

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 46 No. 12

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1966

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The New Missionaries

Canon Hugh Montefiore, Vicar of the Cambridge University Church, who was in Dunedin for a series of lectures at the University of Otago, expressed a "love-hate" relationship towards his Church and rejected the doctrine of the Virgin Birth (*Otago Daily Times*, June 28, 1966). He said, "believe me, I would not want to belong to any other church." He is of course entitled to his opinions as Hugh Montefiore, as Wells, Shaw or Marx were entitled to their opinions, but I doubt whether any other church would tolerate him in a position similar to that of canon or vicar. He blamed criticism of Professor Geering's views on the Resurrection on "the time lag between academic theology and the popular beliefs of the people." But this set of theologians is leaving the people with no beliefs at all, popular or otherwise; the French translation of the Bishop of Woolwich's book, for instance, entitled it "Dieu sans Dieu."

And when the people have lost all belief or standard of criticism the World Council of Churches steps in to tell them what they should believe and do and pay. Montefiore said that Christianity should be extricated from its popular image of "fairy tale stuff", but the new myths of the World Council are far more incredible and sinister. The Geneva Conference "recommended that the issue of Rhodesia be turned over to the United Nations" on the grounds that Britain had failed to bring about a "just solution" (*Daily Telegraph*, July 26, 1966). This resolution toned down an original draft deploring that Britain had shown no willingness to negotiate "with African nationalist leaders." Inevitably, they called for a re-examination of "the Christian attitude to sex."

More startling perhaps, Cecil Northcott reports in *The Observer* (July 23, 1966) that Dr. Eugene Blake, the general secretary elect, calls for "something like a 'world tax'" so that everyone could contribute to the underdeveloped countries. The general secretary, Dr. W. A. Visser't Hooft, had issued a challenge to "work out the dimensions of a world society in which each nation felt responsible for the welfare of all others" (*Church Times*, July 22, 1966). In fact, the World Council itself acts like a global busybody, intent to ruin any promising experiments—like Rhodesia—that conflict with its one-world prejudices.

Meanwhile in the real world, distinct from the nightmare phantasies of the new theologians and of the World Council, we read that Mr. David Loshak, the journalist, now stands trial in Freetown, Sierra Leone, and that a British journalist "has been detained in the Congo at Lubumbashi, formerly Elizabethville" (*Daily Telegraph*, July 27, 1966).

The *South African Digest* gives some cheerful news which we should doubtless not see reported elsewhere. We read of "big pay rises for Bantu workers" (June 24, 1966), under the Industrial Conciliation Act, together with a maximum working week of 46 hours for clerks, drivers and un-

skilled workers, and a minimum of £70 a month for trained commercial travellers. On June 30 a Bantu was appointed to "one of the most senior administrative posts" (July 8, 1966) as Assistant Bantu Affairs Commissioner for the Hammanskraal district. Marlene Dietrich, a popular enough character, wants a photograph of herself and some children in a crèche "to go round the world so that people can see that the non-Whites in South Africa are not being ill-treated as we are led to understand." (June 3, 1966). Even Senator Kennedy, whose entourage was refused visas, is reported as saying that "each nation must determine its own future and solve its own problems in its own way, so long as it is in the direction of freedom and equality. We in America do not maintain that we are perfect . . ." (June 10, 1966).

The new missionaries, who turn a blind eye to any virtues of White Africans and to any failures of the Black nationalists ("having eyes, they see not"), might consider some of the findings of Laurens van de Post, an opponent of apartheid, which appeared in *The Sunday Telegraph*, June 12 and 19, 1966. "The strange calm I found over Rhodesia is fundamental to the situation," he writes, and quotes the African greeting, "May you be enabled to go slowly," and he blames the new African leaders for rejecting "the instinctive and traditional wisdom of their own people." He was astonished to find that the Africans in Rhodesia preferred an ordered if accelerated evolution of their role in society to a sudden and violent revolution. The pressure for overnight change "came mostly from outside."

Ian Smith impressed him by his sincerity and by his belief in "meritocracy" and partnership, and was convinced that Africans abhorred violence as much as the whites. The Congolese had asked a Red Cross friend of the author frequently, "Will this independence never cease?" The pathos of this remark will be entirely lost on the new missionaries with their repeated demands for force.

The white settlers gave Rhodesia a creative revolution, introducing abundance into waste lands and giving the natives peace and order, and to do so needed to be men of faith. The new revolutionaries bring chaos and hatred, and try to involve the country in war, while their missionaries chip away at the rock of faith, ridiculing their own people and their beliefs. Those who have created plenty with their own hands would be unlikely to be impressed by the theorists, with their restricted and uncreative views, or to forget their grisly record in Africa.

—H.S.

"Scoreboard 1966" Edition

of American Opinion

8/3 including postage

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

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

The *Spectator* has, over the years, contributed in its own way to the mess in Britain, which, in its issue of August 5, 1966, it describes as follows: "The Prices and Incomes Bill now before the House of Commons, complete with the notorious Part IV, represents the greatest infringement of individual liberty, the biggest departure from the free society, this country has known in the present century except in time of war. There can be little doubt but that in a free vote in the House of Commons it would be, rightly, thrown out by a clear majority. Yet so far from there being a free vote, the Government has refused to allow the new Bill—for that is what, in effect, it is—time to be debated at all, seeking refuge behind a legally sound but morally indefensible piece of procedural trickery that sets almost as unfortunate a precedent as the Bill itself."

The morally indefensible procedural trickery was of much the same kind as the trickery applied to get the Rhodesians to agree to the 1961 Constitution (see *T.S.C.*, August 13, 1966). The House of Commons approved a stiff Prices and Incomes Bill, but then the Government tacked on Part IV, which in the words of R. A. Cline in the same issue of the *Spectator* is likely to rank "as one of the leading, traumatic events in the constitutional and legal life of this country."

No doubt Mr. Wilson flew to his masters in Washington to let them know how he proposed to implement their orders; and to make sure that he would not renege, President Johnson staged a luncheon in which he praised Wilson in terms of which Peregrine Worsthorne says (*Sunday Telegraph*, July 31, 1966): "Recollected in tranquility it makes the flesh creep, and it is difficult to know whether to be more shocked by the Texan's assumption that Britain could be conned in this way, or by Mr. Wilson's fantastic failure to dissociate himself and his colleagues from these grotesque analogies."

A credit squeeze is like cutting down the supply of fuel to an internal combustion engine, except that deprivation of money in an industrial economy damages the economy as well, as our enemies fully understand. In the light of current developments, it is difficult to understand how anyone can fail to see the connection between say the U.S. and

U.S.S.R. collaboration in the Suez crisis, the betrayal at Nassau, the dismantling of the British defence aircraft industry in favour of projected American aircraft, and the congratulations to Mr. Wilson by the U.S. administration as he embarks on measures which if persisted in will wreck the British economy.

And what does the *Spectator* think of it all? "To have rushed through without proper debate legislation that will produce economic inefficiency and industrial strife, that will seriously impede the vital growth of productivity bargaining and—worst of all—that rides roughshod over basic human freedoms, all for no discernible benefit, is evidence of the clearest and most unequivocal kind that the present Government . . ."

Well, that the Government what?

- has been intimidated by the gnomes of Zurich?
- is intimidated by its left-wing critics?
- at last realises the gravity of the situation?
- is considering the formation of a coalition government?
- is determined to use force in Rhodesia if necessary?
- has no alternative?
- has reached an advanced stage of panic?
- will give further consideration to joining the EEC?
- is in the grip of a conspiracy?
- is suffering the consequences of Rhodesian intransigence?

The correct answer (no prize) according to the *Spectator* is "has reached an advanced stage of panic", as a result of which "our political and individual liberties . . . are at stake".

—Panic or no, we have certainly reached the stage where our liberties, and probably our lives, are at stake, precisely as predicted by the late Major C. H. Douglas. He gave, for example, an early warning in February, 1926: "You will quite properly feel inclined to ask at this stage of the argument: 'Are you stating that the condition of affairs in Great Britain is the result of conscious policy aiming at producing the results that we see around us, or are you merely suggesting that British financiers are incompetent?' If the former, what is the ultimate object of that policy?"

"Taking all these matters into consideration, and having made it my business to observe the course of events in the United States of America, together with what information it is possible to glean in regard to Italy and Russia, I have come to the conclusion that we are witnessing a gigantic attempt, directed from sources which have no geographical nationality, to dispossess a defective democracy, and to substitute a dictatorship of finance for it . . . and I may perhaps say that I think that the elimination of an independent upper middle class is an intermediate objective of that policy."

Some years later he wrote: "If there is a spark of virility left in this country, the day the next war breaks out the local representatives of Finance will face a firing party in the Long Gallery of the Tower."

Looking backwards, it can be seen that these warnings have been justified and borne out by events; and to suppose that the present British crisis is not another instalment, indeed culmination of a persisting policy of which the Great Depression, the Second World War, and the current disarmament of Britain are large component parts is to be wishfully or wilfully blind.

On the other hand, anyone who *does* grasp this essential continuity of a policy whose objective is now visible in its present outcome must also realise that the conspiracy is not going to give up because we have become aware of what is happening and do not like it. We understand much better now the connection between Finance and Communism, and Communism shows us what happens when discontent, called counter-revolution, begins to be manifest.

• • •

“The endless passionate debates about ‘national purpose’ that filled the national newspapers, periodicals and airwaves of his native land foundered on a hard rock that many Americans simply could not bring themselves to acknowledge: that they were up against a basically hostile climate manipulated by an opponent who had no real desire to get along with them.

“This fact, so terrifying in its implications and so demanding of sacrifice and courage if the implications were fully acknowledged, was too much for most Americans—indeed for most Englishmen, or Frenchmen, or any other still hopeful peoples of the West—to face. So they spun out the hurrying months and years of the enemy’s brutal advance assuring one another that they must find a Purpose, while the one purpose that could possibly mean anything at all to themselves, their posterity, or the world—simple survival—was slowly but surely allowed to erode away.”

—From the novel *A Shade of Difference*, by Allen Drury.

• • •

In many respects, the novelists tell us more about contemporary events than do the analysts, for they show through the human emotions and character how policies crystallise into history; they make real and credible the intrigues, the plots, the conspiracies which on their various levels underlie the events which are presented to us as mere episodes of ‘news’. They make credible to us the reality of the *management* of the news.

Allen Drury’s novel concerns the actual working of the United Nations, told in terms of the personalities and ambitions and posturings of several key figures. But Drury covered the United Nations as a reporter for Washington and New York newspapers, and so must be drawing on experience for the creation of his fictional characters. One of these is an African from a region of Africa for which he demands immediate independence. The M’Bulu’s ambitions in this respect are exploited, like Mr. Wilson’s (the contemporary Churchill, to paraphrase President Johnson), by more far-sighted manipulators determined on the destruction of Western civilisation.

What of the M’Bulu’s background? Read Robert Ruark’s *Uhuru*, Nicholas Monserrat’s *The Tribe That Lost Its Head*, Joyce Cary’s *African Witch*. These make nonsense of the professional commentaries which see Africa in the light of Western party politics, for they see African political realities in terms of the actually existing passions and beliefs of the various peoples of the Dark Continent. Not for the realistic and experienced novelist the notion that “feudalism is fighting the forces of the future” as an A.B.C. commentator put it. The reality and the fight are in the here and now, between a Conspiracy and an eroding Christian civilisation.

Which do you choose?

The following survey, by Mr. Robert Welch, is reprinted with his kind permission, from the April 1966 BULLETIN of the John Birch Society:

In the hope that copies of this bulletin will be sent or given by our members to tens of thousands of other patriotic Americans, this foreword is primarily written for, and addressed to, all such non-members as we can reach. But we have no qualms about this orientation of our comments, because we believe our members too may find some questions in the following series which should give them pause.

There are a billion human beings on the earth today who would not have the slightest hesitation about their answer to the comprehensive question above, as the significance of that question develops in these pages; or to any of the separate little questions which make our total meaning clear. But for them it is too late. And there, but for the grace of God, go we—down exactly the same road to death and slavery as Czechoslovakia and China and Cuba and the Congo.

For Americans, however, it is not yet too late. All that is needed even now is for an appreciable percentage of its citizens to determine that they will play an active role in settling positively those questions concerning our future which are now being decided negatively by default. For the slow, steady, subtle weaving of the Lilliputian threads of tyranny around the lives of the American people is not due to any blind belief in the idealism, wisdom or desirability of a socialist society, but to the ignorance, apathy, cowardice, and opportunism of those being enslaved.

This is harsh language because it is time for realistic bluntness. And every man or woman who reads these lines had better make sure how far he or she is free from guilt, by commission or omission, of the charges to be considered. We are not writing these lines or asking these questions for fun, but to see how far the reader can be persuaded to search his own soul and come up with some honest answers. And so, with that purpose in mind, let’s begin with fundamentals.

SECURITY OR FREEDOM?

A modern prison guarantees to its inmates food, shelter, clothing, educational facilities, entertainment. The quality and extent of each is determined by forces entirely beyond the control of the inmates. In exchange, the prison takes from each inmate his freedom of movement and of action, the responsibility for his own welfare, and the opportunity to improve his material condition. The Communist state makes no pretense to being anything else, and has no goal of becoming anything else, but a gigantic well run prison. The only opportunity for advancement for anybody is through becoming one of the wardens. But the advantages of living in such a prison do appeal to some men, as against the hardship and uncertainty of struggling for oneself on the outside. What about you? Are you sure? Or do you really want the *security* which a prison offers, so much that you are willing to close your eyes to the fact that its walls are right now being erected all around you?

The steps by which America is being patiently and cleverly converted into a Communist police state are as plain as day. Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, is being replaced by that goal of today’s Liberals,

government of the people, by the government, and for the government.

Paramount among these steps is a taxation program, by nation, state, and municipality, leading towards a situation where the total taxes of all the agencies of government will be taking from you your *total* income. But will this leave you destitute? Not at all. Parallel with taking more of the product of your labor from you by taxation, government will continue "giving" you more "free" education, medical care, recreational facilities; and then, working from the luxuries back to the necessities, more housing for the poor, food for the poor, and clothing for the poor, as all of us are forced by these very circumstances into becoming poor together. Already you do not have to worry about doctor's bills, or the education of your children; tomorrow you will have ration cards which relieve you of any worries about food or clothing; and you will be told which rooms of which houses you and your family can live in as wards of the state. The quality will be down, of course; and even the quantity will be subject to the inefficiencies of a socialist régime. But the worry about providing all of these needs of life will have been taken off your shoulders. Is this what you choose? Are you sure you do not? Then why did you vote for medicare? Or accept and allow the school lunch program? Or what have you done at any point to prevent this gradual transition?

A completely free economy always produces "too much", and must have a million salesmen to find ways and places to move that abundance—largely by converting today's luxuries of the rich into tomorrow's necessities of everybody. The completely socialist economy of **Communism** always produces too little, and must have a million ration clerks to divide what there is. But in a completely free economy, production sometimes gets ahead of salesmanship, bringing about panics or depressions until the market can automatically adjust itself into reasonable balance again. In a completely socialist economy production frequently falls short of minimum needs, causing the lines served by the ration clerks to become long and despondent. Which do you choose? Really? Then why are you and over forty million other Americans receiving a government check every month, representing some form of "help" you are letting the government give you—all the way from Social Security checks to fat profits on government contracts? Or what have you done to keep the government out of businesses where it did not belong?

Today's army of bureaucrats, being constantly enlarged by government, and deployed more extensively at ever lower levels of our economic and political life, is simply the preliminary framework of personnel for the regimented police state of tomorrow. Do you want to have the agents of Big Brother observing, guiding, criticizing, correcting, and controlling everything that you do, twenty-four hours a day, from the cradle to the grave? Then your mistakes will no longer be *your* mistakes but those of Big Brother; and you no longer will have any moral code to worry about, but only Big Brother's regulations which will have replaced it. You say you do not want the army of government agents increased and given more power, until you are never out of their sight, nor out from under the constant impact of their petty tyrannies. Then what did you do, for instance, to oppose the sales tax in your state—or, if your state does not yet have a sales tax, what will you do to oppose it when the legislation is proposed in your state, as it surely will be?

Or what will you do to oppose the Federal Government's presently taking over all of these state sales taxes, "to make them uniform," and reimbursing the separate states with some part of the money received?

For, make no mistake about it. Next to the graduated income tax, which has formed so vital a part of the Marxian program, the sales tax is the greatest help to that program of all the major forms of taxation yet devised. This is because the number of bureaucrats required to administer, enforce, and police the sales tax is so out of proportion to the net cash received by government as to make the sales tax a shameful absurdity as a producer of revenue—but a brilliant and tragic instrumentality as a means of increasing the quantity and reach of government. Yet many a businessman and property owner will listen to the politician's demagogic arguments about the sales tax as a means of reducing the tax load on real estate, or at some other point—as if any additional tax, anywhere or at any time, had ever been used by *any* government to replace and reduce other taxes. The demagogues—and the Communists behind these demagogues—merely count on the greediness and self interest as well as the blindness and gullibility, even of Conservatives, to help them to drop this further net of government's tyranny over the lives of its subjects.

And we are using the sales tax here simply for illustration. Are you willing to fight against increasing governmental controls and regulations and bureaucracy, even when it costs you profits or advantages or handouts—or only when it helps you by taking these handouts from other people? Which do you really choose, *under all circumstances*: more government or less?

Finally, within this category of fundamentals, do you really want a moral environment all around us, or an immoral one? We believe all human experience proves truthfulness to be the very core and *sine qua non* of morality. Do you want everybody else to tell the truth, while you yourself are allowed to stretch it or hide it or distort it? To ask more serious questions in this area might be construed as insulting. And we are not insulting or condemning or even lecturing anybody. We are simply pointing out that there is a very definite breakdown of morality going on all around us today. We merely are asking you to answer honestly, at least to yourself: Are you going right along with all of the changing attitudes towards morality for young and old, because "everybody's doing it"? Or do you so much prefer a better and healthier moral climate that you are doing your responsible part, by example and leadership, to create or restore one?

(To be continued)

Trading with the Enemy

On page 4 of our issue for August 27, 1966 the value of goods sold by Australia to Communist China in the nine months up to March was shown as \$84,111 million. This was a printing error in *The Export Reporter* from which we quoted. The amount should have read \$84·111 million.

The Menace of Communism

Why does the West pursue in Africa the policies so vigorously advocated by the U.S.S.R. and Communist China?
Free on request

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11.
Printed by E. Fish & Co. Ltd., Liverpool.