THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 66 No. 4 JULY — AUGUST, 1987

WHITHER THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION?

The conversion of the emperor Constantine early in the fourth century marked the emergence of Christians from a long period of persecution and martyrdom. *Authority* in the persons of the Elders of the Church was no longer oppressed but stood in an unfamiliar . . . relationship to *Power* as personified in the emperor. . . . About 12 years after the attainment of this unique position, Constantine called together the leaders of the Church in a Council at Nicaea (A.D. 325) which indicated on the highest and most authoritative plane fundamental principles. . . . Reality, it was stated, is threefold; not unitarian, not dualistic; a Mystery best described as Three in One. This was the Nicene Creed. . . .

The Council of Nicaea did not specifically consider the principle upon which Authority and Power might together work out the spiritual and material advancement of Christendom, but in the Creed it stated them. Reality is threefold, and that idea, as developed in the Creed, must to the extent of Man's capacity, be reflected in his institutions. . . . Rejection of the tripodal (trinitarian) framework, the only framework that fits man and society into the universe — has, in its later course, exalted "Totalitarianism"; "Communism", and now an oncoming Luciferianism, salutes and summons the Atomic Age.

The most significant and fruitful facet of this historical perspective is that . . . the trinitarian idea was not to be always or completely denied, as is to be seen in the unfolding of the English constitution. The formative period was in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when English law was administered by the ablest and best men in the Kingdom; it was then that the emerging principles of Common Law were being shaped . . . in England at that time the conjunction of Power and Authority made apparent the third member of the political triad — the Common Law, with all that followed it. Directional inspiration *plus* executive action only exist by virtue of their issue or content. The three are one. In use they can and must be distinguished, but they can never be separated. King John failed in this. He did not distinguish but tried to combine Authority, Power and Law in his own person; and in this violation of well-understood but largely unformulated principles, he brought the constitutional issue to a head. The barons at Runnymede may not have realised fully the part they played, but they played it. They stood as an embodiment of the people of England, the outcome and incarnation of the interlocking activities of Church, King and People; and their purpose was to bring the King to recognise his limitations in this threefold structure by the implementation of the rights of the other parties. Magna Carta was the sign and confirmation of this.

It was a truly English document, containing neither explanations, argument nor reasoning. . . . These decisions fixed established custom, binding the law back to the current usage. Upon ground so secured was cultivated a comprehensive organism of many parts which sustained the King's Justice, Canon Law and the Common Law including in the Inns of Court, virtually a university. For more than 300 years this organic relationship developed, reaching its climax in the life and person of Sir Thomas More. The thread of this fruitful continuity was broken by Henry VIII whose absolutist ambition and his determination to transcend the law, which More resisted, led to the great Chancellor's execution in 1535. With his death, the Law Reports which were a continuous record of the being and the becoming of the Law fluctuated and then ceased. It is true to say that the English people with their customs, characteristics and achievements sprang out of and exist because of the adequacy of this trinitarian setting — though something was lacking or we should have it yet. In 1535, the current induced by these conditions was immensely strong and neither Henry nor (Thomas) Cromwell and their like could do more than check or divert the flow. But the tide had turned. The disruption of the Common Law and the undermining of the Constitution has taken another three or four hundred years and still continues, as has been shown by such distinguished lawyers as Lord Acton and Lord Hewart. Major Douglas summed it up ". . . we now have the merest shell of a Constitution, Single Chamber Government dominated by Cartels and Trade Unions . . .".

Consider then these signposts of the past; the Gospels, the Athanasian Creed and Magna Carta. Although so widely different in content and expression, each is a crystallisation of the same policy. It is this history which we must cultivate; Christian charity (*caritas*) in which to live and grow, Athanasian (Greek) penetration of reality as the guide to growth, and British determination to secure results. These also are *one* in our Constitution; but that Constitution has been crippled and made impotent. For its restoration another crystallisation of policy is needed. In the opinion of Douglas: "Constitutionalism must be organic; it must have a relation to the Universe." "It is necessary to provide individuals, *as individuals,* not collectively, with much more opportunity to judge political matters by results, and to be able to reject, individually and not collectively, policies they do not like. . . ." To crystallise these directives into history is to bring substance to things hoped for and to provide evidence of things to come; it is the establishment of the threefold Constitution as a "production unit" of truth and freedom. — Extracted from "The Cultivation of History" by Hewlett Edwards, *The Fig Tree,* September 1954.

(The author of the article makes acknowledgement to the following sources:

Mediaeval Papalism by Walter Ullman.

Christian Philosophy in the Common Law by Richard O'Sullivan, K.C.

Realistic Constitutionalism by C. H. Douglas, 1947.)

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: One year £3; airmail £3.50; Australasia $6.

Offices—Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 6TD. Tel: Sudbury 76374 (STD Code 0787).
—Editorial: 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 6LR.
—In Australia (Editorial, Subscriptions, Business and Books): Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: C. R. Preston, Meadow Cottages, Burndell Road, Yapton, Arundel, West Sussex, BN18 0HP, U.K. General Deputy Chairman: Dr Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX. Deputy Chairman, Australasia: H. A. Scoular, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

AN UNCHANGING ISSUE

The return of a Conservative government to a third consecutive term under the same Prime Minister indicates a fundamental shift in the British political scene. Despite the electoral propaganda directed at the unemployment, poverty and homelessness which is said to affect millons of voters, the Socialist or collectivist approach to these problems was decisively rejected. This is bound to have far-reaching repercussions on the future of the Labour Party.

The Alliance also suffered a severe defeat and fell far short of its aspiration "to break the mould of British politics". A radical restructuring of its forces appears to be imminent.

How will their victory be exploited by the triumphant Conservatives? The slow but patchy spread of relative "prosperity" which has induced their present success, though notably not in Scotland and parts of the North, obscures the underlying fact that it is almost wholly dependent on debt-financing. "Consumer credit," so-called, otherwise personal indebtedness, is at a record high level and continuing to rise, while the number of debtors trapped in hopeless and irredeemable debt causes increasing concern. Major capital projects such as power stations and urban redevelopments, which are contributing to gross consumer purchasing power, incur massive capital debts requiring servicing from future earnings recovered from future prices.

The National Debt, now double what it was when Mrs Thatcher came to power in 1979, absorbs in interest charges £1 out of every £3 raised from taxes on incomes — roughly the same as the total Defence budget. But in the welter of election rhetoric about the funding of the National Health Service, or Education, or Defence, whoever heard a word about funding the National Debt?

On the economic plane, debt-financing remains as the one fundamental issue unmentioned and unchallenged by anyone, but only by Social Crediters. The exposure of its multitudinous social evils in all their manifestations, nationally and internationally, continues to be one of our essential tasks and duties.

THE WORLD DEBT CRISIS

Banks running for cover

In February 1987, Brazil, the largest debtor country, suspended interest payments on the £46 billion debt owed to commercial banks. On 21st May, Brazil imposed a further 90-day moratorium on repaying capital on its short-term debts. Ecuador had previously taken a similar line. *The Scotsman* (22nd May) reports that "the Bank of England . . . is concerned that more debt-laden countries will soon follow Brazil and Ecuador and refuse to pay interest on debts, which now total £164 billion compared to about £24 billion in 1976.

America's leading bank, Citicorp, had earlier that week generated shock-waves in international banking circles by increasing its provisions for bad debts by £1.8 billion to £3 billion. Said *The Scotsman,* "If Brazil starts negotiating with Western banks about debt repayment terms, the situation could be defused — allowing the U.K. banks off the hook. If not, several U.S. banks are expected to follow Citicorp's lead and write-off a big chunk of Third World debt in the next few weeks."

Bank shares generally fell sharply, some £600 million — or almost 5% — being knocked off the stock market value of the Big Four English clearing banks in two days. Increasing provision against bad and doubtful Third World debts will seriously cut into their profits. "But", says *The Scotsman,* "the Bank of England is concerned, saying it would be disruptive if some U.K. banks had to catch up with their bad-debt problems all at once. *After all, many of the world's leading banks would be technically insolvent if their loans to problem countries were not repaid."* (Our emphasis, Ed.)

So what can be done?

First, "securitisation", described by *The Sunday Times* (24th May, 1987) as "a process of bundling together a series of doubtful debts and selling them to outside investors as a new asset" . . . and it has developed rapidly in recent years. Salomon Brothers, the large Wall Street broking firm that is one of the leading dealers in the new secondary market for Third World debt, estimates that trading volume in these assets will total $10 billion to $15 billion this year. Some 250 banks and 50 non-financial organisations are involved in trading the debt of about a dozen countries. Because the new assets are very risky — the developing countries may default on the principal and/or the interest payments — the loans trade in the secondary market at much less than their nominal value. Salomon estimates that Brazilian loans now cost 64% of their face value. The loans of other countries cost even less. Peruvian loans, for example, cost only 11% of their face value. (Peru has said it will limit interest payments to 10% of the value of its exports.)

But more may be needed — what then? Simply transfer the debts, or part of them, from the banks to their governments and thence to the taxpayers!

"The U.S. and U.K. governments, in particular," says *The Scotsman,* "are trying to find a solution to the debt crisis, but little has happened to date. If the worst happens, banks are likely to seek support from the governments which prompted them to lend to Third World countries in the first place. Increased tax write-offs for bad debts* would

(Continued on page 5, column 2)

* "Bad debts" — a means of giving away for nothing goods and services of that amount.

"WE ARE NOT THEOLOGIANS; BUT. . . ."

In an article entitled "Tackling Indifference to God", *The Times* religious correspondent Clifford Longley (25th May, 1987) writes, "There should not be universal amazement — though there may be some ironic amusement — that a new report on doctrine from various top theologians in the Church of England will be called, so it is understood, *We Believe in God,* as if there was a contrary impression that had to be corrected. Most theologians, even Anglican ones, believe in God. When published, it will make a trilogy with two earlier reports from the same body, The Church of England Doctrine Commission. . . .

"Its revival was a herald of a wider trend in Anglicanism towards taking basic theology more seriously. . . . The progress of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission has also forced theology back more into the mainstream of church decision-making. . . .

"The still relatively low status of theologians was demonstrated by the membership of the Archbishop's Commission on Urban Priority Areas which produced *Faith in the City,* for they were considerably outnumbered by sociologists and 'practical men'. It never would have occurred to the Church to refer the whole question of inner city areas to the Doctrine Commission, though there might have been some logic in such a decision.

"The biggest single crisis facing the Church of England, as it faces all the churches in the Western world, is that represented by the term secularism, and it is an issue crying out for systematic theological treatment, such as only a body like the Doctrine Commission could give it, if the Church had confidence enough in them to commission it. . . . There is an evangelistic, missionary purpose underlying their (the Doctrine Commission's) work so far, that of making Christianity intelligently credible to Everyman in the modern world, but the task is hardly likely to bear fruit unless and until Everyman is brought into the argument as a full partner. It is a principle of education that to teach mathematics to Johnny, the teacher must not only know mathematics but also know Johnny.

"From the churches' point of view, the most disturbing aspect of secularism is not hostility to religion or disbelief in God, but indifference to all such questions. The phenomenon of indifference also breaks down the facile division between believers and non-believers, for there are believers who are indifferent, and many atheists who are far from it. . . . The phenomenon of indifference is a challenge to theologians to justify their existence, to stake a claim to have something to say that people need to listen to. . . ."

We have received from "The Gild of St George" (Rose Cottage, Hadassah Grove, Liverpool, L17 8XH) a timely pamphlet by Dewi Hopkins entitled *"More Particularly"* (Price 25p net). A "Publisher's Note" states:—

"Social Credit is the Policy of a Philosophy. As such it proposes a viewpoint of Reality; a critique of society and criteria for literary and historic criticism.

'More Particularly' is the second essay by Dewi Hopkins to venture into the field of Social Credit criticism.

An important objective of Gild of St George pamphlets is the exploration of such aspects of the Social Credit."

While the pamphlet should be read in full (and it merits several readings), readers of *The Social Crediter* will gather from the following quotations its importance as a tool ready to hand at this time of confusion in the secular and religious realms. Dewi Hopkins takes his title from a prayer composed by Jane Austen (1775-1817) of which the following is the beginning, "More particularly do we pray for the safety and welfare of our own family and friends wheresoever dispersed. . . ." He begins his pamphlet by quoting a passage from *Mansfield Park,* Chapter 30. In Note 1, he writes that "the novel is well worth re-reading as an essay on the inter-relatedness of religion, principle, duty and family affection and loyalty".

Commenting, he continues, "It is not often that Jane Austen makes such overt statements about religion (though her treatment of clergymen in her novels tells us a great deal). . . . It has been well said that for a religion to be believed as true and not just pander to emotionalism or to be intellectually curious — for it to be, properly speaking, a religion — it must be bound back to observed reality, and it surprises me that what passes for Christianity in some quarters is based not on the words of Christ and the Apostles so much as on a generalised sentiment of niceness, tolerance, liberalism and an emotion of love worked up by artificial stimulation. Nothing is condemned as wrong; nothing is opposed as tending to the destruction of the faith; and we have no call to love our enemies, because we dare not identify them as such, or even our friends, because that would imply some sort of obscure prejudice.

"Whatever else may be said about the New Testament it deals with observed realities. When we were children we were taught that a parable is 'an earthly story with a heavenly meaning'. It is not often pointed out as an equal truth that parables are earthly stories with earthly meanings, and that they would be ineffective parables if this were not so. . . . The more we think about the parables, the more clearly connected do we see the 'two' meanings to be; and this strikes me as one of the main differences between our religion and any of the others — that it is so realistic and practical.

"The idea of spiritual truth without some material correlative seems to me to be heretical. It leads into dualism and abstractionism, when either the spiritual or the material comes to be regarded as exclusively real, and I think that the error into which we are led today is to see this life as real and the next as spiritual, then 'only spiritual' or 'true in a sense'; that is, not really true at all. What follows from this is an excessive fear of death and an obsessive concern for physical health that becomes by progression of ideas a concern not for the health of the individual but for maximising the health of the community (in this case an abstraction) under the direction of experts. Collective health care becomes an aspect of government economics, with people as statistical units incapable of responsibility or rational decision because they are not 'experts'. In the end health becomes a matter of avoidance of illness and death and keeping subject citizens occupied; out of hazardous activities; and away from unhealthy thoughts about life, death and religion except in small, measured, State-approved doses."

Further on, after sections on the miracles and the Creeds, Dewi Hopkins writes "Of the great Creeds of Catholic Christianity the Athanasian Creed is the most difficult to say with fingers crossed. This is one reason for its importance to us and, perhaps, for its unpopularity with today's clergy. With this view of the Christian religion as a realistic one I believe it is possible to understand Jane

Austen's linking of principle and belief — objective principles, not 'personal values'. In such a religion we ought to find the best principles for life in a society 'in earth as it is in heaven'; the principles stated so clearly in my opening paragraph (quotation from *Mansfield Park,* Ed.) are good Christian principles to start from. Having a religion that we know to be bound back to reality, our perception of reality may be usefully and properly bound back in its turn to our religion. This hardly needs saying, I suppose, but when we know that things are not working out as we wish they would — and they are not — it is sensible to refer back to our store of wisdom and understanding. Those who are turning the world upside down do this themselves in a perverted way (e.g., justifying revolutionary terrorism by reference to the scourging of the temple money-changers and calling it 'liberation theology' — an ugly concept at odds with the teaching of the New Testasment, which has nevertheless taken the fancy of the authors of 'Faith in the City' and other members of the Church establishment); yet we are sometimes inhibited from going to our best source for guidance by a reluctance to seem 'religiose' and perhaps by the bad example of some who ally themselves with and bless, in the name of Christianity, movements that might destroy it or reduce it to parity with all other religions (which would eventually destroy all particular religions and leave only 'Religion'.)"

Commenting on the third Gospel's "the kingdom of God is within you", the author writes "The marginal gloss gives 'among' as an alternative to 'within', but obviously 'within' is regarded as the more likely meaning. . . . If Greek scholars disagree about this, it is likely that it is one of those words able to contain a range of significations that cannot all be rendered in one word in another language, so that it loses in translation. . . . The seventeenth century translators found it natural to put the individual first, and their twentieth century successors, equally naturally, perhaps, put the community first. I guess that this might be one of those 'new insights' that we hear so much about, but to me it is not an insight but an error, or an imbalance, if you like. For it does reflect the tendency of our time to put the collective before the person ('confounding the persons'). . . ."

In this context, Dewi Hopkins embarks (p. 8) upon a brief exploration of the present defective financial system. "Yet we find that we are living in a society whose whole material economy is based on debit finance . . . and debit finance is not working. The two things that keep us from final, worldwide economic catastrophe are, on the one hand, the incredible outpouring of natural gifts and the rapid growth of technology and, on the other hand, the late and grudging acquiescence in the forgiveness of debts through the device of private, corporate and national bankruptcies, when irrecoverable debts are eventually written off. Even then, attempts are made, often successfully, to entice defaulters into even more damaging, more long-term debts. The real cost of this is seen in misery, poverty, suicide and war.

"What is the answer? Well, we have it, don't we? Just do as we have been told. All money is issued as having been created out of nothing. It is then partly filtered down to individuals as payment for labour (for which, as everyone knows, there is decreasing need) and sucked back to the point of issue as debt repayment in many forms including taxation, while nations go on building up national debts because the money system is inherently incapable, without modification, of being self-liquidating. Christians should wish to aim at something more practical, more realistic, more wholesome and less destructive. That is, we should have faith in what we say we believe, and in what is something more than an emotionally satisfying form of words. It has been suggested that money could be issued in sufficient quantity, on a realistic calculation of what is needed and wanted and of what can be produced and supplied in the way of goods and services, to function as effective demand.

"Since a large part of our capacity to produce comes from the natural creation and from the efforts and ingenuity of our predecessors, *this proportion* of the total issue of money represents our common inheritance, and we all have a natural right to an equal share in it, as a dividend; as such it should be issued to us. This is not a new proposal, and it is claimed that it would end poverty by giving everyone a basic income; make the word 'unemployment' obsolete because 'employment' would not be the condition for receiving this basic income; and open up undreamed-of possibilities for the free development of people's lives. . . . It is a proposal not for revolution but for a small adjustment to clear out a blockage in the system, so that our country's long progress towards democracy can continue. . . .

"The supreme requirement, love of God and my fellow men, including my enemy, must be met, and if we find a better, more efficient way of using our wealth, based on a Christian apprehension of realities, there will remain two ways in which we need to exercise charity towards people of other nations. One is to relieve the suffering caused by great disasters, the only appropriate question being how to do so most effectively. The second is missionary work. We are commanded to spread the Word in any case, and if doing so can be shown to bring life more abundantly in a material as well as a spiritual sense, then it is doubly incumbent on us to set a better example than we do at present, with our economic system at odds with our proclaimed belief. If our example is then freely rejected, we cannot be blamed for the plight of other nations. At every level, the attempt to shield people from the consequences of their acts is misguided."

Concluding the pamphlet, the author writes "For there is a sense of 'first things first' which is Christian and scriptural: 'But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel' (1 Timothy V, 8).

"Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small" . . . (Longfellow). It has been said that the Church should be the authority on "the mills of God". Dewi Hopkins echoed C. H. Douglas in his definition of religion, which Dr Tudor Jones referred to in the following passages from the Epilogue to *"Elements of Social Credit — an Introductory Course of Lectures"* (1946).

"The Policy of Social Credit is Liberty, in other words, 'Life and more abundantly'. . . . Social Credit is applied Christianity; it reflects in its actual structure the characteristic doctrines of the Christian religion. 'Now the word 'religion', again going back to its etymological derivations, derives from a word meaning to bind back; it is related to the word ligament. . . . It is the binding back either of action, or of policy — particularly of policy in the sense that I was using the word policy — to reality. . . . It does not necessarily mean, for instance, that your

(Continued on page 6, column 1)

SATANIC FORCES

"India, in so far as it became a political entity, was a British creation. Its history as such began on the last day of the sixteenth century, when Queen Elizabeth granted a charter to a London company trading with the East Indies. From this flowed in due course the establishment by the British of a common administration for the great sub-continent, and the adoption of English as the common language of educated Indians, where previously the many races spoke about 200 languages. In these circumstances, British withdrawal was the death of India, reflected immediately by partition into 'India' and 'Pakistan' and conflict between these arbitrary units over Kashmir. . . .

"All this, of course, in the pursuit of world dominion by conspiratorial internationalists, who, as Major Douglas wrote in a memorable article, care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow. The British Empire was the greatest barrier to world dominion, and its destruction the prime objective.

"Douglas also wrote that while world dominion had not the slightest chance of ultimate success, it had every prospect of setting back civilisation by several centuries. And this is what it has done, with consequences in famines and crime gaining almost daily momentum. No wonder that Douglas considered that the apex of the conspiracy probably contacted Satanic forces. . . ." B. W. Monahan, *The Social Crediter,* 11th March, 1967, quoted in "The Moving Storm".

Richard Wurmbrand has written a book, *Marx and Satan,* Crossway Books, 1986, ($5.95 plus $1 for shipment from General Birch Services Corporation, Belmont, MA 02178).

F. R. Duplantier comments on this book in an article "The Devil made him do it", (*The New American,* 8th December, 1986). "In *Crime and Punishment,* famed Russian novelist Fyodor Dostoyevsky depicted with brilliant insight the criminal's compulsion to confess. It is not surprising that the Communists, the greatest mass murderers in the history of the world, share this compulsion — though their moments of candour have more the air of bragadoccio than penitence. To a man, the Soviet leaders from Lenin to Gorbachev have boasted of their intentions to enslave the world. Unlike the common criminal, however, who expects to be punished for the crimes to which he confesses, or to be restrained from the commission of those he has acknowledged plotting, the Communist who publishes his evil deeds and evil plans seems confident that he will go unchallenged.

"His impunity derives from the inability of his intended victim to understand his motivation. We simply cannot fathom why anyone should want to enslave, torture, and murder millions of people. And because we cannot understand the inspiration for such inhumanity, we tend to discount the reality of it. There was a time when all men believed in the existence of evil, knew its origin, and understood the means with which to combat it; but in this 'complex' age of ours we are no longer satisfied with simple answers, and our 'sophistication' has rendered us defenseless. . . .

"In an earlier age we might have been able to dismiss Richard Wurmbrand's *Marx and Satan* as a superfluous work. . . . His thesis that the evil wrought in the world by Marx and his disciples can only be explained by Satanic influence, would have seemed axiomatic. . . . The question is: Is Wurmbrand justified in assuming that it is possible to prove *anything* to people who refuse to believe? And if his book does convince our modern sceptics — as it should — that Karl Marx was a Satan worshipper whose overriding goal in life was to lead as many men as possible into damnation, will they also conclude that Satan does exist, or will they merely be amused by Marx's 'gullibility'?

"In a first chapter entitled 'Changed Loyalties', Wurmbrand documents a dramatic shift in the young Marx's first allegiance. 'In his early youth, Karl Marx professed to be and lived as a Christian. . . . But Marx was not out of his teens before he became profoundly and passionately anti-religious. In a poem entitled 'Invocation of One in Despair', he made his bold confession, 'I wish to avenge myself against the One who rules above'. Another poem, 'The Player', is even more ominous. . . . Wurmbrand explains that 'in the rites of higher initiation in the Satanist cult, an enchanted sword which ensures success is sold to the candidate. He pays for it by signing a covenant, with blood taken from his wrists, agreeing that his soul — will belong to Satan after death.'

"Devil's Advocates.

"The volume and intensity of Marx's self-incrimination are overwhelming. And Wurmbrand cites similar material from the pens of Lenin, Stalin and other prominent Communists. To disbelieve that these men were dedicated Satanists, we must deny both the physical evidence of their evil ('By their fruits you shall know them') and their own testimony. . . ."

In *The New American* of 19th January, 1987, a correspondent, Marlene N. Metzinger, referring to the above article by F. R. Duplantier, writes: "Having never before heard Karl Marx described as a Satan worshipper, I sought out biographies of him. . . . Robert Payne has included in their entirety Marx's poems *The Player* and *Nocturnal Love.* . . . In short, Payne confirms Richard Wurmbrand's appraisal of Marx as an accomplice of the devil: 'The pact with the devil was the central theme of *Oulanem* and appears in various disguises in many of his early poems. It was a subject on which Marx brooded frequently, not only in his youth. Goethe's *Faust* was his bible, the one book which he regarded with unreserved admiration, and he liked to read out the verses of Mephistopheles, just as he liked to sign himself "Old Nick". He had the devil's view of the world, and the devil's malignity. Sometimes he seemed to know that he was accomplishing works of evil.'"

The World Debt Crisis *(Continued from page 2)*

be something the banks would welcome. The clearing banks are hoping that the Bank of England will act on their behalf to put pressure on the Inland Revenue to allow more generous tax treatment of bad debt provisions.

'Citicorp claimed some £1 billion back on the £3 billion it had set aside as loan losses from the taxman but British banks get a much worse deal from the I.R."

Quoting a banking analyst, *The Scotsman's* report concludes that "only political pressure will result in the Inland Revenue adopting a more lenient stance. Citicorp's success in clawing back a third of its provisions from the tax

(Continued on page 6, column 1)