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

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

†The Social Crediter 5 Feb., 1972, p.1
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 en-trenched 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—that 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...
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 re-inforcing 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 hypotheses as Marx etc./Mao etc., 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 blame 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 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 than to make Catholics realize the implications of supporting the I.R.A.

The other essentials are that Stormont be weighed in the balance and get on with the job of Attorney-General of the Union.

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 GHETTOES 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?