

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 62 No. 6

NOVEMBER - DECEMBER, 1983

The Big Idea

By C. H. DOUGLAS

THIS TREATISE, HERE CONTINUED, WHICH FIRST APPEARED SERIALLY IN THESE PAGES BETWEEN JANUARY AND MAY, 1942, AND LATER IN BOOKLET FORM, WILL NOT BE FAMILIAR TO MANY OF OUR PRESENT READERS. FOR OTHERS A RE-READING SHOULD PROVE ENLIGHTENING.

XII

The details of the Marconi Scandal are available to anyone interested in them. They were fully reported in the newspapers of 1912 and are in the files of the British Museum or elsewhere.

The only matters which are important in connection with it are (1) The comparative rarity of this type of politico-financial scandal in the United Kingdom. (2) The part played by the Isaacs family. (3) The prominence of the Cabinet Ministers and other public men alleged to be beneficiaries, and their immunity.

It is, of course, well known that every effort is made to prevent the rise to political power of individuals who cannot be blackmailed in some form or other. On the Continent, and more particularly in France, financial corruption became so universal that only something especially flagrant, such as the Stavisky affair, would attract much attention. In England, it is probable that until the opening of the twentieth century, which saw a marked lowering of the standards of political life, together with a transformation of business ethics, financial corruption had in its grosser forms been almost unknown in political life for fifty years.

The Managing Director of the Marconi International interests was Mr. Godfrey Isaacs, brother of Mr. Rufus Isaacs, K.C., afterwards Lord Chief Justice of England and Viceroy of India: first Marquis of Reading.

In 1917, as the result of the collapse of Russia from causes which have been indicated elsewhere, Germany was in sight of victory. Rigid financial orthodoxy had strained the credit of the Allies to breaking point. As Sir Cecil Spring Rice has pointed out in his Letters, President Wilson was completely dominated by the German-Jewish group of which Kuhn, Loeb, the Schiffs and the Warburgs were the moving spirits and these had not only done everything possible to achieve the destruction of Russia both internally and externally, thus depriving the Allies of the strategic advantage of a double front, but had obstructed British interests in the United States to an extent which in any other circumstance would have amounted to effective participation in the war on the side of Germany. Lord Reading headed a delegation to Washington which resulted in the entry of America, with the co-operation of Kuhn, Loeb, into the war on the side of the Allies, and the turning of the scale against Germany.

I think that it is important to recognise the philosophic

detachment of this group from the interests alike of Germany and the Allies, because it was the primary factor in raising Japan to the position of a first-class Power. No doubt the Pearl Harbour fiasco thus made possible was one of those unfortunate incidents which seem to be inseparable from the operations of God's chosen people when engaged in High Finance.

What was the exact nature and scope of the bargain concluded by Lord Reading in 1917, we shall probably never know. That it was aimed at the elimination of the British Empire, is certain. Beyond making the United Kingdom responsible for the repayment *in gold* for all sums credited as the *price of goods supplied*, whether to Britain or any other Ally, some kind of effective control over every aspect of British life and policy was imposed. The Bank of "England" was placed under an American "adviser" and an obviously nominated permanent Governor; an Irish "settlement" which placed, as we are now witnessing, a potential enemy across St. George's Channel, was forced, and Rufus Isaacs, Marquis of Reading, became Viceroy of India, with a member of the bullion-broking family of Samuel Montagu and Company as Secretary of State for India in Whitehall. From that date, the chief factor in Indian affairs has been the Indian National Congress, an organisation mysteriously subsidised from outside India, whose maximum "paper" affiliation has never exceeded four and a half millions out of the four hundred millions of India's population and is generally much less. It is detested by all the better elements of the population.

During the most critical period the Finance Minister for India was Sir George Schuster. It is not unimportant to notice that the present Secretary of State for India is Mr. Leo S. Amery, a colleague on the Board of Messrs. Marks and Spencer of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff. We do not hear much of Mr. L. S. Amery just now, any more than we hear much of Mr. Benjamin Cohen, U.S.A., but it would be very unwise to assume that either of them is idle.

Now, it is difficult for anyone who is not familiar with India to understand that it is perhaps there that the clearest indication of the war of the international Jew against British culture can be perceived. What is being attacked and undermined in India is prestige, and prestige is a basis of credit. To put the matter another way, the Indian problem can be reduced in essence to a battle between prestige based on character, and prestige based on money—real human credit in conflict with the golden calf.

This attack on British prestige has been in progress for a long time—Kipling's *Mutiny of the Mavericks*, written in the early nineties, was an amusing dramatisation of something which was already no novelty. The unscrupulous attack on the regular Army, and its capable officers, resulting in the warning by the Home Secretary to an illustrated newspaper which, whether rightly or wrongly, is generally credited to the control of Mr. Sieff, and the advertising by the "B".B.C. of the achievements of overseas troops, to the exclusion of those from the United Kingdom, are examples of the same policy.

It may perhaps be remarked in passing that, taking the condition of India into consideration, British *Administration* in India between 1857 and, say, 1900, was probably the finest example of successful Imperial Rule which the world has ever seen. It could not be, and it was not desirable that in the nature of things it should be permanent, but it was as far removed from the picture of soulless tyranny which was persistently circulated amongst people who had never been within ten thousand miles of it, as the fantastic figures of "thousands of British Officials battenning on a downtrodden peasantry" were from the fact that the Indian Civil Service never reached a figure of 1,500 Europeans, and is now less than five hundred in number. British *Policy* in India is not quite so safe from criticism, for the simple reason that it was *primarily* a financial and mercantile policy. But even in this, there is little which was peculiar to India.

This vital question of prestige is linked directly and clearly with the financing of Japan, and the parallel corruption of Russia by the Schiff group. The culmination of it was the abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty under pressure from Washington in 1922, probably one of the most fatal pieces of folly ever perpetrated by any British Government at any time. From the date of this abrogation, it was mathematically certain that any and every embarrassment elsewhere would be complicated by an enemy gratuitously created in the area in which we were, at one and the same time, weakest, and from which it was most necessary we should draw uninterrupted supplies of oil and rubber.

It is not possible that any explanation of the events of the past twenty-five years can be adequate, and *therefore not possible to ensure that proper action is taken to deal with their consequences and to prevent their repetition*, which does not provide an answer to the following questions:—

(1) Why was Rufus Isaacs chosen to head the delegation to Washington in 1917, and what were the undisclosed terms that he made?

(2) When an Eastern Front was essential to the quick defeat of Germany, why, and at whose request, did the British Government facilitate the release of the Jew, Trotsky, from Halifax, Nova Scotia, so that he might be sent to Russia by Germany to assist in the Bolshevik Revolution, the first act of which was to make a separate peace with Germany at Brest-Litovsk?

(3) Who foisted the British catastrophe, Baldwin, and Montagu Norman, on us, and kept them in office until Great Britain was weakened to the status of a fifth rate power?

(4) Why was the Japanese Treaty, which had relieved us from any serious embarrassment in the Pacific, denounced? What, if any, undertakings were given by the United States to meet the situation which was bound to result from the insult involved in its denunciation, and isn't

it odd that the Japanese can't take the Philippines, which are at their back door, but can take Singapore, and that there's only one great General, MacArthur, although he's never won any battles, and that all our Generals, who have been fighting for years, mostly without equipment, are "Brass Hats," "Blimps," and "Old School Tie" failures?

(5) Why was a Jew, Rufus Isaacs, anathema both to the Indian Moslems, the Palestine Arabs, and the Indian Princes, the only reliable bases of British stability in the Middle and Far East, made Viceroy of India? Why had Ramsay Macdonald, the "Labour" Prime Minister, to make a visit to Rufus Isaacs in India, before he could assume office? Why has the Labour Socialist Party, the friend of International Finance, persistently meddled with the Indian question, of which it knows nothing?

(6) Who controls the Bank of "England" and its apparently permanent Governor, Montagu Norman? Who authorised him to co-operate with the American-German, Dr. Schacht ("the most unscrupulous and oleaginous scoundrel I have ever come across"—Lord Vansittart), in financing Hitler with British credits? Certainly not the Foreign Office.

XIII

If I have been successful in presenting the outlines of the picture as it presents itself to me in the light of incidents of which I have direct knowledge, certain conclusions to be drawn from it would appear to be inescapable. They are:

(1) That International Financiers may be said to have a key "affix" the mono-syllable "mon-". *Money, monopoly, monotheism, monarchy* (not kingship, but totalitarianism), *monstrous*.

(2) That International Financiers, the richest body of men in the world, consciously propagate the theory that the poor are poor because the rich are rich, thus providing a body of uninformed voters always eager to support taxation, so preventing the rise of any considerable body of men with sufficient economic power to oppose international Financiers. There is, of course, no difficulty in paying taxes when you create the money with which to pay them. Once admit this thesis and it is easy to transfer the resentment against taxation to an allegedly "Democratic" Government which is as "Democratic" as the Bank of "England." The object of the present fantastic taxation is not to win the war but to ruin the people. The whole theory rests on the patent fallacy that there is a fixed, insufficient, amount of wealth.

(3) International Socialism is simply world monopoly. It is propagated by International Financiers everywhere, and an elaborate organisation of teaching bodies such as the London School of Economics, is subsidised by them to turn out quantities of "intellectuals" with no practical knowledge of any economics other than the rules of the Gold Standard. No Labour Government ever attacks International Finance.

(4) For the better attainment of these ends, the obvious truth that the objective of "government"-*"Industry-"*"Employment" is simply increased human satisfaction, is perverted to convey the idea that the object of government is to provide employment, with or without satisfaction, and therefore the "Government" should employ everyone. The abolition of private property, which merely means absolute centralisation of economic power, is the primary means to this end.

(5) While all international Financiers are not Jews, many are, and the observable policy of these Jews and of Freemasonry is that of the Talmud. This group can be identified first with Pan-Germanism, and secondly with Pan-Americanism, both of which aim at the destruction of British culture and prestige either by conquest or absorption.

(6) Since 1917, at least, but probably for much longer, the most dangerous enemy of the British people has been a group of German-American Jews operating mainly in America who used Germany first, and the United States later. Had Germany won the 1914-1918 phase of the war, the United States would soon have been put in her place. As soon as it became evident that Germany had lost the first trick, and the Jews had won it by the dismemberment of Russia and the control of the Russian development, along Talmudic lines, the whole weight of this group was directed to obtaining control of the Armistice *via* the United States. The decline of the British Empire, and the rise of Hitlerian (Totalitarian) Germany is the direct result of this control.

(7) The link between the international Jew Financiers and such politicians as can be easily identified as having facilitated this plot (whether knowingly or because it is part of the equipment of a successful politician) is undoubtedly secret societies such as Grand Orient Freemasonry and the New York B'Nai B'rith. What is the bearing of English Freemasonry on the matter, I am not clear, but I am convinced that it has put the whole weight of its influence in opposition to Social Credit proposals, which I am also quite satisfied offered, at the time they were put forward, the only concrete method of dealing with the menace. The Moscow Government knew it, and said so.

It must be remembered that the essence of Freemasonry is that 99 per cent. of Freemasons don't know what it is about, or what they are doing, if anything.

There is no difficulty in recognising the Masonic group in English politics—it is the group which rushed off to the United States for instructions after the Munich postponement of the second phase of the war. If this war is won by Great Britain, it will be because Mr. Chamberlain delayed it for twelve months, in spite of the efforts of Mr. Baldwin's "white haired boys." If it is lost, it will be partly because of the success of Masonic influence in putting the British Army under the control of a senile incompetent, General Gamelin, and largely by the mass of useless officials foisted on us by the Fabian-P.E.P. agencies of international monopoly. But it isn't going to be, in spite of them.

What bearing, if any, on more recent events, the fairly well established fact that Hitler is the grandson of an illegitimate daughter of Baron Rothschild of Vienna has I do not know. But the naive idea that attention should be focussed on the largely verbal "anti-Semitism" of German, rather than on the Talmudic Jew policy and philosophy which has been steadily pursued equally by Hitler as by the Kaiser with his entourage of Ballin, Rathenau, Bleichroeder and many others, ought by now to be untenable.

The very large increase in the membership of the Fabian Society, it is stated, is almost entirely due to German-Jew "refugees," who thus mould the "Planners." I have direct evidence that many of these pre-war refugees worked furiously for war, and hardly troubled to conceal their belief that Germany would win it.

It is convenient to mention at this point, that the present

and preceding articles of this series were written without having the advantage of having read Mr. A. N. Field's informative book *All these Things*, although, of course, I was aware of its existence. Various attempts to obtain it from time to time have been met with the reply, "Out of print—Temporarily unobtainable." By the kindness of a friend, I have now been able to profit from it. Mr. Field is evidently informed in much greater detail in regard to, for instance, the Marconi affair, than I am. Such information as I had was derived through entirely distinct channels, and the fact that Mr. Field's interpretation of the facts and the general situation coincides with my own is therefore the more significant.

All these Things is in no sense a book on monetary reform, which lends additional interest to the following paragraphs:

"If the existing social order is violently overthrown as Mr. [G. D. H.] Cole advocates, it will only be because the mass of people are suffering want and privation. The existing order is capable of producing in abundance all that the people require. If they are unable to obtain all that they require, it is mainly because they lack the money to buy it. The problem is thus a monetary one. But if by monetary reform this state of things were remedied, a violent overthrow of the existing social order would be most unlikely. It is a very striking fact that, taken generally, Communists and Socialists are as violently opposed to monetary reform as is the moneyed interest itself. Their *sine qua non* is not so much the betterment of conditions, as the violent overthrow of the whole present constitution of society. Destruction is the immediate objective."

Quis benefici?

XIV

A passion for giving orders is almost complete evidence of unsuitability to give orders.

An order, or command, is an inherent pre-requisite of a function. To be justifiable, it must proceed from someone who is fully aware of its effect, of the capacity of those to whom it is given to carry it out in the circumstances in which it is given, and aware of the constant supervision required to ensure fulfilment. All this, in its turn, requires technical knowledge of devolution—the resignation of the order, giving faculty at the proper stage, to someone else; and a rigid self-discipline not less exacting than that imposed. People who have had much experience of giving orders justifiably and successfully, give as few orders as possible, by reason of having learnt that the surest way to make trouble for yourself is to give an order.

A Utopia is a comprehensive order, and it is significant that the *devisers* of imposed Utopias are invariably those people, organisations and races who manage their own affairs worst.

Notice particularly the use of the word *devisers*. Observation of political affairs, and some experience of life, has convinced me that the real Plotters, while having the clearest possible conception of their own objective, rely in

(Continued on page 7)

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 £3.00.
OFFICES—Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD. Tel. Sudbury 76374 (STD Code 0787).
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX. Tel. 01-387 3893.
In Australia (Editorial Head Office): 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: H. A. Scouler, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099. **General Deputy Chairman:** C. R. Preston, Rookery Farmhouse, Gunthorpe, North Norfolk NR14 2NY, U.K. **Deputy Chairman, British Isles:** Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX.

Then — and Now *

Since its inception *The Social Crediter* has borne the mast-head statement: "This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas", (the author of the concept of credit as the underlying asset of a given community.)

Douglas defined credit as "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen". This amounts to a community-shared belief that, for example, a money token, in itself of little *inherent* value, can be exchanged for some article of relatively great value to the individual surrendering the token. A cheque, of virtually no intrinsic value, but with the token value of, say, \$10,000, may be exchanged for, say, a motor vehicle priced at \$10,000.

Now if, for example, a car manufacturer can produce 100 cars per week priced at \$10,000 each, this productive capacity is useless if 100 individuals have between them less than \$1,000,000 nominal value of tokens.

Douglas's conception, then, was that the social credit of a community should be a correct estimate of the *general* productive capacity of that community to supply the goods and services desired by the *individuals* of that community, and that that estimate should be monetised by the distribution of money (or value) tokens, to the extent of that estimate, to the individuals of the community. Part of that distribution would be some form of "cash" token, some part subsidy to reduce prices of consumable goods below the accountancy cost, and part to meet wage and salary costs of production. In short, the distribution, or decentralisation, of the *power* inherent in credit as defined.

This synopsis of the concept of course needs to be complemented by a careful reading of Douglas's major work, *The Monopoly of Credit*, and is intended only as an introduction to what follows.

The Social Crediter receives from time to time correspondence complaining of its re-publication of articles first published years ago. Such re-publication is provided because the essential points brought out in the original, mostly overlooked at the time, have become far more apparent in the light of subsequent developments in the field of political economy.

In our issue of May 29, 1971, the following Note appeared

* Our editorial for July-Aug. 1981 repeated.

under the heading *From Week to Week*:

The propaganda drive to get Britain into the Common Market can hardly be described as other than ruthless. The Times of May 4, 1971, in a leading article of 81 column inches says that if the 'negotiations' fail, "That would be a total, disastrous and unmitigated defeat for us, threatening our industry, our currency, our standard of living, our level of employment and even our political institutions with a crisis in the 1970's to which we have no apparent answer". Not even the politicians have been as dire as that.

There is a quite fundamental fallacy, to which no one ever seems to allude, underlying the so-called economic argument for 'joining': as *The Times* puts it, "Our industry will have free access to the whole European market". What is ignored in statements such as this is that that market is already being supplied: Europe is no 'underdeveloped' continent where the provision of 'aid' would provide for unlimited exports. Again, how much of 'our' industry is still ours, and how much already the property of international cartels, to whom British sovereignty remains a potential threat?

Until someone can force disclosure of *all* the documents relating to Britain's international indebtedness — which, under orthodox financial methods, is unrepayable, but which, as things are, represents a formidable sanction, it is difficult to determine how much of the effort to 'gain' entry to the Market is simple economic ignorance, and how much sheer treason. For the meaning of entry is the surrender of British sovereignty, with the Red Army poised to ensure that any effort to regain it will be crushed. Treason to the shadowy figures behind the Council of Ministers will be found to have far more serious consequences than treason to the British Crown.

In the ten years since the article appeared, the condition of the world has deteriorated to a state even more dire than *The Times* predicted as a consequence should Britain refuse absorption in the European Economic Community. But over that period the political and economic commentators of the mass media have treated the crescendo of disasters as though each had no roots in the past, nor pointed towards an all too probable final catastrophe. This approach is what Douglas characterised as the episodic view of history.

The Social Credit point of view is that so far from the series of disasters being merely episodic, due to the 'incompetence' of successive Governments, they are in fact links in the chain of a well thought-out long-term policy designed to reduce the individual to a mere unit of factory-fodder in a totally planned One World under an armed World Government. For the present, the chief mechanism of this policy is the centralisation and monopoly of credit — the antithesis of the Social Credit concept of the proper use of credit.

The growing spate of Company take-overs and amalgamations, together with increasing international Cartelisation, plus a growing threat of war, are pointers to the culmination of the long-term policy of World Government.

With this prospect in mind, we recommend to our readers — and others — a study of "A Social Credit Perspective" (*T.S.C.* Dec. 1978), and the booklet *The Crime and the Cure*, with its advocacy of a Campaign for Economic Democracy. If ballot-box 'democracy' as practised is not defeated, the end is nigh.

The Individual and the Group

"Our task, is not to capture politics, but to fragment them". This short sentence of eleven words written by C. H. Douglas in 1950 is a statement of brilliant political strategy.

"Capture"—to take possession of.

"Politics"—the art of the possible.

"Fragment"—to reduce a whole to many separate components.

As always Douglas wrote with an economy of words to convey a wealth of meaning that was, and still is, an object lesson for those who follow him today. Compare the wordy nothingness of so many of today's political economists and commentators, and consider how relevant to his subject Douglas always remains.

The early sections of the first book written by Douglas, *Economic Democracy*, were concerned with an extensive examination of the relationship between the individual and the group of which he is a member. The individual interest against the institutional powers of enforcing conformity to already decided policies. It was a theme that Douglas never abandoned. Indeed all his writings were to focus attention on this major issue, and the problem that he stated so clearly all those years ago still remains unresolved, not by Douglas, but by the continuing power of the forces of misdirection that he identified as the source of the policies of destruction, who used the flaw in the accounting system as the lever of control.

Readers who have access to back copies of *The Social Crediter* will find a re-reading of those issues a most rewarding study. They are a revelation of how encompassing a knowledge of social dynamics C.H. Douglas presented to his readers. He wrote with a concentration on that glimpse of reality that has never been surpassed. He saw more plainly then, than many of us do now, that the policy of government is to submerge individuality beneath a mass of institutional direction inspired by a mounting jungle of regulation, mis-called law.

The social forces of the world in which we live may be directed into one of two paths. Either the concept of group control - institutional direction - becomes dominant, or the individual asserts his own personality and lives as a person free to make his own decisions of the most suitable goal for his own particular and peculiar abilities. In the former, members of the group, or state, conform to the requirements of the dominant philosophy of the personalities who control policy. Disagreement is possible but life is that much more difficult that few choose but to conform. It is interesting to observe this fact in actual practice. The most dominated members of a group are the members of a governing parliamentary party. They either toe the party line, as presented to them by Cabinet, or lose their endorsement as the party selection for the next election. This is a complete perversion of the concept of members of parliament being elected to represent the interests of their electorate. Obviously they do not. The current very strong and vocal opposition to changes in the taxing of lump sums received as superannuation on retirement has found no public support among Australian Government Members of Parliament. It is claimed 80% of voters oppose the tax but the party line must not be breached. The M.P. must support his leaders for the "good of the country".

In the alternative, but so far unrealised, state the group comprises members who have joined to co-operate in achieving a mutually agreed and published objective. Leaving the group would impose no penalty except for the loss of that increment of association enjoyed as a willing contributor to an agreed policy. Of course, it is just as important that entry to the group should be as optional as contracting out. Any restrictive conditions on entry would be fully declared and accepted beforehand.

One philosophy of life is based on a belief that man is an unstable element in an ordered society, and that consequently he must at all times be subject to the directions of a self appointed authority. The other philosophy believes that man will find his greatest achievements when left free to develop, within the broad outlines of principles of association known to all. The stultifying hand of compulsion directed by unlimited power without authority, or free association with personal responsibility in every aspect of the social fabric.

At present all governments direct their population through a system of coercion. Some more vigorously than others perhaps but, in all, this covert policy is the fruit of a philosophy of compulsion in human affairs that has existed for hundreds of years. At the same time it presents itself to a mesmerized electorate as an instrument of public demand. The extent of this compulsion seems to vary with the national temperament of the indigent population. This is probably one of the hidden reasons behind the enthusiasm for a multicultural population so beloved by our great planners.

The control of finance which brought with it control over politics and the media has given the coercionists temporary ascendancy over the philosophy of freedom - Individual freedom.

For nearly two thousand years this struggle between the philosophies of Judaism and Christianity has persisted, until now the final decision is surely near to hand. All the odds point strongly to Judaism being the winner but the struggle is not yet resolved, and there are a few signs that the leader is running just a bit scared. The frenzied efforts to impose more and more control by taxation, and the determination of so many people to resist this undisguised robbery is one such sign. The increasing number of letters appearing in the press that vigorously oppose government control and interference in life is a pointer to a growing awareness of the problems of human association that must be resolved. These are matters that the coercionists are determined to resist to the last.

A determined effort at this point to expose the forces aligned against the interests of every man and woman in this country could possibly force the leading runner against the rail, and leave the way clear for a sustained run to final victory for individual freedom.

The task before Social Crediters then, is to increase the numbers who are aware of a diversion of the social credit - a belief inherent in society that men in free association can obtain the results they desire. This awareness may be intuitional rather than knowledgeable but it is there and should be aroused.

To quote from a certain manual of political strategy "Nothing is so dangerous as individual initiative".

— E.L.W.

Socialism and its Concomitants

Those trusting souls who believe that socialism is a movement to protect the worker from rapacious management may be interested to read of British Leyland's recent encounter with some patriotic supporters of the Socialist League.

The Socialist League, which is directly connected with the International Marxist League, succeeded in placing 13 of its members who are also members of the Transport Workers Union in British Leyland's workforce. These 13, who included 3 women, had all submitted falsified documents regarding their qualifications to support their applications for employment. But not quite as you might think. Their higher, and in some cases academic, levels of education had been suppressed and a lower level of ability more suitable to the positions they sought had been substituted. The I.M.L. according to a former member Mr. Roger Rosewell, seeks not to obtain better conditions for workers but rather to achieve a total collapse in industry and politics so that a takeover by communist supporters may be secured. Hence the infiltration of British Leyland's workforce, to provide the necessary leaders when the signal for insurrection arrived. Fortunately for British Leyland their own staff investigations uncovered the plot and the 13 members of the Socialist League were dismissed.

In Australia the continuous dislocation of production in the Pilbara and further south in the construction industry should alert a "workers' government" to the distinct similarity between the projected situation in B.L. and the actual situation in this country. But, will it? No way, mate!

While we head for economic annihilation helped along by scandalous taxing of individual effort ostensibly to pay for social welfare assistance for the needy but, in actual fact, to prevent any except the cunning few from obtaining any financial independence, preparations for industrial disintegration proceed apace. Then when all is in readiness the obligations imposed on the Federal Government by its external agreements will compel us to seek assistance from the I.M.F. and the World Bank. Just as Brazil, Argentina, *et al*, so too will we be forced into an austerity programme to restore the economic health of the nation. Too bad if thousands of young Australians are driven to drugs and violence to relieve the boredom and frustration of idleness in the prime of their lives.

This loophole in the Australian Constitution that enables the Federal Government to conclude treaties with foreign countries, and then by enforcing the conditions of these treaties to control the decisions of State Governments, is looming as the greatest challenge to the constitutional powers of state governments ever devised. The recent decision of the High Court of Australia (4-3) that prevented the Tasmanian State Government from pursuing a policy decided in its own parliament was based on this power of the Federal Government to conclude foreign treaties. But in this case it was not an agreement with a foreign country but a charter issued from U.N.O. that was held to give the Federal Government the right to countermand a State parliament decision. The implications arising from this ruling by the High Court are almost unlimited when it is realised that Australia has signed over 340 agreements with foreign countries and the U.N.O.

The constitutional issues first raised by C.H. Douglas nearly forty years ago in England have never required more urgent consideration in Australia than they do now. The concomitant questions of power and authority loom large and should be clearly resolved in the minds of everyone concerned with government in Australia.

— E.L.W.

Churchill and the Belgian King

The following letter to the Editor appeared in *The Daily Telegraph*, London, September 30, 1983:

From Lord KEYES

Sir, I read of the death of King Leopold of the Belgians. It is particularly sad that he did not live to read my biography "Outrageous Fortune," which will be published by Secker and Warburg early next year, for he was keenly looking forward to it.

In writing it I have fulfilled the burning resolve of my father, Admiral of the Fleet Lord Keyes of Zeebrugge and Dover, that the truth concerning the King should be fully and irrefutably revealed.

In 1939 and 1940 my father, who became a close friend of King Albert in World War I, paid three clandestine visits to Belgium at the invitation of King Leopold, in order to establish secret liaison links with the British Government. And when Hitler's *Blitzkrieg* struck Belgium on May 10, 1940, Sir Roger was immediately sent there by Winston Churchill as the War Cabinet's Special Liaison Officer with the King, and remained at his side at his G H Q until the early hours of May 28, when the Belgian army, abandoned by the British and overwhelmed by the massive assaults of the German Army and Air Force, was forced to surrender.

Four hours later, as the Admiral was stepping ashore from a motor torpedo boat in England, full of praise for the Belgian Army and their King, Paul Reynaud, the Prime Minister of France, broadcast a vitriolic diatribe in which he falsely accused King Leopold *inter alia* of surrendering his Army "suddenly, without a word of warning to his allies," and branded him as a traitor.

Reynaud thus destroyed the reputations of the much admired soldier King and his Army, in order to provide a scapegoat for France's military and moral collapse.

Although Reynaud was later "completely discredited" (as *The Daily Telegraph* observed at the time), he managed in the meantime to induce Churchill, who had cabled Keyes: "We greatly admire the attitude of the King" and signalled to Lord Gort, the C-in-C: "We are asking the Belgians to sacrifice themselves for us," to endorse and even augment his mendacious denunciation of the King, in the Commons on June 4, amid cries of "shame" and "treachery" from Members.

Keyes, an MP, was horrified by his lifelong friend's action, which Churchill had taken in response to French pressure to support their "*nous sommes trahi*" propaganda line, belief in which "had greatly strengthened the morale of the French people."

Churchill was, of course, piqued by the King's refusal to desert his Army and come to England with Keyes, and also desperately anxious to keep France in the fight for as long as

possible, and to secure control of the French Fleet, or at least deny it to the enemy, when she succumbed.

Yet Adml Keyes's diaries and papers, and numerous documents from other sources, prove beyond doubt that Churchill was fully aware of the fact that the Belgian Army, far from exposing the flank of the British Expeditionary Force had, by its brave and prolonged resistance until nearly two days after the B E F began its evacuation (without informing the Belgians or French), held up the advance of 14 fiercely-attacking enemy divisions, supported by the bulk of the *Luftwaffe*, thus preventing them from cutting off the B E F's retreat to the coast, and making possible the miracle of Dunkirk.

As to the two Prime Ministers' charges that the King failed to warn them about the capitulation of his Army, the records show that while he repeatedly warned them of that inevitability from May 20 onwards, *via* Adml Keyes and others, neither Churchill nor Gort *ever* informed the King or the Admiral that the B E F had been in full flight from the battlefield by sea since May 26. (Gort's biographer pleads in mitigation that "he was expressly ordered not to do so" by Anthony Eden, the Secretary of State for War.)

Sir Basil Liddell Hart thus summed up the situation in a lecture at King's College, London, in 1960:

The unfortunate Belgian Army absorbed the weight of the German frontal attack from the North. By the time the Belgian front was turned the British had slipped out of reach and were nearing shelter at Dunkirk. But if the King had left Belgium on May 25, 1940, as his Ministers and Mr Churchill urged, the Belgian Army would probably have surrendered immediately. . . . If so, the British would have had very little chance of escaping encirclement, so that it could very reasonably be claimed that they were saved by King Leopold who was then violently abused in Britain and France.

As a result of this completely undeserved abuse by Reynaud and Churchill, the King was branded by the world Press as a "coward," "deserter," "traitor" and labelled, *inter alia*, "King Quisling" and "the Rat King."

Since the *Daily Mirror* vilified Leopold in these terms, and also abused Adml Keyes for defending him, he sued it for libel.

Although the Cabinet ordered Keyes not to bring his case to court, in an attempt to spare Churchill and Gort embarrassment, and also muzzled the B B C, he obtained damages, apologies and handsome tributes to himself and Leopold from the newspaper in June, 1941, and the King was resoundingly vindicated throughout the world, under headlines such as "Leopold was a hero."

But since memories are short and mud sticks, all the defamatory material which was spawned by Reynaud's "great lie" remains in circulation, to be repeated *ad nauseam* by undiscerning writers.

I therefore hope that the comprehensively documented exposure of the facts in my book will halt this trend and correct the historical record once and for all.

KEYES,

West Farleigh, Kent.

The result of the Referendum on the return of King Leopold appears to

put beyond doubt what many of us have for some time suspected, that the "will of the majority" basis of sovereignty is a Freemasonic racket. While the preponderance of votes for the King was not large — about 57 to 43 — it was in proportion, more than twenty times the Socialist Parliamentary Majority which claims the right to rule us in this country. There are certain factors which can normally be depended upon to produce a majority vote for the wrong policy, hence the Freemasonic advocacy of d'markrazi. In this case something has slipped; so of course the vote must be disregarded, and all good Socialists must foment strikes to prevent the return of the King. . . .

— C.H. Douglas, T.S.C. April 1, 1950

Attitudes to Israel

The following letter to the Editor appeared in *The Times*, London, September 30, 1983:

From Mr Dennis Walters, MP for Westbury (Conservative)

Sir, Years ago any protest against Israeli policy or action was promptly denounced by British Zionists, who form the powerful Israeli lobby, as antisemitism. It was a disagreeable form of blackmail and its intention was to intimidate and thereby silence any criticism of Israel.

Those of us who were not prepared to submit to this sinister form of political pressure and continued to criticise Israeli policy whenever we thought it right to do so were under constant attack from the lobby.

Greville Janner, in his letter today (September 26) about Mr Roald Dahl's review of *God Cried*, revives the tactic.

Mr Janner and his fellow Zionists, with a few honourable exceptions, remained lamentably silent as the armed forces of Israel launched their unprovoked attack on Lebanon, devastated that unhappy country, killing countless thousands of innocent civilians, and systematically laid to waste the capital city. . . .

They even remained silent when a year ago at Sabra and Chatila, General Sharon, the Israeli Minister of Defence, connived in the appalling massacre of Palestinian women and children.

The slavish support British Zionists have given Israel, however indefensible its conduct, has been shameful.

Greville Janner's sanctimonious attack on Mr Dahl therefore makes particularly indigestible reading and by bandying about charges of antisemitism as a way of answering criticism makes an unwelcome return to argument by smear.

Yours faithfully,
DENNIS WALTERS,
House of Commons.

The Big Idea

(Continued from page 3)

the main on the devisers of Utopias to provide them with a ready-made popular propaganda. Then, by control of the Press, Broadcasting, Political and commercial patronage and other mechanisms of social and economic power which can be summarised under the control of credit, the widest publicity and assistance is given to the particular Utopia which lends colour to the concentration of power (such as "Abolition of private Property," "The Classless State," "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity"), and the Utopianists and

their dupes wake up to "The Dictatorship *over* the Proletariat"—the Slave State.

There is, I think, one safe rule to apply to all Schemes, Plots, and Plans. It is, I believe, called the Golden Rule, and it is not new. Disregard all fine phrases. Disregard all appeals to your "Public Spirit." Don't bother about Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Don't waste time trying to find out who the Proletariat are going to dictate to, when we're all propertyless, and so all Proletariat. Merely enquire "What are you going to do to me, and how do I stop you if I don't like it? Can I kick your inspectors and your Ogpu-Gestapo and your Kommissars out of my (excuse me, my mistake, the proletariat's) house, or can they kick me? If I believe that it isn't my business to spend the rest of my life making tractors for China, and say so, do I get my coupons, or don't I? In the bad old days, to quite a considerable extent, I did. I should have been just like everyone else in that respect, only the coupon merchants (who seem to have names suspiciously similar to the Planned Utopians) said that what they called a reserve of labour, and other people called the unemployed, must be available and so couldn't have any coupons."

If you ask the Utopian this kind of question, you will discover an interesting fact—that one of the biggest parts of the Big Idea is the indispensability and invulnerability of the Ogpu. Or call it the Gestapo—or the G-men. Or the "snoopers." We don't hear much about the Ogpu nowadays, but, like Mr. Benjamin Cohen of the U.S.A., it's there. And so we come to the core of the matter—it isn't the scheme that matters—that's just to keep you quiet, like Mackenzie King's cry of "Hands off Alberta." It's the sanctions that matter. You think a World State would be governed by Saints? Remember the wise Lord Acton, "Absolute Power corrupts absolutely."

There is in existence, unpublished, and carefully protected against "accidents" the main outlines of a Scheme which would accomplish all the social betterments which the realities of the situation at any moment make possible—and that is much more than any Utopian proposal contemplates. That scheme has at the moment no practical value whatever. What is required is a shift of sanctions.

"The Jews show a strong preference for the Emperor [Wilhelm], and there must be some bargain. Since Morgan's death, the Jewish Banks are supreme, and they have captured the Treasury Department, . . . forcing upon him [the Secretary to the Treasury] the appointment of Warburg, the German-Jew, on the Federal Reserve Board, which he dominates. The Government itself is rather uneasy, and the President himself quoted to me the text 'He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep.' One by one the Jews are capturing the principal newspapers, and are bringing them over as much as they dare to the German side."—SIR CECIL SPRING-RICE, British Ambassador to Washington, to Sir Edward Grey, November 15, 1914.

"The majority of the English do not realise that, having done their duty by the inner Jewish circle, they have now got to disappear as a world Power." —*The Coming War* by GENERAL LUDENDORFF, Chief of the German General Staff; published 1931.

Well, there we are. Where do we go from here?

It cannot be overlooked that corruption, misinformation, the insidious social poisons of Hollywood and Broadcasting

House, the extraordinary success of the abstractionist idea that it is better that all should be miserable than that only some should be happy—that there should be no grass in the field rather than that some blades should come up first—have gone very far in this country. It may be—I do not think so—that there are not enough English, Scottish and Welsh, submerged and bedevilled as they are by swarms of aliens, still able to recognise facts, and strong enough to deal with them. But if it should prove that there are enough, the general outline of their task, grim enough in all conscience, is clear.

Like most important matters in the Universe, it appears to have a trinitarian aspect. It involves an ideology, a dynamics, and a technique. They are separate, but indissoluble.

The ideology begins very simply. We have to discard the idea that every child is born into the world to mind someone else's business, and substitute the fact that he is responsible for minding his own. That he should help, not meddle. It is not without interest that Mr. G. D. H. Cole divides his time between Planning the Universe, and writing detective stories. The Ogpu complex.

The next point is equally simple and far-reaching—that groups are inferior to individuals. Majorities have no rights and are generally not right. They are an abstraction to which it is impossible to impart the qualities of a conscious human being. The attempt to construct a system of human relationships on the "rights" of majorities is not democracy. If it were, democracy would stand self-condemned. There is nothing of that kind of democracy in the New Testament but plenty of it in the Jewish Bible—the so-called Old Testament. It is only possible to associate, *i.e.*, to form a majority, for the purposes of a function—"we descend to meet." To rule humanity by function is exactly what the Jews wish, and have largely succeeded in doing. Socialism is the complete rule of the individual by functions, and is Satanic. *Demon est Deus inversus*. "Total war" is a total demonstration.

Genuine democracy can very nearly be defined as the right to atrophy a function by contracting out. It is essentially negative, although, contrary to the curious nonsense that is prevalent about "negativeness," is none the less essential for that reason.

This genuine democracy requires to be carefully distinguished from the idea that a game is a necessarily bad game simply because you can't or won't play it, and therefore the fact that you can't play it is the first recommendation for a chief part in changing the rules. On the contrary, that is an *a priori* disqualification. For this reason, if for no other, a period of discipline in the prevalent social and economic systems in, say, the early twenties, seems highly and pragmatically desirable. No play, no vote. Bad play, Grade 3 vote. But you needn't do either.

The power of contracting-out is the first and most deadly blow to the Supreme State.

(To be continued)

THE CRIME AND THE CURE
With a supplement entitled CULMINATION
65p posted
BLOOMFIELD BOOKS
26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD
Agents for K.R.P. Publications Ltd.
in respect of book sales only.