

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49 No. 17.

SATURDAY, 15 NOVEMBER, 1969

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Review of the Crisis

(Originally published in *The Australian Social Crediter* in 1947)

(Continued)

(9)

The 'dollar crisis' is the intersection of dollar diplomacy and Fabian strategy; but there are some curious features.

To begin with, there is considerable mystery as to where the dollars have gone. American official circles are reported to be sceptical as to whether Great Britain is really so short of foreign exchange as her spokesmen make out. On the other hand, there is plenty of evidence that dollars have been squandered. The Government said that the loan was to be used to convert British industry from war to peace economy; in fact, it was used on current consumption, and at a rate much greater than was estimated (publicly) even allowing for the increase in U.S.A. prices. Again, it has been reported that the date at which 'convertibility' was to become effective was insisted on by the *British* officials. In short, there is plenty to suggest that a 'dollar crisis' was an integral part of Fabian strategy.

As regards dollar diplomacy, it must be remembered that the U.S.A. is for the present the headquarters of international finance—i.e., of international financiers, who have made dollars, rather than gold, the medium of international exchange. In these circumstances, a dollar 'shortage' is the equivalent of a restriction of credit, and the mechanism of a 1947 edition of the 1929 'world depression'.

Now we know (see especially C. H. Douglas: *The Big Idea* and *The Brief for the Prosecution*) that the 1929 'depression' was deliberately brought about for the purpose of introducing what was then called 'rationalisation of industry' in Great Britain, and the 'New Deal' in America. Both designations were synonyms for what is now called Planning; and the correct designation of Planning is *Monopoly*.

The construction of national *monopolies* is the policy pursued by the Communists, the Fabians, the Bank of 'England', the Nazis, and the New Dealers. To say that the financiers who financed all these developments don't know it is to strain credulity altogether too much.

(10)

On August 10, 1906, there was deposited in the British Museum a copy of a book by Sergyei Nilus which embodied a document known as the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. This document has been published separately in several editions, and is fairly readily available today. Every effort has been made to dispute its authenticity, and its actual

origin has never been established. But what is quite undeniable is that it explains a political strategy in remarkable detail, and accurately anticipates the developments of that strategy in the events of the present day. That is to say, the *Protocols* bear the same sort of relation to world events as did *Mein Kampf* to German developments, or *The Problems of Leninism* to Russian developments. Incidentally, it has been said that Hitler was not the author of *Mein Kampf*; if that is true, it is quite irrelevant to the consideration of whether the programme of the book was related to the development of German strategy. *Mein Kampf* was *authentic*; and so are the *Protocols*.

The *Protocols* describe a political strategy designed to achieve world dominion for its authors:

"Before us is a plan in which is laid down strategically the line from which we cannot deviate without running the risk of seeing the labour of many centuries brought to nought.

"In order to elaborate satisfactory forms of action it is necessary to have regard to the rascality, the slackness, the instability of the mob, its lack of capacity to understand and respect the conditions of its own life, or its own welfare [cf. Hitler]. It must be understood that the might of a mob is blind, senseless and unreasoning force ever at the mercy of a suggestion from any side. The blind cannot lead the blind without bringing them into the abyss; consequently, members of the mob, upstarts from the people [i.e., the majority of 'Labour' and other *political* leaders] even though they should be as a genius for wisdom, yet having no understanding of the political†, cannot come forward as leaders of the mob without bringing the whole nation to ruin." (*Protocols*, I, 17 & 18.)

The contemporary outcome of this doctrine is the emphasis on the unfettered right of the majority to destroy minorities, regardless of the fact that the majority consists of minorities. This majority is nothing but a mob, organised by propaganda, and at the mercy of "suggestions" not so much from "any side" as from the controllers of the main channels of propaganda—the Press and the radio.

(continued on page 3)

†The word "political" is not defined in the text of the *Protocols*. It is used as a substantive, and evidently includes the meaning of *policy* and of the organisation concerned with that policy. It is, of course, true that a genuine understanding of *policy*, and of the devotion of an organisation to the pursuit of that policy, is rare. The Socialists in particular are obsessed with administration which they largely confuse with policy.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY

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 45/-; Six months 22/6. Three months 11/6.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11. Tel: 01-534 7395
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1. Tel: 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 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles, Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. 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. 2001.

Vol. 49 No. 17

Saturday, 15 November, 1969

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Under carefully controlled conditions, even outright Communist countries hold elections, for elections give a spurious mandate for any atrocity—not necessarily physical—the Government intends to commit. Britain is not yet an outright Communist country, and its Government is only crypto-Communist. But perhaps the major tenet of Socialism is that Socialism is irreversible; and if an election is held in Britain with any possibility that the Conservatives might win, it will be in the belief that they either will not, or cannot, reverse the “giant strides” towards permanent Socialism that have already been achieved. The recent Conservative Party conference must have gone a long way to promote such a belief. But there are other possibilities.

Constantine Fitzgibbon in an article entitled “Britain: A Fascist State?” published in the *Daily Telegraph Magazine*, Oct. 10, 1969 remarks: “It would not be beyond the ingenuity of the present government’s ideologue lawyers to prolong this parliament, and therefore this despised government, almost indefinitely while continuing, and as they hope perfecting, their levelling process. . . . When the economic crash comes it is not inconceivable that they may use this catastrophe, of their own and their predecessors’ creation, as a pretext to destroy what still remains of the democratic system in Britain. It is conceivable that they might even use the catastrophic situation which they have allowed to develop in Ulster for the same purpose”.

Mr. Fitzgibbon seems clearly to realise, as most commentators seem not to, that Fascism, Nazism, and Socialism are all the same thing; and that “Butskellism”, the continuing policy of the Conservative Party, is part of the same consensus.

“And even if the present bunch carry out their constitutional duty and surrender by holding a general election, and the present Conservative Front Bench becomes box instead of cox, and pursues almost identical policies, and the decline continues until the crash comes, then what?”

Until the crash comes . . . as come it must. The higher strategy, to which Mr. Wilson may be privy, but subordinate, and Mr. Heath probably not privy, but equally subordinate so long as he pursues “almost identical policies”, is predicated

on a crash. A world growing richer in real capacity to produce wealth but which sees no future but in ever-expanding exports and austerity at home; a world where bumper crops frequently amount to an agricultural catastrophe for the growers; a world of forced employment in an increasingly automated industrial system; a world of non-productive bureaucrats expensively remunerated to interfere with production; a world where politicians maintain their power by exploiting greed and envy; a world where commentators see nothing but incompetence and stupidity when the set-up reeks of conspiracy and treason—all this is a prelude to a planned financial disaster. And then the real masters will take over.

Speaking at a Press luncheon in Canberra on Oct. 17, 1969, the Australian Prime Minister, Mr. John Gorton said: “Resources can only be taken from the tax-payers’ pockets”. As he probably does not understand what he said, we shall classify this remark as gibberish. It is *money* the government takes from tax-payers’ pockets, and the more money the government takes, the greater the government’s control over the *use made* of the *country’s* resources, with a corresponding diminution in control by consumers—i.e., citizens as individuals. Mr. Gorton also referred, approvingly, to “economic management”; but this time he probably did understand what he said—that the government should tell the citizens what they should do which, of course, is Basic Socialism, reducing the election issue (if there is one) to a question of competence.

In the early days of the Socialist advance, there was genuine opposition to increasing governmental power; but as such power was acquired, the fruits of office became more tempting than the restoration of freedom, which is being steadily strangled in the interest of greater and more “competent” management. Unless the electorate learns to write the agenda, it is doomed.

Into the Ditch

The Rev. Colin Morris, Minister of Wesley’s Chapel in City Road, London has a headline in *The Observer* (Sept. 21, 1969) which announces, “Church Leader Backs Freedom Fighters”. His book, soon to be published, “takes the form of a reply to a request for pastoral advice from a Rhodesian African nationalist, who is also a Christian, as to whether he is right to take up arms with the Freedom Fighters. Mr. Morris says unequivocally that a Christian is justified in using violence to win freedom in Rhodesia”. Yet Mr. Morris allows that the overthrow of Ian Smith is “near hopeless” and he must know that in practice a terrorist will burn the native huts and kill the natives’ animals and probably the natives as well.

But he covers this encouragement of lawless barbarity with a transparent veil of theology, saying that he could “wish for a theology of violence from the pen of a great theologian who dared to strike . . .”. I do not know whether this church leader has any connection with Martin Luther King, who did not advocate violence, but the ditch into which he would lead people is not unfamiliar in the streets of Belfast and Londonderry, Detroit and Chicago.

Another headline, in *The Times*, Sept. 22, 1969, “Permissive Society a Step Towards Maturity, Bishop Says”,

draws attention to some of the thoughts of Dr. Robinson, soon to be Dean of Trinity College, Cambridge, one of which is that there is "still a lot of freedom to be won for minorities, racial and sexual, in the permissive society". This religious leader guides to the type of ditch exemplified by No. 144 Picadilly, the interior of which *The People* described graphically enough. There can be little in common with maturity in attitudes that dodge all responsibility. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in the same newspaper, contents himself with saying that the church "should show more concern for God and the community", a somewhat meaningless set of words these days.

In fact (*Church Times*, Sept. 19, 1969) the Bishop of Coventry uses much the same phrase when he says that the church "seems to have been far more concerned about personal behaviour than about social behaviour", while the area of "the church's concern seemed so often tragically limited". He forgets perhaps that many churchmen have become sickened with the "concerns" of the World and British Councils of Churches, and that attention to local needs may help preserve what remains of a Christian community, and be far from "trivial". The bishop, however, rushes on at this "most thrilling moment in history when science is pushing out the barriers of knowledge, when technology is hurling us into a new world of thrilling interest and adventure". And finally he savages his "sheep" with the gibe that clergy and services look like a television newsman "dressed in seventeenth century garments". Some people, of course, especially readers of Aubrey's *Brief Lives* and its Introduction, might take this as a compliment.

The Bishop of Cariboo, until recently Executive Officer of the Anglican Communion, would appear to need some guidance himself: "I don't know," he says, "whether I ought to go on receiving a stipend from the Church". But he too turns on his diocese, saying, "We are leading a criminal life adopting the standard of living that we do". But the bishop must have heard something of the Social Credit thesis that the poor are *not* poor because the rich are rich, that all are being robbed by fraudulence, and that subversion is deliberately weakening the West.

These blind guides might, if they had eyes to see, profit from the words of the Ven. A. R. Lewis, also in the *Church Times* of the same date: "Rhodesia's battle today—faltering though it be—is not for White supremacy but for those standards of Christian civilisation which Europe brought to Africa and is now abandoning".

—H.S.

THE MOVING STORM

Contemporaneous commentaries on linked events of 1964-1968, with an Introduction on historical significance

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

A selection of notes from *The Social Crediter* with an Introduction and an Index.

Paper cover 13/- posted. Hard cover 26/- posted.

Supplies of the Hard cover edition are expected from Australia. Advance orders will be accepted.

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

Review of the Crisis (continued from page 1)

"The abstraction of freedom has enabled us to persuade the mob in all countries that their government is nothing but the steward of the people who are the owners of the country, and that the steward may be replaced like a worn-out glove.

"It is this possibility of replacing the representatives of the people which has placed them at our disposal, and, as it were, given us the power of appointment." (I. 28, 29.)

"The administrators, whom we shall choose from the public, . . . will not be persons trained in the arts of government, and will therefore easily become pawns in our game in the hands of men of learning and genius, who will be their advisers . . . The intellectuals of the *goyim* will puff themselves up with their knowledges and without any logical verification of them will put into effect all the information available from science, which our *agentur* specialists have cunningly pieced together for the purpose of educating their minds in the direction we want." (II. 2.)

Elsewhere it is made clear that "the information available from science" comprises those 'progressive' doctrines which are the stock in trade of the 'progressive' Socialists, and of the 'experts' from, for example, the London School of Economics who advise the administrators (i.e., the politicians) drawn "from among the public". The London School of Economics is an outstanding example; it was endowed by Sir Ernest Cassel, and its trainees are in fact preponderant in the Civil Service. The politicians, on the other hand, are in the main labour agitators, miners, engine-drivers, errand boys, etc., etc.—"pawns in the hands of men of learning". Every observer of Parliament knows the extent to which Ministers are dependent on their advisers for the answers to even simple questions. The policy of which they are the temporary administrators is far too complex to be mastered except by many years of hard study; but they are obliged from the very beginning of their term of office to be consistent in their presentation of that policy, to the administration of which they succeeded.

"In the hands of the States of today there is a great force that creates the movement of thought in the people, and that is the Press. The part played by the Press is to keep pointing out requirements supposed to be indispensable, to give voice to the complaints of the people, to express and to create discontent. . . . Through the Press we have gained the power to influence while remaining ourselves in the shade . . ." (II, 5.) The part played by the Press in the dramatisation of the 'dollar crisis' and the "indispensable requirements" to which it allegedly gives rise is too obvious to require further emphasis. But the chief requirement is that "we must work harder". 'Full Employment' plus!

". . . All these so-called 'People's Rights' can exist only in idea, an idea which can never be realised in practical life. What is it to the proletariat labourer, bowed double over his heavy toil, crushed by his lot in life, if talkers get the right to babble, if journalists get the right to scribble any nonsense side by side with good stuff, once the proletariat has no other profit out of the constitution save only those pitiful crumbs we fling them from our table in return for their voting in favour of what we dictate, in favour of

the men we place in power, the servants of our *agentur*? Republican rights for a poor man are no more than a bitter piece of irony, for the necessity he is under of toiling almost all day [Full Employment] gives him no present use of them, but on the other hand robs him of all guarantee of regular and certain earnings by making him dependent on strikes by his comrades or lockouts by his masters.

"We appear on the scene as alleged saviours of the worker from this oppression when we propose to him to enter the ranks of our fighting forces—Socialists, Communists, Anarchists . . .

"By want and the envy and hatred which it engenders we shall move the mobs and with their hands we shall wipe out all those who hinder us on our way." (III. 5, 7, 8.) The "normal revolutionary situation".

"This hatred will be further magnified by the effect of an economic crisis, which will stop dealings on the exchanges and bring industry to a standstill. We shall create . . . a universal economic crisis . . ." (III. 11.)

"At the present time we are, as an international force, invincible, because if attacked by some we are supported by other States . . ."

"In order to give the *goyim* no time to think and take note, their minds must be diverted towards industry and trade. Thus, all nations will be swallowed up in the pursuit of gain and in the race for it will not take note of their common foe. But again, in order that freedom may once for all disintegrate and ruin the communities of the *goyim*, we must put industry on a speculative basis: the result of this will be that what is withdrawn from the land by industry will slip through the hands and pass into speculation, that is, to our classes." (IV. 4.)

". . . We shall create an intensified centralisation of government in order to grip in our hands all the forces of the community . . ." (V. 1.)

As for the Dollar loan: ". . . by our intrigues we shall tangle up all the threads which we have stretched into the cabinets of all States by means of the political, by economic treaties, or loan obligations. In order to succeed in this we must use great cunning and penetration during negotiations and agreements, but, as regards what is called the 'official language', we shall keep to the opposite tactics and assume the mask of honesty and compliancy. . ."

(11)

The essential strategy of world dominion revealed in the *Protocols* may be summarised quite briefly, for it is essentially simple, and depends far more for its success on unswerving resolution and a complete disregard for human misery than on any remarkable ingenuity. The central strategy was to gain the monopoly of credit; the *Protocols* refer to gold, which has been, if it is not still, the basis of financial credit. Then this money power is used to appeal to the worst side of human nature; to achieve a sufficiently comprehensive control of the great media of propaganda; to systematically and over a long period inculcate deliberately false doctrines; and to exploit the inevitable consequences of putting false doctrines into practice. This exploitation takes the form of centralisation of every form of control—i.e., the creation of greater and greater monopoly, culminating in

police States; and the final step, yet to be consummated, is to superimpose on these a world monopoly, or World State, with those at present in control of finance in control of that State, quite automatically by virtue of "economic treaties and loan obligations".

(12)

The threads are being tangled with a vengeance, and it is easy to observe that it is being done, not so much *by*, as *from* America. Great Britain has been brought very close to a point where her continued existence will entail the final surrender of her sovereignty, not voluntarily, but because she has no option other than disintegration. And it is easy to recognise in the personnel of the Socialist Government dupes "puffed up with their knowledges", bribed and corrupted with delegated power, and pursuing their "insatiable material needs". Some consciously, some unconsciously—all are Fifth Columnists in fact.

They have been cunningly entangled in all sorts of international agreements with International Authorities, such as the Emergency Food Board and the Bretton Woods Agreement, surrendering to the former their rights over their very food supplies and to the latter control over their own credit. Part of the agreement with the International Emergency Food Board required member Governments to *place themselves in a position to carry out its recommendations*—a pretty example of "great cunning and penetration during negotiations", for it employed the age-old temptation, the temptation of power-over-others. The Government thought it could use the agreement to strengthen its position as a Government; as a justification for an advance towards dictatorship in accordance with Fabian theory; but the real sponsors used the agreement to corner the world's food supplies in order to use them as an economic sanction against any recalcitrant States.

This is the general picture throughout. The Fabians have been out-manoeuvred; they thought they could use International Agreements as means to their own ends; and in fact the true Internationalists have used them as a means to the end of the Fabians. As anyone can see for himself, the Fabians will take ('American') orders, or else . . .

(To be continued)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD DOMINION

By C. H. DOUGLAS

The post-war years in Great Britain under the Attlee Socialist Administration were critical, for in those few years Britain, victorious in war, lost the peace. Throughout that period the late C. H. Douglas wrote a series of penetrating commentaries dealing with the politics, economics and conflicting philosophies of the times. He warned the British of the fate being prepared for them—the fate which has now befallen them. Once-Great Britain is now derisively referred to as the Sick Man of Europe. This did not "just happen", nor was it, as it appeared to be, mere incompetence. It was the maturation of long-prepared conspiracy, preparing the ground for the *coup de grace* under the Wilson Administration. The selection of commentaries comprising this very important book make it unique among Douglas's works, and highly relevant to the current situation.

Paper cover 13/- posted. — Hard cover 26/- posted.
Supplies of the Hard cover edition are expected from Australia. Advance orders will be accepted.

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

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