

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 66 No. 5

SEPTEMBER — OCTOBER, 1987

THE INTERNATIONAL IDEA

by Eric D. Butler

Almost every paper one reads at present contains reports of increasing numbers of take-overs in every field, all financed by those who have the power to create money as a debt owed to them. But there are also reports of growing economic cooperation between Western based multinational organisations and all Communist countries, including China. Lenin would be delighted with what is taking place. He said that a World Communist state would be impossible until an international economic system had been developed. The New International Economic Order, endorsed by the United Nations, Moscow and Peking, and the International Bankers, is the blueprint for what is planned.

As early as 1924, when the first edition of *Social Credit* was published, C. H. Douglas was predicting that Civilisation would inevitably disintegrate unless action could be taken to reverse the growing centralisation of power. In an early article, *The International Idea*, Douglas pointed out that the drive towards a World State was rooted in the age-old will-to-power philosophy. He drew attention to the studies of the American Brooks Adams and others who had documented how the basic cause of the collapse of all Civilisation had been the centralisation of power.

Irrespective of how power is centralised, it always has the same corrupting influence, not only of those who use it, but, generally overlooked, of those over whom it is used. The draining of power from the individual also drains from him his initiative and creativeness. The individual is driven down the scale of existence as he becomes the mere tool of those who have power over him. He loses his soul and can actually come to love his chains. The modern Welfare State is of the very Devil and basically anti-Christian.

In his realistic approach to what is termed history, C. H. Douglas said that history was not a series of disconnected events, but crystallised politics. A study of big maps was essential, he said. The seeds of the present plight of the world were sown a long time ago, but it was during last century that they started to emerge in growth which was to foreshadow the shape of things to come. There were two major factors in the situation developing last century. First was the British Empire which, since the loss of the American colonies, developed through the progressive decentralisation of power and, together with the British-originated industrial revolution, beckoned mankind towards a new type of Civilisation in which all power, economic and political, could be decentralised, providing the individual with growing independence.

Much of the evidence provided by Douglas in a series of books, concluding with *The Brief for the Prosecution*, to demonstrate his theme that there was a conscious policy, pursued over a long period of time, to create a World State, was deductive. The fact that Douglas has been proved correct by events, is a striking testimony to the genius of the man who went right to the core of the human drama. In more recent times the evidence concerning the World State

programme has become more obvious. Some of the most authoritative evidence concerning a global conspiracy, was provided by the prestigious historian, a liberal, not a conservative, Professor Carroll Quigley, in his *Tragedy and Hope*.

Quigley said he had been given access to the documentary evidence of how the International Bankers, exercising power through credit creation, were using the Communists and other revolutionaries to create a New World Order. Quigley himself said he had no objection to what was being planned. But he disagreed with the attempted secrecy concerning what he regarded as a noble and idealistic conception of a world Utopia. Douglas had dealt with the deadly menace of Utopias imposed by idealists long before the Quigley book.

Douglas said, "When we accuse the world's great financiers of being merely conscienceless buccaneers, there is a sense in which we do them less than justice, and at the same time fail to recognise the deadly danger which they embody. The great financier is in most cases a great idealist, and sooner or later constructs a Utopia which it is his constant endeavour to impose upon the world . . . society is never in more deadly danger than when it is committed to the mercies of the idealist, and particularly the Utopianist. [. . .] What we really demand of existence is not that we shall be put into somebody else's Utopia, but that we shall be put in a position to construct a Utopia of our own. And this idea of a centrally controlled world in which everyone lives under uniform conditions, elaborated on a basis of statistics . . . is at the back of the drive which is being made to induce us to believe that the world can be considered as a single unit. Cultures, climate, tradition, race, and habit all give the lie to this idea, and as the human personality develops, it becomes more individualised and specialised in its outlook, and less and less amenable to centralised direction."

The development of the British Empire along with a distinctive British culture, was seen as a major stumbling block to the programme for a World State. It had to be destroyed. The programme of destruction was promoted by the Financier-Communist alliance. The Soviet was established by International Finance in 1917 and has been maintained by International Finance ever since. Any prospect of a regenerated British Empire after the Second World War was dealt a deadly blow by forcing a reluctant British people, who were betrayed by the British Conservative party, into the European Economic Community, one decisive factor being the claim that a "united" Europe would better be able to withstand the Soviet challenge. The E.E.C. has played a major role in providing economic blood-transfusions to sustain the Soviet. Mrs Margaret Thatcher's recent visit to the Soviet has paved the way for still more economic assistance from Britain. The "Anti-socialist monetarists" of the Thatcher

(Continued on page 3)

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.

ABSTENTION AND CONTRACTING-OUT

It has been a feature of recent voting exercises that people increasingly show their lack of belief in the efficacy of their vote (to change anything) by abstention. That is not the same as contracting-out but it is regarded as the best that can be done in the circumstances. Why is this? Education policies provide a good explanation, though there are many more of such examples.

Over the past two decades, parents and teachers have seen governments, of whatever hue, kill off the grammar schools, politicize the curriculum, and generally forego well-tried standards in favour of "progressive" untried aims. The results have gone deep. In spite of the words thrown at the electorate in the atmosphere of power-seeking which dominates General Elections, will anything change?

From the Conservative Party, the latest indications are that parents (and governors) will be permitted collectively to contract-out of local authority control, and schools which take this action are to receive their funds direct from central government (subject to providing education to a certain unspecified standard). This could be a loosening of the collectivist shackles, but why not go the whole way and give *individual* parents the power to contract out by taking "education vouchers" to be used at the school of *their* choice?

If Mrs Thatcher (or indeed any Prime Minister) is determined to combat collectivism, she need only offer to the individual, where practicable, this power to contract-out of specific State services. Such services could be faced with an effective revolt if what is offered, either in quality of service or in objective, is unacceptable and a great step forward would have been taken towards Economic Democracy. Those overtly or covertly opposing such a reform could justly be identified as enemies of freedom. And what would the reaction be if the nation were told that "there are not sufficient vouchers"?

A PLEA FOR A REALISTIC POLICY

The following covering letter, together with a copy of *The Social Crediter* for July/August, has been sent to each of the diocesan bishops in England.

CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM

Penrhyn Lodge,
2 Park Village East,
London, NW1 7PX.

10th July, 1987.

My Lord,

LIFE MORE ABUNDANT?

I venture to write to you at a time when, in spite of the unprecedented "war of words", vital questions have been left unasked. One question I would ask here is — when we pray the Lord's Prayer and say, "Give us this day our daily bread" are we asking for "full employment?"

You may well have observed how the General Election propaganda from all parties concentrated on issues posed almost exclusively *in financial terms*; for example, the financial costs of the Health and Education Services, possible cuts or increases in taxation, how much each party intended to borrow. But was any politician heard to say "if it's physically possible, then it must be financially possible also?" Yet this is the only realistic approach to today's most urgent problems of poverty amidst plenty; of homelessness and urban dereliction while construction workers are idle, though needed; and of ever-increasing debt, personal, national and international.

Does not Christianity assert that institutions should serve Mankind, not enslave it? Social Credit reflects this truth. Our present financial system distorts reality, permits hunger and starvation while "surpluses" mount, produces sterile "unemployment" instead of potentially creative leisure, and converts what should be the mutually beneficial exchange of national surpluses into fierce international competition for a "favourable balance of trade" and eventual "trade war". Establish the principle that money should be servant, not master, and the necessary technical adjustments to the system can follow.

The enclosed issue of *The Social Crediter* pleads for a new realistic approach to these social and political problems which remain largely unaffected by the result of the General Election. Our particular plea is for your consideration of the true alternative policy, as briefly indicated on page 4, and if you are convinced of its truth, for your influence towards its implementation.

Yours sincerely,

Basil L. Steele
(Dr B. L. Steele).

The International Idea (Continued from page 1)

government accept uncritically the Black Magic of financial orthodoxy, which insists that a nation can only sustain its domestic economy by a "favourable balance of trade".

President Ronald Reagan, another staunch anti-Communist, who initially described the Soviet Union as an "evil empire", has progressively retreated under the influence of the same Black Magic until now the U.S.A. is not only supporting the financing of Poland and other Eastern Bloc nations, as well as the Soviet Union, but subsidising grain exports to the Soviet Union. American pressure on Japan is resulting in Japan looking at China and the Soviet Union as areas to which they can finance greater exports. There are suggestions that Japan might use its massive trade credits to take over Third World debts. Top Japanese bankers are members of the Trilateral Commission, headed by David Rockefeller. The Trilateral Commission is an advocate of a global economy. The world's largest financial institution is now Japanese, Nomura Securities Co. Ltd. Nomura has moved into the international equity markets and believes that the move into foreign equities is essential for establishing itself near the top of the projected 20 mega-companies which will dominate the world's financial markets by the end of the century.

"Modernisation" in China and Gorbachev's alleged liberalisation coincide with the escalation of the non-Communist nations' economic problems, one being what to do with mounting surplus production. The Grand Design of openly meshing the economies of all nations has now come into the open, with both Moscow and China inviting the multinationals from the rest of the world to invest in their countries through joint development projects. This concept has excited the interest of one of Australia's leading takeover experts, Mr John Elliott. Misguided Australians who term themselves conservative and anti-Communist, believe that Mr Elliott would make an excellent Australian Liberal Prime Minister!

Multimillionaire Armand Hammer of Occidental Petroleum has a long record of providing aid for the Soviet Union. Back in 1973, when Richard Nixon was President of the U.S.A., Armand Hammer signed one of his biggest deals with the Soviet, a 20-year agreement to provide the Soviet with huge quantities of concentrated phosphoric acid, a vital liquid fertiliser. The recently deceased William Casey, head of the C.I.A., was at that time head of the American Export-Import Bank. Casey was urged by President Nixon to provide the Soviet with a low interest loan of \$180 million to help finance the Hammer project. That was back in the era of *détente*, strongly supported by the Rockefeller's man, Secretary of State Dr Henry Kissinger. It was during this period that the International Zionists and the Soviet moved large numbers of Jews out of the Soviet, where they were allegedly being persecuted.

Following in the footsteps of Nixon and Kissinger, President Reagan toured Communist China in 1984, offering American technological and other assistance. On 29th April of that year, Armand Hammer signed an agreement with the Chinese government to develop a massive open coal pit in China, the biggest in the world. Reports of similar non-Communist based multinationals investing in both the Soviet and China are now appearing almost daily. The internationalisation of the world's

economy is taking place quite openly. It is being financed by International Finance. The nexus between International Finance and Marxism is now clear for all to see. There can be no argument now about what is taking place. The only question is whether the Grand Design can reach its ultimate objective? And the short answer is, No; for the reasons Douglas mentioned. Truth can be challenged, but not destroyed.

The basic problem is how to minimise the damage of the inevitable break up of civilisation. Douglas commented in *Social Credit* that "There is, at the moment, no party, group or individual at once possessing the power, the knowledge, and the will, which would transmute the growing social unrest and resentment (now chiefly marshalled under the crudities of Socialism and Communism) into a constructive effort for the regeneration of Society. This being the case, we are merely witnesses to a succession of rearguard actions of the so-called Conservative elements in Society . . . a process which can only result, like all rearguard actions, in a successive, if not successful, retreat on the part of the forces attacked."

Events have confirmed what Douglas wrote over 50 years ago. But progressively the *idea* of Socialism as an answer has been exhausted. What has proved a colossal failure no longer can attract. The brutalising effects of Communism, wherever tried, have become more widely known. And with the much-publicised "New Right" offering no basic solutions to the human drama, it is not without significance that while large numbers of the young are despairing of the future, many committing suicide, there is evidence that a growing number of the same young are looking for alternatives. Theories which in practice produce growing disasters, no longer attract. The theory of "racial equality" results in a growing number of disasters around the world, the latest example being in Fiji.

So long as the life-force is sustained in the seed which drops into the decaying vegetation on the forest floor, it can result in the new growth. The very disintegration taking place today is producing the conditions in which new growth can, over a period, take place. The task of those who have grasped the Social Credit idea, is to ensure that it is protected. In one sense, those who have grasped the Social Credit idea are entrusted with a type of sacred trust. They are the true conservationists of this globally destructive period in man's history, showing how as internationalism results in still greater convulsions and destruction, there is a genuine alternative, that a policy of Death can be overcome with a policy of Life More Abundant.

Reprinted from *The New Times*, Melbourne, May, 1987.

REAGAN UNDER FIRE

The American people are being defeated in their minds by the sheer quantity of information being pumped out by the media on the subject of the so-called Irangate scandal, the accusation being that arms were supplied to Iran and the profits thereof used to help the Contras in Nicaragua, in defiance of American law.

Yet the information which has been filling newspaper pages for many months, not to mention the electronic media, can be regarded as reflecting only part of the proceedings of the bicameral investigating committee, all of which again is only a tiny fraction of the information that is

(Continued on page 5, column 2)

THE MESSAGE OF MRS THATCHER'S TRIUMPH

Mrs Margaret Thatcher's stunning victory in the recent British election, giving her Conservative Party a majority of 101 over all other parties, was a happening of the greatest imaginable importance to Britain, to the West and, therefore, to the whole world.

It was a happening of global importance not because of any immediate effect it is likely to produce, but rather as a sign that something of importance had begun to happen all over the world long before the British election. Revolutionary forces which have given the world a century of conflict and tragedy without any precedent in history can now be seen to have suffered a change that could be irreversible.

In other words, the recent election means far more in the global context than it means in Britain.

The story of what happened in that election is told with commendable frankness and accuracy in the language of leftist lamentation and recrimination. For example, the *Guardian*: "It is a sensational and chilling result. Not the name of the victor, but the magnitude of her triumph." And from the *Observer*: "The only interpretation she can draw from her large majority is that the country approves of what she is doing: she can carry on doing what *they* like."

What made the result all the more shocking to the left was the fact that, according to all the known rules of modern party politics, not to mention the opinion polls and the opinions of the pundits, it should not have happened. All have had to admit that there was something profoundly wrong in all their calculations.

The *Guardian* writer, Hugo Young, came closest to the elusive truth: "It was a victory above all for her. . . . She won as a force of nature. That is the measure of her achievement. Few leaders have been more cordially disliked, by her own supporters among others. But her command of the unlikeable virtues — the tough, the inflexible, the indignantly self-righteous — still pulls in the votes."

Margaret Thatcher seems to have had some need to be "a force of nature" in order to resist all the temptations of conventional party politics.

Writes Nicholas Wapshott in the *Observer*: "It was her wish to announce the radical menu for the next five years that was the heart of the behind-the-scenes tiffs at Central Office. Norman Tebbit (Party Chairman) and the Saatchis (public relations consultants) were keen on a punch-up with knocking copy against Labour and the Alliance; Mrs Thatcher wanted to inspire her people with the next round of Thatcherism." Her advisers were evidently appalled at the idea of disregarding all the well tried rules of political marketing, but she stood to her guns and was proved right.

So, what is it that Mrs Thatcher has done and now proposes to go on doing?

Answer: She has at least started the process of setting in reverse that revolution which, ever since the end of World War II, has been drawing Britain towards a total surrender of everything for which Britain ever stood as a free and independent nation.

She had to ride along with the revolution — for example, she had to go along with the betrayal of kith and kin in Rhodesia* — but much that lay within the bounds of the

possible she dared to attempt and has largely succeeded in doing. She has virtually broken the power of the trade union leaders — by the ingenious device of restoring power to union members — and she has made a good start with the re-privatisation of enterprises which had been nationalised by Labour governments.

The *Guardian* writer is frank about prospects which now alarm the left: "Determined to scorch socialism from the face of Britain, the Conservatives are suddenly presented . . . with the means, the time and the popular authority to do so. Nor if they attempt it will they have to concern themselves too much with the parliamentary opposition. For opposition politicians the election result is as bad as it is wonderful for the government."

Major areas that will demand Mrs Thatcher's early attention if she is to continue to scorch socialism from the face of Britain include the national health service and the education system which have run into crisis situations.

If we are to get at the full meaning of the British election in world-historical terms, we must consider briefly the present plight of the parliamentary opposition: the Labour Party and the Liberal Party and Social Democratic Party Alliance.

The *Guardian* writer is frank about the prospects: "It is no longer (a question) of how to effect a liaison between a revived alliance and a 'sensible' wing of the Labour Party, but whether it is possible under the Labour banner to reassemble and fructify the divided millions of the progressive vote. It looks right now a remote idea. History and personality, to the left of Kinnock in the party and to the right of him outside it, tell strongly against it. Old fissures, covered up for the duration (of the election), beckon once again. Mrs Thatcher has much else of which to be justly proud. *But to have rendered all opposition so pathetically impotent* as she contemplates the next five years will give her, regrettably, the greatest pleasure of all." (Emphasis added.)

The inclusion of five fiery Black radicals in Mr Kinnock's parliamentary team will certainly not make it easier for him to rebuild the Labour Party as a credible government-in-waiting. We could go on and on about possible developments in British politics, but what we most of all need to know are the possible implications of the British election for the West and for the rest of the world.

What has happened can be stated in one short sentence: Socialism is dead!

Margaret Thatcher has begun to dismantle the works of socialism and has been given a clear mandate to carry on with the job. And the Labour Party, historically Britain's socialist party, has proved itself powerless to intervene. Again, because socialism as an ideology, as a faith, as an intellectual frame of reference, is dead. It is true that a few members of the Labour Party still believe in socialism but these, the so-called "militants", have become an acute embarrassment to the party hierarchy. So Labour Party leader Kinnock now finds himself wearing socialism like an albatross about his neck.

In other words, any part of opposition if it is to have any chance of defeating the Conservative Party will have to free itself once and for all of the incubus of what was once for the Labour Party holy writ.

* See chapters on Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) in this writer's book *Truth Out of Africa* (Veritas, second and third printings, 1985, 1987).

(Continued on page 5, column 1)

The Message of Mrs Thatcher's Triumph (Continued from page 4)**"Conspiracy of Truth"**

There are many places in the world where socialism is still being imposed or implemented — even on our side of the Iron Curtain, indeed even in Britain after eight years of Thatcher rule — but the important fact remains that as a faith, as a religion substitute for the educated, both in the socialist and so-called free world it has been abandoned beyond any hope of ever being revived.

It is significant, surely, that in all the rhetoric poured out by leftist politicians and journalists during the last election in Britain it would have been hard, if not impossible, to find one sentence of socialist doctrine being used in an attempt to prevent Mrs Thatcher from continuing to "scorch socialism from the face of Britain"!

The only aim the *Guardian* was able to offer the Labour Party leader was that of trying to "reassemble and fructify the divided millions of the progressive vote". And it was precisely the spokesman of this "progressive vote", now without an ideology or a programme of action, which Mrs Thatcher found it so easy to overwhelm.

The *Observer* writer accuses Mrs Thatcher of having now "embarked on the third term of her shamelessly populist revolution", adding that the weight of her success is not so much that she has won three elections in a row but that she has been re-elected after eight years of making substantial change in Britain.

What that means is that Mrs Thatcher has secured massive public support to press on with a counter-revolution; that is, the reversal of a revolutionary process which has afflicted the whole world in our century. In all the circumstances, this seems to have been a task that only a woman could have dared to attempt, a woman with a will capable of resisting the almost irresistible persuasions of expediency — the male politician's Achilles heel.

And it was possible only because the intellectuals serving the other side, that is, the side of Big Money, now lack a coherent ideology and faith capable of sustaining themselves and of being communicated to the voting masses.

If this can happen in Britain it can happen anywhere, and for the same reasons.

What we can be seeing, therefore, are the first clear signs of a turning of the tide against a big-money revolution which has given the world a century of conflict without precedent in recorded history. From now on we can expect to find the left with its money, its politicians and its mighty media being increasingly drained of credibility.

Footnote: A "Psychic Epidemic"

Two expressions used by Margaret Thatcher's leftist critics are deeply revealing and call for a few words of comment; one is the reference to her "shamelessly populist revolution", and the other the description of her as "a force of nature".

Both comments are, of course, derogatory from a leftist or "progressive" point of view which assumes that in politics people are given what their rulers believe to be in their best interests and not what the people themselves might want. The populist view, on the other hand, is that the first duty of the political leader is to consult the will and instincts of the population.

But what can be wrong with a political leader being "a force of nature"?

Answer: According to the leftist or "progressive" system of values, it is the main purpose of the intellect to supersede and conquer nature, including human nature in those to be ruled; indeed, human nature is seen as the main obstacle to the attainment of an imagined perfect ordering of the world. It is this attitude of mind, this flight into unreality, this idea of plasticising and remoulding human beings to meet the requirements of an imagined political ideal, which Carl Gustav Jung has described as "a psychic epidemic" afflicting the educated classes in the West. And it is this morbid attitude of mind which so eagerly adopted Marxist socialism as a personal religion substitute and as a political working programme.

Being a self-proving product of the intellect, socialism could not be proved wrong; all that was wrong with it, as experience has amply demonstrated, is that an unalterable human nature will always guarantee that socialism cannot be made to work.

Note: Articles in past issues of *Behind the News* on socialism include "Antidote to Fabian Socialism", November, 1982, and "A Close Look at the Socialist Religion", September, 1984.

Reprinted from *Behind the News* by Ivor Benson, June/July, 1987, Heron Books, P.O. Box 29, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 6EF.

Reagan under Fire (Continued from page 3)

technically available, including stacks of documents, many of them marked "Top Secret".

Quite possibly the Reagan administration has been pursuing policies in regard to Iran and Latin America that are in conflict with the requirements of those secret powers which have so long controlled American politics from behind the scenes. In a word, Ronald Reagan has been offering some resistance to what can only be called "the world revolutionary trend". Reagan's policy of "constructive engagement" in regard to South Africa comes under the same heading; he cannot openly defy the forces operating through a Congress packed by America's secret rulers, but he can drag his feet and put obstacles in their way. Mrs Margaret Thatcher has been playing much the same game in Britain, but with more success.

There is good reason to believe that the main objective of America's secret rulers now is to get rid of Ronald Reagan before the end of his term as President. One possible way is to prove him "guilty" of some form of "law-breaking" and another is to pile on the pressure in the hope that his health will break.

One of the key pieces in this drama is George Bush, the Vice-President, the Trilateralist one-worlders' own man. There seems little chance of Bush being accepted by either of the main parties as a candidate in the next presidential election, but if he could spend a little while in the White House as President his chances of being nominated would, of course, be greatly improved.

We can, therefore, expect the present vicious campaign against Reagan to continue, spearheaded by the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*; these two "establishment" newspapers call the shots, and the rest of the media pack, including radio and television, follow suit.

Reprinted from *Behind the News* by Ivor Benson, June/July, 1987, Heron Books, P.O. Box 29, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 6EF.

AN AGENCY OF CENTRALISATION

Trilaterals over Washington by Antony C. Sutton and Patrick M. Wood was published in 1979, followed by Volume 2 in 1981, by The August Corporation. Appendix B of the latter volume is a list of members and former members. Among the British members (1981) appear the following names: Denis Healey, Edward Heath, David Owen, Lord Shackleton and Peter Tapsell. Among former members in public services: Lord Carrington, Bernard Hayhoe, and unlisted former members, Lord Harlech, Reginald Maudling.

The penultimate issue of *Approaches*, double issue nos. 93/94, published shortly before the death of its Editor, Hamish Fraser, on 17th October, 1986, had an eight-page supplement consisting of a translation of an article which appeared in the journal *Spectacle du Monde* under the title "The Trilateral under the Spotlight". An editorial note preceding the translation reads as follows: "The following article has been translated by Geoffrey A. Lawman from the December 1985 issue of the expensively produced French review *Spectacle du Monde*. Its main significance is not so much what it says — for it tells us little we didn't already know from other sources — but WHERE it is said. For hitherto such information had been published only in 'samizdat'-type publications. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first occasion when it has appeared in a large-circulation popular review."

The first part of the article is reprinted below, and the remainder will follow in our next issue (Editor, *The Social Crediter*.)

The Trilateral Commission

Mr Gorbachev is no longer able to get his own way by the threat of force, and we shall be seeing him come cap in hand to ask for all sorts of things, and especially credit. The bankers of the Trilateral are waiting for him.

"It is time to put a stop to the naïve ideas circulating in the Press about the Trilateral Commission. We are not the cabinet of a secret world government. . . ." This defensive rectification comes from the mouth of M. Paul Delouvrier, the chairman of the French section of the Trilateral and joint founder of that Commission.

This body, noted as much for its influence as for its discretion, held its last meeting privately in Paris from the 25th to the 27th October, 1985. The principal speaker at this routine meeting, which was attended only by the representatives of the European continent (the initiates used the term "regional meeting"), was the Frenchman Raymond Barre,¹ who had been co-opted into the Commission by that organisation's recruiting agents more than 12 years ago.

A top state official like M. Barre, M. Delouvrier admits his fascination for technical problems, and is very ready to express his contempt for the fine detail of small-scale projects. Now over 71, he still claims to be an "electrician" by profession, a reference to the 10 years, from 1969 to 1979, that he spent as head of the E.D.F., the French nationalised electricity industry. A tax inspector since 1941, this senior bureaucrat has followed a career typical of so many "Trilateralists", serving the State under several successive Republics. His name is linked to a number of large-scale achievements: the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community, whose financial division he directed from

1955 to 1958; the "Constantine Plan" set up in Algeria during his term as Delegate General of the French Government in that country from 1958 to 1960; the overall planning of new towns in the Paris area, which he supervised during the 1960s; and the public establishment of the Parc de la Villette, of which he was in charge from 1979 until his recent retirement.

It was he personally who in autumn 1973 introduced the Trilateral Commission into Europe.

The official goal of this "think-tank", set up in the U.S.A. in the previous July through the efforts of David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Max Kohnstamm, a close colleague of Jean Monnet in the "Action Committee for a United States of Europe", was "to harmonise political, economic, social and cultural relations between the world's three market-economy regions (hence the term 'trilateral'), namely Western Europe, North America and Japan".

Directed by three leaders of equal authority, the American David Rockefeller, the Japanese Isamu Yamashita (boss of the Mitsui corporation) and the Frenchman Georges Berthoin (international chairman of the European Movement and former E.E.C. ambassador in London), the Trilateral recommends a dual policy to governments: the gradual integration of the economies of the free and Communist worlds through a systematic fostering of commercial exchanges; and the transfer to the Third World of a part of the sums currently devoted by the West to armaments.²

The principal objective that emerged from this October's meeting in Paris was to exert pressure on official American circles to bring home to them the "dramatic" character of the U.S. budget deficit and to get them to work in Congress to limit the increase in credits for defence expenditure that President Reagan is currently asking for.

Free trade between "East" and "West" and the setting up of a system of World Government are the favourite subjects for discussion in the Trilateral, which frequently draws a favourable contrast between the economic "rationality" of its own view of the world and the "disorder" caused by the continuing "anachronistic" insistence on national sovereignty.

This doctrine was formulated early in the 1970s by the former chief of Mr Jimmy Carter's National Security Council and first director of the Trilateral Commission, Zbigniew Brzezinski ("Zbig" to his opponents, by reference to the "Big Brother" of the World Government portrayed by George Orwell in his 1984). Born in Warsaw in 1929, Mr Brzezinski did not renounce his Polish nationality until 1949. As the son of a diplomat, he continues to have close links with Central Europe. His wife Emily is the daughter of the Czechoslovakian President Benes, deposed by Hitler in 1938, and who after the war resumed the presidency from 1945 to 1948 in a country by then under Communist control.

A Harvard graduate (like Henry Kissinger, another prestigious European immigrant, who took American

¹ M. Barre has already served two terms as France's Prime Minister under the previous President Giscard d'Estaing, from 1976 to 1978 and from 1978 to 1981, and was widely tipped in the Press as her next head of government after the parliamentary elections in March, 1986. He appeared to be trying to oust Giscard, Chirac *et al.*, as leader of the "Liberal wing" and next President when Mitterrand's term ends in 1988. (Trans.)

² In fact, its intervention in the Third World is consistently subversive.

nationality in 1943 and became "Zbig's" rival within the Trilateral after acting as President Nixon's chief diplomatic trouble-shooter), Mr Brzezinski first came to prominence through his leadership of two bodies dependent on the Rockefeller Foundation: the "Institute for the Study of Communist Problems", which he took over in 1961, and the "Institute for Research on International Change", of which he became chairman in 1966. He took good care not to commit himself over the Vietnam war.

The main strand in his thinking is that the Soviet empire enjoys a rational system of government, and that the West would be well advised to co-operate with it if we want to preserve peace and "stabilise" international relations.

"Marxism", he wrote in his *Alternative to Partition* (New York, 1965), the book in which he set out his programme, "has made a decisive contribution to defining the nature of our period and man's relation to History in all historical periods . . .".

Brzezinski has never been slow to commend "the humanistic objectives of Communism" and the "progress" Russia has made in passing from Tsarism ("a jingoistic dictatorship" in his words) to Bolshevism. He has not hesitated on several occasions to shock Western public opinion: for example, by describing the existence of the Berlin Wall as "a positive factor" ("to encourage the Eastern-bloc countries to break away from the U.S.S.R. would not serve the cause of peace", he was saying as early as the end of the '60s), or by declaring, as he did on 22nd May, 1978 before the U.N. special session on disarmament, that "From now on we need no longer fear Communism . . .".

Many of his published works lay bare his underlying thinking, but there is one of them which in itself sums up the long-term objectives of the Trilateral. This is *The Technetronic Revolution*, published in New York in 1971.

The ideal set out here is that of world political unification through the joint influence of technology and electronics (hence his invention of the term "technetronic") seen as the main foundation underpinning a gigantic market, together with the establishment of "organised blocks" ("technomorphised", in Trilateral jargon) within which ideological differences will progressively lose all significance in a stable world-wide system.

"The technetronic revolution", explains Mr Brzezinski, "is based on the rise of a new class of specialists and the appearance of a truly intellectual technology . . .". There has been no better definition of the power of the technocrats.

Convinced, like all technocrats, that a "pure social science" will sooner or later take the place of "sterile" national egoism, Brzezinski is in favour of "limiting the sovereignty of states" and replacing this by supernational institutions, these last being seen as free of "emotional bias". As a corollary to this he sees the risk of war disappearing as the economic systems become more closely integrated, and he is convinced that the U.S.S.R. is no longer expansionist and had given up any ambition of exporting the revolution onto the international plane.

"The entry of French or Italian Communists into coalition governments is less of a danger to democracy than is sometimes claimed" stated the fifth official report of the Trilateral in 1978.

Behind this broadly optimistic view of the relationship of

forces lies a tradition in favour of World Government that had grown up at the beginning of this century among banking circles on the American East coast, circles who saw it as their function to "widen the bounds of rationality, and not to earn money", as M. Jacques Attali expressed it in his justificatory biography of the British businessman Sir Sigmund Warburg, heir to the bank of the same name.

The founder of this tradition had been the Englishman Cecil Rhodes (1853-1902), a coloniser of genius and first formulator of the doctrine of a universal "pax britannica" based on commerce. Inspired by the ideas on political economy of his fellow-countryman John Ruskin (1819-1900), the theoretician of what the inter-war years were to call "the Synarchy", Rhodes was responsible for the foundation of a "trans-national pressure group" unique of its kind, the "Pilgrims' Society", named after the English puritan settlers who arrived in America on board the *Mayflower* on 20th November, 1620.

Inaugurated in London in 1902 and in New York in 1903, the "Pilgrims' Society" immediately became the "think-tank" of the American "Eastern establishment", a hundred families, either "W.A.S.P." (i.e. White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) or Jewish, in alliance with the "opinion-formers" of the liberal Left.

Their first success was the creation in 1913 of the Federal Reserve Board, which removed all control over the issue of money from Congress and the American Government, and internationalised the credit system; this coup was planned in total secrecy by the G.H.Q. of the "Pilgrims" at a meeting held on Jekyll Island. Two other projects were discussed at that meeting: the setting-up of a World Parliament (which took shape as the League of Nations after the First World War), and the dismantling of the colonial empires (a principle taken up by the United Nations after 1945).

The greatest banker of the period, John Pierpoint Morgan, was present at the meeting. He was a disciple of Rhodes, and he saw the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 as the first sign of an economic and social upheaval which could lead to the creation of a world-wide political system.

His disciple Nicholas M. Butler was to admit, 20 years later, at a lunch organised in New York by the "Pilgrims' Society" that "Communism is a means that leads to the establishment of a world government, a world police and a world currency".

If we are to believe the *Washington Post* of 2nd February, 1918, the Morgan bank paid out nearly a million dollars to Lenin's supporters during that year. Moreover, two other banks were particularly instrumental in helping the new Soviet regime to establish itself, those of Warburg and Kuhn Loeb. Of the three Warburg brothers, German Jews, two, Paul and Felix Warburg, had become naturalised Americans in 1902, and were now pillars of Wall Street. Their brother Max, who had stayed in Germany, continued to support the war-effort of the Second Reich. It was through him that most of the financial aid for the Revolution was channelled.

Jakob Schiff, who controlled the Kuhn Loeb bank, was to become the official financier of Lenin and Trotsky. In February 1917 the latter was repatriated from America to Russia through the good offices of Charles Crane, the all powerful chairman of the Democratic Party's financial commission. A close associate of President Wilson, whose "Fourteen Points" he inspired, Crane is the man who, even before the final victory of the Bolsheviks, was paving the

An Agency of Centralisation (Continued from page 7)

way for the entry into the Russian market of the biggest American companies, in particular Ford and Westinghouse.

Three names still sum up for us the political trend worked out by the "Pilgrims' Society", those of Hammer, Ford and Rockefeller.

Armand Hammer, 88 years old this year,³ is a "Soviet-made man". A personal friend of Lenin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev (the latter boasted that he had learned to write with Hammer fountain-pens), he held the exclusive monopoly of trade with the Soviet Union until 1924. Lenin, who was fond of repeating that "he would get the capitalists to sell him the rope he would use to hang them with", confided in 1921 to this notable ally: "If the capitalist countries see a chance of making money out of us, they will compete against each other for the best price. Thus Soviet power will be secured while the West is divided. . . ."

A few days earlier Hammer had acquired the rights of the asbestos mine at Alapaievsk, in the Urals, in the area where, three years earlier, Nicholas II and the imperial family had been executed (it was Hammer who handled the sale of their jewellery, and thus provided the nascent Soviet state with its first source of foreign currency).

An indefatigable devotee of and propagandist for the Soviet regime, it was Hammer who, in 1921, persuaded Henry Ford to take an interest in the reconstruction of Russia. From 1922 to 1927, Ford, the leading figure in world capitalism, sold 27,000 tractors to the U.S.S.R. In 1971 his son, Henry Ford II, was to build the giant Kama works, whose lorries are today scouring the roads of Afghanistan. As for the Rockefeller family, it has been instrumental in transforming the Iron Curtain into a transparent plate-glass window through its Chase Manhattan Bank (whose Moscow branch is located today in Karl Marx Square).

John D. Rockefeller, founder of "Standard Oil" and his son John II (nicknamed "The Distributor") sponsored the inception in 1920 of a specialised offshoot of the "Pilgrims", the Council for Foreign Relations (C.F.R.), with Paul Warburg as its director, which has influenced United States foreign policy for many years. Its present chairman is David Rockefeller, 70 years old, the son of John II and Abby Aldrich, heiress to the bank of the same name.

With its headquarters in a luxurious Park Avenue building in New York, the C.F.R., with 1,400 members today, has always considered itself free from party-political allegiance. Thus its representative figures in the 1930s were Averell Harriman, the railroad millionaire, but also Harry Hopkins, special adviser and later Secretary of State to President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was on the advice of these two that Roosevelt recognised the U.S.S.R. in 1933, and negotiated the Yalta agreement in 1945. His unsuccessful opponent in the 1940 presidential election, Wendell Wilkie, whose manifesto "One World" pre-dated by 13 years the inception of the United Nations, was also a member of the C.F.R.

"We shall have world government" Paul Warburg testified to the U.S. Senate on 17th February, 1950, "whether or not you like it — by conquest or consent".

³ An article in *The New American* of 16th December, 1985 quotes a *Miami Herald* columnist as saying about Hammer that "the 87-year-old oil tycoon may be the only capitalist in the world who gets friendlier treatment in Moscow than in Palm Beach". Cf. also "The Prince and the Un-Pauper" supplement to *Approaches* No. 92 (H.F.).

Less than four years later, in the middle of the Cold War, the C.F.R. decided to open its membership to the non-Anglo-Saxon Europeans organised in the so-called Bilderberg group (from the name of the hotel in the small Dutch town of Oosterbeek where it held its first meeting). Each year since 1954 its members have met in a different venue: at Megève in 1974, for example, and at Montebello in Canada in 1985. One-hundred-and-ten persons, including Raymond Barre, attended this last meeting. It attracted little publicity, but was conducted under strict security measures.⁴

The "Bilderberg group" was initiated in Europe by Joseph Retinger, a shadowy figure of whom little is known except that he was the real power behind the Polish general Sikorski (exiled to England, killed in 1943) and after the war became the confidential agent of Jean Monnet.

The latter, nicknamed "The Inspirer" by General de Gaulle, and "Father of Europe" by his admirers, had by then reached the summit of a most active career. Michel Debré, his unremitting opponent during the 1950s, remembers Monnet as being behind all the projects designed (as Debré saw it) "to destroy the character of France", and in particular the European Defence Community (E.D.C.).

Jean Monnet (who had not even passed his school-leaving certificate) was sent in 1908, at the age of 20, to represent his father's brandy-exporting business in Canada. Within the year his contacts with the banking establishment of the American eastern seaboard had won him an important post with the New York bank of Lazard, and he soon achieved status as an international financier of the first rank. His organisation of the Allied War Transport Pool in 1917-18 was notably effective. He helped his friend Paul Warburg set up the "Council for Foreign Relations", and in 1923 became assistant secretary-general of the League of Nations. As a strong advocate of better understanding with the young Soviet republic (where he was to marry his wife in 1934), between the two wars he became the official economic adviser to several governments: that of Roosevelt (whom he persuaded, in 1938, to supply planes to France, and whom he continued to advise throughout the war), but also those of Chiang Kai Shek in China, of Colonel Beck in Poland and King Carol of Rumania.

Twice, in 1940 and 1943, Monnet was of assistance to de Gaulle (later to be his bitterest opponent) in the latter's rise to power: he put at the general's disposition the apartment of the London manager of Lazard's (in the hope that the Free French leader would back his plan for a union between France and Britain, which Paul Reynaud's government had rejected 24 hours before the armistice); and, in 1943, he ensured (by two votes, his own and that of Maurice Couve de Murville) the exclusion of General Giraud and his replacement by de Gaulle at the head of the "French Committee for National Liberation" (C.F.L.N.) in Algiers.

He was tempted to enter politics at the Liberation, but found greater satisfaction in devoting himself to the construction of a supranational Europe, destined in his view to be one of the constituent regions of a united world (though de Gaulle was to describe his "Europe" sourly as "a Europe dreamed up by geometers and one-world fanatics").

⁴ Britain has been fully represented in the group: among those who attended its 1965 meeting in Italy were James Callaghan, Gladwyn Jebb, Jo Grimond, Denis Healey, Douglas Jay, Harold Wilson (and as many more). Garret Fitzgerald, Taoiseach of Eire, is also a Bilderberger.

(To be continued.)



Bloomfield Books

Principal: D. A. Martin

26 Meadow Lane
SUDBURY
Suffolk
ENGLAND CO10 6TD

Telephone:
National: SUDBURY (0787) 76374
International: + 44 787 76374

Your ref:

Our ref: BB/TSC

The following books, mentioned in the text of 'THE SOCIAL CREDITER' Vol.66 No.5 September-October, 1987, are all included on the book list of Bloomfield Books. They are available and may be ordered as indicated below.

Please supply:

- ... copies "Social Credit" by C.H. Douglas p/b @ £4.00 £
- ... copies "The Brief for the Prosecution"
by C.H. Douglas p/b @ £2.50 £
- ... copies "Tragedy and Hope" by Carroll Quigley H/B @ £30.00
N.B. This title is temporarily out of stock.
If required, please order but send no
money. We will advise when the new stock
becomes available and payment may be made
then.
- ... copies "Truth Out of Africa" by Ivor Benson p/b @ £3.50 £
- ... copies "Trilaterals over Washington" by Antony C. Sutton
Volume 1* p/b @ £4.75 £
- ... copies Volume 2* p/b @ £4.75 £
- ... copies "Ninety-Eighty-Four" by George Orwell p/b @ £2.00 £

ENCLOSED is remittance for £

NAME: Mr./Mrs./Miss/Title

ADDRESS:

.....
.....

A copy of the full price list may be sent if requested.
Please indicate if this is required.

* Limited stock only of these two volumes of
"Trilaterals over Washington" as they
are now out of print and virtually
unobtainable.