

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 50. No. 8.

SATURDAY, JULY 11, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

SOUTHERN AFRICA & THE WORLD CRISIS

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

The following, originally completely confidential, appreciation addressed to the Prime Minister of the Republic of South Africa was forwarded via the Embassy in Australia some eighteen months ago. No acknowledgement has been received, nor is there any evidence that South Africa is following anything but an orthodox policy. Because of the great problems of expansion and development Keynesian economics are still practicable in South Africa, whereas they are visibly breaking down in such fully developed countries as Britain and the U.S.A. The evidence is that these policies, basically unsound, are persisted in to the point of economic breakdown when a World Remedy under the auspices of a World Government — Communist or otherwise — can be imposed. In the meantime, Southern Africa is being politically isolated.

I. POST-WAR DEVELOPMENTS

At the conclusion of the 1939-1945 war, with Germany and Japan decisively defeated, world power was shared between the U.S.A., Britain, France and the USSR—the so-called Big Four. The U.S.A., however, with its immense mobilisation of both man-power and resources, its invulnerability, its logistical ability, and its exclusive possession of the atom bomb, was by far the leading world Power, and could have imposed on the world a *Pax Americana* of either a military or benevolent nature.

Twenty-two years later the world is confronted with two so-called Super-Powers in apparent confrontation but which, if they came to agreement, could impose an impregnable World Government over the whole globe. The USSR, however, has always maintained that its objective is a totally socialist world, and it means by this a fully centralised world government managing the economy of the world as a whole, and able and intending to enforce its writ and to put down rebellion against policies which would inevitably run counter to national aspirations. Thus the immense productivity of the U.S.A. and other highly industrialised countries would be dispersed in pursuit of planned global re-organisation.

National groupings, however, under suitable conditions throughout history have striven for separate development, resulting in the development over the centuries of highly distinctive cultures and consciousness, in individuals who contact differing cultures, of a feeling of national identity. Thus the movement towards total world government is contrary to the historic development towards differentiation—a situation which requires the use of force, or the credible threat of the use of sufficient force, to stamp out national aspirations.

Yet in the past twenty-two years immense and visible progress towards world government has been made. The early post-war

years saw an immense expansion of Communist domination geographically in the face of American demobilisation. But progressively also there has been the destruction of national economies and institutions by subversion; and the promotion of de-colonisation has practically everywhere set back severely both economic development and progress towards civilisation.

One would think that the fruits of these years would bring into question the validity of the policies pursued. But in fact one finds that the U.S.A. has in every important instance supported Communist objectives by its actions, whatever verbal confrontations have been indulged in. Currently, though fighting Communist controlled Vietnamese in Vietnam, the U.S.A. is supplying the USSR with critical materials, though unquestionably aware that the war could not be sustained for a week without massive Russian supplies and technical assistance to North Vietnam. The American involvement in Vietnam under such circumstances undoubtedly furthers Communist purposes.

Similarly, after a period of denying that Russian missiles were being deployed in Cuba, the U.S.A. Administration acknowledged their presence. The outcome of the subsequent 'crisis' was an American undertaking not to invade Cuba, and to withdraw American missiles from Turkey. Since then it has been repeatedly reported that Russia has built Cuba into a virtually impregnable fortress, stocked with missiles and provided with huge underground storage facilities and underground tunnels suitable for aircraft takeoffs.

There are many other instances where U.S.A. actions and pressures belie words and ostensible positions. The main ostensible U.S. position has been the "containment" of Communism; but in fact the whole post-war period has seen the continuous expansion of Communism. This can be explained only by the incompetence of those in control of U.S. foreign policy, or by their complicity in a strategy designed to secure World Government.

II. THE STRATEGIC SITUATION

In 1904 the English geographer Halford Mackinder enunciated the theory of geo-politics which was adopted and developed by the German General Staff. In this theory the Eurasian land mass and its peripheral water areas is the pivotal area of world politics. Control of this area, called by Mackinder the Heartland, would provide the basis of absolute world conquest; and such control was the objective of the strategy of the German General Staff. Control has, however, been achieved by the USSR.

(continued on page 3)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 45/1, Six months 22/6, Three months 11/6.

Offices—

Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Tel. 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Tel. 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001 (Editorial Head Office)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougement, P.Q., Secretary, H. A. Scouler, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

An article by Stewart Steven, Foreign Editor of the *Daily Express*, published in that paper on June 8, 1970, estimates that the Russians could secure control of the Suez Canal in just twenty-four hours, for use "as its own private highway deep into the Indian Ocean". This view of the Middle East—and indeed, world—situation will be familiar to consistent readers of *T.S.C.*, but generally speaking, it seems to be excluded from the Mass Media and in consequence most people seem blind or asleep to the danger. Mr. Steven writes: "For Britain, in particular, the effect would be catastrophic and incalculable. Our oil would be cut at the source—our trade routes and our enormous investments in those areas would be put at peril."

But the present situation is now more of the nature of a *fait accompli*, and it has been brought about more than anything else by the dismemberment of the British Empire. The Russians are there; how can it be even imagined that they would passively watch the reconstitution of a force capable of dislodging them? "If the Soviets take the Suez Canal by force they must be met with force" (Steven). What force? When the Egyptians "took" the Canal, American "force" was deployed against the British and French; has *that* leopard changed its spots?

"The Labour party is the party of internationalism. The Conservative party is the party of patriotism. Unlike the Labour party, it is a party committed to the idea that this nation, as a nation, shall continue to exist.

"The only hope of the Conservatives is to awaken the sleeping patriotism of the electors to the fact that the nation is in danger." Thus Peter Simple in the *Daily Telegraph*, June 9, 1970.

Unfortunately, the Conservative party also contains internationalists; Mr. Heath has said that he is one of them. The writing concerning the danger to Britain has been very plainly on the wall since 1967, and only a little less plainly for several years before that. But the issue has always been between patriotism and internationalism, and the Conservatives have been too compromised by their own involvement in internationalism to bring the issue into the open by the denunciation of traitors, with chapter and verse. The Conservatives have "won" the election but their future is uncertain. Unless the patriots among

them can defeat the attempts made by their leaders to get Britain to adhere to the Treaty of Rome, our continuance as an independent country will cease. Force now is incapable of stopping the Soviets, unless the U.S.A. is prepared to use nuclear weapons. But exposure of traitors could just possibly alter the political climate. If internationalists began to fear for the safety of their own skins, as collaborationists did when the tide of war turned, who knows what would happen?

RUSSIA AND MIDDLE EAST

The following letter appeared in *The Times*, June 3, 1970. Sir John Glubb made his personal interpretation of the Middle East situation known in a small book, *The Middle East Crisis*, first published in 1967, with a revised edition in 1969.

From Lieutenant-General Sir John Glubb

Sir,—I was interestd in the article from your Washington correspondent in your issue of May 27—Russia-U.S. Test of Wills. Mr. Heren states that "an impressive array of intelligence reports" prove that Russia's objective is to dominate Asia and Africa as well as the Middle East. No intelligence reports are necessary for this purpose. Informed writers and speakers have been pointing out this fact ever since the 1967 war.

Unfortunately, Israel's dispute with her neighbours has been so emotionally reported that the British public have forgotten their own interest in their support for one side or another. There are two main requirements for the domination of Europe, Asia and Africa—command of the sea and a base in the Middle East. Russian bases in Egypt and the rapid build-up of her fleets in the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean show that she has appreciated **this**.

The Soviet Union is completely indifferent to the interests of Israelis or Arabs. Her policy is directed against the U.S. and Britain. By cutting down the Royal Navy, we have been her biggest helpers to dominate Europe, Asia and Africa. As soon as she has established naval command of the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, she will be able to dictate her terms to Britain, for we earn our living from seaborne commerce across these oceans.

This much has been obvious for three years without intelligence reports. We must, however, beware of the present sudden flood of propaganda directed by Israel, to enable her to get more jets from the U.S. The Israeli analysis is too egocentric. Russia is not building up her strength in the Middle East to destroy Israel but to destroy us. The Middle East countries do not want the Russians, but fear of Israel supported by the U.S. has driven them to admit Soviet forces.

Israel now asks for more arms from the U.S., which will further alarm other Middle East states and cause them to admit more Russians, and so it goes on. More United States arms for Israel and more Israeli air raids on her neighbours are of immense assistance to the Russian expansion.

The only answer to this situation is not more weapons but more strenuous efforts for peace before we are all ruined.

Yours faithfully,

J. B. GLUBB.

West Wood St. Dunstan, Mayfield,
Sussex, May 28.

Southern Africa and The World Crisis

(continued from page 1)

This is the central fact of the present world strategic situation.

Russian Communism is commonly portrayed as an expansionist military power seeking conquests, as in Africa. But the USSR is an instrument of International Communism, whose strategy is control of the Heartland, and disintegration of peripheral areas important to the 'West'. Thus the assistance the USSR provides for the "newly-emerging nations", of Africa in particular (except for the southern border of the Mediterranean) is assistance in self-destruction. And again, the U.S.A., in its anti-colonialist posture, and by its "aid to under-developed countries", is furthering Communist objectives. Such "aid" was explicitly laid down as a Communist technique by Communist theoreticians before the war ended.

Now Communism, so largely identified in the public mind with the actual and potential military exploits of the USSR, is in fact the contemporary manifestation of an attempt to institute a World Government—an attempt with a documented history of continuity going back a quarter of a millennium. The early steps were the destruction of the monarchical and feudal order, and the substitution of government masquerading behind the forms of what has become known as majority rule. Actual government has increasingly been exercised through personnel indoctrinated in socialism in the first place by the Fabian Society of London, and latterly in institutions such as the London School of Economics and Political Science founded or inspired by the Fabian Society. Originally the doctrines of Fabianism were recognised as revolutionary, but by generations of permeation into universities, education, and churches they have become the established orthodoxy.

Fabian Socialism, however, has always envisaged the eventual destruction of national sovereignty, with the consequences sketched in Section I herein. Marxist revolutionary doctrines and techniques were developed parallel to Fabianism to cover this development.

The transition from Fabianism to Communism may be said to have begun with the first World War, which, seen in the light of subsequent developments, prepared the way for the second World War.

During the first war, and as part of a complex deal to secure American entry into the war on the Allies' side, the British Government agreed to issue the Balfour Declaration, "viewing with favour the establishment of a National Home for Jews in Palestine". After the second war Jews from Europe and Russia were flooded into Palestine, which eventually, with international connivance, was declared the independent State of Israel, thereby creating an intractable Arab problem, and a perfect cover for Russian penetration of the Middle East—rightly described as the cross-roads of the world.

The objective of this long-term strategy was revealed in the June 1967 Israeli-Arab war. This has made the Arabs far more dependent on the USSR, has enabled the establishment of a formidable Russian naval presence in the Mediterranean, and with the evacuation of American air bases in the region, and the handing over by the French Government of their Algerian air base to Algeria long ahead of time, the Middle East is now virtually denied to the West, accessible to the USSR, and Europe's oil supply is in jeopardy. Europe, in effect, is now surrounded, and its lightning conquest a major possibility. In such an event

American public opinion probably would not sanction an American endeavour to retrieve the situation by conventional means, or the use of strategic atomic weapons with the threat of retaliation.

As well as the Balfour declaration, the "deal" between Great Britain and the U.S.A. included drastic economic conditions, such as Great Britain's underwriting the Allies' war debts—conditions which imposed external sanctions over British internal policies. By these means, Great Britain was reduced in strength to a position where she could not avert renewed war by Germany—a war the real purposes of which are revealed in the present consequences.

Britain has occupied a unique position in world affairs by virtue of its island position at the heart of civilisation, and the homogeneous character of its people. The Anglo-Saxon character has always been recognised as the great barrier to world domination by a World Government. Both world wars, the economic policies of the inter-war years, internal subversion, and US pressures combined with immense debts have eroded Britain's position to one of virtual impotence. Economic policies under Mr. Wilson's administration, so apparently idiotic, could only be deliberate, designed to end forever British autonomy.

Bearing in mind Stalin's dictum that in Communist practice "words must bear no relation to deeds", and examining the deeds of the USSR, the U.S.A., and France under de Gaulle, it is evident to the perspicacious observer that the strategic conquest of the world has been accomplished, but not consolidated. Although the U.S. Administration is unquestionably in the control of the World Planners, American public opinion is not, and if mobilised and directed to an understanding of the true position, would at this stage constitute a formidable threat to the final plans for World Government. There are some signs of this occurring. This probably introduces a time factor as against the patient gradualness which has obscured the real significance of both major and minor occurrences. But a point has now been reached where such significance is appearing, as the moves that have been vital can be perceived from the perspective of the end-play, as in a game of chess.

And as in chess, the end of the game is "checkmate" on the world scale. The World Planners want an intact world, not a nuclear holocaust. The occupation of Europe, taking the U.S.A. "by surprise", and therefore credibly without response, would create a situation where the American public would probably accept a surrender of their national sovereignty to the United Nations, which would arrange international inspection teams to ensure that its disarmament directions were policed. This situation would confront Southern Africa with a nuclear ultimatum.

III. THE SOUTH AFRICAN SITUATION

In the context described above, it appears that the Republic of South Africa occupies a critically unique position. It is the one country of significance which retains the power of independent initiative, and the fate of the world may be decided by the use it makes of that power. The lives of many millions of the human race are still at stake, and many will yet be murdered or pass into slavery. But though at present the forces of evil are in the ascendant, good-will predominates in human nature, and one sufficient example might unleash the power of that good-will. This is a small chance against a great certainty. Southern Africa cannot survive as an island of freedom and prosperity if the rest of the world is enslaved. In this situation, the Republic of South

Africa has nothing to lose, but possibly everything to gain by a correct and successful use of her initiative.

The vital and vulnerable factor in the whole situation is that what can only be called the world conspiracy has progressed by ensuring adherence to certain rules, just as the strategy of chess depends on the rules of chess. In the international sphere, the vital rule is that so long as you can keep control of economics so long you can keep control of politics: but no longer. The greatest threat to world tyranny is individual prosperity, if the latter is unconditional.

Prosperity is a relative term, not necessarily to be seen in modern terms. Some natives live in a kind of paradise in the Pacific Islands, and throughout the world there have been contented and, relative to their way of living, "prosperous" peasants. Discontent has as often as not been the result of subversion, or contact with an alien culture, just as urbanisation alienates the farmer. And on a simple base great civilisations with noble accomplishments arose.

With the industrial revolution, however, an entirely new factor was introduced. Depending on the harnessing of power derived originally from the sun's energy, this revolution continuously multiplied the effectiveness of man-power, thus ever more rapidly expanding and extending the basis of prosperity. Because there has been great misrepresentation in this matter, it is most important to emphasise that true prosperity begins in the provision of the fundamental necessities of life—food, clothing and shelter. Unimpeded access to those necessities is the very basis of freedom. Obstructing such access is the fundamental instrument of government. This is exemplified in the fact that when the Communist Party seizes a country with a peasantry, it nationalises the land and collectivises the peasants. This is the most fundamental form of keeping control of economics.

In industrialised societies the problem is much more complex, because the greater the production of physical wealth, the less justification there appears for denying access to it on the scale which expanding production makes possible. This is the fundamental problem of the World Planners, and the reason why national sovereignty—i.e., independence—must be destroyed. Then the resources of the industrialised countries can be dispersed.

The industrialised world lies between the extremes of free private enterprise which is progressively capable of enormously expanding the production of wealth, and of World Government with unlimited capabilities of dispersing wealth at least for several generations, by which time Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* would be established. In this interim period, the Planners are faced with the problem of maintaining political control by continuous economic control. The accumulation of wealth in private hands threatens this economic control, and this is the vulnerable aspect of the threat.

Distribution of production in industrialised countries is in the main by the payment of monetary incomes. The problem of the controllers is to prevent to any large extent the accumulation of incomes as *personal* (as opposed to institutional) savings, since savings confer independence. Reliance on continuous income subject to conditions leads to dependence, and hence control.

The present solution of this problem of maintaining control has several aspects, the most important of which are: Inflation, Taxation, and Confiscation (Death Duties and Capital Levies). Hire-purchase which both increases prices, and creates a form of economic bondage, contributes to the control.

Progressive taxation and confiscation are items in the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels—i.e. they are political rather than economic measures in intention, and can be replaced by other methods of providing government revenue. However, they have been incorporated in Fabian Socialist economic theory, and their Marxian origin has been lost to view in current economic theory.

But inflation is also a political instrument, and the problem is always stated as being one of "controlling" rather than of eliminating inflation. Continuous price-rises offset the natural rise of productivity, create wage-demands and industrial unrest, and wage demands when granted enter into prices, thus making the process a self-sustaining one. The overcoming of inflation would in all probability be a mortal blow to the World Planners. It is precisely here that the Republic of South Africa's unique opportunity lies. A Government policy of reversing gradually the inflationary spiral is entirely practicable and would progressively ameliorate social pressures.

(To be continued)

R.I.P.

Our old friend W. Wilson, after a long and courageous struggle against disabilities.

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL CREDIT

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

A New Revised Edition

The present increasing and dangerous plight of the whole world, despite the advances continuously being made in science and the technique of power-production, is forcing more and more people to an examination of the foundations of civilization and the origin of our trouble. This little book was written originally to relate the later to the earlier phases of the doctrine first enunciated by the late Major C. H. Douglas fifty years ago, and developed by him over thirty years. The first edition has continued to serve its original purpose, but in this edition the opportunity has been taken to revise the text in the light of the rapid developments of the past twenty years in which events have brought out the significance of policies; and to incorporate some information which has become available in that period. A glance through the index will be sufficient to reveal how much more than a matter of monetary systems is involved. Social Credit is a *policy*, and the only policy extant which offers citizens freedom in security, and the practical means to keep government in its proper place. It is the exact antithesis of totalitarianism.

10/6 posted

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

Circular Press Limited, Colwyn Bay.