

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 52. No. 6

SATURDAY, 10 JUNE, 1972

7p. (1s. 5d.) Fortnightly

A Movement for Survival

In the magazine, *The Ecologist*, for January 1972 thirty-three distinguished scientists have permitted their names to be published as giving general support to a lengthy document, entitled "Blueprint for Survival", which has been drawn up by a "small team of people, all of whom, in different capacities, are professionally involved in the study of environmental problems". Their aim, the authors say, is to form a *Movement for Survival* because they believe that they have sufficient evidence to show that, "if current trends are allowed to persist, the breakdown of society and the disruption of the life-support systems on this planet, possibly by the end of this century, certainly within the lifetimes of our children, are inevitable"

It is hoped that this movement will become international (*The Club of Rome*, consisting of scientists and industrialists from many countries, with similar aims has already been formed) and that governments will be persuaded to take remedial measures while there is yet time.

The Blueprint opens with the statement that our "Industrial way of life with its ethos of expansion" is "not sustainable" and, as already indicated, "its termination within the lifetime of someone born today is inevitable unless it continues to be sustained for a while longer by an entrenched minority at the cost of imposing great suffering on the rest of mankind."

"We can be certain, however, that sooner or later it will end (only the precise time and circumstances are in doubt) and that it will do so in one of two ways; either against our will in a succession of famines, epidemics, social crises and wars; or because we want it to—because we wish to create a society which will not impose hardship and cruelty upon our children—in a succession of thoughtful, measured and humane changes".

This quotation has certain rather puzzling features. For instance, consider the sentence: "Unless it continues to be sustained for a while longer by an entrenched minority at the cost of imposing great suffering on the rest of mankind". The meaning of this is not at all clear: the authors do not tell us whether the minority are entrenched already or whether they will entrench themselves at some appropriate time in the future and "impose great suffering" which, if things are left as they are much longer, must inevitably involve great austerity for the majority, practically amounting to slavery. This would give us the "while longer", but it would be hardly *worth-while*.

If our ecologists will study the works of that father of ecology and sociology, Sir Patrick Geddes*, they will find that he recognised an entrenched minority more than fifty years ago. He called them "the world apart", meaning the

bankers and financiers and their associates. He noted that they could finance war and destruction thus building up what he called kakotopian debt but they could not finance improvements and build up eutopian credit. He advised them to change their thinking but his words had no effect.

Montagu Norman called this minority—he was their very good servant—the "Caravan"; he said "The dogs bark but the caravan moves on". That was his method of answering criticisms. He is also reported as saying that "the hegemony of World Finance should reign supreme over everyone, everywhere, as one whole supernational control mechanism."† Perhaps there is a danger that Norman's friends and their successors will welcome the assurances from the ecologists that a crisis of resources exists: it will give them a pretext for speedy action, well thought out, no doubt, but hardly humane, because as C. H. Douglas warned us: "They care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow". The death toll of two world wars, the Congo, Nigeria, Vietnam and the Russian and Chinese revolutions could indicate that this is not merely fantasy; in fact, our ecologists need not fear that the over-population problem will be prolonged and serious. There are methods of dealing with that that are not envisaged in their programme.

However, if the ecologists are quite sure of their facts and remain completely honest, they need not falter. It is possible, even now, to upset the time-table of those whom we must regard as our enemies. Exposure is one good weapon and genuine and effective proposals for a reversal of economic policy and for conserving and protecting real resources may well bring these enemies into the open.

In a preceding paragraph I mentioned credit—eutopian credit—in connection with Sir Patrick Geddes who understood it well. He called it the "crowning legacy of western inventiveness" and "the key of economic entrance into Eutopia", although "the present possessors of the key (the bankers) have been too much inclined to use it for a lock-out". He made it quite clear that the rightful owners of the key are the community, not the bankers—an all important point. I mention this because I am not sure that the authors of "The Blueprint" fully appreciate it. If they do not, I would recommend that they follow up their study of the works of Geddes with a study of those of C. H. Douglas whose famous A plus B Theorem, with its corollaries, penetrated to the heart of the present expansionist economy and indicated the direction that remedial measures should take. This was published more than fifty years ago but, even then, and even assuming that his advice would be taken, Douglas concluded his first book, *Economic Democracy*, with the

(continued on page 2)

*See *Our Social Inheritance* by P. Geddes and V. Branford, 1919. Also, *Patrick Geddes, Maker of the Future* by Philip Boardman, 1944.

†*The Social Creditor* 5 Feb., 1972, p.1

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.

Vol. 52. No. 6

Saturday, 10 June, 1972

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"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."

Technological expertise, the nervous system of World Government, resides in the 'developed' countries, so that, for the present, the immolation on a grand scale is being confined to the Indian subcontinent, Africa, and Southeast Asia, where the potential power of a World Police Force can be demonstrated to the world at large without too much danger to the would-be World Government. A few million or billion dollars worth of damage to various U.S. cities by means of Molotov cocktails, plastic explosives, etc., is no real threat to Fort Knox or the Federal Reserve Board or the Bank of England, but does serve to distract attention from the setting up of the mechanism of World Government. Quite obviously, 'America' is heading for humiliating defeat in Vietnam, so that the only escape route will be to join in with Communist Russia and Communist China in World Government—on Communist terms. Communist terms are the physical elimination of all potential resistance to all-powerful government. Even now it is still being reported that as the North Vietnamese conquer South Vietnam, the Communists are exterminating systematically from prepared lists of potential leaders of resistance.

And if our readers cannot see the connection between the 'Show-Biz' in Vietnam and the *treachery* which is surrendering British national sovereignty to a Power-House in Europe, it is not for want of warnings published in this journal with increasing urgency ever since its inception. The ultimate immolation is now very close to home.

A Movement for Survival

(continued from page 1)

words: "Thus, out of threatened chaos, might the Dawn break; a Dawn which at the best must show the ravages of storm, but which holds clear for all to see the promise of a 'better Day'. Today the ravages are greater, there is chaos in many places, and the promise will be much harder to realise.

—T. N. MORRIS.

The Irish Question*

Discussion of the Irish Question is well nigh impossible because there is a wilful refusal on both sides to make distinctions. This inability arises from several MYTHS entrenched in the minds of the protagonists on both (or is it several?) sides.

The first set of Myths on the Nationalist side is centred around Partition. It is firmly believed in the South that Partition was enforced by a British Government to cripple Ireland economically and culturally and that it was responsible for the civil war in Eire. The Myth is so central to anti-Partition that it must be examined.

Partition resulted in a Province about two-thirds Protestant (or at least non-Catholic) and one third Catholic. This Province is Protestant in SENTIMENT but not by Constitution. The Stormont Government has always made provision for a Catholic Chaplain to Parliament (Westminster does not) and its aid to Catholic schools is more generous than aid in England and Wales.

Partition also resulted in a Free State with a population 95% Catholic. Eire under the De Valera Constitution was a Catholic State with a special relationship between Church and State written into the Constitution. However protestants were in no way discriminated against, aid to protestant schools being 100% grants, and the first President of the Republic being a Protestant.

~~NOW WITHOUT ANY DOUBT AT ALL 90% OF THE POPULATION OF EIRE WANTED AND STILL WANT A CATHOLIC STATE ENSHRINING CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES OF MORALITY AND FAMILY LIFE IN ITS LAWS.~~ Both major political parties are in fact committed to the special position of the Catholic Church. Without Partition Eire could not have been a Catholic State by Constitution any more than Ulster could have been a Protestant Province by Sentiment. IN SHORT PARTITION WAS NECESSARY FOR THE ASPIRATIONS OF BOTH SORTS OF IRISHMEN.

On the Nationalist side (north and south of the border) there is a wilful refusal to accept this aspect of Partition—the British and the Unionists are not the only beneficiaries. The Reverend Ian Paisley is therefore right in challenging Mr. Lynch to say if he really wants an end to Partition and its obvious concomitant—a secular Ireland.

We do not know what Mr. Lynch really wants, but we do know that the people of Eire do not want a secular Ireland, and it would do no harm for them, and for the Catholic leaders in the North, to acknowledge this fact.

Another misconception, this time shared by Unionist and Nationalist, that the I.R.A., the Civil Rights mob, Miss Devlin, *et. al.* "represent" the Catholic "Cause." They do not. They are not fighting for a United Christian Ireland, much less for a United Catholic Ireland, they are fighting for a Castroite Ireland. (Miss Devlin calls it a "Workers' Socialist Republic" but she means the same thing.) LET US GET THIS ABSOLUTELY CLEAR: THE I.R.A. *et. al.* REPRESENT NOTHING REMOTELY ASSOCIATED WITH CATHOLICISM.

Which brings us to the Rev. Ian Paisley. Mr. Paisley is an orthodox Protestant. He is not a modernist nor does he

* From the *Liverpool Newsletter*, Jan./Feb., 1972, with permission.

support Permissivism and he is staunchly anti-Marxist, but he is what is usually termed a "bitter" Protestant. This prevents him from seeing that in both Doctrine and Social teaching he probably has more in common with his Catholic fellow Ulstermen than he has with many a non-Catholic "Modern" Churchman. The Rev. Ian Paisley's contribution to the present mischief in Ulster arises not from his trenchant defence of the Stormont Constitution but to his reinforcing by his utterances the belief on the part of Catholics that they are "on the same side" as the I.R.A. and that they will be kept as second class citizens in Ulster.

We now come to Miss Devlin. We have no doubt that she is a sincere, even pious, Catholic, but she is a "Private" Catholic like the Kennedy's. That is, her Catholicism exists in a separate compartment of her mind—ironically enough her relationship to Catholicism is protestant! From her utterances it is plain that the long Catholic tradition of the Social Order affects her political thought not at all. Her political philosophy was moulded and is still directed by the adolescent Trotskyism/Maoism of the Students' Union. Of course Miss Devlin is still young and subject to the blinding ENTHUSIASM which attends conversion to such self-proving hypotheses as Marx/etc./Maoism, but her mischief making potential resides in exactly this enthusiasm, whether expressed in bomb throwing in Derry in 1968 or the jaw-breaking gibberish of her platform dialectic.

We now come to the origin of the present phase of "The Troubles" in Ulster. As we pointed out in a much applauded article in the August 1969 issue of *Newsletter*, the old antagonisms were dying and as a result of the O'Neil/Lynch meeting it was possible to see the emergence of the concept of "One Nation in two States" in Ireland. Mr. Paisley is to be blamed for whipping up Protestant opposition to these developments which in no way threatened Ulster's status. Internally in Ulster the Unionists took the two traditionally Nationalist Westminster seats in 1959. (In 1955 the two seats were won by Sinn Fein candidates ineligible for election and after by-elections had produced the same result an Electoral Court awarded the seats to Unionist runners up). The Unionists held the seats in 1964 and again held them in the midst of the Labour landslide of 1966—anti-Partition was evidently at a premium.

Which brings us to Mr. Wilson and his "First Hundred Days"—a period dominated by his tiny majority. Under the shadow of imminent Parliamentary defeat Mr. Wilson launched a tirade against the twelve "safe Tory seats" in Ulster and proposed that the Ulster M.P.'s. should be excluded from voting on domestic matters. To butter up the Irish vote in England he then ordered the remains of Sir Roger Casement to be returned to Ireland. From a Lord Birkenhead or Sir Edward Carson such a gesture would have been generous, but in the context of Wilson's electoral euphoria it had about it the same aura of calculation and success hysteria as his award of the M.B.E. to "The Beatles." (A now long forgotten cacophonous "pop" group.)

According to *The Sun* Mr. Wilson now began to see his premiership crowned by a final solution to "The Irish Problem" which as we have said had almost ceased to exist. This Gladstonian pose would probably have done as little harm as his many other poses, had it not been for the disastrous policies devised for Mr. Wilson by his two alien Economic Advisers, Balogh and Kaldor. During 1964 *Newsletter*

warned that these two Hungarian Marxists were anti-prosperity, that they believed economic systems existed to promote "Plainer living, higher thinking and more painful dying," to quote a Douglas satire, that in pursuit of, this ideology they had reduced Ceylon to poverty and communal bloodshed and that they were hell-bent to do the same in Great Britain. The Wilson terror was disastrous for Ulster for it swept away the growing prosperity which had been the basis of the growing communal peace and tolerance.

Enter the left-wing pundits and producers of the B.B.C. Wilson's utterances and gestures on the Irish question were the signal for the well-oiled Left wing transmission belt to go into action. Plays were broadcast which raked up old memories, comment became free on such programmes as "World at One," and the crisis came to a head with a "Civil Rights" march across Ulster, emulating in organization and aims the "Civil Rights" marches in the U.S.A. which spawned the Black Panthers as they were evidently intended to do.

The slogan of the March was "One Man, One Vote" which in fact existed in both Westminster and Stormont Constituencies. However in local government the vote was restricted to householders (as in Britain up till 1947). As there are more Protestants than Catholics in Ulster it is obvious that the local government system affected Protestants adversely. However it is a fact that the boundaries of local government wards and Stormont Ridings have remained unchanged since 1926 in spite of changes of population. Catholics say that this is something engineered by the Town Hall and that it effects slum clearance and re-housing. Protestants say that re-housing etc. is affected by the desire of both communities to remain self-contained. Whatever the truth is the attitude of Stormont was shortsighted in allowing such fossilization of boundaries to go unremedied.

Other "Civil Rights" concerned employment, and here *Liverpool Newsletter* has stood four-square on the overriding right of any man to employ whom he wishes for whatever reason he wishes. Such a view cannot be held in the question of race and put at one side in the question of religion. However the case of employment in PUBLIC service is a different matter, and here again Stormont made a rod for its own back. The more we see of Stormont as a result of present publicity the more apparent it becomes that its mistakes arose, not from bigotry as we supposed, but from insensitivity. Again, whatever the truth, Stormont allowed an exploitable situation to grow.

From the Civil Rights Movement came, as was intended, violence and counter violence, the objective being to prompt Mr. Wilson into introducing direct rule from Westminster, which in turn would have caused insurrection on the part of the Protestant majority; a civil war which would have involved Eire and from this hell-brew the shadowy Puppeteers of the Civil Rights Crowd would have plucked their United Soviet Ireland.

Mr. Wilson's euphoria however was over; his fingers had been burnt in Rhodesia and he did not react as expected. The Protestants almost did, but a firm stand by the army pacified the mobs on both sides of the barbed wire picket lines. During the period of calm that followed the promised electoral reforms were introduced and it seemed that the Ulster situation had been saved. Accordingly the I.R.A. were called in to scramble it again.

The objects of the terror campaign are plain enough. To provoke the army and police into gross retaliation by shootings, and the Protestant community by bombings.

The political motives are deeper. The Provisional I.R.A. are termed a "Right Wing Nationalist Organization," but the term is only relative to the now ultra-Marxist "Official" I.R.A. The Provisionals want a United Ireland, which must of necessity be a secular Ireland, that is an Ireland with secular marriage, secular schools, divorce, birth prevention and abortion. Neither Catholic nor Protestant want this sort of Ireland, but Partition is the only barrier against it!

Meanwhile the official I.R.A. hoard their ammunition and keep their powder dry. **IF THE PROVISIONALS SUCCEED IN PROVOKING A PROTESTANT BACKLASH, THEY AND THE ORANGEMEN WILL EXHAUST THEMSELVES IN MUTUAL FRATRICIDE.**

At this point the Leftist transmission belt in Great Britain will raise the cry "Let them get on with it. What right have we to interfere? Bring the troops home." Political pressure will be built until it is sufficient to persuade the Government to withdraw rather than lose the next election.

The Official I.R.A., fresh and well armed by Czechoslovakia will then step in to pick up the pieces in Ulster, at the same time staging a coup in Dublin. (Riots in support of the I.R.A. have already been staged in Eire.) The way will then be open to establish a Cuba style regime in Ireland, outflanking Europe's defences.

What is the essence of Religious Liberty for a Catholic? The right to send his children to Catholic schools? The right to attend mass and receive Holy Communion on Sundays? The right to have a priest at his death bed?

All these rights the Catholic in Ulster has now, but in the China and Cuba which the I.R.A., Peoples Democracy, Miss Devlin, *et. al.* hold up for Irish emulation, **THERE ARE NO CATHOLIC SCHOOLS. THERE ARE NO CATHOLIC CHURCHES. THERE ARE NO CATHOLIC PRIESTS.**

These are the facts which the Catholics in Ulster, but especially the Catholic leadership, must be made to face up to. The real character of the I.R.A. must be relentlessly exposed by Government information and the questions we have posed must be put as strongly as possible to the Catholic leadership and honest answers insisted upon, for it is this **ESSENCE** of the situation that Catholics have continuously evaded, hiding behind Partition, housing, employment, all issues rendered out of date by the developments of the past four years. No greater blow can be struck at the Conspirators by Stormont than to make Catholics realize the implications **FOR THEM AND FOR THE FAITH OF THEIR CHILDREN** of supporting the I.R.A.

The other essentials are that Stormont should be seen to be equally stringent in nipping in the bud any Protestant violence, that the Electoral reforms be applied immediately, that internees not actually connected with the I.R.A. be released, **BUT** that at the same time the Security forces take an aggressive role in destroying the I.R.A. in the field and in discouraging its civilian support in the streets—after due warnings, bricks and petrol bombs should be responded to in the same way as bullets.

THE NEXT STEP

We have spent a lot of space in attempting to clarify what we consider the essential aspects of the Ulster situation because we think it is possible to make an informed guess at the Conspirators next step. It will be to launch a pro I.R.A. campaign in Britain. As in their successful campaigns against the nuclear deterrent and against the defence of Viet-Nam, the Left will seek to confuse the issues in the public mind with red herrings about "Leaving the Irish to settle their own destiny" and from that base build up public opposition to continued resistance. No doubt a few extra ingredients from the "Stop the Seventies Tour" will be added.

The Conspirators can count on the assistance of the Great Unwashed for demonstrations and sit-ins, upon the Pink Professors for Teach-ins, upon the Leftie journalists for write-ups and the B.B.C. newscasters for posing the wrong questions and obscuring the right ones.

WHAT READERS CAN DO: We of the Right may for once have anticipated the Conspirators.

We are few and disorganized but nevertheless each reader can play a part. First, whenever a newspaper or Radio newscaster implies that the conflict is one between Catholic and Protestant write insisting that it is a conflict between Ulster and the I.R.A. Second, take every opportunity to write to the press clarifying the issues along the lines suggested by *Newsletter*. Third, Catholic readers might care to write to Cardinal Conway and other Bishops putting to them the facts as we have detailed them. Fourth, avoid in letters to the press criticizing or attacking either the Orange Lodge or the Ulster Catholics.

FINALLY, for those who think they are not involved, the following quotation from the MAY 1969 issue of the *International* (organ of the Trotskyist "International Marxist Group") may serve as a disabusement:— (preparations for the spreading of the struggle in Northern Ireland) ". . . to the outlying areas of the British Isles where, just as in Northern Ireland, economic depression combines with **ELEMENTS OF A FEELING OF NATIONAL OPPRESSION; LIKewise IN THE BLACK GHETTOS OF THE BIG INDUSTRIAL CITIES, WHO COULD CONFIDENTLY PREDICT THAT IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS THE EVENTS OF DERRY WILL NOT BE REPEATED IN MORE EXPLOSIVE FORM?**" Who indeed?

THE SURVIVAL OF BRITAIN

Contemporaneous Commentaries on linked events of 1967 - 1970
by **BRYAN W. MONAHAN**
Edited and arranged by T. N. MORRIS
Clothbound — £1. 10p posted

THE FIGHT TO WIN

by **BRYAN W. MONAHAN**
"The necessity for the defeat of the European Communities Bill is very much part of this total situation".

8p posted
5 for 25p.; 10 for 40p.; 15 for 55p.; 30 for £1. 00p

K.R.P., Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E11 3NL