I DON'T know if there are any readers of these words who believe that if Adolf Schickelgruber, better known as Hitler (but perhaps more correctly described as Rothschild), had, in the inscrutable wisdom of Providence, been dropped from a second storey window at an early age, there would have been no World War. There may be. There are kindly people who believe that Henry the Eighth had six wives because he was just unlucky, and that Mr. Anthony Eden goes to Washington at critical periods because he belongs to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel amongst the Christians.

But to any such, I will render the only service to them in my power. I advise them not to read any further. For in this matter, to suppose that the cure for war is to make it impossible for anyone to wage war, is to concede victory to the organisers of the great wars of, at least, the past two hundred years. War is a terrible affliction—none of us at this time is likely to overlook that. But the danger which threatens us is that, in sheer horror of ever more devastating and, so far, completely inconclusive wars, we may surrender to a slavery so far-reaching and irrevocable that its contemplation is a glimpse of hell. Or, shall we say, we are faced with the permanent enthronement of Might divorced from Right, without Might risking even a kick on the shin.

That is, of course, the inescapable alternative so long as we are content to accept the present situation as a war between the Axis Powers and the so-called United Nations. No prize fight promoter was ever put out of business because the contestants were both battered into insensibility and remained permanent wrecks, more especially if he was in a position to arrange that likely bruisers should starve or fight. Anyone who cannot see that the depression of 1929-33 is of a piece with the re-armament of 1933-1939, or who will believe the nursery tales concerning the "Men of Munich" and their efforts to defeat the promoters, can only pray that they may be preserved from foolish speaking.

But there are encouraging signs that prize fights are not taken quite so much at their face value. Without pausing to recall the various reasons which were adduced for the comparatively localised wars of the nineteenth century, and previously, it may be noticed that our wars are, if bloodier and more devastating, proportionately more high-minded and mystical. It may be remembered that the earlier, or 1914-1918, phase of the present war was fought for the purpose of making the world safe for democracy. Democracy in the abstract having been so far removed from Democrats as to be virtually unassailable, and, like a certain well-known brand of whisky, still running and ten times the price, we are now lending to defend the right to be free, thus enthroning Freedom with Democracy, while bringing Magna Carta and Regulation 188 within the orbit of the Lease-Lend Agreement. Hypocrisy being the tribute which vice pays to virtue, we may at least hope that it shows some indication of becoming more expensive. And it will be noticed that the "B.B.C.'s strongly marked religious fervour (combined with State Socialism) has, with unerring instinct, realised that the primary British need to hear about the weather, which enabled a Hymn to be administered at 10-30 a.m. in "peace" time before the Weather Bulletin, has now been transferred to the curious craving for information as to the exact number of inhabited but unnamed localities freed by our Russian Allies. So we have our Hymn and Alleluia at 7.59—practically a certainty. You get your dose.

While there appears to be a widening comprehension that the actual labels of the contestants do not indicate the destination of the major stakes involved, it is nothing less than astounding to observe the inability (to give it the most charitable interpretation) of even the more favourably placed commentators to see the facts which are available to anyone. For instance, Mr. W. Herridge, for some time Canadian High Commissioner in Washington; is sure that we have to do thus and such, or the next war will be between Fascism and Communism. To assess the value of this prevalent idea, let us examine the origins of Fascism and Communism.

Most crooks in a big way are Saviours, although, through the ages, at long intervals, there have been Saviours who were not crooks. These latter can generally be identified by the fact that they are unpopular until a long time after their, in the main, violent death. But we are not now concerned with them.

Al Capone saved both the whisky business and the American sufferers from the local urge to mind other people's business and provided the excuse for setting up the American
Gestapo, Herr Schickelgruber-Hitler-Rothschild is saving Europe from Bolshevism and providing the opportunity for America to reconstruct Europe and Signor Mussolini has disposed of plenty amidst poverty. The list is in no way exhaustive.

The technique of this saviour business is simple and was well understood by Robin Hood, who took all you had, and gave you back your car fare. Modern Chancellors of the Exchequer, beginning with Mr. Lloyd George who took ninepence from us all and gave some of us fourpence back, subject to tax, regard it as the core of Finance. Generalised, the idea is to arrange an intolerable situation, and save you from it at the cost of accepting one barely tolerable. You are threatened with going all the way to Moscow, if you don't agree to go half way to Moscow. If you don't like Churchill, try Emmanuel Shinwell.

In considering the probable slogan for the next World War now so confidently predicted in well-informed quarters as a preliminary to giving up some more freedoms to avoid it, we shall, I think, be well advised to look at the well-tried principle just enunciated, and to consider whether any developments of the pre-1914 and pre-1939 periods are common to the "improvements" which have just been introduced into civilisation, and whether they appear to follow the standard technique. Such an enquiry will be found to provide somewhat remarkable information.

Now, once you have surrendered to materialism, it is quite true that economics precedes politics, and dominates it. It is not in Bolshevism, Fascism, the New Deal, and P.E.P. or the London School of Economics Fabian Society that we shall find the origins of what we are looking for. These are ostensibly political systems, and derive from, rather than give birth to economics. While this is obvious and axiomatic, it is not so obvious, although equally axiomatic that the principle works both ways. That is as much as to say, if you can control economics, you can keep the business of getting a living the dominant factor of life, and so keep your control of politics—just that long, and no longer.

Now let us look at the developments in economic control. Don't confuse this with technical progress, with which it has nothing whatever in common. Probably the most important aspect of this subject is one with which the general public is completely unfamiliar, although some of its component members might be interested to know that the curious, illogical, and immensely publicised attack on what is called "the profit motive" is designed to provide what Lord Stamp called suitable psychological preparation. To the small circle familiar with the subject, it is known by the innocent title of "management control."

It may perhaps be remembered by those who notice such things that one of the usual and effective replies to the complaint of oppression by large corporations, banks, railway and public utility companies, etc., is, that the average shareholding in them is of the order of a few hundred pounds. The personal control of the partner or majority stockholder has been replaced by the small shareholders. The argument is of course exactly the same as that which measures democracy by the percentage of the population having votes. That is easy to apprehend when your attention is drawn to it. What is not so easy, and requires a good deal of technical knowledge of a highly specialised kind, is to understand the vast and extensive, and very silent revolution which has been taking place in the legal power of the stockholder over an undertaking for which (on the idea of the reality of money) he provided the capital. Since most of this alienation is the work of German-American-Jewish lawyers, commonly called Corporation Counsel, it had, up to the outbreak of the present hostilities, developed further in Germany and America than in Great Britain. Possibly with the able assistance of Mr. Benjamin Cohen, Jr., of the U.S.A., who has been here for some time, there are signs that we are catching up, and the organisation of the Bank of "England" is clearly devoted to it.

However that may be, it is patent that the separation of ownership from control, which is a feature of stock dispersal and legal devices such as voting trusts (one of which has just been constituted by Sir Stafford Cripps, Minister of Aircraft Production, in respect of the arbitrary acquisition of Messrs. Short Bros.), proxies, and other devices, is being pursued systematically in regard to industrial property, just as it is, under the agitation for "nationalisation," in regard to land and credit.

It would take us much too far afield to pursue this aspect of the policy into its amazing ramifications. But two results are significant. The first is that the shareholder is no longer only of the stock-market, the market for what was originally his property is little more than the loose expectation that a group of men, who have nothing to expect from him and little to fear, will consider his interests, which they are continually told by the "B.C." and the Archbishops, are dubiously moral. Most shareholders would agree that they don't get much consideration and will get less. If his stock is not exchangeable for valuable considerations (and who controls the Stock-Market?) he is expropriated.

The second is that he can have no say in the use that is made of "his" property. It becomes, in theory, the tool of a neutral technocracy, but anyone of ordinary common sense knows that it obeys the policy of whoever appoints the management. Let us say, capturing export trade. It is the International Banks who appoint the management.

This systematic separation of control from ownership and responsibility began in Germany during the days of Ballin, Rathenau, Bleichroeder, Deutsch and others of the Jewish ring of bankers and industrialists who surrounded the Kaiser. It was transferred to the United States by the Warburgs, Schiffs and Strausses with such lawyers as Felix Frankfurter assisting. The core of the idea is power without responsibility. You cannot effectively punish a corporation or sue a Government Department.

It should be noted that this technique was highly developed many years before either Bolshevism, Fascism, the New Deal, or P.E.P. were heard of. Bearing this in mind, we are in a position to follow the technique into governmental systems, and to consider the activities of various contemporary (if temporary) celebrities.

The practical history of Bolshevism may be said to commence with the financing of Japan in the 1904-1905 War against Russia. The Japanese Minister of Finance Takahashi wrote a Memorandum to the Japanese Government, in which he said:—

"Mr. Schiff had a grudge against Russia on account of his race.... for this purpose it was deemed fit to admonish the ruling class by an object lesson. Mr. Schiff saw in the war the welcome opportunity to make effect his cherished idea." (Jacob Schiff, Life and Letters by Cyrus Adler.)

The immediate result was the issue of the Imperial
Japanese Government 6 per cent. Sterling (not dollar) Loan.

It might appear, at first sight, that this transaction was merely a routine example of financial practice, similar, for instance, to the assistance given to Hitler by the Bank of "England" under Mr. Montagu Norman, which was so helpful in enabling Germany to re-arm.

But I think that there are differences. It is true that Mr. Norman has expressed his contempt for the general population in no uncertain terms ("The dogs bark, but the caravan moves on"). On the other hand, he has also regretted that he is no economist, and does not know what to do (Montagu Norman: A Study in Financial Statesmanship, by Paul Einzig). So we must assume that he is only the broker's man. To know with certainty whether there really are differences between financing Hitler and financing Bolshevism, we should of course require to know who is the broker. But to revert to Mr. Schiff.

It should be realised that the effect of his initiative on this occasion was to set the British to work (it was a Sterling Loan) to build up the Japanese Navy, because Mr. Schiff, like all his co-racists, dislikes culture, and prefers Kultur. The object is clearly stated—an American, or German (without reference to dates, it is difficult to say) Jew, he "deemed fit" to put the British to war against "the ruling classes of Russia" as "an object lesson."

At the same time: "The subsidies granted to the Nihilists at this period by Jacob Schiff were no longer acts of isolated generosity. A veritable Russian Terrorist organisation had been set up in the U.S.A. at his expense. It covered Russia with its emissaries, charged to assassinate Ministers, governors, heads of police etc. . . . and to create insurrection . . . . the cost was estimated at more than fourteen million [gold] roubles" (Figaro, Paris, February 20, 1932). Of course it all came back ten times over in profits from the "re-construction" of Russia. To quote the banker's hymn: "Whatever, Lord, we lend to Thee, repaid a thousandfold shall be."

Now, before briefly considering the consequences of this operation, I think it is important to be quite clear that the merits or otherwise of the Russian Imperial Government, from the point of view of the Russians, are not in question. The only point on which we can be certain is that no Russians have been injured in general intercourse outside Russia since it disappeared. Whatever the results, and we are beginning to experience them now, the "ruling classes" were to be taught a lesson because they were not willing to take orders from a German Jew resident in America. That the results to the Russians were of no consequence, is demonstrated by the fact that many millions of Russians, not of "the ruling classes" perished, and millions more were reduced to poverty and exile, by the Bolshevik Revolution. But no Jews. Soviet Russia is "presented" to Europe and America and represented by two Jews, Maisky and Litvinov, who are as typically Russian as a Sasson is typically English.

Of course the consequences were much wider. In the article in the Ottawa Citizen, by Mr. Herridge, to which reference has already been made—an article which reads like the rechaufee of a conversation with an exponent of international Freemasonry—amidst a welter of what, without wishing to be offensive, I can only describe as dangerous nonsense, he remarks, "Germany attacked; a fact of only tactical significance. For if Germany had not attacked, Russia would have." In that I am sure he is right, and that the social and economic structure both of Russia and Germany make war certain. It is not too much to say that the consequences of the activities of Mr. Schiff, his firm, and his associates were:

1. The inauguration of an Asiatic war complex, accompanied by a delusion that the day of the white man was over, not merely in Asia, but everywhere. "Pearl Harbour" was conceived in New York. Trouble in India dates from the beginning of this century, and was hardly existent before. Yet political reform in India has been rapid and continuous.

2. The World War had as its fundamental idea "Drang nach Osten." A weakened Russia, like all these World Revolution movements, played straight into the hands of Germany—the Germany of Frederick the "great," who is now being idealised by Goebbels.

3. The transfer of the subversive activities of international finance to France and England. The technique of flooding the country with refugees, many of them propagandists, is a repetition of the period following the French Revolution. How is it that no Socialist Party has ever attacked Finance? How is it that the programme of the Commonwealth Party (notice the Cromwellian touch) reads like a banker's dream?

Russia is a country of nearly 200,000,000 people with vast resources. The individual Russian has always been a brave and fatalistic soldier. For twenty years, the Soviet Government has been preparing for war. Where is all this propaganda coming from, which in quarters accustomed to denounce war as a capitalist trick, heralds as an immense military achievement derived from the Soviet system, the very desirable, but surely not very remarkable fact that 200,000,000 of people, fighting on their own soil, on short lines of communication, have held up (if they have held them up), one enemy fighting on lengthening lines of communication while an allegedly inefficient country of 45,000,000 held up three empires, and assisted the Russians? Who in their senses could argue that the most backward and illiterate country in Europe is the pattern for the rest? To anyone who will consider the evidence, I cannot see any conclusion from it but one—that the totalitarian state in all its forms is a gigantic plot against civilisation, and that only political adolescents could fail to see that it proceeds from an international source, using international bribery for the benefit of an international caste to whom all cultures and races, but one, are foreign.

The object of the various New Orders is simplicity itself—it is to prevent the rectification of the defects in the organic growth of civilisation, almost all of which proceed from the Finance which the New Order mongers never attack. . . . .

. . . . .

One of the ideas essential to any understanding of genuine political activity can perhaps be most easily expressed in the language of gambling. To the roulette player, Rouge et Noir is a game of chance. To the keeper of the Bank, it is a certainty.

To the Stock Exchange gambler, gain or loss on a stock movement depends on whether he is a bull or a bear. To the Stock-Broker, all that matters is that enough people shall buy and sell stocks. In this case, his percentage is a certainty. To the racegoer who backs the favourite, the victory of an outsider means loss; to the bookmaker it merely means a larger gain than if the favourite won.
I do not think that the importance of understanding this principle can be over-rated, because the manipulation and perversion of the gambling spirit is of the very essence of International policy. The fundamental idea is always to play a long-term certainty against a short-term possibility so that a win for the genuine gambler is at best or worst only a postponement of the inevitable final loss. It is called insurance.

I can imagine that someone who has not devoted much attention to the subject may observe that anyone who gambles deserves to lose. That is the Whig idea, propagated to justify the fact that Whigs only invest in a certainty. But, in fact, gambling is a special form of the adventurous spirit from which all progress is born, whereas insurance is a financial fallacy; and no greater disaster can overtake a community than to lose the spirit of adventure. That is why a mass of Law which smothers initiative and substitutes a financial fallacy for the dividends of an adventurous adventure is a creeping death.

Now, World War, Parts I and II, like all previous wars, is a gamble between A and B for the certain advantage of C. It is essential that the Programme of Part III shall be the combination of A and B, for the elimination of C. Since the position of C rests on an abstract fallacy his effective elimination is in sight.

The derivation of Bolshevism, as we have seen, covers a fairly lengthy period. Fascism, by which name it appears to be fashionable to designate anything which isn't labelled Bolshevism, is as a title contemporaneous with the rise of Mussolini. It is quite easy to show, however, not merely that its origin is identical with Bolshevism, but that it is merely Bolshevism wintering in the Mediterranean. Its aims are similar, and its technique, like that of German National Socialism, or P.E.P., is localised centralisation in order to transfer power to International Centralisation—as you might say, "C." It is the second episode, in point of time, in the advent of gangster Government. . . .

The “Heartland”

Following is an extract from The State of the World which was first published in The Australian Social Crediter in March and April, 1946. It was reprinted in The Social Crediter with an Introduction in 1967 followed by publication in booklet form: (Booklet price 55p posted)

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 network 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 strategic 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 land."

"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.

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.

Orders for books and booklets to Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 6TD.
In March, 1979, K.R.P. Publications Limited publishers of The Social Crediter, received notice that Miss Jane Catmur's tenancy of the premises at 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.U, would be coming to an end. Miss Catmur had been appointed in 1964 to manage the business affairs of the company, and from 1966 the company had been using accommodation in her business premises. Consequently it became necessary for the company to make arrangements for moving.

In The Social Crediter November-December, 1979, we announced our change of address to 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, in order to give plenty of warning to our subscribers and customers, although the actual removal took place in March, 1980.

Some major reorganisation was necessary because of the move from London and also in anticipation of the marriage between Miss Jane Catmur and Mr. Donald Martin, National Director of the British League of Rights, which took place in April, 1980.

Agency Agreement

After careful consideration the directors of K.R.P. Publications Limited, who wished Miss Catmur to continue as company secretary and to manage the company's affairs after her marriage, made the following arrangements.

An agency agreement was made with Bloomfield Books, owned by the British League of Rights and managed by Mr. Donald Martin at 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, whereby Bloomfield Books purchased the stocks of books of, and now act as the agent for K.R.P. Publications Limited in respect of book sales only. Consequently all book orders should be addressed to Bloomfield Books now.

Independent Identity

K.R.P. Publications Limited retains its completely independent identity, continuing to publish and distribute The Social Crediter, while making use of office facilities provided at 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk. Orders for subscriptions, back numbers of The Social Crediter and any other correspondence should be addressed to K.R.P. Publications Limited (Manager: Jane Martin, i.e. Mrs. D. A. Martin).

Editorial matter for The Social Crediter continues to be handled by the Deputy Chairman, British Isles, of the Social Credit Secretariat, Dr. Basil L. Steele at Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX. All correspondence for the Social Credit Secretariat in the United Kingdom should continue to be addressed to him also.

As part of the agreement with Bloomfield Books and as a service to our readers, K.R.P. Publications Limited has made arrangements for them to carry books recommended in The Social Crediter, and will distribute from time to time with The Social Crediter booklists from Bloomfield Books.

Australia

In the Australian edition of The Social Crediter May-June, 1979, a notice concerning Australian and New Zealand book sales appeared stating:

Tidal Publications wish to announce that, because of the restricted limits of their outlets, their lack of effective means of advertising, and the ever increasing need for the dissemination of the information and knowledge lying dormant in the considerable stocks of their publications, arrangements have been made for the transfer of the bulk of their book stocks and book sales to The Heritage Book Service, Third Floor, Presgrave Building, 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, Victoria 3000. (Book orders in Australia and New Zealand were then directed to various branches of The Heritage Book Service in both countries.)

These various arrangements will, we feel sure, result in a wider readership of our contributions towards clarification of international politico-economic developments, whilst at the same time making available the wider lists of books available from Bloomfield Books and The Heritage Book Service.

Jane Martin, Secretary,

It is highly recommended that our earlier publications, some of which are listed below, and not forgetting back numbers of The Social Crediter, should be re-read in the light of current events.

Alternative to Disaster  Antecedents of Communism  (50p)  (45p)
Destalinisation  Antecedents of No Coexistence  (25p)  (30p)
What We Face  Antecedents of The State of the World  (25p)  (30p)
The Art of the Possible  Antecedents of Zimunism  (35p)  (65p)
Development of World Dominion by C. H. Douglas  (P.B. £1.15, H.B. £2.25)
The Moving Storm by Bryan W. Monahan  (P.B. £1.15, H.B. £2.25)
The Survival of Britain by Bryan W. Monahan  (£1.80)
Theory of Subversive Action by R. Cosyns-Verhaegen  (65p)

BOOKS and booklets from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England COlO 6TD.

BACK NUMBERS of The Social Crediter (40p each; 10 or more 30p each) from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England COlO 6TD.