

"All that is necessary
for the triumph of
evil is that good
men do nothing . . ."
— EDMUND BURKE



THE NEW TIMES SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 19 No. 02

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

February 2018

CONTENTS

A Paradox - the Evolving, Emerging Individual and the Evolving, Emerging Collective (state) By Arnis Luks	1
Jordan Peterson, Classical Liberalism, and Douglas Social Credit By M. Oliver Heydorn, PhD	3
Social Credit and the Christian Ethic By Norman F. Webb	7

A PARADOX - THE EVOLVING, EMERGING INDIVIDUAL AND THE EVOLVING, EMERGING COLLECTIVE (STATE) By Arnis Luks

The nearest the human mind and language can get to a statement of Truth is a paradox - "For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it," - it is quite probable that the approach to a practical problem, even our very actions themselves, may require to be in a sense paradoxical in order to be sound. - NORMAN F. WEBB

- * Language between a newborn and its mother is of a 'song' - utterances of different pitch to draw attention and communicate between themselves. This case is presented by British psychiatrist and author Iain McGilchrist, and also that 'pre-language man' sang to communicate. Is it any wonder the power of music moves the soul?
- * Life is a continuum as is the evolution of language and thought. It is not static. From 'our own' conception onwards we are developing, evolving and forming anew. Our cells are constantly being replaced as each cell in turn dies until finally the whole body dies. Our progeny live on. So it is with developing our intellect, we continue until age, disease or death occur, and so can hand our intellectual legacy to our progeny.
- * As humans we tend to think and express thoughts orally as they arise. When we speak them, those thoughts are tested for validity in the public arena of ideas. This is why the spoken word is so important and powerful. It is only in this arena of frank discussion and debate that thoughts can be challenged and tested and as individuals, and in concert (civilisation), we can develop and move forward. The design (collectivist purpose) behind the race laws (18C in Australia) and gender laws (C16 in Canada) is for thinking to become stunted and atrophied. The state is exceeding their boundaries of authority and encroaching into the area of the individual's rights and freedoms.
- * When a person is born they did not do anything to achieve this. They did not work for it, or in any way have a right to claim it. It is a free gift from our Creator. So it is that the individual is born free. The individual desires to be free. The collectivist (state) claims ownership over everything, including our children, like chattels.
- * There is much talk about rights. The right to an education, to life, to liberty, to happiness (whatever that means) and if you do not live in a communist/collectivist country, the right to property. Property, during times of duress, gives the owner the opportunity to provide their own stable food supply and security. With property rights also comes the right of inheritance including material, cultural, technological and spiritual. These rights of inheritance are most important. Common Law, part of our inheritance, took thousands of years to develop and the rights garnished are basically - do as you want except these things listed which you must not do...the reverse and opposite of a Bill of Rights. The collectivist (state) claims that a Bill of Rights is a good thing...what the state gives the state can take away! The state constantly issuing new laws and edicts to restrict the individual.
- * Every person is unique. When you look closely, even at identical twins, you see differences. Their choice of careers, preferences for certain music, literature or the arts can markedly differ. Clothing, food selection and other life choices go to show how different we all are. The physical appearance is what we see, but it is the inner part of a person that we get to know which becomes most apparent in a long term friendship and relationship, where their character, personality and innermost feelings come out. One individual over another may willingly impose significant suffering upon themselves to achieve desirable ends such as pursuing higher education, or building a home, or raising a family, or some other goal. Collectivism, in its many forms, acknowledges only the group (majority) at the expense of the individual. The collectivist will always present their actions, no matter how violent (the end justifies the means), being for the 'greater good'. Conformity, not uniqueness is king.
- * Only the individual can be moral. A person can be led astray by others but in the end they alone choose or refuse to do good (to others). Only the individual, not the group, can be held responsible. In fact, the individual can be lost to the group.

* Major issues discussed on TheCross-Road-ORG forum and also further personal study (continued next page)

(continued from previous page) In groups you are controlled by someone else such as the team captain or party leader.

The group, being controlled by someone, can outwork malevolence such as in a collectivist dictatorship, in the end even giving itself the power over life and death.

* In our 'freedom of choice or action' we cannot avoid considering others - our neighbours. We should ask: "Is what I am about to do good for me today, in a month, in a year AND is it good for my neighbour today, in a month, in a year?" In fact when we act in concert it should be for mutual benefit. We should consider the effects of what we are about to do to other nations, whether in commerce, trade, political, or relations. Our 'in concert' actions should be mutually beneficial, not exploitive.

As such, even our leaders - financial, political, industrial and religious - should be held to account. If they do good then they, as individuals, are deserving of our praise. The reverse is also true. Should they start a war, then they as individuals should face the risk of a war crimes trial. The tyrant or bureaucrat (collectivist) does not want to be held accountable for his/her actions, but rather remains aloof and above the law, in effect exercising what was once known as the 'divine right of kings'.

* If two or more individuals come together, even if it is only playing sport, it is for mutual benefit to achieve desired ends. Civilisations were formed this way, for mutual benefit including security and a stable food supply. How then, can we be free to love God when the state is supreme? You cannot, and there lies a paradox.

* In effect, Prof. JB Peterson said: In the Old Testament, the state is viewed as the entity of Salvation. The idea being, that through a succession of states, with people behaving properly, will eventually establish the proper state. In the New Testament, that idea gets 'deconstructed'. It moves from the utopian state vision to the responsible Individual. A state of individual Being becomes an Individual state of Redemption. Salvation moves from a utopian state vision to a responsibility of the Individual.

We need the state (law, security) but we also need and desire freedom. Unlimited freedom results in anarchy - Lawlessness. Neither the individual's freedom nor authority of the state should be supreme. Authority and freedom both need to be balanced. Freedom comes with personal responsibility, but the State must also be limited (responsible), such as in a Limited Constitutional Monarchy.

* Devolution, (handing power back to lower forms of governmental administration) needs to be pursued by each generation to continuously balance freedom and authority (state). If we are to maintain our freedoms then responsibility is unavoidable. Once we ask the state to manage 'something which we could do ourselves' we hand over our freedom, our rights. In Australia, the

Constitution, being the supreme law of the land, limits the power of Parliament to specific areas only.

The Constitution is not static, but rather robust enough to allow adjustment. Within it is the ability to add further States and also to make changes using Referenda. When the Authority (state) is overstepping its boundary it becomes the 'people in concert' responsibility to call it to order and make the necessary adjustments, if necessary, even to the constitution. This becomes unavoidable if we are to preserve and reinvigorate our's and our children's freedoms.

* Once an election ballot is completed it is only the start of the responsible vote. 'Nature Abhors a Vacuum', so when we vote irresponsibly (by not continually ensuring our representative is informed of our wishes), something will fill the void. Leaders of all persuasions, given the unbridled opportunity, will always take more power to themselves. Each voter, (whether they voted for that politician or not), needs to 'make contract' to ensure their representative is always informed of their wishes.

The position of 'handing over responsibility' or 'delegating authority' to the politician having been completed on the voting slip is incorrect. This simply hands the difficulty of 'removing authority and restoring freedoms' on to future generations. The similar error is hoping for the 'Strong Man' to fix our difficulties. This also leads from the milder Alt-Right onto facism and the dictator (collectives). We cannot avoid our individual responsibility to restore and reinvigorate our freedoms.

* Social Credit is the policy of the 'philosophy of freedom', insisting that the individual is free, moral and responsible. Social Credit also recognises the necessity of the state (Authority) but insist it must be limited to only those areas that cannot be performed by a lesser power (Devolution). That laws are to be 'only the minimum necessary' so the individual is free to pursue other things of their choosing, without adversely affecting others - our neighbours. It is a policy of freedom with responsibility.

CH Douglas's first book '*Economic Democracy*', is more focused on the 'rights of the individual to independence' than financial reform, although without financial independence the individual is not free at all. The financial system, being used as a 'tool of power' to control the individual using taxes, interest, inflation and an unbalanced price system, is specifically designed to cause unnecessary suffering by limiting, under the central-banker's control, access to our economic abundance which is only part of our cultural inheritance.

The technology-driven economic system is only part of the communities inheritance, but as such belongs to everyone as an equal share-holder in our country Australia, not collectively, as in the authoritarian state, nor, and especially, the banking-political-industrial coterie or oligarchy.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) Our constitution, being the agreement between the people and the authority (government) needs to be reviewed and reinvigorated. Such things as Citizens Initiative Referenda & Recall, equal State representation to the High Court, review of all active foreign affairs agreements, Re-establishment of independent State Banks to finance all state projects and abolition of the Loans Council. These all need to be

JORDAN PETERSON, CLASSICAL LIBERALISM, AND DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT

By M. Oliver Heydorn, PhD (all references available on the website TheCross-Roads.ORG)

Jordan Peterson, the now famous Psychology Professor from the University of Toronto, has sometimes identified himself as a Classical Liberal. With his rise as an internet phenomenon, the social philosophy of Classical Liberalism and the political/economic systems inspired by it appear to be receiving a fresh impetus (or is it merely a final breath of air?) as the modern society in which we live, a society originally based on the principles of Classical Liberalism, sees itself falling deeper and deeper into a post-modern Marxist tyranny, both economic and cultural.

While Peterson says many true and beneficial things and has, I think, done much good in a world that is rapidly retreating from the Classical Liberal ideal of a 'free society', it is critically important for Social Crediters to come to the realization that, far from being the solution to our societal ills, Classical Liberalism is very much part of the problem and that the social philosophy which Douglas advocated and which provides Social Credit with its undergirding is something fundamentally different from Classical Liberalism. Insofar as any one word might accurately describe it, the social philosophy upon which Douglas established his Social Credit vision of society is 'Christian' and not Liberal. Political, economic, and social Liberalism, i.e., the idea that coercive institutions are only justified if they maximize the negative rights of the individual, the right 'not to be interfered with', is, in fact, a very subtle and insidious corruption of the Christian ideal for society as something that exists to serve the individual and to secure the conditions of his well-being ... so that he, in turn, might serve God and his neighbour.

Classical Liberalism is a false 'philosophy' in the Douglassian sense of that word; that is, it provides us with a false picture or conception of reality. Public policy that is based on such a false philosophy must, and indeed has, led to disastrous results. Indeed, while a society based on the principles of Classical Liberalism might be infinitely preferable to the sort of society in whose direction we are steadily travelling, it is largely on account of that Liberalism that we have arrived at our present position in the first place.

Political, economic, and social Liberalism – whatever its intentions in theory – has proven itself to be a highly corrosive force which, in the name of the individual, has

carefully considered. Resolution, not Revolution!

We, have a history of unique, strong, resilient and tough people, who went out into this harsh land to tame it. Being the children of these pioneers, we, as individuals in concert, must now step forward to reclaim our cultural inheritance from the malevolent authority - the collectivist state. ***

PS. Happy 99th birthday Stan Woolford, Adelaide, SA

destroyed many of the institutions, laws, mentalities, and customs that have traditionally protected the cultural and moral integrity of our society. There is not a single phenomenon decried – and rightly decried – by social and cultural conservatives, whether we speak of legalized abortion, euthanasia, pornography, and same sex 'marriage', or the rise of feminism and the breakdown of marriage and the traditional family order, or the erosion of civic values, manners, and personal responsibility, or the proliferation of a vapid and international consumerist culture with American accents everywhere, or the phenomena of mass migrations and the imposition of multiculturalism on organic communities, that has not been defended and indeed been championed and brought about in the name of individual 'rights'. All these manifestations of corruption and decay are just Liberalism working itself out as it inexorably tends to its final and logical conclusion: total social disorder and disintegration.

Since nature abhors a vacuum, the tremendous deficiency in social cohesion and direction which Liberalism leaves in its wake, i.e., its amorphous mass of atomized individuals with no bonds with or obligations to anything greater than themselves and with no common philosophy or policy, merely leaves the door open for the will of the strongest individuals in society to impose itself de facto on the rest of the community:

“... the average man in the street, including the average politician, the average statesman, and the average person, does not even know where he is going, much less how to get there. That is one of the chief explanations of the chaos now, and it leaves the way clear to those who have a conception of the world they want. So long as they have a clear-cut conception, together with the use of the organisation which alone can achieve success, and which is actually working in the world, they will continue to be the force which imposes present policy on the world. That is why the system stays,”²¹

While it speaks of the rights of every man in theory, Liberalism invariably leads to a society which passively accepts the law of the jungle, i.e., of 'might is right', as the general organizing principle in its affairs.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) Wherever Liberalism has been adopted as the reigning social and political philosophy, we have seen the domination of vested interests in the realm of economic policy over and above the common good for decades now, if not centuries. This is not at all surprising given that, in our modern societies, the single most powerful element is composed of financial elites. It is only more recently that we are beginning to see the transformation of that financial and economic monopoly and domination into a total cultural and political domination ... a domination that goes so far as to undercut the very first principles of the Liberal social order itself. The audacity and irrational demands of the 'Social Justice Warriors', demands which Peterson has rightly opposed with such vehemence, have made the self-destructive nature of Liberalism increasingly evident. It is by means of such phenomena as Social Justice 'Warriorism', sponsored by the powerful in high places, that Liberalism eventually degenerates into tyranny.

The deception involved in Liberalism is so satanically clever because it advances, under the guise of 'freedom', a state of affairs in which the unjust domination of the powerful reduces the bulk of the society into one form or another of what could only be described as slavery.

Douglas recognized that this Liberal mechanism of occult control has been one of the most significant flaws in the operation of political affairs in post-Reformation England:

"Now, if you remember, the religious aspect of the Civil War was freedom of conscience, so-called; in other words, you were to be allowed, and you very rapidly did have, under the Protectorate, 57 religions, all different, and the only reason that you did not have 570 religions was that people could not think quickly enough. I am not saying that any one of them was either right or wrong. I am not interested. The rather subtle point I am trying to make is this – that the philosophies in the mind of the people in the country became completely chaotic, and that left the way open to the dominance of a philosophy which was not any one of them. I am not suggesting that the philosophy before the rise of the Protectorate was a right philosophy. What I am saying is that the attempts of the Stuarts was to have a unified principle behind their policy, and that it was completely offset under the plea of freedom of conscience, out of which there could not possibly come a coherent policy, nor did there."²

The notion that Liberalism must end in tyranny is surely ironic, but it is entirely what one might have predicted on the basis of a careful observation of both the natural world and of human history. We live in an imperfect world, indeed, in a fallen world according to Christian revelation and teaching.

In the world as we know it, and not as we perhaps might have it, the establishment of order and the achievement and preservation of authentic progress require intelligently directed effort in the service of a realistic policy-objective. Things don't flourish in an optimal manner if you simply leave them alone. If, for example, you want to have a garden with food sufficient to feed your family, you must take measures to secure the garden and to ensure that the conditions necessary for the growth and well-being, or the flourishing, of your fruits and vegetables will be met. This requires building protective barriers like walls or fences to keep rodents and other animals out, the use of various interventional measures to hold insects and other pests at bay, and perhaps the use of irrigational equipment or fertilizers to assure optimal growing conditions. If, in the name of some abstract ideal of 'freedom', you leave the garden completely undefended and the plants unprovided for, i.e., at the complete mercy of the vagaries of nature, you should not be surprised if and when the plants fail to flourish and your family starves as a result.

Indeed, it would appear that, for various reasons which I cannot either explore or properly substantiate in the course of this present article, Liberalism was deliberately introduced, or else inserted as the dominant political/economic ideology in the West, in order to ensure that culturally, socially, and morally, the West would be eventually shorn of all its defensive armaments and supportive infrastructures and effectively and thoroughly gutted as a result. Liberalism has, in fact, served as a sort of Trojan Horse by means of which the barbarians have been led inside the gates of the city. The barbarians, of course, are not the enemy as such, but merely the blind tools of destruction employed by the superior forces who designed and built the Trojan horse and who convinced the West to receive it as a great gift. We cannot reasonably expect to either turn back the hands of time to an earlier period when the fruits of Liberalism were not so poisonous, as perhaps Peterson hopes to do, or that a bold reassertion of Liberal principles in the face of the intensifying insanity can save us. Liberalism cannot help us; it is how we got here. To reverse our fortunes we must replace Liberalism, which is simply a secular corruption of the traditional Christian social order, with the social principles of true Christianity.

The general errors of Classical Liberalism appear to be at least threefold in nature: 1) the 'individual' with which Liberalism is preoccupied seems to be more of a theoretical abstraction, along the lines of 'Rational Economic Man', than something which has concrete men and women who actually do exist as its referent; 2) the rights that Liberalism seeks to maximize or promote are framed mainly – if not also exclusively – in negative terms, i.e., 'the right not to be interfered with'³; and

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) 3) Liberalism has simultaneously denied that anything outside of the abstract individual, such as concrete communities, the natural law, or even God Himself could be the possessor of legitimate rights which might limit or constrain the alleged negative 'rights' of individuals. The only limit which Liberalism admits is that no one should have the right to prevent others from exercising their negative rights. In its most extreme variation, that of libertarianism, Liberalism reduces the state to the role of a 'night watchman' whose only powers and duties involve protecting life and property.

Thankfully, C.H. Douglas recognized (at least implicitly at the beginning of his career as a public figure and more and more explicitly in his later writings) that the social philosophy upon which his economic and political proposals were based and which he regarded as the correct or right way of looking at the world was not Liberalism at all – whether classical or otherwise – but was fundamentally Christian in orientation.⁴

In his very first book, *Economic Democracy*, Douglas indicated that the Social Credit vision for society was based on "... the supremacy of the individual considered collectively over any external interest."⁵ Superficially, this may sound like Liberalism, but Douglas immediately proceeded to qualify his statement by insisting that what he was advocating must not be confused with either anarchism or individualism (aka Liberalism), and, least of all, with any sort of collectivism:

"First of all, it does not mean anarchy, nor does it mean exactly what is commonly called individualism, which generally resolves itself into a claim to force the individuality of others to subordinate itself to the will-to-power of the self-styled individualist. And most emphatically it does not mean collectivism in any of the forms made familiar to us by the Fabians and others."⁶

The contrasts with anarchism (i.e., the claim that no coercive institutions are justified) and collectivism (i.e., the claim that coercive institutions are justified because the individual is relatively unimportant and exists to serve the group in any case) are pretty stark and do not require exhaustive clarification. But Douglas also differentiates the Social Credit position on the nature and rights of coercive institutions from that of Liberalism.

Social Credit differs from Liberalism precisely because it eschews, as does Christianity, the three errors that were mentioned earlier.

Yes, groups and associations and society generally exist to serve the individual, so that the individual can survive and flourish. But the 'individualism' of Social Credit is not the rugged, self-sufficient individualism of the libertarian or the 'me first attitude' of the Classical Liberal. It is, instead, a social individualism which recognizes that human individuals exist as 'persons-in-community' and do not and cannot exist apart from the family and other organic associations of which they

form a part. Because human individuals are dependent on these groups for their survival and flourishing, and even for their very existence, it must become clear that the functional necessities of these groups, i.e., what these groups require in order for them to continue in existence and to flourish, must also be fully respected for the sake of the individual. That is, if we seek to serve the individual, to maximize his legitimate claims to autonomy and freedom and to promote his well-being, it is not the abstract individual, nor this or that individual, but rather each and every concrete individual who must receive, on an equitable basis and in the context of his various organic bonds with others, his due share in the benefits of political, economic, and cultural association.

From this it follows that the correct social order must not seek to merely maximize the negative rights of individuals, but to secure various legitimate positive rights for them. A positive right or a positive freedom is the guarantee that one will have access to various resources, whether economic, political, or even cultural, so that one can choose how to live one's life and without which no number or degree of negative rights are of any use whatsoever. It can be entirely legitimate to impose limits on the negative freedom of this or that individual in order to ensure that all concrete individuals in the community possess the kind and degree of positive freedom that is their due if the true purposes of political and economic association are to be adequately achieved.

From a Social Credit perspective, what matters above all is that associations, which only exist in the first place in order to serve the well-being of concrete individuals, can fulfill that purpose well. The demands of function must therefore trump any theoretical claim of this or that individual, or of some abstract individual, to not be interfered with. The assertion of various negative 'rights' on the part of the individual must be subordinated to the functional necessities of associations so that all individuals can be properly and satisfactorily served by the association in question.

Individual bankers, for instance, can and ought to be forced to abide by the Social Credit monetary policy, i.e., the 'Distribution of Credit' (even if their personal benefits in terms of power and profit would be less than they are under the current 'Monopoly of Credit'), if the imposition of that policy is necessary for an economic association to fulfill its true purpose well and to optimize, in the long-run, the economic advantages of every individual (including those of the bankers themselves).

Economic Liberalism, i.e., the unrestricted free reign of the market (which exists nowhere on earth in a completely pure form in any case) is incompatible with Social Credit's insistence on the priority of function over any abstract preoccupation with 'freedom'.

In the same way and for the same basic reason, political, social, and cultural Liberalism are also incompatible with a Social Credit and Christian society.

(continued from previous page) To briefly cite just one other example, the old 'White Australia' policy is complete nonsense to the Liberal; it was an arbitrary and unjust limitation on individual migrants by the state ... migrants who, under the existing 'Monopoly of Credit', might be of great financial and hence economic importance. If we are all just atomized individuals floating in the ether, how can any 'discrimination' not based on financial or economic considerations be justified? But to the Social Crediter (and to the true Christian we might add) who is keen on minimizing social conflict and in protecting organic identities and cultures for the benefit of the individuals who were organically connected, racially and culturally, to the society that gave them birth, such a policy made a great deal of practical sense.

Thus we see that for the Social Crediter, true freedom in association is not the ability to do whatever one wants within the widest possible limits (i.e., the night watchman state of the libertarian ideologue), but rather the ability of each and every individual to exercise his

SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE CHRISTIAN ETHIC By Norman F. Webb (1937 *The Fig Tree*)

Since the dawn of history the cry of reformers has always been for a "change of heart." Of the practical efficacy of that unqualified appeal we have no means of judging other than an examination of the actual condition of the world as it is today. Under that test it would appear to have failed. Nevertheless, the great majority of society, with, it must be admitted, considerable encouragement from the press and the pulpit, and the pronouncements of bank chairmen, still holds blindly to the belief that a change of heart is an essential preliminary to any change for the better in social conditions, and denies environment any claim as a means to a change of heart.

In short, although we like to think of this world of aeroplanes and scientific wonders as very modern indeed, the truth is that the pre-Darwinian, pre-Baconian attitude of mind still rules. In support of this attitude Christ's words are often quoted: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you," manifestly a searching truth; but it seems to me the weak point in the argument is always the fact that so few of those who hold the view appear themselves to have experienced the change they recommend.

Until the rise of the Social Credit movement, there has never been a constructive, co-ordinated opposition to the monopoly which this theory enjoys, and a challenge to it is long overdue. As Major Douglas very profoundly says in his book "Social Credit": "Virtue may flourish in the gutter, but if virtue can only flourish in the gutter, as some people would have us believe, then it is time that the nature of virtue received severe scrutiny."

Social Crediters, applying the discoveries of Darwin,

free initiative while calling, to the fullest extent possible, on the resources of society to help him achieve his legitimate aims.⁷ From this point of view "... there is no difficulty in conceiving a condition of individual control of policy in the common interest, ..."⁸

In other words, all people should be free to exercise individual control of policy (both negatively and positively) so long as it does not threaten the common interest, i.e., so long as it is not anti-social. The common interest is what lies in the interest of each individual; i.e., it refers to those interests which all individuals necessarily have in common, or common policy.⁹ And what is our most general common policy? Our most general common policy is for the various political, economic, and cultural associations which comprise a nation to be able to fulfill their true purposes to the extent that this is objectively possible and with the least amount of trouble to everyone. Social Credit insists that this common policy must be respected and fulfilled and this, in turn, requires reigning in all those who would make an abstract or theoretical 'freedom' an idol. ***

assert that if the conditions of life are changed, the heart will respond. That, shortly, is the Social Credit declaration of faith, and I believe it to be both sound and Christian. Christ fed the five thousand in the wilderness. He was not of the opinion that they would be more spiritually minded fasting than fed. It is just here that the problem reaches a deadlock.

It is a sort of spiritual stalemate, and in the ensuing check and pause an acute sense can plainly detect the premonitory tremors of a vast society breaking up. It can serve no purpose to become either impatient or "rattled," but it must be admitted that the matter is urgent, since it is quite possible that the future of an entire civilisation depends on its solution. If it were just a question of giving a decision on the side of one or the other school of thought--the change of heart or the change of environment--how simple it would be; but we must not forget that the core of the problem, our practical difficulty, is that both sides appear to lack the essential dynamic that is needed to stir up the public to a realistic sense of the present state of affairs.

My personal belief is that judgment cannot be given to either; that the truth of the matter lies somewhere between the two; as I firmly believe Truth itself to be a balance of forces.

I suggest the two changes are interdependent. They must, so to speak, occur together; the job is to be tackled at both ends simultaneously, like a tunnelling of the Alps. In his book "Social Credit," contrasting the claims of what he calls the classical and modern spirit which, broadly speaking, correspond to the two schools of thought I am considering--Major Douglas says,

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) “It is probable that, as in many controversies, there is a good deal to be said for both points of view, but it is even more probable that approximate Truth lies in an appreciation of the fact that neither conception is useful without the other.” Or, as I wish to suggest, it may be just their combination that would produce the spiritual impulse for which we are searching. For since it is a fact that the nearest the human mind and language can get to a statement of Truth is a paradox--“For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it,” and many others--it is quite probable that the approach to a practical problem, even our very actions themselves, may require to be in a sense paradoxical in order to be sound.

It is, you see, a “live” problem, a spiritual problem, which is a conclusion that we Social Crediters have to some extent avoided, for the reason that, as a class, we possess that trained cast of mind that is intensely apprehensive of emotional excess. I believe that it is our destiny to live down that fear, as, indeed, in the near future many fears and prejudices will have to be overcome; and that the road by which it will be achieved is through a realisation of the fact that the scientific mind is the type of the modern religious mind, in fact the neo-Christian. Science is knowledge. In action it is the research and documentation of natural law. For that job there is only one essential, besides training and common intelligence, and that is integrity, singleness of purpose: the “single eye” that, as Christ said, is the only means to enlightenment. In that sense the scientist is truly religious in spirit. He knows that all personal bias and preconception must be eliminated from the mind; that facts as they come to light must be accepted, not for any moral reason, involving punishment, but simply because it is only in that obedient, impersonal, selfless spirit that Truth, his objective, can be attained.

To me Christianity is realistic in the highest degree; but it was not the Church, but two superficially mundane interests that brought me to an appreciation of the realistic and practical quality of Christ’s teaching. In the first place it was the study of art, and later the study of that philosophy we call Social Credit. And the more I examine them the more do Christ’s teaching and Social Credit identify themselves and fuse in my mind. I put down here my interpretation of the fundamental principles of Christianity, solely for the purposes of my analogy; not minding though I must be treading on ground already covered and re-covered by commentators and theologians, whose books I have never read and never shall read. What I have found, then, in Christianity is a technique of living; and it is with me that, whatever adherence I may give to Social Credit or anything else, the technique of personal existence must be my primary concern. I cannot, I will not, let my interests be an escape from my personal problems. Rather, I must solve my personal problems for the sake of prosecuting my interests more effectively.

Christ was a realist, the greatest that ever lived by my definition of Realism, which is a concern with the immediate present, with facts as they are. “The Kingdom of God is within you,” said Christ, and that to my mind is an eminently realistic statement. It was Idealism that shoved Heaven up into the sky, and that has persistently postponed human blessedness to any time and place except here and now; when just here and now are all that we really possess to work on. It is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a bedevilled world that displays all this passion for securing the future and leaves the present to shift for itself.

It is because of the realism of their belief that Social Crediters find themselves so markedly opposed to a world that sees no hope other than in Plans--Four, Five, and Ten Year--and Boards and Leagues, and Conferences; all idealistic, all projecting themselves outward from an unsolved, immediate present, into an intellectual, Utopian dream of what might be, of what ought to be. “Take care of the present and the future will take care of itself,” is the lesson of both Christianity and Social Credit; and I say it is Realism as opposed to Idealism. It may be impious, it certainly is both unscientific and misguided, to try to see any distance into the future: acceptance of, and obedience to, facts is the creed of both Christianity and science. Newman’s “One step enough for me” may be childishly simple; but it is profoundly and truly a summing-up of the Christian point of view and, I would add, the scientific also.

The Christian task, as I see it, is to attain the right attitude towards life, to understand and carry out its laws as disclosed. What follows, follows; and it is just here that faith comes into operation. It seems to me an astonishingly foolish mistake, and one very frequently made, to confuse faith with blind belief; they are in no way related. Faith might be defined as an unshakable understanding that obedience to a known law must produce correct results, even though, as Major Douglas puts it, “the end of Man is unknown”; in other words, even though the actual nature of the ultimate result is hidden from us.

The Social Credit faith is of that nature, and so, too, is the truly Christian, and it is with that quality of faith that we need to inspire society. Lacking it, people dread any change, and demand to see the whole social programme complete with blue prints and a five-years unconditional guarantee. The best analogy I can think of is learning to ride a bicycle. The doubting, human intelligence wants to be assured that its owner will be held up before it can permit him to pedal off, whereas the truth is that until he pedals off he cannot be supported.

The individual soul, and the right understanding of its relation to its original source, was for Christ the beginning and end of existence, and nothing recorded that He did or said suggests even faintly that man exists for any other purpose. *(continued next page)*

(continued from previous page) "Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," as a pronouncement, gives stable government its proper place and emphasis, as a means to an end; but "... unto God the things that are God's," postulates, without defining, the end to which government is to be the means.

The true, democratic, interpretation of the Sovereignty of the People, as defined by Social Credit, is exactly this attitude applied to the structure of the State and the place and the function of the individual, as that for which and by which the State exists. Christ's short life was spent in defence of the individual, and nearly two thousand years later Social Crediters find themselves waging the same battle.

He clearly foresaw the danger of the elevation of means into ends, which has culminated in the Collectivist State and its suppression of the individual to the group. No dogmatic Church could have bound Christ in His lifetime. It was only after His death, and not until several centuries after, that it succeeded in shackling and dogmatising his troublesome dynamic philosophy; but in the eyes of Him Who had created the philosophy, "the sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath."

The identity of Christ's teaching and what we call Economic Democracy is, I believe, fundamental. The two are in contact at every point--even to this extent, that the primary obstacle to the realisation of both of them is the same. That obstacle is, literally, the very devil, and its name, for want of a better term, is Puritanism.

To any that are hurt by that use of the word, I say, give me a better or as good, and I will gladly substitute it. But puritanism as I understand it (erroneously connected in many minds with purity) has, I affirm, nothing in common with Christ's teaching. Again we are in need of a definition; although, indeed, this quality is so diffuse, so universal, so "human," as to be almost indefinable in a phrase. The will-to-power perhaps comes nearest to the root of it, but that phrase itself requires defining.

Let me put it negatively. When Christ, One Who for all His countrified simplicity, understood more of life than anyone before or since, said to the young man who asked Him for a decision between his brother and himself, "Man, who made Me a judge or a divider over you?" He was demonstrating in the highest degree the opposite impulse to that which I designate Puritanism. "Judge not, that ye be not judged." There is a law of life; and I think that Christ has plainly demonstrated for us that the primary fact of existence is that we are here and conscious, for the purpose of learning to understand it. The puritanical misconception is that we are here to administer the law. Is it surprising, therefore, that the world presents the picture it does, when the individuals, who compose society, each of them to a greater or lesser degree, conceive of themselves as administrators of their own interpretation of a law that has as yet been only faintly apprehended by a handful of choice spirits?

Puritanism, as I said, is of the devil, clothing the very deepest and darkest passion of the human mind--the impulse to dominate over one's fellow mortals--in a moral disguise.

And can we wonder if the hedonist, who for all his shallowness, at least has sufficient love for his neighbour to allow him to work out his own salvation, gets away with so much of our sympathy? It is the Puritan who has always been ready to shed blood in the past (for there is no more terrible human phenomenon than the man who identifies God with his own abysmal will-to-power), and it will be the Puritan who will be ready to shed it in the future.

Christ's realistic mission was to free man, and the opposition He met is precisely the opposition presented to Social Credit. The truth is that the Puritan element in man does not wish to be free. Because its desire is to dominate over its fellows, it opposes the idea of their enfranchisement, which is its own. The Devil fears freedom above everything, and his own most of all. It is quite natural then that when applied science comes along offering material freedom and abundance, the Puritan--the Devil's advocate that lurks in each one of us--should be arrayed against it; or that when we espouse a movement calling for a realistic acceptance of the fact of economic freedom, we are met with deadly resistance from the vested interests of the Prince of Darkness.

The foundation of the Christian teaching is Love. It is a difficult matter to grasp, and very wide in its application, and the word itself has been so narrowly identified with sexual attraction that we can hardly employ it profitably. There are many definitions, but it will serve our purpose to take one; trust, in the sense of absence of fear--"perfect Love casteth out fear." That form of love Social Credit represents.

Social Crediters affirm a belief in the fundamental decency--goodness, if you like--of human nature in the face of a world cowering abjectly before its own degraded picture of itself. Coercive legislation, and armaments, and leagues, are all the direct outcome of fear and hatred--distrust of human nature. Into that dark abyss our present civilisation seems to be descending; and constructively opposed to that world-wide tendency there are literally only two forces, the teaching of Christ, and the philosophy of Social Credit, which I say are one and the same.

The actual clash that is to herald the social breakup cannot be very long delayed. In the interval still remaining, can these forces not be brought together, and from their identification a real Christian democratic nucleus be created, round which the remnant of this present marvellous and tragic civilisation might re-form? It is conceivable that the actual break-up might even be averted, and the spirit of the age take that sudden renewal and swing upward with which an apparently dying piece of music sometimes starts off again on a fresh and finer flight. That, as we know, is the vision that Social Credit has opened up for some of us; but, so far, we have not been able to communicate it to the great mass of the people. In this combination I have suggested, may lie the secret of the dynamic we search for, when the change of heart and the change of environment become, as I believe they should, complementary to one another. ***