Russia’s Ultimate Aims

By C. H. DOUGLAS

(Originally published in The Social Crediter, February 10, 1945)

The Comte de St. Aulaire, from whose remarkable book, Geneva versus Peace, we quoted recently, remarks “The League of Nations was conceived in Berlin... We learn this fact from Von Bulow... it is at Berlin that the ring is completed, after traversing Washington, Paris, London, Budapest and Petrograd. The mutual affinities of its ancestry, plutocracy, revolution, Freemasonry and Pan-Germanism, are so close that it may be wondered if there is not, beneath them all, another identity.”

In this, the gravest crisis of the world’s history, it is essential to realise that the stakes which are being played for are so high that the players on one side, at least, care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow.

They have no nationality, no morals, no scruples and no regrets. The League of Nations was conceived in Berlin, yes. But it was proposed and pressed by Wilson, the representative of men who had fought (well, a little anyway) to defeat the country in which it was conceived. It is not accidental that a film, and we know who controls the films, has appeared at this time which presents Wilson as a giant among statesmen, instead of, as he was, a second-rate schoolmaster completely dominated by Schiff, Strauss, House, Baruch and Brandeis.

To a world not distracted by rocket-bombs and Ministries of Fuel and Power, it would be uniformly obvious that a manipulated clamour is being raised in favour of the scum of the underworld in each country as it is “liberated”. This scum has obtained arms in large quantities under the pretext of resistance to the Germans during the occupation. How much resistance was actually offered, we may, or may not, learn at a future date. We may, or may not, also learn the principles on which the arms of the resistance movements were distributed. But we already have sufficient experience of what happened in Greece, Belgium, and parts of France (always backed by a prepared clamour from the “British” Socialist Party) to be assured that a massacre of the Right has been prepared. The text-book is available to anyone who supposes that we are alarmists. It is written by Stalin, and its title is Problems of Leninism. In a valuable commentary which should be read by everyone (What are Russia’s Ultimate Aims?, 9, Hazlewood Road, Glasgow), Mr. H. W. Henderson remarks “No one acquainted with Communist tactics in Germany before the advent to power of Hitler, can fail to be impressed with the fact that unity between Communist and Socialist Parties could have kept the Nazis out. This was however rendered impossible by the actions of the Communist Party, acting under instructions from Moscow.” Now, the Russian Revolution, and its spate of murder, was financed from New York with the assistance of Germany by some of the richest men in the world. And these same men are those who have persistently opposed effective monetary reform with the obvious intention of retaining an army of discontent for use against the Right. That is to say, there is a working coalition between the scum of the underworld and the richest men in the world to murder those from whom alone redemption for the underworld can come, in order that any threat to the power of the financier may be removed. The underworld will be dealt with just as easily as Stalin deals with any opposition, when the underworld has done its job.

The quotation referred to, with comments by Douglas, are from our “Week to Week” notes for February 3, 1945:

“Russia... is the victim of a syndicate organised to destroy the nations... Why are the New York bankers along with the German General Staff, the responsible authors of the Russian Revolution?... The solidarity of faith which obtains between the New York bankers and the Bolshevik leaders and the feelings inspired by the sufferings of the Jews in Czarist Russia, are not a sufficient explanation of this paradox. However, are we not paying too great an honour to Freemasonry when we attribute to it the greatest share in the genesis of the League and in responsibility for its acts? Is not this secret society a society with limited responsibility, not only by reason of its mental weakness, but also because it is above all Masonry when we attribute to it the greatest share in the genesis of the League and in responsibility for its acts? Is not this secret society a society with limited responsibility, not only by reason of its mental weakness, but also because it is above all the instrument of forces more secret still, and more to be feared? Is it not unjustly accused of all the sins of Jewry? And if Freemasonry is but an instrument, then President Wilson was but the instrument of an instrument.”

The preceding quotations are taken from Genève contre la paix by the Comte de St. Aulaire, Ambassador to Great Britain (1920-1924). The English translation is published by Sheed and Ward. It must be remembered that it is written, not by a propagandist, but by a trained professional diplomat of wide experience. It should be read by every serious student of contemporary events.

None Dare Call It Treason

Over a million copies of None Dare Call It Treason have already been sold and it is now available through K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 5 New Wanstead, London E.11, at the following prices, including postage:

Single copies 5/6d. (6d. postage)
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The One Conspiracy

We have recently pointed out that post-war developments have in themselves made it plain to see that C. H. Douglas (to the consternation of some of his supporters) definitely stigmatised in 1935 as an international conspiracy to achieve World Government, naked and ruthless and what is now generally recognised as the International Communist Conspiracy, are one and the same thing. From 1939, and ever more urgently through and after the war years, Douglas devoted his efforts to endeavouring to effect an exposure of this Conspiracy, and repeatedly warned that the only hope of saving Christian civilisation lay in dealing with the conspirators, the most important of whom, of course, were in control of the U.S. Government. The war, as Douglas saw so clearly, was in essence a prize-fight, arranged by “promoters” to destroy European civilisation, so that the world could be reconstructed by a World Government operating through, for the time being, Russia and America until the United Nations organisation could take over officially.

The matter is so important that we re-publish once again (on page 1), for the benefit of old as well as of new readers, Douglas’s succinct summary of the situation, originally published in T.S.C. for Feb. 10, 1945. It is quite easy to see from this that the “Cold War” is simply the continuation of the strategy which marked the end of World War ‘II’—that “loss of the peace” against which Douglas warned us, as urgently as he was able, while the war was in progress.

World Policies

“No since the wild fury of Senator Pittman, Solly Bloom, and Emmanuel Celler when Mr. Chamberlain nearly succeeded in averting the Second Phase of the War in 1938, has there been such an outburst from New York and Washington as that which has greeted the Labour Party’s revolt against both the Schuman Plan and the Council of Europe seems at first sight to be anomalous, although it assists the Kremlin, but we think that the incongruity is more apparent than real. It should be remembered that a policy of centralisation is always (but only) favoured by individuals who expect to be at the apex of the pyramid. As an ultimate policy, all the Leftists favour centralisation but only at the correct moment. There are, beyond all reasonable doubt, three apparent World Policies at the present time: Zionism, Communism (with its ancillary policies of the Managerial State and State Capitalism) and World Government. It is more than probable that at the highest levels these are all one; that the U.S.A., Moscow and Messrs. Bevan and Dalton are all working to the same end, although with a limited comprehension of what that end will be. But that end involves conflict, as the only alternative to the threat of conflict. ‘Only in war, or under threat of war’ as Mr. Bevan’s friend, Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, said through his P.E.P.”


Warning

“What we are suffering from in modern times is the failure of the primitive liberals to see that freedom does not begin when tyranny is overthrown. Freedom is a way of life which requires authority, discipline and government of its own kind.

“The modern liberal democracies are in the early stages of the vast creative effort to invent and to make work the kind of authority and discipline and government under which free men can enjoy freedom.”


“We” is of course that Peoples’ Democracy, the U.S.A. The term Peoples’ Democracy was so used by President Roosevelt.

The U.S.A. used to be a Constitutional Republic, and the Constitution was expressly designed to prevent its conversion into a Peoples’ Democracy ruled by the Executive.

The next step is the Police State, to impose the discipline, which seems now to be all that is lacking.
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CORRECTION PLEASE!*  

ITEM: From an Article by John LaHoud in The National Observer, July 20, 1964:  

Moscow has been pursuing a policy of co-existence with capitalism to the renewed scorn of Red China, which is following more classic revolutionary policies.  

CORRECTION: The classic revolutionary policy of Communists, whether they are in Moscow or Peking or New York, is world conquest. And “co-existence” is only one of many strategic moves to accomplish world conquest. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover warns us: “The over-all intensification of subversive and intelligence activities against the United States reveals the underlying treachery and deceit in Khrushchev’s pious statements about ‘peaceful co-existence and friendly co-operation.’ Communists never entertain any ideas of a permanent reconciliation with non-Communists.”  

ITEM: From “Why Not Trade With Soviets?” by Peter B. Greenough in the Boston Globe, July 16, 1964:  

The rationale of opening our gates further to Red goods, and vice versa, is ably explained in the current HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW by Harold J. Berman, professor of law at Harvard University.  

CORRECTION: And the irrationality of opening our gates is very ably explained by Representative Bruce Alger (R.-Tex.) in the Congressional Record (July 6, 1964):  

“The United States is supporting and aiding Communism by money, by food, by arms, by moral support, by trade, by cultural exchange, by giving them our military and nuclear secrets. We are pretending that communism and Communists mean no harm. We are aiding them as they aid other Communists and eliminate any vestige of freedom in the subjugged countries.  

‘Why? Because there is profit to be made by some businessmen in foreign aid, military expenditures, and big Government spending.”  


The United Nations could be fatally weakened by an open fight over Article 19 of the charter, under which the Soviet Union faces the loss of its vote at the next General Assembly for failing to pay its peace-keeping assessments . . . .  

CORRECTION: It defies reason how a financial cripple such as the United Nations, can be “fatally weakened” by losing a dead-beat, such as the Soviet Union. It further defies reason how the UN, with the purpose “to maintain international peace and security,” can be fatally weakened by the loss of history’s greatest aggressor, the Communist imperium.  

ITEM: From an Article by Mark R. Arnold in The National Observer, July 20, 1964:  

The late President [Kennedy] was identified with the liberal wing of the Democratic Party. Several of his advisers were affiliated with the Americans for Democratic Action, an organization that is anathema to conservatives. But President Johnson’s philosophy is not so easily definable, hence not so susceptible to attack.  

CORRECTION: “You say I am not a liberal. Let me tell you I am more liberal than Eleanor Roosevelt, and I will prove it to you. Franklin D. Roosevelt was my hero—he gave me my start.” Lyndon B. Johnson, as quoted by Robert Spivak, New York Herald Tribune, December 1, 1963.  

ITEM: From an Editorial in the Boston Herald, July 19, 1964:  

The transfer of Leonid I. Brezhnev from the Presidency [sic] of the Soviet Union to . . . the Secretariat of the Communist Party and the simultaneous elevation of Anastas Mikoyan to the Presidency [sic] is one of those internal shuffles aimed at strengthening the government now and for the future . . . . It was like a shift in the board of directors of a large bank. Commissars in gray flannel suits. Is this good? From our point of view it is but only in the sense that the Khrushchev regime is better than some other Communist regimes Russia might have. We prefer the men in gray flannel suits to another Stalinist or a Maoist regime.  

CORRECTION: From J. Edgar Hoover’s A Study of Communism, we learn that the Khrushchev regime is continuing the Leninist-Stalinist aggression against the United States:  

“The delegates to that meeting [of representatives of 81 Communist parties from throughout the world that convened in Moscow in November, 1960] formulated a document of intentions which should have served to alert all free nations everywhere to the growing threat which communism represents to freedom.  

“Issued in December, 1960, the document constituted, in effect, a new Communist manifesto. Hidden among the semantic distortions in the new Communist manifesto, was the declaration of purpose. Divested of all semantic subterfuge, the purpose emerged as a clear and unequivocal call for the launching of a new and all-out offensive by Communists everywhere in support of the program for world conquest.  

“Of utmost importance in the new manifesto was its singling out of the United States as the main enemy. The United States was attacked as ‘the mainstay of colonialism today’ and branded as ‘the main economic, financial and military force of modern imperialism.’  

“The Moscow declaration of 1960 amounted to an unmistakable call for an attack on all human freedoms and non-Communist groups and intensified agitation of the so-called class struggle.  

* Extracts, reprinted with permission, from CORRECTION, PLEASE! and A Review Of The News which is published weekly by Correction, Please, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178, U.S.A.
ITEM: From an Editorial in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, June 25, 1964:

The duplicity of Indonesia's President Sukarno becomes more evident each day.

CORRECTION: Sukarno has not been practising duplicity. As long ago as November 10, 1962, William Schulz, writing in Human Events, set the record straight: "For sixteen years, Sukarno has guided Indonesian affairs with an iron hand. This flair enabled him to win the Order of Lenin and to chortle in Djakarta: 'Thus, I am a Communist of the highest order.'"

ITEM: From an Article in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, June 25, 1964:

Fifty million $ in [United States] aid removed Brazil from the pro-Castro lists.

CORRECTION: State Department policy and United States aid were staunchly behind Comrade Goulart. Goulart and his regime were overthrown by informed Brazilian anti-Communists from the military, political, religious, and business communities in spite of United States "aid."

ITEM: From a Column by Walter Winchell in the Boston Record American, June 17, 1964:

The Congolese Government turned Mr. Lumumba over to the Katanga regime at that time [1961]. Shortly afterward Mr. Tshombe's government announced that Mr. Lumumba had been killed by angry villagers. His body has never been found.

CORRECTION: We would expect the New York Times' correspondent to be at least aware of the sensational disclosures made by Moise Tshombe concerning the death of Lumumba. These disclosures were made in the Belgian periodical Pourquoi Pas (January 31, 1964). The article caused so much discomfort among Tshombe's enemies that the Belgian government seized the entire issue. The H. du B. Report (April 1964) carried the full story, the essential point of which was that the liquidation of Lumumba had been entirely planned by the Central Congolese government under Cyrille Adoula, and carried out in such a way as to make it appear that the Katangese government was to blame. Thus far, to the best of our knowledge, this sensational story has not appeared in any major American newspaper.

ITEM: From a Column by Walter Lippman in Newsweek, July 6, 1964:

The hard truth of the situation is that the passage of the [Civil Rights] bill, which at long last abolishes the legal badges of Negro servitude, is enforceable only if and as the preponderant mass of the nation is prepared to observe it.

CORRECTION: The "hard truth" is that the bill has nothing to do with the so-called "badges of Negro servitude." According to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, it is "part of the pattern for the Communist takeover of America." Two past presidents of the American Bar Association are of the firm opinion that the bill was "skilfully drawn with the patent, deliberate intent to destroy all effective constitutional limitations upon the extension of Federal governmental power over individuals." The bill will be enforced only if and as a preponderant majority of Americans resist these plans.

ITEM: From an Article in The National Observer, July 13, 1964:

When independence came to The Congo in July 1960, he [Moise Tshombe] decided to secede, and the United Nations troops helped the central government defeat him in the ensuing civil war.

CORRECTION: Not quite! The UN first claimed it was preventing civil war; it was later proved that the UN precipitated the incredible bloodshed to destroy Tshombe and his anti-Communist regime. When independence first came to The Congo, Tshombe sought a peaceful federation of the Provinces, but, in fact, was illegally arrested and detained while trying to accomplish this. Any chance for peace and order has been delayed in The Congo for over three years by the barbaric actions of the UN "Peace Forces" there.

ITEM: From an Article by Emmett John Hughes in Newsweek, July 13, 1964:

The harsh truth about South-east Asia is that the United States pursues a "no-win" policy against the Communist enemy, and it will just as long as the State Department (aided and abetted by the Defense Department and the CIA) is controlled by its present occupants. The Vietnamese sequel to the Korean fiasco will continue unless, in the words of Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R.-Ohio), "...and it finally can end only at the conference table, with men from Peking and men from Washington seriously discussing the whole range of their conflicts throughout Asia."

CORRECTION: The harsh truth about South-east Asia is that the United States pursues a "no-win" policy against the Communist enemy, and it will just as long as the State Department's "personnel and its security and other policies be investigated from top to bottom with the purpose of eliminating subversives and questionable personnel."
