

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 45 No. 14

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1965.

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The Great Betrayal

By C. H. DOUGLAS

WE CONTINUE THE SURVEY WHICH ORIGINALLY APPEARED IN THESE PAGES IN 1948. EVENTS SINCE THEN, AND PARTICULARLY THOSE CURRENT, ADD EMPHASIS TO DOUGLAS'S SYNTHESIS:

(II)

Mr. Winston Churchill is by ancestry half Hanoverian Whig and half American, and by political upbringing and association a Lloyd Georgian Liberal with powerful Jewish support. None of this would suggest a tendency to produce a starry eyed political idealist with a trusting temperament of a Babe in the Woods, and it is therefore doubly significant that Mr. Churchill (it is stated on good authority) has refused to accept his salary as leader of the Opposition in the present Administration. It suggests that the trend of events is not such as he had anticipated, or at any rate, he has no wish to be paid for even passive complicity in it.

With no desire or competence to find excuses for him, I find it difficult to believe that he has not been double-crossed. And the nature of the double-crossing is not far to seek. Mr. Roosevelt, it would seem, took his measure accurately, recognised his overwhelming passion to be a second Marlborough, and gave him a fairly free hand to win the war so long as not many Americans fought seriously, making, however, complete and effective arrangements to win the peace. Clearly, as Mr. Roosevelt's friends would assure him, no better plan could be imagined than that outlined by Mr. Jaques. How it was arranged that the "Labour" Party should be returned is difficult to know, but that it was arranged is nearly certain. Never in the chequered history of the secret ballot conjuring trick, has such bare-faced imposture been staged as in the election of 1945, with its hundreds of thousands of U.S. soldiers all canvassing against "the feudal system" ("why don't ya have a d'markrazi like Amurrica?") and its three months' interval between the ballot and the vote counting.

At this point, it is useful to obtain some idea of the nature of the Parliament which was "palmed," to use the appropriate conjuring term, on the British Isles under the name of a "Labour" Government. Of the 398 members accepting the Government Whips, 124 are Trade Union officials, 48 publishers, journalists and authors, 45 Municipal politicians, 41 barristers and solicitors, 41 business men, 34 schoolmasters, 12 Co-operative employees, 12 doctors and dentists, 10 university teachers, 10 farmers, five Army, Navy and Air Force officers, three civil servants, three Free Church ministers, one policeman, and five unclassified.

Whatever may be said of this collection, and a good many things may be said of it, it is not "Labour" in any reasonable or distinctive meaning of the word. Anyone with the slightest acquaintance with the subject would recognise its character. It is a Parliament of Fabian Socialists and P.E.P. nominees hand-

picked for Mond-Turnerism, united by a common preference for white collar jobs over "workers'" employment, and an equal determination to tell other people how to work rather than to work themselves. That is to say, it is almost identical with the New Deal background which had propagandised Franklin Delano Roosevelt and blanketed its failure by precipitating the Second World War. While many of its constituent members did not know it, it was an international, not a British, body, committed in advance to wreck its native country.

It is almost certain that the genesis of the Parliamentary victory of the so-called "Labour" Party can be found in the conditions imposed on Mr. Churchill in 1940 after Dunkirk as a condition of "Labour" support, and the situation at this time can be synthesised by observing that *every party outside Mr. Chamberlain's group was being advised by the same international body*, and that the present interests of that body are geographically centred in New York. In consequence the complete elimination of Great Britain as a Power is essential to the role so engagingly recalled by Mrs. Roosevelt, that "Britain" is the first line of defence of the United States. "That," added Mrs. Roosevelt recently, "is true today." That is a proud thought for the survivors of the British Empire.

Obviously, every piece of advice, now practically amounting to an order, which was tendered by Mr. Roosevelt's entourage has been good advice—as viewed from Wall Street and Washington. And, in the main, Mr. Churchill took that advice, which probably included a suggestion to hand over the post-war baby to the trained arms of Mr. Attlee and the London School of Economics. To provide Mr. Attlee with a loyal background on the American model, Lord Citrine (T.U.C.) is now Chairman of the British Electrical Authority at £8,500 *per annum*. Sir Frederick Burrows (ex-railway clerk) was made Governor of Bengal (!) at £9,000 *per annum*, Sir Ben Smith, a most admirable ex-able-seaman, is paid £3,500 *per annum* for running the West Midland Coal Mines, Mr. Jack Benstead, a Trades' Union official, £5,500 as a member of the Transport Commission, *etc., etc.* There are dozens of others. These are "out in the country." But, if my addition is correct there are between sixty and seventy Ministers or near-Ministers on the higher pay-roll, all of whom, together with the ordinary Members of Parliament, were immediately rewarded for their allegiance by a large rise in salary. Many of the Opposition Members feel also that it would be a pity to be too censorious of an Administration with such sound principles, more especially as their leaders appear curiously willing, or even anxious, to be more Socialist than the Socialists.

Briefly, then, the public at large may have lost the peace once again, Great Britain may now be "Britain"; but with the aid of significant sections of all political parties, we have achieved the proud position of the First Line of Defence of the U.S.A., are

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: EUSon 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 EUSon 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.

in the process of becoming a Work State on a standard of living arranged from Washington, America will be free to treat the world as her oyster while we fight for her mistakes, will take what she wants from us, and give us what she can't use herself, and it will, and has, become clear that as in Hitlerite Germany and Russia, only fools will work either manually or technically—all the knowing ones will be good Party politicians.

It has been the fashion in Bloomsbury, and in those places where the Fabians sing, to jeer at the British Empire (“pure Kipling, old boy, ha! ha!”) and in general the ways of the Victorians. While many valid criticisms can be made both of the organism and the period, most of them traceable to that financial system the Fabians are so careful not to attack, it would be a cardinal error not to assess the significance of this attitude. Passing over the fact that the Socialist is not naturally a traveller or an adventurer, except in the less desirable sense of the word (the very roots of Socialism are antipathetic to individual initiative) he is a worshipper of logic—of pure reason, which he mistakes for intelligence. The Fabian Society itself is the descendant of the Encyclopaedists who ushered in the Age of Reason. That this is not a British trait—in fact, the typical Englishman distrusts logic to a degree which denies it its legitimate use—is only one of many indications of the alien philosophy sapping our native vigour. The *premises* for arguments in favour of the Empire are in the main hidden, and the deductive method does not apply. But the *proofs* are clear, even if to the man in the street, the reasons are not, that the British Empire was a far more admirable growth than any mechanistic League or Union of Nations, precisely because it was not reasonable—it was organic.

(III)

There is really no room for doubt as to the nature and origin of the attack on the British Empire. It is fundamentally a cultural attack intended to eliminate or at least minimise the conception of human “quality” by substituting “equality”; and a recognition of this fact is the only key to a situation which is otherwise a mass of unrelated contradictions. It is an international attack, utilising national forces.

Attempts to define a culture are always unsatisfactory and inadequate, and the explanation of this can, I think, be found in

its nature, which is four dimensional—it has an extension in Time, or it is not a culture. The ruling culture of the British Empire, and the feature which distinguishes it from many other contemporaries is tradition, i.e., it is a true, not a spurious culture; and it is tradition more than any other factor, which the sponsors of dialectical materialism, Socialism, Marxism, and Communism attack. There is little doubt that behind all of these is a Power which is completely aware of the reality of extension in Time, and of the immense dangers to which humanity is exposed by “a break with tradition.” It is perhaps unnecessary to add that an extension in Time is only *one dimension*, but it is a *fundamental of quality*. (“My Word shall not pass away.”)

Perhaps as elementary an introduction to this subject, in the political sense, as any other, is afforded by Spain under General Franco.

Times being what they are, it may be necessary to insist that I have neither intention nor desire to apologise for General Franco, if he requires apology. What I do see quite clearly is that, with his associates, he defeated a primary attempt of Judaeo-Freemasonry, the Power which is using tradition to destroy tradition; that he stands as a protagonist, and a not unsuccessful protagonist, of the opposition to Judaeo-Masonic-Communism; that the culture of the British Empire and its traditional basis, was a primary obstacle to the Masonic World Plan; and that, whether we like it or not, our natural ally in the present struggle is “Franco-Spain.” And perhaps one of the greatest services rendered by the Canadian Royal Commission on Espionage was to uncover the existence of *e.g.*, *Englishmen*, “who placed loyalty to a (un-named) world Power above that which they owed to their own country”—a situation with which General Franco had to, and did, deal.

On April 17, 1948, the Washington (U.S.A.) *Times-Herald* published in a leader, portions of a correspondence which apparently passed between Sir Samuel Hoare, now Lord Templewood, then British Ambassador to Spain, and General Franco. So far as I am aware, this correspondence has not been published here. It may be noticed in passing that Lord Templewood belongs to a Quaker-Whig banking family, and that he was in Moscow at the time of the fall of the Czar.

On February 21, 1943, General Franco wrote to Sir Samuel Hoare:

“Our alarm at Russian advances is common not only to neutral nations, but also to all those people in Europe who have not yet lost their sensibilities and their realisation of the peril.

“Communism is an enormous menace to the whole world and now it is sustained by the victorious armies of a great country, all those not blind must wake up.

“If the war's course continues unaltered it is evident that the Russian army will penetrate deeply into German territory. If this comes to pass, would it not be of the greatest danger for the Continent and for England, a sovietised Germany which would furnish Russia her secrets and war constructions, her engineers and specialists, giving that country the opportunity of building a huge empire extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific coasts?

“We think the situation extremely serious and we appeal to the British people's good sense to consider the matter; for if Russia occupies Germany nothing and nobody will stop her.

“If Germany did not exist, we Europeans would have to invent it, and it is ridiculous to think she could be replaced by a confederation of Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs and Rumanians, who would rapidly convert to a confederation of Soviet states.”

The test of science is prophecy.

Now listen to the sapience of the Quaker-Banker-Whig. He wrote:

"You say the greatest European danger is communism and that a Russian victory would mean the triumph of communism in European countries that would bring the destruction of European civilisation and of Christian culture.

"Our point of view is, on the contrary, entirely different . . .

"The feasible situation at the end of the war will be thus: French, English and American armies will occupy the European continent. These armies will be supplied with the best war weapons and would include fresh, first order troops, not wasted and tired as those of Russia's armies.

"I dare to bear prophecy that, at the moment, THE GREATEST MILITARY POWER IN EUROPE WILL WITHOUT DOUBT BE THAT OF GREAT BRITAIN . . . Consequently, British influence will be the greatest ever seen in Europe since the time of Napoleon's downfall.

"This influence will be supported by an enormous military power . . . with it we shall maintain full influence in all Europe and will help her reconstruction.

"So I accept no fear of afterwar Russian danger for Europe. Nor can I accept the idea that Russia will, at the end of the war, follow an anti-European policy of her own."

(IV)

Perhaps it is desirable, at this stage, to bring again into prominence the practical importance of recognising the world's ills as the result of a long-term policy. A skilful propaganda to the contrary has been linked with anti-Christianity. Reference to the subject has been made before, but, *e.g.*, the course of events in Alberta demonstrates that it will bear constant recall.

The first point on which to be clear is that if we are *not* faced with a long-term policy, our position is quite hopeless. If every step in the industrial arts merely confronts us with more devastating wars, more restrictions and controls, and, except in the United States, a lower standard of life, mankind is so hopelessly perverse that his only tolerable future lies in early annihilation, more especially in view of our decreasing (average) intelligence. But if we are facing a Satanic policy, our position, although very serious, is not necessarily irremediable. But we must first face the facts. No policy, no cure. Clear policy, clear problem. A problem clearly stated is half solved. The second aspect of this situation is equally indisputable. Policies *in vacuo* are a contradiction in terms. Policies embody strategies; you do not fight a strategy, you fight the human beings who are carrying out that strategy. "It's the system we're fighting not men" is one of those half-truths which are of the greatest assistance to the Enemy Generals.

Akin to this is the "anti-anti" or "anti-negative" propaganda. Without attaching too much importance to the fact that a double negative is a positive (*i.e.*, an anti-anti Jew or Russian is, by definition, a pro-Jew or Russian, not a neutral) it is fairly obvious that the main use of this technique is to stampede the innocent into disclosing their position, thus being put on the defensive. The best defence is attack. Do you propose to allow your enemy a monopoly of it?

This raises the question of (a) The inimicable objective; (b) The Enemy troops.

For clarity and brevity it would be difficult to improve on St. Matthew 8-9: "And the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down, and worship me." That is an

offer of World Dominion, on condition of the acceptance of collectivism—the worship of the group idea.

In these days we are fortunate in one thing, if in no more. We can accurately see and read in our daily paper that the devil's offer has been accepted, and two attempts, the League of Nations, and U.N.O. have been set up. By their fruits, ye shall know them.

Now as to the troops. As Mr. Jaques so clearly brought out in his speech, much, and probably the most important part of the organisation of the World State is financial and industrial—the control of credit and raw materials.

While it is difficult to deny the existence of such organisations as the international chemical trust, the World Bank and international monetary fund and similar world cartels, because they are visible to the eye and mentioned in the newspapers, their relation to the world state is not so visible and not so easily exposed. But if we grasp the fact that the essence of Communism, which is the politics of the World State, is centralised vesting of the planet in an organisation expropriating and cutting across all local and personal sovereignty, we cannot be much in error if we identify internationalists, open or concealed, with treason to the individual and his race and country. In an earlier part of the speech by Mr. Jaques to which reference has been made, he remarked, "The hon. Member for Macleod said, if I remember correctly, that there are just two kinds of people in the Civil Liberties Association (a Canadian "Red Front"), traitors and stooges, the dupes." *Caeteris paribus*, it appears to me to be true that any organisation which is working to transfer sovereignty from those who are associated under a national constitution, to those who have secretly concocted an international constitution by the misuse of national resources, whether those persons are working inside or outside the country, are enemies of, and traitors to, believers in the national conception. Their motives may be diverse and obscure; but when you see an enemy soldier, obviously working for your destruction, you do not investigate his motives, you shoot.

There are myriads of organisations which are working to destroy nationality (*not* Stateship) ranging from the highly "respectable" Royal Institute of International Affairs openly financed by cartels (Chatham House, whose secretary, Dr. Toynbee, said "we are working secretly, but with all our might, to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations") to the hundreds of Communist shop-stewards in industry working like muskrats to cripple and disrupt local control. And, it should be remembered—there is a lucrative career in it.

The "Canadian" Broadcasting Corporation is notoriously "Red", and the genealogy of its parent organisation, the "B".B.C., as well as its peculiar form of extra-national management and its link with the patent monopoly of the Marconi network, can best be viewed as the functionalised monopoly of information. The London School of Economics has linked internationalists (frequently, but not always, Jews) in key positions in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

So far as the population of these islands is concerned, the triumphs of the traitors have produced swift and spectacular results. Mr. Attlee's Administration claims that there are more persons gainfully employed (*i.e.*, being paid paper money) than ever before. Not only that, but they are (so it is said) more efficiently directed, using more power and better machines and methods than would have been deemed possible in the time.

To which I should myself comment that not ten *per cent* of the population is really better off, by which I mean has more control over its material and spiritual destiny, than it had fifty years ago, and this includes the New Kommissary, and ninety

per cent are not merely worse off, but their prospects are infinitely worse. That is where they have been brought by "traitors and stooges," in an era of unparalleled advancement in the industrial arts, directly and solely due to individual initiative.

If that were all, it would be serious enough. But the basic wealth of a nation is in its intangibles. It is faith which moves mountains, and the decline of faith is perhaps the most noticeable change in the general population. No-one believes in anything or anyone, any more. Let us eat, drink and be merry in the Black Market, for tomorrow one more big racket will be put over on us. So far from the consumer being always right; he no longer has any rights, he merely has a few coupons. He doesn't give his orders to the shopkeeper, he gets what the "Co-operative" decides to let him have, of any quality or none, and if he doesn't like it, he mustn't throw it away—it's an "offence."

And if any explanation is required or given; it's the export drive. He is told to save, and his savings are taken off him by Government-stimulated rising prices, taxation, and down-right confiscation. He "buys" a house, and pays ten times what his grandfather did for the same house, and finds he hasn't bought it; it can be, and is, "requisitioned" at the instance of any obscure alien in a selected bureau. Until it is, and sometimes after, he pays in rates and taxes more than the original rent, for the privilege of "owning" it. If he murmurs, one of his conquerors tells him that "we" don't intend an Englishman's home to be his castle. In fact, "we" will see that it isn't. Why not emigrate? "We've plenty to replace you, and we are replacing you—you've served your turn."

(To be continued)

Majority Rule

"Ortega y Gasset sums up the situation in his well-known book *The Revolt of the Masses* with a harsh candour we shall do well to ponder. He quotes:

"The characteristic of the hour is that the common-place mind, knowing itself to be commonplace, has the assurance to proclaim the rights of the commonplace and to impose them wherever it will . . . The mass crushes beneath it everything that is different, everything that is excellent, qualified and select. Anybody who is not like everybody, who does not think like everybody, runs the risk of being eliminated. And it is clear, of course, that this 'everybody' is not 'everybody.' 'Everybody' was normally the complex unity of the mass and the divergent specialised minorities. Nowadays, 'everybody' is the mass alone. Here we have the formidable fact of our times, described without any concealment of the brutality of its features."—F. M. R. Walshe.

If anyone has an explanation of majority rule which will meet this criticism, we should like to hear of it.

MANACLES FOR MANKIND

by Mark Ewell

8/2

"Manacles for Mankind" argues that the thrusting minorities which wrestle to control the world, far from obeying objective motives, are swayed by the Communists' maxim: "Remember, all lands are governed by the few who only pretend to consult with the many."

This book makes a formidable indictment of U.N.O.'s championship of Human Rights. Well-informed defenders of the Christian West will welcome it as a timely and reliable contribution to the subject. The general reader who vaguely distrusts U.N.O. but does not know why will find this exposure an eye-opener of far-reaching significance.

FINANCE AND COMMUNISM

A leaflet outlining the task facing Social Crediters. It appeared as the supplement to "The Social Crediter" on August 28, 1965, and is available from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 5 New Wanstead, London, E.11 at the following prices:—

1 copy 6d.

20 copies 5/-

50 copies 10/-

It may have been noticed how more and more the actions of President de Gaulle are conforming to Communist objectives. The largely unknown history of events in Algeria and France are described and documented in *The Tragedy of France (8/3)*, reprinted from the magazine *American Opinion*.

The reality behind the racial riots in the U.S.A., is told by an ex-Communist negro, Manning Johnson, in *Color, Communism and Common Sense (8/3)*. Shortly after publication of this book, the author was killed in an 'accident'.

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

A brochure dealing with the conspiracy behind the Vietnam "peace" moves, and behind Indonesia's threat to Australia, and containing a comprehensive list of books on the Conspiracy.

Free—on request

IT'S VERY SIMPLE, THE TRUE STORY OF CIVIL RIGHTS

By ALAN STANG

By closely examining a number of the more active Civil Rights groups, their tactics and their leadership, Alan Stang's book makes it quite clear and very simple that they are following closely the programme drawn up by the Communists as far back as 1928 to promote a revolution in the United States.

8/3

THE GRAVEDIGGERS

By PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY and CHESTER WARD

The story "managed news" suppressed—who is really disking nuclear war?

6/2

NO CO-EXISTENCE

A highly synoptic account of the essential history of this increasingly troubled century.

1/3

From

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 5 New Wanstead, London E.11

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd. at 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.

Printed by E. Fish & Co. Ltd., Liverpool.