

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 61 No. 2

MARCH – APRIL, 1982

Registered by Australia Post
Publication No. NBH0274

Programme for the Third World War

By C.H. DOUGLAS

THIS TREATISE, HERE CONTINUED, WHICH FIRST APPEARED SERIALLY IN THESE PAGES BETWEEN APRIL AND AUGUST, 1943, AND LATER IN BOOKLET FORM WILL NOT BE FAMILIAR TO MANY OF OUR PRESENT READERS. FOR OTHERS A RE-READING SHOULD PROVE ENLIGHTENING.

V

One of the ideas essential to any understanding of genuine political activity can perhaps be most easily expressed in the language of gambling. To the roulette player, *Rouge et Noir* is a game of chance. To the keeper of the Bank, it is a certainty.

To the Stock Exchange gambler, gain or loss on a stock movement depends on whether he is a bull or a bear. To the Stock-Broker, all that matters is that enough people shall buy and sell stocks. In this case, his percentage is a certainty. To the racegoer who backs the favourite, the victory of an outsider means loss; to the bookmaker it merely means a larger gain than if the favourite won.

I do not think that the importance of understanding this principle can be over-rated, because the manipulation and perversion of the gambling spirit is of the very essence of International policy. The fundamental idea is always to play a long-term certainty against a short-term possibility so that a win for the genuine gambler is at best or worst only a postponement of the inevitable final loss. It is called insurance.

I can imagine that someone who has not devoted much attention to the subject may observe that anyone who gambles deserves to lose. That is the Whig idea, propagated to justify the fact that Whigs only invest in a certainty. But, in fact, gambling is a special form of the adventurous spirit from which all progress is born, whereas insurance is a financial fallacy; and no greater disaster can overtake a community than to lose the spirit of adventure. That is why a mass of Law which smothers initiative and substitutes a Beveridge insurance plan for the dividends of an advancing adventure is a creeping death.

Now, World War, Parts I and II, like all previous wars, is a gamble between A and B for the certain advantage of C. It is essential that the Programme of Part III shall be the combination of A and B, for the elimination of C. Since the position of C rests on an abstract fallacy his effective elimination is in sight.

The derivation of Bolshevism, as we have seen, covers a fairly lengthy period. Fascism, by which name it appears to be fashionable to designate anything which isn't labelled Bolshevism, is as a title contemporaneous with the rise of Mussolini. It is quite easy to show, however, not merely that its origin is identical with Bolshevism, but that it is merely Bolshevism wintering in the Mediterranean. Its aims are similar, and its technique, like that of "German" National Socialism, or P.E.P., is localised centralisation in

order to transfer power to International Centralisation—as you might say, "C." It is the second episode, in point of time, in the advent of gangster Government.

Now, it is important to observe that, subject only to modifications to suit the climate, the advent of the New Order in Italy followed almost exactly the same essential process as that which established Lenin and Trotsky. Italy has always been riddled with secret societies. She sustained heavy defeats in the 1914-1918 phase of the war, and these defeats were followed by social and industrial disorganisation, which culminated in the seizure by the "workers" of Italy's most famous engineering organisation—the Fiat Works at Turin. The seizure was complete, but the "workers" found to their astonishment that you can't eat motor-car parts, and that the banks require certain formalities to be observed in regard to the signature of cheques.

The Italian is no fool, and the whole of this "Communist" seizure of the Fiat factories has a curious air, more particularly since within a short period of time after the meek restoration of the works to the management, it became known that "American" interests had taken over Fiat.

But it was clearly a highly effective excuse for drastic action, and the financial controllers of Italy, Counts Volpi and Pirelli, produced a Saviour who had a long reputation as a Socialist. The March of the Black Shirts on Rome, led from behind by Mussolini in a "train de luxe" (a march which could have been stopped by a battalion of regular soldiers), announced the Dawn of the New Day, and, as in Russia, wages dropped to subsistence level and strikes became a thing of the past. Both Bolshevism and Fascism had a short way with strikers.

VI

To those who wish for considerable elaboration on the point, there is available a mass of documentary and other evidence to establish three common factors in the essential nature of the Russian Revolution, the Fascist Coup d'Etat, and the National Socialism of Hitler's Germany. These factors are (1) They all claimed to be Socialism, and, in fact, are Socialism, in the only sense in which Socialism appears to have any definition—the subordination of the individual to the omnipotent State and those behind the State; (2) They were all financed from the richest and most powerful financial groups in the world, all three having

verifiable connections with Wall Street and Pine Street, New York; (3) They all suppressed "the right to strike" with ruthless physical force.

Doubtless to a less degree, these three characteristics are identifiable in the United States, under the name of the New Deal, and in the peculiar rush of post-war control measures known as "Planning," in once-great Britain.

It is fairly obvious that we are faced, perhaps for the first time in history, with an attempt to superimpose on the entire world, from some pervasive and undisclosed centre, "overwhelming power behind Law." There are local variations; but the Big Idea can be identified without difficulty.

It is a situation which I think can be called formidable. To obtain a detached view of it, requires some reconsideration of the way things happen. It cannot be in the limits available a comprehensive survey; but it is essential that it should be realistic. Let us begin with slavery.

The word itself, which is probably German, meaning a Slavonic captive, is one of a group of magical words, the use of which can usually be guaranteed to create an illusory emotional picture in place of a reasoned idea. To most people in these islands, it is a curious mixture of brutal overseers flogging aged saints, and women and children on ice floes being chased by bloodhounds. Yet at the same time, its chronology in most people's minds is more or less in the far distant past.

The facts, of course, are that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is about as true a general picture of negro chattel slavery as that which is being presented to the American public at the present day of British rule in India. Negro slaves (to put the matter on the lowest grounds) were property, and continuous ill-treatment was bad business. I doubt very much whether ill-treatment of slaves in the Southern States ever compared with the vicious cruelty of English industrial conditions in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, or was even very much worse than the treatment of negroes in parts of the Southern States in recent years. That is not the point.

The second point which is curiously overlooked is that, if we regard the American war of Abolition as the end of official slavery in "white" countries, there are plenty of individuals still living who were born slaves. The point I wish to make is that the economic structure of the world from pre-historic times to within living memory was founded upon a slave class and some form of slavery was regarded as, and probably was, inevitable. And during this very long period, there is little evidence of unrest, and no evidence that such conditions as, for instance, the nail-makers of Cradley Heath, or the child labour which made the fortune of Engels, the patron of Karl Marx, endured, would have been, or was, tolerated by public opinion. Yet, not slavery, but conditions under which slavery operated, have undoubtedly been distorted and exaggerated.

When a false picture of something is circulated on a large scale, experience teaches us to look contemplatively at the remedy, and in this connection we can, I think, derive useful information from the well-known letter written by an "American" banker towards the close of the American Civil War:—

"Chattel slavery will be abolished by the war, and this we and our European friends are in favour of. For slavery is but the owning of labour, and involves the care of the slave. We can obtain the same result with less trouble by controlling the money."

We notice at once that the effect of the substitution of

what labour agitators call wage-slavery, for chattel slavery was firstly to increase the demand for money, and so enhance the power of the banker and money-lender, and secondly to make economic insecurity of the "worker" an essential feature of the new system.

When, however, power-production made obvious the threat of economic plenty for all, it also made obvious the political impossibility of maintaining for much longer the sanction of economic security. It is perhaps not too much to say that the abolition of slavery became practicable with the invention of the steam engine.

Perhaps it now becomes clearer why "the right to strike," *i.e.*, the right to contract-out, is eliminated from the New Orders. It is, precisely, the dividing line between slavery and Freedom, and was first denied by the Trades Unions. We are, in fact, reverting to chattel slavery because of the breakdown of wage-slavery, and it is recognised that the slaves must be well fed and looked after, because they are property. And it will be remembered that no slave could own property, because it would enable him to contract-out, so, for the slaves, property must be abolished, *i.e.*, "nationalised."

I am confident that we should be much helped in our consideration of the events of the past fifty years, if not before, if we had access to the records of the "*Alliance Universelle pour l'Action Maçonnique*" whose permanent headquarters are in Algiers—where General Eisenheuer's headquarters are, you know. Or even to the Minutes of the Meeting in 1920. Perhaps Admiral Leahy, until recently U.S. Ambassador to Vichy, who, if I am not mistaken, was present, could assist.

Meanwhile, it appears desirable to consider the truth, if any, in the statement that men are born free and equal, and in the light of our conclusions, why Columbus discovered America. There must be some excuse for him.

VII

The claim that "all men are born free and equal," if anyone makes it, clearly rests, even to be arguable, on the proposition that each new birth is a new individual, *ab initio*. This idea meets with little support nowadays. Without calling in the various doctrines of reincarnation anyone who will spend a little time observing half a dozen babies of about twelve months old must admit wide differences, not to be accounted for by either health or environment. The human infant almost certainly begins a new day with certain individualities, however acquired, and "equality in individuality" is one of those combinations of words which have to be translated into usable form to be believed.

As to all men being born "free," it is, in these days, difficult to grasp what the claim meant. Obviously every infant is under compulsion to breathe and to be fed. That it comes passively under the human laws which claim to protect it from murder, cruelty, and neglect, is just as much a negation of the statement that it is born free, as if these laws imposed a handicap upon it.

While the phrase "equality of opportunity" is being substituted for the cruder idea and freedom has moved out into mid-Atlantic, the claim is in essence still much the same. It is that, by passing Education Acts, sterilising the unfit, punitive taxation, Planning the Land, and killing initiative along the well-tried lines developed in the Post Office, we are ushering in the age of the Common Man, whom God must have loved because he made so many of him.

(At this point, the organ will please play *Land of Hope and Glory*.) In the meantime, however, we are unfortunately unable to find a cure for the common cold.

There is, of course, a radical difference between the repudiation of the idea that all men (and women) are equal or are born equal, which seems to me to be demonstrably untrue, and the *non sequitur* that the differences in economic and social status in individuals which exist at the present time are correct reflections of individual differences. They certainly are not. There are "reincarnation" theories which appear to claim that they are—that every individual has created the circumstances in which he now lives by his actions in the past. Apart from many other objections to this idea in the realm of philosophy, it appears to be logically indistinguishable from determinism.

But what is true and important, I think, is that the ideas being so widely propagated by Marxists and others, that the characteristics of a race, not to say an individual can be revolutionised in a lifetime, are not merely nonsense—they are deadly, dangerous, nonsense.

I do not believe that the individual character is much changed in one lifetime. People become a little wiser, or a little more foolish, a little kinder, or a little harder, a little more reliable or a little less honest. They may and do take veneers, but the real wood changes slowly. I do not believe there is any ascertainable difference in the Russian of to-day, and the Russian of the Czarist period, other than the disappearance of a travelled and at any rate superficially cultured class who were certainly more decorative.

As the logical, as well as factual consequence of this, the comfortable idea that the human race has made great progress in the past five hundred years is largely dispelled. Dr. Tudor Jones expressed this opinion (I think on anatomical and biological grounds) several years ago. My own opinion is based on a closer study of fourteenth century documents than has been feasible to me until recent years.

This fact, if, as I believe, it is a fact, goes right to the root of social science. It is an immediate and devastating answer to the idea that you can conceive, or "Plan" a social system, and then fit people into it. You simply haven't got the people, and can't get them before your gim-crack system breaks down. Still further, you get increasing maladjustment of the "progressed" individuals who do exist, and you open the way to exactly the kind of leadership from which the world is now suffering—and not only in Germany.

It is really astonishing how irrational and mutually exclusive are some of the current ideas of a new society. For instance, "competition" is held up as wasteful and anti-social. Yet if "equality of opportunity" means anything at all, it means that anyone is free to compete for anything, on a scale far beyond such competition as now exists. It may be noticed in passing that "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" is a phrase admittedly of Masonic origin. Yet the very essence of Masonic organisation is inequality, "degrees," "craftsmen," "Masters," and "Grand Masters," and the extraordinary technique of secrecy and remote control.

Fifty year ago, the number of General Managers of British Railways ran into hundreds. Admittedly some of these were very minor posts, but the simple fact is that hundreds of railwaymen had a chance to obtain a type of experience they coveted. I doubt if, in the old sense of the word, there is one General Manager of a British Railway nowadays. There are, for the moment, four obedient employees of the Bank of "England" who may, for all I know, use that title. I hope they like their job. I don't

like their railways. The ordinary railwayman has about as much chance of becoming G.M. as of becoming Lama of Tibet.

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is the same conclusion at which one arrives, so far as I can see, by every route. The problem to be solved is not to provide a world for heroes, which by experience not merely requires a hero to live in it, but ensures that he shan't live in it long. It is to prevent the heroes from turning the world into a monopoly for heroes, so that old ladies can do a nice bit of knitting without being blown through the window by a hero practising.

Which brings us to Columbus.

The Power of the Conspiracy

Political Intelligence Weekly (London), Feb. 18, 1966, finds it incredible "that any individual with such a Communist-front background [as Arthur Goldberg] could successively become a Justice of the US Supreme Court and an American Ambassador to the UN, especially when the US Government is taking on Communism in Vietnam".

We do not find it incredible. It is in fact a brazen display of the power of the Conspiracy. The picture of the world now is one of the steady emergence into openly exercised power of a World Government which, for decades past, has secretly pulled the strings attached to nations from concealed positions of power—mainly financial power. The international control of credit and exchange has meant the control of national governments, which have thus been constrained to follow economic and trade policies which have led to wars and centralisation of power in institutions at the cost of the liberty of individuals.

— B.W. Monahan in "Week to Week" notes, *T.S.C.*, March 12, 1969.

• • •

Since then the power of the Conspiracy has become more brazen.

Wanted

Should someone be able to help Mr. A.J.M. Musgrave-Rikkers, Flat 31, Pickering Court, 25 Kapoola Avenue, Felixstow, S.A. 5070, who would like to obtain a copy of *The Fig Tree* (original series), No.4 March, 1937, will they please contact him.

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.

Annual subscription: \$6.00

Offices: (Editorial and Business) Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

English Edition published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel — Chairman: H.A. Scouler, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099. Deputy Chairman, British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX.

1980s Project

In "A Social Credit Perspective", published in *The Social Crediter*, Nov. - Dec. 1978, B.W. Monahan referred to the "1980s Project" of the Council on Foreign Relations. In this connection the following review from *American Opinion*, Jan. 1982, is of interest.

Soviet-American Relations In The 1980s: Superpower Politics And East-West Trade

by Lawrence T. Caldwell and William Diebold Jr., Introduction by John C. Campbell, 1980s Project/Council on Foreign Relations. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York *et ubique*; 314 pages (paperback), \$7.95.

Nuclear Weapons And World Politics: Alternatives For the Future

by David C. Gompert, Michael Mandelbaum, Richard L. Garwin, John H. Barton, Appendix by Franklin C. Miller, 1980s Project/Council on Foreign Relations. McGraw-Hill Book Company, *vide supra*; 370 pages (paperback), \$6.95.

NOTHING could be more presumptuous than what I am now going to do, which is to review in one or two pages two books totalling 684 pages of heavy reading on subjects of earth-shaking importance, by eight prestigious scholars representing the most influential politico-intellectual cartel in the world today. These books are not in themselves important, but they are of immense importance as typical examples of prevailing doctrine in the highest circles devoted to — devoted to *what*?

You know what they call it? They call it "environmental management." You think as I did at first that environmental management means having a catalytic converter on your car; protecting the glaciers in Alaska, and slandering James Watt as Secretary of the Interior — silly business like that. That's kid stuff, and you and I are the ones being kidded. Hear now the words of Lawrence T. Caldwell, Ph.D., a poly sci prof at Occidental and a N.A.T.O. Research Fellow among other distinctions equally grave. After observing that the Soviet Union and the United States are both "global superpowers," Caldwell avers that the U.S. "can choose between strategies of fighting brushfires or of environmental management." *Fighting brushfires* means "rushing to each scene where Moscow asserts its interest and . . . trying to

counter each advance of Soviet power." To act thus, Caldwell says, would be to "abdicate initiative in world affairs to the Soviet Union." Alternatively, he continues happily, "the United States can join with the Soviet Union to manage the environment created by their shared and conflicting interests." The environment to be managed is not that of nature, certainly not that of any delimited portion of the globe. It is the whole of the globe, and not merely its physical substance, either, but all of the "interests," either "shared" or "conflicting," of the "global superpowers." I don't know how you could describe much more explicitly a new world order in the form of a *Soviet-American condominium*. Soviet-American relations in the 1980s have as their purpose to effect a merger. And how is that to be done? The answer is in the book's subtitle: "Superpower Politics And East-West Trade." You can read this whole book if you like, but I have just told you what it says.

The other volume in this 1980s Project/Council on Foreign Relations series deals with the most dramatic result so far of East-West trade, which is the balance of nuclear terror. Nuclear weapons, like automobiles, would not be found in the East today if they had not been developed in the West yesterday. (Well, actually, they haven't been *found* in the East yet, but they are presumed to be there.) Attribution of unlimited nuclear capability to each of the global superpowers is the source of universal terror; political limitation of the nuclear capability of both superpowers is seen as the first prerequisite of survival. Such limitation requires either a third force superior to both superpowers, or else a merger of the two. The second alternative seems simpler.

The whole situation appears to confirm the reasoning of the organized "Atomic Scientists" of the 1940s: *There is no secret. There is no defense. World government is required.* All arms control measures since then have been approaches to unified control of superpower nu-

clear capability, which control would necessarily involve an approximation of world government. "Environmental management" is a new way to put it, but the 1963 Test Ban Treaty, the 1972 A.B.M. and SALT I Agreements, the 1974 Vladivostok Accord, and the 1976 Threshold Test Ban were all and each steps toward world control *of and by* the global superpowers. Now comes the Reagan challenge of START, Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, proposing that the U.S. give up its plan to put Pershing II missiles in Europe, if the Soviets agree to dismantle SS-20s and other nuclear missiles aimed at West European targets. Despite real or pretended skepticism from Moscow regarding the deal, START sounds like a good thing.

With one exception. That is, we don't know how many SS-20s *etc.* the Soviets have, and in existing circumstances could not know whether they had dismantled any or not. Oh, it may be said, of course we know! We have counts based on aerial reconnaissance. That is not my understanding. (Of course, I'm no expert, and I don't know who is.) My understanding is that we have photos of (and can count) *missile-launchers*, which are hard to conceal. Missiles are easy to conceal, and we can't pretend to count them. Somebody tell me if I'm wrong about that.

Now here is what I think is the *sine qua non* of each and every international agreement to limit arms: VERIFICATION, verification of stockpiles, of weapons on hand, and of manufacturing facilities. To make an arms-control agreement without means of verification (which we have never had) is like a corporation effecting a merger with another corporation without previously having access to, or audit of, the latter's inventories, security portfolios, ledgers, *etc.* You need to know what you're merging with. The Soviets have never agreed to any independent audit.

If world government is required because there is no defense, as we are repeatedly told, then there must indeed be no secret. Open the door, Moscow! — MEDFORD EVANS