

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 42, No. 11

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1962

6d. Fortnightly

“THE CHOICE BEFORE EUROPE”

In discussing this important book* there is difficulty in selecting one extract in preference to another, as every page contains something of notable meaning, said in a manner which must compel the attention of anyone who feels that a Christian civilisation still has a part to play in a world of centrally organised evil.

The first section was written by Marshall Juin, who was Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Forces in Central Europe in 1951-56. This part deals with the military aspect.

THE RAPE OF EUROPE

The second, and larger part of the book has the above title, and deals with the ideological conquest of Europe; it points to the similarity of purpose of the two mighty empires of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. Henri Massis asks those people who say that we have to choose between the two “Is there indeed any real choice?”

That the U.S.A. has been the instrument used to destroy Europe and Western civilisation is obvious enough; that she is being used to destroy the entire economic, cultural and political basis of White Civilisation is becoming obvious even to Americans. It becomes important therefore to try to discover why the U.S.A. should be chosen for this work of destruction.

Massis quotes the American humanist, Irving Babbit, who wrote at the beginning of this century:

“We possess 90% of the world’s motors, 75% of its oil, 60% of its steel, 70% of its copper, 80% of its telephones; our masses, taken as a whole, enjoy a standard of comfort such as the kings of Europe have never known, but we no longer look to moral ‘Work’ for happiness. In the name of democracy, we are in danger of producing one of the most insignificant species of human being that the world has yet seen”.

The natural resources of America are enormous, and the application of modern technology to these resources has made available wealth beyond anything seen on this earth. The financial and political power concentrated in the hands of those who manipulate the collective wealth of the U.S.A. is so great that its introduction into world politics has created deep concern in the minds of many thinkers.

Massis quotes the following from Talleyrand’s *Mémoires* (1851). “She (the U.S.A.) will develop into a gigantic power, and a time must come when she will want to have a say in our affairs and to take a hand in them. Political wisdom should therefore warn the governments of the old countries

to watch with scrupulous vigilance lest any pretext arise for such intervention. On the day when America deploys her full strength in Europe, peace and security will depart from it for many years to come”.

The pretext for intervention arose through Marshall Aid, and because of this aid the U.S.A. claimed the right to “organise” Europe and unite it under one authority.

Speaking of the world conquests of the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., Massis writes, “It is nevertheless, a *moral* colonisation, far more than conquest or the annexation of territories which threaten us today; it is the very soul of the subject peoples that Russians and Americans threaten to transform. Convinced of ‘the superiority of their primitive vigour over what they choose to regard as the exhaustion of the whole educated, cultured, successful race’, they do not hide their contempt for the European values associated with forms of civilisation which they say are now completely outworn. They themselves, newcomers on the world stage, claim to be utterly fresh and new, and therein lies the fascination which each of these young nations, in its own way, exerts over many minds. Is it not right and proper for them to be original, to give both the world and history a fresh start?”

The revolutionary forces which have today financial, political and military backing are easy enough to detect. They are the policy makers behind America, Russia and the “Liberal Intelligentsia”. This international élite has but one policy, and that is Monopoly - usually called Unity - which means elimination or liquidation of all those organisations, institutions and individuals which might challenge that monopoly.

This international élite has decided that there are to be no separate nations or governments, only one World Government; no separate churches, only one World Church; no private property and no production not permitted by the Central International Authority. In other words, all roads of escape and all chances of revolt are to be finally removed.

Such plans would meet with violent opposition if they were made obvious to many people. Why then is it so difficult to make them obvious? The answer is brain-washing.

It is worth noticing how the Americans, Russians and the Leftish Intelligentsia have all been brain-washed with the same ideology. Americans continuously have their minds indoctrinated with the evils of “Imperialism”, “Colonialism” and of Monarchy; and have been readily used by those in power to undermine and destroy the British Commonwealth in particular, and then the French and Portuguese Empires. The Morgenthau Plan for the elimination of Germany as an industrial unit is most revealing.

The ever-increasing ramifications of technological developments, and the automatic progress associated with such processes, has gone to the heads of many people, and induced

* *The Choice Before Europe* by Marshall Juin and Henri Massis (Eyre and Spottiswoode—1958).

(continued in column 2 overleaf)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices—Business: 9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon 3976.

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

From Week to Week

Britain's "decline has taken place suddenly, sharply, and, if not absolutely, certainly drastically, since the Second World War—all in fifteen years". So *The Times* (July 28, 1962) in the course of an appreciation of a series of articles entitled "The Pulse of Britain" by its Midland Correspondent. "The causes were external" comments *The Times*: but adds, later, "the emphasis of effort has got to be shifted inwards"—by service to under-developed countries, greater attention to planning, re-organisation of government "where needed".

Clausewitz: "War is the continuation of policy by other means". What *The Times* calls decline, we call political defeat—that is to say, 'Britain' 's plight is the outcome of policy, the means of policy, in this case, being economic and propagandistic. "Once you have surrendered to materialism... economics precedes politics, and dominates it". (Douglas). Virtually every resource of propaganda has been employed to induce a surrender to materialism and in consequence the dominance of policy by purely, but false, economic considerations.

More planning? Yes—by the Common Market Commission. Are economic directives from such a source any different in principle from say directives from a victorious Nazi—or Communist—central governing committee?

Douglas warned, about twenty years ago, that Parliament, having served its purpose by disintegrating the structure of our society by which we achieved the greatness preceding our 'decline', might well be superseded, and already it is clear that Parliament is becoming another of our quaintly surviving pageants. The democratic disgust—about the only thing the universal electorate is able to express, and is currently expressing—is treated with contemptuous disregard by the governments on both sides of the House. Once effective responsibility for economic and political decisions has been got safely out of the country, what will the results of elections matter?

"THE CHOICE BEFORE EUROPE" (continued from page 1)

them to believe that all progress is automatic. Many people who are taking part in this rapid development feel themselves to be in the vanguard of a rapidly moving army. This has given the younger nations in particular a sense of superiority over the other nations not so richly endowed with natural resources. This feeling of superiority has been easily used to give a feeling of contempt for all standards of the West, so removing the last bulwark against regimentation by American Big Business and Soviet Centralised Industrialism.

How the fanatical belief in the new religion of "Progress" has been engendered to trap ignorant people can be illustrated by a simple example. A lecturer throws on the screen a picture of a decrepit T Model Ford alongside a gleaming modern limousine. The contrast is so startling that it is greeted with shrieks of laughter. And, with grandpa seated in the T Model Ford, and a contemporary teenager in the modern sedan the personal meaning of the word "Progress" is driven home, and to the teenager this means that he is vastly superior to grandpa. By a suitable choice of "history" in the schools and universities the students very quickly acquire an acute sense of their moral superiority, not only over their elders, but over all past generations.

It does not appear to be the duty of teachers or professors to tell teenagers that progress in the mechanical processes is automatic, whereas in art and morals there can be regression.

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Great world forces have been brought together to create a United States of Europe, and to force Britain to become a member.

The intense pressure being exerted on Mr. Macmillan appears to be reaching breaking point and reminds one of the pressure exerted on the previous Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden, before he collapsed and resigned after the Suez Crisis.

Any Prime Minister whose country expends a disproportionate amount of energy on foreign trade, as does Britain, can be held up to ransom by powerful international bandits.

It is worth noticing that the policy-makers in America had decided many years ago to create a United States of Europe. It was made clear by Roosevelt and others that the British Empire was to be dismantled and that the links between the British Commonwealth were to be severed. Whether the complete destruction of the sovereignty of the British people was aimed at is not clear, but that would be the result if Britain became a member of the United States of Europe.

Henri Massis quotes from the *Uncertain Ally* (London, 1957) as follows:

"When in 1947 the countries of Western Europe decided to ask for assistance and financial aid from the United States, General Marshall expressly stated in his Harvard Speech that 'for the purposes of combined recovery and reconstruction—and under United States patronage—Europe was to be united'. It could not have been made clearer that, in the opinion of the American leaders, the Marshall Plan implied the future creation of an integrated Europe, the nations of which should look beyond the limits of their own territory and band together, handing over their sovereignty to the authority of a higher state. The American Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, was soon to state this quite unequivocally in his

book *War or Peace* (1950). 'The United States', he wrote, 'now has the opportunity to bring about peacefully what . . . ought to be done, but what will not be done unless there is a friendly but firm outside pressure. The United States can and should take that opportunity and exert that pressure. We have the right to do that because at Europe's request we have made a tremendous investment in Western Europe.'

That the prosperity of the Common Market is an economic bait being used to entice the British people into a political trap is becoming obvious to an irate British minority.

This promised prosperity, which is so easily possible, is almost entirely due to technological developments, and has been available for the asking to Britain, France and Germany for a long time. But these countries have not been allowed to indulge in their own wealth, only to exploit it.

The international fraternity who have been in charge of this export racket are prepared to expand credits sufficiently to allow Europe a greater proportion of its own wealth under certain definite conditions; these conditions are, as always, *that it surrenders all political and economic control to a centralised body.*

In this body the British will be in a minority, as will the French and the Germans. Would you like to know who will run this organisation? You guessed right the first time—the same people who run the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. will run U.S.E. (call them US for short).

It is evident that those in control of policy know that the larger an organisation becomes the more easy it is to prevent either a minority or a majority group from gaining control. Only those who can capture the strategic control points in a country can command the success of any political or economic policy.

THE CHOICE BETWEEN TWO MONOPOLIES

In the international sphere we are being asked to choose between two monopolies, and as the choice offered is similar to the choice offered to us in domestic politics it is instructive to examine what is happening nearer home.

It has been known for quite a long time that the rank and file have no appreciable say in the vital policies of their own political party; like commentators on the B.B.C. and A.B.C. they can say anything they like as long as they reveal no secrets, nor challenge the real as opposed to the advertised policies of the policy-makers.

As soon as there is any sign of revolt against caucus control the rebels are drawn aside and told that their vote will be considered as a censure motion and accordingly they will be voting for the opposition. The idea of putting a much-despised enemy into power sounds so repugnant and treacherous that the whips very seldom fail to reduce the most intractable of rebels to obedience.

By this means the majority in the Party has been reduced to impotence, yet it is behind the very effective screen of "Majority Rule" that the work of dismantling the power of two mighty nations, Britain and U.S.A., has been relentlessly carried on, step by step, for the whole of this century. Any person who reveals this work of destruction is immediately subject to a violent campaign of abuse.

The onward march of American Big Business as it conquers each country in turn has met with remarkably little opposition. Even among those who intensely dislike the Americanisation of their country are to be found those who

rub their hands with glee as they hear about the output of some Russian factories reaching the level of American factories. Evidently, the chief criterion of a civilisation is the factory index of output, especially that for export.

The worship of size and of large numbers is something new in history. I don't think there is anything natural about it. I think it has been imposed on an ignorant people by constant propaganda. It is one of the chief inflections of Americanism most abhorred by the European.

As there is a great difference between a small organisation and a large one, a difference not only in size but in kind, it becomes important to realise the peculiar weakness of any large organisation.

An industrial organisation employing several thousand men must plan far ahead. It must plan an uninterrupted stream of supplies and a continuous market for the finished article. This demands, above all other things, a guaranteed continuity of operation, and this can only be ensured by coming to terms with a financial house, a political party, and the central trade union organisation. To run foul of any one of these organisations means almost immediate disaster, as a stoppage of its input or output would be financially crippling. It is obvious that any large organisation exists by permission of a small group of men.

The existence of this group of key men in charge of the political, financial and trade union organisations was known in England as Mond-Turnerism. The difference between Russia and America in this respect is probably more academic than real; in America there appears to be room for two parties, in Russia only one.

The fighting between political parties inside and outside the U.S.A. seems to be at a level where no serious damage is done to either party; in Australia the chief function of the opposition leaders appears to be to keep Mr. Menzies in power; a similar statement could be made about the chief opponents in the international field.

The connection between large industrial groups, the export trade and International Finance becomes obvious when it is realised that the output of a large mass-production factory is so enormous that with ever-increasing automation the output cannot be sold without international markets.

For many years the international banking houses advanced foreign customers money to buy Britain's factory output; today America pays factories for their output and gives it away in aid to foreign countries and by other devices. In other words, the American people get nothing in return for these exports, but those in control of aid to foreign countries have the pleasure of indulging their lust for wielding the power Emperors never had, and imposing their schemes on a helpless world. What Britain has suffered in the process is obvious for all to see.

PLANNING THE WORLD

America looks upon countries like Britain, France and Germany as ridiculously small parts on the map of the world, and therefore very unimportant. She looks upon these geographical spots as Woolworths looks upon a country store, as something to be "taken over", organised and integrated under one centralised authority.

It is fashionable among the "enlightened ones" to speak contemptuously of the idea of nationhood and separate nations. All war, they say, is due to rivalry between nations, and there-

fore if nations are abolished war is abolished. This sounds very true but it is just as true to say that all strife and hatred is between persons and if we eliminate persons we eliminate strife. As far as wars are concerned, the last two world wars were not national at all: they were international. Massis points out that the American civil war was one of the bloodiest in history. He also shows that nationhood is not the product of ambitious men but the organic growth of centuries. Each nation has its own particular contribution to make and cannot make it if it is submerged in a large concentration. It can no more do so than can an individual who is continuously submerged in a group with no privacy of his own.

Massis foresaw the helplessness of the international rabble which called itself the United Nations army in Africa and writes as follows:

"Always we come back to this question of domination, to which every great process of centralisation inevitably, and automatically leads, since there is always someone who, in order to make himself master, will be only too ready to use that perfect instrument—*centralised power*."

"Europe, taken as a whole, cannot submit to such an alternative without disappearing altogether. 'For Europe', said Michelet, 'is not just a haphazard grouping, a mere juxtaposition of peoples. It is a vast and harmonious instrument, a lyre of which each nation has a chord, a separate tone. There is nothing arbitrary in this arrangement. Each is necessary in itself, necessary in relation to the others. To remove a single one is to change the whole, to make this harmony of nations impossible, discordant or dumb.'" (p. 86).

"The reality of Europe is the Nation. Europe herself is not a nation', as Michel Debré aptly remarks. 'To attempt to force nature, and through supra-national authorities create a new nation which would be the legal basis of those authorities, would be to pitch Europe into an adventure from which she might never recover; it would be leading her into anarchy, putting her at the mercy of an outside power, or ensuring the domination of one nation over all the others.'" (p. 87).

"To decapitate the sovereign states may mean going into battle with only a heterogeneous mob which has no personality, hardly even a name, and lacking that incentive to self-defence which nations draw from their past history. Thinking to have built a rampart, we should have set up only a flimsy piece of scenery. Such an empty show of strength could have only one result—it would bring the danger nearer, for not only would it probably turn out to be ineffective in war, but it would certainly prove powerless to settle a single one of the problems of peace". (p. 89).

THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE GROUP

The fatal tragedy of Russian and American centralised organisations is their treatment of men as 'things'.

The cry goes forth "we want more scientists", and nobody tells us why. "We want more efficiency in industry", and yet no one seems to know the meaning of the word. The people who talk mostly about 'efficiency' are busy organising what they are pleased to call 'built-in obsolescence', which, being interpreted, means that the cars, and the tools, and the clothes they produce are specially designed to wear out and become outdated as soon as possible.

This, of course, is fraud on a colossal scale, and can only be made acceptable to an economically regimented population

under the smoke-screen of "Full-Employment".

As Full Employment and automation are mutually exclusive, it follows that in modern societies there is a continuous and fundamental conflict between the intelligent element of the community and the official element in charge of political and economic planning.

Two cars in the garage and a house full of gadgets is no recompense for a life spent in a neurotic, machine-made society over which we have not the slightest control.

Few people in the U.S.A. or in Britain are happy about the benefits of the alleged prosperity. It would appear that the chief industry of the future is going to be the building of mental asylums for the most 'successful' people on earth.

It should be remembered that the Christian West gave birth to the expansion of spirit and adventure that led to the technological developments of the modern world. That these modern developments are being used by alien forces to destroy the Christian West is something that has not yet been discovered by those institutions which are supposed to be the guardians of this great heritage, the Church and the University.

Henri Massis concludes his brilliant essay on "the Rape of Europe" by pointing to the origins of this mighty heritage:—

"The outstanding feature of European civilisation is its essentially Christian character, for it was Christianity that made it. There are to be found the very origins of its existence. Without the faith, Europe, the home of Western civilisation, would be nothing at all. Its reality lies in the universality of its message: its *raison d'être* has been, and still is, to spread the faith throughout the world.

"For modern Europe's contribution to the world is technical progress and not a vital faith, that fundamental, integral Christianity which is itself being forgotten or disavowed. It is her heresies, her rationalism, her materialism, her atheism, which have invaded Africa and Asia, and these same Western errors are at work in Moscow, Washington and Peking. The inner conflict between the materialistic West and the Christian West has transposed itself to a world scale, and within a few years has assumed the proportions of a world-wide civil war.

"Yet if the spirit of the West is immortal, the Western nations may quite well die. They are putting their trust in a youthful America; they are relying on her technical and military aid to help them back up the slopes down which they have slid so rapidly. That is all very well, but what good are Marshall Plans and Foreign Aid Programmes, what good is American economic power, no matter how great, to remedy the deep-seated evil which is endangering the Western world—the denial of God? What good will the finest weapons in the world be in the hands of peoples unsure of themselves, cut off from their past and their tradition: peoples who have become economic and above all spiritual proletariats, fascinated by the ideological dynamism of the opposing camp and ready for any adventure in despair? American machines will not give them back a soul, but if only Europe could regain the soul she has lost, her heritage of genuine humanism, and her heritage of Christianity, might bring home to America that she herself still has to 'acquire a wisdom grounded on the constants of faith and reason, a spiritual life'"*

—JAS. GUTHRIE.

* Jacques Maritain.