THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 44 No. 20 SATURDAY, JANUARY 2, 1965 Saturday, January 2, 1965

Reflections on the Elections

(REPRINTED FROM *American Opinion**, DECEMBER, 1964)

The latest tabulation of the popular vote shows 42,328,350 for Johnson against 26,640,178 for Goldwater. And the most important question left is: How many of these 68,968,528 people knew what they were voting for, or against? One comment is, to be sure, an exaggeration, but still worth repeating: on the Democratic side, the followers did not know where they were being led; while on the Republican side, the leaders never did understand where their followers wanted to go. Let's examine first, from this point of view, the Democratic landslide.

These forty-two million Americans actually voted, of course, for repeal of the Declaration of Independence. For two decades each Administration has been gradually surrendering American sovereignty piecemeal, to the United Nations and to such intermediate stations on the way to UN-One World government as NATO. The Johnson Administration has shown its clear intention of making this surrender more rapid and more complete. But the pro-Johnson millions thought they were voting simply for frank and willing co-operation on our part with other nations. And *nobody* on the Republican side told them otherwise.

All of these forty-two million supposedly responsible adults voted for scrapping the United State Constitution entirely, as an absurd and useless antique; and for replacing it with whatever modernistic pieces of legislative furniture might appeal to the taste of the Supreme Court. But most of the pro-Johnson hordes had no slightest idea that this was the case, or that their vote could be so interpreted. They thought that they were simply being good citizens by upholding "the law of the land", or voting for those who believed in upholding it. And to the best of our knowledge, none of the Republican spokesmen made any serious effort to shatter these dangerous illusions.

Here were forty-two million people who voted for paying more and more billions of dollars out of their own pockets, into the pockets of Communist tyrants or Communist sympathisers all over the world. The money will be used to make the hard lives of these poor struggling murderers much easier; to enable them to consolidate their cruel power more rapidly; and to assure that their advance towards enslavement of the whole world will have plenty of capitalistic fuel to support it. But of course most of these millions never dreamed of such a thing. They were happy in the belief that they were buying "peace in our time" with a noble coin known as "foreign aid". And they certainly would never have learned anything different by listening to the Republican campaign speeches.

Here were forty-two million citizens, most of them just as patriotic as the rest of the population, who nevertheless voted for completely disarming the United States; for doing away with our army, navy and airforce; and for turning ourselves into sitting ducks for any international marauders who might set themselves up in business by stealing an A-Bomb. The protection against such aggressors is to be supplied by the United Nations, the most brazen collection of criminal aggressors in the world.

This is like having a field full of sheep ask the lions to come in and protect them from the wolves—and having all of the fences removed so as to make the protection job easier for the lions. But these forty-two million sheep did not know that they were so voting, at all. They had been repeatedly assured, and now believed, that the lions were really all very good vegetarians like themselves. These sheep were voting for a millennium they had been promised, when the wolves and the sheep and the lions would all dwell peacefully together in one huge corral. Nobody pointed out to them how gleefully the lions were licking their chops over this prospect, or how many similar sheep the same lions had already devoured. Instead you might have thought at times that the Republican campaign leadership was itself trying to win the vote of the lions.

II

These forty-two million Americans cast their ballots for a programme in which the government will soon own more land, run more businesses, employ more people, and spend more money than all American industry put together. This is simply an insidious, gradual and supposedly painless method by which the government takes over *all* property and all production, and converts its subjects into vassals and serfs working on the government's estates. But of course the future serfs do not know this, and *nobody* told them. They had been assured, instead, that they were voting to be saved by a beneficent government from cruelly exploiting each other through using their own property and running their own affairs. And they could have heard all the speeches and read all the statements of the Republican campaign without understanding one bit better the road ahead, down which they are rushing so gleefully.

These forty-two million people have voted for a continued raising of the limit on our admitted national debt, and for then having the debt climb fast to each new limit. They have voted for a continual rapid expansion of the unmeasured and unadmitted national debt which—like the part of an iceberg under water—is many times larger than the visible part above the surface. They have voted for grandstand plays in tax reduction, which have no fiscal justification and simply increase the national debt; and for all of the other insidious methods by which our own government is heading our currency towards further devaluation, on the path to final repudiation and worthlessness.

These good people have voted for steps which—still gradually at first, as now, but then more precipitously—will wipe out the value of all of their savings, their life insurance policies, their

(continued on page 3)

* Published monthly except July by Robert Welch, Inc., Belmont, Massachusetts 02178, U.S.A.

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 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

Offices: Business: 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1.
Telephone: EUSton 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—
Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

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

Are They Really Traitors ?

In the second leader for November 16, 1964, the *Daily Telegraph* discusses the reprisals being taken against those alleged to have taken part in a plot in Tanzania, and is not clear whether there ever was such a plot. "If it was concocted by the Communist officials in Zanzibar," the writer continues, "that would explain why European farmers are among the victims of punitive measures." And then we read the key phrase: "For any established pocket of prosperity in Africa is a target for Communist disruption." The paragraph notes that the Foreign Minister of Tanganyika has set himself "at the head of the O.A.U. Committee for Liberation of Mozambique".

Elsewhere in the same issue we read of Rhodesian police hunting terrorist gangs which have "slipped into the country from Zambia". Mr. Kaunda, President of Zambia (formerly Northern Rhodesia) does not wish his country to become a base for terrorists, but "does not want to offend militant African nationalists by clamping down on them severely". A captured terrorist said that he had bought six machine guns in Lusaka, the capital of Zambia.

I must confess to ignorance of the whereabouts of Lusaka, but now it becomes prominent news as a base of subversion. Nor did I know much of Dar-e-Salaam, where President Nyerere is titular head of the Tanzania Government and where "the recent Cabinet reshuffle shows that the Communist partisans have gained ground". In fact President Nyerere has said that the European farms take-over was not linked with the alleged plot, and that "he would not change his decision about the take-over whatever the world said and even if he had made a mistake".

We have found it difficult enough at times to maintain a feeling of "nationalism" in the British Isles, where Scottish and Welsh inhabitants often feel themselves slighted by the English and where Eire has broken away quite recently. It is hard to believe that a citizen of Lusaka feels much natural interest in a citizen of Dar-es-Salaam or much enthusiasm for the leadership of Col. Nasser. So that "African nationalism" has evidently been imported for the benefit of outsiders.

If a Rhodesian read this issue of the *Daily Telegraph*, he would doubtless agree that the Communists were attacking "any established pocket of prosperity in Africa" and would feel anxious that his life's work should not be undermined and ruined; nor would he wish his family to share the fate of the 1,000 Europeans held at this moment by the rebels in Stanleyville. For, to quote again, "Experience shows that the greatest danger to Europeans comes in the last hour or two before the army takes over. Rebel leaders flee and bands of youths, who delight in terrorism and murder, take over." The *Daily Telegraph* has given excellent coverage to the situation and may stiffen resistance to the Suicide of the West.

I know of two families who have lived years in Rhodesia, and the men in each family fought in the last War. The Rhodesians are trying to work the Constitution which they were advised to accept, and in view of all that is happening around them, they are unwilling to hand over themselves and their future to people who might not be able to resist Communist subversion. And they have committed the unpardonable crime of looking twice at ballot-box democracy, described once as the perfect instrument for crushing minorities.

Yet our rulers fail to look twice at the progress of events in Africa or to learn by experience; they would appear to be callous regarding the fate of Europeans in that Continent, to consider irrelevant the massive loss of life among the coloured peoples and to listen only to the noise made by terrorists. Mr. Enoch Powell (an opponent of Mr. Wilson?) has recently poured scorn on the idea of our former imperial greatness, but surely the sense of decency and honour have declined disastrously. While bowing before "African nationalism"—which could be made the excuse for any communist atrocity—we have abdicated from any sense of white or Western solidarity, and abandoned the poor ordinary peaceful coloured African to be a pawn in the evil game of power.

I would not wish to judge the Rhodesians, who seem to be able to manage their affairs as competently as anyone in the vast continent, but I should not hesitate to say that it was wrong to use the word "traitor", and that the inner circle of enemy power must have been delighted at this further evidence of British disintegration. —H.S.S.

Red Lights Flashing

We read (*Daily Telegraph*, November 17, 1964) that the Government of Ceylon is under the control of its Marxist members who wish to control the press and close the courts. On the same day our Members of Parliament have blandly accepted a steep increase in salary. (The clergy of the Church of England await a promised increment of £25 a year.) I favour the suggestion that an M.P.'s salary should vary inversely with the cost of living, and then they might bestir themselves to pass on to the consumer the benefits of improved process.

And perhaps the best explanation of the embargo on arms for South Africa, announced on November 18, is the reply of Mr. Wilson to Sir Alec Douglas-Home: "Let me tell him that not to have made this statement would have far-reaching implications to our loyalty, to our membership of the United Nations and to our relations to a very large number of Commonwealth countries in Africa and elsewhere." This expresses the priorities in Mr. Wilson's mind clearly enough. —H.S.S.

REFLECTIONS ON THE ELECTIONS (continued from page 1)

bonds and mortgages, and will redistribute wealth from the industrious and frugal into the hands of the shiftless. But this was not done deliberately by the shiftless themelves, for their own specific benefit. (If they could plan that far ahead, they would not be shiftless.) This was done by millions of reasonably prudent and honourable citizens, simply because nobody told them about the signaficance of their vote. They believed, instead, that they were merely voting for higher wages, more government contracts to business firms, more government cheques to individuals, more money in circulation, and all of the factors which appeared to them to constitute prosperity.

One of the most cruel lies ever devised by the Communists, and spread widely for them by their Liberal dupes and allies, is that the national debt doesn't matter because we owe it to ourselves. This is exactly like having a father rob little Johnny's piggy bank of its carefully hoarded pennies, in order to buy himself a beer, and then claim that it doesn't matter because the money is all in the same family anyway. But if any of the Republican campaigners explained any of these facts of fiscal life to the American people, in connection with their forthcoming vote and its meaning, we must have been reading the comics at the time in order to avoid the monotonous drivel on the political pages of the paper.

These forty-two million neighbours of ours voted for more riots to be instigated by racial agitators, for more racial bitterness, and for greater use of all of these fomented troubles to forward Communist purposes. The Johnson Administration did not even pretend to disapprove of such riots and agitation, nor to have any intention of preventing their increase. It merely begged the agitators to hold up long enough during the election campaign to keep the electorate from becoming aware of what was in the cards for the future. But the total explanation by Republican spokesmen of this whole sinister programme was not enough to wake up one per cent more of the voters to these plans by the Communists for undermining our nation. Instead of knowing the truth, most of these forty-two million voters were told, and believed, that they were endorsing some great humanitarian appeal for justice and honourable action, known as "Civil Rights".

If Chiang Kai-shek had been able to tell the Chinese people that Mao Tse-tung's "agrarian reform" was merely a Communist slogan and programme, for attracting gullible idealists all over the world to Mao's support, and for beguiling the peasants themselves into offering less resistance—then the Communists could never have subjugated the mainlaind of China. Chiang, however, never had the means nor the opportunity for getting this information and understanding over to the hundreds of millions of Chinese. Nor would it have been easy in those days to offer convincing proof of Mao's intentions.

But the Republican leadership in the campaign just finished had plenty of means, and a perfect opportunity, for telling practically all of the American people that the "Civil Rights" slogan and drive was a most important and integral part of the long-range Communist plans for the gradual take-over of the United States. And the supporting evidence, both plentiful and conclusive, was right in the instructions which the Communists have repeatedly been publishing for their own people ever since the early 1920s. The Republican campaigners, however, treated the truth about the Communist hands and purposes behind the "Civil Rights" drive as if it were some kind of state secret—which maybe it was!

III

The failure of the Republican spokesmen to tell the American people the facts of life, in a world threatened by the Communist Conspiracy and its collectivist forerunners, was not because any of these matters we have mentioned were so hard to explain. To illustrate and support this point, let's look a little more "in depth" at one of the positions for which the Goldwater-Miller ticket was most widely and effectively criticised. And this is with regard to Social Security.

Most of these forty-two million Johnsonites voted for stealing from their children in order to escape the responsibility of looking out for their parents. But of course they did not realise that they were making any such decision. Not five per cent of them knew that the Social Security system doesn't have a dime, and is three hundred billion dollars in the hole. Not even one per cent understood that this gigantic embezzlement, vaguely presented as in the nature of an insurance system, is nothing more than a general government taxing programme and a government handout programme, which are made to appear closely related by some deceptive nomenclature. These programmes are not even both administered by the same bureaucratic agency. There is almost no real relationship between the income from taxation and the outgo for benefits. And the whole fraud is nothing more than one of the insidious but gigantic steps whereby a central government is gradually establishing itself as the Communist "Big Brother" of George Orwell's 1984.

Economic security for the individual has to be paid for in just one of two coins, production or freedom. Through a complete surrender of all freedom, as by getting oneself committed for life to a penitentiary, a complete guarantee is acquired, also for life, of the three basic necessities—shelter, food and clothing. The quality and quantity of the necessities provided now depend on the production level of the total economy, and on the character of the bosses of the prison system; not on the production or earnings of the individual inmate.

For illustration of the situation in a Socialist economy, the parallel is neither unfair nor fanciful. At many stages of Socialist development, neither the price paid nor the security bought may be as complete as indicated above. But the degree of individual economic security provided by the state always runs basically proportional to the amount of freedom sacrificed. This will remain so, as both increase, until the whole nation approaches the status of a gigantic prison, with correspondingly complete economic security for all of its inmates. But here again the quality and quantity of the necessities supplied will depend on the production level of the whole nation, and the character of the wardens who determine how that production shall be divided.

In the Americanist system, if its working parts had been allowed to continue untrammelled by government interference, government competition, and government control, economic security for the aged would have been purchased entirely out of production rather than out of freedom. It must be remembered that while food, shelter and clothing are *necessities* for an individual in a civilised community, the guarantee that he will always have them is not. This guarantee, with the comfort that it brings, begins as a luxury, which a prudent man will start purchasing, as he does other luxuries, as rapidly as he can afford them. And when the total economy is so productive that most individuals can afford certain luxuries, those particular luxuries —definitely including various forms of future security for an individual or his family—gradually and wisely become accepted as necessities.

Among the first of these luxuries in the category of security were fire insurance and life insurance. Both got under way in America only a comparatively few generations ago. As the margin grew, between production (or wages for a part of production)

and the requirements for those things already accepted as necessities, more and more individuals bought for themselves—out of this margin—the comfort of fire insurance. And fire insurance itself became commonplace as fast as frugality and the demands of competitive goods or services would permit.

By a few decades ago the same development was beginning with regard to old-age pensions. The greatly increased production from the growth of the American factory system, with all of its machinery and efficiency, provided a margin above the accumulated earlier demands, which now made practicable a very rapid spread of private pension systems. In fact, the growing competition for labour was already causing the most foresighted American business firms to begin the institution of pension plans, as a means of attracting more and better labour. As is always the case, the less ably managed firms would have been driven by competition to emulate the leaders.

These pension plans would, of course, have been fully funded. The money with which to pay the future commitments, on a sound actuarial basis, would have been withdrawn, at the time these commitments were made, from the current earnings of companies or the current wages of individuals, or both; and would then have been safely invested for that purpose. Since the total economy was reaching a point where it could afford to provide this luxury—and to let it become gradually converted into a recognised necessity—there is no doubt that solidly funded pension plans, and corresponding private insurance plans for the self-employed, would have become almost as adequate and routine as is fire insurance today.

Instead of this natural and happy Americanist development we have had the Socialist imposition of a government "social security" system. This system is not funded at all. The collection of increasing taxes in the future to pay the obligations of the past will inevitably reduce the value of the money with which those obligations are paid. And the whole vast machinery by which government thus takes from *future production* to pay for past promises will destroy individual freedoms, chip away incentives to production, and *damage* the total economy, exactly in proportion to the quanity of the promises it makes.

The situation is the same as if, when this country did begin to be able to afford fire insurance, about four or five generations ago, the government had stepped in and practically pre-empted the field. Instead of counting on *current* premiums to pay, on an actuarially sound basis, for future policy benefits, the government—any government—would have started cheating at once. It would have claimed that, since future premiums on future policies would pay for losses on older policies as those losses came along, it was entirely all right for the government to take the money from current premiums and use it for regular government needs. This is a course of action for which any insurance executives who tried it would and should go to jail, but it is exactly what is being done by government with money paid by taxes into a theoretical Social Security fund today.

Also, government would soon have made fire insurance *compulsory*, so as to be able to count on the revenue from a vast number of premiums. Then it would steadily have expanded the property list for which fire insurance was compulsory, as well as the amount of coverage required for various items of property. And it would next have started increasing, percentagewise, the costs of the premiums themselves (this being admittedly necessary to cover in some part the waste and inefficiency of any government operation). Then slowly but certainly the fact would gradually have been taken for granted that the fire insurance premiums were just another form of general taxation, while the benefits or losses paid were just another form of government largesse—and wasn't it wonderful of government to look out for its citizens so well?

This is exactly what has happened in the case of "social security". And in appropriating to itself this tyrannical role of warden in a colossal prison, the government will have completely prevented the development of a sound pension system, an Americanist system, for providing economic security for the aged. But probably ninety-five per cent of the pro-Johnson voters did not understand any of this. They believed they were voting against any curtailment of such wonderful "progress" and "humanitarianism" as Social Security. And goodness knows there were only the most feeble and sporadic efforts on the part of the Goldwater campaigners to tell them the truth.

(To be concluded)

CORRECTION, PLEASE!

ITEM: From a Book Review by Victor Perlo in *People's World* (Communist), August 29, 1964:

[The U.S.S.R.] *stimulates revolutionary and national liberation movements by example and education, and not by interference in other countries' internal affairs.*

CORRECTION: "Actions continue to speak louder than words, and certainly the Communists have shown no indication of a sincere quest for peace.

"The take-over of Cuba and effort to convert it into an island fortress against democracy; the ever-constant infiltration of Red Fascists into countries of Central and South America to create a Sovietised Latin America; the increase of espionage activities by Soviet and satellite agents in our country, particularly those who strive to penetrate our Government processes from the protection afforded them by diplomatic assignments in New York and Washington; the frantic efforts of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to subvert our youth; and the intense drive of the Communists operating from concealed positions to wrest control of the movement for Negro rights—does all this indicate a real and sincere desire to live in peaceful co-existence?"

Source: J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, November 16, 1963.

Strong Poison

"The tide has turned in Rhodesia. From now on white supremacy will ebb away. In a few years there will be a black Government in Salisbury.

"Little by little the pressures will be applied [*by whom?*] . . .

"The process will be tedious, but its end sure. A dozen constitutions may be written and torn up, a score of promises made and broken. But the only outcome will be—one man, one vote [—and one party ,one Leader, one platform.] . . ."

—Douglas Brown in the *Sunday Telegraph*, November 1, 1964.

• • •

As things are now, we would say that the end is almost equally sure in once-Great Britain. "In a few years (?) there will be a Red Government in London." (*T.S.C.*)

"It is going to be a most disagreeable time for all." (Douglas Brown.) But so long as it is "most of all, of course, for the white Rhodesians", Mr. Brown does not seem too horribly perturbed.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E11.

Printed by J. Hayes & Co. (T.U.) Woolton, Liverpool 25.