

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 69 No. 2

MARCH — APRIL, 1990

WHEN AN ISSUE BECOMES A POLICY

Now the euphoria, then what? The morning after will soon be dawning on Eastern Europe and its celebrants far and near. As the downfall of collectivism is presaged and the Western vultures gather, must the newly liberated territories settle for enthrallment with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the European Economic Community, the trans-nationals and global manipulators in general?

Those attentive to the prognostications of the Rt Hon Enoch Powell last year were not taken by surprise over recent developments. But largely unrecognised were the earlier presentiments of another commentator — the Rt Hon Michael Heseltine. In a speech before the Royal Institute of International Affairs at Chatham House on November 23rd, 1988, he foresaw “a more dangerous, less predictable world, in which a new ingredient of instability returns the continent of Europe to yesterday’s dangers.”

He noted Soviet advocacy of what they call “ecological security”. Herein “the paradigms of national security based on egotism and military, above all nuclear, deterrence require urgent revision.” Mr Heseltine pinpoints the punch-line of this declaration of Soviet intent, dated October 11th 1988, as:

“We believe that the renunciation of certain military programmes, whether planned or undergoing, could be made use of to channel the released resources to establish an international regime of environmental security.”

Mr Heseltine went on to quote *Pravda* of July 2nd, 1988 as reporting the chairman of the new USSR State Committee for the Protection of Nature saying:

“The chief polluters of air, soil and water are enterprises of the Ministry of Power and Electrification, the Ministry of the Chemical Industry, the Ministry of Mineral Fertiliser Production, the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, the Ministry of Non-Ferrous Metallurgy, the Ministry of the Oil Industry, the State Agro-industrial Committee and others.”

Mr Heseltine was in no doubt: “What we are seeing is a well thought-out, carefully crafted attempt to hijack the environmental agenda for ulterior purposes.” He went on: “We face the prospect of a difficult round of weapons modernisation within the Atlantic Alliance. We have complex negotiations to pursue on conventional force reductions and on the next round of strategic nuclear arms limitations.

“The linking of the environment and security offers many opportunities for mischief-making with Western public opinion.”

In particular, said Mr Heseltine, the Soviet “Green Peace” was tailor-made for the West German electorate. He foresaw the possibility of “siren calls for resource-and-technology transfer” or as the Soviet submission to the United Nations put it: “mutual access to advanced technologies”.

He said the Soviets would then decide: “how much of it is used for environmental purposes, how much for military purposes or how much to help an inefficient economy to catch up by our efforts where their own have failed.”

Pointing out how close environmental technology is to the military needs (surveys from space, data banks etc), Mr Heseltine observed: “No one should doubt, in the wake of Chernobyl, the difficulty of making a persuasive case for denying them technology that is as crucial to our safety as it is to theirs.”

He concluded: “We are witnessing the birth of green geopolitics. We must be sure we are well prepared.”

How then will we be prepared?

We realise that the revised governments of the Soviet bloc, in despatching collectivism, do not readily embrace the Western practices of what is passing for capitalism. It is our concern to point the more excellent way of Social Credit which enhances their sense of individual worth yet protects with a shared experience. If we in the West recognise that our own systems are inherently flawed, we must encourage the liberated East to eschew our sins and to pursue what is good neighbourliness and good husbandry. To this extent, the emphasis by the Soviets on the green issues and the pressure on the West to conform is welcome. But we must be certain that our grounding of this issue is in the inherent attributes of Creation and not in socio-economic expediency.

It is at this point that we must return to our question: after the euphoria, what? Not for long is the human spirit allowed free play, the ideologies jump in where angels fear to tread. It is our contention that the Soviet ploy has been to retreat in order to advance. Communism rejected is not communism dead.

Communism will allow itself to be over-run, knowing that doctrine has had its day; tomorrow belongs to fear of natural disasters. Emerging again as its champion defender, Communism will play the exploiters of Ecology at their own game: fear. In face of this, we say that the world has more than enough of its worldly needs; use and distribution must and can be harmonised; people must be reconciled to each other, serving each other globally in the same spirit as can be achieved in a hamlet. This is not a dream, it is a vision; and it is a vision that must be enacted, lest we all perish.

IAIN MCGREGOR.

A short version of Mr Heseltine’s speech can be found in “The Salisbury Review”, December 1989, £4, from the Claridge Press, 43 Queen’s Gardens, London, W2.

It is heartening that you should have chosen the occasion of your speech to the UN General Assembly to address the ecological crisis facing our planet. It was a timely speech and, given the global nature of the problems, a highly appropriate forum in which to make it.

That said, the contents of your speech are worrying. You say that *"We have all recently become aware of . . . the prospect of irretrievable damage to the atmosphere, to the oceans, to earth itself."* This is surely to pass the buck. There is nothing "recent" about the warnings from ecologists, soil scientists, climatologists and others that our activities are causing irreparable damage to the biosphere. In 1972, a full 17 years ago, we ourselves stated in the Preface to our *Blueprint for Survival*:

"An examination of the relevant information available has impressed upon us the extreme gravity of the global situation today. For, if current trends are allowed to persist, the breakdown of society and the irreversible destruction of the life support systems on this planet, possibly by the end of this century, certainly within the lifetimes of our children, are inevitable."

Nor, at the time, was this judged a gratuitous statement: on the contrary, it was endorsed by some of the leading scientific brains in Britain, including Sir Peter Medawar FRS (Nobel Laureate), Sir Julian Huxley FRS, Sir Frank Fraser Darling, Professor C. H. Waddington, Sir Macfarlane Burnet and Sir Peter Scott.

On the specific issue of the greenhouse effect, we warned:

"The CO₂ content of the atmosphere has increased at the rate of 0.2 per cent a year since 1958. One can project, on the basis of these trends, an 18 per cent increase by the year 2000, from 320 ppm to 379 ppm. This might increase the temperature of the earth by 0.5°C. A doubling of CO₂ might increase mean annual surface temperatures by 2°C."

These projections were, if anything, conservative: certainly they are entirely consistent with climatologists' current predictions of the "insidious danger" which we face. We also documented in detail the damage we are doing to terrestrial ecosystems, to the oceans, to food supplies, and to human health. The *Blueprint* received wide publicity and prompted serious political debate. Indeed, Mr Peter Walker, then Minister for the Environment and now your Welsh Secretary, was briefed personally.

Since *The Blueprint*, other reports — some commissioned by governments, others by groups such as Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace — have reiterated the threat to our environment and to our survival. President Carter's *Global 2000* report, published in 1980, could not have been more explicit about the prospects.

"If present trends continue, the world in 2000 will be more crowded, more polluted, less stable ecologically, and more vulnerable to disruption than the world we live in now."

We do not raise this issue to make a political point or to nit-pick over words, but because we are alarmed that, despite the wealth of hard data that has existed on the environmental crisis for 25 years and more, you should only "recently" have become aware of its importance. On the nuclear issue, for example, your government ministers now claim that the true costs of nuclear electricity have only recently come to light. This is nonsense. Seven years ago, we ourselves published a detailed study, commissioned by us and undertaken by the Committee for the Study of the Costs of Nuclear Electricity, showing quite clearly that the Central Electricity Generating Board was using an accounting sleight-of-hand to disguise the true costs of nuclear power. Seven years later, the CSCNE findings have been broadly confirmed. The study concluded:

How Green I

An Open Letter

"We contend that the high capital cost of building nuclear plant, their poorer than expected performance, as well as rapidly rising nuclear fuel costs, have already made electricity from nuclear plant considerably more expensive than that from coal-fired plant . . . If other considerations are taken into account — doubts about reprocessing, waste disposal, decommissioning and reactor insurance — then the economic case against nuclear power becomes overwhelming."

The study was sent to the relevant ministries and to your own office. It was ignored. Its findings were elaborated upon at the Sizewell Inquiry; they were ignored. A subsequent study, sent to Mr Parkinson, then Secretary of State for Energy, showing that Electricité de France had also falsified the costs of its nuclear programme was similarly ignored.

The question is: why? And why indeed for nine out of the ten years that you have been in power has your government been so dismissive of those who have tried to bring the environmental crisis to your attention?

You tell us that we need action to improve agricultural methods: *"Good husbandry which ploughs back nourishment into the soil rather than the cut-and-burn which has damaged and degraded so much land in some parts of the world."* It is hard, however, to blame "cut-and-burn" agriculture for the massive rate of soil erosion in the USA (4,000 million tonnes of top-soil a year — enough to fill a train of freight cars long enough to circle the earth 24 times) or the increasingly worrying levels of erosion in East Anglia.

You extol the virtues of multinationals — "far from being the villains, it is on them that we rely to do the research and find the solutions." But you seem to have overlooked a critical consideration: it is the research of the multinationals which has caused many of the problems in the first place. It was not peasant farmers — "cut-and-burn" or otherwise — who produced PCBs or DDT or CFCs or indeed the nuclear waste that you hope industry will find a means to "make safe". It was multinational corporations. Moreover, once many millions of pounds have been spent on researching and developing a product, there is an almost unstoppable momentum to put the product onto — and to keep it on — the market, regardless of evidence of harm. Thalidomide was an example; many pesticides too; so also asbestos, whose dangers were known for a full 30 years before US companies agreed to stricter regulations on its use. Even as we write, we learn that ICI is lobbying against restrictions on the production of methyl chloroform, a chemical which is estimated to be contributing as much to current ozone depletion as either of the two most destructive CFCs. Nor does the record of multinationals in the Third World inspire confidence. Frequently, they have chosen to "dump" dangerous products and processes in developing countries, when environmental controls become too tough in the industrialized world.

You say we need more research before taking action. *"Before we act, we need the best possible scientific assessment: otherwise, we risk making matters worse."* How? When all the evidence suggests that we are heading for massive climatic destabilization, almost any measure to

Our Valley?

Mrs Thatcher

reduce greenhouse gas emissions can only be a step in the right direction. There will never be absolute scientific certainty on this issue — and further research is unlikely to reveal anything, other than details, that we do not already know. As *Science* points out, “*The fundamental theories of how greenhouse gases trap heat have been substantiated by billions of observations of the atmosphere.*”

You single out growing human numbers as the prime threat to our environment. “*Put in its bluntest form: the main threat to our environment is more and more people, and their activities: the land they cultivate ever more intensively; the forests they cut down and burn; the mountain sides they lay bare; the fossil fuels they burn; the rivers and seas they pollute.*”

We would in no way wish to underplay the problem of population growth. But it is difficult to invoke the ghost of Malthus to explain, for example, the current destruction of North America’s forests. What about acid rain? Or the activities of the lumber industry? And with regard to tropical forests, what about logging, ranching, dam schemes, colonization programmes and large industrial projects — these get no mention in your speech.

So too, it is not human numbers alone that are behind the increase in greenhouse gases. The bulk of population growth today is in the Third World, but it is not the Third World that is the major emitter — either today or historically — of either CFCs or CO₂. You cannot blame Indian peasants who have never seen a fridge, let alone a deodorant spray-can, for the rise in CFCs. It is us, the Northern industrialized countries, who are responsible. The figures speak for themselves. The USA, with just 4 per cent of the world’s population, is responsible for some 24 per cent of global CO₂ emissions. India, by contrast, is responsible for just 2.2 per cent of emissions, yet it is home to one sixth of humanity.

Indeed, your speech seems to have failed to grasp the essential nature of the crisis — that it is our industrial patterns of consumption and production that are at the root of the headlong dash to destruction. You tell us, “*We must have continued economic growth in order to generate the wealth required to pay for the protection of the environment*”. Indeed your commitment to growth is such that although you accept the need to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases, you believe it vital that “*this should be done in a way which enables all our economies to continue to grow and develop.*” In effect, the achievement of growth must take precedence over the measures necessary to avert climatic catastrophe.

Of course, we would like to see growth in some sectors of the economy — for example, a large-scale re-afforestation programme is essential. However, if tree planting is to achieve the desired ecological and social ends, commercial considerations must take a secondary role — the precise opposite of your prescription. Planting eucalyptus and cutting them down every ten years, as is happening throughout the Third World, may increase economic growth, but it is ruinous for both the environment and local villagers.

You argue that market forces act “as a corrective” against this destruction. “*As peoples’ consciousness of environmental needs rises, they are turning increasingly to*

ozone-friendly and other environmentally safe products . . . the new products sell and those which cause environmental damage are disappearing from the shelves.” But the new ozone-friendly propellents cannot repair the gaping hole in the ozone layer over Antarctica. Moreover, whilst it demands little sacrifice from either industry or the consumer to change from one type of spray-can to another, the same is not true when it comes to the major changes that will be necessary if we are really to reduce greenhouse emissions. However aware we the public may be of the ozone hole, we still buy fridges and air-conditioners containing CFCs and the market (which does not reflect the ecological costs of CFCs) is encouraging us, not discouraging us, to do so.

Nothing could demonstrate the wrong-headedness of your approach better than your decision to donate £100 million to the Tropical Forestry Action Plan (TFAP). The TFAP, as has been exhaustively documented in *The Ecologist*, is not a plan to save the forests. As its name makes clear, it is a plan to extend forestry — in effect, to promote commercial plantations. Indeed, its conservation programme consists of no more than assisting “*in the establishment of a national network of protected areas designed to conserve representative samples of ecosystems.*”

We urge you to withdraw Britain’s support for the TFAP. Much of what the greens have to tell you may at first appear unpalatable. But if we are to leave a world fit for future generations to live in, it is critical that you act on their recommendations.

Extracts from *The Ecologist*,
Jan/Feb 1990.

Worthyvale Manor, Camelford, Cornwall, PL32 9TT.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas. The Social Credit Secretariat is non-party and non-class, neither connected with nor supporting any political party.

Subscription rates (one year): U.K. inland £5.00; overseas surface mail, £6.00; overseas airmail £7.50; Australasia \$6.

- Offices — Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD. Tel. 0787 76374.
- Editorial: 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 6LR.
- In Australia (Editorial, Subscriptions, Business and Books): Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

BOOKS and booklets on the subject of Social Credit and allied subjects are available from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and in Australia from Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

ADDITIONAL COPIES of THE SOCIAL CREDITER and back numbers are available from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and from Tidal Publications in Australia, address above.

Booklist and prices upon request.

*Please send me **The Social Crediter** for a year.

NAME:.....

ADDRESS:.....

.....

.....

Enclosed: £.....

Insights

Coming to Terms with Terms

“THE ECONOMY”. The state of the economy attracts daily comment in the press and media. Thus it may be “overheating” or “slowing down” or be “basically sound”. Its “rate of growth” is measured and compared with other economies. Key aspects of its performance are the levels of “unemployment” and whether the balance of overseas trade is “favourable” (in financial surplus) or “unfavourable” (in financial deficit). The state of the economy is of such importance that it is generally regarded as the dominant factor in determining the outcome of general elections.

It is safe to conclude that orthodoxy envisages the “ideal” economy as one of “continuing and unlimited growth” which would thereby ensure “full employment” and a “favourable balance of trade”. Leaving aside for the moment the potentially disastrous ecological implications of such a situation, Social Credit sees the *objective* of a successful economy in quite a different light.

Contrary to the accepted wisdom, the primary function of any economy is not “to provide employment” nor to strike a “favourable balance of trade”. Its purpose is to provide the population with the necessities and amenities of living at the lowest possible prices and with the least possible expenditure of energy. With the application of science and technology to productive processes of all kinds, this objective is being achieved with ever-increasing mechanical efficiency and an ever-diminishing input of human labour. Advanced “capital-intensive” economies thus produce more than sufficient for people’s consumption without having to employ all those available for work.

This “unemployment”, so-called, is common to all advanced economies regardless of whether they are nominally “capitalist” or “socialist” or “mixed”. It is heavily disguised by the vast numbers of people “employed” on work which adds nothing to the sum total of necessary consumable goods and services, while nevertheless sustaining and increasing the demand for them through the distribution of incomes. Into this broad category we can assign the armed forces and the defence industries, most of the civil service concerned with the redistribution of incomes via taxation and social security, and also the huge fields of popular entertainment and broadcasting.

By contrast, the less developed countries, including some “communist” economies, maintain “full employment” through relatively backward “labour-intensive” production methods, their populations enjoying only a low standard of living or even only a bare subsistence, interspersed with famines.

“Full employment” is thus no longer necessary in the advanced economies. They can easily produce sufficient for their peoples’ needs without it. It is also no longer relevant as a political objective. Any attempt to achieve it would necessitate a drastic reduction in present living standards in order to compete with the cheaper labour of the Far East and the Third World. That would be rightly and fiercely resisted by trade unions with inevitable industrial strife and disruption.

By contrast, the progressive supplementation of wages and salaries by a National Dividend, payable as of right to all individuals irrespective of other income, would tend to encourage social cohesion and amity. It would be obvious to all as shareholders in a common enterprise, such as “Great Britain Unlimited”, that the dividend would be related to efficient production and harmonious working practices.

The cries for “full employment” and for “job creation programmes” are in reality motivated by the need to generate more purchasing power to offset the chronic deficiency which is inherent in orthodox capitalist accounting. But that deficiency could and should best be met by the twin techniques of a National Dividend, and a National Discount on retail prices eliminating any possibility of inflation. Thus, in an advanced economy, the right to a basic income need no longer be tied to possession of a “job”.

This distinctive approach to the place of the individual in society with its potentiality of liberating him from economic servitude has been encapsulated in the matchless words of C. H. Douglas, as follows:

The Financial system, in its control over production, stands to the works or factory system of the world, considered as an economic unit, in the same relation as the planning department of a modern factory does to that factory.

The distribution side of the financial system exercises a function not dissimilar to that of the progress department of a factory.

No discussion of the financial system can serve any useful purpose which does not recognise:

(a) *That a works system must have a definite objective.*

(b) *That when that objective has been decided upon it is a technical matter to fit methods of human psychology and physical facts, so that that objective will be most easily obtained.*

In regard to (a) the policy of the world economic system amounts to a philosophy of life. There are really only three alternative policies in respect to a world economic organisation:

The first is that it is the end in itself for which man exists.

The second is that while not an end in itself, it is the most powerful means of constraining the individual to do things he does not want to do; e.g., it is a system of Government. This implies a fixed ideal of what the world ought to be.

And the third is that the economic activity is simply a functional activity of men and women in the world; *that the end of man, while unknown, is something towards which most rapid progress is made by the free expansion of individuality, and that, therefore, economic organisation is most efficient when it most easily and rapidly supplies economic wants without encroaching on other functional activities.*

RECOMMENDED READING

Benson, Ivor	Truth Out of Africa.
Burkitt, B. & Baimbridge, M	What 1992 Really Means: Single Market or Double Cross?
Douglas, C. H.	The Brief for the Prosecution. The Development of World Dominion. Economic Democracy. The Monopoly of Credit. The Policy of a Philosophy. Social Credit.
Monahan, Bryan W.	The Moving Storm. The Survival of Britain. Why I am a Social Crediter.
Reed, Douglas	The Controversy of Zion.
Robertson, Thomas	Human Ecology.
Social Credit Secretariat	Elements of Social Credit. Zimunism.
Sutton, Antony C.	National Suicide — Military Aid to the Soviet Union. Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution.
Tether, C. Gordon	The Great Common Market Fraud.