







# PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Creditor," England. (Continued from last issue.)

In a popular Sunday newspaper Lord Vansittart refers to "the dupes of those Leftist pan-Germans, operating under cover of anti-Nazism" in the following words, printed in block capitals, with underlining, in the original: "This has always been a phoney war, and we may get a phoney peace, unless at long last, these people are put, and kept, in their place."—"Sunday Dispatch," August 1, 1943.

I might, perhaps, be allowed to add to the fairly modern adjective "phoney," one still newer, "microphoney."  
Lord Vansittart was Chief Diplomatic Adviser to the Foreign Office. I draw a very sharp distinction between the highly-trained official, of which class he is a representative, and the infesting bureaucracy which crept in under the prestige of a totally different organisation designed for special objectives outside the routine of the business man. And I consider the paragraph I have quoted, in the light of the training and experience of its author, to be deserving of very serious attention. It is certain that it is made on the basis of exact knowledge, and I trust that the knowledge will be made available at such a time and place as will insure that it will be the basis of action.

But the general truth of it leaps to the eye. What adjective would you apply to a "British" broadcasting organisation from which, almost any night at 5.30 p.m., you may hear an unctuous voice murmur, "Good night, children—ever'whab" and at 6.01 p.m. a hearty fellow tell you, "Our bombers were out over Germany last night? (And a good thing, too)." What adjective would you apply to a situation in which "statesmen" mouth clichés about a war for freedom, while men who fought in the first round of that alleged fight are imprisoned, without trial, without a formulated charge, and without hope of release? Or to a world in which forty million individuals, 99 per cent. of whom only wish to be allowed to mind their own business, are killing and wounding each other for some undisclosed objective known only to half a dozen men who don't agree on it themselves?

Lord Vansittart plants his indictment on too narrow a base. It is a phoney war and a phoney peace are part of it.

Supposing I were to say to you, "I am organising a cricket club. You are all cricket enthusiasts, so I feel sure that you will join my club, and will deposit all your idle deeds, stocks and shares, and other valuables with the secretary as a guarantee that you will obey my orders"—you would probably remark that, under the circumstances, you think you'll play golf.  
But suppose you had been brought up from birth to believe that you MUST play cricket, and you must join my club, and that, of course, placing all your eggs in my basket was only a formality. And supposing that, when you were all neatly registered, I were to say, "This organisation, which we humorously call a cricket club, is really planned for plainer living, higher thinking, and more painful dying, and you can't resign"—you would complain, wouldn't you? To which the answer is, "No, you wouldn't" because you in fact don't. Most of you merely say that more people must join the club—"full employment."

In the face of a worsening world situation of which the foregoing little parable is not an unfair picture, it is still possible to speak of Labour as a "class" without more than one person in a million observing that the claim of "Labour" to be a class is just elementary lack of education. Labour is a function, not a class, and a Labour Government is government by function. We hear a good deal about rooting out Fascism, largely from the "Left" which agitates for "Labour." Again, not one in a million could define Fascism, which is rule by function—the corporative State. The hand ruling the brain. But not really, you know. A gang of crooks ruling everyone. A few Labour bosses, and a majority of Finance bosses.

If this business of the relation of function to policy were really difficult to understand, then it would be possible to believe that the native intelligence quota is so low that no blame attaches to anyone for its mishandling. But the native intelligence quota is not low and the general principle is quite easy to understand. OPINION IS CONSCIOUSLY MISDIRECTED BY THE AGENTS OF INTERESTS WHICH KNOW EXACTLY WHAT THEY ARE DOING. PRECISELY, THEY ARE STRAINING EVERY AGENCY OF MISDIRECTION TO LEAD THE COM-

## U.S.A. CONSTITUTION

"The value of this [U.S.A.] Constitution to the world at large, as well as to the States it united, was greatly enhanced by the practical sense which confined the principles it embodied to the actual necessities of the Commonwealth it erected. The power of the Federal Government to tax the citizens was limited to Federal functions. The Federal Government was given only those powers which the State Governments could not, in fact, exercise. All powers which the States could exercise with effect were still reserved to the State legislatures. The word 'State' though preserved was in fact a misnomer. The former States with their legislatures were preserved to function as Provinces with local Governments of their own."  
—Lionel Curtis, "Civitas Dei," p. 418.

"New Times," November 26, 1943—Page 4

## MON MAN INTO A TRAP FROM WHICH THERE IS NO ESCAPE

At the present time there is hardly a trades union leader who is not telling his bemused constituents that he is going to make a new world in which "labour" is the only voice which matters. There is only one state of the world in which "labour" can even remotely claim to represent humanity, and that is—"in war, or under threat of war." In any sane civilisation "labour" has never been of so little importance, by reason of its displacement by power. And, if there is any sanity after this war, its importance will be less. The trades union constitution-makers are the worst enemies of their audience—if their audience pays any attention to what they say.

To any thoughtful Englishman (pace the Scot and Welshman) one of the more serious aspects of false propaganda is that it must inevitably recoil on the British people. It is most desirable that there should be a working agreement with America, but we are going the worst possible way to obtain one. This fact is recognised in rather unlikely quarters. The "New York Times" of May 9, 1943, commenting on the egregious film, "Mission to Moscow," remarks: "The whole effort to represent Soviet dictatorship as advanced democracy. This film is anti-British, anti-Congress, anti-democratic, and anti-truth."

According to the Communist "Daily Worker" (U.S.A.), Messrs. Warner Brothers, the Jew film monopoly, are spending half a million dollars to advertise "Mission to Moscow"—nearly twice as much as was ever previously spent on advertising one film.

Almost contemporaneously (April, 1943) a widely-read periodical, "America Preferred," published an article, "Do We Win or Lose the War?" In the course of this article the author remarks:

"The American people are not committed to an amalgamation with the British Empire, and they will not tolerate any conspiracy to accomplish such amalgamation, once they realise fully what is intended. The American people have never voted to socialise or communise the United States, and there is no reasonable ground for believing that they ever will do so. The international bankers recognise that internationalism stems from collectivism, just as economic nationalism stems from individualism, but the bankers have no intention of yielding the control of the collectivised and socialised state to the 'proletariat,' and there is no great fear

## DR. MACAULAY AND HIS NEW GOSPEL

To the Editor, Sir,—Last week-end (this letter dated Nov. 22—Ed.) I took your issue of the 12th inst. away with me to the reply to "Stirrem's" answer to my disclaimer of his first letter. I did not find the time required even to read carefully his answer, so must apologise for missing a week's issue.

"Stirrem's" reply falls into three parts. In one part he quotes the authority for imputing certain words to me which I repudiated. His authority is an "Argus" report which I have not seen. I accept his statement that he quoted accurately what the "Argus" said; for example, his statement that the "main object of the conference was to give the world DIRECTIONS, etc." I hope, however, that he will also accept my disclaimer that I ever used the word "directions."

In part 2 he attempts to score, and at least once does score, good debating points. For example, he quotes my use of the phrase "for good or ill"; and makes some play with the question: if it be for ill, why co-operate? My point, however, was that the old way of independent, rival States, has ceased to be tolerable in the modern world. It means anarchy and war. Some better way has to be found, even if it has ills of its own.

What I call Part 3 of his letter, however, is the emergence of the fact, as I deem it to be, that behind the argument as to what we each said or mean there is a real difference of opinion.

The Round Table members thought, and I think with them, that some kind of World are to avoid further and bigger wars. Our wisdom, therefore, was to seek for the best we might advise our several constituent bodies as to the principles involved in such a world, and to do what we could to avoid those dangers. I gather that "Stirrem" the war will be necessary, but that he every right to think so, and to say so. But such a paragraph as that in which he refers to our "evident intention to abolish democracy" or to the presence of an economic "mist" who was to not there to lead their detend to quell any possible unseemly allusions to the god of finance." Such suggestion as to the supposed American source of the funds to pay the Australian dele-

that they will be required to do so. With a proper understanding and respect for the lessons of history, they realise how absurd is the 'dictatorship of the proletariat.' This is the reason that international bankers are so generous with their subsidies to international communism. This is the reason that Mr. Hoover, Mr. Willkie, Earl Browder, Mr. Roosevelt, Judge Frankfurter, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Hopkins, Mr. Baruch, Ben Cohen and the partners of J. P. Morgan can be found in the same bed. Their points of agreement are fundamental. Their differences are trivial.

Amongst the less intelligent criticisms of the group of ideas known as Social Credit is that it is disguised anarchy—a kind of go-as-you-please free for all. The argument is equivalent to saying that claim to choose whether I will play cricket or tennis is a claim to make the rules of cricket or tennis.

But the criticism has an important truth contained in it—a truth which the collectivist monopolists understand clearly. Freedom of choice does ultimately mean negative control. Negative control is the only control the man in the street requires. He needs a bridle on the mass expert.

If sufficient individuals disapprove of an article, it will go off the market for the simple reason that it will have no market. But only if there is an alternative. If there is no alternative, you become the tool of the gangster. If you have freedom of choice, you needn't. Social Credit is the escape from gangsterdom.

"This is a gangsters' war, for the benefit of gangsters and the perpetuation of gangsterdom. You can have just as many like it as you wish. To that end, the first essential is to demand the right to interfere in everyone's business, preferably without understanding it. That encourages everyone to interfere with you, and a good time is had by all. Then use as many words which have no ascertainable meaning, as possible. Demand higher taxes for everyone and complain about your own. Otherwise leave Finance severely alone. Professor Laske will help you.

A very few years of "peace" founded on these principles will ensure a hearty welcome to the next war. (All rights reserved.) (Concluded.)

## THE DARLING OF THE "CITY"

Mr. Herbert Morrison bids fair to rival Viscount Snowden as the darling of the "City" and the international financier. At a love-feast to celebrate the centenary of the "Economist," which is edited by the ineffectual Geoffrey Crowther and commonly considered to represent the views of Sir Henry Strakosch, who in turn represents the South African Gold interest, Mr. Morrison didn't repeat on this occasion the celebrated dictum of Viscount Snowden acclaiming the Bank of "England" as the greatest moral force in the world; but just you wait, Clarence.—The "Social Creditor," England, Sept. 18.

## SYNTHETIC RUBBER

In the British House of Commons July 20 Mr. Shirwell asked the Minister of Production whether he could make a statement on the progress of investigation into the production of synthetic rubber in Great Britain; and whether any proposals had been made to him on the subject.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Production (Mr. Garro Jones) in the question under review and the proposals for the manufacture of synthetic rubber and various rubber substitutes have been investigated. Substantial supplies of synthetic rubber are expected from Great Britain. No decision has been made to produce synthetic rubber in Great Britain, but certain suggestions have been communicated to this country have been examined by British firms, who have been asked for their information in regard to these proposals.

Mr. Shirwell: "Is it not true to say that the British firm referred to in both the question and the answer have made a firm offer to the Minister of Production that they are ready to instal plant and that all that is required to enable the country to produce synthetic rubber is the consent of the Minister, and why should we not produce it here instead of allowing this important commodity to be produced elsewhere?"

Mr. Garro Jones: "In regard to the first part of the Supplementary Question, it is perfectly true, I believe, that the firm is confident that they can produce synthetic rubber, but my right hon. Friend's confidence is well founded. With regard to the second part of the Question, the answer in the United States, and we have good reason to believe that that expectation will not be disappointed."

## THE NATURE OF WAR

(Continued from page 2.)  
men under him, and there can be little doubt that many of Churchill's Meynarts words, Churchill is being surrounded by men whom he himself did not pick.

Since Germany lost command of the air the centre of gravity of the war has shifted from military strategy to political strategy. The scene is being set for the new structure of peace; key men are being selected and placed in strategic positions round the world.

The people of the world have had no say in the selection of these key men. I am quite certain in most cases the Governments of the world have had no say in the selection of these key men.

The political structure of the world will be settled in the next few years in a shape which may last for centuries. The plan that has been devised for us is one of centralised world control. The plan consists of four parts:

1. A Central World Bank, controlling a gold currency and controlling the central banks of each country.
2. An international Air Force, which will be able to control any country which refuses to give servile obedience to the edicts of the international controlling authority.
3. The subjection of the Christian religion to one in which the "State" is supreme over all individuals, and in which no one has any rights except through the State; this idea is already supported by a large number of people.
4. By the introduction of Bureaucratic Socialism no one will be held responsible for anything; a complete alibi could be supplied for every crime.

There are four things which can destroy this scheme; they are:

1. Personal initiative—that is, faith in oneself.
2. The power of an idea, which can spread like a bush-fire.
3. The spiritual nature of Man, which refuses to be satisfied by material things and animal comforts.
4. Exposure of the real enemy.

## GET THE FACTS!

What is Democracy? What is Fascism? What is Communism? What is National Socialism? What is Socialism? What is the Christian religion? What is the Church? What is the State? What is the individual? What is the family? What is the nation? What is the world?

All these questions are answered in a clear and simple way in a pamphlet, "THE FACTS," the excellent pamphlet, "THE FACTS," which is available from the United Electors of Australia, Ewan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I. Price: One shilling plus postage (1/6).

Every democrat should get a copy of "THE FACTS," and circulate them as far as possible. ORDER NOW.

LATEST BOOKLET BY DOUGLAS  
"The Land For The (Chosen) Racket."  
By C. H. Douglas.  
Price: Two Shillings, Plus Postage.  
Intending purchasers are advised to order booklet is now available. Limited stock only. Order from:  
The Democratic Federation of Australia (A/asia), 296a Pitt Street, Sydney.

## IMPORTANT NEW BOOKLET

"Power Politics and People's Pressure"

A timely exposure of the conspiracy for international control of your country. This booklet is fully documented, with some disquieting information. To work effectively, social crediters must keep abreast of the facts. "Power Politics and People's Pressure" is a valuable contribution to this end.

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW.  
Price, 1/1, post free, from The United Electors of Australia, 5th Floor, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

Printed by M. F. Canover, 25 Collyer Quay, for the New Times Ltd., Melbourne.