, p. 51).

It is against the background of this policy that we have to consider the politics of the past sixty years. The greatness of Great Britain and the British Empire resided in the tradition of personal initiative—freedom. It was necessary to the success of the World Dominion Plot that the British should be fettered, and war was seen to be the instrument of the collectivism which would infallibly ruin them. *Every statesman of the Old Order* (Salisbury, Grey, Neville Chamberlain) *who recognised that war should and could be avoided*, from before the South African War to the present time, has been eliminated by the same influences dominant now and exemplified in "the guilty men of Munich" propaganda.

If, as we believe, collectivism has certain inherent attributes, which are inimical to the human being (although it is quite possible that collectivism is a preparatory stage to genuine individualism—an aboriginal soil from which the conscious man emerges), it is clear that to oppose a collectivity by another collectivity is merely to stimulate the growth of both of them, just as we have seen the war collectivities, and the factory industrial system which is part of them, grow, not in one country, but in every country.

There are two major considerations which alone offer an escape from what would appear at first sight an inescapable bondage; the fact that internal disruptive factors will wreck any collectivity *if it is not attacked from outside*; and the rectification which can be effected if the power to contract-out can be established. It has been said that the most—perhaps the only—hopeful development of international law is in the field of neutrality. Neutrality is, of course, the power to contract-out.

—*The Social Crediter*, September 3, 1949.

Foresight

The grant of independence to Ruanda-Urundi under pressure from the United Nations was noted in the *Daily Telegraph* some weeks ago, and a little later the *Sunday Express* gave an account of some disturbances in that country. A child could have foreseen them. On June 27 the *Daily Telegraph* reported Sir Roy Welensky as saying that if the grant of independence to Ruanda-Urundi were followed by chaos and bloodshed, it would be "a triumph for the grand Communist design in Africa". Sir Roy also attacked the saying of Mr. Mennen Williams that the United States had checked Communist infiltration into Africa.

The results that follow causes are clearly predictable, they have been foreseen and will be foreseen. But foresight or plain common sense of this kind is at present restricted to those on the very fringe of public affairs; those in a position of influence either lack foresight and common sense, or they have not yet made use of those attributes.

Another immediate series of events is taking place in Canada. The Governor of the Bank of Canada retires, presumably because the Prime Minister has rejected his advice; the Prime Minister declares on the eve of the general election that he has the "unemployment problem licked"; and immediately after his re-election he introduces measures of drastic "economy".

These measures will bring restriction and probably suffering to Canadians. Their country is rich in minerals in the North and in food in the South, yet for purely financial reasons or considerations, they are denied access to this real wealth. It is a clear case of pressure from *outside* the productive system, in fact the financial system has tightened its strangling control over production, which is only to be distributed according to rules prescribed by finance.

The Canadians seemed to have been aware of some of these events as they no longer voted so wholeheartedly for Mr. Diefenbaker: a number turned again to the "Social Credit" Party, so-called, which, on the face of it at least, is dedicated to grasping the financial nettle. I take it that the Liberal Party which has also gained in strength, is more inclined to "America" than the Progressive Conservatives. Possibly the wrangle which took place in America between the Cardinals Spellman and McIntyre, Dr. Billy Graham and Mr. Herbert Hoover on the one hand and the New York Board of Rabbis on the other, over the very harmless-looking prayer, with which the State schools begin their day, may have caused some Canadians to think again about their neighbour.

A number of people have some appreciation, in a fatalistic kind of way, about what is happening in Africa. But few will bestir their minds or clean them of prejudices to consider what is happening to Canada, whose economy is so clearly being assaulted by evil forces. The word economy means simply household management. The running of British homes is interfered with by these same forces, so that people are diverted from the real business of living to petty worries of a financial kind.

I believe Mr. Macmillan is correct in one respect—that the people do not want socialism. He fails to see that they do not want it from a "Conservative Party" any more than from a

"Labour". He contents himself with government by metaphor and simile. We are to have a "touch of the brake"; bye-elections are like an "exhaust pipe"; Africa is subject to a "wind", and now we may say we see him "forging ahead regardless" to the Common Market.

The responsible and adult individual will take little notice of these figures of speech but will require the virtues of foresight and common sense. If these are applied to the current situation, he will see that somewhere from the shadows, evil pressures are being exerted—not least through the mechanism of finance—to stunt the growth of the British Commonwealth and to degrade its people. If he desires to alter the direction of events, and to move towards freedom and personal responsibility, he needs to use such influence as he has to reveal the truth and to rectify fashionable errors. For the Way, the Truth and Life itself are inseparable.

Portugal

THE FOLLOWING REPORT IS FROM *Portugal*, JUNE 1962, PUBLISHED BY THE PORTUGUESE SECRETARIAT FOR INFORMATION:

The Portuguese Foreign Minister, Dr. Franco Nogueira recently addressed a group of British journalists who visited Lisbon. He answered many questions on the Portuguese provinces in Africa, Goa, the Azores, the United Nations, the Congo and so forth. He was asked if the Portuguese Government expected incidents in the Province of Mozambique, on the East African coast, as a sequel to the conflict in Angola. The Minister replied: "We anticipate trouble everywhere. Mozambique is no exception. Tanganyika officials have made no secret of the fact that they intend to help Mozambique nationalists—if 'nationalists' is the word".

The minister added:

"We have found out that 'nationalists' in some places include even Poles and Algerians, and it was a British newspaper which only recently carried a report to the effect that Algerians and other assorted nationalities were training in North Africa for "work" in Angola and other places.

"Goa—The situation there at the moment is not exactly clear, but 50-60 Portuguese passports are being issued daily to persons wishing to leave. Big changes are under way. The police and administration have been changed and religious persecution has now started. Before the Indian Union took over there was complete freedom of religion; the standard of living was four to five times that of India and the administration was sound and efficient. All that has gone.

"Angola—Contrary to reports freely circulating in many places, only eight per cent. of the country—by the northern border—was affected by the recent troubles there. So it is not right to say that what happened in Angola was a rebellion. The population of that particular area is some 450,000, but only two or three thousand Angolans were involved, many of them through fear and blackmail. Yet we had a (British) magazine claiming 500,000 persons were killed.

"Azores—Negotiations with the United States on a new agreement for U.S. bases in the Azores are not taking place, as reported in some quarters. At least, they are not taking

place now. It would be more appropriate to put any questions on this matter to the 'interested party'.

"United Nations—We are accused in the U.N. of atrocities, slavery, denial of human rights etc. Often these accusations have the support of our dear Western friends. I find myself hard put to it not to laugh at the impudence of it all. Look at Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia, Guinea, Ghana and so on, some of the countries in the forefront of these accusations. Why, the Saudi Arabian Government officially announced, quite recently, the appointment of a new director for slave affairs. Yet Saudi Arabia is one of the strongest leaders of the anti-Portuguese section in the U.N., and as for Ethiopia, well, I was in Addis Ababa just two years ago and saw slaves being sold just outside the city, but Ethiopia is a 'champion of democracy' in the U.N. and has the support of many western nations.

"Congo—Here again we see the Indian set-up and influence. The largest contingent there is Indian. But what happens when they are relieved by other Indian groups? Do they go home? No sir, they don't. They stay on, bring their families over to join them and fresh recruits take their place. All this trouble there is wrong, but look at the interests involved.

"Spain and Portugal—It is not true that we are contemplating a Federation, however loose. We maintain very close, cordial and intimate relations with the Spanish Government in all fields, and reports of a Federation are without the slightest foundation. We don't need to federate to understand one another and to co-operate on all matters of common interest for our two nations".

Finally, when questioned about the position of Portugal as regards the admission of Spain to NATO, the Foreign Minister stated:

"We have, for years, held the view that Spain should be a full member of NATO. It is not complete without Spain".

Political Systems

Many sing the praises of ready-made political systems, which they would apply to every social structure irrespective of its nature, at every stage of advancement and culture, to every race and in every climate. They are indifferent to human personality and the conditions under which nations live, for they are obsessed by their individual political doctrines or dreams of domination. Their *a priori* reasoning divorces them from reality, and, disregarding the lessons of history, they are all too eager to build a future whose foundations are not in the past. For them retrospection is a vanity. Such is not our outlook.

—Dr. Antonio de Oliveira Salazar; Address to the National Assembly on April 28, 1938. From *Doctrine and Action* by Dr. Salazar, published by Faber and Faber Limited, November, 1939.