

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 67 No. 3

MAY — JUNE 1988

GETTING TO GRIPS

During the last few months, copies of *The Social Crediter* with supporting covering letters have been sent to several Government Departments and their Ministers, particularly those with the largest budgets. The purport of this action has been once again to challenge the practice of "borrowing" from the banks by our elected Government and to demand an end to dependence on this system of debt creation. A "stock" response has been revealed as coming from the Treasury. It goes as follows:

"The Government recognises the danger of a rapidly-growing National Debt and accordingly has reduced its borrowing. But while the Government has a responsibility to ensure that the growth of the money stock is at an appropriate rate, it cannot accept that there is no role for the private sector in the provision of finance, nor that it should not charge. Money can be allocated within the economy more efficiently according to market forces by private sector institutions under the broad supervision of the Government and the Bank of England than by the Government itself. Within this allocative process, the rate of interest is the price mechanism which equates the supply of funds with the demand.

"A regime where Government expenditure is financed by credit which is neither repayable nor incurs interest, which amounts to printing money, would not solve the problems of inflation; indeed it seems well calculated to make it a great deal worse."

There are several points in this response which call for further comment.

Having long argued in these columns for an end to Government borrowing, we can but welcome the fact that the Chancellor has at least achieved that limited objective. He has even been able to repay a miniscule £3 billion of the National Debt. Moreover his Medium Term Financial Strategy envisages a further debt repayment of £3 billion in 1988-89 and the PSBR remaining at zero for the following three years. So far, so good. The runaway train of Government borrowing has at least been braked to a halt, giving an opportunity for those in power to be persuaded that it can now be reversed. It is a sad commentary on recent governments that this should be the first opportunity since the early 1950s. In the meantime the soaring National Debt has demanded ever-increasing sums of taxpayers' money to meet the Debt Interest, about as much as is spent on Health, or Education, or on Defence. One has only to recall the clamant demands for more money for the Health Service and Education to visualise how such vast sums might be better deployed than on just paying interest.

Although in consequence of an expanding economy Public Sector Debt Interest has been declining as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product, that in no way reduces its impact on the taxpayer, nor of course on prices to the consumer to whom all such overheads are finally passed on. At £17 billion for 1988-89, it is the equivalent of the yield from 10p in the £ of Income Tax, or 70 per cent of the yield from VAT.

The admission that "the Government has a responsibility to ensure that the growth of the money stock is at an appropriate rate" sits very oddly with the facts of the matter. Until 1987 the Treasury announced "target ranges" for "narrow money" (indicated by M0) and "broad money" (indicated by the former £M3). Since then, and following changes in the definitions of monetary aggregates (see page 2), the Government has set no formal target for broad money growth, confining itself to a 2 to 6 per cent growth rate for M0. The growth rate in broad money (now indicated by M3) is currently reported to be about 20 per cent per annum. Where does all this new money come from? Only through the creation of credit by the private banking institutions, now augmented by the evolution of some building societies into banks. Coincidentally with this credit boom, private sector indebtedness reaches record heights — a further illustration of the validity of the A plus B Theorem enunciated by C. H. Douglas.

As to the curious comment that "it (the Government) cannot accept that there is no role for the private sector in the provision of finance, nor that it should not charge", this was never suggested in our representations and can only be regarded as sheer evasion of our central argument that Government funding should be financed by means of a Public Sector Credit Requirement, i.e. interest-free and debt-free, on the strength of the nation's credit worthiness as indicated by its general economic efficiency and measured by its Gross Domestic Product. We have never argued that "there is no place for the private sector in the provision of finance". There is the whole field of commerce and industry in which private financial institutions can play their part. But for the nation's money supply to be left in the hands of private banks as now is an abdication of responsibility for which both Government and taxpayers pay very dearly. "Permit me to issue and control a nation's money" said Meyer Rothschild (1790) "and I care not who makes its laws."

The allocation of money should realistically be determined by the available tangible resources. We hear much about the shortage of money for very many projects, notably the Health Service and Education, but little about the real resources available to meet the requirements or an explanation as to why they cannot be marshalled to the task. "No money available" is simply absurd when the fact is that money is created by the banking system "out of nothing".

Finally there is the claim that "printing money" would make inflation worse. This is astonishing when we have just witnessed the doubling of the National Debt since so-called monetarism became the vogue. The bogey of inflation is raised as though the banking system has been successful in this respect. One has but to compare the price levels of the past two or three decades to refute this and we repeat that if the present financial system is continued, inflation and collapse are inevitable. It must be said that the great expansion in bank credit over recent years, as now measured

(Continued on page 8)

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: One year £3; airmail £3.50; Australasia \$6.

Offices—Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 6TD. Tel: Sudbury 76374 (STD Code 0787).

—Editorial: 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 6LR.

—In Australia (Editorial, Subscriptions, Business and Books): Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: C. R. Preston, Meadow Cottages, Burndell Road, Yapton, Arundel, West Sussex, BN18 0HP, U.K. General Deputy Chairman: Dr Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX. Deputy Chairman, Australasia: H. A. Scoular, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

NEW WORLD ORDER

The article beginning on page 3 of this issue, compiled by Dr Basil Steele, is a recognition of what Social Crediters have long understood, namely that a conspiracy exists to create a collectivist all-powerful one-World State, ruled by a self-perpetuating elite, and that the essential tool for the pursuit of this objective is the present world financial system.

The New American (29th February, 1988) says of this danger facing all nations, "Fourteen years ago, a remarkably frank proposal appeared in the pages of *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the world-government-promoting Council on Foreign Relations. Authored by Columbia University professor and former State Department official Richard N. Gardner, the article was remarkable for its explicit willingness to do away with national sovereignty. In "The Hard Road to World Order", Professor Gardner lamented the failure of like-minded internationalists to achieve "instant world government" or "a greatly strengthened International Court", and listed 10 specific steps towards building the "house of world order". The first three of these involved the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). That was 1974, and the plan was clear. . . . Now it is 1988. . . . and on 19th January, the *New York Times* announced that President Reagan 'has opened the door to Soviet memberships in the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade'. Reporter Clyde H. Farnsworth was quick to note: 'The new position contrasts with the President's strongly stated opposition last year'. He added that this new White House attitude 'makes no explicit link between trade and human rights', as was the case in 1987.

"During the 1987 Reagan-Gorbachev summit meeting, Soviet officials went shopping around for loans, credits and economic help in any form. They obviously hit the jackpot. Not only will membership in the World Bank and the IMF open the credit spigots of these U.S.-taxpayer-supported institutions; the prestige of membership will also help Moscow tap private credit sources. And membership in GATT will help the Kremlin gain additional access to Western markets. Communist barbarism has been rewarded again.

"With Ronald Reagan's considerable help, Professor Gardner's 'Hard Road to World Order' has been made a great deal easier" (John F. McManus, *The New American*).

WASHINGTON STATE REFERENDUM 41

As we went to press for our January-February issue we reported the imminent challenge to the Federal Reserve Board mounted by State Senator Metcalf. Referendum 41 asked the population whether the State should challenge the constitutionality of the Federal Reserve Board before the U.S. Supreme Court. In the event 38 per cent of the voters said "Yes" while 62 per cent said "No".

In an article in *The National Educator* (Fullerton, California, December 1987) Senator Metcalf attributes the defeat to lack of money to finance his campaign to educate the population as to the merits of the issue. By contrast the large banks who opposed the object of the referendum had unlimited funds for their counter activities in public relations.

In concluding his article, Senator Metcalf writes: The defeat of Referendum 41 is obviously a tragedy not only for Washington State citizens but for America. We had a chance to get this issue before the Supreme Court in time to save this nation from the coming economic catastrophe. The recent stock market collapse on Black Monday, 19th October, and subsequent indications of monetary instability in the nation, would have won the election for us had we had the resources to properly take advantage of it. As it is the future is not optimistic.

If another state can step forward and proceed with a lawsuit we may still get it into court in time. If not the vote in Washington State destined this nation to endure continuing and increasing monetary instability, resulting long before the end of the century in a monumental monetary collapse in the United States and probably the Western world.

MONETARY AGGREGATES

The following is extracted from *Economic Progress Report*, No. 191, August 1987.* A number of changes were made earlier this year to published statistics for various measures of broad money. A new aggregate M4 was introduced and other aggregates were renamed.

Over a number of years there has been a progressive blurring of the distinction between banks and building societies. The 1986 Building Societies Act, which came into effect earlier this year, marked a further step in the evolving status of the societies and opened up the possibility of their becoming banks. M4 was introduced in the light of these developments. It covers the same types of deposit as M3 but includes deposits with building societies as well as banks. £M3, mainly bank deposits, was renamed M3.

The definitions for M0 and M3, the aggregates most used for narrow and broad money respectively, are as follows:

- M0. Notes and coin in circulation with the public *plus* banks till money *plus* banks operational balances with the Bank of England.
- M3. M1 *plus* private sector sterling time bank deposits *plus* private sector holdings of sterling bank certificates of deposit. (Note: M3 was formerly £M3. M1 denotes notes and coin in circulation with the public *plus* private sector sterling sight bank deposits.)

* *Economic Progress Report* is normally published every other month and is free of charge. Copies are available from *Economic Progress Report* (Distribution), Central Office of Information, Hercules Road, London, SE1 7DU.

COUNCIL, CONSPIRACY AND CONSEQUENCE: Christianity or One World Religion?

A two-part review-article, "Vatican": an Overview, by the Editor, Father Paul Crane S.J., appeared in *Christian Order* (October-November 1986), part one entitled "Conspiratio" and Conspiracy, and part two, Secular and Secularisation. The review was stimulated by a reading of Malachi Martin's "brilliant and massive" novel "Vatican", published in the U.K. by Secker & Warburg, 1986, and by Pan Books (P/B), 1987. The following extracts are taken from the review-article by Father Crane, who writes: One of the very great merits of this fascinating book is its balance. Which does not mean for a moment that it is dull: a thing of compromise. . . . I found it enthralling; compulsive reading — all 657 pages of it.

Pages that ring true

And why? Because, I think, fiction though it is, it comes so very near the truth of events that may well have cradled the Second Vatican Council on its eve, during its course and well into its aftermath, up to and including the present. A fair number of interpretations can be placed on these events; a good many of them titillating in their own way, but, at the same time, too good or, perhaps I should say, too bad to be true. The authors overplay their hand out of a not particularly creditable desire to entrance. . . . In the course of not too long a time, they become generally and rightly discredited.

There is none of this in Malachi Martin's massive novel. . . . In essence it might be described as an essay in current ecclesiastical history, attractively trimmed and brilliantly contrived. As such, a catalyst coming very close to what may well prove to have been the truth, dimly perceived by many, sensed strongly by those of us who have reflected hard on the events that have overtaken the Church we love during the last quarter of a century.

The great point about Malachi Martin is that he works no theory to death, flogs no dead horse; maintains a delicate balance between likelihood and what can be classed with fair objectivity as somewhat extreme views. His pages ring the more true for all that. Take, for example, the question of conspiracy, masonic or communist or what some call the money power. There are some who will flog this theory to death. They are obsessed with it to the point of acute neurosis, rendered incapable thereby of rudimentary rational judgment. These have always existed in the Church and they will continue to exist. . . . It is worth pausing at this point for a moment's reflection.

Conspiracy and "Conspiratio"

At the outset it is important to note the difference between conspiracy in the narrow and simple sense indicated above, and the Latin word from which it is derived; viz. *conspiratio*. The two are not the same, though one necessarily implies the other, for what *conspiratio* signifies in its English translation is a "breathing together". . . . But, you can have a breathing together (a *conspiratio*) without a conspiracy; in the sense that like-minded men — in an Establishment say, or what we might call a peer group — will tend to move together in certain directions without conspiring — in the narrow sense of the word — to do so. At

the same time, this in no way prevents the few, who are engaged in a real conspiracy, from working on the prejudices of those who are "conspiring" but not conspiring, and manipulating these to suit the basic interests of the manipulators and so of the real conspiracy itself. . . . It has happened time and again in the history of the Church. I am very sure it is happening at the present time. The thought in no way startles me. What does startle me is the complacent ignorance of so many English Catholics, who tend to rule out any thought of a real conspiracy within the Church as no more than the deluded raving of what they think of as a "Latin imagination". Their world is still full of "decent chaps" particularly if it is an English world; and decent chaps do not conspire. Alternatively, I am startled by the tendency of a few to see everything in terms of real conspiracy; they make no distinction between conspiracy and *conspiratio*, between manipulators and manipulated.

An Example of Manipulation

Examples are plentiful in this kind of manipulation. Let me take one, not drawn from Malachi Martin's book, but relevant in this context. The case I have in mind is that of the German Bishops at the Second Vatican Council. They were, as Father Ralph Wiltgen, Author of *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber* and others have shown us, a dominating influence in what is known as the Alliance of Rhineland Bishops (West Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, Austria and Switzerland) who pitted themselves at the Council against the Higher Prelates of the Roman Curia and their episcopal supporters elsewhere. There can be no doubt but that this struggle took place. Neither can it be doubted that its net effect over the years was to weaken enormously the authority of the Church and, with it, that of the Papacy itself. The details of that weakening are there for all but the purblind to see. . . .

[Father Crane puts forward a "not unsound hypothesis" regarding the reasons for this] . . . I am not saying for a moment that this rankling within German and French episcopal minds provided the Rhineland group of Bishops with the central motivation that drew it into almost instant confrontation with the Prelates of the Roman Curia and their supporters. All I am saying is that it could well have been a motive; and that, if so, the Soviet K.G.B. with its overwhelming desire to break the power of the Catholic Church, seen as a major obstacle to its dream of world conquest, would have been a keen supporter and, in fact, done all it could to further disgruntlement of the French and German Bishops and channel it into effective anti-Papalism. Surmise this may be, but it provides an excellent example of (Soviet) conspiracy taking advantage of an existing *conspiratio* (the breathing together of the Rhineland Bishops against papal authority) in the interests of the Soviet aim, which is the destabilisation of the Catholic Church as an essential step in the destabilisation of Western Europe, which is the penultimate aim of Soviet Power; a step essential to that which is ultimate; namely, the conquest of the world. The work of the K.G.B. would have been done here, as always, at several removes, carefully over the years. This is a reasonable, not wild, speculation on my part. . . .

Conspiracy Works on Secularist Breathing Together

Malachi Martin is not one of those dominated by the conspiracy theory. Far from it. He is *aware* of conspiracy, as I would be aware of it myself. He is also aware of that breathing together I have called *conspiratio* and of the way true conspiracy works on it for its own ends, as I am sure has been the case over the years in the Church; but to reduce it all to no more than a Communist, Masonic or Money-Power plot is to my way of thinking, nonsense, and dangerous, too, for conspiracy cannot work without something to work on and that is provided, as a rule, *by conspiratio*; those who breathe together and those whose breathing can be manipulated by intelligent conspirators to suit their own design.

[In part two of the review article of Malachi Martin's "Vatican" headed "Secular and Secularisation", Father Paul Crane S.J. writes:] I made the point (in part one) that conspiracy, within the Church or outside it, is not, of itself alone, the *sole* cause of the troubles that beset the Church at the present time; it may not be the chief; it is best thought of, I would suggest, as a manipulative contributory, a force working not unintelligently on the neo-modernist Secularism at present besetting the Church, particularly in the persons of its clergy and Religious, high and low. . . .

I believe that the author of "Vatican" is of the same mind. In other words, you cannot take masonry by itself or communism by itself or what, for want of a better word, we call the money power by itself and say that, if it had not been for one of these, the Catholic Church would now be all right and at peace with itself; a force once again to be reckoned with by the World. I do not believe this. My own belief, like that of the author, as I see it in his pages, is that there is certainly conspiracy from within and without the Church; but that this is the case because and only because the Church, at the time of the Council and since, was and remains ripe for it; providing ground, that is, then and now, for conspiracy to work on.

[Father Crane sees Secularisation as *a distortion for the Secular*. The following short extracts from his review-article deal with Pope John XXIII, who called the Second Vatican Council:]

Pope John XXIII, for all his peasant astuteness, was basically, I would say, a simple man in the finest sense of the word. His inclination, in consequence, was to trust those about him. The tragedy was that he extended his trust when, in the Roman Curia and the higher echelons of the Church in the field, particularly that of Europe, neo-modernist Secularism was taking its toll. . . . I doubt whether he realised what was afoot covertly in the Church he loved so dearly. . . . In no way a Roman himself, he was going to "show them" that, though his time might be short, there would be no stop-gap about it. . . . He expected priests and Faithful in the Catholic Church to respond, when called to do so by himself, with the same trustful love that he extended to them. . . . The new "Pentecost" would not be shared because neither priest nor Faithful, still less Religious, were ready for it. Naturalist Secularism and neo-Modernism had already made their way into the Body of Christ. Already stricken with a wasting sickness. . . . Pope John knew when he was on his last legs that the responses he longed for would not come. He must have scented that this would be the case when the Bishops of the Rhine Alliance wrenched the Council out of the context he had planned for

it, in its early stages. It was, in a certain sense, off course as soon as it had begun. The Council Fathers — or, at least, a powerful caucus amongst them — were not with him, and the dissent spread as the Council went on its way and the *Periti* took over. Pope John knew that now there would be no New Pentecost. . . . It laid the old Pope low well before his cherished Council was done.

(Extracts from the review-article on Malachi Martin's "Vatican" in "Christian Order" . . . Oct./Nov. 1986 . . . 65 Belgrave Road, London, SW1V 2BG.)

"The Spirit of Vatican II" is appealed to by those who seek for far-reaching changes in many sectors of religious and secular spheres though they conflict with traditional beliefs and practice. Amongst traditionalist clerical critics are Archbishop Lefebvre and the Abbé de Nantes (described by Brocard Sewell as *Fidei Defensor*).

In 1979 a book "A Study of Syncretism" (The Background and Apparatus of the Emerging One World Church) by John Cotter was published by Canadian Intelligence Publications, Flesherton, Ontario and it is obtainable from Bloomfield Books, Sudbury, Suffolk. 116 pages with index. On the back of the title page appears the following:—

"Christian atmosphere, Christian tradition and morality . . . is diminishing and is in fact to a great extent displaced by a way of life and thought opposed to the Christian one." (Pope Pius XII on 6th September 1958 in one of his last messages before his death.)

The following, quoted from the book, may give an idea of its contents:

Does the United Nations have in its universalism a new world religion up its sleeve, ready to be inflicted upon an unsuspecting world, perhaps after an intensive period of brain-washing and propaganda in its favour and against Christianity? Referring to the creation of the U.N. WORLD POLICE FORCE, a U.N. official was quoted by *Time* magazine, 26th November 1956 — at the time of the Suez crisis — as follows: "The idea has been floating around for years," said a U.N. official. "Hammaraskjold reached up into the air and brought it down and there it was, sitting in the middle of the room, staring at us."

The Religion of the United Nations Organisation.

"The coming World-state . . . will be based upon a common World Religion, very much simplified and universalised and better understood." (British Socialist writer, H.G. Wells.)

The only religious symbol in the U.N. headquarters is an obscenely posed statue of Zeus, pagan Greek god. . . . The London weekly Catholic paper *The Universe* in its issue of 5th June 1953 stated: 'The United Nations Organisation, like the League of Nations, makes no formal acknowledgement of Almighty God and never collectively invokes the Divine Blessing.'

Cotter quotes from an article by Professor Julian Huxley, a former Director General of UNESCO . . . "UNESCO: Its Purpose and Philosophy" . . . "its outlook must, it seems, be based on some form of humanism . . . global in extent and evolutionary in background . . . Its task of promoting peace and security can never be wholly realised through the means assigned to it — education, science and culture. It must envisage some form of world political unity, whether through a single world government or otherwise, as the only certain means of avoiding war."

Sir Julian Huxley, an atheist, went on a Communist-sponsored tour of the Soviet Union in 1931. . . . A complementary approach to Huxley's suggests that, as the U.N. cannot base itself on any *one* religion, and, as no *single* religion can solve world problems, the only answer is a vast *synthesis* of *all* religions as the spiritual foundation of the U.N. This proposal, which has become increasingly popular in recent years, is now being voiced by prominent personalities in conferences, lectures, literature, universities, broadcasts, media, etc. and interfaith organisations throughout the world. [Cotter continues:]

Adherents of these views — and they enjoy immensely powerful support at the United Nations and at the top echelons of government in our Western world — summarise their ideas as follows: All religions are one in origin and based on a common principle — the spirit of brotherhood. . . . Since no one religion is capable of meeting the challenge of modern times, so all religions must be merged into a Universal Brotherhood.

This will eliminate the need for any separate religion . . . it is alleged that a synthesis of all world religions, or *religious* integration is the only way to meet the challenge of our time and to achieve 'world peace'. . . .

Definitions of Syncretism

The second (definition) is by Dr W. A. Visser 't Hooft (first General Secretary of the World Council of Churches) in his book 'No Other Name: The Choice between Syncretism and Christian Universalism' (The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1963). On page 11 he writes: 'The word syncretism should be reserved for another type of religious attitude . . . This is the view which holds that there is no unique revelation in history . . . and that it is necessary to harmonise as much as possible . . . so as to create one universal religion for mankind. . . .' [Cotter continues:]

Ecumenism is not the same as syncretism; the big difference being that ecumenism is supposed to be limited to Christians, whereas syncretism includes all religions whether Christian or non-Christian. The term *ecumenical* is defined as 'of the whole Christian world or church'.

The great British Anglican layman Bernard Smith . . . was the first to expose a cunning redefinition of the term *ecumenical* by the World Council of Churches — which also applies to many of the 'ecumaniacs' mentioned herein. Mr Smith wrote:

"The W.C.C. has redefined the word 'ecumenical'. Hitherto it has been popularly understood and used only in the context of church unity. Now the secular meaning of the original Greek has been restored: instead of 'all Christians' it now means 'all the inhabitants of the world'. This universalising of its meaning has one purpose: to enable the W.C.C. to escape the constraints of a specifically Christian identity. The W.C.C. no longer even pretends to be Christian."

(Quoted in *Approaches* magazine, Scotland, August 1974.)

Arnold J. Toynbee — Syncretist

The late Dr Paul Hutchinson said that Arnold Toynbee was perhaps the most influential Westerner advocating syncretism. This case is interesting because in 1939 in his 'A Study of History', Volume 6, Toynbee's position was this: Christ is the *only* Saviour; Christianity is the *only* true religion: any attempt to treat Christianity as equivalent to

the other higher religions, any attempt at syncretism, is a sign of an inner schism, a spiritual falling. Yet when Volume 7 was published in 1954, Toynbee had switched completely to the syncretist position.

In 'A Study of History', Volume 7 (page 428, n. 2), Toynbee proclaimed himself no longer a Christian. He held that all higher religions are 'variations on a single theme'. . . .

He (Toynbee) wrote, 'Either the various churches and religions will snarl each other out of existence until no more is left of any of them . . . or else a unified human race will find salvation in a religious unity.' (Abridgment, Vol. II, by David C. Somervell, O.U.P., 1957.)

It would be interesting to know what caused Toynbee to change his position from orthodox Christian in 1939 to a four-religion syncretist in 1954 and a seven-religion syncretist in 1956. Toynbee's columns appeared regularly in many newspapers in the Western World. They closely identified themselves with the Communist party line and tended to blame America and the white man for everything. [John Cotter: *A Study of Syncretism*]

Regular readers of *The Social Crediter* will not need to be reminded of the part played by the late Dr Arnold Toynbee of the Royal Institute of International Affairs ("Chatham House") in the attack on National Sovereignty; they will have realised the significance for the future of this country of the passing by the present Administration of the Single European Act.

"Assisi Re-assessed"

In an article in "The Remnant" issue of 28th February 1987 reprinted as a supplement to *Apropos* No. 1 (Editor A. S. Fraser, Portree, Isle of Skye, September 1987) John Cotter refers to the 19th June 1955 U.N. Festival of All Faiths in celebration of the 10th anniversary of the United Nations at the San Francisco Cow Palace: This service was an amalgam of all religions and all denominations of Christians (except two) were represented. The two exceptions were the Lutherans and the Roman Catholics. Yet on 27th October 1986, exactly the same sort of meeting was held in Assisi, Italy, and it was summoned by the Pope himself. Moreover, the Pope went one better — he arranged for African animists, who worship the Great Thumb, to attend! What happened in the Roman Catholic Church in these 31 years? Is it changing? Or is it being changed? If so, *who* is it *being changed by*? . . . John Cotter concludes:

"Will the Roman Catholic Church now join the W.C.C.? Bear in mind that the W.C.C. (represented at Assisi) is heading towards syncretism at great speed."

The late Hamish Fraser commences his study "The Increasingly Imminent Menace of Communism" presented at the Convention of All India Laity Congress in 1986 (and published as a supplement to *Approaches* No. 95) by quoting from the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI *Divini Redemptoris* (1937):

"Venerable Brethren, see that the faithful be put on their guard . . . Communism is intrinsically evil, and therefore no one who desires to save Christian civilisation from extinction should render it assistance in any enterprise whatever. . . ."

Hamish Fraser comments:— This definition is authoritative . . . because it has been corroborated so terrifyingly in

the half-century since *Divini Redemptoris* was published. . .

When *Divini Redemptoris* was published, Soviet Russia's war crimes — including the massacre of Polish officers in Katyn Forest, not to speak of the later massacre of prisoners of war criminally returned to Stalin's mercy with the complicity of the Allies — had yet to be admitted. Eastern Europe had yet to be incorporated within the Soviet Empire; . . . Communism ruled only one-sixth of the world's peoples, today the proportion is nearer one in three . . . Today, moreover, in the wake of the 1962 Rome-Moscow agreement, the very Church of Christ has been infiltrated and largely occupied by ecclesial proponents of a '*liberation theology*' that is simply Revolutionary Marxism in a '*Christian*' guise, and as a consequence, the institutional Church is becoming increasingly integral to the Revolution. . . .

The organised recruitment of Orthodox and Catholic Christians — and subsequently of masses of Protestants too — began with a vengeance in the wake of the German invasion of Soviet Russia. . . .

Being nothing if not a realist, Stalin became only too well aware that ordinary folk could not possibly be roused to defend the Soviet slave empire. Therefore the call went forth to defend '*Mother Russia*' and, to make it all the more convincing, a '*Mother Russia*' wherein the Orthodox Church appeared to have been given a vital role in sustaining the war effort.

In the post-war period, however, while on the one hand, the newly re-established Orthodox Church was subject to renewed persecution under Khrushchev, simultaneously, the main thrust of its activities was increasingly directed to the subversion of Western ecclesial bodies — in particular the increasingly syncretist *World Council of Churches*.

However, with the occupation of Poland and its incorporation within the Soviet Empire, Moscow's attention also became increasingly directed towards the subversion of the Catholic Church. . . .

. . . It was not until 1958 that the Soviet manipulation of religion for political purposes became a major factor in the ecclesial equation. This became possible in Prague with the establishment of the Soviet-controlled *Christian Peace Conference* (C.P.C.), a body analogous to the already cited *Council for the affairs of the Orthodox Church*, AND NO LESS OBEDIENT TO MOSCOW'S DIKTAT.

What is particularly significant and frightening is the extent to which all Western ecclesial bodies, not even excluding the Catholic Church have been influenced by the C.P.C.-directed Soviet '*peace*' offensive. . . .

However, all this would have been impossible but for Vatican II's 1962 Rome-Moscow Agreement which forbade even the discussion of Communism by the Council Fathers and thus made possible the emergence of that '*liberation theology*' which, by identifying Christ with the Revolution, gave Moscow the means whereby it could proceed to brainwash the entire world to its advantage.

But for the Rome-Moscow Agreement and '*liberation theology*', Moscow would probably have laboured in vain; as it was, however, it soon became possible for Communism to harness even Church Institutions as well as Churchmen to the Revolution's chariot. The rest we know.

In retrospect, it is clear what was the main objective of the Soviet '*peace*' offensive. So long as Bishops and Churchmen generally accepted Rome's definition of Communism as

'*intrinsically evil*', there was a most dependable international nucleus on which anti-Communism could rely for support. Once the leaven had become an anti-leaven, once the Revolutionary cause began to be presented as essentially '*Christian*' by Churchmen and even by Church-sponsored organisations, secular anti-Communism too was fatally undermined. For it then became possible for Communists to become acceptable even by Catholic Churchmen as *bona fide* allies.

For Communists to become acceptable as allies it was first necessary to invent a super-menace . . . This invention would not have been possible but for the post-Conciliar perversion of both Churchmen and Church institutions. And it was achieved primarily through the treason of such Catholic Churchmen as had begun to insist that it is not Communism but Anti-Communism that is '*intrinsically evil*'. . . .

Terrible as war is therefore, still greater is the menace of Communist violence. Indeed, such is Communism's track record that the number of its victims already approximates the number that might be killed in a nuclear war.'

— (Extracted from *Approaches*, No. 95.)

Quoting John Cotter again — (*Assisi Re-Assessed*):

At its 5th General Assembly (of the World Council of Churches) Nairobi, Kenya, November, 1975, representatives from non-Christian religions were invited and allowed to read short papers to the Assembly. But in Vancouver, July-August 1984, non-Christian religions were invited not as mere observers, but as fully participating members! Moreover, the W.C.C. is now almost totally Communist. *Time* magazine, 21st August 1983, under the caption 'The Curious Politics of Ecumenism', wrote: 'To the World Council of Churches, the Soviets are sinless.' . . .

Finally the Vatican is still considering the Lima Liturgy (B.E.M.—Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry) manufactured at Lima, Peru, by theologians, mainly Protestant, but including 12 Catholics under the general leadership of Protestant Max Thurian of the '*ecumenical monastery*' in Taizé, France.

The Barque of Peter is indeed sailing on treacherous seas!

Assisi

The chief organiser was Roger Cardinal Etchegaray, the President of the far-left Justice and Peace Commission, but he was aided by the United Nations World Conference on Religion and Peace . . . 155 religious leaders participated from 12 major religions — Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, Jews, Hindus, Zoroastrians, African animists (including snake worshippers), from Togo, Sikhs, Shinto priests from Japan, Jains, two American Indians (one being the medicine man of the Crow Indians, Montana) and the Bahais (who believe that Christ was just one of nine divine messengers and not the most important one). The Christians included Robert Runcie, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Emilio Castro, the present Secretary General of the World Council of Churches and Patriarchs of the Russian, Bulgarian and Czechoslovak Orthodox Churches, and the Greek Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople. The Dalai Lama 'God-King' exiled from Tibet was also there. . . .

John Cotter quotes from a report on the meeting and then says of the Pope's Assisi speech: 'This speech was laced with quotations from the documents of Vatican II, which he said showed how '*such a great event sprang from the*

teaching of the council'. Here we have the source of all this — Vatican II — and there can be no question of 'misrepresentation' since the Pope himself has interpreted it."

Syncretism Denied

'What will take place at Assisi will certainly not be religious syncretism,' said Pope John Paul II on 22nd October 1986. According to the Pope the difference lay in the fact that they had not 'come to pray together' but 'come together to pray' . . ."

Cotter comments:— Who will ever notice these essentially 'fine print' reservations, in effect a question of mere semantics? It would seem as if some malignant hand behind the Pope is determined to stampede Catholics into Syncretism, while technically not committing the Pope to it. . . . Remember, the well known Fundamentalist leader, Dr Carl McIntyre called Assisi 'the greatest single abomination in church history' — the same sentiments as expressed by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, who called it 'the supreme imposture' . . . 'the culminating insult to Our Lord' and also, 'in my view, this is a diabolical act'.

The basic principle behind syncretism is that all religions are of equal validity. While the Pope does not actually say this, his praise and uncritical deference towards heathen man-made religion and to Judaism will certainly convey to many that basic principle, i.e. his incessant travels must serve to reinforce the syncretism of Assisi.

Soon after Assisi, the Pope told a group of American Senators that peace efforts are 'only faltering attempts, founded upon sand' without a 'strong sense of universal brotherhood'. (Our Sunday Visitor, 30th November 1986.) The term 'universal brotherhood' is one much used by Freemasons and Marxists. Of course we are all human beings, but there is the feeling that this essentially Masonic term is designed to by-pass the Incarnation willed by God. But if we take the word 'brotherhood' in a collective noun sense as in the Brotherhood of the Mafia, it becomes even more sinister, i.e. that the 'Brotherhood's' power (read the Brotherhood of the Illuminati or whatever the behind the scenes world conspirators now call themselves) is Universal. . . . [John Cotter: *Assisi Re-Assessed*.]

John Cotter writes on the theme of the "Brotherhood" in an article printed in a supplement to *Apropos* No. 2 January 1988, entitled "Gorbachev's 'World Consultative Council' or 'Has the Brotherhood attained Universal Power?'" :—

In the Soviet newspapers *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, 17th September 1987, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev called for 'a vastly-expanded role in world affairs for the United Nations'. His article was entitled THE REALITY AND GUARANTEES OF A SECURE WORLD. In view of the already substantial Communist control of the United Nations and the widespread penetration of its specialised agencies, Gorbachev can only mean that the United Nations becomes a COMMUNIST WORLD DICTATORSHIP. Incidentally — and we must fervently pray, accidentally — the Pope himself in Detroit on the 19th September 1987, urged governments 'to trust the United Nations' (as Toronto *Sunday Sun*, 20th September 1987 put it).

. . . let us examine the background to another highly significant remark of Gorbachev in his same article. We quote from the Toronto *Star*, 26th September 1987, 'in a rare article written for the Soviet newspapers *Pravda* and

Izvestia, Gorbachev argues that 'A world consultative council under U.N. auspices uniting the world's intellectual elite' is needed to help shape the future. 'Prominent scientists, political and public figures, representatives of international public organisations, cultural workers, should all be involved', he writes.*

Less than 20 years ago, the *Voice* magazine (no. 73, 1970) wrote, 'The time is coming when these Elder Brothers of mankind will not only direct from behind the scenes of life, but move out and take their place as recognised and acknowledged leaders in the world'. We wonder whether 'these Elder Brothers of mankind' and Gorbachev's 'world consultative council' are not one and the same. (The *Voice*, a vicious, syncretist and occult NEW AGE magazine, was published from a Sussex, England, address until 1973 when it moved to South Africa.)

Let us now examine the possible, nay probable background, to Gorbachev's 'world consultative council' and the kind of 'peace' it would guarantee for us — the 'peace' of a world-wide Gulag archipelago, the 'peace' described by St Augustine as no more than 'the cruel enforcement of injustice'.

Background to the Universal Power of The Brotherhood.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE ILLUMINATI was formed by Adam Weishaupt in 1776 and supposedly dissolved in 1785. But just as the Comintern (Communist International) founded in Moscow in 1919 which was supposedly dissolved in 1943, is most certainly very much in existence today, so we feel the BROTHERHOOD OF THE ILLUMINATI IS STILL VERY, VERY MUCH ALIVE. In fact it may well be the 'hidden hand' behind the TRILATERAL COMMISSION, the COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, the CLUB OF ROME (which has many members from the Iron Curtain countries including from Soviet Russia), the BILDERBERG GROUP, the ASPEN INSTITUTE, the BROOKINGS INSTITUTION, the PUGWASH SYMPOSIUM, the DITCHLEY PARK FOUNDATION (England) etc. . . .

John Cotter then refers to the 'Testimony of Walter Rathenau', 'a German millionaire Socialist Cabinet Minister and international financier' who said 'only 300 men, each of whom knows all the others, govern the fate of Europe. They elect their successors from their entourage. These men have the means in their hands of putting an end to the form of any state which they find unreasonable.' Rathenau held a similar position in Germany in World War I to that held then by Bernard M. Baruch in the United States (the U.S. War Industries Board). Rathenau's brother-in-law was the Comintern chief Karl Radek so Rathenau would be in a pretty sound position to know the truth!"

Cotter quotes next from George Orwell's "1984", where . . . Orwell puts the following message into the mouth of O'Brien 'a man of mysteriously high rank in the Inner Party' who says: 'I can tell you that the Brotherhood exists, but I cannot tell you whether it numbers a hundred members or ten million . . . you will have heard rumours of the

* Footnote by Editor of *Apropos* . . . "In *The Scotsman* (18th September 1987) Gorbachev is reported as having proposed 'the creation of a U.N. sponsored grouping of the world's intellectual elite to enhance prospects for global security. A council of prominent scientists, politicians, cultural and religious figures could seriously enrich the spiritual and ethical potential of contemporary world politics.'"

existence of the Brotherhood. . . . The Brotherhood cannot be wiped out because it is not an organisation in the ordinary sense.” The late Sir Winston Churchill’s Essay on Leon Trotsky in “Great Contemporaries” (pp. 168-9) is then quoted.

Finally, Cotter quotes from a speech by Deputy N. S. Khrushchev at the Joint Session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on 8th February 1955, which appeared in the now defunct Cominform weekly journal “For a Lasting Peace, For a People’s Democracy” . . . (11th February 1955).

“Comrade Deputies, on the instruction of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and the Council of Elders, I wish to propose as Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Comrade Nikolai Alexandrovich BULGANIN.” Cotter concludes:

The term ‘Council of Elders’ is very similar to those used above to describe the leaders of Universal Brotherhood in occult and New Age literature. Not much is known about it. Even the late Lord Beaverbrook’s influential London *Daily Express* (9th February 1955) said: ‘Such a council has never been mentioned before.’ Whatever it is, it must have been in a position to give ‘instructions’ to ‘Dictator’ Khrushchev about who should be made the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union!

The mysterious ‘Council of Elders’ was further mentioned in the Moscow *New Times* weekly newspaper as urging the ‘putting an end to’ the Solidarity Trade Union Movement in Poland. . . .

A link can be discerned between the ‘Council of the Elders’ behind Khrushchev and the statement made by the late head of Princeton University Institute of Advanced Studies, J. Robert Oppenheimer† as follows: ‘I believe that only a world council of wise men can assure peace on a scientific basis.’ (*Time*, 5th May 1958) “Hmmm, . . . ‘A world Council of wise men’? Now where have we heard these terms before? (From *Apropos*, No. 2, January 1988.)

Coda

It was (Pope) Angelica’s habit to listen in silence as personal reports were made to him by his emissaries; only at the end did he add a few simple-sounding questions that might bring to light whole new possibilities in a situation. When Rico had made his report and answered the Pontiff’s queries, he had one question of his own.

“I understand, Holiness, the importance of a breakthrough with Soviet Moscow and the Sovietised Orthodox Church of the U.S.S.R. But surely an iron-fisted order from the Politburo delivered through Pimen will not stop the Council from dealing forcefully with the most important and threatening factors of our time — with Marxism in general and Stalinist Marxism in particular.”

It was also Angelica’s habit to draw objections out, to have them stated as concisely and succinctly as possible.

“What do you mean, little son?”

“I mean, Holiness, that the Council will surely repeat the condemnations of Marxism that Popes since 1870 have issued?”

† “He was fired by President Eisenhower in 1954 as a ‘Security Risk’ and because of ‘fundamental flaws in his character.’”

Angelica’s answer was quick and firm.

“You’ve seen the *Schemata*, little son, that give the subject matter of the Council’s discussions?”

“Yes, Holiness.”

“Does any of them deal with Marxism or Communism?”

“No, Holiness. But I thought the condemnation of Marxism would be dealt with in a separate *Schema* as a special issue.”

“There will be no condemnation of Marxism nor any attack on Communism, nor any critique, direct or indirect, of the Soviet Union.”

“Now” — Angelica stood up indicating that the conversation was over. “I am most grateful for the way in which you accomplished this mission. I thank you, little son.” The Pontiff’s face broke into a sun-ray smile. “Whenever you want, please come and see me. Just phone Ducocasa.”

As Rico made his way to the elevator on the fourth floor, his mind was awash in troubled disappointment over Papa Angelica’s twin decisions to exclude the Greek Orthodox observers and satisfy Soviet chauvinism.

(From “Vatican”, a novel, page 231, by Malachi Martin. Secker & Warburg, London, 1986 and Pan Books (P./B.), 1987.)

Getting to Grips (Continued from page 1)

by M3, is itself nothing more than “printing money” by the private banks, yet the rate of inflation has been reduced from 27 per cent to 4 per cent.

The Social Credit technique of the compensated price, by which government uses new debt-free money to compensate retailers on condition they lower prices, positively locks the door on inflation. The technique is well known and easily administered. Only the courage and the will to apply it is needed. Those who have the power have the responsibility.

RECOMMENDED READING

Abraham, Larry	Call It Conspiracy.
Allen, Gary	None Dare Call It Conspiracy.
Douglas, C. H.	The Brief for the Prosecution. The Development of World Dominion. Economic Democracy. The Monopoly of Credit. The Policy of a Philosophy. Programme for the Third World War. Social Credit.
Monahan, Bryan W.	The Moving Storm. An Introduction to Social Credit. The Survival of Britain. Why I am a Social Crediter.
Sutton, Antony C.	National Suicide — Military Aid to the Soviet Union. Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution. Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler.

BOOKS and booklets on the subject of Social Credit and allied subjects are available from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and in Australia from Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

ADDITIONAL COPIES of *The Social Crediter* and back numbers are available from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and from Tidal Publications in Australia, address above.

Prices upon request.