THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 40. No. 5. SATURDAY, JUNE 25, 1960. Postage, 2d. 6d. Fortnightly.

? Versus the Synagogue of Satan

by C. H. DOUGLAS

(Originally published in *The Social Crediter* in 1940, and re-published for the benefit of those who have not easy access to our back numbers).

"Do men gather figs of thistles, or grapes of thorns?"

•

"There are only two world policies, Freedom and Domination"

•

"That is moral which works best" (*i.e., achieves its object most effectively*).

Before 1914, Great Britain and France were comparatively free countries—gravely mismanaged, but not enslaved by law. Germany was the most regimented country in the world, by no means excepting Russia. War broke out with, superficially, every circumstance favouring Germany. She declared war at her own time, and was sure of victory.

In three months, Germany was decisively defeated at the Battle of the Marne. The French and British Armies operated under their own commanders-in-chief.

In 1918 Germany surrendered. If the competence necessary to run the traditional whelk-stall had been applied to the situation, instead of leaving it to international German-Jew-American-crooks and their satellites, the German people could have been set on their feet and made happy, while at the same time the German Reich could have been removed for ever from the position of the menace it has been since its inception, and will be until its destruction, in common with other centralised dictatorships.

From 1918 to the outbreak of war again, the history of both Great Britain and France is one long tragedy of centralised maladministration and half-baked "socialism," with no other discernible object other than the strengthening of financial and industrial monopoly and "Political and Economic Planning," accompanied by bribes to Labour to keep it quiet pending the establishment of a world Police tyranny under the League of Nations and the Bank of International Settlements.

When war was declared in September, 1939, everything apeared to favour the Allies. If it didn't why did we declare war? Only a fool declares a war he expects to lose. It was explained in great detail how marvellously we were organised on the latest scientific principles. It is unnecessary to recapitulate the havoc that "Hitler" inflicted on this country by the black-out, bureaucracy and billeting, without firing a shot. Were we not under the unified command of General Gamelin in the West, behind a Maginot line which probably 98 per cent. of the population, not merely of Great Britain but of France, believed to be a practically impregnable fortress stretching from the sea to Switzerland, instead of a useless, and nearly unused, sham, stopping at the point where its extension to the sea would have made it invaluable?

Only by a miracle was the flower of the British Army saved from the greatest disaster of all history, within one month of its disposition by this same unified command. Does any sane Englishman believe that the Belgian débacle was an "accident"? Within two months, France, still under unified command, but separated from the British *who saved themselves* with the loss of incredible quantities of arms and stores, all placed in "planned" positions, was utterly broken, except for sections which refused to act under centralised orders.

Are we, in this fateful hour, learning anything? I doubt it. Or don't we want to beat Germany? Every newspaper which has been conspicuous for its advocacy of monopoly (which is to say every newspaper which is part of the newspaper control monopoly), clamours for more control, more deprivation, less freedom more police action. More Russia and Germany, in fact. The outstanding Fifth Columnists in this country for the past 25 years are the "great" newspaper proprietors.

Now, it is quite certain that the winning of Armageddon involves the defeat of the German armed forces. I am confident that there are and have been for more than 150 years, Satanic forces behind Germany, using Germany for their own ends, just as those Satanic forces have landed us in an unnecessary war which it is hoped will be the end, not merely of Great Britain, but of British culture—the culture of tolerance and individual initiative which the Planners detest and fear. To win this war involves a good deal more than the defeat of Germany, but—one thing at a time.

(*continued on page* 3)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which 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* 30/-; *Six months* 15/-; *Three months* 7s. 6d.

Offices—Business and Editorial: 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST. *Telephone*: *Belfast* 27810.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones. Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36, Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSton 3893.) Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420, Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

CRYSTALLIZATION

Events since they were written have brought out or emphasised the meaning in numerous of the notes under the heading "From Week to Week," written or inspired by the late C. H. Douglas and published in these pages during the second phase of the World War. Of the near infinity of political commentators, Douglas alone penetrated to the very heart of world politics, and not only exposed the cause of our malady, but progressively elaborated the cure.

The cause is still operative, the cure untried. What Douglas had to say then is applicable to our present situation which is continuous with our previous situation, and for those of our readers to whom access to earlier volumes of *T.S.C.* is difficult, and for other reasons, we propose to re-publish a further selection of his notes.

The date of original publication is given in brackets after each note.

• • •

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* is owned by Messrs. Sears, Roebuck and Company and is edited in Chicago. It is about as British as Adolf Hitler, Mr. Bernard Baruch or the 1940-41 policy of the "B."B.C. and its "friendly Alien" staff.

(Aug. 22, 1942.)

• • •

"Encyclopedia" is a word much beloved of Freemasons and World Planners. The French Revolution was intimately associated with the Encyclopedists and their peculiar methods of presenting "knowledge" in watertight compartments, analogous to the grades of a secret society.

(Aug. 22, 1942.)

• • •

Unfortunately, as so often seems to be true, there is a reality behind the crude materialism of Encyclopedism. It is a fact that the human individual can only assimilate wisdom to the extent that he becomes wise. Any ascent in the scale of real consciousness appears to be something like lifting yourself up by your own bootstraps.

The comparatively simple idea, for instance, that freedom involves functional discipline of a high order seems to be too much for the majority. Nothing in the present political chaos is more nauseating than the idea so sedulously propagated that a war such as that now in progress, which itself is the outcome of world intrigue to ensure world slavery, is a desirable thing because it "teaches the masses to obey rules." It does nothing of the sort. It teaches the masses the technique of complying with the law while eluding the reality.

The 1914-1918 phase of this war produced a generation of "lead-swingers" who were mental and moral invalids, where they were not physically incapacited. They were an easy mark for the Fabian Society and the Planners. Those people who say that war is terrible, but that the peace will be awful, may easily be right, unless better work is being done by such bodies as the Army Educational Corps than would seem to be humanly possible.

(Aug. 22, 1942.)

• • •

Communism is the most rudimentary social system of which we have any knowledge, and is, incidentally, the exact opposite of State Socialism, with which most people confuse it.

With few exceptions, such as the cuckoo, all the higher animals have evolved from communism to rudimentary conceptions of private property.

Modern political communism can be traced without difficulty to the nomadic tribes of the middle East, who, immemorially lazy, moved their flocks from place to place to avoid labour of systematic cultivation.

Socialism, on the contrary, is pure, abstract, intellectualism run mad, and politically adopted for interested purposes.

Russia is not, and never has been, a communist State—it is an example of State Socialism.

The centralisation which is an inevitable feature of State Socialism contains the certainty of war, and it is not too much to say that the Socialist State is primarily a War State.

(Aug. 22, 1942.)

• • •

It appears to be possible to make any statement on the transcendent merits of the Russian social and economic system, which is State Monopoly, Socialism, or State Capitalism, whichever label you prefer, with the assurance that the response will be that of the children when the rocket goes up. A news-letter quotes General Schestakov as saying that "by the socialisation of agriculture, the Soviet Union will soon be self-sufficient in food."

Prior to the Bolshevik Revolution, Russia was not only self-sufficing in food on a general standard of living higher than that obtaining in 1939, but was the largest exporter of food, and particularly wheat, in Europe.

So far as it is possible to obtain information on Russian affairs, Socialism has done one thing, and one thing only, and to do that has required immense outside help. It has equipped a magnificent army, the human material of which has always been of the highest class for fighting purposes. As Socialism always pretends to detest war, this achievement seems to require explanation.

(Feb. 12, 1944.)

? *VERSUS THE SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN—*

(*continued from page* 1.)

The defeat of Germany involves maximum efficiency over an unspecified time. Is it possible to state the conditions of this efficiency? I think that it is.

First consider the simple proposition that the more static the situation, the less dangerous is absentee management-centralised control. Centralised control of graves seems fairly unexceptionable. The military acquiescence in "unity of command" so far as it ever existed in 1918, grew out of the trench warfare of 1915-1918 which was purely static, punctuated by catastrophes hatched out by absentee-management. This war is not static. The British Army of 1940 is as good, or better, than the British Army of 1918. It has been made to look like a team of elementary schoolboys playing Cambridge University at Rugby Football—by "unity of command."

The first essential of maximum efficiency is not unity of command, it is unity of intention. Are we fighting this war to beat Germany, or to put over some secret scheme of a "new order of society" *vide* Mr. Anthony Eden, Mr. Baldwin's white-haired boy, who is controlling the British Army? Why has not a single Communist been arrested when hundreds of Fascists have been interned?

Every competent authority knows that Russia is a mere satrapy of outside interests—originally American-German-Jewish, now more directly German. What is the "Russian" Jew Ambassador, Maisky, who is in constant communication with Berlin, doing at large in London? Is he assisting in "unity of intention?"

Does Mr. Eden think that all the virtues, all the brains, and all the competence flourish in an order of society, exemplified in Soviet Russia, a country of 180,000,000 of people, 70 *per cent.* of whom cannot read or write, a country with a record of mass-murder never remotely approached under the worst of the czars, riddled with corruption, on the verge of famine? Because if Mr. Eden, and those like him, are chiefly interested in making Britain Communist, we are not going to beat Germany. We don't need to. Germany would like nothing better than that we should "go Communist." The powers behind Germany and Russia are willing to take the Dictatorship of the World under any title which dupes the greatest number, until such times as it becomes no longer a matter of consequence what the dupes think.

While I am confident that argument is lost on Mr. Eden, and those of his colleagues who share his views, I feel that it should be put on record that the overwhelming majority of the people of this country detest almost equally the *realities* of Communism, Nazi-ism (National Socialism) and Fascism. And perhaps, as an insignificant individual whose roots in these islands go back more than a thousand years I might warn much more significant persons than Mr. Eden of the rising anger of *the British* at the suggestion that we have to take our social ideas at second hand via either a paperhanger, an Italian gangster, or an Asiatic mass-murderer.

It must surely be evident to anyone capable of appreciating the meaning of events—a capacity which involves a cold disregard for the distorting verbiage of war propaganda—that there are immensely powerful Forces operating through the Germano-Russo-Italian bloc and the "D'markrazi" bloc, but outside either of them, which are merely concerned to ensure that whichever bloc "wins," the centralised power of organisations, whether masquerading as Pan-Americanism, Federal Union, the Bank of International Settlements, or Dr. Arnold Toynbee's vague and un-named World Sovereignty, shall be intensified; and a particular social ideal (so far as I can see, quite similar to that depicted in the *Protocols of Zion*) shall be imposed upon the world, and maintained by what Lord Lothian describes so attractively as "Law (i.e. absentee management) supported by over-whelming force." The nucleus of this social scheme is a bureaucratised factory system on the Russian model, "industrial welfare" is presented as the final aim of the millenium, and Henry Ford, its Prophet.

That these Forces worked systematically, and with immense cunning and ability, first to weaken, and then to present Great Britain with the alternative of State Socialism or World War, seems clear. For twenty years we followed the usual British half-baked course of compromise during which period every interest except Finance was systematically attacked. I am inclined to suspect that this policy was to some extent abandoned with the happy, but far too long delayed, exit of Mr. Baldwin, who was ably assisted by such Labour admirers of the Bank of England as Lord Snowden. From that moment, if not before, war was inevitable, and the threat of defeat was substituted for the threat of war.

That Hitler and Germany were, and are an indispensable factor in this diabolical policy, is obvious. To what extent Hitler is a tool in using anti-Semitism, or rather, anti-Jew instinct, in the same manner that he cheerfully sacrifices half a million men in a Blitzkrieg to gain a pre-determined objective, can only be judged by its assistance towards the ultimate objective. The misery through which Germany passed at the hands of the Jews in the pre-Hitler days, served the same purpose in reconciling the German population to the finance-backed Hitler, with his "Guns before Butter" policy, as is served by the determined maintainance of an under-privileged class in the "d'markrazies." It stimulated a revenge complex for use as a weapon against the diminishing number of persons economically or politically capable of individual initiative. My own feeling is that Hitler is merely the usual "Myth" (we have a typical instance in this country at the present time—*vide* U.S. press) on which to father an imposed policy, and if he departed from it, he would be "liquidated."

Yet I am happy to feel that, immensely clever and able as have been the preparations for the instillation of a world tyranny, they are not going wholly according to plan. In order to make a little clearer the reason for this dawning faith, it is necessary to examine to some extent the nature of a Plan—one of the key words of the present period, and, perhaps for that reason, one of the most subtly misused and misunderstood.

The attraction which the idea of "Planning" has for many wholly well-intentioned people, is due in a considerable degree to the confusion in their minds between tactics and strategy. *If you have decided* to build a house, which is a strategy, you quite probably draw a plan of it, which is tactics. *The essential nature of a plan is that it is a*

means, not an end. And a plan, as such, is static, and quite foreign in nature to an organic growth, such as Society. Similarly, if you have decided to conquer the world, you make a succession of plans, the *object* of which is Strategical. The plans in themselves are tactical. But to anyone familiar with warfare, an observation of a number of tactical plans will reveal the grand strategy. In short a plan pre-supposes an objective *which has already been decided.*

Now this Plan business is clearly and indisputably interwoven with the "Leader" racket and State Capitalism, cunningly mis-called Socialism. Not only is this the case in Germany. The racket began, although it did not originate, in Russia, and the "Planners" who are for the moment in control in Great Britain, are running the "Heaven-sent Leader" stunt, notably in the Jewish controlled New York Press, which is also pro-Roosevelt-New-Deal. In the "British" Press, claims, which any technically-trained engineer knows to be absurd, are being made for the miraculous results of a government more unrepresentative than any in history.

And, while the "British" Press, for obvious reasons, is doing its best to obliterate the facts from the minds of the general, and in particular, the Labour-minded population, Germany, Russia, and Italy, are not only actually, but titularly, *Socialist States,* and the triumvirate of gangsters who rule them are the fine flower of Socialism. War, accompanied by immense financial bribery and rising prices, is clearly Socialism's opportunity in Great Britain. These confuse the issue and give the appearance of successful organisation to what is, in fact, cumbersome, inefficient and oppressive. In short, there is conclusive evidence that the war is a screen for an attempt to impose despotism everywhere under the guise of Socialism.

I think that there are real grounds for hope, not only that this "common war aim" is widely recognised, but that Great Britain is now beginning to face a Real Enemy, and will beat Him both in Germany, here and elsewhere.

One of the many vicious fallacies which I think will be dispelled in this process, is the idea that mere quantity, in human beings or elsewhere, is a satisfactory substitute for quality. Life is intolerable under a system which allows millions of individuals to be swung into action by a puppet "Leader." But it is equally, or even more intolerable, under conditions which impose the ideals of an uninformed majority inspired by crooks, on the activities of the diversified aptitudes of the human race. The *well-being* of the majority is always right: the *ideas* of the majority, as such, are invariably wrong.

Mrs. Mary Clarkson

We deeply regret to record the death, on June 10th, of Mrs. Mary Clarkson, for many years a supporter of the Secretariat.

48

Legislative Despotism

The following is from Gustave Le Bon's *The Psychology of the Crowd,* written about 60 years ago, and is particularly applicable to evils which are manifesting themselves today:

"Legislation since this period has followed the course I pointed out. Rapidly multiplying dictatorial measures have continually tended to restrict individual liberties, and this in two ways.

"Regulations have been established every year in greater number, imposing a constraint on the citizen in matters in which his acts were formerly completely free, and forcing him to accomplish acts which he was formerly at liberty to accomplish or not to accomplish at will.

"This progressive restriction of liberties shows itself in every country; it is that the passing of these innumerable series of legislative measures, all of them in a general way of a restrictive order, conduces necessarily to augment the number, the power, and the influence of the functionaries charged with their application.

"These functionaries tend in this way to become the veritable masters of civilised countries. Their power is all the greater owing to the fact that, amidst the incessant transfer of authority, the administrative caste is alone in being untouched by these changes, is alone in possessing irresponsibility, impersonality, and perpetuity.

"There is no more oppressive despotism than that which presents itself under this triple form.

"This incessant creation of restrictive laws and regulations, surrounding the pettiest actions of existence with the most complicated formalities, inevitably has for its result the confining within narrower limits of the sphere in which the citizen may move freely.

"Victims of the delusion that equality and liberty are the better assured by the multiplication of laws, nations daily consent to put up with trammels increasingly burdensome.

"They do not accept this legislation with impunity. Accustomed to put up with every yoke, they soon end by desiring servitude, and lose all spontaneousness and energy. They are then no more than vain shadows, passive, unresisting and powerless automata.

"Arrived at this point, the individual is bound to seek outside himself the forces he no longer finds within him. The functions of governments necessarily increase in proportion as the indifference and helplessness of the citizens grow.

"They it is who must necessarily exhibit the initiative, enterprising and guiding spirit in which private persons are lacking.

"It falls on them to undertake everything, direct everything, and take everything under their protection. The State becomes an all-powerful god. Still, experience shows that the power of such gods was never either very durable or very strong."

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., (T.U.), Woolton, Liverpool.