

SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 69 No. 3

MAY — JUNE, 1990

"Whilst complete self-determination of the individual is probably impossible . . . the smaller the genuine political unit the nearer we are to self-determination of the individual." — C. H. Douglas.

IT'S ALMOST TOMORROW . . . AND SO WE MUST PART

Harmony used to be a word you could rely on — you knew what was meant. Various voices of diverse tones blending into melody, delighting and inspiring themselves and others. Somewhere along the line, it has become abstract and coercive and bastardised into "harmonisation". A colloquial dictionary would put it: "as in the E.C."

Such cynical twist of words is encountering less and less objection until it is almost a godsend, rather than an established right, to get some plain talking. Thus a modest, unadorned £1.50 booklet, published a year ago by what was then the British Anti-Common Market Campaign, remains one of the few harbour lights in a sea of obfuscation. Entitled "What 1992 Really Means: Single Market or Double Cross?" it grows more timely by the hour (if more dated in a year). Painstakingly, its early pages make sense to the economist and impress the seeker after truth. In the last few pages, in its summing-up, it incontrovertibly declares a verdict of "Guilty" to the charge posed in its title. There is no doubting the advocacy of the authors, right from the start, and they certainly point out fallacies and illogicalities and downright fraud as they go along, but only in conclusion are we left with the consuming urge that we cannot let this go on a moment more.

Brian Burkitt, senior lecturer in economics at Bradford University, and Mark Baimbridge, a graduate in economics from Bradford, are not easily quoted nor summarised; their argument is too closely knit and too densely populated with figures for a brief review. Perhaps that is why only such as *The Times* and *The Glasgow Herald* took the trouble to give space and thought to what should be placed before every voter not only in the UK but on the continent of Europe and in every land where EC influence is felt. This is because such influence is unadulteratedly pernicious. It is a harsh judgment, but read this book then dare to disagree.

To mention just one point of especial note to Social Crediters in this regard:

"The ultimate objective of monetary union within a single market involves total convertibility of currencies, the elimination of exchange rate fluctuations, the fixing of parity rates and the complete liberalisation of capital movements. Under such a system countries that pursue full employment policies remain unprotected from those who do not, so that the UK becomes a prisoner rather than the master of its own destiny."

The authors observe:

"It seems incredible, given the historical effects of EEC membership, that any UK politician can contemplate surrendering control over its fiscal, monetary and exchange policies to EEC institutions.

"The effective government of Britain would then reside in a constitutionally independent European System of Central Banks and the views of voters would become of secondary importance in comparison to those of a small oligarchy of financiers." (*Our emphasis.*)

This latter policy, alas, is that adopted by Michael Heseltine who is becoming more and more heir apparent to the Thatcher throne. A look at Mr Heseltine's career and associates suggests he has not deviated from a clear sense of direction usually emanating from the Bilderberg group. Thus while his competence cannot be gainsaid, his rising star is to be watched with grave misgiving.

Under his premiership, we cannot expect our authors' advice to be followed:

"The minimum requirement to restore self-government to the UK is the immediate repeal of Section 2 (2) of the 1972 European Communities Act which makes EEC decisions binding in Britain."

In the event of withdrawal or other arrangement with the EEC, the authors list the bargaining strengths: a major contributor to the EEC budget, the only net consumer within the EEC of many of the agricultural products currently in surplus, overwhelming net importer of EEC manufactures, most important provider of fishing waters to the EEC Common Fisheries Policy, and the only EEC country self-sufficient in energy.

It should be remembered that the UK electorate have not been consulted either on the main moves or the projections. As Teddy Taylor asked in the Commons: "How many European Economic Commission directives were considered by the House before and after 10 pm and how many were not considered by the House at all?"

Came the answer: 751 EEC documents were deposited at Westminster in 1989. Of these only 96 were debated — 32 before 10 pm, 40 after 10 pm, and 24 in standing committee.

Many of these directives affect every life in the UK and are obviously presented to thin numbers of MPs and go unreported because the media have already finished for the day. This is not only a gross dereliction of duty on the part of many representatives whose private interests come before their public function, it is positively sinister.

Here, then, is evidence of what the authors underline: the reduction of member-states to regions with the centralisation of policy-making power in the institutions of a customs union. Westminster has already thrown in the towel and is content to settle for domestic bickering. It is both pathetic and shameful. But above all, it is treachery.

IAIN MCGREGOR.

You shall know the truth, said Jesus (John Ch. 8, v. 32) and the truth shall make you free. That was a promise made only to those who believed in Him and those who, as He said, would “abide” in His word. In a world starved of truly great statesmen, are there any leaders consciously fulfilling that condition? Behind the fine words and the glorious sentiments, is there any plan fit for the Kingdom of God?

Is the Western world too far gone to adopt a new way? If so, will a prophet from the newly emergent democracies of the Eastern bloc come to the fore by popular acclaim to cast aside the masks of politics and to get on with the business of living amicably and fairly with the neighbours? The chance is there. Witness playwright Vaclav Havel in his first speech as ad hoc President of Czechoslovakia:

“My dear fellow citizens,

For 40 years you heard from my predecessors on this day different variations of the same theme: how our country flourished, how many millions of steel we produced, how happy we all were, how we trusted our government and what bright perspectives were unfolding in front of us.

“I assume you did not propose me for this office so that I, too, would lie to you.

“Our country is not flourishing. The enormous creative and spiritual potential of our nations is not used sensibly. Entire branches of industry are producing goods which are of no interest to anyone, while we are lacking the things that we need. A state which calls itself a workers’ state humiliates and exploits workers. Our obsolete economy is wasting the little energy we have available.”

Vaclav Havel went on to deplore the standard of education and the pollution of soil, rivers and forests; then said:

“The worst thing is that we live in a contaminated moral environment. We felt morally ill because we became used to saying something different from what we thought. We learned not to believe in anything, to ignore each other, to care only about ourselves. Concepts such as love, friendship, compassion, humility or forgiveness lost their depth and dimensions and for many of us they represented only psychological peculiarities, or they resembled gone astray greetings from ancient times, a little ridiculous in the era of computers and spaceships.”

The previous regime, he charged, “reduced Man to a force of production and Nature to a tool of production. In this it attacked both their very substance and their mutual relationship. It reduced gifted and autonomous people, skilfully working in their own country, to nuts and bolts of some monstrously huge, noisy and stinking machine, whose real meaning is not clear to anyone. It cannot do more than slowly but inexorably wear down itself and all its nuts and bolts.”

The moral contamination had affected “all of us”, he said.

“We had all become used to the totalitarian system and accepted it as an unchangeable fact and thus helped to perpetuate it. In other words, we are all — though naturally to different extents — responsible for the operation of the totalitarian machinery, none of us is just its victim; we are all also its co-creators.”

He declared:

“We have to accept this legacy as something we committed against ourselves. If we accept it as such, we will understand that it is up to us all, and up to us only, to do something about it. We cannot blame the previous rulers for everything, not only because it would be untrue but also because it could weaken the duty that each of us faces today, namely the obligation to act independently, freely, reasonably and quickly.

The Art of t

“Let us not be mistaken: the best government in the world, the best parliament and the best president cannot achieve much on their own. And it would also be wrong to expect a general remedy from them only. Freedom and democracy include participation and therefore responsibility from us all.”

Noting the “enormous human, moral and spiritual potential and civic culture” just awakened, Vaclav Havel said:

“From where did the young people who never knew another system take their desire for truth, their love of free thought, their political ideas, their civic courage and civic prudence? How did it happen that their parents — the very generation that had been considered as lost — joined them? How is it possible that so many people immediately knew what to do and none of them needed any advice or instruction?”

He offered two main explanations:

“First of all, people are never just a product of the external world, but are also able to relate themselves to something superior, however systematically the external world tries to kill that ability in them; secondly, the humanistic and democratic traditions, about which there had been so much idle talk, did after all slumber in the unconsciousness of our nations and ethnic minorities and were inconspicuously passed from one generation to another so that each of us could discover them at the right time and transform them into deeds.”

He was quick to mention, however, the immense cost the new freedom had entailed in martyred lives and exile, not only in his own country but the others of the Soviet bloc. They must not be forgotten, he said:

“First of all because every human suffering concerns every other human being; but more than this: they must also not be forgotten because it is these great sacrifices which form the tragic background of today’s freedom, and of the gradual emancipation of the nations of the Soviet bloc. They also form the background of our own new-found freedom: without the changes in the Soviet Union, Poland, and the German Democratic Republic what has happened in our country could scarcely have happened. In any event, it would not have followed such a peaceful course.”

Looking ahead to “civic, national and political self-confidence”, he said:

“Self-confidence is not pride. Just the contrary: only a person or a nation that is self-confident in the best sense of the word is capable of listening to others, accepting them as equals, forgiving its enemies, and regretting its own guilt. Let us try to introduce this kind of self-confidence into the life of our community and, as nations, into our behaviour on the international stage. Only thus can we restore our self-respect and our respect for one another as well as the respect of other nations.

“Our state should never again be an appendage or a poor relation of anyone else. It is true we must accept and learn many things from others, but we must do this again as their equal partners who also have something to offer.

“Our first president wrote: ‘Jesus, not Caesar’. In this he followed our philosophers Chelcicky and Comenius. I dare

e Impossible

to say that we may even have an opportunity to spread this idea further and introduce a new element into European and global politics. Our country, if that is what we want, can now permanently radiate love, understanding, the power of spirit and ideas. It is precisely this glow that we can offer as our specific contribution to international politics.

"Masaryk based his politics on morality. Let us try in a new time and in a new way to restore this concept of politics. Let us teach ourselves and others that politics should be an expression of a desire to contribute to the happiness of the community rather than of a need to cheat or rape the community. Let us teach ourselves and others that politics can be not only the art of the possible, especially if this means the art of speculation, calculation, intrigue, secret deals and pragmatic manoeuvring, but that it can even be the art of the impossible, namely the art of improving ourselves and the world.

"We are a small country, yet at one time we were the spiritual crossroads of Europe. Is there any reason why we could not again become one? Would it not be another asset with which to repay the help of others that we are going to need?"

However, he saw an obstacle:

"Our main enemy today is our own bad traits: indifference to the common good, vanity, personal ambition, selfishness and rivalry. The main struggle will have to be fought on this field.

"There are free elections and an election campaign ahead of us. Let us not allow this struggle to dirty the so far clean face of our gentle revolution. Let us not allow the sympathies of the world which we have won so fast to be equally rapidly lost through our becoming entangled in the jungle of skirmishes for power. Let us not allow the desire to serve oneself to bloom once again under the fair mask of the desire to serve the common good. It is not really important now which party, club or group will prevail in the elections. The important thing is that the winners will be the best of us, in the moral, civic, political and professional sense, regardless of their political affiliations. The future policies and prestige of our state will depend on the personalities we select and later elect to our representative bodies."

Vaclav Havel concluded his first speech thus: "People, your Government has returned to you!"

By contrast, the drive and direction of the European Community are combining to remove government further and further, by easy stages, from the control of the people it claims to represent. This process must be halted and reversed before it becomes consolidated into a new and unmanageable empire of Eurocrats of the same kind as that now collapsing in Eastern Europe.

As Hansard for March 13th, 1989, recorded the MP for Chesterfield (Mr Tony Benn) warning:

"When people discover that whoever they vote for, they cannot change the law or the system of taxation under which they are governed, either they will go to Brussels and petition the Commissioners — who are the modern kings — or they will say:

"Why bother to vote? Let us take more direct action to change the law."

"That delicate fabric of consent on which our system of Government rests has already been fractured. We do not know all the consequences. One consequence is separatism in Scotland, as some people in Scotland believe that they would be better off conducting their own negotiations. The fragmentation of the United Kingdom is an inevitable consequence of membership of the EEC. . . .

"The time has come to warn the House, and even the passionate Common Market Europeans, that we go thus far but no further. If we dig deeper into the pit, we may find that the courts would not even accept our right to repeal the European Communities Act. We would be in a constitutional crisis of enormous magnitude if we were to repeal section 2 to regain the power that we have lost and the court said: 'Sorry, but in effect, by usage and practice and common law, Parliament has lost the right to liberate itself.'"

RECOMMENDED READING

Benson, Ivor	This Age of Conflict.
Burkitt, B. & Baimbridge, M.	What 1992 Really Means: Single Market or Double Cross?
Douglas, C. H.	The Brief for the Prosecution. The Development of World Dominion. Economic Democracy. The Monopoly of Credit. The Policy of a Philosophy. Social Credit.
Maré, Eric de	A Matter of Life or Debt.
Monahan, Bryan W.	The Moving Storm. The Survival of Britain. Why I am a Social Crediter.
Robertson, Thomas Social Credit Secretariat	Human Ecology. Elements of Social Credit. Zimunism.
Sutton, Antony C.	National Suicide — Military Aid to the Soviet Union. Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution.
Tether, C. Gordon	The Great Common Market Fraud.

Britain and Overseas, published quarterly by The Economic Research Council, Benchmark House, 86 Newman Street, London W1P 3LD.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas. The Social Credit Secretariat is non-party and non-class, neither connected with nor supporting any political party.

Subscription rates (one year): U.K. inland £5.00; overseas surface mail £6.00; overseas airmail £7.50; Australasia \$6.

Offices — Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD. Tel. 0787 76374.

— Editorial: 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 6LR.

— In Australia (Editorial, Subscriptions, Business and Books): Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

BOOKS and booklets on the subject of Social Credit and allied subjects are available from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and in Australia from Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE SOCIAL CREDITER and back numbers are available from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and from Tidal Publications in Australia, address above.

Booklist and prices upon request.

Insights

Coming to Terms with Terms

“UNEMPLOYMENT”, as the term is almost universally used, carries the connotation of economic sickness — what politicians and commentators refer to as “the cancer of unemployment”. It is “an evil” to be avoided at almost any cost. But what they are really deploring, unthinkingly, is the *loss of income* from employment.

The opposite condition, “full employment”, is held up as one of the most desirable of all economic objectives. Political parties all claim it as a principal aim of their policies. It is deemed to be the prime purpose of the economy — to keep people in work. If there is unemployment, jobs must be “created”, and fierce international competition ensues as governments induce or bribe foreign firms to set up factories in hard-hit areas.

For most people, getting and keeping a job is an all-pervading consideration and the greater part of the educational system is devoted to preparing people for qualifications which might ensure, if not a “job for life”, a succession of profitable jobs over a life’s span. In the 1984 coal strike the miners defended their threatened jobs with the cry, “Not just for me but for my son and his son after.”

In short, employment in return for an income is the accepted norm — the means has been turned into an end in itself. Or as C. H. Douglas has put it, “It” (i.e., economic servitude) “is the most powerful means of constraining the individual to do things he does not want to do; i.e., it is a system of government. This implies a fixed ideal of what the world ought to be.”

The concept is powerfully reinforced by the quasi-moral tone of the “Work Ethic”. One “ought” to have to “work for a living”. “The devil makes work for idle hands.” But curiously, the “leisured classes” who are fortunate enough to have incomes independent of employment are not conspicuously antisocial and many of them devote their time and money to socially beneficial activities. And who would not like to be “independent”? “If a man shall not work, then neither shall he eat.” That simple statement of an economic fact of life in the subsistence economies of St Paul’s day has been elevated into a spurious principle of morality, quite regardless of the advances in applied science which have produced a superabundance of material goods with ever-increasing efficiency and ever-decreasing reliance on human labour.

Thus imbued from an early age with the philosophy of the Work Ethic, it is small wonder that it requires a major intellectual leap to free oneself from an ingrained habit of mind. But consider the accelerating pace of change in the advanced economies. Just as the first industrial revolution introduced mass production by machinery and the second harnessed natural sources of energy to drive it instead of human energy, so the next revolution bids fair to liberate human energy even further and explode the concept of “full employment”.

Under the heading “Microelectronics in Japan’s New Industrial Revolution” (*Britain and Overseas*, Spring 1989), Takashi Kiuchi spelled out some of its main features. “For years now” he wrote, “people have been talking about a new industrial revolution and recent developments seem to indicate that it is finally under way. The core force of the revolution is microelectronics, which is transforming the technological foundations on which nearly all industries rest. The technologies involved are unique in that they can be applied across the entire spectrum of industrial activity.”

“Microelectronics was first extensively applied in process automation, especially in heavy industry. Then manufacturers of all sorts embarked on factory automation, and not long thereafter they started work on office automation. At that point, service industries joined the revolution, recognizing that computers and related equipment could enhance efficiency in areas once considered incapable of rationalization. . . .

“One of the salient features of the revolution has been the fusion of mechanics and electronics . . . into what is known in Japan as the *mechatronics* sector, of which the robot industry is a representative example. . . . Mechatronics also covers the automation of assembly lines using computers, robots and related devices, *as exemplified by the workerless factories now coming into being.*” (Emphasis added.) “Defined broadly, mechatronics encompasses even distribution innovations like point-of-sales systems, medical equipment like CAT (computerized axial tomography) scanners and educational tools for computer-aided instruction.”

Workerless factories are now to be matched by paperless offices as the application of mechatronics to office procedures progressively “liberates” large numbers of office staff employed on routine paperwork, a process also known as “redundancy”. The microchips at the heart of these processes are themselves being revolutionized. In 1983 it was thought remarkable that a microchip could perform one million discrete operations a second. The latest microchip marketed by a US firm is capable of 80 million operations a second.

So where is it all leading? Inevitably under the present flawed cost-accounting conventions under which prices always outrun incomes, and the continuous generation of irredeemable debt by the world’s banks, to ever-fiercer competition for world markets in order thereby to secure the essential “cash-flow” to liquidate production costs. In this war of attrition, the international conglomerates become bloated with acquisitions and “take-overs” while their staffs of whatever occupation or nationality become mere expendable industrial fodder in this unending “peacetime” conflict.

Is there a sane alternative? Unequivocally, yes!

First, base the creation of credit, debt-free, on the ever-increasing national productivity; second, eliminate the flaw in current cost-accounting by applying a retail price discount at the point-of-sale, a sure-fire counter-inflationary measure; third, issue a basic income (national dividend) to each individual as of right over and above any wages or salaries earned.

It is ironic that the revolutionary processes now at work in industry and commerce should simultaneously ensure material abundance whilst threatening the individual’s claim on it. That claim depends less and less on his employment and more and more on his share of the cultural inheritance which has made abundance possible. Only the application of scientific principles to distribution can transmute “the evil of unemployment” into “the bounty of leisure” and assure each individual of increasing economic security and independence.

*Please send me **The Social Crediter** for a year.

NAME:.....

ADDRESS:.....

.....

.....

Enclosed: £.....