

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 46 No. 7

SATURDAY, JULY 2, 1966

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The Art of the Possible

Notes for an address given by Dr. Bryan

W. Monahan at Sydney on May 29, 1966

I take it we have met here tonight because of a common concern with the course of international events, which form an increasingly obvious menace to our way of life, and quite probably even to our very lives. But the act of meeting also means, I believe, a desire to *do* something. A saying attributed to the great German strategist Clausewitz defined politics as the art of the possible; and what I want to look at is the problem of what is possible in our present situation.

The first step in discovering what is possible is to state the problem which has to be faced, and to state it in a form where it can be seen whether a solution is likely to be possible. A vast amount of effort by well-meaning people has been wasted on trying to solve the wrong or irrelevant problems, like a person trying to save the cake in the oven when the whole house is burning down. This waste results very largely from the way world news is presented to us. It comes as a series of apparently disconnected episodes— isolated events about which people very frequently take sides, and fight each other, thus preparing the way for any one who may intend to conquer us, if there is anyone. Whether there is anyone, and if so who, is the very problem which we have to uncover, and state correctly.

Now if events—and by events here I mean such things as the war in Vietnam and the Suez crisis, the Korean war and the situation in Rhodesia—are not disconnected, they must form some sort of a pattern. If someone represented these various events by dots on a sheet of paper, and only showed you one or two at a time, in a random fashion, you could not tell whether or not they formed a recognisable pattern. Or if you were shown the sheet of paper edgewise on, you could not know of the existence of the dots; and this, in an analogical way, corresponds to suppression of facts in the presentation of news.

To know whether the dots form a significant pattern, you have to see them all together, and this means that you have to look at the face of the paper. You have to do something—turn the paper face towards you, instead of just looking at what you are shown; and if part of the surface is masked, you have to remove the mask.

I think we can usefully carry this analogy further. You are probably all familiar with the sort of puzzle picture which consists say of a line drawing of a tree, and has a caption: "Here is the tree; where is the cat?" You look at the picture, and after a while some of the outlines of the tree isolate themselves into the outline of a cat somewhere in the foliage; and of course once you have seen it in that way, it can thereafter be seen at a glance. In fact, it is very hard then *not* to see it.

In the field of world events, the vital factor is time. What

I mean here is well illustrated by the nature of a funny story. A story is told in time, it takes time, and the sort of story I have in mind is for some time only a recitation of events over a period of time; but it is at an instant of time—when the story is finished—that it becomes funny and makes you laugh.

For instance, a man was standing on a railway platform and he caught sight of an old Indian squatting in a corner, selling oddments and wrapped in a rug. While he was looking at him another man said, "You know, that Indian has the most fantastic memory I have ever come across. He can tell you the exact day practically anything you can think of happened." So the first man got curious, and went up to the Indian and asked him if it was true that he had a wonderful memory. The Indian just grunted and nodded his head once. So the traveller said; "Could you tell me what you had for breakfast on June 14th two years ago?" The Indian said, "Eggs." The traveller blinked, but didn't want to press the matter with the taciturn old fellow, and walked away thinking that he had asked for that one; he probably had eggs for breakfast every day. But many months later he was on the same platform, and there was the Indian. So he thought he'd go up and pass the time of day. He went over and said to the Indian: "How?" "Scrambled," said the Indian.

Now I'll tell you a true story, which is not funny, but which has a point. Several years ago I received through the post a request—addressed to me by name "as a well-known anti-Communist"—a request to complete a detailed questionnaire on my personal life, education, interests, war-service, foreign travel, etc. This surprised me greatly, because at that time I was not a well-known anti-Communist. I could not even decide whether Communism as such, in the form of Russian conquest aided by internal revolution, was the ultimate threat. All I was sure of was that increasing trouble lay ahead. But I did believe that I was being invited to write my own dossier for the use of the Communists. This invitation came from a research Fellow of the Australian National University. And I have since learned that there is a group of Communist academics in that University who regard themselves as the brain behind Communism in Australia.

The point I am trying to get at is that to understand what is going on in the world, you have to be able to recognise the wholeness of the situation. You must consider, not isolated crises, but the relation of one crisis to another. As the news is presented to us from day to day, one disaster or another merely seems disastrous; but the real question is to see whether there is a pattern to these disasters.

(continued on page 3)

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 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1
Telephone: EUSton 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—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone EUSton 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It is well to be clear as to what our present situation is.

There are two major factors: the threatened population explosion, which will come about as the result of the man-made disturbance of the ecology of the planet, and the waste of the planet's physical resources on an ever-increasing scale which would exhaust many of them in the course of a few centuries, which is an insignificant time in the span of human history.

We do not delude ourselves that these facts are discoveries of ours. Far-sighted men saw them long ago, and set in train policies designed to safe-guard the survival of their own descendants. Operating on the one hand through financial power, and on the other through subversion and conspiracy, they have gradually brought about the present situation, in which we are rapidly being engulfed in revolution and disarmed in favour of World Government with power to ensure its self-survival for as long as history lasts.

So rapid is the approach of the culmination of revolution that resistance to world government is beginning to appear. So the only remaining question is: how much longer will counter-revolution remain possible? And where?

Not in England. As Marx predicted, foreigners have made the revolution for the British, and the final controls are being clamped down now. Anyone who can should read Constantine Fitz Gibbon's *When the Kissing Had to Stop*. It is more applicable to the present phase of the British disaster than Orwell's "1984", which is, perhaps, why, so far as we know, it has gone "out of print."

• • •

On May 3, 1966, the Portuguese Minister of Foreign Affairs issued a statement at a Press Conference. It dealt with British conduct in relation to Portugal in connection with the Rhodesian affair, and, allowing for the niceties of diplomatic usage, was as strong a condemnation as could be made.

The Minister also observed: "For the first time in public debate the African countries realised that they are the stake in a vast game that far outstrips them, that they

can hardly follow but which is not necessarily identifiable with their real longer-term interests. For the first time the African countries saw that principles, ideals and the very truth were swept aside, so easily, to achieve aims that were closer to the heart of the great powers than of the countries of Africa."

The African countries, yes; but not their peoples. It is the resources of the African continent which interests not so much the "great powers" as the invisible world government, in its dual aspects of Finance and Communism. The peoples of Africa and of Christian civilisation stand in the way of the heart's desire of the International Conspiracy, so in their millions they must perish to clear the way for the Grand Design.

Pax Britannica

A few items from this morning's newspaper (*Daily Telegraph*, May 25, 1966) should finally dispel criticism of Mr. Ian Smith's policies from any reasoning mind. We read that the Kabaka of Buganda was besieged in his palace in Kampala and that "nearly 200 of the Kabaka's bodyguard together with about 40 Government troops are reported dead." In a clash between tribesmen and Government forces the death roll "ran into many hundreds. Among them were two British surveyors . . . they were beaten to death."

The crisis, according to Llewellyn Chanter, originated in rivalry between Uganda's tribes. "The Bantu tribes in the fertile South are fundamentally hostile to the Nilotic peoples of the North. Dr. Obote is a northerner." The opposition chief whip, now reported dead, accused Dr. Obote and the Deputy Army commander of corruption, and Dr. Obote retaliated in March by abolishing the Constitution. The Kabaka, Sir Edward Mutesa, had appealed for United Nations intervention in Uganda "to avert a calamity", while if he is now dead the peoples of Uganda are said to fear "that a worse bloodbath will follow."

The reader, sickened by the ranting demands at UNO for war against Rhodesia—against which only New Zealand objected explicitly, and which Russia supported—has heard little of the explosive situation in Uganda. It is callously assumed that no one need be concerned if African kills African and a few whites get in the way; if a white raises his hand against a black, the Bishop of Matabeleland makes an entry in his dossier; and if blacks kill whites, then the latter are presumed to have deserved it. I wonder what the bishop had to say about the brutal murders in Rhodesia the other day.

Meanwhile President Kaunda complains of the "great economic sacrifices" made by Zambia to test Britain's policy of sanctions, and says that Britain will be to blame "if, as seems likely, more innocent blood is shed in Rhodesia as a result of a self-generating explosive local situation or external intervention." To call the invasion by a gang of foreign-trained and armed thugs the result of a "self-generating explosive local situation" shows that Dr. Kaunda does not know what words mean. They were sent in because the local situation showed no signs of exploding. And Kaunda himself has advocated shedding blood by external intervention, and his policy is responsible for these great sacrifices which have also proved expensive enough to Britain.

At the same time the chairman of the UN Colonialism Committee, Mr. Collier of Sierra Leone, complains at Dar-es-Salaam that the British failed to negotiate with "African representatives," and presumably meant the leaders of the rival "nationalist" organisations and not the chiefs. Most Rhodesians of any colour doubtless find it a relief to enjoy, under their own government, a peace from the terrorist activities of these "representatives" which the British did little to ensure. I would not imagine that Mr. Chipunza, leader of the Opposition in Rhodesia, who returned to Salisbury from Malawi today, has any desire to disturb this peace, and he would doubtless be consulted and has been consulted by the British.

In fact the British politicians have abrogated their peace-keeping role in Africa, under American and Russian pressure, and yet cannot trust peaceful Rhodesia. On the other side, the international trouble-makers and enemies of Britain, the foreign and the national subversives, regret in their rake's progress only one factor in Rhodesia: the almost complete lack of bloodshed.

—H.S.S.

The Art of the Possible *(continued from page 1)*

A writer on these matters once pointed out that in considering them, individual people had what he called "their moment of truth." Things they had known but largely disregarded suddenly fell into a recognisable pattern, and individual events took on a previously unrecognised significance as parts of a larger whole. We all know, for example, that crime and immorality are on the increase. Is that part of the pattern of disasters?

Well, what I want to do is put certain events before you so that you can find out for yourselves whether they make the same pattern to you as they do to me.

The reason why I couldn't feel certain about Communism at that time was that years of study and observation had convinced me that there was a factor of tremendous importance in the world situation which was never taken into account in what you might call the professional commentaries concerning that situation. What situation?

Before the first world war we had a well-established system of national sovereignties, headed by Great Britain. After that war we still had a system of national sovereignties, somewhat re-arranged, and shaken up, and with internal cohesion loosened by a decline in moral values and the loss of so much of the best of the youth of the nations. But we also had the Versailles Treaty, containing the seeds of the second world war.

During the second war we were introduced to the idea of the "Big Four", with the implication that they would shape the postwar world, and that the other powers did not matter much, if at all.

Since that war we have been conditioned to accept the idea that the fate of the world, at any rate at the present time, depends on the Big Two—the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. And that is true in that no other nation could now impose its will on the world, as Germany and Japan once thought they could.

That is the picture we are invited to inspect—two giants facing each other, one determined to impose universal socialism, the other standing for freedom and free enter-

prise. This conflict supposedly leads to events like the Korean war and the Laos war and the Vietnam war, with others to follow if Communism wins in Vietnam.

What is wrong with that picture? What is so wrong as to make it entirely misleading is that something of the utmost importance has been left out of it. If we call nations as they used to be "powers" in the sense that their national policies affected world events, there is another power which is not national, but international, with an international policy which affects world events. That is the financial power. But it prefers not to be talked about.

I am not going to inflict a lot of economic theory on you, but there are some things I hope to make as clear as I can, because you have to know about them to see the whole picture, or at least to look at the picture in the right way.

The first is the nature of money. I suppose most people get their idea of money by handling it—cash in the pocket, notes in the wallet, money paid over the counter, money in tills, and by extension, money in banks. This handling of money makes it appear like a commodity, something that can be exchanged for another commodity, just as you might exchange a cauliflower for a cabbage.

This commodity view of money is true only to a very slight degree. Most of what operates as money is not the cash which you handle, but what is known as bank credit, of which we hear a good deal these days, without many people knowing what it really is.

If you go to a bank and ask for a loan, and can meet the conditions laid down by the bank, you are given permission to overdraw your account. That means that if you write a cheque, the bank will honour it, and others, up to an arranged limit, and will write in its books that you owe them the amount of the cheque. Having written the cheque, you exchange it say for some office equipment to enable you to expand your business, hoping out of the increased profits eventually to pay back the bank. But the man who sold the office equipment pays that cheque into a bank, which records it as a deposit in his favour. Now the bank which allowed the overdraft did not borrow from anyone else's account—that is to say, the total of deposits in that bank was not reduced by the amount of your cheque. On the other hand, the bank which receives the cheque does show an increase in the total of deposits.

When you come to pay back the bank, the process works in reverse. A cheque in repayment of an overdraft does not increase the deposits in the bank. As money it simply disappears, and the bank writes in its books that you owe less by the amount of that cheque.

These so-called loans and repayments are being made all the time, but over a period of time loans are made faster than repayments, leading of course, to a more or less continuous rise in the total of deposits. These deposits are really almost entirely simply entries in books, and yet they constitute at least ninety per cent of *what is regarded* as the money supply of the community. The rest, as coins and notes, is used only for the smaller cash transactions of the community; but most financial transactions are by cheque.

The two important aspects of this situation are these: first, the usual condition of the granting of an overdraft is that it must be paid off at a certain agreed rate; and secondly that the purpose for which the money is to be used must be approved by the bank. These two conditions give the bank

control over the policy of the person to whom the overdraft is granted, and the overall policy of the bank in granting overdrafts generally means an overall control over economic policy. When, as is the case, individual banks are under the control of a central bank—in Australia, the Federal Reserve Bank—you have centralised control over the country's economic policy.

What we call the monetary system is actually in its operation a licensing system. Money is issued to permit certain economic activities, and to inhibit others.

But the centralisation of control over economic policy goes further, because central banks are themselves governed by the convention that their activities must be limited by their holding of gold or some acceptable foreign currencies, usually called "hard currencies". The provision of these reserves, so far as international loans is concerned, is in the hands of international banking institutions, so that these institutions have in the international sphere the same sort of power that reserve banks have within nations. And that simply means that the international banking system is a world power whose policies affect world events just as surely as the movement of armies and navies. And as a world power, international finance is just as concerned as a visible nation to extend and consolidate that power. Its difference from a nation is that it has no visible geographic location, and its structure as an organisation is kept as unpublicised as possible, and its ultimate controllers are unknown—probably the best kept secret in the world. But those controllers implicitly claim to be a world government, and the independence of nations is a challenge to the continued power of that government. Its natural response to that challenge is to destroy the independence of nations. And the best way to do that is to make nations fight each other. The visible outcome of the two world wars is the destruction of Great Britain as the leading world power, and the apparent concentration of world power in the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., which are supposed to be in conflict.

I said that the world Power of International Finance has no visible geographic location. But it has a headquarters—a centre for directing overall operations—and, of course, agencies in every country, and these agencies largely control the policy of each nation. The headquarters has shifted over the years, being at one time in Europe, then in Great Britain, and it is now clearly in the U.S.A.

When I was undecided as to whether Communism in its aggressive Russian form was the ultimate threat, I asked myself the wrong question. The correct question was: is there more than one conspiracy behind the mounting disasters of our times? I have been completely convinced of the essentially conspiratorial nature of international finance for well over twenty years; but before the war I had little knowledge of the ramifications of international Communism. Russian Communism to me was a form of totalitarianism indistinguishable from Nazism, with no prospect of conquering the world. And it never would have had any prospect of such conquest without the aid of the U.S.A., the headquarters of international finance. And that answers the question. There is only one international conspiracy, and Communism is a part of it. The great mistake to avoid is the mistake of taking the part for the whole, which of course is the mistake which every device of propaganda is forcing on us.

Now let us try to block out the whole picture. The central feature is the existence of a group of people, probably quite small in number, which forms an invisible world govern-

ment, and which appoints its own successors. The main power of this group has always been monopoly of the power to provide money, which power directs economic activity, and thus can and does steer nations into courses of collision, starting from trade war and ending in military conflict. You have only to ask yourselves how often you have felt what you could do if you had the money, to experience the power that lies in the sole right to originate and recall the money supply of the nations. It leads to control of the media of mass communications; it gives the power of patronage on an immense scale, so that the best brains in the world are at its disposal.

But this immense power of an invisible world government is threatened by the increasing prosperity of nations, so that purely financial control has to be reinforced by, and ultimately replaced by, the power of physical government. The general strategy to that end is socialism, and the end-stage of socialism is the police state as exemplified in Russia and Nazi Germany.

Socialism is the centralisation of all power in the State—the building of more and more powerful government. It was first tried out and applied in Germany at about Bismarck's time. The ideas were then introduced to Great Britain largely through the Fabian Society. Later the London School of Economics was founded by the Fabians and endowed by the international financier Sir Ernest Cassel "to train the bureaucrats who will run our future socialist State." The theory behind Fabianism was that patient and long-term gradualism would eventually transfer all power to the State, and that London School of Economics trained economists would gradually infiltrate into the civil service, and in the course of time come to control it and be the real government behind the façade of parliamentary democracy. And of course this is exactly what has happened, greatly aided by the two world wars.

Now bearing in mind that increasing prosperity of nations and individuals is a threat to government, it becomes quite clear that the patent economic inefficiency of socialism is a designed inefficiency, and not simply due to the ineptitude of the individuals. The real objective of the so-called welfare state is to keep everyone employed—i.e., governed—despite ever-increasing productivity.

(To be continued)

The Art of the Possible will be published in booklet form.

Communist Conspiracy Package

1. Antecedents of Communism
2. No Co-existence
3. What We Face
4. A Treatise on Treason
5. Destalinisation
6. A Prophecy?
7. Finance and Communism

Price for the set 8/6 including postage

3 sets 23/- " "

6 sets 41/- " "

12 sets 68/- " "

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, E.11

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11.

Printed by E. Fish & Co. Ltd., Liverpool.