

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 47 No. 13

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1967

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The State of the World

(from *The Australian Social Crediter*, March and April 1946)

Introduction 1967

In 1945 it must have appeared to most people that with victory war was done with, and that when its ravages had been repaired, an era of peace and prosperity would dawn. Who was left to make war?

The late C. H. Douglas, however, from the very beginning had seen the war as merely one frightful incident, like the First World War and the Great Depression, in a long-term and continuing policy of which the culmination was to be a World Government of a world police-state. He recognised the existence of an occult government, largely identified with the Money Power, as organised internationally, but spreading its tentacles increasingly into national governmental organisations through such agencies as Fabian Socialism,¹ the London School of Economics, penetration of universities, and control of the media of communications. Of the inner core master-minding these huge events he wrote: "They care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow".

The state of the world has grown steadily worse since 1945, and appears now to be on the brink of explosion. And the evidence of conspiracy, once in the main largely conjectural, is now abundant, clear, and readily available. In these circumstances, it seems worthwhile to republish without alteration, but with added notes, a review of world affairs published in *The Australian Social Crediter* in March and April, 1946, since the essential thesis remains unimpaired, and foresight is more convincing than hind-sight. As well as factual material, this article contains projections, which on the whole have proved accurate, but, not surprisingly, inadequate. The emergence of Israel as a State in 1948² was not foreseen, nor "aid to underdeveloped countries", the "population explosion", the chaos in Africa, the conquest of China, the wars in Asia, the gradual decay and dissolution of India. But the connections between these large events, all implicit in the phrase "the immolation of the peoples of a continent", have become ever more apparent, and have been discussed from time to time in articles in *The Social Crediter*, some published in pamphlet form.³ More important, hard evidence of conspiracy, which can now largely but not wholly be identified with the activities of international Communism, has become available in the form of eye-witness accounts, exposure by former Communist agents, and the results of Congressional and other enquiries in the U.S.A.

The negro riots in the U.S.A. were planned, as part of the strategy of a Communist world take-over, as long ago as the 1920s;⁴ their actual promotion at this time is a strong indication that the culmination of conspiracy is close. There are other indications.

It should be evident to anyone who follows the news that President de Gaulle has consistently promoted Communist objectives.⁵ The most important result has been the effective neutralisation of NATO. It has recently been reported that the USSR is building up supplies in East Germany, thus preparing the way for a "settlement" of the German "problem"—probably merely by ultimatum, since West Germany now lies like a nut between the crackers of East Germany and de Gaulle's 'neutrality'—"Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals".

The Middle East, the strategic centre of the world, is under the virtual control of the USSR, via Israel. The position is that intervention by "the West" is virtually impossible, because over twenty years of intensive propaganda have made the threat of nuclear war both credible and unthinkable. The no-win war in Vietnam is conditioning the peoples of continents to the futility of war; and under cover of these developments Communism is consolidating its gains and grip in the essential strategic areas, and denying them to "the enemy". If Europe falls, either under ultimatum, or as a result of a lightning war as rehearsed in the Middle East, the Mediterranean would immediately become a Russian lake. Asia is in ferment, India is collapsing; and there is near civil war in the U.S.A. The USSR is alleged to be overtaking U.S.A. nuclear superiority, and to have deployed an anti-missile system; China is alleged to have the hydrogen bomb (made in Russia?). The U.S. Secretary of Defence refuses to deploy an anti-missile system. There is already talk of a U.S. withdrawal from forward bases in the Pacific to islands nearer home.⁶

The stage is thus set for a shattering world crisis, in which, because the threat of nuclear annihilation is credible to the people of the U.S.A., a surrender to World Government, in the first place by the Communists, already in control of the UN *organisation*, might appear inevitable.

The text of the original article follows:

"At the moment (February, 1945), there does not appear to be much likelihood that the German contributions to the general hell will be overlooked, and if there is any truth in the statements that the German atrocities have been largely directed against the Jews, they will not be. But it is obvious that the International-New-Deal-Peppers-and-Planners are counting on using Germany as the scapegoat to which to divert attention from the consolidation of their war gains. That in this country not less than America, the Managerial State—'All Power to the Official'—was decided upon in 1931 if not long before, and organised in the sure and certain hope that a nice big war could be provoked and kept going while its position was buttressed 'in war, or under

threat of war' is so clear that only wilfulness or unfamiliarity with the facts can obscure it. We do not think we are likely to see a period of crude deflation on the cessation of hostilities, because the dog has learnt that trick. But that both individual purchasing-power and individual freedom of initiative will be curtailed by every possible means, and there are many, is evidenced by the care with which 'the threat of war' is being prepared to replace 'war'. And God wot, the threat of war is not far to seek."

We quote this paragraph from *The Social Crediter* of a year ago because it provides for those "unfamiliar with the facts" an excellent perspective of the past year's events. The military phase of the war ended with the terroristic demonstration of the atomic bomb; and it is clear in retrospect that hostilities were prolonged, despite the efforts of the Japanese, to enable the dropping of those bombs. On the conclusion of the military phase, the "threat of war" phase was substituted without so much as a day's delay, and the "administrative adjustments" referred to by Lord Rothschild were set in train.

During the war, arrangements were consolidated to ensure a condition of apparent world famine. We are indebted to an editorial from the London *Sunday Express*, reprinted in the Sydney *Daily Telegraph* of February 26, 1946, for a demonstration that the appearance is false. This article reports that world stocks of wheat next June will be 2,000,000 tons more than in June, 1938. Elsewhere it has been reported that Argentina is burning grain in locomotives.⁷

Thus the "threat of war", plus artificial famine, provide the necessary background for the conversion of governments into dictatorships. In Eastern Europe the process is crude; totalitarian governments have been installed under the guidance of Soviet Russian trained Russian agents, and are backed by Russian arms. Thus in Yugoslavia Marshal Tito has been installed. Tito is a Josef Broz, or his double; there is some doubt. The real Broz, after early Communist activities in Jugoslavia, took part in the Spanish civil war, then returned to Moscow, where he received special training. In 1941 he returned to Jugoslavia as head of the Secret International Terrorist Organisation (Tanya Internatsionalna Terroristichka Organizatsiya—i.e. T.I.T.O.). There is a report, however, that the real Broz "disappeared" under Russian auspices, and was replaced by a double, provided from the same larder.

Again, in Poland, a Russian sponsored totalitarian government has been installed under M. Bierut, whose real name is Krasnodebski. This man in 1921 accepted Soviet citizenship. "Attached at once to the Polish section of the Comintern, he spent several years on theoretical training and practical courses in Moscow. In December, 1924, he was sent to Poland for the first time, and almost at once became one of the leading personalities of the Communist Party. For a time he was organising demonstrations and riots to undermine the institutions of the Polish State." (*The Tablet*, July 14, 1945.) Later he became head of the Polish section of the OGPU. In 1941 "he was dropped from a Soviet plane into Poland . . . was ordered to take advantage of the German occupation to build a network of Communist organisations, and with their assistance to set up institutions and an administration to rival the Underground Polish authorities acting under the Polish Government in London. In March, 1944, Bierut, accompanied by four other people

. . . crossed the frontier into Russia. Upon their arrival at the Soviet capital they introduced themselves as the Polish National Home Council, and the only 'genuine representation of the Polish Nation'."

The Times, and the socialist Press generally, connived at all this, and at the same time prepared the ground for the Socialist victory at the British General Elections. This achieved, the next step was taken. Without warning, American Lend-Lease supplies were cut off, precipitating an era of intensified austerity which could be held to justify the totalitarian measures of the new Government.⁸

A drive for exports took the place of the "period of crude deflation" which followed World War I. This is very important. Industry has grown up from its beginnings to serve the multitudinous needs of *individuals*. But "export trade", like war, provides an over-riding objective. It provides a reason, an excuse, for the *organisation* of industry; and the organisation of industry implies the organisation of the community to serve it.

The measures known collectively as Social Security are, in reality, nothing but the administrative arrangements underlying the total organisation of the Community. They were originally developed for that purpose in Germany. The essential principle involved is to prevent the individual accumulating savings, and hence independence, and thus to force him into subjection to the mass of detailed regulations governing every aspect of existence which are brought into being under special enabling clauses of the main Acts. This is the "Managerial State—'All Power to the Official'".

British National Socialist legislation can be seen, in perspective, to fall into two chief divisions. The first comprises Lord Rothschild's "administrative adjustments", and comprises the various measures for organisation of industry and community—nationalising of banking and industry, control of investment, and the reduction of all members of the community, except Government officials and bureaucrats (including the managerial class and labour Gauleiters), to a common level, "the managed". Included in this is the equalisation of income through controlled devaluation of money (planned inflation), plus taxation.⁹ The inflation—i.e., rise in prices—rapidly reduces the real value of professional and small business incomes; this process is offset by wage increases for the low wage earners. The objective is an approximate equalisation of all non-official incomes at a level which will not permit of individual savings. It is important to observe that this level may include, later on, a moderately high standard of living; but that standard will be compulsory, in order to absorb all income. The contingencies which normally would call for savings will be met by so-called "insurance". This is not genuine insurance. Contributions are simply taxation, and the benefits are the provision of a minimum income, or special services (e.g., medical treatment) under narrowly defined and regulated conditions. Thus independence for the individual will be impossible. So long as he does as he is ordered to do—i.e., remains "fully employed" in the various jobs to which he is directed¹⁰—he will be well-fed, and by degrees adequately housed and amused. If, however, he endeavours to assert his independence, his income will be cut off, and he will have no savings to carry him on, and no free-choice of alternative employment.

The propaganda for "Social Security" is merely an elaborate disguise for the conditions that obtain in the Army, and it is not improbable that once the total organisation of the community, with the abolition of all independence, is achieved, the disguise will be dropped. But this is chiefly a question of administrative convenience.

The second division into which legislation falls comprises sanctions—means of enforcing the "administrative adjustments". Under this heading are grouped international commitments, propaganda, and direct coercion.

International commitments (with which the export drive may be classified) provide a justification, a "total" objective. Contributions to UNRRA, maintenance of occupation forces, acquisition of dollars, membership of UNO, etc., etc., are supernational objectives, and hence external to national politics, and hence *outside the sphere of the individual*. That is to say, supernationalism stands to the individual as does religion, and is, in fact, metaphysically equivalent to religion. Now quite casual inspection of supernational politics of the present day reveals that it is a mass of lies, murders, corruption, wars and destruction; Satanism, the incarnation in institutions of oecumenical Evil. But the reader may call it what he will, so long as he will judge contemporary supernationalism by its fruits, and grasp its metaphysical reality. He may find his own interpretation for the expression "possessed by the Devil".

Propaganda is quite obviously "possessed by the Devil". It is driving Man to destruction. International "News" is derived from international news-agencies; but it is not, for the most part, news, but propaganda, and at times of decisive importance, it carries the *policy* of international Communism. On the principle of admitting freely what is already known, it is now freely enough admitted we made a "mistake" in supporting Tito. It is now clear, in retrospect, that the Press clamour, lead by *The Times*, in favour of E.L.A.S. in Greece might have been fatal to the British Empire; and *it will become* clear that the international propaganda campaign against Franco is in order to promote fatal developments.¹¹

Under cover of the situation created and maintained by international commitments and propaganda ("the threat of war"), the means of direct coercion are being steadily consolidated. Russia and its satellites are, undeniably, police-states. In Great Britain, the police forces have been centralised, the Ministry of Social Security—*i.e.*, of central control of the individual—set up, and officials of various departments have been armed with powers of entering private homes on various pretexts, and of securing 'evidence' in connection with industrial accidents. Every day sees an increase in the power of the official to mind the individual's business, with, of course, a reciprocal decrease in the individual's self-determination.

If people are deceived by the ostensible objectives of socialist legislation, they will pay the price. "By their fruits shall ye know them." If they excuse the means by the ostensible end, they make a pact with the Devil, and they will, quite literally, go to Hell. Socialism in being—in Russia, in Germany, and now in Great Britain¹²—is a history of the degradation of the individual, and of climactic wars. It cannot be otherwise.

By their fruits: not by their advertisements. It is only natural that these things should be put forward in disguise;

and if we cannot distinguish between words and things, we shall perish. If the lesson of Germany was not enough, because it was too far away, and if Russia, farther away still, seems like a paradise—then judge by the socialism we have; judge by falling production, rising prices, murderous taxation, increasing anarchy, loathsome austerity; that is policy in practice, the proletarianising of the community.

How can the sincere Socialist—the one who merely *votes* Socialism—believe that the tin-pot mechanism of the Party vote will enable him to overthrow the ultimate possessors of power? Does he seriously think that the 'Capitalist' Press will assist in its own overthrow? On the very premises of the Socialist, Socialism as advocated must be a 'Capitalist' plot for the final enslavement of the worker. But the 'Capitalist' is not the independent business-man; he is the International Capitalist—the Cartelist and the Financier, who control the international news-agencies, and own government debts, and who through those debts hold a lien on the physical assets of every country, and who, under the guise of Socialism, are putting the bailiffs in. It is childish to believe that Socialism has come into power *against* the will of the ultimate International Power.

The state of the world is no accident; for those who will look, it bears every mark of design. The Mark of the Beast.

And? F. A. Voigt, in *Nineteenth Century and After* writes: "The question *What can we do?* has many answers, and whoever gives an answer may do so according to his knowledge, his capacity, and his station (there are many, indeed, who give answer beyond all these). But one answer, at least, is possible to the humblest: To bear witness. To bear witness, to give evidence, to communicate truthfully, to place on record, which is being done by many thousands of men home from overseas, who, in their letters or in what they have to say when they return home, are doing more than the Press and the wireless to promote an enlightened public opinion. It is the duty of all who can do so, whether in print, in their letters, or in a talk, to withstand or rectify, in however restricted a manner, the cumulative falsification of history perpetrated by the principal media of publicity in our time . . ."

One of the functions of the Press is to mislead public opinion, even informed public opinion, as to the timing of the plot. The public is taught to think that if after all they don't like "Socialism", they can simply change the Government in five years time, and revert to freedom. It is not so. Under cover of party politics, the shackles are being bolted. *It is intended that when we find we don't like what we've got, it will be too late to do anything about it. And that won't take long.*¹³

"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 . . . 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 Social Crediter*, February 10, 1945.) We warn

the decent men of the Left as well as of the Right that if they don't wake up *now* their massacre is certain.

On February 18th, Mr. Churchill was closeted in Miami with Mr. Bernard Baruch and his U.S.A. Branch Manager, Mr. James Byrnes. On March 5th Mr. Churchill gave the signal we have been expecting. From 1942, when Germany double-crossed Russia¹⁴, until, virtually, March, 1946, the international news-agencies have systematically concealed the development of the situation. Under cover of the "line" that we must secure Russia's co-operation, and therefore must say nothing which might offend her, we have sacrificed the Poles, and connived at the installation of police-governments run by specially trained Russian agents in every country traversed by the Red Armies. The facts that have not been concealed have been explained by the plea that Russia is "nervous" (poor mighty child), and therefore entitled, at any cost of human slaughter and suffering, to make her boundaries secure by extending those boundaries by the incorporation of her neighbours and the "social-engineering" of their populations.

It is not doubted today that Germany aimed at world conquest. What is not widely appreciated is the embracing nature of the strategy she followed. This strategy is carefully described, and documented, in a study by Derwent Whittlesey (*German Strategy of World Conquest*: London, F. E. Robinson & Co.). As one of the foundations of this strategy, the German General Staff developed the conception of geopolitics, which, however, was first voiced by the English geographer Halford Mackinder in 1904.

"Mackinder's concept of the geographical structure of the earth begins with the Eurasian land mass and its peripheral water areas.

"For a thousand years a series of horse-riding peoples emerged from Asia through the broad interval between the Ural Mountains and the Caspian Sea, rode through the open spaces of Southern Russia, and struck home into Hungary in the very heart of the European Peninsula . . . That they stimulated healthy and powerful reaction, instead of crushing opposition under widespread despotism, is due to the fact that the mobility of their power was conditioned by the steppes, and necessarily ceased in the surrounding forests and mountains . . .

"Is not the pivot region of the world's politics that vast area of Euro-Asia which is inaccessible to ships, but in antiquity lay open to the horse-riding nomads, and is today about to be covered with a net-work of railways? There have been and are here the conditions of a mobility of military and economic power of a far reaching and yet limited character in this region. Russia replaces the Mongol Empire. Her pressure on Finland, on Scandinavia, on Poland, on Turkey, on Persia, on India, and on China replaces the centrifugal raids of the steppe-men. In the world at large she occupies the central strategical position held by Germany in Europe. She can strike on all sides and be struck from all sides, save the north. The development of her modern railway mobility is only a matter of time. Nor is it likely that any possible social revolution will alter her essential relations to the great geographical limits of her existence. Wisely recognising the fundamental limits of her power, her rulers have parted with Alaska; for it is as much a law of policy for Russia to own nothing overseas as it is for Britain to be supreme on the ocean."

"Remembering how large Russia loomed on the political horizon in 1904, it is easy to see why Mackinder cast that country for a role it has only now (about 1942-3) begun to play. In revising his thesis after the War of 1914-18, he retained Russia as the pivot area, calling it the 'Heartland'. He then recognised Germany as the active force in a possible combination with Russia, extremely dangerous to maritime Great Britain," (*Op. cit.* pp. 65-67.)

The geopolitical conception was considerably extended, and developed by the German General Staff to a theory that whoever controlled the "Heartland" held the key to absolute world conquest. In this, of course, the development of air power, not considered by Mackinder, made a vital difference.¹⁵

As the result of the defeat of Germany, the "Heartland" is now in the absolute control of Russia, as originally envisaged by Mackinder.

In considering this situation, we must ignore ideology. Ideology is a weapon. As Stalin said, "Words must have no relation to actions . . . Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds." The now highly-elaborated geopolitical theory makes the possession of the Heartland a temptation that may prove irresistible, if not to Stalin, then possibly to his successor. So that any realistic foreign policy must bring forth a "healthy and powerful reaction" from other nations—or so one would think.

Yet British foreign policy, in particular, appears senseless. Not content with the outcome of the policy of appeasing Germany, we have adopted the identical policy as regards Russia.¹⁶ To try to reconstruct our foreign policy is like trying to piece together a jig-saw puzzle that has a key piece missing; it won't hang together.

And there is the vital clue. There is a piece missing. The essential fact to grasp is that *national foreign policies are the resultant of the native foreign policy plus an international component*. And because in general the nature of the international policy deflecting the native national policy is unrecognised, foreign policies are essentially unpredictable, and we are plunged into a series of wars which we do not want, and which could certainly have been avoided by a realistic national foreign policy. Wars are actually outmoded, in the sense that modern industrial development provides potential plenty for every nation. The British Empire, however it came into existence, is not now in any sense an aggressive entity. For some time past it has practised the essential requirement of non-aggressiveness—economic and political decentralisation. Yet the British Empire has been chiefly concerned in the last two wars, and is clearly to be involved in the next¹⁷—hence Mr. Churchill's speech.

It can be stated quite definitely that our continued existence as an Empire, as a set of Nations, and as a culture—all three or any of them—depends on our recognising, and dealing with, the alien policy which deflects our own. The situation is analogous to a chemical experiment in which the results do not conform to those predicted, because of the unsuspected presence of an impurity in the reagents. Discover and eliminate the impurity, and theory and practice coincide.

This alien policy has been described and analysed by Major C. H. Douglas in his books *The Big Idea, Programme for the Third World War*, and *The Brief for the Prosecution*. It has, as its immediate objective, the elimination of the British Empire and its culture.¹⁸

To describe the situation very briefly: in addition to the recognised Great Powers in the world—let us say, the Big Three—there is a fourth. The fourth Great Power is the Jewish nation, which, because it has no fixed geographical State, is overlooked as such. Nevertheless, it has a Government, which is largely secret, and that Government has a

policy. The policy is derived from the mystic philosophy of the Jews—the belief that they are the Chosen People, with a mission to organise and govern the other peoples of the world.¹⁹

Now, since this Power has no country, and no army,²⁰ its foreign policy must be pursued by other than the methods of direct armed conquest. Its most important weapon is Finance—money-power. Thus at the centre is Jewish State policy. Outside this, as it were, is the organisation of International Finance, which is predominantly, though not entirely, Jewish. International Finance, as such, has a policy; but that policy is derived from, and furthers, Jewish State policy.

The technique of the policy is really absurdly simple; in essence it consists of mortgaging property, and foreclosing. The foreclosure is, in practice, the dictation of policy. Thus all governments are in debt, and all have to borrow. The conditions on which they can borrow are conditions dictated by the policy of International Finance, and put forward as principles of “sound finance”. Now financial policy dictates economic policy, and economic policy, as things are, delimits politics so-called.

Theoretically, virtually the assets of the whole world are mortgaged to the banking system—*i.e.*, the Money Power; legally, there is no reason why the Money Power should not take possession. But practically it is impossible, because public opinion would revolt; so that some form of police force to prevent revolt must be established. So that over and above the purely financial technique by which the Money Power has established its claim to ownership of the world, on behalf of its hidden masters, politics have been controlled so as to lead to a world police-force.

This is being achieved by the elimination of nations through wars, and the subordination of the remaining nations to their bureaucracies through Socialism.

In 1942, Major Douglas wrote: “Socialism, or to give it its correct name, Monopoly, is not a *production* system, which is exactly what one would expect from its origins. That this is a simple statement of fact is being demonstrated in this country at this moment. It is a legalistic system based on a power complex supported by a set of abstract slogans which its policies and results contradict, where these have any concrete meaning. The idea so skilfully inculcated that confiscation of property will assist in the distribution of wealth is, of course, completely without foundation. Socialism is a restriction system, as any examination of Socialistic practice in the Trades Unions will confirm, and it has two well-defined principles—centralisation of power, both economic and political, and espionage.

“That is to say, every advance towards Socialism is an advance towards the Police State . . .” (*The Big Idea*.)

Nearly a year after the end of the war, conditions in Great Britain are much worse than during the war. This means, not that Socialism has failed, *but that it is succeeding*. It is doing what its true authors intended it should do—reduce the people to a condition of penury and slavery. Politics and economics are both predominantly in the service of the secret Fourth Great Power.

Now the operation of this fourth major foreign policy in the world must normally be to call forth a “healthy reaction”, both economic and political, to it. But as the policy is a secret policy, the effect is simply a confusion of policies, until the threat is so obvious that a distinct policy does

emerge. The British policy towards the threat of Russia can be seen more and more clearly to have been absurd; but equally, the threat is becoming so obvious that only one *British* policy is becoming possible.²¹ But, of course, immense damage has been done.

The main strategy of the Fourth Power is destruction of the national institutions of the other three powers from within, and the manipulation of the three powers into conflict with each other. As the fourth power “owns” each of the others, it will dominate the world when one of the three dominates the world. But, since Russia already has a developed secret-police system, and is militaristic, Russia may be billed to eliminate the other two. But in the meantime the next phase is apparently intended to be the destruction of the British Empire by Russia. To this end, by paralysis of British resistance, the strategic position of Russia has been enormously strengthened, while the economic position of Great Britain has been ruined. Food and coal reserves have gone, industry has been wrecked by interference and the threat of nationalisation, and morale has been virtually destroyed by a combination of Utopian but impossible promises and austerity.²² Moreover, Russia has an enormous fifth-column in all countries of the British Empire, and the integrity of the Armed Forces has been sapped by the propaganda of the Services’ “educational” organisations. At the same time, America has been bought off by the prospect of quick profits from the dissolution of the British Empire, so that, as can be judged by the Press reception of Mr. Churchill’s speech, the British Empire has been virtually isolated.

We have been manoeuvred into a position where it is too late to do anything about the military situation. That was intended. If anything can be done about the general situation, it can be done *only by a direct challenge to the power of the Fourth State*. The genuine nationals of the British Empire and the United States will have to eliminate the power and the policy of the International Jew. Once that is done—and only if it is done—Russia may be stayed. But God knows how little time remains.

Only a few weeks ago, there was but an occasional bare whisper in the daily Press that Russia just conceivably, in certain circumstances—if we offended her by saying so, for example—*might* become a threat. We were told just enough to warn us of the danger of saying more. But that phase has passed. Mr. Baruch has given the “go” signal to Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Churchill has passed it on through all the modern resources of controlled propaganda. Even the fatal words “appeasement” and “Munich” are once more becoming common currency, and with the aid of little daily doses of instruction, the Common Man is rapidly becoming an expert in foreign affairs, and soon should be able to realise that the Third World War is on the way.

In noting this development, we must emphasise that the propagandised programme for the Third World War is not by any means necessarily the version that will be followed, any more than the abridged Beveridge Plan represents the real designs of its sponsors. But just as Hitler and Beveridge and their henchmen, the boys of the “B”.B.C., kept attention directed in the wrong direction while the authorised full version of their programmes were available at a slightly higher price (in money) and a much higher price in effort, so the authentic programme for the next phase of the War

is available from the pen of no less than one of the chief actors: we refer to *Problems of Leninism*, by Generalissimo Josef Stalin, now—ominously—Minister of Defence.

The Russian Government is the exponent of a fairly highly elaborated dogma derived from a philosophy known as dialectical and historical materialism. The doctrines involved in this dogma have various origins and histories, but their modern expression began with their formulation as a system by Karl Marx (Mordecai) and Frederick Engels, and their extension by Vladimir Lenin (Ulianov). The current system is generally known as Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism has, however, been further adapted by Stalin, whose pronouncements are surely authoritative.

Russia is governed through the hierarchy of the Communist Party. Party membership is absolutely conditional on a thorough grounding in Marxism-Leninism, and promotion in the hierarchy requires a high degree of "theoretical" knowledge—*i.e.*, knowledge of the theory of Marxism-Leninism. "There is one branch of science which Bolsheviks in all branches of science are in duty bound to know, and that is the Marxist-Leninist science of society, of the laws of social development, of the laws of development of Socialist construction, and of the victory of Communism . . . †

To "improve the work of the Marxist-Leninist training of Party members and Party cadres", the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (B) in 1938 undertook certain "major measures", including the organisation of "one-year Courses of Instruction for our lower cadres in each regional centre"; "two-year Lenin schools for our middle cadres in various centres of the country"; "a higher school of Marxism-Leninism under the auspices of the Central Committee of the C.P. S.U. (B) with a three-year course for the training of highly qualified Party theoreticians"; and "six-month Courses of Instruction for teachers of Marxism-Leninism in the higher educational establishments."²³

The over-all policy pursued by Soviet Russia is, of course, derived from the beliefs so thoroughly inculcated.

A study of Stalin's dicta on "theory" makes it quite clear that there has been no alteration of any description in principle. There has, certainly, been modification; modification is held by the exponents of the theory to be essential if it is to remain living. This is simply the "improvement" and "refinement" of the theory by constant "experiment", modification in the light of practical experience. On the whole, it is held by the theoreticians that the theory is amply proved, and that world history is shaping itself exactly in accordance with the expectations derived from the theory. And so, in fact, it is.

The practical essence of the theory is that the present form and organisation of the world is derived from the Capitalist mode of production. Capitalism contains certain inherent defects, or "contradictions", which quite inevitably lead to its decay and dissolution, to the accompaniment of economic crises and wars. The Capitalist system necessarily involves the oppression of the lower classes of the population, and consequently engenders in them a revolutionary outlook, which inevitably leads to their rising against the upper classes, and *eventually* establishing their own power

as rulers "by hurling, step by step, one section of the bourgeoisie after another from the heights of power, in order, after the attainment of power by the proletariat, to kindle the fire of revolution in every country . . ." (Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*.)

According to Marxism-Leninism, the real social structure of the world, under Capitalism, consists of its class structure, and nation-States are quite secondary.²⁴ That is to say, men are united primarily by their classes, so that to belong to the proletariat, or "toiling masses", class, overrides considerations of nationality. The proletariat *class* is considered to be a world fact; the class is homogeneous, and opposed in interest and outlook throughout the world to all other classes which it will, "step by step", hurl from power.

The picture is, therefore, that of two forces like two armies, radically opposed throughout the world. Because of the inherent defects in the Capitalist system which gives the Capitalists and their sub-classes their power, sooner or later, and somewhere or other, the proletariat force must "break through" the line of the Capitalist forces. Once this happens, the whole nature of the struggle is changed, for the victorious segment of the proletariat becomes the leader of the rest of the world-proletariat, and strategy alters accordingly.

Stalin describes the strategy of this stage, *which was reached with the October Revolution in Russia*, quite explicitly:

"Objective: to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries. The revolution is spreading beyond the confines of one country; the period of world revolution has commenced.

"The main forces of the revolution: the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries.

"Main reserves: the semi-proletariat²⁵ and small-peasant masses in all developed countries.

"Direction of the main blow: isolation of the petty-bourgeois democrats, isolation of the parties of the Second International, which constitute the main support of the policy of *compromise* with imperialism.

"Plan for the disposition of forces: alliance of the proletarian revolution with the liberation movement in the colonies and the dependent countries."²⁶ (*Foundation of Leninism*.) (Italics in original. Our paragraphs.)

"The fundamental question of revolution is power." (Lenin.) In order to achieve the maximum power, it is necessary for the first country achieving the initial victory of the proletariat to organise itself in such a way as to obtain the greatest power. That is to say, it must organise itself on totalitarian lines under the direction of a General Staff under a Chief of the General Staff; it must, in short, become a fully organised army, in order to play its necessary part in the continuation of the world revolution. *This is the true and only meaning of the term "dictatorship of the proletariat"*. Jokes about "dictatorship over the proletariat" are entirely beside the point. "Dictatorship of the proletariat" is purely and simply a technical term in the vocabulary of Marxism-Leninism, and relates to the *strategic concept of having a properly organised force available to assist revolution as it occurs elsewhere in the world*. "The revolution in

†J. Stalin: Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B) (1938).

the victorious country must regard itself not as a self-sufficient entity but as an aid, as a means of hastening the victory of the proletariat in other countries." (Stalin.)

Similarly, the terms "petty-bourgeois democrats" and "parties of the Second International" refer to what we call "Labour" or "Labour-Socialism". The formation of such groups is regarded by the theoreticians as a natural phenomenon in the development of the world revolution.²⁷ Their role is to demonstrate to the oppressed toiling masses that only revolution can succour them and one of the first tasks of the victorious revolution must be to liquidate these "compromisers with imperialism" who have committed the crime of betraying the revolution, and who are rivals for the leadership of the proletariat. The appearance of these groups is only a demonstration of the progress of the general revolution, which, according to Lenin, would take some decades to run its course, during which the deepening crisis would be marked by depression, unemployment, and war, as well as such "petty bourgeois expedients" as Fabianism and Social Democracy. All this would have to be, however; the first country to achieve revolution could do no more than help to intensify the crisis, act as a beacon to the toiling masses, and prepare for the decisive moment by building up its own strength and organisation.

"It is not enough for revolution that the exploited and oppressed masses should understand the impossibility of living in the old way and demand changes; for the revolution it is necessary that the exploiters should not be able to live and rule in the old way. Only when the 'lower classes' do not want the old way, and when the 'upper classes' cannot carry on in the old way—only then can revolution triumph. This truth may be expressed in other words: *Revolution is impossible without a nation-wide crisis (affecting both the exploited and the exploiters)*. It follows that for revolution it is essential, first, that a majority of the workers (or at least a majority of the class conscious, thinking, politically active workers) should fully understand the necessity for revolution and be ready to sacrifice their lives for it; secondly, that the ruling classes should be passing through a governmental crisis which would draw even the most backward masses into politics . . . weaken the government and make it possible for the revolutionaries to overthrow it rapidly." (Lenin, quoted by Stalin.)²⁸

While the strategy of Marxism-Leninism remains steady and consistent through this period (*i.e.*, the period between the Russian Revolution and World Revolution), *tactics*, which are largely the concern of the Communist Parties in various countries, vary with "the ebb and flow" of the developing situation in those countries. Any criticism of the contradictions of Communist activities therefore miss the point entirely; there is no variation in strategy, *which is centred in the General Staff (Politbureau) in Russia*, and which is consistently preparing for general revolution; but it is in the very nature of tactics to vary with the fluctuating fortunes of the struggle. For example, the recent Iron Workers' strike is said to have resulted in a defeat for the Communists. That is not so. The objective of the strike was to reduce the reserves of critical materials—iron and coal—in order to hasten on the "nation-wide crisis", and "weaken the Government"; and in that it succeeded. The tactics were designed to lead the workers in and out of the strike, covering both manoeuvres with suitable slogans and propaganda. From the *strategical* point of view it was essential that the

strike should "fail" at a point short of a full crisis. The strategical objective of all such tactics at present is to worsen the lot of the community, and increase the difficulties of the "petty-bourgeois" (compromising) Government.²⁹ The recent Coal Report is striking evidence of the strategical success of tactics as applied to the coal industry.

It must be admitted that the Marxist-Leninist theory appears to find practically complete confirmation in the state of the world. The end of the "Imperialist war" (into which Russia was, despite her detachment, drawn) finds the "Capitalist crisis" still more intensified, and "petty-bourgeois governments" still less able to cope with it. The changes "demanded" by the oppressed masses are quite clearly not alleviating their condition, and the various factions of "the ruling classes" (including Labour parties) are at loggerheads. A fresh outbreak of revolution is anticipated in Greece, and local tactics are being directed accordingly. France is highly unstable, and would detonate into revolution if fresh civil war could be promoted in Spain. The British Empire is distracted by "liberation movements in colonies and dependent countries" and by threats to Empire security as in Persia and Palestine.

There is, however, another side to the picture. The vital and fundamental premise of the Marxist-Leninist theory is *the automatic and inevitable nature of the "contradiction" in Capitalist economy*. The Capitalist does not oppress and exploit the Worker because he likes it, but because he cannot avoid it. He, like the Worker, is caught up in a System he cannot control. As Lenin emphasised, Revolution would be impossible unless a general crisis arose.

The central aspect of the Capitalist system is money. The Capitalist "produces for profit", and profit is taken in money. That is to say, the vital aspect of Capitalist economy is in its relation to the financial system and the financial system itself consists of certain "principles", or rules, or laws; for example, the principles of "sound finance". *Thus the Capitalist conducts his business and makes his profits according to the rules which govern the use of money.*

The Marxist-Leninist position therefore rests ultimately on the question of those rules. Are those rules, in the nature of things, genuine "laws" like the laws of physics; or are they conventions, man-made?

On the hypothesis that the rules are laws, and therefore unchangeable, it follows that the Capitalist is helpless, and faultless; the case for his liquidation hardly rests on a very satisfactory moral basis. But it also follows that no improvement is possible, even in Russia's case, unless the use of money is abolished; but Russia has not abolished money, and claims an improvement; in point of fact, Russia *has* modified the rules. In general, however, it is quite clear that the rules are modified constantly, not only by Russia, but everywhere. Whether or not a country is on the gold standard is a case in point—it is the result of a decision. But the "laws" of a strict gold standard are different from the "laws" of a dollar or sterling standard.

Thus the Marxist-Leninist strategy is applicable to a situation that has its origin in the results of the operation of rules of finance. Who is responsible for those rules?

Although there is some overlapping of personnel, especially in the case of Big Business and the cartels, through interlocking directorates, it is quite clear that the production

and the financial systems are separate entities. It is also clear that the financial system is far more highly centralised than is the production system. In practically every country there is now a Central Bank which has well-defined functions, including especially the regulation of the volume of money. But these Central Banks in turn come under a super-Central Bank, the Bank of International Settlements, though at the moment there is some indication that this Bank's function will be transferred to the World Bank working in co-operation with the International Fund. However that may be, it is the case that there is a *world centralised financial system*. In the case of industry—the production system—on the other hand, such world centralisation as there is relates only to specific industries, notably the chemical industry, while the greater part of industry is relatively independent, and unco-ordinated.

Now in the nature of things an unco-ordinated industry cannot impose a consistent policy on centralised world finance; but, by setting up and maintaining the rules of the system, finance can, and does, impose a policy on industry. Broadly, the rules are in the system of accounting, and in the necessity of making a financial profit, according to the accounting conventions.³⁰

Marxist-Leninist strategy is derived from and dependent on an intensifying crisis; and that crisis derives from the financial rules under which industry is conducted. If the crisis disappeared, Communism would retrogress, as is clear from the quotation from Lenin.

Now as long as finance and production are lumped together under the term "Capitalism", there appears to be no escape from the necessity for Communism. But finance and production are not identities; they are entirely separate systems. To fail to discriminate, of course, adds to the confusion, for what is required is not any re-organisation of industry, but an alteration in the financial rules which impose a policy on industry.

An alteration in these rules was proposed by the Government of Alberta, and *was opposed by financial interests*; not only opposed, but prevented.

Further than this, there is documentary evidence that International Financiers financed the Russian Revolution.

Surely, now, the nature of the situation is plain. The greatest power in the world is wielded by International Finance, which directs its policy to produce an intensifying crisis as a result of which World Revolution is promoted, the effect of which would be a world dictatorship through, in the first place, the agency of Russia. The purpose is to dispossess every *individual* of any form of property which could confer independence, and centralise all ownership in *institutions* themselves centralised under a World State.

Misunderstanding of this situation at this stage only accelerates our progress to disaster. It must be realised that every effort is made to maintain the fiction of class-war on the one hand, and the threat of Russia as a great *national* power on the other. As a result, perfectly well-meaning, sincere and able politicians constantly make the situation worse.

Russia is *not* a "Great Power" in the national sense; she does *not* want war or territorial aggrandisement in the ordinary sense. *Russia is a reservoir of strength and highly-trained personnel awaiting, expecting, and promoting*

revolution which she is prepared to back. Every intensification of the crisis brings the critical moment nearer; the greater the confusion, the easier her task. Therefore the apparent *threat* of war aids her, and the confusion as to her policy—*i.e.*, whether she just wants to secure her boundaries, or whether she is following Hitler's path of aggression—makes the situation more favourable for revolution.

—We can now put the whole jig-saw puzzle together. The responsible agents in the world are the men controlling the international financial system. Through financial power—the indebtedness of governments and institutions to them—they can either dictate or heavily influence policy. Their efforts are directed along two main lines: *the maintenance of such financial rules as must lead to a world crisis*, and the sponsoring of the Marxist-Leninist theory and its exponents to take advantage of the crisis to institute a World Police State. Financial power has enabled them to secure control of all the main channels of publicity, especially the international news-agencies through which a bias can be imparted to the presentation of world news so as to intensify the crisis. During the war, they secured the setting up of UNRRA whose purpose is to restrict the distribution of food, and lead to famine in Europe.³¹ Through such institutions as the London School of Economics and Political and Economic Planning, as well as the more frankly Socialist organisations, they have disseminated doctrines which have gradually resulted in the institution of a system of bureaucratic socialism in Great Britain which has strangled private initiative and paralysed recovery from the ravages of war, and transferred power from Parliament to a junta concealed behind the bureaucracy.

Europe has now been brought to near-detonation point. Its peoples are being driven to desperation by gross food-shortage, and lack of recovery from the desolation of war. Greece and France are in a highly unstable condition, and might be precipitated into revolution at any time. Whenever this happens, Russia is waiting to come to the assistance of the "victorious proletariat" and to set up the Federated States of Soviet Europe. In the commotion, the life-lines of the British Empire, already frayed, will be completely severed, leaving Great Britain easy prey for either "liquidation" as "reactionary petty-bourgeois" or its own revolution.

Once this strategic situation is grasped, it becomes clear that the well-meaning words of, say, Mr. Menzies are like petrol as a fire-extinguisher. It is also clear why Mr. Baruch, the international financier, gave Mr. Churchill the go-ahead signal, *providing Russia was misrepresented as a military menace.*

The situation is indeed formidable. Now, obviously a strategy opposed to a misconception can do nothing but worsen the situation. That is to say, as long as our policy is based on the assumption that Russia is a potential aggressor in the ordinary sense, every move is likely only to lead nearer to irrevocable disaster. And similarly, every attempted denunciation of, or opposition to, the tactics, as such, of the local Communists only furthers their strategy, because it helps to intensify the crisis. *The vital necessity is rapid amelioration of the crisis, combined with frank exposure of the real situation.*

We most earnestly appeal to those with the potential power to deal with the situation to examine what we say

impartially, and to realise that a great deal of what they believe and take for granted is the result of years of the most careful and subtle propaganda; that certain courses of action, unorthodox in appearance, are practicable and urgently necessary. We can assist them.

Social Crediters have the most urgent task of making plain this situation in the little time that remains. That task is easier now, because the facts so nearly speak for themselves. We have to *turn* the tide; once turned it will flow to its just destination—the combination of A and B for the elimination of C.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

All publications, save those marked with an asterisk, available through K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11 A book list is available free on request, and "The State of the World" will shortly be available in booklet form.

- 1 **Fabian Freeway** by Rose L. Martin; **The Web of Subversion** by James Burnham.
- 2 **Social Credit and Suez**. (*The Social Crediter*, July 1, 1967).
- 3 **Social Credit and Suez; No Co-existence; What We Face; Antecedents of Communism; Destalinisation; The Art of the Possible; Social Credit in 1962; Social Credit in 1967**.
- 4 **It's Very Simple** by Alan Stang.
- 5 **The Tragedy of France—American Opinion Reprint**.
- 6 **U.S. News & World Report**, July 4, 1967.*
- 7 Aid to 'under-developed' countries by 'capitalist' countries was and is a Communist device. See **None Dare Call It Treason** by John Stormer. According to an analysis of U.S. Department of Agriculture and Department of Commerce records by Dan P. Van Gorder: "We have provided statistics showing that our domestic supply of food is tragically short of providing national self-sustaining supplies in case of national or world crisis". See **Ill Fares the Land** by Dan P. Van Gorder.
- 8 The British got rid of the Socialist Government, and under Conservative governments the looked-for post-war recovery was permitted, although to nothing like the extent that occurred in the U.S.A. But with the Profumo scandal, it became evident that a determined attempt to discredit and disorganise the Conservative Party and leadership, and reinstate the Socialists, was being made. When the Wilson administration was securely in office, a 'balance of payments crisis' was discovered, and well-planned emergency economic measures were instituted which could only, and did, severely setback the country's economy, and already there are nearly half a million unemployed, and more anticipated. The virtual destruction of the British aircraft industry means that the independent defence of Britain is probably not now possible.
- 9 This is Keynesian economics, which, in addition to furthering socialist objectives, temporarily averted a complete break-down of the monetary system. Keynes was a leading Fabian Socialist. See **An Introduction to Social Credit**, by Bryan W. Monahan, and **Fabian Freeway**. However, Keynesian economics are now breaking down. "Balance of payments" problems are becoming universal.
- 10 The Selective Employment Tax is the contemporary form of direction of labour; it has, of course, other socialist purposes.
- 11 Spain will fall with Europe. The international campaign has largely been transferred to Portugal (because of her overseas territories) and Southern Africa, where defence against anything but an atomic threat remains possible. A military attack might have been mounted against the Republic of South Africa had Rhodesia succumbed; but a sea invasion, besides presenting formidable difficulties, would be too obvious and revealing of the Conspiracy's purposes.
- 12 And in the U.S.A. Also note the increase in crime, the demoralisation of youth, and racial tensions.
- 13 This projection is inaccurate. It has become apparent that the stage had to be set on a world-wide scale, in preparation for a universal economic and politico-military crisis.
- 14 It has become evident in retrospect and from various evidence that the Communists got the Nazis into power. What was required at that time was war, and Hitler was the man to make it; the moves to involve the U.S.A. and the USSR were made well in advance. The objective is to be seen in post-war developments—'decolonisation', the Cold War, the conquest of China, the seizure of the Middle East.
- 15 And now we have strategic missiles with atomic war-heads.
- 16 The Empire has been dismantled, the Navy severely reduced, the RAF made dependent on the U.S.A., bases abandoned or to be abandoned. And the U.S.A. under mounting atomic threat.
- 17 "Next" turned out to be the Cold War.
- 18 This objective has been achieved, and the larger strategy of the Conspiracy has emerged. See **The Truth in Time**, by Robert Welch; also **The Art of the Possible**, by B. W. Monahan.
- 19 It has become evident that the Chosen People myth has become somewhat diffused, and that many of the top Conspirators are Gentiles. It is also a question of who thinks he is using whom. See **Antecedents of Communism**. But see also **Judaism and the Vatican**, by Vicomte Léon de Poncins.
- 20 This, of course, was before the state of Israel was set up, and the Israeli army organised. Its role was first to provoke the nationalisation of the Suez canal, and then to dominate the strategic centre of the world—the Middle East. The Arabs, of course, are stooges. The Middle East 'crisis' stems from the Balfour Declaration. See **Social Credit and Suez**.
- 21 That policy was the preservation of the Anglo-Saxon peoples as a coherent and economically self-sufficient entity. Britain, Canada, Australia, Rhodesia and New Zealand could have formed such an entity, self-sufficient, but not necessarily exclusive. (See T.S.C., Aug. 12, 1967.) Its basis, of course, would have to be a reformed monetary system. In this connection it is vital to bear in mind that it is **not necessary to import money to buy your own goods**. See **An Introduction to Social Credit**; also **The Last Chance and Now or Never** (pamphlets). But it looks as if the possible has become impossible.
- 22 To this list should be added unrestricted immigration to Britain, with its potentially explosive possibilities.
- 23 See **The Whole of Their Lives** by Benjamin Gitlow, a former top-ranking and international Communist. He describes in considerable detail the intensive training of picked Party members, both secret and open, among other important revelations.
- 24 The solicitude of the USSR for the 'independent' nations is simply the tool for their destruction. We can be sure that the events in the Congo and elsewhere, even in Nigeria, did not take the USSR by surprise. It is the wealth of Africa the Conspiracy wants, not the natives. If the Conspiracy comes off, Africa will be re-colonised by more skilled and malleable slaves.
- 25 In the U.S.A., the negro population. See A. Stang, **op. cit.**
- 26 Note the merging of the negro 'protest' with the anti-Vietnam demonstrations. All of this is isolating the U.S.A., as well as giving the white population feelings of doubt and guilt. It is a very thorough softening-up operation, and ominous in the extreme. In events on this scale, timing is all-important, and this sort of history is not to be repeated. The Conspiracy is playing for keeps.
- 27 Prime Minister Wilson now speaks of Britain as a social democracy, which is a term out of the vocabulary of Marxism. Wilson is no doubt very high in the hierarchy of Fabianism, but he has the colouring of, but a different odour from, a Kerensky, and he is a good deal more malevolent. The point is that he is a step on the ladder of conspiracy and, when the "real" revolution occurs, expendable as an example of the futility of bourgeois social democracy. To real ruthless revolutionaries, his pretensions are ridiculous and his ambition dangerous. For an imaginative but essentially sound fictional treatment of the current situation in Britain, see **When the Kissing Had to Stop**, by Constantine Fitz Gibbon. Pen Books Ltd. London 1962*.
- 28 This paragraph should form the terms of reference for President Johnson's special advisory commission on civil disorders. Why are Lenin's words coming true in fact? Who is provoking a nation-wide crisis in the most prosperous nation on earth?
- 29 A further objective of strikes is experimental—to find out how much disruption can be caused when various segments of the community are put out of action.
- 30 **The Monopoly of Credit**: C. H. Douglas; B. W. Monahan, **op. cit.**
- 31 The disclosures of General Morgan made it clear that UNRRA was in fact a pipe-line for transferring Jews to Palestine—a process which in due course and through terrorism, led to the setting up of the 'independent' state of Israel. The string on which the beads of history between 1914 and 1967 are strung may well be designated "from Balfour to Suez".

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.
Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1
Telephone: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001
(Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

THE COMPENSATED PRICE

This enlarged edition of *The Social Crediter*, distributed at the usual price, is a particular application of the *principle* of the Compensated Price, one of the indispensable tools of realistic economics. The *cost* of this edition is of course increased, but to enable distribution without increase in *price*, the publishers are being compensated from a source of credit which does not enter into costs. Behind this credit lies the expectation that it will be replenished by donations to a good cause—wider distribution—and sales of the article *The State of the World* in booklet form.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

One of the more nauseating features of contemporary journalism is the way in which a select group of editorialists and commentators—represented in Britain, for example, by the group of papers whose views are put forward by the BBC Overseas Service under the title “What the British Weeklies Say”—make their living by trading in words and phrases, with varying degrees of verbal dexterity, snideness and cynicism, supplied by the propaganda department of the Conspiracy.

The Negro “problem” in the U.S.A. is almost universally discussed in terms of *ghetto, slums, rats, under-privilege, poverty, years of oppression, equal rights, lack of educational opportunity, deprivation, discrimination, segregation*. There are no doubt other terms, but any hack journalist who knows what is expected of him can make do with a selection of these.

Ghetto, specifically, is the Jews’ quarter in a town. In many cases Jews made their own ghettos, because, as an exclusive people with exclusive customs, they preferred their own company. In other cases Jews were either forced into a given area, or confined by law to the ghetto.

Whites as well as Negroes live in slums, which in essence are the outward manifestation of the disposition of the inhabitants; a man is not what he is because he lives in a slum; he remains in a slum because of what he is. And the rats swarm in because he throws his garbage out into the

street. If the people of a neighbourhood got together to organise their own garbage disposal, the rats would go.

When the Irish began emigrating to Boston, the conditions which met them were described by the Committee of Internal Health in 1849 as follows: “This whole district is a perfect hive of human beings, without comforts and mostly without common necessities; in many cases huddled together like brutes . . .” (Quoted by Ralph de Toledano, *R.F.K., The Man Who Would Be President*.) But de Toledano comments “. . . the Irish could piece together the remnants of their own culture and look ahead with hope to a day when life would give them more than their daily bread, their drink of whisky, and the blandishments of the corner saloon . . .

“The times were propitious. Industry, numbers, and a natural genius for politics were giving the Irish in Boston and New York the kind of power which in a few decades would place in their hands the control of the big-city machines and open the doors to advancement and eminence in every field of American life.” Thus the second generation Kennedy became a multi-millionaire, and the third—President of the U.S.A.

The Irish have done better than the Negroes, but the Negroes *who have wanted to have done very well indeed*. They have risen in business and the professions, and acquired good homes, cars, and the other modern amenities. According to George Schuyler, a Negro writer (*Human Events*, Aug. 12, 1967), there are at present 320,000 Negro students matriculating in the nation’s colleges and universities; and there are more than 2.5 million Negro-owned automotive vehicles.

It is difficult to believe that facts such as these are unknown to the select band of commentators and ‘reporters’ who are brain-washing the world into the belief that Negro riots are the outcome of white oppression. Some of the commentators no doubt are secret Marxists, working for world revolution and a New Order. But others simply know what is expected of them.

And now Dr. Martin Luther King, also a Marxist, is calling for a campaign of civil disobedience, which he considers will hurt the white power structure even more than do the riots. If this ‘non-violent’ campaign comes off, look out. There is an attempt being made to start civil war in the U.S.A. If it does not come off, it probably cannot be attempted a second time, because its raw material will have become disillusioned, and the truth behind the attempt is becoming more widely known even daily. We appear to have entered the ‘now or never’ stage of the Conspiracy, and the odds are not yet in our favour.

• • •

Probably relatively few people have ever seen a termite. But equally, most people who have been in the countryside have seen the amorphous mounds which are the evidence of termite activity.

Imagine a well-designed and constructed, and for good measure, even beautiful timber home. It is attacked by termites. Gradually it will crumble and disappear, to become another amorphous mound. But within that mound the highly complex social life of the termite goes on—a life of high organisation and full employment.

* G. P. PUTNAM & SONS, NEW YORK, 1967

This is, fairly exactly, what is happening to what we variously call Christian Western civilisation. Its structure is crumbling in the decay of religious, moral and ethical standards. In a world of ever-increasing plenty, the crime rate is increasing several times faster than the population rate; drug addiction is rampant and even finds its public defenders, as does sexual depravity; 'sex' is blatantly commercialised and degraded—look at almost any display of paper-backs; the clergy incite and participate in riots, and lend the support of their office to the propaganda aims of the Conspiracy.

Within this crumbling mound the termites—the Conspirators—are constructing the New Order of computerised technology, in which more and more people are becoming redundant and something less than people, but none-the-less enslaved. The literally terrifying state of contemporary society in the U.S.A. in particular is well described in the

first of Paul Goodman's Massey Lectures (Canada 1966) in which he shows modern technology as completely out of hand, and with the solutions for the problems raised as simply compounding the problems. For example, the small farmer has been driven off the land, but he cannot be absorbed into modern sophisticated technological employment. It would have been better and cheaper to have left him on the land, thus at least not further aggravating the already almost insuperable problems of over-urbanisation—air and water pollution, traffic congestion, slums, crime and violence.

As Lord Acton observed of the French Revolution, behind the tumult lies the design. Indeed, the current world revolution is the lineal descendant and culmination of the French Revolution, and at its core are the lineal descendants of earlier generations of Conspirators. Social Credit could have saved the world in 1918; but only stark recognition of the truth, and dealing with the Conspirators, can save it now.

"East Europe"

It's Really Central Europe, Of Course

By Medford Evans in the Scoreboard 1967 (July-August) edition of *American Opinion*

(Continued)

V

What is so serious about the foregoing odious fantasy of what one would do if one were—*etc.*—is that the imaginary agenda was not concocted simply out of a fevered imagination, but was based on certain things that the Bonn Government has already done. It was December 1, 1966 that Kurt Georg Kiesinger was elected Chancellor of West Germany. Such election is by the Parliament, and to achieve it one must be able to form a Cabinet that will have support of a Parliamentary majority. Kiesinger, a member of the Christian Democratic Party (C.D.U.) and once described as "just slightly old guard", formed a coalition with the Socialists (S.P.D.), whose Willy Brandt, former Mayor of West Berlin became Vice Chancellor and Foreign Minister (equals Secretary of State). Another Socialist given a key position was the "former" Communist Herbert Wehner, who was made Minister for All-German Affairs, in every sense an intriguing spot since it is concerned with the problems of reunifying partitioned Germany.

On December thirteenth, Chancellor Kiesinger made his first policy statement to his Parliament. One news analysis had spoken of "implications . . . with Socialist Willy Brandt now Vice Chancellor, that West Germany would take a more liberal attitude toward the East, would possibly consider economic aid to East Germany and even attempt a *détente* with the Soviet Union." (*The News That Made the Year 1966*, Random House, Page 281.) Kiesinger made the prediction look good. *Current Biography* (April 1967) reported his speech, in part: "He asked for closer relations and greater understanding between West Germany and Eastern European countries, notably Czechoslovakia and Poland. In dealing with the Soviet bloc nations, he avoided the cold war rhetoric of his predecessors . . . He also called for the encouragement of 'human, economic, and cultural relations' with the people of East Germany, but emphasized that such relations should not imply any political or legal recognition . . ." Yet he "implied a modification of the Hallstein Doctrine, under which West Germany since 1955

had refused to maintain formal relations with any nation (other than the Soviet Union) that recognised the Communist régime of East Germany"—and within six weeks, by the end of January 1967, the Hallstein Doctrine was in fact broken by conclusion of a trade agreement with the Soviet satellite Romania. By early spring of this year, Theo Sommer, Political Editor of *Die Zeit*, Hamburg, could write for the prestigious C.F.R. journal *Foreign Affairs* (April 1967): "Bonn has quietly dismantled the Hallstein Doctrine."

You understand that the Hallstein Doctrine was an expression of Bonn's former principle that the Soviet Zone was properly German land subject to the one legitimate German government, which was the one (temporarily) at Bonn, that the provinces beyond the Oder-Neisse line were basically in the same case, and that all these lands should be—once Soviet intransigence could be overcome—reunited under the Bonn Government, which would then "return" to Berlin. Now if the Hallstein Doctrine does not stand, then Bonn doesn't fully believe this any more. Sommer quotes Willy Brandt, who, he says, has announced a revised doctrine, based on three axioms:

1. *German unity remains our goal, but it is not a goal which we expect to attain in the short run or without contradictory developments.*

2. *Détente in Europe must embrace détente in Germany. We shall endeavour to exploit to the full all possibilities of intra-German contracts so that the two halves of our people do not grow even further apart from one another.*

3. *We are striving for a regulated coexistence (How do you like that? Maybe you'll like it better in German: geregeltes Nebeneinander. It's baloney in any language.) in Germany, such as might be useful to prepare for more comprehensive solutions.*

Sommer, of course, as any contributor to *Foreign Affairs* would, likes all that. "The new concept," he explains happily, "calls for cooperative partition instead of antagonistic par-

tion." If you just learn to cooperate with what the Communists have done instead of being antagonistic about it, you'll get along ever so much better! This "Kiesinger-Brandt line has not yet hardened into a detailed program of action. East Berlin (we called it Pankow above) in any case is in no mood to match Bonn's new-found realism. It has responded to Bonn's signals (what fascinating terminology, Herr Sommer!) with a campaign of hate that seems almost pathological (please don't throw us in the briarpatch!). But the cold warriors in East Berlin are bound to lose friends and influence even in their own camp, and then the moderates will have their say (moderate Communists!). Once that comes to pass, the road leading toward a *détente* between the two Germans will be open."

I have no interest in *ad hominem* comments on Herr Sommer, but that phrase "the two Germans" is a Communist phrase. The current Communist position is that there are two Germans. Until now it has been Bonn's position that there is, *de jure*, only one Germany. Bonn's new shift indicates that a fuller statement of the two positions would be: (1.) Communist position: there must be two Germans, if you won't give in, for we never will; (2) Bonn's position: there must be one Germany, and to get it, if you won't give in, then we will have to. That's how The Ratchet works. Of course when King Solomon was the judge in the case of the two mothers The Ratchet didn't work. With no available evidence as to whom the child in dispute between the women belonged, the King ordered the infant cut in two, and half given to each claimant. The false mother was willing to settle for this, but the other cried out: "O my lord, give her the child, and in no wise slay it." Then Solomon directed that this one be given the child: "She is the mother thereof." (I Kings 3: 16-28.)

Note well that if there had been no Solomon to judge between the two, the false mother would have got the child! Maybe Bonn has decided that there is no international Solomon these days.

So long as Pankow continues to say, *Better two Germanies than no Communist Germany*, while Bonn is tempted to say, *One Germany above all, whether Communist or not*, Germany is in danger of going Communist. Which may be the reason why "Liberals" pretend alarm over "Neo-Nazism". Confucius say: Make a noise on the Right, strike on the Left.

Look magazine for May 2, 1967 features an article which oddly combines waving the bloody swastika with certain probing admissions of what is actually going on in Germany. The author, Charles W. Thayer, obviously of "Liberal" disposition (well, of course he wouldn't be featured in *Look* if he were not), nevertheless qualifies as an authentic expert on Germany, Central Europe in general, and even Soviet Russia, having served as a foreign service officer and/or intelligence agent in Moscow, Hamburg, Berlin, Bonn, Munich, Yugoslavia, and Austria, among other places, at one time and another since 1933. He is also a writer of books, notably *The Unquiet Germans*. His article in *Look* is entitled, "The American Era Ends in Germany". Thayer I should say, is not a man to trust blindly, or blindly ignore either.

Skipping over the first half of the article, which seems to be devoted to the Neo-Nazi theme more to satisfy demands of *Look's* well-financed editors than from any deep apprehension of the author's, I think something can be learned from Thayer's comments on Kiesinger and Company, and on the German prospect which they represent. In

a paradoxical characterization, he makes Kiesinger sound like Eisenhower: "He dislikes reading long memoranda and making difficult decisions and is apt to lack force in a crisis. Thus far he has proven forceful and adept at harmonizing the divergent views of the two parties in his coalition." Like Eisenhower (my comparison, not Thayer's), Kiesinger projects an image of rather bland conservatism, but his Administration moves decisively toward radical accomplishments. Two of Kiesinger's top associates are open Socialists and pretty far Left by American standards.

"Willy Brandt," writes Thayer, "has a past that gives him trouble. A Socialist from youth, he took refuge in Norway when Hitler's Gestapo got on his trail. His critics . . . charge that he was a renegade. More just and courageous colleagues, including his rival (*sic!*) Kiesinger, reject the charge, saying that in the circumstances, they would have acted as Brandt did."

Of the next ranking Socialist leader in coalition with Kiesinger, Thayer reports: "Herbert Wehner, too, is a man with a past. An active Communist in the thirties, he became the youngest member of the German Communist Politburo, then in exile in Moscow. During the purges, threatened with liquidation by Stalin, Wehner fled to Sweden and renounced communism. After the war, he returned to Germany and promptly joined the Social Democratic (Socialist) party." Thayer, who knows Wehner quite well personally, calls him a "master political strategist",—a judgment which there seems no reason to question; but when he goes on to say that Herbert Wehner, "as an apostate Communist, is a fierce champion of the parliamentary system", the only possible answer is a shrug.

(To be continued)

Fabian Freeway

High Road to Socialism in the U.S.A.

by Rose L. Martin

Where does Fabian Socialism lead? This excellent and well documented book of 566 pages reveals the shocking answer. It has no place to go but to Communism—unless it is stopped.

57/6 posted

"Scoreboard 1967" (July-August) Edition of "American Opinion"

This "scoreboard" of Communist influence in all the countries of the world gives as percentages, not the popular support of Communism, but the degree of control over the political and economic life of each country exercised, secretly or openly, by the International Communist Conspiracy through all its instrumentalities.

8/3 posted

The Menace of Communism

A brochure containing a comprehensive list of books on the International Communist Conspiracy (with up-to-date list of addenda) indicates the answers to the questions, "Why does the West pursue in Africa the policies so vigorously advocated by the USSR and Communist China? Is it by accident, incompetence or design?"

Free on request.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

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