

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51. No. 11.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 21, 1971

7p (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

Whiteprint for Betrayal

The British Government's White Paper—*THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES*, Command 4715, published July 7, 1971,—must be one of the most peculiar and sinister ever to have been issued. It purports to deal with economic issues; but nowhere is any sort of balanced economic analysis attempted. Conjectural estimates of the financial costs of Britain's entry into the European Economic Community are given; the counterbalancing items are merely opinions and exhortations. A typical passage—para. 59—states: "The costs of joining the Community set out in this White Paper are the price we should have to pay for the economic and political advantages. These advantages will more than outweigh the costs, *provided we seize the opportunities of the far wider home market now open to us*" (emphasis added).

What a proviso! Who, for example, are "we"? More particularly, who is to blame, or will be blamed, if the advantages do not materialise? The workers? The employers? The Government of the day? Or those so-and-so's across the Channel? The advantages are supposed to accrue from a larger 'home' market (but this is already being supplied by highly developed Continental industries, so that British expansion would entail Continental contraction—that is what "competition" means); the stimulation of British farm output ("but at the same time will raise food prices in the United Kingdom and the cost of our food imports . . . but at the same time tariff reductions should lead to lower prices for manufactures which will go some way to offset this increase [!]); and the opportunity to contribute "in ever fuller measure to the solution of the world's North-South problem, to the needs of the developing world". And, "together we could help the poorer countries of the world more effectively than if we were working on our own". This more effective "help" is, of course, an additional "cost of entry".

"These improvements in efficiency and competitive power should enable the United Kingdom to meet the balance of payments costs over the next decade as they build up." But supposing they do not? If they do not, then—without proviso—the costs will outweigh the advantages.

But the economics of the White Paper are in any case a nonsense, because they are based on the implicit assumption that the costs of production are self-liquidating. They are not, which means that every industrialised country requires a financial excess of exports over imports, which is an impossibility. The recurrent economic crises in one country after another—the recurrent unemployment, the bankruptcies, the suicides, ever-mounting inflation, soaring taxation—spring from a defective financial system, and even more importantly, from deliberate persistence in that system. Why is the U.S.A., the world's most advanced industrial nation, a huge Common Market in itself which controls within its own

borders the bulk of its raw material requirements, on the brink of economic break-down? As Social Crediters, we hold no brief for full employment in itself; but unemployment is generally held to be an index of economic failure, especially when coupled with inflation; and by that index the U.S. is failing to a point which may end in economic collapse.

The nub of the White Paper is contained in para. 27: "If we join, therefore, we shall be making sure that British trade and manufacturing interests are represented at the summit of negotiations *where the terms on which we earn our living are decided*" (emphasis added). This looks like, and probably is, a re-affirmation of the point made some time ago in the *Times*—that for some years we have not been our own masters (Aug. 1, 1970)*. According to the White Paper, "There is no question of any erosion [further erosion?] of essential national sovereignty; what is proposed is a sharing and enlargement of individual national sovereignties in the general interest". How do you share an individuality? One's individuality may be merged or submerged in a collectivity, as the individual is submerged in the mob; but an enlargement of individuality essentially means isolation from the collective—enhancement of freedom, emancipation. And what is the essential *part* of national sovereignty? What the inessential? Is sovereignty divisible? This is the sheerest double-talk, which might have been taken from Orwell's *Animal Farm*: "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others".

The White Paper is nothing but a fraudulent prospectus; and the real question is why it was put out.

At the conclusion of the 1918 war, a Mr. Montagu Norman, an official of Brown Shipley & Co., representing powerful New York banking interests, was appointed in effect permanent Governor of the Bank of England, against all tradition. He was advised by two U.S. economic advisers, and he imposed a policy of credit restriction on Great and victorious Britain. This move initiated the greatest depression in British history, and rapidly brought about a steep decline in Great Britain's power and prestige. Preparation for renewed world war produced a temporary amelioration after 1933. But any possible restoration of "greatness" was limited by the certainty of renewed war. Britain was eventually among the 'victors' of this war; but any benefit from victory was immediately annulled by the sudden withdrawal of Lend-lease, precipitating an intensified 'austerity', utilised by the Socialist Government to make permanent the shackles of a bureaucratic State which had been imposed under cover of the war. The proposal to 'join the Common Market' is meant to be the final consolidation of this imposition, because

(continued on page 3)

*See *The Survival of Britain*, p. 27: K.R.P. Publications.

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 £2.60 (52/-), Six months £1.30 (26/-).

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., General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

According to the *Sunday Australian*, July 25, 1971, unemployment in Britain has increased, under the 'competent' Tory Government, to more than 829,000, while the rise in price-levels—inflation—has continued. To endeavour to ameliorate this situation, the Government is reducing sales-tax, although the imposition of sales-tax is considered by official economists to be a means of 'controlling' inflation. Restraints on hire-purchase are also being withdrawn, having been imposed in the first place also with the purpose of controlling inflation. It is stated that manufacturers have undertaken to limit price-increases which might be 'caused' by increased monetary demand.

But these measures do not go to the root of the matter, which is that over a period total distributed incomes are insufficient to liquidate total costs generated in the same period. Emphasis on capital expansion, public works and so on, conceal this situation for the time being; but it always remains, and finds its ultimate expression in the apparent necessity to achieve a financial excess of exports over imports. If Britain achieved complete economic unity with Europe, this would simply mean the pooling of this necessity, reducing the number of "great trading blocks" each competing for the elusive export surplus. If the whole world unified to one economic unit, where would the export surplus come from? Well, outer space seems to offer unlimited possibilities. But is that what we are born for?

Fundamentally, this is the situation which underlies social unrest generally. The *exploitation* of this unrest is a further matter, and is directed to an ever-intensifying centralisation and power of government, intended to lead in the end to World Government, which is what Mr. Brezhnev refers to as the total triumph of socialism the world over. And temporarily lowering sales-tax and adding to hire-purchase indebtedness will not avert this 'triumph'. A change in industrial financing along Social Credit principles would, if outside interference could be resisted. This is a question of national sovereignty, and remains open until "we" sign the Treaty of Rome.

NEW EDUCATION*

The Radicals Are After Your Children

By GARY ALLEN

(Continued)

Dr. Moreno's battle cry might well be, "Psychiatrists of the world unite!" He foresees a world empire of automatons manipulated by psychiatrists. This prophet of the "new educationists" foresees the takeover:

As human society is ailing we can expect a psychiatric empire to emerge gradually and spread over the globe. Politicians and diplomats will move into second status. Social scientists, psychiatrists, sociologists and sociometrically oriented socialists will move into first. The mentor in the White House, a future President of the United States, may well be a psychiatrist before another century has passed.

It sort of gives you the creeps. Yet if you ask an educator about Dr. Jacob Levy Moreno (or Ivan Vladimir Morenovsky, if you prefer) you will doubtless be told he is a simple and kindly man who wishes only to help America's kiddies obtain the best possible education. Anyone who suspects otherwise is a wicked enemy of education and children.

As we noted earlier, one of the outgrowths of Dr. Moreno's group therapy system is sensitivity training. Masquerading under some two dozen pseudonyms, it is increasingly used in our schools; and, in some districts, successful completion of a course in sensitivity training has become a requirement for graduation. Most colleges now require sensitivity training for all students preparing to become teachers.

While it has many variations and aliases, sensitivity training nearly always includes group confessions and group criticism conducted by a "trained" leader. The technique is the same as that used by the Red Chinese on American prisoners of war in Korea. It is designed to produce "change" in a person's values and even his personality. Many become psychologically hooked on sensitivity training, caught up in the fascination it holds for those with sado-masochistic tendencies. Others sustain severe emotional damage.

The National Training Laboratory, financed by the N.E.A., admits that sensitivity training "includes coercive persuasion in the form of thought reforms or brainwashing as well as a multitude of less coercive, informal patterns". Which is *why* the socialist N.E.A. promotes it for the schools. Sensitivity training is designed to strip a person of his psychological defenses so that he has no private thoughts which are kept from the group. The group collectively decides what is right or wrong for the individual. Sensitivity programs have been financed by the Ford Foundation, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

From here the plot sickens. Using elements from Dr. Moreno's program and advanced techniques in sensitivity training, Dr. Benjamin Bloom has produced a program known as Taxonomy—a nightmare which would have turned the characters of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* green with envy. Taxonomy, which means classifying according to

*From *American Opinion*, May, 1971.

a system, is a term applied to a systematic measuring by psychological testing of how a student acts, thinks, or feels on a wide variety of subjects. The student would be tested several times each year from kindergarten through grade twelve and results would then be fed into computers in one of thirteen regional data banks already established around the nation by the Defense Department.

The state would thus have a complete psychological profile covering in minute detail every facet of every student's life, thoughts, and personality—thus allowing behavioral scientists to predict how he would react in any given situation. These tests have been so designed that, if the student does not meet the behavioral objectives established, he is recycled through the same material and given more sensitivity training until he is a "right thinker". He would not be graduated from high school until he had the proper social outlook. No one would be allowed to escape this Orwellian brainwash, and the result would be a nation of robots programmed to think and do what they are told.

It sounds like madness, of course. But this Taxonomy system *has already been started* in fifteen California school districts, and all school districts in the state are scheduled to adopt the program by 1973. Plans for a similar program are now in an advanced stage in Florida.

The plan in California has been hidden in a program known as P.P.B.S.—Planning, Programming, Budget System. It is sold to the public as an automated accounting system which also makes certain that teachers are reaching specified educational goals with their students. On the surface it seems designed to promote efficiency, but built into it is a vast program for administering and recording psychological tests for students. The results will go into data banks at Palo Alto, California.

At the present time, the proponents of the P.P.B.S. program are still denying publicly that it has anything to do with Taxonomy, but in seminars with their own people they admit what the program really is. And certainly a nationwide Taxonomy system is on the planning boards. On April 15, 1970, the *Washington Star* reported:

U.S. Commissioner of Education James E. Allen Jr. has outlined a plan for restructuring local schools that would include computerized data systems designed to help professionals "prescribe" programs for helping pupils and their families

Allen suggested each local school system should have a central diagnostic center "to find out everything possible about the child and his background"

After tests and home visits, Allen said, the center "would know just about everything there is to know about the child"

The information would be fed into a computer for use by a team of trained professionals who would write a "prescription" for the child "and if necessary, for his home and family as well", Allen said.

(To be continued)

WHITEPRINT FOR BETRAYAL

This article has been printed in booklet form at the following prices posted— 5 copies 25p, 10 copies 40p, 15 copies 55p, 30 copies £1.00

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 245 CANN HALL RD., LONDON, E.11

Whiteprint for Betrayal

(continued from page 1)

the "terms on which we earn our living" will be decided outside the country. And as the White Paper says, "A decision not to join would be . . . a reversal of the whole direction of British policy under successive governments during the last decade". But it would be more accurate to say two and a half decades—in fact, since Churchill decided not to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, leaving it to more willing hands.

That whole direction of policy, irrespective of Party, has seen Britain's position decline through economic crises, inflation, industrial and social unrest, and enforced liquidation of Empire; which ought to be evidence enough that the direction of British policy was *wrong*, and *should* be reversed. To continue it further by 'going in' to Europe and forfeiting the "inessential" part of sovereignty is to ensure that a reversal will be impossible, and to invite national extinction.

How has it come about that a 'Conservative' Government is continuing such a deep socialist purpose? Part of the answer is that they are acting under the duress of international indebtedness, as in 1918 and 1946 and thereafter. But Mr. Heath is obsessively enthusiastic.

In the inter-war years, Dr. Arnold Toynbee, the secretary of the Royal Institute of International Affairs—Chatham House—the counterpart of the U.S.A. Council on Foreign Relations, disclosed that "we"—meaning, no doubt, the inner Directorate of the Institute and their opposite numbers in the U.S., were working feverishly to undermine "our" national sovereignty, "while denying with our lips what we do with our hands". Whether it is significant we do not know, but Mr. Heath received his education at Chatham House School, before going on to Balliol College, Oxford.

After war service, Heath was for a time an assistant principal in the Civil Service; subsequently he was a trainee in Brown Shipley & Co., already referred to. He was elected to Parliament in 1950, and in 1951 was Assistant Conservative Whip and Lord Commissioner of the Treasury. By 1955 he was Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury and Government Chief Whip. But in 1964, after the Labour victory, he returned to Brown Shipley—as a Director. In 1965 he became Leader of the Opposition, and in 1970 Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury. He was a self-confessed and dedicated Internationalist. Internationalism means "undermining national sovereignty" with a view to transferring it to an International Authority. Such dedication was evidently no bar to a meteoric political career.

A very acute article by A Student of Politics in *Spectator*, July 17, 1971, points out that there are two aspects of getting into EEC—just getting in, and getting into the power-structure which runs EEC. At the present time, this power-structure is run by a Franco-German alliance. As A Student observes; "the French and Germans are quite happy with their position inside EEC. Of course they are. They invented it to suit their own needs, and they run it. The Franco-German alliance may well go on running it".

"In all this, the sensible starting-point for the Tory Party is to take with a pinch of salt the Foreign Office belief that they can master-mind things, and to assume that the tendency of the French and Germans to remain the ruling group in the EEC will be very strong. . . . It is not sensible

for us to join a European grouping basically run by an alliance of which we are not members."

In fact, however, the situation is worse even than A Student supposes. We refer our readers to an article on Germany in T.S.C. of April 18, 1970*. This pointed out that under Herr Brandt, an "ex"-Communist, a new central power-structure, headed by Soviet-trained "ex"-Communists, has been brought into being. Since then there has been the Bonn-Moscow accord which, in our view, brings Bonn within the ambit of the Brezhnev Doctrine—the use of the Red Army to "protect" members of the Socialist camp.

On March 30, 1971, Brezhnev said: "In recognition of its international duty, the CPSU will continue to pursue a line in international affairs promoting the further activation of the world anti-imperialist struggle and the strengthening of the combat unity of all its participants. The total triumph of socialism the world over is inevitable, and for this triumph . . . we will fight, unsparing of our strength". (Quoted by Dr. Stefan Possony, in *Human Events*, June 19, 1971). Is this proclamation to be disregarded?

If the spurious economic arguments supposed to justify British entry to EEC are disregarded, it can be seen more clearly that the political considerations are simply treason. Mr. Heath's confrères are, according to A Student of Politics, "certain metropolitan élites, especially high finance, quality journalism, and certain intellectual circles (among whom must be included the Foreign Office). These people have quite enough power anyway, do not want or need a political party. . . ." This last observation might be better stated as that these people are competent to use *any* Party to further their objectives. Alternating governments serve to conceal the long-term policy—the undermining of national sovereignty. On the other hand, once British sovereignty has been transferred overseas, Parties and Parliament will no longer matter.

It has been said that treaties are mere scraps of paper. But the Warsaw Pact is something more than a scrap of paper—because the Red Army exerts the sanctions to enforce it. The Treaty of Rome will be more than a scrap of paper, simply because none of the signatories separately possesses sanctions to defend withdrawal from it.

Practically everything that is written concerning British "entry" to Europe is treated as a mere matter of opinion, any difference of opinion to be settled by some form of majority vote. But reality is never a matter of opinion. If you walk over the edge of a cliff you will fall to the bottom, and a broken neck is not a good foundation for an opinion. There is hard evidence that the manoeuvring to gain Britain's entry is the outcome of a conspiracy to abolish national sovereignty. The evidence should be tested in a properly constituted Court. But if agents (conscious or otherwise) of the Conspiracy sign the Treaty of Rome, Britain will be extinguished as a nation. And as Douglas wrote in 1945, the most deadly error we can make is to look to the Conservative Party as it has become, and remains, for salvation.

But at least it can be said that the Conservative Party as a whole is not responsible for the White Paper, or the sinister intent behind it. And the true division in the House of Commons is not, or ought not to be, between the various Parties, but between the patriots and those who

*See *The Survival of Britain*, p. 16ff.

seemingly wish to see Britain's national identity surrendered to a centralised international conglomeration leading to world government. Perhaps it is only now at this crisis of survival that the full force of Douglas's words, written in 1945, can be grasped: Speaking of the high importance of tradition, as embodying the culture of a nation—culture is the *soul* of a nation—he observed: "But of course the whole question is beyond argument. No honest person hesitates to admit the defects of the nineteenth century while claiming it was the high watermark of modern civilisation. No instructed person has any doubt that it was, fundamentally, the corruption of the English tradition by the essentially 'vulgar rich' on both sides of the Atlantic and the North Sea to which practically all those defects can be traced—the same vulgar rich who are using mass democracy to complete the ruin they have conceived. And the bulwark against these vulgar rich was tradition; a national ritual arrived at by centuries of trial and elimination. It is in the failure to present that tradition as a living force of which to be immeasurably proud, instead of as something for which to make apology, that the so-called Conservative Party—a body, as such, without a soul—has been guilty of the unforgivable sin, and must suffer for it."

Douglas also drew attention to the suggestion that the key doctrine of Christianity is the supremacy of repentance over the Law—that there is what may without irreverence be called a technique by which the chain of causation may be broken. At this crucial moment of history, it is essential to grasp the fundamental issue. There is every reason to believe that "adhering" to the Treaty of Rome will mean the bloodless "total triumph of socialism the world over"—the bloodshed will occur *after* that triumph, when the liquidation of the *bourgeoisie* is undertaken in earnest, to render impossible any "counter-revolution". Wherever Communism has "triumphed", this has been the pattern. It is madness to imagine that what happened in Russia, China, even in France after the Liberation, will not happen in Britain. It may happen even if the attempt to subject us to the Treaty of Rome fails; for, to quote Douglas again: "In this, the gravest crisis of the world's history, it is essential to realise that the stakes which are being played for are so high that the players on one side, at least, care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow. They have no nationality, no morals, no scruples, and no regrets".

But at least the defeat of the attempt to "join" the FEEC would gain a breathing space, and bring the true issue into the open—with a chance that that issue could not survive such exposure. It is a slender chance; but a chance against a certainty. Let patriots of every Party unite to back that chance and expose the treachery. Mr. Heath and Mr. Wilson and all the committed internationalists *must go*—for our children's sake.

THE SURVIVAL OF BRITAIN

BY BRYAN W. MONAHAN

By 1968 the virtual encirclement of Europe by Soviet forces was plainly visible. Since then, developments have been catastrophic.

Clothbound £1.10p (£1/2/0) posted
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 245 CANN HALL RD., LONDON, E.11