

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol.62 No.1

JANUARY - FEBRUARY, 1983

The Big Idea

By C.H. DOUGLAS

THIS TREATISE, WHICH FIRST APPEARED SERIALLY IN THESE PAGES BETWEEN JANUARY AND MAY, 1942, AND LATER IN BOOKLET FORM, WILL NOT BE FAMILIAR TO MANY OF OUR PRESENT READERS. FOR OTHERS A RE-READING SHOULD PROVE ENLIGHTENING.

NOW that Haiti and Costa Rica have declared their unalterable determination to fight until V-Victory is assured, it is perhaps possible, and permissible, to consider how we may recognise it when we see it. So far, this has clearly been inadvisable. Haiti and Costa Rica, while enthusiastically applauding war as a spectacle, have shown a marked preference for ringside seats, and there is, even now, a strong feeling amongst their populations that this cutting of the ropes and mauling of the "fans," to use the language of the latest belligerents, is not the treatment they had a right to expect, or for which they had bargained.

But it is one of those attributes of war, which make it so popular in the highest circles, that once you have the populations bombing and drowning each other, and in a fair way to famine and pestilence, it doesn't matter what you say caused it, or what would end it except stopping fighting. No properly brought up people ever do that until they have effectively smashed up the furniture, and made it impossible to talk of "poverty amidst plenty" for a long time. "He that will not work, neither shall he eat," is restored to that eminence from which there were dangerous signs, only a few short years ago, that it would be deposed permanently. Already, the scarcity psychology is fully re-established. Everyone has a tendency to eat too much.

Dr. Arnold Toynbee, Secretary of The Royal Institute of International Affairs ("Chatham House"), in a speech which has often been quoted, remarked that the surest sign that he and others were engaged in what could be paraphrased as treasonable activities was that they strenuously denied it. I feel sure that this technique is widespread. It was explained at some length in *Spanish Arena*, together with other curious matters. So that what little has been said of the goal of V-Victory is not really reliable evidence that we shall recognise the goal when we stop fighting.

I have said many times, and take pleasure in repeating, that the Germans are, and have been for generations, a godsend to warmakers, and a pest to Europe. The opinions of Lord Vansittart *ad hoc*, convey to me the impression of being the pronouncements of a competent, trained and experienced expert, and while he has expressly repudiated a "plan" for dealing with Germany and the Germans, I imagine that he could formulate one, and that it would be effective for some time to come—when we are in a position to put it into practice, as we were in 1918, and didn't.

But to agree with all this, and to admit that we have been manoeuvred, or have got ourselves, into a position

in which we have to fight a long devastating, and completely unnecessary war to some kind of a finish which will enable Lord Vansittart, say, to embody his views, is one thing, and to say, "It's all that — Hitler," or even, "those b——y Huns," is quite another. This war is too entirely convenient to plenty of people who don't intend to fight in it, for that to be much of an idea, although it is earnestly desired that the general public should accept it. To what extent the Germans, for their part, have allowed themselves to be manoeuvred into the position of the "goat," is their business.

If you see a man undress on the bank of a river, and plunge in, and you are sufficiently interested to wonder why he did it, you can form three hypotheses:

- (a) He wants to commit suicide
- (b) He wants to get to the other side
- (c) He likes swimming.

You do not say, "This is astounding. No one ever did anything like this before. I can only assume that he wants to catch the 9-15 train to his office." Which is about the level of intelligence required to accept the theory that if it hadn't been for Hitler, the world would be an example of Great Men serving Noble Ends.

There is perhaps no more convincing single piece of evidence in regard to the existence of conscious, evil, forces energising a continuous policy, than the strenuous and skilful endeavour to present a picture of events and of history, as purely episodic. History is crystallised *Politics*, not disconnected episodes. Where it is possible to identify a continuous organisation, it is safe to postulate a continuous policy, and as every policy besides having a philosophy, has an appropriate mechanism, or form of organisation, it is also safe to conclude that similar mechanisms have similar policies and philosophies, even if one calls itself National Socialism, a second, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and a third, the New Deal.

At once, I feel sure that some reader will protest, "Are not Haiti and Costa Rica, those great New Deal countries of the West, joined with Britain (once-great)* and our Russian Allies in the struggle to destroy for ever the Nahzee tyranny?" To which, the answer is, in Costa Rican, "Yep."

At this stage, it is, I think, desirable to consider the meaning which could be attached to the remark attributed to the Archbishop of Canterbury nine or ten years ago, that it might take another great war to bring about those changes which were necessary in the world.

II

It should be observed that the Archbishop did not specify a war against Germany. Another great war would do. Clearly, it was something proceeding from war in itself which, to him, seemed an indispensable ingredient of the sort of New World he contemplated.

Now, I do not suppose that the Archbishop of Canterbury, in spite of his obvious Calvinism, and its consequent Old Testament philosophy, has achieved such an Olympian detachment from the sufferings of humanity during his numerous holidays as the guest of Mr. Pierpont Morgan that he really contemplated as desirable the scenes from Inferno typified by Rotterdam, London, and Coventry. But I cannot see that he could mean anything but the idea covered by the remark of *Planning*, the journal of P.E.P. (Chairman Israel Moses Sieff), that "only in war, or under the threat of war, will a British Government embark on large-scale 'Planning.'" And I think that it is important to consider how this relationship between the Planned Economy of Russia, Germany and the Cost Rican New Deal, and the contemplation of a World War on the one hand, and the reluctance of the British Government to adopt this policy, while making, with certain important reservations, genuine efforts to avoid war, on the other hand, affects the real, though not specified, Peace Aims.

I am going to suggest, and I believe that it is quite easy to prove, that Britain was the only great power which wanted peace and the only factor which prevented Britain from remaining at peace, and still further, maintaining peace in Europe, was the domination of the Government by international Finance and its tools, notably the "Labour" or Socialist Party. And that it was exactly this domination of Britain which, by wrecking individual initiative, provided a spurious justification for "Nationalisation," now called "Planning." The objective was, of course, as in Russia and Germany, monopoly, miscalled Socialism. Once we accept the proposition that Britain is an obstacle to world monopoly, we can understand why the "Labour" Party first pressed for disarmament and then for war.

I do not think that it is a coincidence that both in Socialistic Germany and Socialistic Russia there were, and are, two features in common. One is steady and continuous preparation for war. And the other is scorn of Christianity, two at any rate of whose principles are that individuals are more important than institutions, and that the end never justifies the means.

Men make no mistake when they say that this is an ideological war. It is the war of the Old Testament against the New Testament, of Anti-Christ against Christ. This is not apocalyptic raving—it is not even, in the ordinary sense, religion. It will not be featured prominently in the calls to prayer of the "B".B.C. It is merely a statement of the trinity of philosophy, policy, and mechanism, brought into the present tense—that two philosophies and two policies, those of world domination and the materialistic Messiah, on the one hand, and individual freedom on the other, are now at death grips. Anyone who cannot see that Judaism and Christianity have come out of the Synagogues and the Churches into the Banks, the Masonic Lodges, the Cabinets and the workshops, has little to contribute to the direction of victory and still less likelihood

of recognising it when it arrives. He will not be greatly assisted by the pronouncements of the Archbishops.

To say that the stark issue is abstractions versus realities would of course leave much unsaid. But the Satanic use which has been made of such meaningless phrases as "public ownership and control" is an important feature in the struggle. How can a bloodless abstraction called "the public," having neither position or dimension in time or space, own, still less control, anything? Yet the second largest political party in once-great Britain, the chosen tool of international Finance and intrigue, has largely been built up on blah of this description.

The simple fact is, of course, that the word "ownership" is itself largely meaningless. Except as a legal fiction, you do not "own" anything you do not control, and the object of the drive for "public ownership" is, as in Russia and Germany, to take away individual control and freedom and to centralise power in the hands of a new Ruling Caste. Old Testament moralistic abstractions are perhaps the most powerful agency to this end because they appeal to the lowest mob instincts, and they are not less identifiable when they masquerade under such vestures as "*Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*." Consider the state of France.

Although the fact is a little obscured at the moment, the human individual is the highest manifestation of divine attributes with which we are in day-to-day contact. What differentiates him from the lower orders, when he is different, is his initiative—the fact that he manoeuvres under his own steam. I am confident that there is an organised attempt to drive him down the scale of existence, so that he becomes primarily a number on a card index, by taking away as far as possible any recognisable initiative, his potentially divine attribute. The present war, and the obliteration of nationalities, the talk of Federal Unions and United States of Europe, a purely Masonic conception, are all directed to that end. That is to say, war provides the opportunity, perhaps the necessity, for conditions of existence in which the individual is wholly at the mercy of institutions, and those institutions are ultimately controlled by an international junta.

To say that the present crisis is adventitious—that it "just happened" and that everyone did their best to avoid it, seems to me to be merely perverse.

The part of Germany has been sufficiently publicised. Everyone knows that the strenuous efforts (with reservations) of Mr. Chamberlain, who went to lengths never before approached by a British Prime Minister in "appeasement," were greeted with howls of fury not only by the British Socialist Party but by the Cost Rican press urging us to commit suicide, and were finally and irrevocably defeated by the treaty of non-aggression between Mr. Stalin, who had said that he wanted war, and Germany. (Please note that I do not say "between Germany and Russia"—I do not believe that, politically, there is such a place, though there may be later on.)

The major strategy was simple, if grandiose. You bring about a state of affairs in which International Finance controls trade, industry, and distribution, and would have no check on its extortions but for private enterprise. You bring about, as in 1928, major depressions and crises, and when you have intolerable conditions, as in Germany and the Distressed (Pardon me, Special) Areas, you say nothing can be done about it because there's no money.

When these conditions inevitably bring about war, you say War is the major evil of the world and comes from "private enterprise"; you spend eleven million pounds a day in pure destruction when you were unable to spend eleven million pounds a month for constructive purposes; and you set every available type of propaganda to work to advocate that the affairs of the whole world shall be finally and irrevocably handed over to a monopoly of the powers operating through finance and subterranean intrigue, so that effective revolt becomes for ever impossible.

It is, of course, the convenient fashion to say, "Yes, yes, but that is all past history—we must forget all about that, and work for the future." There is no such thing as past history. Only by being quite certain what has happened, not merely what we are told happened, can we understand what *can* happen. Or to put it another way, only by knowing and understanding what and who caused the war, can we understand how to win the war.

(To be Continued)

The Heat is Still On

This heading is that of a November issue of a Keep Falkland Islands British information circular, issued from 14 Park Village West, London, which we reprint for the information of our readers.

Following the cessation of hostilities and the complete surrender of the Argentine forces on the Falklands one might have thought the future of the Falkland Islands had been well and truly settled.

But clearly this is not so.

The attack by the enemy, who we know want the British out of the Falklands so that the Russian Navy can eventually get there and control the strategic southernmost tip of South America, is now taking the following forms:

1. The death toll of the Falklands Campaign was 'horrific'. Watch the Sunday papers especially. No one likes casualties. The cost of human life lost in the Falklands and the cost of the injuries are a cause for the greatest possible concern. They must all be put to the charge of Lord Carrington who did little to discourage the Argentine attack.

2. The financial cost of the campaign was 'enormous'.

Watch all the papers! In arriving at the cost it appears all the pay of the Services in the Falklands Campaign has been added in although of course this cost would have occurred if the Campaign had not been fought.

And all the training experience gained has been added in too, which is unjust, and all cost of shells and explosives, much of which were due for scrapping anyway.

3. The cost of developing the Falklands for viability would be 'enormous'.

In this the Shackleton Report made its contribution, but the report is a tissue of distortion.

The Report says £40 million would be required to start a fishing industry. Not so, if a second-hand ship is purchased and converted and sent to the Falklands as a mother ship and trawlers sail there under their own steam it would cost little more than £1 million. But the Foreign Office is still stopping this move, (but note the Russians and Poles have been fishing there for years and, of course, no mention of this in the press).

The Shackleton Report makes no mention of oil production in the Falklands. But there are oil associated strata at a moderate depth on shore in West Falklands and considerably more at a moderate sea depth off shore. A few years ago the Foreign Office refused permission for a British oil company to prospect for oil in the Falklands. The Shackleton Report is silent on oil. Who banned mention of it? No mention also of minerals in South Georgia.

Little mention of sea weed. And yet only a few years ago a British company had completed plans to harvest this important crop, only to be stopped at the eleventh hour by the Foreign Office.

In the cost of air access to the Falklands the Shackleton Report, like the Press, has been plugging the same line. It is said only large planes can reach it due to its distance from Ascension Island. Also, as Ascension is loaned to the U.S.A., its continued use for civilian purposes is uncertain.

But the Ascension Islands are British. If a lease has been made with the Americans which excludes British Civilian use, let us know about it. We can then scrap it and charge those who agreed to the lease with, at least, incompetence.

No mention in the air transport business has been made of Tristan da Cunha or St. Helena. Ascension, Tristan, St. Helena and Port Stanley are all approximately 1,200 - 1,600 miles apart, just the right distances for island hopping flights by medium-sized aircraft.

I suspect the Foreign Office policy, dictated to probably by the Zionists, is that Great Britain is to have no presence in the South Atlantic. Hence, Tristan da Cunha was evacuated a few years ago and the excuse given that the island was too subject to volcanic activity. I do not believe it.

One can only hope Mrs. Thatcher's new cabinet Foreign Office adviser will enlighten her on the true position of these South Atlantic islands and their importance to the Falklands, and cause her, as she did in April, thank Heavens, to overrule the Foreign Office.

4. Another in my list of attacks being made by the enemy to secure the eventual accession of the Islands to Russia is that on the Islanders themselves.

I was in Port Stanley in January/February. Then I found the Islanders were aghast that the Islands' Chief Educationalist appointed by the British Government was a full-blooded leftist. What damage has he done? If he goes who will select his successor? God forbid the Foreign Office.

Then there was the case of Mr. Carlisle, brother of Mark Carlisle M.P. He arrived in Port Stanley one day and purchased a farm the next without seeing the property. He then set himself up as a spokesman for the Island farmers. Pro Argentine, of course! Whose money was behind him? Why buy a farm unseen? Why at once speak up as a Falkland Islander? We must watch out for similar developments in the future.

5. Finally in my list of attacks on the Falklands, there has been a completely unwarranted attack on the Falkland Islands Company. One article said it was Rockefeller owned. This is complete rubbish. The Falkland Island Company had done, and is doing, a splendid job and it is pro Islander.

So the message from K.F.I.B. is one, as ever, of vigilance and more vigilance. Vigilance and loyalty in spite of all attacks.

Reuter

From a Guardian Service report in *The Sydney Morning Herald*, May 13, 1982 we glean that "Reuter, the world-famous news agency which has been transformed into an international computer-based business information service over 18 years, has finally turned into a gold-mine.

"Its 1981 profit . . . was 395 per cent up on the previous year." Its shares, it seems, are divided among National Press Association, the newspapers, the Australian Associated Press and New Zealand Press Association.

" . . . Only 10 per cent of Reuter's income now comes from its traditional newspaper and media subscribers . . . its most successful product, the Reuter Monitor, a computer-based display unit which allows subscribers to retrieve market prices, news, and key information, from a constantly up-dated computer base. . . . Everyone in finance has to have the Reuter screen.

"Reuter has only one real competitor in this new field — Telerate, now partly owned by Exco. Reuter dominates Europe and the Far East, and Telerate North America. Each is moving into the other's heartland, but it's hard, for the moment at least, not to see room for both."

• • •

News and Finance are concentric.

Birds of a Feather. . .

It has been reported that Mr. Heath, the former British Prime Minister, has become a council member of "Iris", a sort of private enterprise C.I.A. using a powerful computer in Virginia. It was set up to provide a worldwide intelligence service for businesses and governments.

Lord Carrington, the former British Foreign Secretary, has joined Dr. Henry Kissinger's firm which provides "strategic planning" advice to assist corporations in making international business decisions.

Both organisations are Washington-based international consultants.

L. Denis Byrne

After a long illness L. Denis Byrne of Edmonton, Alberta, has died. He was a Fellow and at one time Deputy Chairman for Canada of the Social Credit Secretariat.

John Hargrave

The following is from Peter Simple's column in the *London Daily Telegraph*, December 1, 1982:

A remarkable Englishman has just died at the age of 88. Most people, probably, have never heard of him. It was not always so and should not be so now. His name was John Hargrave.

Everybody has heard of the Blackshirts. But black was not the only colour of shirt to be found among the many political movements competing for public attention and support in the Thirties. There were also the Greenshirts.

John Hargrave was their founder and leader. They believed in the "Social Credit" theories of Major C.H.Douglas, another

remarkable man whose birth centenary in 1979 went almost disregarded, perhaps because he was a genuine revolutionary who opposed the whole banking and financial structure of the world—"The Money Power."

Some of the activities of the Greenshirts were open to ridicule. One day a party of them marched three times round the Bank of England and deposited there a green brick containing the message "Declare the National Dividend." They put on a Christmas pantomime in which Montagu Norman, then Governor of the Bank, appeared as the Ogre.

When the Public Order Act banning para-military uniforms was passed in 1937, the Greenshirts faded out along with the Blackshirts, though they had little if anything in common. The theory of Social Credit persists to this day, though little is heard of it. This is not surprising. It is decidedly unpopular with the great ones of the earth.

As well as being a political leader, Hargrave was a novelist, an aeronautical engineer (inventor of an automatic navigator which he claimed was later used in the Concorde — to me a black rather than a green mark), a lexicographer, artist, psychic healer and authority on Paracelsus.

A crank? A man whose life and work will be forgotten? So much the worse. John Hargrave was no crank. History brings strange reversals. A time may come when this extraordinary man will have the fame and esteem he deserves.

THE CRIME AND THE CURE

With a supplement entitled *CULMINATION*

In C.H.Douglas's words: "We are more than ever, if possible, convinced that a falling price level, without loss to producers and entrepreneurs is the very core of social and industrial pacification. And we are equally convinced by 30 years' specialised experience and observation that the coterie which is at the core of world unrest knows it too, and is determined at whatever cost, extending to the complete destruction of civilisation, and even of the terrestrial globe, it will not have that solution, which would automatically wrest power from it as nothing else would."

65p posted

BLOOMFIELD BOOKS

26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 6AP

Agents for K.R.P. Publications in respect of book sales only

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 £3.00.

OFFICES—Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD. Tel. Sudbury 76374 (STD Code 0787).

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX. Tel. 01-387 3893.

In Australia (Editorial Head Office): 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

Personnel—Chairman: H. A. Scoular, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099. General Deputy Chairman: C. R. Preston, Rookery Farmhouse, Gunthorpe, North Norfolk NR14 2NY, U.K. Deputy Chairman, British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX.